

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 16 March, 1982

Time — 2:00 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER** by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. D. James Walding (St. Vital):** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

## PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

**MR. JERRY T. STORIE (Flin Flon):** Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for The Pas that the report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before we reach Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have two school groups. There are 25 students of Grade 11 standing from the Miles MacDonnell Collegiate, under the direction of Miss Lindsay. The school is located in the constituency of the Minister of Finance.

There are a group of students of Grade 12 standing from the River East Collegiate, under the direction of Mrs. Redekop. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for River East.

On behalf of all the members, I bid you welcome this afternoon.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. BRIAN RANSOM (Turtle Mountain):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy and Mines.

Reports arising from the meeting of Ministers involved in the negotiation of the Western Power Grid indicate that negotiations are somewhat ahead of where they were a year ago, which is not in itself especially good news.

I wonder if the Minister could advise the House if, in fact, negotiations are as far advanced as they were last October when the three western Ministers unanimously recommended an interim agreement to their respective governments.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

**HON. WILSON PARASIUK (Transcona):** Mr. Speaker, last October, three Ministers agreed to a fairly loosely worded interim agreement whereby they would try and reach a final agreement in two years. That agreement was never taken forward to any of the respective Cabinets by any members of the three provinces' negotiating committee and that agreement was quite loose. We reviewed it, Mr. Speaker; we found that it required some modification in order to protect Manitoba's interests. We have put forward proposals for those modifications. The Alberta Government said that those modifications, or requests for modifications, weren't unexpected.

So, Mr. Speaker, what we are trying to do is ensure a long-term agreement for Manitoba which would protect Manitoba's interests and provide for a fair development, a fair sharing of the benefits from that development to all parties.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could advise the House the nature of the modifications which have been recommended.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, the three Ministers agreed that, while we are pursuing these negotiations, that it wouldn't be a good idea to debate these in public and, frankly, Mr. Speaker — I hear some groans from people on the other side of the House — all we are doing, Mr. Speaker, is following the course of action that the previous government took and pursuing these negotiations with the other two governments. We are trying to pursue these negotiations in good faith, Mr. Speaker.

We hope to, indeed, reach a successful achievement of those negotiations despite some attempts by members on the other side, it would appear, Mr. Speaker, to somehow sabotage those negotiations.

It is not the purpose of the New Democratic Party Government, Mr. Speaker, to sabotage those negotiations. But, indeed, Mr. Speaker, it is the intent of this government to safeguard the interests of Manitoba in a way that wasn't done by the previous government.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, it's interesting that the Minister is going to safeguard the interests of the people of Manitoba by keeping the information secret. Perhaps the Minister could advise the House when he expects an agreement might be concluded.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, I might comment that I'm trying to keep an informal understanding operating between the three Ministers involved in the negotiations, with respect to the way in which the negotiations will be conducted.

It is our hope, Mr. Speaker, that we can pursue, as expeditiously as possible, the development of the interim agreement. But, it is understood that the development of the final agreement is a very complicated process that may, indeed, take up to two years to accomplish.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G.W.J. (Gerry) MERCIER (St. Norbert):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. Mr. Speaker, in view of the announcement yesterday by the Minister of Education that as the effect of raising school taxes in the Winnipeg School Division by some \$28 on an average assessed home, and in view of recent announcements by the School Board in the City of Winnipeg, all of which result in an increase of well over \$200 for the owner of an average home for total property taxes this year, would the First Minister now admit that he misled the public of Manitoba when he guaranteed, in his election document, that the NDP Party would ease the property tax burden?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, we'll have a great deal of opportunity to discuss in full this question during the Budget. But I want to point out to the Honourable Member for St. Norbert that this government is, indeed, undertaking a great deal of payment, by way of grants and programs to municipalities and school divisions, during a period of time, Mr. Speaker, when, indeed, this government could, because of the deficit situation that we have inherited because of the cutbacks re fiscal transfer payments, we could very neatly and very easily take the course of action that the previous government had taken in 1977 and 1978 and say, no increase, restraint. That's not our approach, that is not our direction and, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to advise you that the municipalities and school divisions, indeed, understand the difficulties that this government is working under in very very difficult financial and economic times in Manitoba.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that an average homeowner in the City of Winnipeg can anticipate no financial relief from this government this year, Mr. Speaker, can the First Minister advise what they are prepared to do for senior citizens who, in fact, over the four-year period of our administration, paid less taxes in 1981 than they did in 1977?

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I fail to understand the statement of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert because it was only two or three weeks ago that the Minister Responsible for Urban Affairs announced a grant in this House to the City of Winnipeg. A grant, in fact, which exceeded any previous grant to the City of Winnipeg from the Province of Manitoba and a grant, Mr. Speaker, that went some distance - not as much as we would like, because we are dealing as I mentioned in very difficult times - but did do something to make up for three years of stingy treatment on the part of the previous government in respect to its fiscal relationship to municipalities.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside):** Mr. Speaker, a further question to the First Minister. Now having found out that the homeowners face the additional taxation burden, can he tell the House why it is that among the first decisions this Cabinet did was to reduce the

provincial share of flood protection cost to Red River Valley municipalities by 5 percent and, indeed, blackmail those communities into suggesting that the only way they can get that flood protection is for them to come up with \$300,000 - \$400,000, or 10 percent? That is in keeping, I suppose, with the promise to reduce the burden of taxation on municipalities.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. AL MACKLING (St. James):** Mr. Speaker, subsequent to the questions put last night in the Committee on this question, I have had an opportunity to look at the departmental files, and it would appear that recommendation from staff went to the former Minister —(Interjection)— Well, the former Minister was the author of the last question, Mr. Speaker. And it is clear that the recommendation from staff was that the arrangement that has been offered to the municipalities be proceeded with, and that staff have indicated this proposal should be communicated to the towns affected. But apparently a decision was made that communication would not occur and that the matter would be left with the government and they did nothing about it.

**MR. ENNS:** Some time ago we heard from the Attorney-General how he had to cut millions of dollars out of the Estimate procedure because of the staff suggestions. I ask the Honourable Minister of Resources, or any member of the Treasury Bench, was there or do their search of records indicate any reaction on the part of the previous administration to that staff recommendation? Indeed there was none; we rejected it.

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, a question was asked and an answer will be given. The file indicates that staff recommended that communication go to those communities, and that government directed that there be no communication, the matter would be dealt with Cabinet; and there was no dealing with this question in Cabinet until we came into office.

**MR. ENNS:** I ask a final supplementary question to the Honourable Minister. Obviously they are spending a great deal of time in researching the records — as they should. Mr. Speaker, I ask them, is there any recorded Cabinet decision with respect to that question? There is none. I ask them a further question. That Cabinet met early in February, I believe, and made the decision to accept the staff recommendation; that's the difference. They are run by their bureaucrats.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, I gather that was a question and I will respond to it. There is no question but this government will look to staff for advice and direction but we are not slavishly bound by it. But when problems are brought to our attention we will not duck them, we will deal with them. As I indicated in Committee last night this government is prepared to meet with those officials and I've instructed that the

representatives from those communities meet with me as soon as possible and we'll review those arrangements; and if it's possible we will consider ameliorating the severity of any increase in their budget problems, but we will deal with problems, we won't duck them.

**MR. ENNS:** One question I direct to the First Minister. Will the First Minister confirm that his Cabinet, meeting in Session, dealt with this matter, made the decision to reduce the provincial support for flood protection works in the valley community diking system by 5 percent, and instructed the Minister of Natural Resources to indicate to the communities involved that they would have to pick up 10 percent of the cost? Will he confirm that such a decision was made by the New Democratic Party Cabinet, I believe, in February?

Mr. Speaker, I direct that question to the Honourable First Minister because I do not believe the Minister of Resources was in Cabinet at that time. I do not want to be unfair to the Minister of Natural Resources but it is his Cabinet colleagues that made that decision, to charged this impost on the municipalities.

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, the answers were given in Committee last night. The request came from staff and certainly the correspondence went out and the municipal people involved have received a letter to the effect as to what the arrangements are. Yes, the government did make a decision in respect to it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Morris.

**MR. CLAYTON MANNESS (Morris):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a question to the First Minister. I am wondering if he could confirm that the increase in property tax on a section of land within the RM of Macdonald, due to increased education levy, the increase in property tax, will total \$250.00.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that question as notice, I would have thought that the honourable member might have been wiser to have given me some notice of a detailed question such as that prior to entry into the House.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Health and I would ask him whether funding has been withdrawn from a Diabetic Education Service Program that was in place under Dr. John Moorehouse at the Health Sciences Centre?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**HON. LAURENT L DESJARDINS (St. Boniface):** Mr. Speaker, I will have to get the information for the honourable member.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. DONALD ORCHARD (Pembina):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Natural Resources. Was he aware, Mr. Speaker, of the letter that went out March 4th requesting, from municipalities and towns in the Red River Valley, a 10 percent forced participation in the diking and flood protection of those communities; was he aware that letter went out?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, this question was asked of me in Estimates last night and, as matter of fact, both the Honourable Member for Pembina, the Honourable Member for Lakeside, the Honourable Member for Morris, and others, dealt at length with this question. I have indicated that such a letter apparently went out; I was not aware of it, but I am not ashamed of it. We will deal with those communities if they have a problem, but we will act to protect people from flooding. I also indicated that I thought it was important that government treat all people in Manitoba fairly, and that some communities have been offered flood protection providing that they pay 15 percent of the cost by the previous administration, and we thought that everybody should be dealt with fairly.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In that request for equity that the Minister of Natural Resources has identified, he is now charging residents of the Red River Valley a cost they never had to bear traditionally and that is what we object to, Mr. Speaker.

The question to the First Minister, Mr. Speaker, is did the Cabinet make the decision that resulted in the letter going out to those communities in the Red River Valley?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I would draw to your attention that the Minister of Natural Resources has been asked that question and answered that question previously.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Natural Resources said he was unaware of that letter going out, and I would like to know who made the decision for that letter to go out. Was it Cabinet or was it internal staff?

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

**HON. ROLAND PENNER (Fort Rouge):** Mr. Speaker, it is well known and ought to be known to the members opposite and, at least, the member who previously spoke ought to give us that courtesy of his understanding, if he has any, that the Estimates that are tabled are tabled as the collective decision of Executive Council. If he doesn't know that, then he ought to know it. And to raise the question in the way he has seems to me a breach of, at least, the ethics of this House if no other breach, certainly a breach of the intelligence of this House.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

**MR. RANSOM:** On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Pembina was simply trying to confirm the nature of a policy decision. A policy decision had been made by the government — at some level within the government — and the Member for Pembina was simply asking a straightforward question whether or not that was a decision made at the ministerial level or one made by the bureaucrats. It seems, Mr. Speaker, that is a very legitimate question to place before the House.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Surely the Honourable Member for Pembina, having been a member of the Treasury Bench at one time, is conversant with normal methods of asking questions and the answering thereof. He is entitled to put his question to whichever Cabinet Minister he wishes but he may not dictate who answers the question. I believe it's also an accepted fact that the present Minister of a department answers questions for that department whether or not he was a Minister at the time the matter inquired into took place. May we possibly continue? I think the Member for Pembina has had three questions.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, can the First Minister confirm that his government has undertaken a new policy direction in regards to flood protection in the provision of permanent flood protection in the Red River Valley by charging those municipalities and towns 10 percent of the capital cost?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I point out to you that the Member for Pembina seems to be having some difficulty because I believe this is the third time that the Member for Pembina has asked the same question to the Treasury Benches. I think it was very very clear and very clearly put by the Attorney-General that the Estimates as are tabled in this House are the result of collective decision-making by the political people that govern the Province of Manitoba, not by bureaucrats, but political people that govern in the Province of Manitoba.

I would have thought that the member would clearly understand that, having been a previous member of the previous government's Treasury Bench, Mr. Speaker, and I find it somewhat disturbing to think that for three years the honourable member would have so sat and would not have realized that indeed Estimates are the responsibility of the government, the political people, not the bureaucrats.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**HON. JAY COWAN (Churchill):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Member for Niakwa asked me a question concerning the Odor Control Program in the St. Boniface area. I indicated to him that I would respond to him with more details as soon as that detail became available. I'd like to at this juncture inform the

Member for Niakwa that my staff have informed me that there are a number of industries in the St. Boniface area which do in fact generate odor emissions. They are operating under orders of the Clean Environment Commission. They are the Canadian Gypsum Co. Ltd., Frank Fair Industries, Interprovincial Cooperatives Ltd., Burns Foods Ltd., Custom Abattoir, East-West Packers, J.M. Schneider or O.K. Packers, Midwest Byproducts Co. Ltd., Shell Oil Co., A.J. Pet Foods Ltd. or Dabco, Canadian Packers Ltd., Manitoba Hog Marketing Commission and the Public Markets Ltd.

Now all those with the exception of Shell Oil are operating under orders and operating within the guidelines. There is a hearing of the Clean Environment Commission, which will be held in respect to Shell Oil on March 22, 1982, which is for the purpose of reviewing and renewing their present order.

So I provide that information to the honourable member and tell him as well that the sewer problem, which he commented upon, is a city jurisdiction. I've asked my staff to contact the City of Winnipeg and ask them to contact the member directly so that he can provide them with more detail and they can provide him with an update as to what they are intending to do in regard to any potential problems.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

**MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health. Can the Minister confirm that the victim of the shooting incident at the Montcalm Motor Hotel was first taken by ambulance to the St. Boniface Hospital?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, that's another one that I'll have to take notice of. I have no information of this happening.

**MR. BROWN:** While the Minister is conducting that inquiry I wonder whether he could also at the same time inquire as to whether there was any indication that this patient would have had a good chance of remaining alive if he would have received care sooner because the Victoria Hospital was right next door to the Montcalm Motor Hotel?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, if that information is available, although I don't know how you can determine such a thing, but if it's available I'll also pass it on to the House.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism.

Can the Minister confirm that there are 5,000 less people working in the manufacturing sector at the end of February, 1982, than there was at the end of February, 1981?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

**HON. MURIEL SMITH (Osborne):** Mr. Speaker, I don't have the statistical sheet in front of me, but I am sure that the honourable member afterwards has no doubt secured his information from a statistical sheet from our Department of Statistics. I have no doubt but that the figure is correct.

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Can the Minister also confirm, Mr. Speaker, that there are 6,000 more employed in Manitoba at the end of February, 1982, than there was in February, 1981? These statistics are from the Statistics Canada, Mr. Speaker.

**MRS. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel with those statistics.

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Has the Minister had detailed discussions with the Minister of Energy regarding the programs that are in place or can be put in place to have Manitoba have its employment increased over the next year and a half, which is becoming absolutely crucial?

**MRS. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, there are ongoing discussions with all of the Ministers with the intent of increasing employment. We are also interested though in not only increasing employment but ensuring that the conditions under which employment is increased make for the long-term benefit of people in Manitoba. We're not prepared to pay any price in order to get jobs which may be short run or may be too costly or have too little positive impact on the economy of Manitoba.

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I would like the Minister to inform the House whether she believes that projects that would last at least 25 years in this province and create up to 3,000 jobs are short run and are bad planning.

**MRS. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, if I understood the question correctly you're saying you want an opinion from me as to whether all the jobs that have been created in Manitoba in the past months are short term or — I'm afraid the question was unclear to me — if the member would care to clarify it?

**MR. JOHNSTON:** The Minister suggested in her answer or indicated in her answer that the jobs that the government were going to put in place would be long-term jobs.

I ask the Minister if she believes that the large projects that could be put in place in the very near future that would last for 25 years creating upwards to 3,000 jobs is short-term? Does she not believe that 25 years of employment or jobs for Manitoba is not a good situation?

**MRS. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, my intent was that to get the best value for public dollars expended, we're looking for the maximum number and quality of jobs and spin-off effect in the Province of Manitoba.

Some of the mega project type jobs would be a

large bulge in the construction period of an operation, but there might not be as much benefit in the longer term, or you may only have jobs which deal with an initial part of an industrial process and not have more processing manufacturing components to them.

We felt that it was in the best interest in spending public monies to ensure that we get the most benefit in return; and that will continue to be our intention.

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, does the Minister not believe that the potash industry in Saskatchewan has created jobs for many years? Does she not believe that the forest industry has created jobs for many years? Does she not believe that a \$700 million refinery would create jobs for many many years?

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

**MR. PENNER:** Yes, on page 132 of *Beauchesne* — the honourable member can refer to it — "It must be a question, not an expression of opinion, representation, argumentation or debate," and that's exactly what we have. It's not a question. It's a purely rhetorical flourish. The question was answered and I don't think that a supplementary encompasses this kind of rhetorical posturing.

**MR. JOHNSTON:** On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Minister kept continually answering my questions with an insinuation that the projects were not such that they would create long-term jobs.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Would the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek care to rephrase his question?

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, does the Minister of Economic Development, or could the Minister of Economic Development confirm to this House that the potash in Saskatchewan has created long-term jobs, that the forest industry has created long-term jobs and that the \$700 million refinery would create long-term jobs which would create at least 25 to 30 years construction on the Nelson, which is long-term jobs? Can she confirm that those are jobs that are worthwhile for the Province of Manitoba?

**MRS. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, when we are looking at the creation of jobs, we're trying to look at the total situation. Jobs that are created with a large amount of profit to a company which then allows all the profit to leave the province and not get reinvested is not automatically a good investment. Jobs that are created and which require a low price for a Manitoba resource are not necessarily in balance a good deal for the Province of Manitoba.

If we can get jobs, plus profits, plus some spin-off benefits, then we will have a package that truly makes sense.

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Can the Minister confirm that companies pay taxes and that people pay taxes which does benefit the province and makes the money for the education expenses that are brought forward?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

**MR. ABE KOVNATS (Niakwa):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Education.

Has the Honourable Minister of Education been contacted by either the St. Boniface School Board or the group of interested parents about the elimination of the only total English junior high school in the Windsor Park area?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Education.

**HON. MAUREEN HEMPHILL (Logan):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have been contacted by parents related to the issue in that school division and by parents related to the same issue in other school divisions.

**MR. KOVNATS:** To the Honourable Minister, a supplementary question. I'm not trying to catch the Honourable Minister, we've got a touchy situation and we're trying to correct it. Would the Honourable Minister work towards obliging these group of parents to see that an English language junior high school is maintained in the Windsor Park area?

**MRS. HEMPHILL:** The Member for Niakwa is raising an issue and a concern that is a very emotional issue and it is one of great concern to parents, to teachers, to school trustees and to people in this House.

I've been speaking a great deal outside of this House on the issue and I'm pleased to have an opportunity to say a few words on this issue inside this House.

The Public Schools Act, under Section 119, clearly gives school divisions the right to decide on school closure. I have no intention of interfering with that right that exists in the legislation now or of changing the legislation as it exists. And I have been saying that clearly: "You must make the decisions; you have the responsibility."

But, I have been saying something else and communicating it loud and clear, I hope, and that is, that this is not a local issue facing us of a school division or a school. It is a provincial issue and it is a provincial issue because we are being hit with three forces at the same time: declining enrolment, size of schools and expansion of bilingual programs. It is the combination of these three issues that is causing the terribly difficult decisions that we're faced with today.

I believe that my department and this government must provide both leadership and support in this critical issue and not leave it totally up to school divisions to get through. I want to describe a bit to you, although there'll be a detailed announcement in a few weeks, what approach we are taking.

(1) We are going to give support to schools that are declining in enrolments, that are becoming small schools. We're going to give them additional financial support. But, I don't think that that is the most important thing that is going to happen. While I am not going to make the decisions or tell them what they have to do, we are going to talk about the process that must be undertaken to make the decisions.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Does the Honourable Member for Virden have a point of order?

**MR. HARRY GRAHAM (Virden):** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I believe that answers are supposed to be short. We should not have to listen to a 20-minute speech in a question period.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I hope that the Honourable Minister of Education has almost finished.

**MRS. HEMPHILL:** Yes, I have two more points to make. I think that it's all related. The honourable member was asking me what I intended to do to help the parents and I am indicating what I intend to do to help the parents.

Apart from giving financial support to the schools, I'm going to bring out policies that affect the procedures that will be undertaken prior to decisions being made about school closures.

(1) We are going to communicate criteria, other than just quality of education and educational costs, and that criteria will relate to stability of neighbourhood. There are more things that are important here and more costs than just school programs.

(2) Specifically to the question from the Honourable Member for Niakwa, we will be developing a procedure for the involvement of parents and the involvement of community in the decisions where we say that what the professionals and the educators say is important, but also it is important to take the values and the attitudes and the feelings of the parents in the community when you make the decision.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. In view of the fact that financing arrangements with the Federal Government will be terminated at the end of this month, I wonder if the First Minister could advise the House whether he expects that new arrangements will be in place before the end of March.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**HON. VIC SCHROEDER (Rossmere):** Mr. Speaker, it is probably unlikely that there will be a new Act passed by Parliament before the end of March, 1982; nevertheless, hopefully Parliament will be back in Session soon and they will be dealing with their preliminary Estimates, as we will be in this House. It is our view that once those Estimates are passed that the Federal Government certainly will have the authority to continue on with its spending based on those preliminary Estimates in view of the fact that there will be another Act passed as there has been a number of times in the past when the five-year agreement ends. It is a position that we believe is well founded in that.

I don't believe that these Acts are always passed before the end of March in the year when the agreements expire. I should also point out that we're dealing here with a situation that is somewhat different from ordinary legislation in that there is a fall-back of having a provision in our Constitution that says that in this country there will be an equalization scheme. So we have that provision operating above what an individual statute might be saying.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, can the Minister advise the House whether he has received replies to the two letters that he sent to the Minister of Finance federally asking that the decisions with respect to EPF and Equalization be delayed?

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Speaker, I haven't received written replies, I have spoken with Mr. MacEachen.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would be kind enough to advise the House as to the nature of the reply.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, the reply as was fairly obvious a couple of weeks ago was that he wanted to go ahead with the initiation of certain legislation, the total effect of which I, quite frankly, do not yet know because it is legislation that hasn't been provided to the provinces ahead of time and I suppose that it's seldom that legislation is provided to individuals or other governments before it is presented in Parliament or in this Chamber.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the Minister if we could conclude then that it is his feeling that the Federal Government has made an irrevocable decision?

**MR. SCHROEDER:** I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Government has made a decision to introduce a proposal which will substantially put Manitoba at a disadvantage as compared to where we would have been had we had the old fiscal arrangements continued for a further five years.

It is also my belief that the proposal which is being put forward by Mr. MacEachen is considerably better than what we would have had, had the proposals originally put forth by Mr. MacEachen on November 12th when my honourable friends were still in government, had those proposals been introduced.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, does this mean the government is prepared to accept these kinds of cuts that are being made by the Federal Government in the established programs financing arrangements and in the equalization formula? Is the government prepared to accept those kinds of cuts without so much as a whimper?

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Speaker, my telexes and letters to Mr. MacEachen have been public for some time. I would leave it to the public to decide whether those documents, which very very clearly spell out our disagreement with the initial federal proposal and with the subsequent federal proposal, I will leave it to the public to decide whether there has been no cry of outrage from this province, because there has been. Mr. Speaker, we have shown, I believe, the people of this province that what is happening is an unjust off-loading of the federal deficit on to the provinces, I have said that in the past and I will say that again. I have said in the past that I believe that we must continue on and strengthen principle of equalization and the principle that there should be a fair type of sharing of national revenue for post-secondary education and health care, and that those areas should not be cut

back and the have-not provinces shouldn't be the ones to suffer most.

At the same time, when I look at the group on the other side who were completely silent, Mr. Speaker, when the Tory Government — the Joe Clark Government — cut them back on transfer payments, never even told us about it. When I look at that group that for years was complaining about the federal deficit, which the Feds are now cutting back by cutting us, I say they have not moved anywhere and had they been in government, Manitoba, I suggest, would have lost far more money and would not have regained the transitional payments from Ottawa that this government by hard reasonable bargaining has regained for this province.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Morris.

**MR. MANNES:** Mr. Speaker, I would like ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture. How many appeals has the Manitoba Marketing Council held over the past couple of weeks in respect to matters relating to the very serious pricing disputes within the industrial milk sector?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. BILL URUSKI (Interlake):** Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that question as notice.

**MR. MANNES:** Could the Minister tell us when Council's decision will be handed down on the appeals in question?

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I would expect that the member is not requesting that I interfere in the process at all. I don't know at this point in time, Mr. Speaker, but I'll certainly check.

**MR. MANNES:** Well, I submit, Mr. Speaker, when people have been thrown out of work and the whole industrial milk sector is in jeopardy that the Minister would apprise himself of the situation and know these facts. I don't know either but I would hope that maybe tomorrow he could report.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The time for Oral Questions having expired; Orders of the Day.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with the Orders of the Day just if I might make an announcement to the House concerning next week. As the members of the House know, or most of them, next week marks the opening of the Brandon Winter Fair, I believe on Monday night, and by tradition the House, at least tradition of recent years, the House does not meet on Wednesday to enable those members, and I hope it will be most members of the House who would like to go down to this very very important event in the annual life of the province, to the Brandon Royal Winter Fair.

I have spoken to the House Leader of the Opposition and he's aware of this announcement, and it would be our intention that the House would not meet

next Wednesday, and if that is agreeable, then again in accordance with past practice, the Minister of Agriculture will arrange for a bus to take all of those down who want to go. We'll perhaps draw lots in terms of seating arrangement. Harry Enns and I can sit next to each other and talk philosophy and matters of that kind. At least one of us will talk philosophy and the other will try to understand it. We thought the two Dons could sit together, but all of that can be worked out.

So if that's agreeable to the House, I would ask that the members of the House who would like to go, and I hope most if not all of them do, should make their names known to the Minister of Agriculture, or perhaps to make it easier first to the respective House Leaders and then to the Minister of Agriculture. — (Interjection)— Wednesday, March 31st, thank you very much. I would have been prepared to go to Brandon next week. — (Interjection)— That's right it seems an awfully long time away.

On the Orders of the Day for today, Mr. Speaker, again as previously announced, would you instead of calling the Government Bills I'd ask that you call firstly the Motion on Ways and Means. And accordingly if that's in order I'd like to make that motion.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Ways and Means for raising of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, with the Honourable Member for Flin Flon in the Chair.

### COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS INTERIM SUPPLY

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Jerry T. Storie (Flin Flon):** The resolution before the House is:

BE IT RESOLVED that towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty on account of Certain Expenses of the Public Service for the Fiscal Year ending the 31st day of March 1983, the sum of \$794,236,590, being thirty percent of the total amount to be voted for departments as set forth in the Main Estimates for the Fiscal Year ending the 31st day of March, 1983, laid before the House at the present Session of the Legislature, be granted out of The Consolidated Fund—pass.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

### IN SESSION

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

**MR. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for the Pas, that the report of the committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

**MR. SCHROEDER** introduced Bill No. 14, an Act for Granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the Province for the Fiscal Year ending the 31st day of March, 1983, and to Authorize

Commitments to Expend Additional Money in Subsequent Years (The Interim Appropriation Act 1982).

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance, 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 to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, with the Honourable Member for Flin Flon in the Chair for the Department of Community Services and Corrections and the Honourable Member for The Pas in the Chair for the Department of Natural Resources.

### CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

#### SUPPLY — NATURAL RESOURCES

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Harry M. Harapiak (The Pas):** I call the meeting to order. We're on Parks, 5.(a)(1) Salaries — the Member for Lakeside.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I just note that the Salary Item under this appropriation remains identical with the exception of a \$100 rise. Does that reflect, obviously, some reduction in staff or a decision not to fill some vacancies in staff? I'm simply attracted by the fact that the salary figure is virtually identical to the one in the previous year and recognizing inflationary costs it would indicate that some slight change in the staffing of the administration, in this instance, has taken place.

I might include in that general question, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister and his staff, has the position of Parks Director been filled; a position that was carried out with efficiency, I believe, and with dedication by the previous Parks Director — I don't know his name escapes me, wild Irishman, I might remember tomorrow better — but who has gone on to serve in another capacity within the department. At least when I left the department the position of Parks Director, as such, was not filled; although there was a person in place whom I recognize in the acting capacity. So, those two questions on this item, Mr. Chairman, would perhaps start the consideration of this division of the Estimates rolling.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Minister.

**MR. MACKLING:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether I got all of the observations and the questions involved, but the position of the Parks Director has now been filled as of this morning, Mr. Jim Potten has been appointed.

**MR. ENNS:** Pardon?

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Jim Potten, P-O-T-T-E-N.

In respect to the numbers, the dollars in respect to staff, I gather that there are some adjustments in staff



and as they work out there is no increase in the dollars involved.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, perhaps I should, but the name doesn't readily come to mind; can the Honourable Minister give the Committee any further background with respect to the new Parks Director for the Province of Manitoba in the Department of Natural Resources?

**MR. MACKLING:** Apparently, Mr. Chairman, there was a job search, or the job was bulletined, and it was bulletined widespread; and apparently this gentleman comes from Alberta and had been interviewed and is the successful candidate.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I take it there was a competition held for this position? It was advertised in Manitoba as well as, I gather in other parts of the country. My obvious question to the Minister, again appreciating the fact that he has not had the time to acquaint himself with the individual members of the very substantial staff that he is responsible for, but I take it that it was the feeling of the department and of the government that the position could not be filled internally.

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I wasn't part of the evaluation process, but I gather that this was as I've indicated a job-candidate search that was extensive and that the gentleman involved, Mr. Potten, had worked in Manitoba before and he has been an Assistant Deputy Minister of Alberta Parks, so he has experience.

**MR. ENNS:** Just one final question on that matter, Mr. Chairman. You indicated, Mr. Minister, that the decision was made, I believe you said this morning or today or yesterday. Could the Minister indicate when Mr. Potten will be resuming his duties as such, and I gather replacing the role that had been carried out by the person to his left, Mr. Wong, who's been, I take it, acting in that capacity in these last months?

**MR. MACKLING:** I understand, Mr. Chairman, that he'll be resuming his duties, Mr. Potten that is, on May 1st.

**MR. ENNS:** Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 5.(a)(1)—pass; 5.(a)(2)—pass; 5.(b)(2) — the Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Minister could inform us when examining the carrying capacity of either development of cottage lots or development of campsites, what type of a methodology the department is using to determine the carrying capacity of a body of water.

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, short of having the criteria before me which I do not have, I'm sure that the department evaluates the size of the lake or the stream that's proposed for development, and determines its capacity to handle human participation and

the probable environmental impact of human beings and their various accessories, boats and other equipment used by cottage-users on a lake, determine the likelihood of leaching of wastes into the lake, the type of shoreline the lake has; a great many factors I am certain would influence the decision, but certainly the magnitude of the water body would be, I suppose, the most important criteria involved. So that if you had an extremely large lake, of course, its capacity to regenerate and to diffuse and dissipate waste material that might otherwise come into it from the participation of residents around the lake is that much greater than a small lake, and obviously there has to be a certain amount of scientific guesswork in respect to this, but I'm sure that there is a fairly extensive body of criteria that the department follows that I have not had anything to do with yet, so whatever criteria has been followed for some years likely has been continued unchanged.

**MR. BANMAN:** Is part of the basis for determining the carrying capacity of any body of water, is a system such as a lake alert method used? Does that form part of the criteria?

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I'm not familiar with the term and the honourable member who was the former Minister of this department may be more familiar with that than me, but I advise my department that whatever that term means, yes, it is one of the determinants.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, on another matter, I just want to make a few brief comments about some things with regards to parks planning that have upset me over the years, and maybe it's something that I have had a difficulty with, but I believe a lot of Manitobans have and that was the period of time where we got into a situation where we were developing campsites and cottage subdivisions about a mile or half-a-mile away from a body of water. Such areas as the Shellmouth where we had a campsite developed so far away from the water that it makes it almost impossible for people to walk down to the water. I guess what I'm saying to the Minister and hope that he will take this to heart when he's looking at new plans; I think the majority of people in Manitoba whether they be Manitobans or people travelling from other countries go out to our streams, go out to our lakes and would like to be as close to the water as possible. In other words, I don't think there's any aesthetic value to putting a campground up somewhere away in the bush and having people tramp a mile to that particular site. So I'd ask the Minister when he is looking at maybe extension of existing campsites and things like that, that he has a look at the possibility of bringing those sites as close to the water as possible.

I realize there are considerations that have to be taken into question when you're looking at that; you have to look at shoreline erosion and all kinds of things. But after all, we advertise on our tourism brochures and everything, "Come out and hear the cry of loon." If they stick you a mile back from the water, you can't hear the cry of any loon. I think that if you look at some of the developments up at Baker's Narrows, for instance, where you built those cottages and you built

them on a beautiful peninsula, but they stuck them in about 200 yards from the water and still used up that whole peninsula. If those cottages could overlook the water at one point, I think you'd have a much more successful type of endeavour in trying to rent them or even trying to dispose of them than sticking them somewhere way back in the bush.

As I said at the outset, that's always been a sort of sore point with me. I think that we have such a wonderful natural heritage here in Manitoba and when people get out and want to be close to the water, they want to enjoy that scenery that goes with that and the other amenities and I don't think that we should be sticking campsites in a long way from a body of water so that people have to almost get into their car and you have to provide another parking place for them down there so that they have to take the car down there.

So, having said that under Planning, Mr. Speaker, I have got that off my chest. I hope the Minister will take that to heart.

**MR. MACKLING:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I certainly would share with the honourable member a concern that the planning take into consideration the best use of the topography. However, I would assume that in some instances where we have a raised level back from the lake, even though cottages may be situated some hundreds of feet or even yards back from the lakeshore, if it is on a raised slope the scenic view and the aesthetics can be just as desirable.

I know that, for example, in places like Winnipeg Beach, Grand Beach, people enjoy the lakeside and the country air despite the fact they may live in cottages far removed from the water, but they are able to get to the water and get to public beaches and the amenities in the area. The cost of developing all shoreline properties would be prohibitive. We have to make sound use of the area. I am given to understand that there were 375 cottage lots established in 1981, of which 155 were taken, and 224 remain available for development, a significant number not being available. I understand equally that the shoreline lots are the first ones taken up in every instance. So, there is no question about the higher desirability of shoreline cottages, but we cannot accommodate all those who want to live in a park area by providing everyone with shoreline lots. It just couldn't be done.

**MR. BANMAN:** The east end of my riding is rather unique in that I have a community there, Falcon Lake, which is basically a service community. The Natural Gas Pipeline has a fairly large contingency of people that live there year around. I don't know whether I am under the right section, but I think there should be some discussion with regards to the problems of servicing that particular community, and also the direction that parks and the increased number of people involved in the permanent residency in parks is going to create over the next number of years.

I say this to the Minister because I know for a fact, that we want to go ahead, at least I believe it is the intention of any government to provide services for tourists, for people who are going to be using those facilities. In a case like Falcon Lake where you have year-round residents, it becomes very difficult to

maintain their year-round status. In other words, it is the three months of the year, if they are lucky three-and-a-half months of the year in which they have to make their total capital cost pay their mortgages and make their living during that time.

One of the problems that we faced, particularly in Falcon Lake, is the problem of providing facilities to individuals who move in, start up a business. There are no further service lots. I believe there are some lots available for trailers, but if an individual is to come in, open a business, or set up residency there, he or she has no way of getting a lot, no way of building a home unless they are ready to buy an existing facility. This creates some problems for people who move in, and I know I've dealt with some people who have opened a business and then, of course, find it very difficult to find a place to live; even people for instance, from the Pipeline who want to live within that community within the township even, find it virtually impossible to find accommodations.

On the other hand, in order to keep that community going in the winter months a lot of the merchants feel that in order to do that, you're going to have to have a few more permanent residents there so that it pays to provide the services to them as well as to maintain the proper staffing levels for some of the other service facilities. In other words, you've got to have some people to draw on to run these things.

Now, as I said at the outset, it's not an easy problem to solve and I think successive governments have wrestled with this and the problem is, however, growing because there are more and more people taking up permanent residency within that area. And of course the school problems and the taxation problems that are related to that bring in greater difficulty.

I'm wondering if the Minister could tell us if there is any move to make available any more service lots to people who wish to set up permanent residency if they are buying a business, or if they intend to work within that area, or if we will maintain the policy which I guess has existed over the last number of years, that we will not be opening any other facilities in that area?

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, the honourable member has confirmed in his statements the fact that the concerns he comments on are long-standing ones, the problem of a larger number of permanent residents in the park and the problems associated with that. It is my understanding that the problem of permanent residence in the park is one that has been studied in the past, and will continue to be understudied by several departments. There are in the park that the honourable member refers to, Falcon, there are 55 permanent residences there and they do create ancillary problems by virtue of the demands that are made in respect to all other facilities that permanent residents seek including education, the heavier demand for use of sewage systems and so on. We have provided a greater measure of equity in the system by a substantial increase in the cottage-lot fees, having increased them to, I think it's \$260. The lots in Falcon were 160 and they went up \$100, and they are 260. So, there is a considerably greater recovery from the point of view of the Parks Branch in respect to the cost. But there are greater costs associated with permanent residents in the park, there's no question

about it, and it's not a matter that I can indicate is easy at solution.

**MR. BANMAN:** Well, I know the Minister is going to receive all kinds of advice from the current Chairman because he's got a real problem up in The Pas, I believe, which is going to be a pretty sticky one to solve.

The problem I guess in my riding in Falcon is a little different than his because we do not have the people that are moving out to Falcon Lake and then commuting to Winnipeg which is not the case in the Member for The Pas' riding where a lot of people are moving out to the Park, paying the lesser fee and yet using all the facilities, recreation and otherwise, that the Town of The Pas is providing. I know that's a sore point over there and I'm sure the Member for The Pas if he could be sitting where I am right now, would be making those comments because that situation is going to have to be resolved.

But I guess the point I'm trying to make in a nutshell is that to develop a community such as Falcon Lake becomes extremely difficult when you don't provide any new additional building sites for permanent homes, and that's a problem that the community has faced over the last ten years I guess.

I know the department has spent some money on upgrading the sewage facilities out at Falcon, the lagoon has been expanded I understand. I would just at this time urge the Minister and his department to have a look at the possibility of providing some more serviced sites to people who want to come in there, want to set up permanent residency and develop that community to a larger extent because right now they either have to commute from Ontario where they can buy property, or from other areas such as Hadashville or even further away from that. So in order to build up a little community there and provide some of the services that are needed and provide the numbers of people that can do that, I believe that is one of the things that we should be looking at.

I wonder if the Minister could give me a little bit of guidance. In dealing with problems of the different taxation levels within the parks and how concessionaires and that are dealt with. What section would we look at that?

**MR. MACKLING:** Just a minute. That would be under the Visitor Services (e).

**MR. BANMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister can advise us whether or not there have been any changes made in policies with respect to park management?

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, not that I'm aware of.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, could the Minister advise whether any policy changes are contemplated?

**MR. MACKLING:** That's too soon for me to comment on.

**MR. RANSOM:** Perhaps then, Mr. Chairman, the Minister would agree to advise the Committee of his general views with respect to the philosophy of park management?

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I won't elaborate on my views at this time. I think it's obvious that my views are going to reflect the views of government and we will be making policy decisions in respect to park management and usage during the course of the next four years. To engage now in an extensive review of what direction I think the parks should be following, I think, would be a lot of guesswork on my part.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that no policy changes have been made and none are contemplated at the moment and the Minister doesn't wish to go into detail of discussing any and I can understand that, can he assure the Committee that in fact then there will be no policy changes made in the area of park management until we are examining the Estimates a year from now, when the Minister has had some opportunity to become more familiar with the department?

**MR. MACKLING:** No, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. RANSOM:** Well then, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister is aware that there will be policy changes made, I think it would be incumbent upon him then to give us an indication of what those policy changes might be.

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, the honourable member wants to play games. He has elicited answers from me indicating that to date there has been no review by me of policy and I don't know to what extent my colleagues in Cabinet have done so either. These are Estimates prepared, initially at least, under the previous administration. I haven't had sufficient time in the ministry to reflect on any policy directives that I might recommend to my colleagues, but to indicate now that I must review with my honourable colleague what views I have and will develop in the future is something that I just can't accept.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister is very quick to say that I want to play games. I want to assure him that I'm interested in knowing what this government intends to do with respect to the management of the parks that every Manitoban has an interest in, and when the Minister comes before this Committee with his Estimates and is asked a simple question about his views on park-management philosophy, I think that is a question that we should expect to have some answer to. In the absence of an answer, then I want some reasonable assurance that there aren't going to be policy changes made. The Minister won't give that assurance; that's his prerogative to do so. I then would ask him what procedures are being pursued at the moment with respect to planning for provincial parks?

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, in respect to planning for provincial parks, we will develop plans, but we will not implement plans until we have felt that we have had sufficient dialogue with the owners of the

parks in Manitoba and they are the people of Manitoba. We won't take direction from the official Opposition only. We'll take their views into consideration and if the honourable member has some constructive critical advice as to the mistakes of previous park planning then we'll certainly want to hear them, because I'll want to reflect on his views as well as the views of anyone who is interested in the best use for parks. The honourable member certainly must have some strong views and I would like to hear them in respect to the adequacy of our present park planning and what improvements should be made in respect to it.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't want to be accused of playing games. Here we now have the curious situation where the Minister wants to know what my views are with respect to park planning and the management of parks. I should draw to the Minister's attention that he is now the Minister of Natural Resources. When I was the Minister of Natural Resources, I did make my policies known and in fact they were set down in writing and made public and I'm concerned, I'm simply asking questions from the point of view of the people of Manitoba. I'm not here to give my views on it.

I want to know then, is the Minister following the procedures of park planning that were in progress when the New Democratic government took over responsibility for government last October?

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, the only parks planning that I'm aware of that the honourable member refers to that had any public profile was the Whiteshell Master Plan Development, and that certainly is under continuing review and when the subject of that review is at a stage where we're satisfied then again that public articulation of the planning is warranted, that will proceed.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, the Whiteshell was indeed the first plan that was being prepared, but that was only the first of a series that were intended to be done for each park and indeed there were others that were under way. There was planning being done specifically for the Turtle Mountain Park, for instance. What I'm asking about is the procedure that was being followed with respect to the development of these plans; is that procedure still being followed? Does the Minister intend to follow that through to its logical conclusion and develop plans for each of the parks?

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I haven't studied the procedure that the department has been following, but I have requested no change in respect to the program. I understand that in connection with the Whiteshell Park, there is ongoing review of the Grass River Park and the Turtle Mountain Park and just recently, I confirmed with staff the desirability of a review by way of a master plan approach to the Hecla Island Park.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, has the Minister had an opportunity to examine the basis upon which commercial ventures are allowed to operate within parks in terms of the gross take that the government gets from commercial operations? Has the Minister

had an opportunity to review that situation?

**MR. MACKLING:** Not yet, Mr. Chairman, but certainly will, along with many other factors of the involvement in parks such as the degree of whether or not we have hunting allowed in parks, whether and to what extent other uses of parks like forestry, mining, continue to be employed in parks, what parks should be considered to be more in the nature of wildlife or remote-access parks. There's a whole range of considerations that are ongoing within the department with which I will be associated and certainly will be wanting to have some more full understanding of the criteria involved, and how those developments are articulated with the public, and how the greatest public awareness and then consensus of the best use of our park system can be formulated.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would then assure the Committee that since there are presently publicly-stated park management policies in place, can the Minister assure the Committee that if and when he makes changes in park management policy that those will be publicly announced?

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I haven't had an opportunity to review the park management policies that my honourable friend refers to. When I have and if there are changes, certainly we believe in open government and they will be openly and publicly announced and will be the subject of consideration by all concerned.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Gladstone.

**MRS. CHARLOTTE OLESON (Gladstone):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't know whether this falls under this section or not, but I was wanting to ask about particularly the Spruce Woods park. Does this government intend to proceed with the projects that were planned in that area with regard to the beach facilities and education programs and, last year I believe we were told that there was to be a new camp-site facility opened. Are you proceeding with that?

**MR. MACKLING:** When we get to Item (d) and (e) there are appropriations in there for that park and also under Capital, I'm advised. I could elaborate on them then or I can ask staff to brief me now, if you'd prefer for me to try and get you the answer now.

**MRS. OLESON:** It doesn't matter, I still want to ask the question.

**MR. MACKLING:** I'll see if I can get the answers right now so you can have two kicks at the cat, so to speak, if you want.

Mr. Chairman, I'm advised in the Capital item which we will be coming to, that's Item 13, there will be provision in that item for ongoing work at the Spruce Woods Provincial Park, which would include sewer and water use area, a complete sewage lagoon and beach playground construction, stable upgrading, road surfacing, loop roads and electrification.

**MRS. OLESON:** Thank you, that is the then ongoing?

**MR. MACKLING:** Yes, that's what I understand to be the case.

**MRS. OLESON:** Is there anything new planned that this government intends to implement in that park? Since the park usually is filled to overcapacity most weekends for campsites, are you planning any new expansions in that park in the near future?

**MR. MACKLING:** Not that I'm aware of, Mr. Chairman.

**MRS. OLESON:** I was wondering if there were plans to replace the concession facility that was burned down some years ago. There isn't at present any facility of that nature right in the park site and I was wondering if there are plans to replace that building which was a very fine building, but during the flood it got somehow short circuited and burned.

**MR. MACKLING:** Not this year, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek):** I'd like to ask the Minister, under Park Planning are there more plans being developed at the present time to have more roadside parks in the Province of Manitoba?

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that we have 130 provincial wayside parks at the present time and in the planning or projections there was no increase provided for in the Estimates.

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to comment to the Minister that between — and I believe it's Highway 392 — between Thompson and Lynn Lake, one of the requests that we received from the people of that area, because of the long stretch of road, that there be a roadside park available to them to rest along that long stretch of road and you've explained that there's nothing in the budget to increase them, but I think that's a very important one from the point of view of those people up there and also from the point of view of tourism.

The roadside parks you mention, there's I30 and I take from the Minister there's no — and of course this is planning I don't know what you have in your Capital Budget — are there any plans for upgrading any of those roadside parks for having better facilities for tourists?

**MR. MACKLING:** I'll start with the first area, Mr. Chairman, in respect to the roadside or wayside parks, on PTH 392 I'm advised that there are three now between Thompson and Lynn Lake, and it could well be that in that area we could add more. I would imagine my department will look at that and advise me. Apparently there have been requests made in the past.

Now in respect to upgrading of the wayside parks my understanding is that no, there's no provision in the Capital for upgrading.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Emerson.

**MR. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, am I to understand

that the Capital projects for parks is going to be under Item 13?

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, all of the Capital items are under Item 13.

**MR. DRIEDGER:** I have a little problem with some of these projects that I'd like to specify to and I just have a few of them. Whether they would be under maintenance, whether it be a continuation or whether they be Capital projects. I'm referring to, for example, the dock facilities at Birch Point on Lake of the Woods, a project was undertaken there last year and the docking facilities was part of it. There were negotiations going on with the Federal Government at the time; they have a special department that works with this, and I'm wondering at that time there was a sort of understanding that if the Federal Government would not participate in the docking facilities at Birch Point that the Provincial Government would proceed to then undertake a portion of that work on their own. I realize now it's maybe in a grey area whether it is Capital or not, I wonder whether the Minister can give me some indication whether that project is going to be an ongoing project.

**MR. MACKLING:** I understand, Mr. Chairman, it's not in our Capital Budget.

**MR. DRIEDGER:** Then I would like to go on to the area of the Grindstone Point Development; I understand certain lots have been sold in the general area there. Can the Minister indicate whether a licence has been issued for commercial business to be established, a service industry be established at Grindstone?

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that the lots in Grindstone Point are leased lots, that when the Parks Branch considers that there is sufficient base for commercial operation, then they will prepare a prospectus and invite commercial people to tender on those commercial prospects.

**MR. DRIEDGER:** Could the Minister then indicate at what point does the department feel it feasible to proceed with that commercial unit? The Minister indicated if at a certain point so and so many lots were leased or constructed on, I suppose, there must be a point at which a decision gets made to proceed with the commercial units.

**MR. MACKLING:** The decision-making process is not that simple in respect to some areas such as the Grindstone Point area because, as I'm given to understand, while there is a 400 lot potential full development, the base for commercial operation isn't as full as in some areas. That is, it's a 10-week commercial operation, and there will probably be therefore some greater difficulties in arranging a reasonable package for commercial operation for that short time.

**MR. DRIEDGER:** Could the Minister indicate to some degree, how many of these east lots out of the 400 are active lots now that are being built on, have cabins on?

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I understand that approximately 260 are under lease at the present time.

**MR. DRIEDGER:** In the opinion of the department this is not adequate yet to have commercial units being established on that place.

**MR. MACKLING:** No.

**MR. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, I have to express some regret, first of all, and I suppose I'll have a chance to maybe discuss this further with the Minister under 13.(c), the fact that the only point that we have on Lake of the Woods for recreation at Birch Point, the department has seen fit or the Minister has seen fit not to continue with that project there. It gives me grave concern; I'm certain the people of Southeast Manitoba are going to be very concerned. I'd just like to say that in looking at the Estimates it doesn't appear as if there is that much concern about the continuation of expanding in many of these things. When we look at the monies that are designated under Capital projects between water resources, the diking and parks, there is a limited amount of funds that will be expended really. I would like to encourage, though, the Minister and his departmental people to consider the further development of recreation facilities in the southeast, specifically in the Moose Lake area, where I think there is tremendous potential. When we consider the kind of pressure that lakes like St. Malo Lake get, where on weekends it's just filled to overflowing and we have good potential facilities in areas like Moose Lake where the northern point can be developed as a natural sandy beach, I think people have been looking at it from time to time for further development there to accommodate a lot of people.

I would hope that in planning for the future that there is some concentration being zeroed in on the southeast; a lot of the activity has been going in the Whiteshell area and the southeast corner which is actually very handy for the American tourist, as well as the people from Winnipeg. It's always sort of being overlooked and I want to indicate to the Minister that I will be pursuing this matter continually to try and have facilities and recreation facilities improved in Southeast Manitoba.

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I encourage the honourable member to do that. I think it incumbent on any member of the Legislature, particularly when he has a constituent base that is affected to continue to assert on behalf of his constituents their desires and endeavour to have the government reflect your concerns. My understanding is, in respect to the wharf, the dock at Birch Point, the advice is that further construction would not be warranted; it would be wasted. The boat launch itself will continue to be maintained and further dredging as required will be carried out to ensure access for fishing.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Lakeside.

**MR. ENNS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, under the item of Park Planning I have several detailed questions which perhaps could be asked under different sections of the division but they do reflect to planning. I

would ask specifically, the Minister has referred to — I suppose it could be called one of the major planning efforts undertaken by the branch in the last year or two — the Whiteshell Master Plan, of course, can the Minister indicate to me the mechanics of what he or his staff advises him will be followed now? It's my understanding that the rather lengthy procedure of public hearings and public input into various draft reports has been completed. The department is in possession of the final draft plan, if you can call it that, but I appreciate as I'm sure the Minister appreciates that these are staff recommendations at this point and nothing more.

So when I ask him about the mechanics, is he in a position or has he had a chance to familiarize himself with the Whiteshell report, and does he perceive moving that forward to Cabinet for approval? Those are the kind of mechanics I'm asking for. Are there any dates that the Minister can indicate? This is of a matter of considerable interest to many Manitobans and, of course, of specific interest to the 3,000 odd cottage cabin owners in the area, plus the many thousands of other people that use the park on a day or weekend basis. Can the Minister indicate what he's going to do with the Whiteshell Master Plan? I'm asking him to indicate at this point as he already has in the response to the Member for Turtle Mountain indicate the decisions of this government or this Minister's attitude. I'm just asking for the mechanics of it. Will it proceed for consideration on to his desk and then on to Cabinet for rejection or acceptance of all or portions of that report?

**MR. MACKLING:** Basically, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member has reflected the answer in his question. The draft plan will be the subject of and is being the subject of review by my department, further governmental review. When that process has been completed, then there will be a continuance of public review by publication of the further draft plan and the public will be invited to participate in that review, make constructive criticism or give us advice. Then again, it will go back to the department for consideration reflecting the views of the public and hopefully at that stage we will have determined that the broadest consensus consistent with sound use of the plan of the park will have been attained and the plan will be successfully completed.

The concern is to ensure that the public has an opportunity to be part of the rationale or having a significant input into the decision-making process. Part of that has already taken place and I think we owe it to the public to again bring the plan to the public for its further consideration. Because when we're making decisions about parks, it's not merely for the term of our lifetime but the lifetime of those who come after us. If we take longer and take greater care in the planning of a park, I think it is time well spent.

**MR. ENNS:** Has the Minister had any opportunity to acquaint himself with the operation at Falcon Lake that is referred to as the Captran Development? Can his staff advise the Committee of the status of that development at Falcon Lake? Is it proceeding or is it being held up? I haven't heard lately about the project but the Minister will recall it introduces a new concept

of time sharing, time sharing of vacation facilities in that park. I'd appreciate any comments the Minister has on that operation.

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I haven't had an evaluation shown to me of that development, nor have I received any critical comment in respect to it. I gather that it's an ongoing commercial development and will be evaluated with interest to see how that is accepted by the general public.

**MR. ENNS:** On another subject, Mr. Chairman, but still having to do with planning, the Department of Natural Resources and this particular division of Parks has always been interested in the lease renewal arrangements with the Department of National Defence for the Camp Shilo military base. The Minister will be aware that encompasses one of the unique features in Manitoba — Manitoba's only desert. The sand dunes are really impressive to spend some time on and I know that it is the feeling, certainly of some of the professional staff, that some additional portions of those valuable, unique sand dunes ought to be excluded from the military lease arrangement and to be brought under the greater protection environmentally as well as from an aesthetic — an attraction to the Spruce Woods through a park system that perhaps a little harder bargaining on the part of Manitoba at a time when the Federal Government is anxious to renew a 10-year lease. Particularly in view of the lucrative West German Military Rental Contract that is attractive to the Department of National Defence that we should, as a province, just dig our heels in a little bit and recapture or gain control of additional portions of that particularly unique bit of Manitoba property.

I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, that this is essentially an agreement that another division of his department, or of Crown Lands I take it, is part of in making the arrangements with the federal department, but I've recognized that Parks has a specific interest in that piece of property. I would encourage the Minister to use the full powers of this government, alluded to the co-operative attitude that the Manitoba Government has with the present Federal Government, to take advantage of that situation and exclude — we are not talking about a great deal of land — several additional quarter sections or half sections of what is a massive 90,000 acre tract of land that is being leased so that West German tanks can roll over it. Of course, I shouldn't allude to it in that way, they are part of our nato allies and part of our military establishment but, nonetheless, for any of those who have had the chance to jog up and down those sand dunes as I have had, one cannot help be impressed with that particular part of Manitoba.

I've known some to use some aid in travelling those sand dunes, mechanical aides, little tricycles of that kind, but I want to assure this Committee that I remained environmentally pure and walked them gently with every step of the way and therefore gained that much greater appreciation of them.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage the Minister to pursue that course. It would seem to me to be an opportunity to test out the Federal Government's willingness to co-operate with this new government.

**MR. MACKLING:** I look forward to the day, Mr. Chairman, that I can take the honourable member by the hand and lead him through our park in the Bald Hills. Because although it's a gritty matter, we have been negotiating with persistence and we are going to grind down, I think, the Federal Government to a position where we do establish a five square mile park in a part of Manitoba that has unique environmental characteristics.

It is a significant part of our geography. It is, I understand, unique in North America. I think it is the most northerly desert area in Canada and it does have significant features that we want to preserve and we are certainly working on that. I am hopeful that the agreement negotiations that are currently under way with the Federal Government will be successfully concluded, and we will have a park there to protect the interests of the people of Manitoba in that unique ecology.

**MR. ENNS:** I thank the Minister for that response and for the invitation, although I do recommend a Honda if we are to walk on those areas again. Mr. Chairman, another area of Park Planning that certainly, I believe, was imaginative and it would be my hope to be carried out by this administration or improved upon and that was what the Parks planner referred to, a linear park development along the Assiniboine River along the Assiniboine corridor. It envisaged tying in some of the existing facilities that are available along the river, tied into the Spruce Woods Park, one of our major parks, as well as other bits and pieces of public property, such as are available at the reservoir of the Portage Diversion site along with even some roadside parks and encouraging private development where that is possible. Could the Minister indicate whether or not he has an opportunity to at least in very general terms familiarize himself with that plan concept and whether we can hope for that to be pursued by this administration?

**MR. MACKLING:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am happy to report that the initial corridor developments have been undertaken and there has been progress made in respect to identifying nodes between PTH 34 and Brandon in respect to the Assiniboine River corridor.

Also, Mr. Chairman, we are considering the plan and design of a centennial park in the Rural Municipality of Cornwallis which would provide access to the beautiful Assiniboine River and provide additional needed recreation in the Brandon area. We have continued in respect to planning and development initiatives in respect to winter recreation opportunities in the Spruce Woods area including the provision for cross-country ski trails, warm-up shelters and ice skating. I could go on in great length, Mr. Chairman, but I think I have indicated some of the scope of the department's activities in this area and we have a continuing interest in expanding and encouraging the development of park area in Manitoba.

**MR. ENNS:** One final question, Mr. Chairman, again to do with Planning and another subject. The department is involved in what is known as the agreement for the recreation and conservation for the Red River corridor or better known as the ARC Agreement. I

don't know whether the Minister has had an opportunity to look at this substantial document. This document is one of three reports required for approval of an ARC Master Development Plan. This document together with the revisions and modifications arising from review of the public information document will provide the basis for the preparation of an ARC Master Development Plan recommended by the board and for approval by the federal and provincial Ministers. This is a program for the restoration of historic sites; the Red River corridor, of course, has specific significance in this regard. I wonder if the Minister or his staff can advise again what is the status of the ARC Agreement. I take it from having read this report that to date it is still very much in the study stage. Can the Minister shed any light as to whether or not what the prospects of a signed agreement are, and when perhaps some initial actual projects will be undertaken even if it's at this stage perhaps just the acquisition of some additional land?

There were a number of, I think, very innovative and exciting developments planned for this historic stretch of the Red River Valley. I appreciate that it's being done in co-operation with the Parks Canada people and that always requires additional time in terms of getting the paper work shuffled, but I would appreciate any comments the Minister has with respect to the ARC Agreement.

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, in respect to that development, the administration or the overview of that development has now been transferred to Urban Affairs. However, our branch continues to have involvement in respect to the specific park sections of that immense project. We are involved in specific undertakings in respect to Netley Marsh, the River Road and Lockport, and tenders close in respect to proposals regarding those particular sights and areas in the next few weeks.

I might say that included in respect to the Lockport development of some significance is some archaeological endeavours and also some provision for a handicapped recreational opportunity, handicapped fishing, and I think there are some imaginative and interesting developments taking place as part of that overall development that the honourable member refers to.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

**MR. RURIK (Ric) NORDMAN (Assiniboia):** Mr. Chairman, I guess the part of that park program would be the development of the proposed park at the confluence of the Red and the Assiniboine. I believe that's part of it, is it not?

**MR. MACKLING:** Yes, that's what I understand, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. NORDMAN:** We would have no further update on that at the present time, do we?

**MR. MACKLING:** My understanding, Mr. Chairman, is that Parks Canada is undertaking that specific park at the confluence of the rivers and in respect to the

Fort Garry Gate Interpretive Centre.

**MR. NORDMAN:** One more question. I understand that there's been an increase of 45 percent in the rental rates for campsites in the Whiteshell. Is this an increase of the magnitude considered fair?

**MR. MACKLING:** The increase in the rate of campsites went from \$4 to \$5.00 That's 25 percent or less — 20 percent.

**MR. NORDMAN:** Maybe then I'm speaking of lots, not just campsites, lots for trailers and so on. I believe it is 45 percent — from 110 to 160?

**MR. MACKLING:** It went from 110 to 160. I haven't got my calculator.

**MR. NORDMAN:** It's approximately 45 percent. You know, all it went . . .

**MR. MACKLING:** That may be. That may be.

**MR. NORDMAN:** You know, all at one time. I don't think the users are unhappy about the raise in — maybe it's justified, but all at the one time, that's what is their concern.

**MR. MACKLING:** Well, I don't think I can add anything further.

**MR. NORDMAN:** Fine, thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Inkster.

**MR. DON SCOTT (Inkster):** Thanks very much, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to depart I guess from just straight questions and make some commentary. It is not unusual I guess. —(Interjection)— It's allowed, thank you.

The first thing I'd like to address, I guess, is just basically the direction that the evolution of park planning has taken in Manitoba. I must first off state that prior to 1978 there was very little intent towards any direction on parks planning in the province.

It was done very much on an ad hoc basis, and what really brought the whole situation to a head was when the previous administration came up with a proposal to back up and gave permits to cross land exempting the company or the individuals involved from the environmental assessment and review process to put up a 200-unit condominium on the Big Whiteshell Lake on a point of land right at the junction or right at the exit of the Little Whiteshell Lake where the Little Whiteshell and the Big Whiteshell join.

As everyone in this Assembly I think is very well aware, there was a great kaffuffle and whatnot after that point in time and I think quite justifiably, the government recognizing that there was a faux pas, backed down and started to move towards a process under quite a bit of protestation of which I must take I guess a little bit of credit in that I was very much involved in the pushing for us to start a master planning process in the province. I'm very pleased that we now have such a process under way.

However, I have —(Interjection)— that's a compli-



ment to the previous government, yes — that the mechanism has at least been started. But I do have, Mr. Minister, very grave concerns as to the direction and the intent with which that master plan started. Now, the first park to be planned was the Whiteshell, and I have some problems and we can't go back unfortunately, back three years, and start the process over again and I have no intention of doing that. But before we move that much further, I would suggest that we have to start to look at the rationale with which the park management plans have been developed thus far and to the stages that they're presently in and look at the philosophy behind those developments.

I think we have to as well recognize that they have been taking place somewhat independent of an overall strategy for parks in recognition of the various types of parks in Manitoba. I have here which may surprise some people of the number of types of provincial parks that are in existence in Manitoba. We have, I believe it's 13 different types of parks in the Province of Manitoba and there are 12 different types of parks.

The first one is a provincial natural park and I'll read the descriptions as are found in the regulations to the Act: "Provincial natural parks are areas which propose exceptional or which possess exceptional value or quality in illustrating or interpreting the natural heritage of the province." That's the natural parks.

Provincial wilderness parks: "Areas which through their management and use will be perpetuated in a primitive state, free of development and accessible only by non-mechanized means."

I regret to say at this juncture that provision has been in there since 1971, I believe, or when the Act was passed, and there is still yet to be designated a wilderness park in Manitoba. Provincial recreation parks are described as a third type as "Spacious areas close to concentrations of people, the natural attributes of which make it possible to serve large numbers of recreational users without degradation of the basic natural resources of the area."

Then there's provincial recreation travel ways which are "In areas illustrating or interpreting a natural travel route of our province including provincial recreation trailways, parkways and waterways." Then as Provincial Heritage Parks of which there are two vastly different types of parks but under the same classification and they are called areas established to preserve and interpret key elements of Manitoba's natural and human history. One is Elk Island, just off of Victoria Beach and the other is just in front of the Legislative Building, Memorial Park, so there's a slight difference in the types of parks that can come under this classification, one being in the heart of downtown Winnipeg and the other being at the base of Lake Winnipeg.

Then there are special use parks, six categories of special use parks and we've dealt with one of them already today. There's wayside parks. There are provincial campgrounds for overnight or long travel routes or adjacent to resource areas such as lakes and forests. There are marine parks. There are access sites which are classified as a type of park for trail head parking and boat launching. There are information centres, manned and unmanned, for purposes of giving information and directions to vacationers and

tourists and there are seasonal dwelling areas to provide developments of cottages, subdivisions, group camps, cabins and trailer villages for recreational purposes.

My point in going through that, Mr. Minister, is that I feel that we have started into planning our natural parks first and the intent with which we started going after the natural parks. I'll read the description again, "Areas which possess exceptional value or quality in illustrating or interpreting the natural heritage of the province" has been turned around. The emphasis of those parks has been turned around towards the recreational aspect and the recreational aspect I don't mind so much as much as it has been more towards a fairly intensive use of recreation. We have a document titled, "Master Planning Strategy for Manitoba Provincial Parks." It came out, I believe, in 1979 and it says here, "We maintain that if all the conservation management, preservation and recreational activities are to be provided within the fundamental framework of human enjoyment and benefit" and they further say that we believe this to be the original intention of the Act and one that the government supports.

So, they're automatically moving away from any sense of preservation within the parks and, I might add, that The Parklands Act specifies the order first to be, conservation and management; preservation; and third, recreation. Yet, we have changed the intent and the spirit; I believe the spirit of the Act away from that idea towards one of recreational use.

Now, we have another aspect here out of this and I'd like to quote and it scares me even more. It scared me very much at the time and it scares me still, if we continue with the present bent towards park planning and this quote is, "Management for biophysical preservation should, therefore, be separated from park plans management for ecosystem preservation is in principle incompatible with human enjoyment." I think that is a pretty critical statement for a government paper to have accepted to any degree and I think they have accepted to a great degree in the development of master planning.

So, what I'm starting off with, I guess, is a framework within which we are planning that we should go back, not to square one because we cannot go back to square one, but we should first designate the types of parks more clearly in the public's mind of what kind of park they are and what kind of continued uses and expanded uses are compatible with that type of park. We have not done that to any great degree so far; we're trying to make each one of the parks a park for all reasons and a park for all purposes.

I recognize fully that many of the parks are already severely compromised that come under the classification of Provincial Natural Parks because of historic development. We cannot turn that around. I do not intend to go back and recommend any kind of massive expropriation or whatever of long time uses within our natural parks, but I do believe that we do have to move away from the park policy and this was a new provincial park lands policy that the government published with the first newsletter for the Whiteshell Master Plan and this was, I guess, about two years ago. It's not dated, but when the whole process really got going and there was something in the public's hands, they said, Park Lands will:

(1) Respond firstly to provincial interests for rare, scarce, or special forms of recreation and, secondly, to recreational demands and priorities;

(2) Provide high quality recreational opportunities;

(3) Provide opportunities for outdoor recreation in terms of consumptive uses such as hunting and fishing and non-consumptive uses, both of which are considered equally legitimate;

(4) Provide interpretive facilities and programs;

(5) Accommodate commercial utilization of resources where it does not lessen the future recreational potential or unduly compromise the primary purpose of park land.

To go back over those again, there's no mention in here whatsoever of preservation and conservation. There's no mention in here whatsoever of natural history education. When you read The Park Lands Act which says, "Park lands shall be developed and maintained for the conservation and management of flora and fauna, for the preservation of specified areas and objects therein that are of geological, cultural, ecological and other scientific interest and to facilitate the use and enjoyment of outdoor recreation therein." The last point is recreation therein.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** On a point of order?

**MR. DAVID R. (Dave) BLAKE (Minnedosa):** Yes, Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. If the member is agreeable, I'm sure it's agreeable to the rest of the Committee that if he wants that on the record that he table that document and have it printed in Hansard and we would accept that.

**MR. SCOTT:** I'm finished the quoting of the document.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Okay, proceed, the Member for Inkster.

**MR. SCOTT:** I'm trying to set really a scenario of what has evolved and there has been significant evolution of a change in the intent that I see in reading The Parks Act from what has evolved through the initial stages that has thus far been taking place with the Master Park Planning, significant almost to the point of turning them around so that the third priority in the initial Act, the third listed item in the initial Act, is now by far the primary concern of the Master Plans.

So, if I move on, I think that before we go any further we have to educate to a much stronger degree through publications and through public hearings of just what are the different classifications of parks. Perhaps you've got to change some of the classifications; perhaps 12 or 13 classifications are too many; perhaps some of them shouldn't even be under the jurisdiction of Parks Branch. If that being the case, I think this has to be ironed out, but before you can go in and classify what types of activities are going to be considered within a park, and particularly when you're using a landmark case which the Whiteshell will be, without even having decided publicly and with some public input as to what type of activities are going to be allowed and expanded within provincial parks, I think we're setting a dangerous precedent. I think before we go that much further, a lot of consideration has to be given towards going back and actu-

ally it's a must that we go back and enunciate more clearly in the public's mind what types of parks we have and what types of uses are going to be considered within their public realm in the future for those parks. —(Interjection)—

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Okay, keep going, the Member for Inkster.

**MR. SCOTT:** Would the Minister like to make any comment here? If you wish to, just please interrupt.

**MR. MACKLING:** No, that's okay.

**MR. ENNS:** On a point of order, on the other hand, I'm sure that Committee members would be prepared to accept whatever reading material the honourable member wishes to put on the record and supply that to the Clerk of the House and record that on Hansard.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Inkster.

**MR. SCOTT:** I've already finished quoting, Harry. For the zoning of the parks, the zones that have thus far been evolved in the Whiteshell Plan, we're talking about a back country recreation zone, an extensive recreation zone and an intensive recreation zone, all of them implying varying degrees of recreation. There's no recognition whatsoever given towards the enhancement of the preservation and the conservation aspects of the parks and I think the designations themselves, I would suggest, should be changed fairly extensively so that intensive recreation is in areas where they was presently built up such as like in the Whiteshell, on Big Whiteshell Lake, Nutimik Lake, areas like that can be classified and I would certainly accept the classification of intensive recreation. But I would prefer that the back country areas be reclassified towards sections such as wilderness areas, Class 1 and Class 2; that we move from the idea of extensive recreation and divide that up into areas that can be more, I think, accurately defined as back country areas. Much of the areas at least and part of them should be perhaps taken into as a Class 2 wilderness area where different types of activities are permitted in each one of the zones.

Regarding visitor services, there is very little emphasis on visitor services in general other than self-guard in trails and there has even not been that many of those put together. I can remember some three years ago when I was in with the then Minister, the Member for Turtle Mountain, and we were encouraging at that time that interpretation services be expanded within the parks. He gave us basically a flat rejection saying that natural history education was not the responsibility of Parks Branch or of his department, but rather the Department of Education. And I think that line of thought must be reversed, that your best teaching sources are the people in the field, right on the spot, and we should be encouraging the idea of natural history education in our parks as one of the higher priorities and not one of the lesser priorities.

Now, moving from the specifics of the Whiteshell and of the Master Planning process, I'd like to make a couple of points of the things that I'd like to see us do

in all of our parks and one is the orientation towards family campsites. Presently one of the biggest problems we've had in administering any of the campsites is problems of noise, recreation, or people carrying on with stereos and one thing and another to the wee hours of the morning. This is not conducive whatsoever to a family to be able to take their children out on a camping venture and be in an area where they have some natural history education and they're not continually being bombarded with loud radios and the other paraphernalia that people bring from the city with them. I certainly would like to see us move towards a new type of family concept, perhaps hiking for a relative short distance, a quarter-of-a-mile or so, providing some sorts of wagons or whatever that people can carry their heavier goods in with, so that then they have a campsite which is really in a wilderness setting.

For one area that would work particularly well in, I believe, is Meditation Lake in the Whiteshell and could be used perhaps as a first experimental basis of developing a campsite in there, basically a nonrecognized campsite and a campsite geared towards what one of the original purposes of the parks is — outdoor education.

On another park, moving further north, Nopoming Park, I am led to believe or I understood in the past couple of years there's been severe degradation of the woodland caribou in that area. The numbers apparently have fallen quite drastically; it's a combination of the road itself, giving greater access to hunting; more illegal hunting activity in the area, as well as just a disruption of habitat. Plus there is the added problem in the area where there are cutting leases for Abitibi and where you are into cutting, the cutting has to be done I would suggest under the jurisdiction of Parks Branch with part of the idea, at least, and maybe the principal idea of maintaining the wintering ground habitat for the caribou because that is really critical. I understand they are mostly in the white spruce areas, relatively low lying areas and that is also prime habitat for chain saw and Abitibi and various other lumber interests, because the white spruce is a prime tree for their mill. So, we have a directly competing resource or resource uses there, one for the forestry industry and one for the preservation of the caribou.

The caribou, that herd, I think, are particularly important because they are the southern most herd in Manitoba. The only one further south of them in all of Canada, I believe, is remnants of a herd from years and years ago on a small island in Lake Superior — there are no others. To me just the recognition and knowledge that they are that close to the south, still we should take every effort we can to protect them. We know what overdevelopment in the Whiteshell has done; they used to roam down into the Lake of the Woods area. They are now gone; there are no more there.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Point of order?

**MR. ENNS:** On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I think we are all prepared to give, all of us, a fair degree of latitude and I, of course certainly make sure I use most every inch of it when given the opportunity, but on page 100 we will be dealing specifically in this

department's Estimates, the Wildlife concerns. I share the concerns for the preservation of the caribou herd as well as every other member of this Committee, but we are not talking Parks development. I appreciate he's bringing in the resource allocation question, but I think if he continues with the wildlife concerns at this point there is a particular spot in the Estimates that we can discuss that.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I believe he is within the area of Parks development, so he can continue.

**MR. SCOTT:** Mr. Chairman, on the point that the Member for Lakeside raised, it is particularly pertinent that it be discussed here and that caribou herd in particular because the Parks Branch had removed from some of its jurisdiction the management of the resources within the park, and the removal of that jurisdiction and taken out to the other sections of the park put the preservation into conflict with the resource management. I believe that within the park the primary actor on the designation of what type of resources are going to be used should be under the management of Parks Branch and not under the management of Forestry, not under the management of Wildlife, or not under the management of any other section within that department. The direction should be coming from the Parks Branch with consultation from the other members, they should be able to second expertise from the other sections of the department.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** A point of order?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, on a point of order; we're speaking to a point of order. Mr. Chairman, as much as I'm sure the honourable member would like to lay the responsibility for the degradation of the caribou herds on park planners, but I have news for the honourable member. As long as people are permitted to shoot them with airplanes, in-out of season . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** That's not a point of order.

**MR. ENNS:** . . . the times that the degradation of the caribou . . . more caused by something that walks around on two legs or in an airplane . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order, order, the Member for Lakeside. —(Interjections)—  
The Member for Inkster.

**MR. SCOTT:** Mr. Chairman, I'd certainly agree that the illegal hunting — I mentioned the illegal hunting in it — and the access that I regret that the former NDP government gave across that in Nopoming trail road. That has certainly been a key element in the degradation of that herd. There have been other implications along the way without restrictions towards the hunting seasons in the park and within that area, and all that I'm saying is that within Park Planning's parameters, there should be more jurisdiction over what type of use is of the resources on their lands.

Now, I'd like to make two more proposals and then I'll go into a couple of questions, one is on the regards to wilderness parks and it is 10 years, I believe, since

we had provision for wilderness parks in Manitoba. We have not moved on them whatsoever and I would like the Minister to consider two such possibilities; both of them unfortunately on the east side. I think we should be looking on the west side of the province as well, but on the east side of Lake Winnipeg there is Black Island, and if one is familiar and one becomes familiar whatsoever . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order. We're having problems picking up the taping. There is too much private conversation going on, so we'd like to have a little order. The Member for Inkster.

**MR. SCOTT:** If one could look at the example that the United States Government has given and illustrated over the years with our Royal National Park in Lake Superior, just some 10 miles south of Thunder Bay, one can see the tremendous success that this wilderness park has had which is strictly accessed by ferries, by sail boats and by motorcraft. The access on the island is limited purely to foot travel. They have on staff their rangers who monitor the area consistently, not only telling you to pick up your garbage because there's a rule that whatever you take on the island you must take off, but they also further backed that up with education along the way and you ask these people for any kind of assistance that you want for direction and basically, they are not just there as enforcement officers, their primary purpose is education officers.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The hour is now 4:30, we'll break for Private Members Hour. I am led to believe that there will be a short break and then we will be coming back into the Committee of Supply, so we'll just wait until we hear from the House what's happening in the House.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, on that matter I wonder if you could ask the Clerk to secure the room so we that could leave our material on our desk.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Agreed. Committee will come to order, we are on Parks 5.(b)(1)—pass.

**MR. SCOTT:** Mr. Chairman, on a final point we are going to bring here now or a final two points.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Inkster, you have three minutes left.

**MR. SCOTT:** Three minutes left, okay. I'll be able to get this done easy in three minutes.

The other proposal and the other consideration for a wilderness area and that is the . . . proposal which has been around for 10-12 years at least now and this is for a recreation area north of Nopoming Park going up to some, I forget what latitude it is, but it's fairly far up on the east side. It almost became a national park about five years ago or four ago, and then when the new government came in they squashed any idea of a national park refusing and declaring that they would be giving up their heritage if they went into another national park in the province.

I don't know if that is still the position of the present

government. I don't know the attitudes towards the Federal Government towards even contemplating moving towards another national park in Manitoba, but, if it was I would suggest that might be one alternative we could go. The other alternative which would be much cheaper would be declare the area a wilderness area and I think that should be given strong consideration.

Finally, the Beaudry Park which was designated quite some time ago just west of the city, just west of Headingley, is a beautiful prime example of river bottom land with its elms and tremendous amount of problem with the Dutch Elm disease there, but cottonwoods as well; I was just skiing there this past Sunday. The conditions in the ski trail was vastly improved from what it was three or four years ago, but I am also informed that the park has yet to be designated by the regulations because of that. It is still being administered out of Portage la Prairie and we still do not have any kind of a designation for that area and in the Park Planning with that there has been none yet in that area. I think that it's a small area, relatively contained by the Assiniboine River and taking in a couple of loops of the Assiniboine as the Assiniboine meanders along. It is an area that we have to give more consideration to being so close to the city. I would ask that the province move with due haste towards a designation of Beaudry into a full-fledged provincial national park.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Inkster, your time is up.

The Member for Emerson.

**MR. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, after that I think my contribution I will save for some other time. I pass.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Minister.

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I thank the honourable member for his remarks and I would like to indicate that within — obviously within the members of the Legislature — we have a diversity of viewpoint with respect to Parks Development and I think that we will mutually profit from that diversity of view.

There are within us, I am sure, some who feel that the parks system is a system that has to be exploited to the full by people to get the maximum return, the maximum benefit for the costs that are involved in any Parks system. On the other hand, there are people who would reflect the view that to preserve the integrity of a park, the preservation of the qualities of the park, there has to be tight management control and perhaps diminished use to ensure the protection of that integrity. Between those two, if I could call them extremes, I think government and administration has to find the level of compromise that will satisfy the many interests of people in our parks system.

In respect to the future development, the future planning of parks, I am advised that once our department has been able to finish the specific programs that it has under way at the present time in respect to the Whiteshell and Grassy and the Turtle Mountain Park, that we will be looking forward to the development of a comprehensive parks system plan. Included in that and specifically, the department will be looking

at recommendations in respect to ecological reserves and such specifics, for example. To some it may seem rather different, there might be some snickers of disinterest or humour, but there are some unique areas in Manitoba from the point of view of our ecology and we are concerned to look at them from the point of view of preservation. Such a thing, for example, as the snake wintering grounds in the Interlake are of unique special and unusual significance and they have been the subject of study by people of worldwide reputation.

We will also be considering the areas that the honourable member talked about; the possible development of wilderness parks that would be accessible some perhaps only by water, others accessible by land, in that comprehensive review that I mentioned.

In respect to the concern about the Beaudry park, I am advised that both the Department of Highways and our Department are involved in that and there is ongoing consultation and there is a proposal to develop that park and planning is ongoing in respect to it.

I think that's all I'll say at this time, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, just a brief comment, I am not sure that the Minister was referring to, but when he was speaking about ecological reserves and then spoke about there might be snickers of disinterest in relation to that subject, I simply will point out to the Minister that it was our government that introduced to the last session of the Legislature an Ecological Reserves Act.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** We are on 5.(b)(1) Salaries.  
The Member for Roblin-Russell.

**MR. BLAKE:** Mr. Chairman I have a couple of questions to the Honourable Minister on park planning or management. I'm wondering if the Honourable Minister can advise of any changes contemplated at Assessippi Provincial Park. The planning of that park has never been widely accepted by the public because of the fact that the campgrounds are so far from the recreational area and I'm wondering if the Minister is looking at that item.

I wonder if he can give me any information on the development of Childs Lake Campgrounds at the Duck Mountains Provincial Park.

Also, there has been pressures brought to bear because of the larger numbers of people now that use the Shellmouth Reservoir at Provincial Trunk Highway west of Roblin where the bridge crosses the river, there is a highly utilized area there now and the Parks people go in there and try to assist the campers, but the numbers escalate every year, the number of people who camp in there. It's unbelievable to go there on a weekend and see the dozens and dozens of trailers that's in there and a lot of them are just camping on private grounds. There's a couple of private operators put in a few plugs there to the store, but I'm wondering if the Parks Branch are looking at the expansion of the Parks Branch to assist the people that are coming in that area.

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, in respect to the

Assessippi Park, I'm given to understand that included in the Budget, the Estimates we're looking at, are further campsites and electrification. The honourable member asked me about Childs Lake and I'm not sure what the specific problem there was.

**MR. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Chairman, the Childs Lake campground, the old campground, there's been a new campground developed at Childs and then there's still the old campground there, and there's quite a lot of interest in maintaining and keeping that old campground and it's a two-way struggle. Those that have camped in that old campground for all these many years insist that we maintain it and keep it, even improve upon it, and I'm not sure whether it's feasible or not, but they're certainly not moving into the new campground in the way that was anticipated. I'm just wondering what the department plans to do at Childs in the year ahead.

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, in this forthcoming year at least, the department indicates that there will be no change — that the old campground will continue to be used.

**MR. MCKENZIE:** The other point I raised was west of Roblin on the Shell Mouth Dam area, is the Parks Branch looking at any improvements in there for launching boats — west of Roblin?

**MR. MACKLING:** Not that I'm aware of, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 5.(b)(1) Salaries—pass; 5.(b)(2) Other Expenditures—pass; (c)(1) Salaries—pass; (c)(2) Other Expenditures—pass; (d)(1) Salaries—pass — the Member for Lakeside.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, on the matter of Park Maintenance, I suppose every successive government and every Minister on this item within the overall management of parks is always subject to either praise or criticism depending upon when some of the park users arrive at a facility. If it's the last day of a very busy weekend then the Minister's office and the by-lines and the letters to the editors get filled with complaints about the facilities not being maintained to the degree that the visitors feel they ought to be. On the other hand, I think, and certainly during the previous administration efforts were made to bring and keep this matter continually as a priority item with the maintenance people throughout the parks system that such a thing as a dirty washroom can leave a negative impression whereas perhaps all the rest of the facilities, the park itself, have so many positive features that could be and ought to be talked about and appreciated.

Mr. Chairman, I simply indicate, although there is a minimal rise which I take it is inflationary only from 6,300,000 to 6,400,000, I draw that matter to the Minister's attention and ask whether or not there has been any particular emphasis placed in the overall budget figure here for the day-to-day maintenance of our parks and the facilities that people use?

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that in this year we will be initiating a campers' vacation

reservation system which should facilitate a good many campers. In addition to that, we will be continuing a program — we could call it a bathroom blitz — a vigorous program to upgrade and improve bathroom facilities in parks. In addition to that, there is a user survey that is employed by the department whereby the users in parks are urged to indicate by way of suggestions or criticisms, changes in park facilities or administration that they think is warranted in light of their experience. That, of course, is very helpful in the management of the park system.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, perhaps just a bit more information as to how the reservation system alluded to by the Minister will work. You know, there's always some concerns about the bureaucracy being in position and in place to handle the kind of demands the public makes in these instances. It's been brought to my attention, for instance, when Parks Branch ran Gull Harbour that you couldn't phone for a reservation after 4:30 which is the usual time for public servants to end their day. We're dealing now with holidayers, with vacation people, people that are passing through the province or our own people that wish to make these arrangements. I'd encourage the Honourable Minister to indicate some of the mechanics of how this reservation system will work, how accessible it will be to the public.

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding the department is working on this development and, of course, probably this year it'll be small scale experimental, but what's involved is in a way designed to facilitate the longer-term camper, the camper that is planning to camp for two or three weeks, to allow that camper to initiate a reservation and find out when camping spots will become open and pre-book their intention. Now, I assume that what will be involved is these pre-bookings will be by telephone, but the persons making those pre-bookings will have to register in a prescribed time, nevertheless, to take up that booking. This will facilitate people who are planning to camp for some period and it could facilitate people rather than going out and scrambling and moving from one park to another hoping to find the space that we may be able to facilitate them by this pre-booking system.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Inkster.

**MR. SCOTT:** Just a couple of questions on the registration system for campers, I'm wondering if a person's allowed to reserve any more than one site?

**MR. MACKLING:** No, Mr. Chairman, I think the system would break down if that were the case; it would be one family per site.

**MR. SCOTT:** Precisely. On the other side I'm wondering what is going to stop a person from just thinking about, gee, I'd like to go to the Whiteshell this weekend, I think I'll just phone in and reserve a site and then he doesn't bother showing up. Does he still have to pay the fee? Is there any kind of a penalty for no-shows of people who do not have the courtesy to other campers to be able to pick up the phone and

cancel his reservation?

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, experience is the greatest teacher and although the department hasn't had the experience yet their understanding is that jurisdictions, such as Ontario who have employed this system, indicate that the number of no-shows is not all that significant and so that the benefits to the majority outweigh the problems because other than that it's a scramble situation for anyone going out to the park.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** We're on 5.(d)(1)—pass — the Member for Niakwa.

**MR. KOVNATS:** Just to follow up on the Honourable Member for Logan, it's on Park Maintenance and we're talking about the reservation system. Would the government or the Honourable Minister or any of his employees in making the recommendation on this reservation system, computerize the reservation system so that who do no-show, don't turn up for their reservation, would be rejected and not be given this consideration the next time they apply for a site?

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, the department anticipated this kind of development possibility and it had some discussions with MTS, but the discussions thus far have indicated that the expenses involved wouldn't warrant the development for a pilot. If the experimentation this year is successful then that might be seriously considered another year.

**MR. KOVNATS:** On another point, would Manitobans be given first consideration in the reservation of sites in Manitoba?

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, the bulk of the advertising would take place in Manitoba and the expectation would be that Manitobans would be the major users. However, I don't think that in light of our concerns to facilitate the tourist industry we would want to eliminate tourists from using this facility.

**MR. KOVNATS:** I would just go one part further, when we are talking about maintenance of some of the campsites and I recall years back when I was involved with a particular drive-in theatre where we used to allow a group of people to come in and pick up the beer bottles for particular purposes; they would be buying some particular items, I'm not going to go into the details of it, but what happens and I'm sure there has got to be thousands of dollars worth of empty beer bottles left out at these parks. Now the maintenance crew picks them up; is it just an accepted practice that the maintenance crew are allowed to keep any of these things that are picked up or are they turned over to the department for any particular purpose?

**MR. MACKLING:** My understanding, Mr. Chairman, is that the increase in the deposits in respect to ale bottles has reduced the number of bottles left and most people take them back, but those that are gathered up presumably it may go into a coffee fund or something for park staff.

**MR. KOVNATS:** It's not of any great consequence. I am quite serious about it because as long as it's not of any consequence; a few hundred dollars worth of beer bottles over the summer is really of no consequence and I would like to see the staff enjoy the benefits of cashing in the empty beer bottles.

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I understand it's not nearly that much, but something has to be done with them and I gather that is probably what happens but it wouldn't be of anything like that magnitude.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Niakwa.

We're in 5.(d)(2)—pass; 5.(e)(1) Salaries—pass; 5.(e)(2) Other Expenditures—pass — the Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, some time ago some discussion took place between the department and the Manitoba Wildlife Foundation concerning the expansion of the nature centre at Fort Whyte, in fact, the construction of a whole new facility there which would be, I believe, a great asset to the City and to the Province. At the time that I was Minister there was some discussion as to the possibility that once it was established through the monies available to the foundation that some assistance in maintenance would be provided through the Parks Branch. Has the Minister had any discussion with respect to that project?

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I haven't had any discussions with staff about that yet; I'd have to be informed about that before I'd really be able to deal with it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Inkster.

**MR. SCOTT:** I'm not sure, I think I can squeeze this under Visitor Services, but it's —(Interjection)— it's not caribou, Mr. Chairman. The idea came to me when the Honourable Member for Niakwa had the floor and that is regarding alcohol and drinking in parks. I'm wondering under Visitor Services or wherever, has there been any kind of analysis done of just how much time this takes of Parks Branch staff towards patrolling because of rowdiness caused by drinking or any other form of drug use and if they could give some kind of indication of the cost, both in patrolling, the cost of the cleanup and that sort of thing, how much that adds to the cost of operation of the park?

**MR. MACKLING:** I'm given to understand that in the Regional Services Budget, there are about 80 employees involved in park control. How we would indicate to the extent that park patrol is associated — there's so many things they do; direct people and I suppose assist in guiding people to sites, lost children. I don't think the major part of that would be in respect to liquor. I'm being advised of the offences in parks; liquor performs about 20 percent or a little better than 20 percent of the problems associated with parks, but while I'm responding to the concern, I for one want to indicate my concurrence with the concern to make sure that parks do not become places for the rowdy and the unthinking guests. We owe a duty to those who pay a fee and come into our parks

to enjoy the serenity of a park surrounding and not be the victims of incessant noise and raucous behaviour on the part of people who just don't seem to understand that parks are for the majority to enjoy.

**MR. SCOTT:** Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I would suggest that one way we could perhaps try to alleviate the problem to some degree at least of alcohol and rowdiness in parks is to designate some campsites as non-alcohol campsites. I know the parks people in Ontario have at one point, I think it's some four years ago now, they put their fist down and just said in some parks — I don't know if it was right across the whole spectrum or not — they just said no more booze is allowed in the park and the attendance in those campgrounds which had been just overbooked constantly the first weekend they did it, they had something like a 20 percent vacancy rate, so it shows you just how much on the first weekend. After that, it filled back up, but with many cases a different type of client, a type of client that the parks were trying to attract and to service, and if we want to service the people who are going out for a boozing weekend in the wilderness, then perhaps we should consider the implementation of another classification of park called a Gross Park and put them out in a Tyndall Park Quarry or somewhere like that. —(Interjection)—

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order.  
Mr. Minister.

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that the Parks Branch did look at the kind of suggestion that the honourable member makes and in view of their findings — this is part of the information that they get back in user response forms — that 97 percent of the users were opposed to any liquor ban and only 3 percent, therefore, favoured it, but that's not to say that we couldn't look at that kind of suggestion again. I think the thinking of the Department is now that rather than be completely restrictive in respect to that, there should be an ongoing education program in respect to park usage where people will be moderate in their use of the park, not simply a question of abusive use of whatever it is, any alcoholic or chemical comfort, but in respect to noise levels too and behaviour in parks and that kind of program is probably the better one to follow. That's not to say that maybe in some areas, some smaller parks or maybe some isolated parks or whatever, there might not be consideration for what the honourable member is talking about.

**MR. SCOTT:** Mr. Chairman, I think that in relation to noise pollution if you wish at the park campsites and what not, I would guess at least from past experience that the volume of the radios and what not is pretty well directly proportional to the consumption of alcoholic beverages or whatever else on the site, with the experience, not from being on the consumer side, but on the listener's side.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. BANMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I know this has been an age old problem and I just want to touch

on it for a little bit and that's the problem that we've been discussing here for the last few minutes, but I would suggest to the Minister that the staff are doing a fairly good job of trying to control that. I know that at Falcon and West Hawk we used to have a lot more trouble than we do right now, and I think the reason for that is the Ministers have backed up their staff with regard to some of the evictions that have taken place. I suggest to the Minister that the only way that you can do this properly is give your support as Minister to the people that are enforcing the regulations as established by the department, and when people do get too rowdy, the only way to do it is kick them out of the park. I know that causes problems for the Minister because, as my colleague mentioned, on Monday morning, either you will get a call from an irate parent or somebody how their Johnny or Mary was treated very unfairly and got kicked out of a park, but if you have a close examination of the situation I think you'll usually find it was well warranted. I know from my experience just at Falcon and West Hawk that the officers there, the patrol people, are doing a pretty good job and have done a pretty good job over the last little while and I would encourage the Minister to back up his people with regard to that.

One of the problems that we face in the parks system when we're dealing with people who are operating businesses in there is the problem of the fees that are being charged and levied against the people that are running the different businesses. One of the problems that has happened in the last while is that the rates, I believe, have not been changed over the last number of years and we are now asking people, for instance, that are selling gasoline products, that are selling other things, to pay a fairly high percentage of the gross amounts that are sold to the province. I know that in relationship to some of the other areas, for instance, in a regular municipality the Minister might say, well, it's not that much compared to what another service station operator or another camp operator or motel operator has to pay outside of a park. But I would suggest to you, Sir, that the problem that we are faced with is that these people are operating for three months of the year.

Let me just give an example. We're looking at gasoline now running around \$2 a gallon in the parks. If the operator there can make 15 cents a gallon, I suggest to you that in this competitive market that's pretty good, so he's looking at a 7.5 percent markup. Somebody walks in and puts a Chargex card down on the table that he's got to pay 2 percent off of that and he's down now to a 5 percent margin. If he's asked to pay another 3 percent to the province for that, that leaves him preciously little on a per dollar volume with regard to that particular sale. The same thing applies to such commodities as cigarettes, milk, which is a staple. All these things have a very very low markup and are causing certain problems in the parks.

I reiterate again, I know when you're going to match this up with what is happening in the rest of the province and the municipal taxes that those people are bearing, these people in the park system probably on an overall basis when you look at the year-round figure are not coming up to that amount. But I suggest to the Minister that there is a serious problem out there with a lot of these people trying to make ends meet

and that the Minister should have a look at trying to bring those rates maybe even to just a token rate, so that we can maintain our level of service in these parks and that these people can make a living there because it's pretty tough out there right now. I suggest to you that you have a good look at the items that are of very low percent profit basis, that these people can indeed make a few dollars and provide the services during the summer months even though in the winter-time they just don't have the business there.

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I thank the honourable member for his observations. Certainly, we'll want to look at that very carefully. I'm advised that the department has in the past looked at that and has been endeavouring to develop a comprehensive fee that would cover various concessionaires, but it's extremely difficult because of the diversity of these individual operations and what is contemplated is, first of all, the recommendation in respect to a fee structure and then individual negotiations with concessionaires that then would be referred back to government for decision. We are going to look at that carefully because there is a problem as the member has indicated.

**MR. BANMAN:** I thank the Minister for that response. Maybe if I could just throw in another example of a local contractor out there whose lumber-yard is struggling to make a few dollars, I know he's having a hard time out there. The other day he was bidding against another company from Kenora or wherever it was and he, of course, had to add I believe it's 3 percent I think is the fee right now on top of the contract that he had to submit and it was a fairly large tender. That was just about the point at which, he informs me, that he lost that particular deal. So, it makes it hard for him.

I know that people are having a hard time out there trying to make ends meet and I appreciate the Minister looking into the matter.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Gladstone.

**MRS. OLESON:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister mentioned in the discussions over beer bottles, et cetera, we were talking about education. One thing that I have noticed particularly about Sprucewoods Park lately, is the level of education that's been going on and I hope that is going to continue. We have had people out there giving excellent guides to tours and guiding to students, both winter and summer, causing them to appreciate winter more and to respect it more.

I sat in on a lesson given by one of the people out there last winter to a group of teachers with respect to teaching students — the particular time I was there, they were studying the formation of snowflakes. That may seem a very small item, but I think in the overall picture of education in a park such as that and probably other parks in the province, that is a very important thing. I do hope that this government continues that policy and expands it and I wonder do you have any plans to expand that service.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Minister.



**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I am not certain about the expansion, but certainly the efforts that the honourable member refers to will be continued. The interpretative work in the parks; guided walks, the school groups that may have visits, outdoor education in respect to school classes and so on. All of that work will be continued and I think it adds a greater dimension to the successful use of our parks.

**MRS. OLESON:** Yes, it certainly does and not only, of course, in the winter but in the summer. It makes people far more aware of what they have out there and how fragile that sandy land is in that particular park and I think, flowing from that will become more of a respect for the park and why there have to be so many restrictions. It seems to our local people anyway, who used to as Harry has mentioned trip through the sand; we felt that some of our freedoms were being taken away from us almost when we were no longer allowed to go in there as freely as we were before, but I think that most of us realize that if people were allowed to go in the numbers that are going to that park now and free wheel through the sand, we wouldn't have much left there. Thank you.

**MR. MACKLING:** No comment, thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** We are at 5.(e)(2) Other Expenditures — Member for Niakwa.

**MR. KOVNATS:** Thank you Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make a couple more remarks and then I'll be finished. I wanted to go on record as being totally opposed to the recommendation of the Honourable Member for Inkster wherein there was a recommendation made that some of our customers should be screened to the point whether they drink or smoke or maybe even — well it was drinking but I think that it does progress into other things. I don't think that we can be selective to that degree. I just want it to go on record that I think that if the Minister ever considered allowing customers to come into a camp because they don't drink or because they do drink would be a gross error and I wouldn't like to see it happen and if we reduce the customers coming in because they drink, it would reduce the coffee monies for the different people that work in these different locations. To be very, very serious, Mr. Minister, I think that if you ever considered such a recommendation, it would be the defeat of your government because, you know, we're very, very close to being on an equal basis with your government and I wouldn't want to see it happen that your government would lose on such a small item. Well, maybe I would like to see it happen.

I think what my point is, Mr. Minister, is that I would like this to go on record as opposing very, very strongly that one of the members of this Committee would make a recommendation that somebody be refused admittance to a particular park that is owned by the people of the Province of Manitoba because of their social activities, particularly from drinking.

Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 5.(e)(2) Other Expenditures—pass; 5.(f) Grants to International Peace Gardens — Member for Lakeside.

**MR. ENNS:** I believe that the particular park in question while not, of course, part of the parks system, but has received and continues to receive an annual grant from these Estimates. It is my understanding that — not my understanding, my knowledge — they have requested, partly because of their Centennial celebrations that they are moving into that the department is in receipt of some additional requests for capital improvements to that facility.

Has the Minister or his staff been able to deal with that matter at all or have they looked at it or are they considering it?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Minister.

**MR. MACKLING:** Sorry, Mr. Chairman, could the honourable member identify that concern again?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, firstly and I appreciate the opportunity of clarifying my question. I am not suggesting necessarily, although that would be a matter for the department and the Minister to consider whether or not the annual grant is adequate and suitable. I am pleased to see that being continued but during my time in office, the department was being approached for a one-shot only additional assistance in recognizing the celebrations that the International Peace Gardens is celebrating in the coming year. They had a shopping list I suppose of some additional projects that they wanted to undertake and were asking the government for a once only support in these ventures. I am wondering whether the department's had a chance to look through that list at all and whether or not there is any good news for the supporters, the Board of Directors and the many visitors, both American and Canadian that pass through the International Peace Gardens every year.

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, in respect to the Peace Gardens, I understand that over 1.5 million visitors annually do visit the Peace Gardens. A very extensive portion of the Peace Gardens itself and I'm not sure just how much, perhaps about half, is in the state of North Dakota and that state provides considerable funding and there is a contribution from the Federal Government and the province.

The money included here, this \$50,200, is towards the operational expenses of the park. My staff advises me that last year there was a one-shot grant for Capital of a \$100,000 allocated from lotteries last year. This figure is the ongoing operational grant.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Lakeside.

**MR. ENNS:** Pass.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to bring to the attention of the Committee what the Member for Lakeside has brought now to their attention that the world renowned International Peace Gardens is celebrating its 50th anniversary this summer. I certainly would like to extend to the Minister and to all the members of the Committee and the Legislature an invitation to try and visit the International Peace

Gardens this summer because it is an excellent facility and one that is known certainly throughout North America and indeed in countries around the world. I would hope that I'd see some of my colleagues down there this summer.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Minister.

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I welcome that invitation. As a matter of fact, I recall with pleasure the opportunity I had some years ago when my daughter who is a horse lover went to riding school at the Peace Gardens and at that time I met your esteemed leader who also had a daughter at that Peace Gardens, not in equestrian events but something else. It is a very beautiful park and they do have extensive recreational programs, classes, that are widely used. I certainly would encourage members if they haven't been to the Peace Gardens to, in this anniversary year, go down and enjoy a visit there. Customs treat you well, too.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, one other point. I would just point out to the Minister and he may already be aware that the government appointee and representative on the Board of the International Peace Gardens is the former Member for Virden, Mr. Morris McGregor, who had served in this Legislature for some 18 years and I highly recommend him to the Minister as an appointee to that board. He serves as an excellent ambassador and communicator.

**MR. MACKLING:** I'll just note that with interest.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** We're on 5.(f)—pass. Resolution No. 105. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$10,331,000 for Natural Resources for Parks for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March, 1983—pass.

We're moving into a new department and I'm wondering if we would be wise to call it 5:30.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, yes, that would certainly meet with the approval of the Committee. Might I just say that I welcome the Honourable Minister of Agriculture to the Estimate procedure at this particular time and invite him to be part of the next division that we will be discussing.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Committee rise

### SUPPLY - COMMUNITY SERVICES AND CORRECTIONS

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Jerry T. Storie (Flin Flon):** This committee will come to order. I would ask the members to direct their attention to Page 26, Resolution No. 35 of the Estimates, Social Security Services, 6.(a)(1) Salaries.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Salaries item, the Administration component of this division reflects a fairly substantial increase over 1981-82. The '82-83 request is some 20 percent higher

than the appropriation for last year. I would ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, if he could give the committee the explanation for that.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister for Community Services and Corrections.

**MR. EVANS:** It must be about the increase in 6.(a)(1) Salaries and the primary reason for that increase is the addition of three staff persons.

**MR. SHERMAN:** The present complement of SMYs in this branch or this component then goes up by three, what are the classifications or categories of those three new SMYs, Mr. Chairman?

**MR. EVANS:** Specifically, Mr. Chairman, there'll be two program analysts and one auditor, the auditor will be assisting to monitoring compliance with the program.

**MR. SHERMAN:** That will bring the complement of this particular Administration component then up to 26.5 SMYs, correct?

**MR. EVANS:** Right.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 6.(a)(1)—pass; 6.(a)(2) Other Expenditures—pass; 6(b) Social Allowance Programs, 6(b)(1) Social Allowances.  
Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, can the Minister review for the Committee the increase in welfare rates being paid this year as broken down into the rated items and the nonrated items? He has referred to a 16.5-percent increase, I think, in those rates this year and I want clarification from him as to how that breaks down between the rated and the nonrated items. I know that, for example, on rent, utilities, etc., the Provincial Government pays actual, but in the preparation of his Estimates, there is always an estimate, although it doesn't appear in this book, of the kind of increase that the government is facing in that respect.

What is the Minister's estimate of that increase and what does the 16.5 percent apply to, the rated items exclusively, food, clothing, personal effects, etc.?

**MR. EVANS:** Yes, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, that "yes" may answer the latter part of the question, Mr. Chairman, but it doesn't answer the former part of the question.

**MR. EVANS:** The sky is falling. Yeah, the increase is approximately 12.6 million as you can see from the book, the increase in the item (1) Social Allowances. That breaks down as follows: I'm just going to round these off. \$2 million related to an estimated overexpenditure in the year '81-82. In other words, there were more people requiring Social Allowance Assistance for whatever reason, than had been provided for in last year's budget, so there is an overexpenditure of \$2 million, a shortfall.

There is roughly \$9.2 million to meet the increases announced, the 16.5-percent rate increase, and as I

said, that relates to the personal needs, food and clothing. And then in that 9.2 million also are funds to provide for the increased costs of utilities and shelters over which we have no direct control.

\$757,000 is in there for a workload change. We anticipate a 2 percent increase in certain categories, the disabled and some other general categories requiring assistance.

Lastly, we have another item and I believe we made reference to it yesterday, Mr. Chairman: \$600,000 allowance for adults in guest homes.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, there was consideration at one time being given to a consideration of including basic telephone service as a basic necessity. I'm not sure whether there was a specific estimated sum of money attached to that program proposal, although I think there was, and I think it was in the neighbourhood of a million dollars.

Could the Minister advise the committee as to what is the status of that proposal. Is it included somewhere in this year's package or has there been any decision made with respect to it?

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, we have considered it. This is an item, I guess, that has been considered from time to time in the past, and if we did institute a policy whereby everyone was automatically allowed a phone in the Social Allowance payments, it would cost nearly \$1 million additional in our budget.

The decision — we've reviewed it and we've considered not to move in that respect at this time. I would be interested in knowing whether the honourable member official Opposition's view is that we should provide a telephone as a basic necessity to every social allowance recipient. I'd be interested in the members views.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I'd be happy to discuss those with the Minister outside the House. The subject was raised as a question not as a suggestion. Certainly it was given consideration by the previous government and certainly it been given consideration by the public service, under whichever government is in office.

I think in view of the position that the government in the province faces at the present time in terms of the overall budget, the overall projected deficit, the requirements for funding, for expansion of a number of very high priority programs and the requirements for support for persons who are in difficulty in society today as a result of specific financial conditions such as those related to mortgage interest rates and business problems resulting from current economic difficulties, that a concept of this kind is probably not timely at the moment. I can appreciate the government's difficulty in fitting it into the budget in 1982-83, and I'm not suggesting that I criticize the Minister for not including it in the 82-83 budget but I know that it had been given consideration. I assumed it had continued to receive some consideration under the new government, I simply wondered whether it was included in this overall budgetary figure that's in the printed Estimates.

Certainly when economic conditions are such that people are not losing their homes, their businesses

and their farms, and when some of the services and support programs that are required in the economic and business sector have achieved their objectives and are no longer required, and when we've met the top priority challenges that still continue to face us in the field of health and community services generally, I would think that this is an idea that merits some very serious attention. I'm not disturbed that it is not in this years Estimates, I simply wondered what had happened to it.

Mr. Chairman, can the Minister sketch for the Committee this current caseload situation with respect to social allowance recipients. Are the caseloads in the individual categories of assistance increasing? How do they compare with previous years? What is the current status of those caseloads and the projection for those caseloads in '82-83 on which the Minister has based these appropriations?

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, the average monthly caseload by category tends to be rather stable — I don't have all the figures by category for a number of years back — but generally there is a fairly constant relationship. Indeed the overall number of cases as the member knows, has come down the past several years and at the present time the average monthly caseload is approximately 19,000 and in the year '80-81 it averaged at 19,000.

One of the major reasons, and it has come down as I said back in '75-76 it was 23,864, you can see a progressive decline in those numbers. One of the primary reasons for the decline has been the availability of pensions, particularly old age pensions to those 65 years of age and over. As the member knows we've had as one major category in the caseload, the category of the aged people who, for whatever reason do not obtain sufficient monies to meet a bare minimum as deemed by our studies of the cost of living and so on. The basic needs criteria when they've applied to a great percentage of the aged over the years, have resulted in those coming in under the Social Allowance Program. But that has diminished as the Federal Government has gone into the indexing of old age pensions plus the fact that more and more people coming into the retired category are coming in with the Canada Pension Plan and of course there's the Guaranteed Income Supplement.

So as a result of these other benefit plans there has been a decline in the caseload related to the elderly and that is the major reason why there has been a decline over the years I understand. But at the moment you can say our caseload is approximately 19,000 and roughly half of that is in the disabled category.

**MR. SHERMAN:** My next question, Mr. Chairman, really relates back to some extent to an aspect of these Estimates that we discussed last night in the earlier resolution having to do with Employment Services. In the caseload of clients on mothers' allowances, is there a substantial or significant number of people in that category who are ultimately and successfully and therefore relatively permanently being moved out of the dependency situation in which they find themselves, and into permanent employment as a result of employment services and counseling and

other vocational opportunities being made available to them through that other branch of this department?

**MR. EVANS:** The program that the member refers to and was discussed last night is a relatively modest program and I think it's a step in the right direction. But the information we have is that the mother allowance category has been relatively stable. Roughly a third, 6,200 are in the mothers allowance category.

The staff have advised that on average there tend to be 500 cases coming on stream per month and 500 cases being closed per month. So that those coming in and those going out of social assistance seem to balance off, therefore we find that the average monthly caseload has been relatively constant.

I think the program the member just referred to could have a bearing in this category, but it would have to be much more extensive than what we have at the present time. What we have at the present time is very very modest, but a step in the right direction.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Has the Minister, in his relatively limited exposure to the problems and challenges of this Department to date, yet encountered the challenge of the so-called "father's allowance?"

**MR. EVANS:** Yes, I've been advised that there is a dilemma out there that we should be prepared to treat, I would suggest, men as we would treat women. The men are entitled to as good a break, in this case, as the women. Just to elaborate for other members of the Legislature who may be interested, a mother who has children and has no means of support for whatever reason, say, the husband was killed in an accident, for example, for whatever reason, can automatically, under our Legislation, apply for mother's allowances and, therefore, becomes a case in the social allowance system of the province. This is not true of a father.

A father may, let's say, have the same situation of three children and may have lost his wife for whatever reason, but he does not automatically qualify for social allowance. So you could say that there's some inequity there, particularly when there are more opportunities for women to work, particularly when we have day care programs hopefully that are going to be improving in the years ahead, and other programs that give women a greater opportunity, give mothers a greater opportunity to seek and achieve financial independence. Very specifically, the mother is automatically deemed unemployable and automatically the father is deemed employable, so there is a difference.

So, this is one area that we would wish this task force to look at, that is the area of whether mothers should automatically be given mother's allowances. I believe there's some provinces that force women to take jobs, specifically British Columbia and Alberta, but this would be one major area that we would ask the task force on social allowance to consider.

There are other items that I might mention for the honourable members edification. One other item, of course, would be the whole area of municipal social allowance. To what extent should the municipalities continue in their present role, as defined in the legislation, in social allowance payments and so on. I found

the small municipalities, rural municipalities and small towns are really are not equipped staff-wise to deal with social allowances to the extent that, I think, they should be. I'm not being critical of those municipal jurisdictions, I'm simply stating the situation. So I think this is one other area that this task force will want to address itself; well, indeed, will be asked to concern itself with and that is just what roles should the municipalities in this province play in the future. I don't want to prejudge what they might tell us; we're hoping that there will be a thorough analysis of the facts, a thorough analysis of the situation and that they can come up with observations as to the adequacy of the present system as it involves the municipalities.

There are other questions, too, that the task force will concern itself with, such as, the whole criteria of eligibility, so there are various facets I am sure that we would hope that the task force would look at and would give us advice.

I just might add, Mr. Chairman, that this was a promise made in the Throne Speech and it is a promise that is going to be acted on in the very near future.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman and, through you, thank you to the Minister for that information which really led to my next question, although he's partially answered it. I wanted to ask him to refresh my memory with respect to the time-frame for this task force, whether the task force had been established, or whether a date had been set for its establishment, and the implementation of its responsibilities and its course of work; and what the make-up of that task force would be and how long he anticipates it will be at its work in reviewing these various questions and issues; when he expects a report from them. Are we looking at a one-year process or something within a specific time-frame shorter than that he can put a guesstimate on for the Committee?

**MR. EVANS:** It's very difficult to state. I wouldn't like to even offer a suggestion. I surely don't want to limit the ability of the task force to do a thorough job, so I really wouldn't like to suggest it. From my personal point of view I'd certainly like to see . . . so that by next year, a year from now, we can make, if it's deemed advisable, acceptable, certain legislative amendments to The Social Allowances Act; that, to me, would be ideal. So whether the Committee reported in six months or eight months, it may not make that much difference. If they need a year or more — I would hope it wouldn't take a decade, five years, four years, — obviously those extremes are ruled out. It won't be done in a month; it won't be done in two months and I just wanted to point out also to the members of the Legislature that this legislation has been in place for many a year. It's been in place for eighteen years and there's been, to my knowledge, no substantive change to that legislation, in other words, it's high time, nearly two decades later, to look at that legislation and see to what extent it's doing the job that we want it to do.

**MR. SHERMAN:** What will be the parameters or terms of reference for that task force? Is it dealing with the Department of Community Services and the func-

tions and impact of the Department, as such, or is its exclusive responsibility going to lie in the requirement for a review of the social security system, the income security system and the social allowance programs that make it up? Is it going beyond income security or is it a task force specifically to do with income security programs?

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, it's specifically dealing with income security; it's specifically dealing with the social allowances program, specifically dealing with The Social Allowances Act which was proclaimed February 1, 1960 and, as I stated, there are a number of major issues that the task force will be asked to consider. I'm just repeating myself: (1) categories of eligibility for social allowances; (2) definition and treatment of financial resources in determining eligibility; (3) existence of the two-tier system of assistance comprised of the Provincial Social Allowance Program and the Municipal Assistance Program; so all issues as relate to the legislation that is now in place. How adequate is this legislation that is now in place? You are going to get into broad questions of philosophy perhaps, or general Social Security policy questions. You can't avoid it. That's there as a framework, I suppose. But very specifically, we would like some advice as to how we should proceed in the future with our Social Allowance Programs.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, can one assume then, Mr. Chairman, that there will be no decisions made with respect to any changes in the application of The Social Allowances Act or with respect to the mechanics of categorization of eligible recipients with respect for example, to the whole municipal assistance question; with respect, if you like to the very specific and limited question that I raised a moment ago about so-called fathers' allowances until this task force has completed its work and reported to the government.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, we are limited by the legislation, and of course — as an aside — we are limited by the Federal Government as well. It has certain requirements. But, essentially we are limited by the legislation and by The Municipal Act. I believe The Municipal Act makes reference to the fact that municipalities of Manitoba must provide for welfare recipients, social-alloance recipients.

If I might just interject here, I meant to do this at the beginning at 3 o'clock or whenever, to give the Committee two pieces of information. The Member for Fort Garry asked about the transfer of functions to the Department of Health and from the Department of Health. I have a listing here which he might have showing the transfer of functions to the Department of Health totalling 535.5 staff persons and \$25 million. This is transferred for '82-83 but using '81-82 numbers. At any rate it gives you an idea of what's been involved.

Also, the Member for St. Norbert asked yesterday about the number of children placed in Manitoba for adoption from other provinces, other countries. We have a list here which I will make available to the member for the calendar year, it says calendar year 1981-82. Any rate, I imagine that is a fiscal year or the year ending 1981. This is my only copy so I will read it

into the record, but you can have a copy, we'll get a copy xeroxed. From Ontario - four; Saskatchewan - two; Alberta - one; so that's seven in one year who have been placed for adoption in Manitoba homes. That's importation, if you like. I don't like the word export or exportation because, I think it's demeaning of the children and demeaning of the families involved, because when you say export, you are always thinking of export in order to earn a revenue. Surely, no one is earning revenues. —(Interjection)— I know you haven't said it; I know the Member for St. Norbert is very sensitive to this issue and surely he hasn't said nor has his colleague, but this is a term that has been unfortunately used in the Press. There have been international placements of children for adoption.

As I said, there have been seven placed in Manitoba homes from other provinces and there have been 22 — for the latest year we have only got applications in process and they show 22: 9 from the Philippines; 4 from India; 1 from the West Indies; 1 from Barbados; 2 from Guiana, 1 from Poland; 1 from Indonesia; 1 from Trinidad; 1 from Portugal, and 1 from China. 18 of the 22 are seeking entry for the purpose of adoption and the remainder are children who may just simply be brought here as landed immigrants. But, we will make a copy of this for you, but this is the latest information that we have. It is difficult, we have to obtain this from other authorities. I don't believe that is data that we would collect in the normal administration of the department.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, that will be very helpful information, Mr. Chairman, and my colleague the Honourable Member for St. Norbert and I appreciate receiving that.

Who will be on the task force? In rough general terms, I don't expect names, addresses and phone numbers, Mr. Chairman, but how broad a spectrum of representation is going to be encompassed by the task force?

**MR. EVANS:** We want to strike the balance of people from different areas of expertise, but people who have some working knowledge, this is going to be a working group, a task force. The people who will be named to the committee will have, hopefully ample experience, so that they can draw from their knowledge and experience and give us some suggestions.

I am suggesting, for example and this is hypothetical but I am not too far off, someone from the legal aid system in the province because Legal Aid Manitoba I am advised, has a great deal to do with social allowance clients. Also, the Social Planning Council of Winnipeg, I know as a research body has had a lot of data, a lot of knowledge, I think quite an understanding of the problems that we have. So, it is that type of expertise and the other thing of course, we always have to be concerned and that is, this is the Manitoba Social Allowance Program not the Winnipeg social allowance program, so we have to ensure that we have representation from outside of Winnipeg and therefore there will be hopefully some adequate geographical representation.

I just might add, Mr. Chairman, I have been reminded and it is a good reminder, you want to limit obviously for the purpose of efficiency the size of the task force.

You could bring in many, many groups that would have some interest but the point is that no one of course will be denied the opportunity of making some input, and surely you would want to ask the various municipalities that have some interest in this to make a presentation, to make a brief whether oral or written presentation to the task force. I would hope the task force would move around as it is necessary to enable people in different regions of the province to make their views known. So we would certainly invite briefs and representations from all and sundry, including municipal governments, other social agencies that have some concern, from individuals, from the entire spectrum of the Manitoba community that has some interest in this and wishes to make some input by way of suggestion or information.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Will it be chaired by a member of the public, Mr. Chairman, or by a representative from the department and/or the Minister's office?

**MR. EVANS:** That hasn't been resolved, but it will be shortly.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister about relative abuse of the social allowances system. I think that abuse of the system is limited, but we live in an imperfect world and I think there would probably be an admission by all of us that there is some limited abuse of all programs of this kind. As I recall, the audit section of the department has the responsibility for monitoring the programs and for overseeing the morality and legitimacy of the applications and the respective candidacies for income support, and identifying those instances of abuse where they exist. Can the Minister offer the Committee any insights as to the general situation with respect to abuse?

I recall, and I'm going basically by memory, Sir, being told, and I'm not sure whether it was a public situation that was aired in this House or whether it was conveyed independent of the House in a rather private and confidential manner, I can't really recall. But nonetheless, during the time that I was Minister there was a suggestion made either in the House or outside the House by an employee or a ployee of the system or a former recipient of the system, somebody with relevant former emconnection to the system that there was some significant abuse of the system running to a 5 percent or 10 percent level in the overall general case load. Now, I'm going by memory. I recollect that it was something in that nature and those of us who had the responsibility in those days were, of course, concerned that it be checked out, investigated, and that, of course, as would be the case with the present government or any government, that abuse be kept to a minimum. Can the Minister advise the Committee as to the situation with respect to abuse? Does he have an estimate on the percentage of cases overall in the province in a given year that require investigation by the Audit Branch and that proved to provide grounds for prosecution on the basis that they are false claims? What is the abuse situation? What is the abuse level in terms of the overall program and the general case load?

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, it's virtually impossible to measure abuse. How much abuse is there in the income tax system?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, known abuse.

**MR. EVANS:** How much abuse is there of federal importation laws, federal customs duties laws? How many people have brought across the border certain items that they somehow or other forgot to declare? You know, how much abuse is there of any program or any system? So, I'm sure the honourable member and others in the House realize that you set up any system whereby there are payments involved or restrictions, regulations set in place for the general public or for a portion of the general public, then there's going to be some people who will not abide by the rules and, wittingly or otherwise, will break the rules. I suggest that the matter of so-called welfare abuse is the matter that in the minds of some people at least, is exaggerated. I'm not making any reference to the members opposite particularly if you had anything to do with the administration of the program of the department, you realize that many of these claims are exaggerated.

Quite often, when you get some person in the community who complains about a welfare recipient or social allowance recipient who is getting funds, presumably illegally or under false pretenses, etc., you'll find that it's a general criticism that may be made, but when you want to ask the specifics; give us the name, give us the details, then the complaint seems to disappear. As a MLA over the years this has been my experience, that I've had people come to me when we were in government before and when we were in Opposition complaining about so-and-so on such-and-such a street abusing the sytem or they won't give you the name at first; they'll refer you to someone they know. When you try to get the details, it's just almost impossible.

So, I'm not in a position to say, but I wouldn't be surprised if however you define it — you use the term abuse — I said it's almost impossible to define. I would not suggest that there's any more abuse of this system than there is of many other systems that are put in place by government. If there are overpayments and we find that overpayments have been made for whatever reason, quite often someone suddenly becomes the recipient of a new pension or a new payment or gift or what have you and, therefore, for some reason or other haven't got around to declaring it, well, it's an overpayment and this overpayment situation then has to be rectified and they're asked to pay back and indeed there are many people who are being deducted from their current monthly cheque x amount of dollars to collect back an overpayment, resulting usually from something that hadn't been declared.

I might add I've had a little bit of experience in constituency case work, very minor, but usually the people involved are fairly innocent people. We're talking about really, people who are relatively poor; in fact, perhaps the poorest people that we have in terms of income, not in terms of anything else but in terms of their economic situation. You know, it's very tempting for Mrs. Jones, having received a few dollars extra from someone not to rush out to the Social

Allowance office, the Income Security office to declare that, "I've gotten this few extra dollars and, therefore, I should be deducted." So you can understand the situation.

At any rate, I can advise that we do have this audit group and we have just indicated that we'll add one to the seven that already exist in the audit office and in addition to that, we have three investigators besides these that essentially operate in and around Winnipeg where the bulk of the case load is.

Last year there were 96 cases referred to the A.G.'s department and I understand that 66 cases were disposed of during that same 12-month period; these would be the more serious cases. I'd suggest that the bulk of the incidents where people have received an overpayment can be handled in an ordinary administrative way and indeed is.

**MR. SHERMAN:** The Minister certainly will get no argument from this side, Mr. Chairman, when he suggests that abuse in any program of this kind is hard to pinpoint and identify. Certainly the difficulty occurs in the fact that in many cases it's a general charge that's made by people who, for one reason or another, encounter frustration or have specific axes to grind. There is no valid, specific, legitimate information that then proceeds from that initial charge and as a consequence the department is unable to take any meaningful action. So I would agree that unknown abuse is a very hard thing to pinpoint.

But as the Minister has suggested there is a specific cadre of personnel in this division that has as one of its prime responsibilities, the job of being on the alert for possible abuse, those are the auditors and the investigators to which he has referred. It is among their prime responsibilities to look for and identify overpayment cases, or abuse cases. As the Minister has said, they can refer specific recipients or specific cases to the Attorney-General's Department and prosecutions can flow from that kind of initiative.

My interest at this juncture really revolves around the critical path picture portrayed by that kind of activity. What does that critical path show? We don't show a significant increase in the Social Allowances caseload. On an average monthly basis for 1981 as against 1980 or 1979 the Minister has pointed out we're roughly around 19,000 in total and I'd be interested in knowing whether the investigations in this area by the Audit Branch and by the investigators in 1981 have uncovered cases of overpayment or abuse requiring reimbursement or reference to the Attorney-General in excess of the kinds of figures that have been the experience in preceding years? Had there been more cases of that kind in 1981 than in 1980? Was that total up over 1979? That sort of thing.

In other words, is there more efficient and effective work being done by this particular branch or is there an increase in overpayment that should be a subject of concern for the Minister and the department and indeed this Committee? Or is the volume of overpayment instances or abuse instances roughly proceeding along a status quo line, much as the Social Allowances caseload itself is?

**MR. EVANS:** There has been no discernible upward or downward trend in the percentage of cases that has

had to be referred to the A.G.s department, I'm advised, or indeed can be considered a major audit problem.

What we do find however, it's in the application process as unemployment increases, as times get tougher. In tough times there is a tendency for people to perhaps fib a bit in their application. Remember we're talking about generally very very poor people and they're having a tough time managing.

I want to say also that my experience as a member of the Legislature dealing with people out there in my own riding and around this good province of ours is that — in fact I get letters about it, so-and-so looking for a job and no way am I going to go on welfare — that's the average person. I had many people tell me that they are seeking a job or having tough times but I'm not going to apply for Social Allowance. When I suggest to them, well if you're down and out and you don't have enough for your kids or you don't have enough for this or that, you can always consider Social Allowances because no one should go hungry or without shelter, etc. I've had so many people say to me that no way are they going to apply for Social Allowance because they feel there is a stigma attached to it, that they themselves will work and try to find income to feed themselves and their family, clothe them and provide shelter, etc.

But the fact is that when times get tougher the applications will tend to increase although as I said, the caseload seems to be constant and the applications have to be checked more thoroughly because we find there are more errors and information that just doesn't check out upon review of the application by the staff.

The other point I wanted to make and that is, I'm reminded that we have an audit staff and we also have a Provincial Auditor who has a staff, who checks our audit staff. In fact if anything, they're crawling all over the office and I'm advised we sometimes can't get on with doing the job of delivering the program. We're spending all the time dotting the i's and crossing the t's and putting the semicolons in the right places, and so on instead of getting on with the main thrust. Now that may be just a bit of frustration being expressed here.

The other point is that the Canada Assistance plan has auditors as well, so they come in from Ottawa, or the Federal Government officials and they come in because their dollars are involved — 50 percent is federal money — and they're auditing. So if anything, we've probably got too much auditing that's going on. I'm thinking in terms of the value you're getting. Remember we're spending taxpayers' money for these auditors and for the amount of money we're spending for auditors and the amount of money we're saving for the taxpayers I'm just wondering — I can't give you the information — but I'm just wondering whether they balance out? Maybe we'd save the taxpayers more money if we did a little less auditing and save it on that score. I'm being a bit facetious, I really don't know the answer. But the fact is that the program seems to be well audited and perhaps overly audited.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, as the Minister has pointed out the average monthly caseload in this category, Social Allowance recipients for 1981, was

approximately 19,000. Does the department have any figures yet for the months of January and February — well that was 1981 — does the department have any figures yet for the months of January and February of 1982?

**MR. EVANS:** We will endeavor to get those, Mr. Chairman, we don't have that data with us. From the experience of the staff we don't expect any. The recollection is that there isn't any substantial difference, but we'll get the figures and look at them.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 6.(b)(1)—pass; 6.(b)(2) Health Services

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, the government announced in the Throne Speech that they would be bringing in a program to supply dentures, eyeglasses and hearing aids for senior citizens under a Pharmacare-type concept with a deductible and then reimbursement. How will that dovetail with the Social Allowances Health Services Program that's in place at the present time and has been for some time and covers drugs, dental and optical requirements?

**MR. EVANS:** Just as the Pharmacare program does not presently apply to the social allowance recipient, likewise, the Visage Program which could cover and would cover eyeglasses, dental service and hearing aids under a Pharmacare-type program, as described in the Throne Speech, similarly, would not apply to the social allowance recipients. The facts are, as the member perhaps should know or I will refresh his memory, social allowance recipients do have their entire medical, drug costs paid for, their dental work paid for and other ancillary optical, hearing aid, other ancillary medical need. And this, of course, is what this line refers to and, therefore, in effect they're covered totally right now. We don't believe that there would be much bearing, perhaps unless there's a marginal case, but we essentially don't think there would be any bearing on the social allowance recipient.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, what is happening with the social allowance health services cards and the review of the SAHS eligibility that was carried out under the previous government? Has that program been completed and has the number of persons carrying SAHS cards in the province stabilized, and at what approximate level has it stabilized? As I recall, when the review was introduced, we were looking at something in the neighborhood of, I think, 3,500 cardholders. It may have been 2,800, the figures 3,500 and 2,800 stick in my memory, but the 2,800 might have been the figure after the initial stages of the review were carried out. Can the Minister recap that process for the committee please?

**MR. EVANS:** Well the present number of cases with health cards for '81-82 is estimated to be 18,500; this includes wards of the Child Welfare. Perhaps I can just elaborate on it. There has been a decline, as the

member knows there was a policy decision made when he was a Minister of the Treasury Bench whereby cards were removed from certain categories, I think elderly people. At any rate the figures took a sharp drop in '79-80 and in '78-79 from the previous years. In '76-77 there were 25,100 cases; in the next year '77-78, 23,500; '78-79, 21,600; '79-80, 19,500; '80-81, 19,000; and '81-82 is estimated at 18,500. At any rate I imagine the member has some knowledge of this information.

I just might go back for a half a minute to the matter of drugs and dental work and optical needs of social allowance recipients being covered 100 percent. I'm reminded that if we cover it 100 percent, this category people, under the social allowances legislation, we get 50 percent funding from Ottawa. It's a good reason not to wish to have them put under the Pharmacare; a reason amounting to \$2.5 million - \$3 million next year.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Under the new system, with respect to the SAHS cards, are they still issued on a limited or partial year basis and then reviewed and renewed at specific times through the year, or are they issued on a long-term basis?

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, they are issued quarterly, but reviewed annually. As we review the entire program of eligibility and so on, so at the beginning of each year they're reviewed. It's essentially the same process that was in effect a year or two ago.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Presumably the appropriation requested for 1982-83 includes anticipated new agreements with opticians, and dentists, and pharmacists for these items that are supplied to the social allowance recipients. Is that what accounts, in substantial part, for the increased appropriation being sought when one compares the 1982-83 figure with the 1981-82 print figure, Mr. Chairman?

**MR. EVANS:** Yes, the anticipated increased cost of these services by dentists, and opticians and price increases of drugs are the primary reason for this increase. It can't be the caseload, the program hasn't changed, the caseload hasn't changed so it's really inflation, and I can advise that negotiations have begun, but they have not been completed so the negotiations are under way.

**MR. SHERMAN:** So the Minister has confirmed that it's not predicated on any estimate of a significant caseload increase, it has to do with the cost and price of supplying the services and the negotiations of the agreements with those three groups of professionals.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 6.(b)(2)—pass; 6.(b)(3) Municipal Assistance.

Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether he has any plans to assume, in one form or the other, because I know that's a matter of dispute, the costs of — and this would have to be applicable provincially — particu-



larly with respect to the City of Winnipeg Social Assistance Program presently administered by the city, or is that part of the study that he referred to earlier on and will be dealt with?

The Minister is indicating "Yes," Mr. Chairman, and I assume there will be an opportunity for involvement by the City of Winnipeg and the opportunity for them to make representations on this subject because I know they have felt, for some years, that the province should bear the financial cost of this particular program, but I think the city has also for a number of years felt quite strongly that they would like to do the actual administering of the program themselves.

**MR. EVANS:** Yes, most definitely, the City of Winnipeg would be involved and if all goes well possibly they can be on the task force itself, and I would also elaborate on what I said a few minutes ago. We will seek advice and information from everyone and every organization that's interested in providing that, including the Urban Municipal Association and also the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, but certainly the City of Winnipeg will be involved.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, my past records indicate that the average monthly caseload of municipal assistance recipients had been declining in previous years over the period from the mid 1970's until and through 1980. Can the Minister provide us with the current reading on that situation with respect to municipal assistance caseloads both for the total province and for the City of Winnipeg for 1981 and a comparison with the preceding years?—Are those lists and caseloads still going down?

**MR. EVANS:** Yes, it is true that the average monthly caseload, both for the City of Winnipeg and the province, has tended to decline in the last several years, but in year 1981 there was a slight upward increase. In 1980, the average monthly caseload in Winnipeg was 2,600 and in 1981 the average monthly caseload was 2,700, an increase of 100; and in the province, as a whole, it went from 3,600 in 1980 to 3,800 in 1981.

As the member knows, I'm sure, the municipalities are of course very much involved with the unemployed employable. It's these people, the unemployed employable, that go to the municipal level firstly for assistance, in fact, they continue on the municipal rolls as long as they're in the unemployed employable category. So these figures, the municipal caseload obviously does tend to reflect the lack of employment opportunities in the province or in the city or whatever municipality. While there was some decline in the latter part of the 1970's, in '81 there has been a slight increase over 1980.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Is that slight upward curve continuing in 1982, to date? Does the department have any figures or indications for 1982 yet?

**MR. EVANS:** We don't have the figures with us, but we think there's a slight increase also.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, just before we get off this item (b) complete, I would just like to ask the Minister whether, under the task force review that's

being projected, the review of the Social Allowances Act and Municipal Act and related procedures that are in place by statute and regulation in the province already, whether consideration will be given by that task force to the whole operation as it is affected by the Canada Assistance Plan. Are there any inclinations or initiatives on the part of this government to affect any changes or any modifications in federal support for Income Security Programs and Community Service and Rehabilitation Programs in general? Some two or three years ago there certainly was interest expressed by the Federal Government in changing the method of funding and funding support.

Does the Minister have any indication of any such feelings on the part of the present Federal Government today on that question? Does he, together with his government colleagues, have any concerns about federal funding and cost sharing and the Canada Assistance Plan, and will the task force undertaking the review to which he has referred be looking at that aspect of the income security system too?

**MR. EVANS:** Very specifically, it wouldn't be my intention to ask the task force to look into the area of federal assistance or federal involvement. I might suggest that our efforts have been to try to maintain at least the federal contribution under the CAP Program, Canada Assistance Program; it's been a holding action. We haven't been taking any initiatives to try to get further monies for whatever under this general area of social assistance, but thus far there have been no signs that Ottawa will get out of sharing the cost of this kind of a program. It's been a holding action, but it's been successful so far.

Just on the point that I made a minute ago on giving the member statistics for 1982, we are only now about half way into March and we haven't yet received the information from the various municipalities of the province for February, so the only information we can give you for '82 would be January, already indicated the information for the calendar 1981 — unless you're prepared to wait a few more weeks — but we can get you tomorrow I hope the information for January.

**MR. SHERMAN:** No, that's all right, Mr. Chairman. I asked the question because I asked the same question with respect to the Social Allowances caseload and the Minister and his officials indicated that January and February of 1982 reflected a continuation of the 1981 status quo in the main and I wondered whether they had a similar reading on municipal assistance caseloads and their performances in 1982. I realize it's early in the calendar year and if he doesn't have that information then I understand that.

But I just want to confirm for my own satisfaction that at this point in time heading into fiscal 1982-83, the Minister is satisfied that the Canada Assistance Plan remains in place as is and that the shared cost arrangements under CAP for programs such as those we are discussing at the present time, are secure for the foreseeable fiscal future. Is that what the Minister is telling the Committee?

**MR. EVANS:** Essentially, this is what we're advising the member, that at least for the near future the arrangements that have been in place for some time

will remain in place.

**MR. SHERMAN:** So when the Federal Government talks about reductions in transfer payments — and I recognize that CAP does not represent a transfer payment — but when the Federal Government talks about reductions in transfer payments under The Established Programs Financing Act they are not also suggesting, or implying, or leaving the inference that the Canada Assistance Plan and cost-shared mechanisms of that kind may also be subjected to that kind of reduction. I don't know whether that's a question or a statement, Mr. Chairman, I'd have to read the transcript. If I put it as a statement, I mean it as a question.

Is the Minister assured that the Federal Government's maneuvering and indications in the area of reductions of transfer payments is not reflected somewhere by similar ambitions in the area of funding mechanisms such as the Canada Assistance Plan?

**MR. EVANS:** Essentially there is no structural changes proposed in the Canada Assistance Plan, but we anticipate obtaining \$88,345,000 in the year 1982-83.

**MR. SHERMAN:** \$88,000,000?

**MR. EVANS:** \$88,345,000 compared to \$74,198,000 last year.

**MR. SHERMAN:** So \$88,000,000 compared to about \$75,000,000.

**MR. EVANS:** It rounds off to \$74,000,000.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Okay, thanks.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Dauphin.

**MR. JOHN PLOHMAN (Dauphin):** Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask in regard to municipal assistance whether the assistance provided by the province makes any allowances for administration to assist municipalities in administering the municipal social assistance programs?

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, the Department pays 50 percent of the staff costs of people engaged in full-time work in administering this program.

**MR. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Chairman, am I to understand then that 100 percent of his or her time must be spent on administering a municipal social assistance program before they're eligible for such assistance?

**MR. EVANS:** The short answer is yes, Mr. Chairman. But as I was indicating to the House a few moments ago or half-an-hour ago or an hour ago, we will be undertaking this comprehensive task force review of the entire social allowance system and one important area will be the involvement of municipalities. There are various options that I'm sure the task force will look at, the option of, (1), carrying on with the same system that we have now with no change, that's a possibility obviously of a suggestion. Another would be at another extreme, for the province to take over

entirely all municipal involvement, that there be no municipal involvement whatsoever — I'm not suggesting that should happen — I'm just saying that's the other extreme. There may be other options somewhere in between where we request only the larger municipal governments, the City of Winnipeg, the City of Brandon, Portage, and so on to continue their involvement or maybe just the City of Winnipeg and the City of Brandon. There are different options.

All I'm saying is, that question and that concern expressed by the Member for Dauphin will be addressed by this task force.

**MR. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I'm very pleased to hear that. I just want to say that at a meeting with the Town Council of Dauphin just last Thursday I received information that I had been somewhat aware of that the municipal costs of administering the Municipal Social Assistance Program have increased dramatically in the last three years. The number of people who have asked and demanded the service has increased dramatically as well as the hours spent by the staff and the amount of money spent by the municipality in Dauphin, so they are as a matter of fact looking very strongly towards a change in this program.

I would like to emphasize what the Minister has said already, that it must be reviewed. I'm pleased to see that it's going to be reviewed and I think there has to be some allowances for staffing and not as stringent as they are right now, in that the person has to be a full-time employee if we are indeed going to allow these centres to continue to administer the program themselves rather than the province taking it over.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 6.(b)(3)—pass. 6.(c) Day Care Services. 6(c)(1) Salaries.

The Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I think there are one or two of my colleagues and other members of the Committee who want to address this same topic. Just before we get into it in depth, I'd like to put one initial question to the Minister.

There were references emanating from a recent news conference with the Minister, perhaps an unofficial news conference with him, which suggested that he was looking at shifting the day care system entirely over to a publicly-operated and publicly-funded system and that his interest and inclination was in eliminating private or commercial day care operations from the field, that is any day care operation that had any taint of the unfortunate profit motive that causes a good deal of concern among many members opposite. Subsequent to that there were discussions, I think, with the Minister in a news medium setting in which his position was clarified somewhat. I think though, that the question still remains, not all of us have been satisfied altogether precisely as to where the Minister does stand on this question. I'd ask him directly whether he is contemplating legislation, a day care act or amendments to existing legislation or regulations that will be designed to eliminate privately-operated, commercially-operated, profit-oriented day care centres from the day care field.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, I believe that's a question the answer to which will be revealed when we introduce the day care legislation that's been announced in the Throne Speech. At that time the policy thrust of the government will be outlined in the child day care legislation — The Community Child Day Care Standards Act. And at that time the policy thrusts will be made known. I think that will be an appropriate time to debate it, if there is any debate. I'd be anxious to know what the honourable member thinks, if he like to make some input at this point as to how we should address that question. I'm sure, if we have any debate on the bill, these questions will be well explored at that time.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, that's an interesting position to take. We're discussing the Estimates of the department and of this division and this branch and the Minister has, together with his colleagues and with his officials, put together a requested budgetary appropriation for '82-83 which must be related to some programs, and those programs must be based on either existing or anticipated statutes and regulations. So, I find it a little incredible that the Minister should be suggesting that there has been no decision of this kind made. I would think that this would be the arena and the forum, the Estimates of his department, in which questions of that nature should and could rightfully be explored and discussed. How long are we going to wait, and how long are those persons in the community who have this question in mind, the question that I have posed, going to have to wait for the introduction of the legislation referred by the Minister and an indication as to the government's intention in this respect? I'd ask him that question: when can we expect some format that would provide that indication; and secondly, I would say to him I'm certainly prepared to declare my position on it, right here and now. But I would like to know whether the Minister is prepared to declare his position on it?

I am fully prepared to tell him what I think about the question, whether he'd be appreciative or receptive at all to that position is beside the point, I'm fully prepared to declare it. But as the Opposition, I challenge the Minister to do likewise and tell me his position.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Conrad Santos (Burrows):** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, my position would be the position of this government in the true tradition of British parliamentary practice, where you either hang together or you hang alone. But our policy, and the member is very knowledgeable of parliamentary practices and traditions of Cabinet norms, and so on, that policy position would be a government position, and it will be stated in effect, when the day care legislation is introduced. I want to then hasten to add that these monies relate to existing legislation, existing programs.

I did mention in my opening remarks that we were expanding the number of spaces by 775 this year, so therefore, monies have to be provided for that. In addition we were increasing various per-diem rates, and we were increasing the annual maintenance grant and I believe I outlined that. I can repeat some of that if the member wants but that is the reason for the

additional monies being requested — incidentally not in this particular line, Salaries — we're really out of order here.

You'll see there's been no increase in salaries and virtually a minimal increase in other expenditures. It's the Grants and Subsidies line where the additional funding is being requested, but as I stated, it is not related to new legislation or any change that could come out of new legislation. If and when the legislation is passed, and I assume it will be passed this Session, we will need some time to bring in the various regulations and so on.

Therefore, I would think the impact would be on the next year's Budget, mainly '83-84.

**MR. SHERMAN:** The Minister points out correctly that the items that he's just referred to really come under another lines of these Estimates, but the principle and the issue that we were discussing a few moments ago are being discussed in order and not out-of-order because we're under the Salaries item and that presumably is where the principle and policy and approach of the branch comes under review, similar to the Minister's Salary item at the head of the entire Estimates package. I can only conclude that the Minister is not prepared to deny at this point in time that it's his intention, and his government's intention, to proceed in the day care field with a policy that reserves day care enterprise, exclusively, in the future for public-nonprofit operation.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, I'm repeating now and that is: these major questions, particularly the question that the member refers to, will be dealt with when we introduce the legislation. At that time we will deal with this question and at that time the government's view will be made known.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Tuxedo.

**MR. GARY FILMON (Tuxedo):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could just inform us in which way he sees current standards in day care being inadequate; in what respect does he feel that the standards are inadequate?

**MR. EVANS:** First of all, I want to congratulate the hundreds of people who are involved in the day care system in the Province of Manitoba. The bulk of them are community-based non-profit organizations where the parents are involved on the Board of Directors, and generally a good job is being done. I think generally the physical environment is satisfactory. This is usually subject now to a considerable amount of inspection, particularly in the City of Winnipeg, City of Brandon; fire safety is obviously a primary concern and inspection takes place in that area, and the building conditions generally and so on. Where we would see some improvement and upgrading would be in the program delivery, and I'm thinking particularly where there are larger numbers of children involved, so we can ensure ourselves that we have people that have some knowledge, and perhaps a bit of expertise in this area. So this is where we would look towards some qualitative improvements. Beyond that, of course, we are looking for a larger amount spread

around the province so that indeed people and families can avail themselves of the service so that women, for example, particular women, not just women but particularly women, can become a part of the work force and participate in their occupation if they so choose.

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that we can all understand and agree with the needs for providing quality day care in the province and I don't think that there's any argument on either side of the House as to the need for assuring that it is available to all women, or men, who have to avail themselves of the need for day care. What I'd like to know from the Minister, as well, in view of the fact that he has commended the community-base participation in the program as it exists today of having parents on the Boards of Directors and involved in the decision-making as to standards and quality of programming and so on. Is it his intention therefore to carry on with that concept and continue to have an avenue available for involvement of parents in the decision-making as to just exactly what type of day care they want for their children.

**MR. EVANS:** Perhaps, again, we're getting a bit into a debate about what the legislation will and will not have, like obviously the set-up that is in existence now and has been for some time is, in large part, very good. That is, the non-profit community-based organization where the parents of the children involved are, in effect, entitled to be on the board and virtually run the little day care, or not so little day care, in their own interest. This in my view is the ideal situation, where the parents themselves are directly participating, or have the opportunity to participate in board decisions and therefore in the management of the day care centre. That to me is ideal and I don't think there should be any dispute on any side of the House. We would like to do whatever we can to ensure the expansion of such community-base facilities.

We have to be concerned as well when we talk about upgrading, we have to be concerned that the ratios are adequate, that we don't have too many children per adult and we have to look at the ages of the children. Certainly it's more difficult to look after two, or three, or four infants than it is to look after two, or three, or four children lets say 10, 11, and 12. There's obvious differences based on age. So that's something else that we would want to look at. I think we have some excellent day care centre in the province, and we just want to ensure that excellence is maintained and hopefully improved upon.

**MR. FILMON:** Yes, I'm sure that, as the Minister points out, age is a factor, although I think some of us as parents think that it's more important as they get older it's more difficult to deal with greater numbers as opposed to, I think, the Minister is referring to the younger group. Mr. Chairman, as well I'd like to know if the Minister, or his department, foresee the proposed changes in standards resulting in additional costs, on a per diem basis, per child, in day care; will this improvement in standards result in increased costs and to what extent? Can he give us a ballpark estimate as to what additional costs will accrue to his department by virtue of the so-called change of

standards that he's going to bring in?

**MR. EVANS:** Well, there's no question that if you upgrade standards there's going to be a price tag, and costs are involved. This is true of any program I would submit, Mr. Chairman, day care is no exception. If you demand higher standards in the classroom you demand that no one shall be in front of a class of children who doesn't have a university education. It seems to me somewhere there's an additional cost involved. Quite often the costs will be direct; in some cases that is to be paid out, lets say, by the school division; in other cases it will be indirect, in as much as the taxpayers at large who finance universities generally in this province will be providing for education of X-number of teachers with a higher degree of education, a higher level of training involving more years in those institutions. So, certainly, the answer is yes, there will be an extra cost, but as I said it won't be any different from other programs.

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, thank you Minister for that response. He earlier referred to, in a complimentary fashion, and I concur with his compliments about the community-based parent involved boards and day care facilities as being an ideal to which he and his department would point in terms of providing day care in the province. I'm wondering if he then is saying that he would exclude the freedom of choice of individuals to choose non-community base, non-cooperative day care as an option if, in fact, parents who could afford it, and for whom there was no government subsidy involved, wished to pursue day care as offered by a private organization, whether that be a profit-making private organization or other private organization, would he deny parents the right to choose that option and, if so, for what reason?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. It's now 4:30 p.m., the time for Private Members' Hour. In accordance with Rule 19, paragraph 2, I'm interrupting the proceedings of this committee and we'll return at the call of the House.

## IN SESSION

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Springfield.

**MR. A.J. (Andy) ANSTETT (Springfield):** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there is again no Private Members' business on the Order Paper, I believe there is an understanding that we are prepared to adjourn the House at this time and return into Committee of Supply both in Room 255 and here in the House, and if that agreement and leave is granted, I would propose to move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Member for St. Norbert that the House do now adjourn.

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the understanding that the House will continue in Committee until 5:30 and then reconvene again at 8:00 p.m. this evening, it is moved by the Honourable Member for Springfield, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Norbert that the House do

now adjourn.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Wednesday). The Committee of Supply will continue in Room 255 until 5:30 p.m.

### **SUPPLY - COMMUNITY SERVICES AND CORRECTIONS (Cont'd)**

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Conrad Santos (Burrows):** The committee will please come to order.

The Honourable Minister.

**MR. EVANS:** Well again, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Tuxedo is really touching on an issue which I guess will be debated during the introduction of the new child day care legislation, but I again without wishing to really get into debate, would say that there is a very important question that we have to ask ourselves — to what extent should the state involve itself in all sorts of private arrangements? You know, there is some cutoff point. I don't know where that magical cutoff point is, but as a libertarian, I would say personally I would wish to minimize the influence and involvement of the state in people's lives. If we didn't have to have any police — I would love to have a society with no police force — that, of course, is a great ideal, perhaps never achievable, but — (Interjection) — Fee-for-service policeman. Well, Mr. Chairman, believe it or not, there are many parts — we do have private policemen as a matter of fact — (Interjection) — Yeah, just ex-premiers seem to be good at setting up private police forces. But at any rate, that's sort of a philosophical question the member raises, and obviously there is an area in which surely we wouldn't want to get involved.

There are a lot of personal arrangements that people make, one family with another, with neighbours, friends and so on — relatives, you know — obviously, there's some limit beyond which you don't go. What we want to do is to ensure that children who are placed in collective situations are well cared for. I mean the intentions are great, but we have to be careful that we at the same time are concerned about individual freedom and liberty. Look, the same problem comes up in all kinds of areas involving provincial, federal, municipal jurisdiction.

One has said, and I know that very well — the road to hell is paved with good intentions — and you know some people could argue that you may wish to bring in too many restrictions and regulations and so on, albeit with very good intentions, but nevertheless perhaps causing some difficulties for people unduly. I'm just making a broad sort of policy philosophical-type of statement, so I would prefer to not debate and I won't debate some policy principles that may or may not be in the legislation.

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to hear the Minister's placed the child in the whole mix, in the center of the mix, and in the first and foremost place in the decision making, because I would hope that whatever legislation and intentions he has in mind, will consider the needs of the child first and not be hung up on some sort of philosophical base that says

that because an organization may provide the service and be able to meet all the standards, but has a profit motive at its base, bottom line, or private gain of some sort because a small group or an individual is doing this as a source of livelihood on a private basis, that doesn't exclude them from the offerings in the Province of Manitoba with respect to day care and doesn't eliminate the freedom of choice of an individual mother or father who chooses to make an arrangement with that group or that organization for day care.

I wonder if the Minister could indicate if he believes that privately operated, privately funded day care institutions operating today in Manitoba are or are not meeting current standards in the field of day care?

**MR. EVANS:** My understanding is we don't have any provincial lease institutions or organizations to which the member referred are essentially in the City of Winnipeg, at least the larger ones, the ones that he's thinking about, and these are licensed and inspected if that's the term, by the City of Winnipeg, not by the province.

**MR. FILMON:** Then assuming that the Minister will follow the intention given in the Throne Speech and in previous announcements by his government that he will be setting new standards which presumably will apply to all organizations involved in day care, whether they be private, group, public or what have you; does the Minister believe that the new standards which are intended to be set can be met by other than publicly funded day care institutions?

**MR. EVANS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, that's almost hypothetical and certainly speculative and it remains to be seen.

**MR. FILMON:** Well surely, Mr. Chairman, the Minister must have some reason in saying that he believes you can set standards that can be met by publicly funded and group co-operative or whatever organizationally operated institutions, but is he saying that there may be something unique about these standards that won't be able to be met by privately funded and privately operated day care?

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, I'm not in a position to judge. I'm not in a position to say.

**MR. FILMON:** I thank the Minister of Health for helping me with that comment. But I would like to know from the Minister how he could believe that a privately operated organization couldn't meet the standards that his Department is prepared to set.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, I didn't say that. I'm simply confessing that I'm not all knowing, all seeing, all wise; I just don't have all that information.

**MR. FILMON:** It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that it's a very straightforward thing. If standards are set so they can be understood by somebody whether that somebody is an employee of a private organization or an employee of a public organization — and I don't think anybody has a licence or a monopoly on intelligence today in our community — so if they work for the

government rather than for a private organization they can understand something better.

Truly, if the Minister is telling us that he intends to come up with a set of standards that are readily understandable by at least the members of the Legislature if no one else, then surely he is telling us that if somebody can understand a set of standards they should be able to meet the set of standards whatever they may be. If that's the case then why is it not possible for a private organization to provide day care, meeting the same standards that he's going to set for all day care institutions in the province?

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, for the third time, I didn't say that.

**MR. FILMON:** Then what does the Minister have to say about private organizations meeting standards set by his Department?

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, as I indicated the bulk of the so-called private day care centres are in the City of Winnipeg. They are licensed and inspected by the City of Winnipeg for fire, building safety and so on, there is no program inspection at the present time. We are not involved in it at the present time.

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, has the City expressed any concerns to the Minister or his Department about the ability of these organizations to meet their standards?

**MR. EVANS:** As I recall I received a letter I think, from Councillor Rizzuto inquiring about our intentions and also indicating as I recall, their interest in us becoming involved in this whole area. They seem to be interested in the province becoming involved. (Interjection)—

I see. I'm advised that our information is, the thinking at least among some of the members of the City Council is that if we didn't get involved in setting program standards that they would be wishing to write a new by-law which would in effect enable them to set program standards.

**MR. FILMON:** I assume Councillor Rizzuto was writing in his capacity as Chairman of the Recreation and Social Services Committee. I wonder if the Minister would be good enough to table a copy of that letter with us so we can just see what their concerns are with respect to it?

**MR. EVANS:** I have no trouble with that and I think out of courtesy I should ask Councillor Rizzuto. I don't see any problem with it. I'd have to ask Councillor Rizzuto if he would agree to that, it's his letter.

**MR. FILMON:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I look forward to the Minister's answer on that. Does he envisage then that his new Act will encompass the territory and the prerogatives that are currently being served in day care by these private organizations operating within the City of Winnipeg?

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, for about the sixth time I'll be very pleased to discuss the impact of the legisla-

tion when we bring the legislation in. I don't want to get sucked into speculation as to what the Act will cover and what it won't cover. We'll just to debate that. There'll be ample opportunity to debate all facets of day care programming when the legislation's brought in.

Mr. Chairman, these Estimates relate to the existing legislation. There's not a nickel here which bears or is related to any new legislation. This is strictly money that is in keeping with the program that we have in place now with the expansion of 775 spaces, with the expansion of per diem rates and annual maintenance grants. We are helping the day care community if you will, expand and improve and this is done under the existing legislation, under the existing framework of regulations.

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister's introduction indicated that there was planned for an increase of 775 spaces this year. What was the number prior to the addition of 775?

**MR. EVANS:** It's now 8,152 spaces at the present time and the 775 will be added to that.

**MR. FILMON:** Can the Minister indicate how many were added during last year's program?

**MR. EVANS:** Last year, Mr. Chairman, there were 2,000 spaces added but I gather that was a catch-up because there were zero increases for three years; nothing for three years, last year 2,000. It seemed to me that it was very coincidental.

**MR. FILMON:** The Minister indicates again in his introduction that the per diem rate has been increased to \$9.50. Is that up from \$8.50 am I recalling, or was it \$8.75?

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, it was \$8.50.

**MR. FILMON:** As well, there was a provision in the past for an additional \$1.00 to be charged by day care organizations for their own purposes if their program deliveries required additional funding, to meet their commitments. Is that still available?

**MR. EVANS:** Yes, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. FILMON:** I also recall, Mr. Chairman, that specifically I think it was the day care centre at the Health Sciences Centre that was having difficulty because of its enriched programming and additional features that it offered and I know that their mix of ages of children was different and they had many more in infant care. They also had a sort of study organization or a study unit going on abused children and so on and so forth and because of that their costs, I think, were estimated at considerably above that level, perhaps even approaching \$12 or 13 per day. Can the Minister indicate if there is a limit on the additional amount to \$1 or have some special arrangements been made for the Health Sciences Centre or other day care centres to allow them to recover costs over and above the per diem rate that was being offered by the province?

**MR. EVANS:** It remains at \$1, Mr. Chairman, there have been no special arrangements made for the Health Sciences Centre.

**MR. FILMON:** Can the Minister indicate, has he been contacted by the Health Sciences Centre Day Care Centre about this particular problem and is the matter being reviewed or is there any intention to deal with it or how are they able to contend with the problem at the present time?

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, we have been approached by that Centre; we are reviewing the problem they have. I might point out, of course, and it should go without saying, that they will benefit by the increases in the fees announced and by the maintenance grants; they will stand to receive substantial additional funding from that increase.

**MR. FILMON:** The Minister's introduction indicated, I think, that it would result in about a 14 percent increase in funding to most day care centres. I wonder, he stated those figures of maintenance grants being increased to \$800 for pre-school day care and \$150 for family day care, \$400 for noon-and-after-school care, what does that compare to in the present terms?

**MR. EVANS:** The annual maintenance grants per licenced child space, 1981-82 are as follows: \$650 for pre-school centres, so it goes from \$650 to \$800 in 1982-83; the family day care centre, the family day care is from \$100 last year to \$150 in 1982-83; and the noon-and-after-school centres go from \$325 to \$400 this year. Then, in addition to that, the parent fees per diem have gone up from \$8.50 to \$9.50, as we mentioned, for pre-school day care centres; from \$7.50 to \$9.50 for family day care; and from \$5.00 to \$5.50 for noon-and-after-school centres on school days; and from \$7.50 to \$8.50 on school holidays. So, when you add this all up the impact of this, we believe, comes to around 14 percent.

**MR. FILMON:** Well, Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that information that I had seen from the Health Sciences Centre Day Care Centre indicated that they were running a per diem cost almost one-third above the limit allowed; how are they going to meet that with a 14 percent increase?

**MR. EVANS:** Well, as I said, Mr. Chairman, we are looking at the problem.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could indicate when his government in his caucus will have formed a position on the proposed bill and when it will be introduced into the House?

**MR. EVANS:** Well, the legislation will be introduced into the House as soon as possible. It is our view, the government's view, that we should introduce all bills early rather than late and the Honourable Member for St. Norbert, former Government House Leader, is aware of this ideal that all governments like to

achieve. We will try to bring it in as soon as possible. I can't tell you whether it will be one week, two weeks, three weeks or four weeks, and the reason for that, too, there is printing involved, etc. It is very easy to come up with first reading, but it is the second reading, but we hope to be as expeditious as possible and the sooner the better.

**MR. MERCIER:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I realize the difficulties and that is why I asked the question and I would suggest to the Minister that, if the debate within the government continues for sometime and the bill is not to be introduced until late in the Session, that it may be advisable, rather than pass a bill at this particular Session of the Legislature, you may wish to introduce it in the form as a White Paper or merely a proposal. The reason I suggest this is that there are a lot of people who operate day care centres, work on a volunteer basis and will require some time to assess the provisions of a new Act and its affect on their particular operation and the affect of the new standards that may be included in a new bill.

So, I am just suggesting to the Minister that if it is going to be some time and not until late in the Session when the bill is introduced, there will not be sufficient time for volunteers to properly assess the impact of the bill on their own operations; it may be preferable in order to get the best possible bill to introduce it in the form of a White Paper.

**MR. EVANS:** Well, a couple points. As I said, I don't have total control over this, but we'll try to be as expeditious as possible in introducing the legislation. But I'd make a couple of other points: (1) We have received delegations for many day care organizations, organizations concerned about the day care system in Manitoba, many many briefs, five or six anyway, at least, I would think, lengthy meetings, in fact, among the first meetings I've had as Minister were with the day care people.

Secondly, I would point out that, to a large extent, many of the problems that the individual day care centres may wish to address will come by way of regulation. The legislation, as with most legislation, sets the general parameters. I would hope that we will have ample opportunity to discuss even regulations, which is something different, with people in the day care community possibly over the summer, early fall, and so on. So we want to go quickly, but not so quickly that we do a sloppy job, we want to go at a pace that's reasonable and whereby we give everyone concerned an opportunity to give us the benefit of their views.

**MR. MERCIER:** Well, Mr. Chairman, it may, in fact, be that the regulations will be the most difficult part of the new standards for day care centres to deal with.

Mr. Chairman I would like to raise a problem of a day care centre within my own constituency and one that I know is shared at least by a Day Care Centre in Thompson and may perhaps be shared by day care centres in other parts of the province. The problem relates to the fact that — and this is non-profit day care centre that was formed within recent years — their problem results from the fact that they've purchased their own property to operate a day care cen-

tre out of it and they purchased it last year. Because of assessment provisions in the Act, Mr. Chairman, the first problem is that they are assessed as a commercial operation rather than residential. Now, it may be that Mr. Weir's report on assessment will deal with this particular aspect but I doubt it, Mr. Chairman, because I don't think it has been brought to their attention, I stand to be corrected. But I think it's something that the department itself will have to consider because the assessment naturally has an impact on the operating costs of the day care facility.

So, the first problem, Mr. Chairman, they are faced with is that having purchased their own property and operating as a day care facility, they are liable to be, this particular centre has been assessed as a commercial operation and not as a residential operation. I would say that they have undertaken an appeal and I'm trying to assist them with their assessment appeal but I think the legislation could and should be clarified with respect to their classification. It's simply not equitable that a non-profit day care centre be classified as a commercial operation. I think as with a number of other problems that have been raised with assessment there should be some sort of classification between commercial and residential.

The second problem relates to the fact that as well as being assessed for commercial purposes, they are being assessed for school taxes. The Municipal Assessment Act, particularly Section 25 of that Act, does allow for exemptions for school purposes. Now, this Act of course was passed some time ago and hopefully will be dealt with in Mr. Weir's report, but it was legislation passed many, many years ago. There is a possibility that in their appeal they may come within, and I'm stating this for the record I don't expect the Minister to be familiar with the specific provisions, it may be that they would come within the exemptions in subsections (d) or (h) and therefore be exempt from school taxes.

But again, Mr. Chairman, I'm raising this particular problem for the Minister and his department, because I think they should examine the assessment of day care operations, nonprofit operations, which own their own property, which is a relatively new phenomenon, because most of them as we know operate out of leased space or out of church basements or some sort of public facility and therefore haven't been put in this position. But I think certainly the intent of Section 25 of The Municipal Act, which refers to buildings used by charitable institutions or used for community purposes, if you looked at the intent of this section, I think that the intent would be that this kind of non-profit operation should be exempt from school taxes, but the language is not clear and is not up-to-date and probably was developed many, many years ago. So that it is questionable at this point in time whether they come within the exemption from school taxes in that section of the Act.

So, Mr. Chairman, I raise this particular point because I would hope that the Minister and his department would examine this question with the ever increasing expansion of day care program under our government and now under this government. There may very well be more and more day care centres who choose to purchase their own property who operate their day care centre. I believe that it is

inequitable that they be taxed on a commercial basis and that they not be exempt from school taxes. I would ask the Minister if he would undertake to have his department examine that particular question and perhaps bring in some remedial legislation to clarify the situation at this or the next Session of the Legislature

**A MEMBER:** Point of order, Mr. Chairman, the member has to speak from his own seat.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** I would like to thank the honourable member for his courtesy in reminding me that I don't know where my own seat is, and if that would have been my seat you would have wanted me to push him over to speak from there. Well, thank you for your courtesy but I'm standing in my own seat.

I'd like to say that I did want to interrupt the member when he spoke because I wanted him to make his point, but, Mr. Chairman, I submit that this is rather out of order, this concern that he has which is not a new concern; which is a concern that existed when my honourable friend was sitting on this side of the House. I remember at the time, it's unfortunate that I can't quote the page, but this was brought up and I know that we were referred to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. This is not something that this Minister is responsible for. This is a question that this department can't do anything about; it's the Municipal Affairs that'll have to interpret the legislation or make any change, if any. We are dealing with the program and the way it exists now and if there is any change under a new government with the different grants and that's I think what we should address ourselves to at this time.

**MR. EVANS:** The answer is that we have looked into this. It's been looked into by the staff in the past and as the Minister of Health said, it's a municipal responsibility and the member himself from St. Norbert, referred to the problems of municipal assessment, the Weir Commission, etc. The problem, as I understand it, is that there are so many groups in the sort of quasi-commercial area, if you will; service clubs that may make some money but they're really not a profit-making organization; Boyscouts; the YMCA or YWCA. There are a whole host of organizations that own properties that I understand present a dilemma to municipal authorities, whether to tax at one rate or not, or whether or not to tax at all.

I can tell you that some day care centres in some communities have been successful in getting relief from municipal taxes. One example I do know is the Thompson Day Care Centre where there has been some relief from municipal taxes.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 6.(c)(1) The Member for Thompson.

**MR. STEVE ASHTON (Thompson):** On the point of Thompson Day Care Centre, could the Minister indicate whether it's the view of the department that the increased per-diem rate and the increased grants will help correct the kind of projected deficit that the Thompson Day Care Centre has been faced with, going back not just the last few months, but with the previous government they were indicating their concern about the deficit they were faced with, which



would be in the range of \$10,000 without an increase? I'm just wondering if it's the view of the department that the newly announced per-diem rate and increased grants will help prevent that kind of deficit?

**MR. EVANS:** We can get some more information on that particular day care centre. But to a large extent the increases we have provided will assist the Thompson Day Care Centre to a large extent, but we still want to look at that day care centre.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I wasn't raising this particular point to be difficult. I appreciate the concern that the Minister of Health has raised and I tried to refer to that but I think it's a combination of the two.

To the Minister, does not this situation impact on the budget of Community Services? Are they not put in a position where they are required to pay more money to the non-profit centre, to assist them with payment of taxes?

**MR. EVANS:** The funding is uniform but some centres are treated differently depending on which municipality they are in. As I said, some municipalities are ready to assist them with some kind of a grant or relief from taxes, or a grant equivalent to the tax and that can be done I guess without any amendment to The Municipal Act or what have you, if the municipality in its wisdom deems it advisable to do that.

The other point I'd make is that many, in fact I guess most of the centres are renting facilities. So in effect I suppose you could say the impact of the tax would be felt through the rent charged by the landlord, by the owner of the property. I'm advised that 95 percent of the centres do pay a rent, they don't own their property, so what we're talking about are the 5 percent, the minor portion of day care centres. I might add that they pay anywhere from \$300 to \$1,000 a month. There are only about six to eight centres that own their own facilities.

**MR. MERCIER:** Is the Minister though not prepared to make a recommendation to the Minister of Municipal Affairs that these types of operations at least should not be subject to school tax? I would ask him to examine the exemptions that exist in Section 25 and after considering that, would he not agree that a non-profit day care centre should come within this list of exemptions and not be subject to payment of school taxes?

**MR. EVANS:** We could look into it. It's something the member might wish to bring with the Minister of Municipal Affairs, but we'll ask the staff to look into it.

**MR. MERCIER:** For the record then, Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the Minister for agreeing to look at it and consider making a recommendation to the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 6.(c)(1). The Member for Kirkfield Park.

**MRS. GERRIE HAMMOND (Kirkfield Park):** Mr.

Chairman, I guess I have a concern on the new Day Care Act that's coming in when you're talking about raising costs. I worry more about the people that are just above the subsidy level and when the costs are going up possibly considerably because maybe we're dotting a lot of i's and crossing a lot of t's.

I just would hope that when you're looking at the Act that you take into consideration that although we're all concerned with good day care for our children and more and more people are wanting it and needing it, I think when I hear the Minister mentioning the upgrading, I would hope that it won't come to the point where there will be necessitated a lot of people with degrees in day care centres. I guess this is probably my biggest concern on this and maybe with the legislation coming in in the later part of the Session, it is a time to get these concerns in because we may not have the same time to have that consideration.

I really am concerned also about the public versus the private. I would think that if people could afford private day care that it should be a choice and I hope that they would keep that in mind.

I have a question as to the spaces for the Noon and After School Program, if I could. How many facilities would we be able to open under your new funding, or extra funding?

**MR. EVANS:** Specifically, the noon and after school expansion will be 250 spaces.

**MRS. HAMMOND:** Mr. Chairman, I guess it wasn't spaces I was concerned with as much as the centres themselves. Is there room for the opening of new centres?

**MR. EVANS:** Yes. It's convenient to refer to the expansion in terms of number of spaces, but the 250 spaces will all be in new centres. It will not be an expansion of existing centres.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, two questions occur as a consequence of the exchanges and discussion that has taken place between the Minister and a number of my colleagues in the last 45 minutes or so.

One of them relates to the figure that the Minister gave for licensed child spaces in existence in the province at the present time and I wish he'd repeat that. I may have missed it. I think I heard him say something like 8,000 plus.

**MR. EVANS:** 8,162.

**MR. SHERMAN:** 8,162? I wonder how that squares with the figures in the Department's report? The Department's report shows the total number of licensed child spaces reporting — whatever that means — for the period November 9 to December 6, 1981 which I presume is the last period for which such figures were available in calendar 1981, as 5,758. I beg your pardon?

**MR. EVANS:** Which page are you looking at?

**MR. SHERMAN:** I'm looking at Section 3, Table 18 of

the report, the page number isn't given. It's Section 3, Table 18 and it shows the number of licensed child spaces reporting. That covers family, day care, pre-school group, noon and after school group and it shows a total of 5,758. I don't think anybody in this Committee would have any quarrel with a figure of 8,152 or whatever the precise figure was that the Minister gave, but there seems to be some discrepancy there.

**MR. EVANS:** The difference between the 8,152 and the 7,154, specifically, is that what you're asking and explanation for?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, specifically for that kind of an explanation but I still don't think that the Minister and I are on the same wavelength on the figures. I'm asking for an explanation of the discrepancy between 8,152 and 5,758, that's the number of spaces. This 7,154 is the number of children which is not relevant to the current discussion, because obviously there could be more children than spaces. But the number of licensed spaces reporting is given as 5,758, and I think the Minister said that the number of licensed spaces is 8,152.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, we'll have to come back after the supper hour with a reconciliation of that. We'll try to come up with the explanation of this difference. But I'm advised the 8,152 is the authorized number of licensed spaces that can be accommodated under the budget as it stands at this time. There's got to be some type of tabulation explanation for this, perhaps resulting from an average over the period, the references to spaces reporting. There's got to be some technical explanation but, at any rate, hopefully we can give the honourable member the answer at 8 o'clock.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well thank you, Mr. Chairman. Of course it could be that the initiatives and the momentum that were developed by the Progressive Conservative Administration, most recently in office, produced the addition of 2,500 spaces in the past three months, which came on stream to the benefit of the province in the new administration, but which were initiated and under way under the previous administration. That may be the answer, Mr. Chairman, and I'm happy with an answer like that. We can leave it at that if the Minister wishes.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member would look at the preceding page, Table 17, the figures there jive with what I've just told him. Table 17, Child Day Care Program, Approved Day Care Centres, as of December 31, 1981, is 8,152. —(Interjection)— Okay, we have the explanation. The time that the figures were prepared in Table 18, it was this number that actually had submitted attendance reports, in other words, we hadn't received - the word "reporting" is the key word - the number of licensed child spaces reporting. So based on reporting of 5,758 spaces, I guess other information related to the reporting of that number. But, as I said, if the member would relate to the Table prior to that you'll see that there is agreement between what I stated and what

the report states, 8,152.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well then all those figures in Table 18 are conditional figures and they're based on the number of spaces reporting in that given period of time, and not, for example, the percentages with respect to children receiving subsidy, etc. would refer to the percentage out of that figure reporting, not out of the total figure as recorded in Table 17.

Mr. Chairman, my other question had to do with, at this juncture at any rate, my other question had to do with the Health Sciences Centre Children's Day Care Centre which was referred to by my colleague, the Honourable Member for Tuxedo, in his discussion with the Minister. The Health Sciences Centre Children's Day Care Centre has encountered some difficulties, as has been observed in discussion already, in recent years, in keeping within its budget and successive governments have had some difficulty with a deficit position accruing to that centre. The Minister, in responding to the Member for Tuxedo suggested that because of the increase in the maintenance grants, and the increased subsidies available under his program this year, that there would be a significant additional amount of revenue available to the HSC Day Care Centre in '82-83 and I inferred from his remarks that meant that would ease the HSC Day Care Centre out of its problems. But my understanding, Mr. Chairman, is that some of the problems at the Health Sciences Centre Day Care Centre result from the fact that it has not been operating strictly within the parameters of day care centre operation; that those aspects of day care centre operation provided by our legislation, provided by our program, provided by this branch and those officials who are responsible for day care centres, and the day care program, such as, Mr. Johnston and Mrs. Freedman who are sitting in front of the Minister. In the case of the Health Sciences Centre Day Care Centre there has been some digression from those principles of day care centre operation; that, in fact, it has exceeded those parameters, it has been into all kinds of other programming, extended add-ons in the form of programs that are not conventionally recognized and funded in the accepted traditional day care sense. So that I would have some concern that perhaps the Health Sciences Centre Day Care Centre problem is being buried and submerged here in a gesture by the government that will simply accommodate their problems through additional funding and financing. Is not the essential problem there the problem of conformity or non-conformity with day care standards and requirements; is not the essential problem there the problem of indulging in and engaging in programs over and above regular conventional day care programming. If that's the case then we should be looking to the Health Sciences Centre and it's budget, and obviously the Department of Health, to resolve that problem; we shouldn't be looking to the day care appropriation to pay for other than day care.

**MR. EVANS:** Well, there's no question that the Health Sciences Centre has evolved an enriched program compared to some other centres, and they certainly incurred additional expenditures on that account. They've gone beyond, in effect, I suppose the level of

assistance that we have provided on a universal basis for day care centres in Manitoba and the question arises as to what extent the provincial taxpayer should be responsible for one particular centre going out and incurring additional costs. I'm not knocking their great efforts but the fact is there's a principle involved. Should any day care centre be able to go out and do its own thing, incur additional expenditures and then come back to the government and say, well, we've had these additional expenses, now bail us out. As I said, they may have been trying very hard to do something better and good, I'm not knocking what they're trying to do, but there is a principle.

At any rate, I haven't had an opportunity really to sit down and look at this. I've been apprised of the problem. My legislative assistant is aware of the problem; our staff are apprised of it. I'd like to get more information and look at it. But the dilemma that I've described faces us and you don't want to see anyone with financial difficulties. But to what extent should we undertake the responsibility of bailing them out or to what extent should some other agency or the parents or whoever be responsible for bailing them out of their financial difficulties?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, and that is precisely the dilemma and I appreciate the Minister's remarks.

The day care program and day care funding are obviously in place and supported by the taxpayers of Manitoba to provide a certain standard and standardized level of support. I have no objection if a day care centre wants to go beyond that and provide enriched services, but that's one of the best arguments that can be made for a mixed public and private system.

The Minister asks the very question that I'm asking him. Why should the taxpayers pay for enriched services and add-ons at one day care centre exclusively when there are standardized functions, procedures, operations and programs of day care centres that are recognized and acknowledged in the existing regulations and in the existing programming concept that other centres across the province conform to?

So if the increase in maintenance grants and subsidies and that sort of thing, those types of funding increases, are seen by the Minister as a means of bailing that particular centre out of its difficulties, then I think the ethics of that approach are wrong.

I have great admiration for the Health Sciences Centre day care centre and in fact for all components of the Health Sciences Centre, which is a facility I had some close connection as the Minister knows for my period of time as Minister of Health. But the taxpayers and the other day care centres should not be expected to support or subsidize unevenly, a day care centre that wants to get into other kinds of activities.

Now whether the Health Sciences Centre budget which also depends on the taxpayers should be asked to support it, is another question. That's something that would have to be resolved in the Department of Health and through the Health Services Commission and the Health Sciences Centre Board itself but certainly it should not be a burden that's placed upon the taxpayers through the day care programming appropriation. So that's precisely the dilemma, precisely the question I'm asking the Minister and I would hope

that his legislative assistant and his officials are taking a very close and careful look at it.

Let us by all means have enriched and add-on programs in this field, but let us create or maintain the environment and reinforce the environment that permits that kind of thing to be done fairly, i.e. continue to approve and support a mixed system where there is an opportunity for that kind of programming to be made available to those persons who are willing to pay for it. It should not be levied on the general taxpayer and it should not be conducted in such a way that creates an uneven system of funding and support. So I will be interested indeed in the evaluation of that situation that the Minister and his officials undertake and I encourage them to do it very conscientiously.

Mr. Chairman, there is the question that arises obviously from this whole subject of the Health Sciences Centre day care centre that asks whether in the business of day care or the field or the service of day care, we're really dealing with day care or we're getting ourselves into the sphere of early childhood development and just as in other areas of the Department, we've discussed the debates that exist between different schools of thought relative to particular lines of programming. Here is a classic example of a difference between schools of thought, between philosophies and it's something that I would like to address with the Minister as we continue to examine these Estimates after the dinner hour break.

Are we into day care or are we getting into early childhood development. I would certainly be interested in the Minister's views and philosophy on that subject.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The hour being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair. I will return at 8:00 p.m.