



Second Session — Thirty-Second Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

31-32 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable D. James Walding
Speaker*



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 54A - 2:00 p.m., TUESDAY, 26 APRIL, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, Andy	Springfield	NDP
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BANMAN, Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BLAKE, David R. (Dave)	Minnedosa	PC
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
BUCKLASCHUK, John M.	Gimli	NDP
CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.	Brandon West	IND
CORRIN, Brian	Ellice	NDP
COWAN, Hon. Jay	Churchill	NDP
DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent	St. Boniface	NDP
DODICK, Doreen	Riel	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	NDP
DOLIN, Mary Beth	Kildonan	NDP
DOWNEY, James E.	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	PC
ENNS, Harry	Lakeside	PC
EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
EYLER, Phil	River East	NDP
FILMON, Gary	Tuxedo	PC
FOX, Peter	Concordia	NDP
GOURLAY, D.M. (Doug)	Swan River	PC
GRAHAM, Harry	Virden	PC
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry M.	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupert's Island	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd	Portage la Prairie	PC
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, Gérard	Radisson	NDP
LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling	Charleswood	PC
MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al	St. James	NDP
MALINOWSKI, Donald M.	St. Johns	NDP
MANNES, Clayton	Morris	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin-Russell	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)	St. Norbert	PC
NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)	Assiniboia	PC
OLESON, Charlotte	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald	Pembina	PC
PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.	Selkirk	NDP
PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland	Fort Rouge	NDP
PHILLIPS, Myrna A.	Wolseley	NDP
PLOHMAN, John	Dauphin	NDP
RANSOM, A. Brian	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Burrows	NDP
SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SCOTT, Don	Inkster	NDP
SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
SMITH, Hon. Muriel	Osborne	NDP
STEEN, Warren	River Heights	PC
STORIE, Jerry T.	Flin Flon	NDP
URUSKI, Hon. Bill	Interlake	NDP
USKIW, Hon. Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, Hon. D. James	St. Vital	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 26 April, 1983.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Presenting Petitions
. . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered certain resolutions, directs me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Member for Wolseley, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the Annual Report for the year 1981-82 for the Communities Economic Development Fund.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a further report on spring run-off conditions and prospects dated this day.

The Assiniboine River - the river is rising downstream of Virden and falling upstream of Virden. The largest rise in stage since yesterday morning was at Brandon, where the river rose seven-tenths of a foot. The river was still below bank-full at all points this morning. The latest forecasts suggests that the river may remain just below bank-full even in the Virden and Griswold areas where minor flooding had been expected. No flooding is expected elsewhere along the mainstream.

Some flooding has taken place on tributaries of the Assiniboine River, namely, the Oak River, Birdtail Creek and the Little Saskatchewan River.

The Souris River - river levels are either steady or declining very slowly. With normal weather conditions, a gradual decline in water levels will continue. Valley flooding from the international boundary to Hartney will continue until late May.

In the Westlake-Dauphin-Swan River area, all streams in the area have peaked and are declining. Many streams peaked on the weekend. The Swan River and the lower Valley River peaked yesterday.

Considerable flooding took place on the Wilson River, the Valley River and the Swan River. There was little

or no flooding on the Whitemud River, the Turtle River, the Ochre River and the Vermilion River. However, some diking and ice blasting was required on April 22nd to prevent flooding in the Gladstone area. Peak stages and flows on the Wilson, Valley and Swan Rivers were similar to those of 1979, that is close to the maximum spring peak on record.

On the Swan River ice jams downstream of the Town of Swan River resulted in somewhat increased peak stages. Many other smaller streams flowing off the Duck Mountain experienced flooding as predicted.

At the Shellmouth Reservoir, the water level rose about one foot since yesterday. The inflow is presently near the peak. There is sufficient storage available to prevent flooding in the Shellmouth-Millwood area.

The Portage Diversion. The inflow to the Portage Reservoir is rising. More flow has been allowed to go down the river in recent days while the diversion flow has been kept relatively constant near 1,200 cfs. Diversion flows will be gradually increased in the next five days or so in order to maintain the river flow downstream of Portage la Prairie below 10,000 cfs.

With respect to weather, the precipitation from the current weather disturbance has been quite light and has not significantly affected the run-off situation. While some additional precipitation is anticipated today, amounts should be too small to be of concern.

MR. SPEAKER: 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 15 students of Grade 11 standing from the Westgate Mennonite Collegiate. They are under the direction of Mr. Rempel. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Wolseley.

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

SPEAKER'S RULING

MR. SPEAKER: Also before we reach Oral Questions I have a statement to read to the House.

On Monday, March 7th, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain raised a point of order concerning remarks made by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture who was commenting on words spoken by the Honourable Member for Arthur during the Throne Speech debate.

After several other members had spoken to the same point, I took the matter under advisement in order to review Hansard.

In perusing Hansard I found that the words objected to appear on Page 554 where the Honourable Minister of Agriculture said, "But to make a suggestion that we should write off all farm debts in the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, is ludicrous. It is not only

ludicrous, it is maddening, Mr. Speaker." Other allusions by the Minister to the same topic, on the same page, were made in the form of rhetorical questions to which no objection was made.

A careful study of the remarks made by the Honourable Member for Arthur contained several references to farm debt and the Loan Guarantee Program, but I cannot find any statement or suggestion by the Honourable Member for Arthur that all farm debt in the province should be written off.

Although the statement of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture might be his interpretation or his personal belief of what was said, it is not supported by the printed word. I must therefore require the Honourable Minister of Agriculture to withdraw the relevant remark.

The Honourable Minister.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, there's no doubt in my mind, having heard your ruling, I will abide by it and I withdraw the remark from the honourable member.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If members are prepared to proceed, Oral Questions.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Intervention against PWA

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. In view of the fact that the province supported the application of PWA with a condition that there be six flights a week, which is an intervention, and in view of the fact that the province, after further investigation I have been led to believe that they wrote a letter withdrawing that condition, and in view of the fact it was reported in the Brandon Sun as early as last Saturday, I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the First Minister could advise this House if the CTC has acknowledged the fact that the province has withdrawn that condition.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that the Air Transport Committee acknowledged receipt and the withdrawal of that particular condition pertaining to six days on February 4th of 1983.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, it was disaster that it was there in the first place, but in view of the fact that Air Canada and CP Air has still got an intervention against the PWA application, not wanting the withdrawal of six flights a week, and in view of the fact that if PWA has to abide by that intervention it could be harmful to the service to Brandon and they would lose the competition that they have, and it would be beneficial to those airlines, has the Minister of Transportation arranged to have representation supporting the PW application because of the interventions by CP Air and Air Canada?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the Department of Transport, Transportation Division is in constant communication and in touch with PWA on this issue, and indeed, with the Government of Canada. We have intervened in a way that is supportive to PWA and we've met with them on more than one occasion.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that if the CTC were to approve the application with the condition that there is six flights a week which would mean that Brandon would have to have six flights or nothing - that's very serious - is the Minister going to hire legal representation as the previous government did because there was an intervention to the PWA application before and make sure that the province's position is well known, well represented for the people of Brandon and Western Manitoba.

HON. S. USKIW: Well again, Mr. Speaker, I believe the question has been answered. We have had an acknowledgement from the CTC with respect to our intervention.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the First Minister gave me that information that the intervention was withdrawn. My question to the Minister of Transport, is he going to have legal representation prepared to go before the CTC to show the province's support for the PW application to have permanent service in Brandon?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I again want to reaffirm that we are in constant communication with PWA and are proceeding in a way which they and we believe prudent at this point in time.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, it was reported in the Brandon Sun that the CTC were simply considering extending the present application. I would ask the Minister, is he going to oppose any extension and let them know that the Province of Manitoba wants to have a permanent route servicing Brandon by PWA?

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the member should appreciate that we want to work in harmony with the airline in question. We would not want to move unilaterally on any of these points without a consultative process that has taken place first. We are doing that on a current basis.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister has given these answers and the answers that he gave in Estimates the other night, does he realize, and does the First Minister realize that PWA at the present time can take your reservation if you want to fly after May 30th, but they can't guarantee a flight, and this is becoming a real inconvenience to the people of western Manitoba? I would say that if the province wants to work with the airline, I would ask the Minister if he has pressured and had consultation with the airline to get this presentation done to the CTC?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the Member for Sturgeon Creek doesn't want the province to take

any responsible approach to this question. We have the interests of Brandon and the area at heart on this issue and we have been working quite closely with the people involved, namely, the airline, and they are, in my opinion at least, satisfied with our intervention on their behalf.

Manfor operation - The Pas

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister in charge of Manfor and would ask him, in light of fact that the Federal Government has targeted some 100 large projects for which they say they will receive a fair amount of capital funding, has Manfor been identified as one of those projects by the Federal Government?

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I can't speak definitively for the Federal Government. I do know that we have indicated to them that we believe strongly that Manfor should be in that group. I don't know if they've made all that material public; we do know that they have made prior commitments. Three Ministers had made fairly strong commitments that the Federal Government would be putting money into Manfor. I would expect that if they are allocating money for western development that those commitments made by three Federal Ministers then have a good chance of being honoured.

MR. R. BANMAN: In light of the fact that the Minister is optimistic that this will be one of the projects that the Federal Government will be funding, I wonder if he could inform the House whether or not there are any negotiations now between Manfor or any private company with regard to a possible joint venture or sale of the company. In other words, have some of the proposals that have been discussed previously with some of the companies that were interested in joint venturing or purchasing that particular facility, have these negotiations been revived?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I indicated a few days ago in the House that we are waiting the completion of one component on the studies. It's being done by federal people. As soon as we have that completed then we'll do what we said we would do before, namely contact some of the companies and inform them as to where exactly we are with those development proposals.

MR. R. BANMAN: Another supplementary question. I wonder if the Minister could inform the House whether the Federal Government has indicated any time frames in which they would be announcing this particular project being included in the some-100 projects that they're dealing with at present.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Not yet, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure whether the Federal Government has developed specific

time frames for the entire 100 projects and any other projects that they might be announcing over the course of the next two or three months.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, along the same line, could the Minister indicate if it's within his knowledge - we would understand if it's not at this stage - whether or not any proposed federal grant with respect to Manfor would come first of all under the old existing program of mill upgrading that the Federal Government has had in effect in Eastern Canada for some time; that's No. 1, and 2, whether or not such a federal grant would be contingent upon a matching provincial grant and/or the involvement of a private sector company in a joint venture as was being discussed with them some two years ago?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, when I had discussed this matter with three Federal Ministers, they indicated that would be coming from the mill modernization monies that had been spent in Eastern Canada. Since the Budget they are allocating some money for employment projects. It may be that we can get money from both funds, but I can't say definitively at this particular stage, nor can I comment definitively on whatever requirements there might be. We certainly had been talking to the Federal Government and are conducting the study under the assumption that we would be getting money from the Mill Modernization Program. If there will be further supplements to that program, of course, they will be most welcome here in Manitoba.

Bankruptcies - farmers

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that every time one picks up a newspaper as one did in the Free Press today and saw the warnings that bankruptcies are on the increase and will be for some time; in view of the fact that last week I asked the Minister of Agriculture to convene a national convention of Ministers of Agriculture to focus on the problems that the farm community are having, and have to this point received an acknowledgement of some of the Ministers that it would be an acceptable approach; will this Minister convene a meeting so that they can deal with the farm problems and let the farm people know that somebody who is elected to office and appointed as government Ministers do care about them and are dealing with the problem, Mr. Speaker? Will he convene that meeting?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable member for his question and I would respond in this way. We certainly have no difficulty in convening such a meeting, Mr. Speaker, in order that other provinces

might inform themselves as to the actions we, in Manitoba, are taking and, in fact, we would hope that we would be able to bring to bear on our federal counterparts greater pressure to provide further assistance for the farm community facing financial difficulties. We would have hoped that the federal budget recently tabled would have provided some further assistance to the farming community who are facing great problems.

Sir, I can say that, again to the honourable member, as I said last week, we were the first province in this country to embark on an Interest Rate Relief Program which has assisted close to 800 farmers in this province who are facing financial difficulty, although we have not been able to help every family farm in difficulty we have put into place two Income Stabilization Programs on beef and on hogs, in terms of dealing with long-term stability for the red meat sector.

In the short-term, Sir, we have provided a Loan Guarantee Program to assist farmers, over the next couple of years, who are in difficulty of obtaining operating credit, a \$100 million Loan Guarantee Program. As well, Mr. Speaker, we have put into place a review committee to try and deal with some of the difficulties that farmers have with their financial institutions where communications have ceased between farmer and their institutions.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture takes great pride in standing up and telling the people, through the question period, of all the great successes. Mr. Speaker, I would ask him then to go to the farm community and speak to those farmers who have been turned down by his program people.

A further question, Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Agriculture answer the letter that I asked him to report to, or give us the terms of reference to the Appeal Board that I wrote him last week, after he asked us for names for the Appeal Board, will he tell us what the terms of reference are so members on this side of the House can provide names so as to enable us to make recommendations to the resolving of some of the farm difficulties. I ask for it in good faith, Mr. Speaker, and I have not received anything from him yet; we would like to provide some names, Mr. Speaker.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the honourable member for that. In fact, I did, after the question period the day that he raised that question, instruct staff to have those terms of reference sent to the honourable member, the Agriculture critic of the Conservative party, if he has not received it I'll make sure that that copy reaches him immediately this afternoon so that they can have them.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, what kind of a Minister of Agriculture do we have, how sincere is he? He said two minutes ago that he'd already established the committee, now he's saying he's going to give us the terms of reference so we can provide names? Why, Mr. Speaker, did he not provide us with that information last week? Mr. Speaker, further to that, what was the outcome of the meeting today that he had with that review committee dealing with the one farm bankruptcy in Manitoba that is admitted by the Farm Survival Group

that they shouldn't have got involved with to start with, and that's the only one he's moved to save, Mr. Speaker. Why didn't he give us that information last week, Mr. Speaker, and what was the outcome of the meeting today that he had with that Appeal Board?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member recalls last week, questions raised for almost 40 minutes by the opposition, asked me what we were going to do to resolve the situation that the Portage farmer was involved in. I indicated we were prepared to assist in a review, Mr. Speaker, and, as a result, we did attempt to set up a review panel who have not, at this point in time . . .

A MEMBER: That wasn't today.

HON. B. URUSKI: . . . Mr. Speaker, the member quotes from a newspaper article which, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure is that accurate. I did not meet with the review panel, but I understand that the review panel has made recommendations, both to the farm family and to the lending institutions and, on that case, at the insistence of members opposite, we did attempt to put in that review process to see how it works and to see what can be done.

Mr. Speaker, the decision as to what will happen in this case still rests with the institution and the farm family themselves. On the issue of the providing of the terms of reference, I did, Mr. Speaker, instruct my staff to send that over and, as the member well knows, that we have been on the road, in terms of dealing with another very important issue to Western Canada, and that is the hearings on the Crow rate situation. So, Mr. Speaker, I know staff will be listening to the question period, they will have those terms of reference over to the honourable member.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I thank you. In response to the replies to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, that he has already put this mediation board or review panel into place, can he tell the House and the farmers of this province who is the chairman?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, as indicated earlier in questions to the honourable members, we expect that there will be more than one panel involved on a regional basis. All we have done, on the basis of recommendations made from farm organizations, we asked our ag reps throughout the province to supply names and, on the basis of that, we set up this one review panel. That is not going to be the only review panel that will be involved in this situation. Mr. Speaker, I'll get the names of the three farmers who are involved; I do not have the names of the farmers at hand.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. B. URUSKI: I don't know whether the honourable members want to hear an answer or not.

A MEMBER: I don't know the answer.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I don't think I've ever seen such confusion in all my life as has been coming out of the Minister of Agriculture's mouth and this government. He doesn't know who the chairman is going to be, he says there may be three panels. Could I ask him, again, and I've raised this, I think, for the last week or more, since the 14th, when is this board or this panel ready to go to work?

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

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I told the honourable members opposite last week that there would likely be panels set up in every region. We have not set up those panels, other than dealing with the situation that the honourable members opposite demanded that we do something to assist that farmer, and we have moved on that situation. The final determination, as to how many panels and who will be nominated, we will and want to get recommendations from the honourable members opposite, as well, as I've indicated. But, Mr. Speaker, there was no indication at that point in time that there would only be one panel in the Province of Manitoba. The work of the panel is to deal with one specific area; to assist farmers who are having difficulties with their financial institutions and will not be the end-all and cure-all of any bankruptcies or any foreclosures that institutions may have because we do not know when these matters occur in the farm community until, of course, court orders are issued and receivers are appointed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Minister made reference to the fact that the opposition put pressure on him to solve the problem of one farmer in Manitoba. I believe the reference was made to the one farmer at Portage. That was not the case, Mr. Speaker. We did not pressure him to solve the problem of that one farmer at Portage where it was even obvious to the farm survival group that the individual was in too deep. We were pressuring him, Mr. Speaker, to solve the problems of all the farmers as he promised to do prior to the election in 1981.

The point of order is, he cannot leave it on the record that we pressured him into dealing with that one farm situation, Mr. Speaker. I want him to correct it.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable member for that clarification.

The Honourable Member for Swan River.

Emergency Measures Organization flood damage

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister who is responsible for EMO. Has the Minister received an update from his officials with respect to flood damage to farms along the Swan River, the Woody River and the Birch River in the Swan Valley area.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, we have been on top of the situation. EMO are certainly co-ordinating information from the Department of Agriculture, Department of Natural Resources and the Department of Highways. We have received information and reports on a regular basis from all of those, Mr. Speaker. They are certainly providing information and monitoring the situation.

We have found from the reports that I have received that certainly the matter was not as desperate as it seemed to be inferred by news reports. There are some minor dislocations from homes that took place but only for a short time. No families are in jeopardy at this time. There are a few farms that are isolated, perhaps up to 30 or 40 that are isolated farm yards at this time which will be monitored through the local officials, through reeves and councillors, and if there needs to be assistance to them that will certainly be provided through various departments. This is co-ordinated through EMO.

In terms of the roof-top rescues that were covered on the news, again we have had no evidence that took place either. We understand that an individual was surveying the flood situation from the top of his roof, but certainly was not there for a rescue. I would say that we will continue to monitor the situation, Mr. Speaker, and we will have more information coming and will over the next few days and weeks assess the amount of damage and then determine what action has to be taken at that point.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Minister for his answer. I would also direct a further question to him. Has any of the municipal officials in the area requested assistance from Emergency Measures?

A MEMBER: They don't know who to contact.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, they have not requested specific assistance for any emergency situations that have arisen because of the flood over the last day or so. We've had a number of things take place over the last number of weeks. Certainly the Canadian Wheat Board was notified and asked to have cars available to clean out bins in the Swan River area, clean out the elevators so that farmers could haul grain that was in bins, excess grain, so it would not be affected by the flood. That has taken place over this last while. We have also had sandbags delivered to the area where necessary. There were 40,000 bags delivered to the Dauphin area over the past weekend in case they were needed.

So, we have kept in contact with reeves and councillors in the area and if assistance is required we are prepared to react to it. I might add as well that, we'll provide a complete update of information at a news conference following the question period.

Assessment Review hearings

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, I have a new question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

In view of the fact that the credibility of Standing Committees of the Legislature have been seriously

eroded due to the inaction of the Minister of Municipal Affairs to reconvene the Municipal Affairs Committee relative to dealing with the submissions that were received by the committee some months ago; and in view of the fact that there is a general economic depression in the Province of Manitoba; and due to the fact that the assessment question has tax-saving implications for many Manitobans; I wonder if the Minister can please today tell us when he will reconvene the Municipal Affairs Committee so they can get on with the recommendations of the Assessment Review Committee?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, without accepting the commentary that was made by the Member for Swan River in that there's been a loss of credibility and so on is nothing but rhetoric on the part of the honourable member.

I want to say that a considerable amount of work has been undertaken over the last summer months and over the last year, for that matter, since we have received the report from the Assessment Review Committee. That work is still continuing, Mr. Speaker.

We are at the present time doing another study in another school division and that information will be coming forward, I expect, in the not-too-distant future, and the staff is compiling all this information and putting it together in a form that the committee can deal with. When that information is all gathered up from all these sources that we have, we will be calling the committee together, Mr. Speaker, and we will be doing that in due course and as soon as possible.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Can the Minister confirm that his staff are already busily occupied supplying information for the Federal Minister, Mr. Pepin, so that he can proceed with some payments under his proposal to farmers? Is the Minister so occupied at this time with that kind of data for the Federal Government, that he can't proceed with the Assessment Review Recommendations at this time?

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I want to advise the House and the honourable member, that any information that we will be compiling for the Department of Agriculture, the federal department, will not interfere with any of the work of the assessment people. We will be putting on additional staff which will be paid by the federal people to compile that information for them. That has no effect at all on our study and our assessing of the Manitoba Assessment Review Committee Report. We will be contacting the federal people advising them that we will be providing that information that they require. That is where it's at at this stage. We have not put in place any extra staff to compile that information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I have another question to the First Minister. I wonder if the First Minister could give us an

undertaking that legislation will be brought in this Session, or next Session at the very latest, dealing with the very important question of the assessment problems that have been with us for a number of years and these recommendations are with us and your Minister of Municipal Affairs is not moving quickly enough to get on with this serious problem.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, it regrettable that the Member for Swan River doesn't appear to have confidence in the Minister of Municipal Affairs. The Minister of Municipal Affairs has been working industriously on this particular matter of municipal reform. Indeed I think that members on this side of the House have been most impressed with the time consumed by the Minister of Municipal Affairs in working in co-operation with the municipal people and Manitobans in general, towards ensuring that there indeed be introduced legislative changes leading towards municipal assessment reform.

Development north of Portage Avenue

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Urban Affairs. Can he confirm, Mr. Speaker, that the major components of the federal-provincial proposal for redevelopment north of Portage Avenue, those being the National Research Council Centre and the CBC building, were actually referred to in the Core Area Initiative Agreement entered into in 1981, whereby the Federal Government undertook the following complementary programs to develop the CBC-owned St. Paul's College site and agreed that additional federal or federally funded facilities are anticipated during the life of the agreement, and could include significant facilities involving research or high technology fields, such as a National Research Council Centre? Could he confirm that those were complementary undertakings by the Federal Government in the Core Area Initiative Agreement? I do point out for the record that the province and the city also had complementary undertakings.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes I can confirm that both the CBC, and in a general way, the NRC site were mentioned as part of the background material to the Core Area Initiative. There was no specific commitment made with respect to either of those facilities and I'm pleased that the Federal Government has decided to finally move on both of those projects in the Province of Manitoba.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Urban Affairs then give us his assurance that the Federal

Minister and the Federal Government will proceed pursuant to their undertaking in the Core Area Initiative Agreement, 1981 to construct those facilities, without incurring any further obligation on the part of the city or the Provincial Government?

HON. E. KOSTRYA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I can't force the Federal Government to do specific activities in the Province of Manitoba or in the City of Winnipeg specifically. The position of the province is that it will continue to work with the Federal Government to ensure that the Federal Government activities in the Province of Manitoba are such that they will be of benefit with respect to job creation, with respect to urban renewal, and I will give that commitment to the member that this government will continue to press the Federal Government to have such activities in the province that would complement the position of the province with respect to providing jobs for Manitobans and with respect to urban renewal.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, we are just as concerned about jobs and employment in Manitoba as members opposite. What we are concerned about is that the Provincial Government not be blackmailed by the Federal Government Minister with respect to this matter.

The Federal Government Minister has indicated that he has alternative plans for the existing arena in the City of Winnipeg, should the Federal-Provincial proposal for a new arena downtown be proceeded with. Could the Urban Affairs Minister indicate to us what those alternative plans are for the existing arena should a new arena be built downtown?

HON. E. KOSTRYA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can't answer that question; I do not know what alternate plans may be for the present arena if an additional or another arena or sportsplex is built in the City of Winnipeg so I can't comment on that question.

Mosquito fogging

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of the Environment. In view of the oncoming warm spring weather and some activities that are taking place, I wonder if the Minister could inform us if he intends to maintain a veto on any application by the City of Winnipeg for a permit for aerial fogging for mosquito control.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. COWAN: As the Member for Tuxedo is aware, the City of Winnipeg can undertake spraying programs and the response to those programs on the part of the Provincial Government and the Minister responsible for the Environment is limited. What I do intend to do in regard to that entire situation is to make a statement within the next couple of weeks regarding the government response to the Clean Environment Commission hearings which were held on Mosquito

Control Programs and incorporate it into that will be our response to the many replies which we have had as a result of mailing that report to municipalities and interested individuals in this province and asking for their comments and suggestions. So I believe we'll be advancing a comprehensive program for review, discussion and consideration in the very near future in that regard.

That matter, I can assure the member, will be addressed in that program.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, because there has been some discussion in reference to the possibility of this Minister maintaining a veto, and in view of the fact that the city staff have a great deal more experience in scientific expertise in dealing with mosquito control than does the Minister or his staff, on what basis could he justify superimposing his judgment and veto over the city's decision on this?

HON. J. COWAN: I think the member misunderstands the situation entirely and if I can just correct his perception of the history, I have in fact never imposed a veto in that instance. I do not believe that he will find on record any categorical statement by myself that I intend to impose a veto, nor do I think he'll find any suggestion that I intend to impose a veto. What he will find is that this Provincial Government in a very open and public way had asked the Clean Environment Commission to undertake a review of this situation, had asked for a report, had received a report, had made it public, had distributed it to the public, had asked for responses, have received responses, and now is in the process of making a comprehensive statement which will in fact address that issue. But I'm not at this time indicating that it will address it in any one particular way, nor have I in the past indicated that I intended to veto any such permits.

Universities two-tiered tuition

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Education. I understand that at last evening's Board of Regents meeting at the University of Winnipeg, a decision was made to go ahead with the two-tiered system of tuition fee increase which will result in costs increasing for students well beyond the intended guideline that the Minister put forward of 9.5 percent. I wonder what, if anything, she intends to do about that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, no, I think I don't have to take that question under notice. I think I answered it quite fully yesterday when I indicated that I, as members of the university community, have been concerned for some time over the addition of a wide range of incidental fees that are being tacked onto some of the courses and the impact of those fees on students. The moves that I have taken to date, the moves are two - I described them yesterday - I have instructed the Student Aid Branch to include incidental

fees as legitimate costs to be offset by the Student Aid Branch as are tuition fees, so that all students who are in need and who are qualified to get support from the Student Aid Branch will also be able to get support that will completely offset the incidental fees that they are being charged.

In addition, I have asked the Universities Grants Commission to sit down with the universities and to study this difficult issue, one that has some disparity and differences within each university, within the courses and programs, and report back to me on this issue.

MR. G. FILMON: Well, will the Minister now acknowledge that this kind of double increase in one year renders her political decision last year for a freeze to be a complete sham, and in fact universities are putting through a two-year increase in one year just to get even for what the Minister did last year?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that the universities in Manitoba are receiving support from this government during a difficult year that is unparalleled by any other province in the country, and that even with the increases of tuition, which we asked to be kept at the 9.5 range, we still continue to have almost the lowest tuition fee rates in the country. We must remember that what we were looking at and the communication that was coming from the universities prior to our communication to them was that we were facing tuition fee increases in the range of 20 to 25 percent, Mr. Speaker. There would have been and could have been increases in the incidental fees at the same time by indicating that the tuition fees were not to go beyond 9.5 percent.

I said yesterday I was disappointed that they had not followed through with this principle with the incidental fees, but the combined effect of the two of them I believe is either 10.4 or 10.8, Mr. Speaker, a far cry from, I think - was it 20 percent that was brought in the first year when the — (Interjection) — so I think it's clear that both the level of funding that has been given by this government and the communication and the limitations put on the tuition fee increases are going to give the universities in this province more money to do their jobs than any other universities in the country.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Community Services and Corrections, 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 River East in the Chair for the Department of Education, and the Honourable Member for Burrows for the Department of Highways and Transportation.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: Committee please come to order.

Except for some answers to certain questions, we are now starting with 2.(a)(1), Management Services and Engineering, Operations and Contracts, Salaries and Wages.

The Member for Pembina.

We still have to take up the questions that you have left behind. The Minister is ready to provide some information.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the member asked me to table some information and I have two documents here, one of which has to do with the handicapped program, transportation of handicaps; and the other has to do with the program of the Transportation Division. I can leave a copy of each of those for the Member for Pembina.

Also the member wanted me to indicate to him at what stage he could discuss the appointment of W. Janssen. That comes under the Transportation Division, as well, so he can discuss it. We'll accept that since we took that as notice. We should have dealt with it before we passed that item, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Honourable Minister, if this information is tabled, I think the Clerk is entitled to a copy of both documents.

HON. S. USKIW: Okay, well we have that.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I realize and I thank the Minister for allowing us to go back to Transportation Division to discuss Mr. Janssen. Recent information that has come to light caused me some concern about the Minister's answers, in terms of the Pacific Western application in Brandon. Had I had the information Thursday evening that I have now, I would not have been so kindly to the Minister. I didn't realize that the Province of Manitoba had filed an intervention in the PWA licence renewal which may, indeed, cause some problems of having that licence for permanent jet service to Brandon renewed.

If it were in order for the Minister to accept a few questions on that, as well, I would appreciate it, or we could deal with it in Minister's Salary, whichever he wishes.

HON. S. USKIW: No, we can do it now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister signifies that we can do the questioning now.

MR. D. ORCHARD: The first question I would have is, when was the province's intervention filed with the CTC on the renewal of PWA's jet service licence into Brandon?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, that was on December 10, 1982.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Maybe I'm thinking along the wrong lines here, but I think I would have considered that to be a fairly important piece of information on the licence renewal, particularly when it appears, and may well appear, to the Canadian Transport Commission that the Government of Manitoba is basically siding with Air Canada and CP Air in this licence renewal application which, to me, would be nothing but detrimental to the citizens of Brandon and Westman. If the Minister would like to offer some clarification I'd certainly appreciate it.

HON. S. USKIW: Well I'm rather confused by the member's comments, in that I don't know where CP and Air Canada comes into this question. We intervened on behalf of PWA and on behalf of the City of Brandon.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Then could the Minister explain the nature of the confusion, wherein citizens of Brandon are rather upset that the Provincial Government - they have the distinct impression that the Provincial Government is not providing them sufficient backup to assure that their jet service is renewed - how does that confusion come in?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I really don't what the story is in Brandon. I am led to believe that there was confusion in Brandon on that issue. That resulted from comments that were made by other than people from the Government of Manitoba, some local initiative that was involved in what I believe was misinformation or a lack of understanding of what the process was.

MR. D. ORCHARD: On that line, could the Minister be specific as to the nature of the intervention made?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, if the member wishes I could read to him specifically what was undertaken. On December 10th, we expressed the opinion that the level of passenger and cargo traffic carried by Pacific Western Airlines proves conclusively that their licence authorizing PWA to serve Calgary, Brandon and Toronto is and will be required by present and future public convenience, a necessity. The Government of Manitoba - I am reading an excerpt of our submission - therefore strongly supports PWA's application and requests the Air Transport Committee to renew the licence by deleting Condition 4, which in effect states that the licence was issued for an experimental period of two years; and Condition 2, a mandatory stop at Brandon; and Condition 3, six flights per week in each direction should be retained in the licence.

Subsequent to that, on February 4th, and I believe we met with PWA in-between, we amended our submission by asking them to withdraw that portion of our intervention which requested the Air Transport Committee to retain Condition 3, which is the six flights per week. That was acknowledged by telex on February 4th.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay, the second intervention which removed the province's desire to have six flights per week was done when?

HON. S. USKIW: On February 4th.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Now, the Minister indicates that the intervention was done in conjunction with PWA and the citizens of Brandon, or in conjunction with that.

HON. S. USKIW: Their interests, yes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: On their interests. Were they in agreement with the condition that you subsequently removed February 4th, or did they have no knowledge that was part of the intervention?

HON. S. USKIW: As I recall it, and my staff can assist me on this if necessary. It was pursuant to a meeting that we had with PWA where they wanted us to express a change in that way.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, then, is it fair to say that the December 10th original intervention was done without consultation with PWA?

HON. S. USKIW: That was the basis of our original position, including the six flights. Well, as I understand the scenario, Mr. Chairman, we intervened on behalf of PWA, and on behalf of the service that we deemed was necessary for the community of Brandon, based on the track record to that point in time and the occupancy rate. Subsequent to that, PWA met with us and said we would like you to support us with one minor amendment, which was the section that we then deleted on February 4th. They were fully familiar with our intervention and content, as I understand it, in each case. We went along with them after they had convinced us that the original position may have been a bit tough on them. It was in the interests of the service that we deemed necessary for the community that we wanted to stick to the first position as far as we could.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Is the Minister saying that the December 10th intervention was with full knowledge of Pacific Western Airlines as to the nature of the intervention?

HON. S. USKIW: Yes, they knew the content of our submission.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Is Air Canada and CP Air intervening, insisting that the six flights per week schedule be maintained?

HON. S. USKIW: I'm advised that is part of their intervention, yes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well then, that is no doubt where the original confusion about the Province of Manitoba and Air Canada and CP Air being together on intervention has no doubt come about.

Okay. I know that staff generally have a pretty fair feeling as to how these matters are going before the CTC; they have their information pipeline, does it appear as if the December 10th intervention, and the subsequent amendment on February 4th, are going to lead to a favourable decision? Is any further case needed to be made at this time in the department's estimation?

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that PWA is, of course, involved in a continuing process on their own behalf. We are also in discussion with PWA. My impression is that they feel that they can handle the current situation, that is, that they're satisfied with what is taking place to date. They are certainly not asking us to do anything at this time.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, moving on to the other matter of Mr. Janssen. What's Mr. Janssen's capacity with the Transportation Division; what's his job description and his salary, plus expenses, if any?

HON. S. USKIW: I believe the salary range is \$47,000, Mr. Chairman. The role is still a role that is advisory to the Minister on a number of issues, including the task force on trucking regulations in Manitoba, and the Crow issue, and a number of other areas.

He works interdepartmentally, that is, in the sense that he's on a team with members from other departments on a number of issues and projects aside from these two areas.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I take it that Mr. Janssen is not an Order-in-Council appointment but is still being retained as a consultant?

HON. S. USKIW: I am advised by the administration that he's on a temporary position basis.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Temporary which?

HON. S. USKIW: Temporary, he's a term. He's not on permanent staff.

MR. D. ORCHARD: So he doesn't have Civil Service status or benefits?

HON. S. USKIW: That's correct.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Now, \$47,000 per year, if my memory serves me correct, Mr. Janssen has taken a cut in pay since he came on then?

HON. S. USKIW: Well, I think there's a logical explanation for that, Mr. Chairman. When one hires a consultant, you do it by contract and they're usually more expensive than retention of the same person on a full-time basis. There is also, I believe, pension benefits that accrue under a term position which there wouldn't be under a consultant's position.

Yes, there is quite a substantive reduction in cost to the province with the new arrangement and that is based on the assumption that he will be needed for a period of time so we might as well have him on a full-time basis rather than paying, what we consider to be, a fairly hefty amount on a consulting basis a year ago. It is an efficiency measure if the member wishes to know.

MR. D. ORCHARD: That's fine, Mr. Chairman, we can move on to the next item unless my colleague here . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have it stated in the beginning, we are now moving to Item No. 2.(a)(1) Management

Services and Engineering, Operations and Contracts: Salaries and Wages - the Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I made a request to the Minister to have the department draw up something similar to what was provided last year for each division. I'll just pass that down for perusal. It indicates numbers of staff in each division and it makes it very very simple so they don't have to go through the SMY accounts. If that can be done, I would very much appreciate it and we would save a lot of time.

The only question I would have of the Minister, this year since Operations and Contracts is responsible for drawing up and completing contracts on tendered road work projects and since there is no doubt going to be a sizable reduction in the number of contracts left this year, does he expect the staff to remain fully employed over the next fiscal year?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I think the other day we tabled the Staff Cuts and Additions Document which might be of some value to the Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: That's exactly my question, Mr. Chairman, because I don't believe there's any reduction in staff under Operations and Contracts. I think they remain the same and with less work to do it would seem as if they're going to be underemployed there, or does the Minister believe that they will be suitably putting in their eight hours a day?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, what the member must recall is that this is the administration of the department that he's looking at. He's not looking at the delivery of the projects which is done out in the field at the district level.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I absolutely recognize that. This is the department that makes sure the contract documents on the jobs that are being tendered are properly drawn with all of the paperwork that's involved. My question simply was with a lower road budget and fewer jobs going out, there's obviously going to be less fewer contracts being drawn up. I simply ask the Minister is the same staff complement required in this department to undertake a lower level of work that the Minister is proposing to do under the construction budget?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, as the member should know, the work that these people do is not always related only to projects that the member can identify when we tabled the program. It is the overall administration of the department and preparation in anticipation and promotion of new projects that come year after year. It's not as if they are tied to projects that we have listed for the member's consideration.

The staff that are involved are director of operations, contract engineer, construction engineer, maintenance engineer and their support staff. I don't know that the member is arguing that we remove the director of operations, or that we remove the contract engineer, or that we remove the construction engineer, or that we remove the maintenance engineer. Those are the key staff of the department and around them of course,

we add to that complement based on programming. The area of elasticity is more found to be in the districts, depending on the work in each district.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, I'm not going to belabour the point. Certainly there's no suggestion that you remove the top people, but I would suggest that there are going to be fewer contracts written, hence there might be some staff that aren't as fully employed as they were in other years and that can be argued, I suppose.

Under 2.(a)(2), Mr. Chairman, what are the costs of the road maps this year, and how many road maps are being printed for issuance?

HON. S. USKIW: The '83, we have 600,000 maps and the estimated cost is \$145,000.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we have gone to 2.(a)(2), do I take it that we have passed 2.(a)(1)?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Pass them both if you want.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)(1)—pass; 2.(1)(2)—pass; 2.(b)(1) - the Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, how be we just discuss 2.(b), and then we don't get into any problem with whatever and we'll pass the whole works at once, how would that be?

MR. CHAIRMAN: What's the Minister's position in this regard?

HON. S. USKIW: Yes, that's fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So, we'll take them together. 2.(b)(1) and 2.(b)(2), all at once.

MR. L. HYDE: I believe - did you pass 2.(a)(1)?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, we have. Does the Member for Portage la Prairie have any questions?

MR. L. HYDE: Yes, I would like to bring a point to the Minister, if I may, in regard to the tendering of work out and the practice, as I understand, today is that a successful contractor receiving a tender does not necessarily have to hire local labour, trucks, drivers and such. I'm wondering, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister would reconsider this and try and assist these truck drivers in their own localities with employment because I know with the tenders that have already been let out in our area they're complaining that there's just no work made available for them. I wonder if the Minister could see fit to take and have this practice changed so that our local labourers and truck drivers have employment?

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's always a problem. We have that complaint coming from many areas. I had similar complaints in Lac du Bonnet last year because of a contractor that didn't employ local truckers and so on. The problem with trying to deal with that under a tender system is that you tend to

break apart relationships between the major contractors and their subcontractors. It's quite common in the industry for the major contractors to have a string of subcontractors that they rely on and can depend upon and are assured that the quality of work that they have had experience with will continue for them. When you move from one place to another and they're always having to deal with new people, then it's a little more costly for the major contractor to operate in that way. It certainly doesn't provide for continuity and stability for the subcontractor that usually tie in with the majors.

It's a bit of a shake-up in the industry that would result, as I would see it. Now, we are looking at that, but I'm somewhat nervous about how far we can go with that. Departmental work, non-tender, is easy to effect in that way, but once you go the tender route it becomes a little awkward.

MR. L. HYDE: Mr. Chairman, I can understand what the Minister is saying, but at the same time it's pretty difficult for myself or any other representative of an area to try and convince these people who are sitting at home unemployed with this expensive equipment and work being carried on right within your community. They are bringing in truckers from Winnipeg or wherever it might be. It is pretty hard to explain to these people that this is a practice that our government departments have to follow. I do hope that you can see fit to have this practice changed if you can, because I know in my areas I've got truck drivers with heavy equipment that have been sitting idle. They're talking to me and speaking to me now asking if there is some work that is going to be made available to us for this spring and summer.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I think one of the observations that we should make here is that the current practice is not a new practice. It has been there for years and years. That doesn't mean that it can't change, but I simply point out that I have some reservations about how far one can meddle with that process without bringing a lot of damage and disharmony within the industry itself.

If you are a contractor and you happen to know two or three small contractors, and it is usually a friendly relationship that has developed, you tend to want to funnel work to those contractors through your contract. There is a dependency factor that is built into that relationship where two people who work together, they tend to know how each other functions and how they complement each other's operations. So it's a bit simplistic to say that we can just scrap that relationship and ask each major contractor to find new people with whom they will then enter into subcontracts with, even though they don't know their expertise or the quality of work from past experience or whatever.

MR. L. HYDE: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So we're back to Item 2.(b)(1), and 2.(b)(2) - the Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I notice in Lab and Materials that there's a staff reduction of two. What were the duties of those two staff that are reduced?

HON. S. USKIW: That's in the Construction Program reduction. One of the two is a core rig operator and the other was an engineering aide, Mr. Chairman.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Does it follow through with about a 26-percent reduction in the Other Expenditures that you're going to be doing significantly less core sampling on the various road mixes, concrete mixes and doing less testing for gravel deposits in the province?

HON. S. USKIW: Well, what that represents is program reduction, so we don't need the amount of staff.

MR. D. ORCHARD: This is the department that I believe does the testing for gravel deposits.

HON. S. USKIW: Yes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I know, whilst I had the dual responsibility of this department plus Provincial Land Use Committee where we were clearing the sale of agricultural Crown lands, always there would be a potential objection from certain land types of gravel deposits. We had attempted to increase the inspection rate on those so that we weren't unduly holding up the sale of agricultural Crown land. Is there still extra effort by this division in testing potential gravel sites on Crown land to assure that there is no commercial value of gravel there?

HON. S. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the policy is intact as it was.

MR. D. ORCHARD: That item can pass, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(b)(1)—pass; 2.(b)(2)—pass; 2.(c)(1) - the Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, this is the part of the division that of course carries out a lot of the surveys, and one of the jobs that they were attempting to do was replacing the survey monuments. Is there a reduction in the effort year over year on monument replacement and re-identification of property lines?

HON. S. USKIW: We don't have any numbers for the member, but we haven't changed the effort. We replace as many as we can.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I guess that's my next question then. With a static category of Other Expenditures, in other words, no increase to take care of, no doubt, inflationary pressures, there has to be reduction in that effort. Now, in this program of Surveys and Titles and I was wondering if it was the monument replacement portion that will receive the reduction in effort because of static funding.

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, we will have to operate in a way that is expedient for our priority needs, and we will use the time to our best advantage. I can't really be specific with respect to that item. No doubt, there will be a reduction of work activity based on no growth in the Budget.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I am not sure whether I am right here, but I believe this is when there is a request for legal surveys done, that also comes through here where we've got a lot of subdivisions. Those are often made with no prior notice, and does the Minister feel that he's got an adequate budget to undertake any of the resurveys that might be requested of the department?

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, again I don't know whether it is worth repeating. We will have to conform and comply with the dollars that we have been allocated in these areas. There is no doubt that we are strapped for money and our program will reflect that, whatever area that there is zero growth in terms of spending power.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(c)(1)—pass; 2.(c)(2)—pass; 2.(d)(1) - the Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: The Bridge Division has a four-staff reduction, once again reflecting a lower construction program effort?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

HON. S. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Chairman. There is a reduction of four staff man years which is part of the reduction in the program.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Of the staff reductions, were there any engineers amongst those four that are no longer with the Bridge Office?

HON. S. USKIW: I wonder if the member would recap that.

MR. D. ORCHARD: The four fewer staff, what categories are they? Are they engineers or are they secretarial and support staff?

HON. S. USKIW: There are two engineers, one clerical and one technical person.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Is it fair to assume that staff is reduced through attrition, or were there actual dismissals?

HON. S. USKIW: There were two vacancies which aren't being filled. There is a retirement; there was one death; and two are transferred out. I might point out, Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding these cuts, we're hoping to maintain the level of bridge work, notwithstanding.

MR. D. ORCHARD: The two that were transferred, were they transferred within the Department of Highways or to other departments?

HON. S. USKIW: Within the department, Mr. Chairman.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Then just one other question. To which department were they transferred?

HON. S. USKIW: To Motor Vehicles Branch, Mr. Chairman.

MR. D. ORCHARD: The Minister might have been aware, and I think we discussed this last year in Estimates, about a proposal put together - I believe it was started whilst the Member for Turtle Mountain was Natural Resources Minister and then carried on when my colleague, the MLA for Lakeside was Natural Resources Minister - it basically involved trying to see whether the Provincial Government could assist in the reconstruction of major bridges on municipal roads because some of the municipalities, I'm no doubt sure the Minister is aware, have some fairly large bridges to replace on municipal roads and when you're talking \$100,000 or better it can financially strap the municipalities. My colleagues of Natural Resources and myself instructed the departmental staff in both Natural Resources and in the Highways and Transportation to do a survey of the bridges that were out there, their condition and to give us an idea of replacement costs and to try to formulate criterion under which we might be able to establish a new funding program to provide assistance on major bridge replacement in conjunction with the RMs, a joint funding program if you will.

Two questions. First of all, has the Minister received a completed report from the joint investigation undertaken by Natural Resources and Highways and Transportation, and No. 2, if so, could one of those reports be made available or would the Minister prefer to keep it as an internal document?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, that report was completed and it has been submitted back to the Department of Resources. I don't believe there's been any action as a result of its availability to either of the two departments to date.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I asked this question with full recognition that the Minister doesn't have the funds but would the Minister think that there was a case to be made for some assistance on major bridges to the municipalities? Did the investigation indicate that some bridge replacements which tend to serve maybe two municipalities, but yet must be borne by the ratepayers of one, was there any feeling the Minister got from that report that that is a program that may need some flushing out and possible introduction?

HON. S. USKIW: I'm advised that the committee didn't address that particular aspect. They didn't deal with it in their report, Mr. Chairman.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I realize that probably they didn't provide recommendations but the basis of the report was to identify the numbers and the potential costs, if I recall, of bridges in need of replacement, to give Cabinet of the day a sounding board to see whether the program was even feasible to undertake and that's the question I pose to the Minister.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the committee advised on the numbers of bridges involved but they didn't do a costing on them.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Does the Minister recall how many bridges there were involved in that? Was it quite a sizable number?

HON. S. USKIW: It's about 4,000 bridges, Mr. Chairman.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Surely not all 4,000 were of a size and a cost that would fit what we were considering to be major bridges that municipalities might need some assistance on. Surely we're not talking 4,000.

HON. S. USKIW: My understanding is that the committee were not given clearly-defined parameters as to their role on that question and therefore I believe they reported on the totality of bridges.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I have no further questions there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(d)(1)—pass; 2.(d)(2)—pass; 2(e)(1) The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Under Traffic Division, Mr. Chairman, are there any changes in the criterion for intersection illumination or the request for signal lights at intersections? Are the criterion for installing those still as they were?

HON. S. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we haven't made any changes there.

MR. D. ORCHARD: This is something that I shouldn't bring up to the Minister but I keep forgetting to phone the district office, but at the intersection of 23 and No. 3 at Jordan Corner on the west side, the red bulb in the flashing red stop sign has been out for four or five months and I keep forgetting to phone them: to tell them to replace it. I wonder if that word might be passed on to them.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I'm amazed that it has taken that long to be noted. The Member for Pembina is as guilty as my department.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Now I have to defend myself because I wasn't in any way, shape or form, criticizing the Minister on this one, but the Highway Traffic people drive down that road and inspect it theoretically every couple of days and somehow that bulb has been missed and there has been some night time crashes at that intersection, hence the rumble strips, etc. so if the Minister could just - because I have forgotten for several months - if he could pass that on, I know that he never forgets such things.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, we have made a note of the point and we will deal with it accordingly.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A couple of more questions. Are there any maintenance expense savings that are being undertaken in Management Services and Engineering, such as pavement markings or whatever? Are you finding any cost savings that you can undertake this year?

HON. S. USKIW: No, Mr. Chairman, we have not identified anything other than our reduction of one staff man year in that component.

MR. D. ORCHARD: That item can pass, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(e)(1)—pass; 2.(e)(2)—pass; 2.(f)(1) - the Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, one question. I notice that you're increasing staff by four in Traffic. According to your numbers, '82-83 over '83-84, you're increased by four SMYs. Is that correct?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, my records show a reduction of one in that section.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well I only refer to the April 6th document from the department last year where, under the Traffic section, they have '82-83, 13 SMY and now it appears as if it's 17. There is some confusion between the two years.

MR. D. ORCHARD: So what is it actually, it's 17?

HON. S. USKIW: Twelve, in . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: Oh, well, it's 17 on my sheet. Okay, so I just replace that with 12?

HON. S. USKIW: Yes, that's right. It should 12 instead of 17.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That figure there, 17, should be 12, the Minister says.

MR. D. ORCHARD: That can be passed then, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have passed 2.(e)(1) and 2.(e)(2). We are now in 2.(f)(1) - the Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, when I asked some questions here just a little while ago in Operations and Contracts, the Minister indicated that there was no necessity for reduction of staff here because the District Offices were undertaking the work, but yet I notice that the District Offices, unless there is another typographical error, are up five SMYs, '82-83 over '83-84. That would seem to indicate that the District Offices are going to be doing more work when, in fact, they are going to be doing less work. What are the extra staff required for?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, what we're dealing with there are the departmental engineering aides. In the previous years, we over utilized that category and therefore we are making that adjustment.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Now, if they were over-utilized in other years, how are they going to be over-utilized this year when there is roughly a 20-percent reduction in program?

HON. S. USKIW: The previous approval, Mr. Chairman, was for 69, but we had actually utilized 81.

MR. D. ORCHARD: 69 to 81?

HON. S. USKIW: Yes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Does the Minister anticipate significant transfer of District Office employees from areas receiving little or no highway construction work to areas that are receiving some work this summer?

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, there are a number of things that will happen because of the program reduction. One is that we won't have as many departmentals as we've had; the other is that, yes, there will be transfers of people from one district to another, in other words, from a district that doesn't have a great deal of construction activity to one that may. That's a normal procedure.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Can the Minister indicate from which districts staff will not be required and into which districts they may be going this summer?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, that's a bit awkward to do at this point because we don't know how our scheduling of program is going to take place.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, if I might suggest one staff office where I think there is probably going to be a fair bit of surplus staff because there wasn't a program last year nor is there this year would be the Carman District Office. You could probably clean it out and fire a cannon down there for the amount of road work that's going to be done in the sunny south this summer.

Now the Minister indicates that departmental staff will not be hired, where does that show up? Would that not show up in the District Office staff complement?

HON. S. USKIW: No, Mr. Chairman, that comes out of the construction budget figure.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Fine.

HON. S. USKIW: While I have the floor, I would like to respond to the Member for Pembina on the question of firing cannons down the Main Street of Carman.

MR. D. ORCHARD: No, no, just the District Office.

HON. S. USKIW: Just the District Office. I happen to have had that problem in Selkirk district for three or four years, and I used to make regular phone calls to the District Engineer asking him when he was packing his bags because there was really nothing to do in that area for a good number of years. His answer to me was, well, most of my staff have gone, I'm one of the few that's left. So perhaps that is what's happening in Carman this year, I don't know.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can't quite understand what the Minister is saying, because last year when the Minister introduced his road program - and I could find the specific reference in Hansard where he said that this is the most equitably and fairest distributed road program that we have seen for four years, making specific reference of course to myself and my colleague, the MLA for Lakeside. You see, that's where we have a little bit of trouble because it's two

years in a row now where we're getting shut out in southern Manitoba. I know the Minister has problems with some of his more vocal colleagues from time to time on the other side of the hall there.

I only have to remind the Minister that we are dealing with a pretty - you know, everybody's got their priorities in construction, but I don't think it's unfair to say that in eight years or so there was very little reconstruction done in southern Manitoba. I wouldn't want to see the Minister follow the same mistake three years in a row, so I am putting in my plug for the Carman District Office for next year, so it's on the record six months before the Minister has to draw up that road budget. I only hope that he can find it within his means to schedule a little work down there because I don't want those fellows to get too rusty. They're going to have to crank up the machinery about three years from now and do a little work then. I want them to at least not have forgotten all the things they learned in the four years that we were in government.

I can see the Minister isn't going to agree with me, so we might just as well get a few more questions here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(f)(1)—pass? No? Mr. Minister.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I think what the member has to recognize is that we are indeed locked into a number of very expensive projects in Tory land which are carry-overs, and I talk about Trans-Canada and No. 12. That's about an \$8 million tab, all in about four miles; and then there are two other projects there that are about \$1 million apiece; and then there's Highway 75. None of these areas are politically motivated the way this government is or doesn't reflect this government's politics, Mr. Chairman, and we have not detracted from fulfilling the need in those areas. It's awfully difficult in a reduced budget to spread the few dollars that we have in such a way that every Member of the Legislature would be satisfied, given the fairly massive carry-overs that still have to be completed.

I think it's fair comment that areas that have - for lack of a better word - been starved for a few years are quite anxious to see some evidence of the Department of Highways in that area this year; and given a small pie, it makes it difficult to respond to all of the regions of the province.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I certainly am glad to hear the Minister reaffirm that there are no politics involved in 75 which is our major interconnect from Winnipeg to the United States, and in the Trans-Canada Highway. I would think that those two are relatively important to all Manitobans, the interchange on No. 12, and Trans-Canada is there because of traffic volumes and traffic volumes only. It wasn't something that we relished undertaking just as the Minister is not going to relish undertaking at some point in time the overpass on No. 7 North, which no doubt at some point in time, is going to have to be constructed from purely a safety standpoint.

Those projects have and always will be undertaken by governments of all stripes in the Province of Manitoba. I'm glad to see that they're still ongoing. Within the District Offices - well no, probably I should

wait till we get down to Maintenance before I pose my questions on the Maintenance Budget - but could the Minister indicate whether the staff complements in the District Offices have been maintained throughout the past year?

HON. S. USKIW: Yes, they have been maintained, Mr. Chairman.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I have no further questions on that one, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(f)(1)—pass; 2.(f)(2)—pass; 2.(g)(1) - the Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I note that there's a staff reduction of two, if the numbers are correct, in Highway Traffic Inspection. Could the Minister indicate what two staff positions are being reduced?

HON. S. USKIW: Yes, one clerk and one inspector. The clerk resigned and the inspector retired and we're not filling those two positions.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the trucking industry in particular, I think, has probably been highly critical for the last five years of the level of inspection. The Minister is undertaking a specific study on the regulation of the trucking industry to see if some of those, call them regulatory bottlenecks, can be overcome without the addition of more staff. I note in the Other Expenditure category that they're down by 12 percent over last year.

Now with the reduction in staff and the reduction in Other Expenditures, this no doubt is telegraphing to the trucking industry of the Province of Manitoba that there will, in all likelihood, be a fairly significant reduction in Highway Traffic Inspection activity and I suppose one could correlate that with an increase in the potential number of infractions that may well take place on the highways of the Province of Manitoba.

Has the Minister received any recent communication of concern from the trucking industry as to a less than adequate inspection for Highway Traffic Inspection service to the province?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the decrease is attributed to the abolishment of employee private vehicle standby charge at the government scales and that was a negotiated reduction, \$31,700, that pretty well accounts for that reduction, Mr. Chairman.

MR. D. ORCHARD: When the Minister indicates that it was achieved through negotiation, I assume achieved through a negotiation with the MGEA?

HON. S. USKIW: Yes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I find that commendable.

HON. S. USKIW: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. L. HYDE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to speak to the Minister in regard to Highway Traffic Inspections. It was just in the course of last summer that it was brought to my attention by one of our heavy truckers in the area that, as he explained it to me, he believed that he was being unduly harassed by inspectors in the area. He mentioned to me the fact that he was stopped, I believe if I recall properly, five times within the matter of just a few miles by inspectors giving him a thorough thrashing, if you want to say that, but I'm wondering if this practice is going on elsewhere within the province.

If it is, I wonder just whether it's the right way to go about it because these people are stopping these big trucks, heavily loaded, as I say five times in a matter of a mile or two or three, I think they're just pressing their luck a little too far.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I accept the message that is in the comment by the Member for Portage. There is no doubt from time to time inspection staff could be a bit overbearing with respect to their job and maybe even with respect to certain people in the industry, I don't know. Sometimes there's legitimacy to it and other times there may not be.

We have tried to indicate to our inspection staff that we want inspection but we want some common sense and humanity to be applied. We don't believe that we ought to be using tactical methods, entrapments and this kind of thing, unnecessarily. At the same time we don't want to forego the need for inspection.

We have received a complaint with regard to the specific that you're mentioning and we have advised the department on a course of action, so we appreciate the point you're making and we are dealing with it.

MR. L. HYDE: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Assiniboia.

MR. R. NORDMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, I didn't realize that this was the place it should be brought up, but I was in communication with a mobile home company who were moving two mobile homes from west on Portage Avenue to Saskatoon over the past weekend. It appears that they are receiving a certain amount of harassment as well, in that when they got to the weigh station at Headingley, the Inspection Branch there held them up for five hours, they missed a whole day of their show in Saskatoon and the only thing that they could hold them up on was a sign which, under the regulations, states that the sign should be in fluorescent paint. They have been using this same sign for about two years and it has not fluorescent paint on it. By virtue of the fact that a mobile home cannot be moved after dark, I think this was very unnecessary harassment.

I spoke to you about this last week but this is a further development since then, that this was not the same mobile homes I spoke to you about. These are two others that were regular mobile homes that were being transferred and they were held up for five hours while they got those signs to comply with the regulations. I don't suppose the people at the Inspection Branch will tell you anything other than the fact that they were

not alerted but they were alerted to watch for this movement of a motor home.

I certainly wish that something will be done about it. This is a businessman who's trying to make an honest living and if we're driving them out by actions such as this, then I guess we deserve what we get.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I know that these things can happen from time to time and I regret that the incident occurred, if it occurred as the member described it.

We are going to be undertaking a complete review of all of the inspection and permit system - we intend to do that - and the idea of the review is to come up with a system that is more expediting, if you like, and which can deal with problems like that in a quicker fashion.

I don't believe that the department's role is to unnecessarily delay or hamstring somebody's business or enterprise. In fact, it ought to be a role of trying to assist people through - that should be a positive role - and it's to that end I hope that after we do our review which will involve all of the inspection staff, we intend to have some seminars and workshops. Essentially the message will be that we as a department, ought to be accommodating as much as possible and we should appear to be that way.

I know from time to time we will always run into a situation like that but we hope to minimize that to the extent that it's possible.

MR. R. NORDMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, on that particular one I will follow that one up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask the Minister some question regarding a policy or if there's any change being made to accommodate interprovincial people who require special permits. I know there are several places along the Saskatchewan border, maybe not in the Province of Manitoba, but in the Province of Saskatchewan. Is there any thought being given to making permits available at those specified points rather than create some inconvenience of having to phone ahead and get permits, if there's any consideration being given to making single trip permits available at border crossings or very close proximity?

HON. S. USKIW: Perhaps the member might want to clarify somewhat. We don't have scales at all of the border points.

MR. H. GRAHAM: No, but in some cases Saskatchewan has, say for instance, Moosomin.

HON. S. USKIW: Oh, yes.

MR. H. GRAHAM: The Saskatchewan Government has an office there and I was wondering if the Minister would give consideration to working probably jointly with the Province of Saskatchewan. I'm sure it's just a matter of working out some details.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, if what the member is suggesting is a measure that can streamline the workings of our private sector that moves interprovincially, I certainly wouldn't want to oppose that and certainly if there's a means of working closer together, we'll look at that, sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Assiniboia.

MR. R. NORDMAN: Mr. Chairman, while we are in this section, I believe I did mention to the Minister and the Deputy Minister last week, but I just want to get it on record that they will be taking into consideration the movement of 16-foot trailers. As it stands today in Manitoba the only way you can move a 16-foot-wide mobile home is with a 16-wheel dolly. Now, it appears that there are only maybe two of them in Western Canada, so if a manufacturer or a sales organization wants to sell or move a 16-foot trailer, they're in trouble.

Other jurisdictions, British Columbia - well, no, I don't believe they'll move anything because of the mountains there - but Alberta and Saskatchewan are in the process of allowing movement of these trailers with as few as 12 wheels on the dolly. I hope that Manitoba will be taking that into consideration and maybe coming down with something that's just a little easier for the operators, whether it be the sales or the manufacturers. I think we have two companies here in Manitoba that do manufacture mobile homes of this size and if they can't sell them they're in trouble.

Here, again, I think we should be encouraging businesses to stay in Manitoba and if by giving them easier movement of their product I think we have something to develop from there. So I do want to have that on record, Mr. Chairman.

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, the member knows that we are quite aware of the issue. I simply want to remind him that we consider the 16-wheel system much safer on the highway. We are awaiting the results of the tests in Alberta and when that is known, I believe both Alberta and Manitoba will come to some decision.

Saskatchewan is not happy with its permitting of the 12-wheel system although they are condoning it for the moment. But I suspect when the Alberta results are known if they confirm the need for 16 wheels, that Saskatchewan may again look at their regulations.

We're not going to move on that until that study is complete and we have the information.

MR. R. NORDMAN: Fine, Mr. Chairman, but I do want our department to move on it and not particularly have to wait for someone else to make a decision before we make a decision.

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I hope the member appreciates that what we are trying to do is avoid duplication of effort. There is some costing involved in doing this study and there is no point in every province doing their own. I think we can share the information and it's on that basis that we decided to wait for the results from Alberta.

MR. R. NORDMAN: I believe the Saskatchewan or Alberta survey that was being done was supposed to

be ready by the 1st of March. Could we follow up on that? It's now just about the end of April. Could we make enquiries as to where they stand with it, please?

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm led to believe that our staff is currently in constant contact with their counterparts in other provinces on matters such as this one and that will happen as a matter of course.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, on that point the Minister indicates that Saskatchewan, although they're not satisfied with the 12-wheel dolly movement of a 16-foot-wide, they are allowing it by permit. The circumstance that my colleague is bringing up, I think, caused the loss of a sale in this one particular case. In the interim time where you don't have your program laid out, could you not allow the movement with those 12-wheel dollies, as Saskatchewan does, to expedite business out of this province?

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, the movement of 16-foot-wide trailer that was drawn to our attention a week ago, had much more to do not only with the 16-wheel dolly but with the fact that during restrictions is very difficult to authorize the movement of those wide trailers because of the need to travel on the shoulder, either for the trailer itself or one passing the trailer. One could imagine what could happen if a semi-trailer in passing a 16-foot-wide object would have to take the shoulder, which is very soft at the present time, and would either jackknife or upset or whatever. The dangers are quite evident there. It is for that reason more than the 16-wheel question that we said, not during restrictions.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I very much appreciate the Minister's position on that particular one but I would hope that when restrictions come off and if a decision hasn't been made that the Minister could allow some flexibility and allow those kinds of moves in the interim. We wouldn't want to deprive anyone of a sale opportunity or manufacturing opportunity and I think the Minister is sympathetic to that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister in making some comments in this area has twiggged my interest a little bit as to what is the backlog at the end of the restriction period? What is the backlog of those large buildings beyond 15 or 16 feet that are ready to move? Does he have a good feel for that number?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, most of the builders are aware that during that period of the year we don't allow them to go. They simply don't apply for the permits, so we have no way of knowing what volume is out there waiting for the restrictions to be lifted.

MR. C. MANNES: I bring this subject up because I had a very real instance in . . .

HON. S. USKIW: Live example.

MR. C. MANNESS: . . . my constituency where certainly a local group who were acting on behalf of their church, bringing in a manse, wasn't aware of that situation, and they missed by one or two days. I'm curious as to how many groups in a year find themselves not really knowing the regulations, because in fact when you do it maybe once in 20 years as a volunteer group, of course, you can't know all these things. I'm wondering how many in a year are caught by the regulations coming down.

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, the group that the member refers to perhaps don't know the regulations and the laws, but the movers certainly do. There's no doubt every year some of the movers try to get beyond that deadline date in order to accomplish their task. I don't fault them for it. We recognize that they are aware of it, but they're hoping to get another one through, if they can, all the time.

MR. C. MANNESS: So the individuals who are volunteer groups or who move a home only once in a lifetime, they're the ones that are always usually caught with the regulations coming down.

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't believe they're caught. There's no doubt in my mind that the mover in question was aware of the timing. We don't expect the public to have that kind of information but, if they are using commercial movers, the movers certainly know the rules. It's a mover that was caught.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(g)(1)—pass; 2.(g)(2)—pass.
Resolution 97: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$15,766,300 for Highways and Transportation for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984—pass.
The Member for Radisson.

MR. G. LECUYER: I have a number of questions I would like to ask and are related to the Perimeter Highway, and I wonder if it comes under this section.

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Planning and Design could.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNESS: With the Member for Radisson's indulgence, I would only like to ask one question of the Minister leading into this evening's Estimate period.

HON. S. USKIW: What is the question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is the question?

MR. C. MANNESS: I'd like to serve notice on the Minister that I'll be asking some specific questions regarding the design on Highway 75. I would wonder if he could have somebody in support of himself at that time, so I could pose those questions this evening.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the member might want to elaborate what it is that he will be seeking from us. I understand one of the items is location and cost comparison; there may be other things. If there

are, if you would indicate to them, we'll certainly attempt to have that information for this evening.

MR. C. MANNESS: Well, I don't want to usurp the Member for Radisson's time, but certainly specifically in those areas the rationale behind the proposed route and the cost relationships between that and a route that the citizens, particular of Glenlea, felt should have been taken, No. 1. No. 2, some questions on the structures under Highway 75 in St. Norbert to accommodate the La Salle River, specifically those areas.

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, that latter item is really the property of the City of Winnipeg. We're into the boundaries of the City at that point, so we cannot deal with that at this point in time.

MR. C. MANNESS: Well, that's fine, Mr. Chairman. I just noticed that was one of the items considered under the Capital area. I'll hold it till then, but I thought it was in the Design area that I'd like to bring up some of the water flow restriction involved. I thought this was the appropriate time to do it.

HON. S. USKIW: I want to respond to that latter point, and that is the City of Winnipeg has the jurisdiction. They have their own staff design crew that deals with that. We're not involved at that point on that highway.

MR. C. MANNESS: Thank you, to the Member for Radisson.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Radisson.

MR. G. LECUYER: Okay, I have a number of questions I'd like to ask the Minister with regard to the Perimeter Highway, specifically, the completion of the Perimeter Highway. These concerns date from way back, before I have ever been a member in this Legislature.

Basically, what I would like to begin by asking the Minister, if the completion of the Perimeter Highway, that is, the section between No. 1 Highway and No. 59 Highway, northeast of Winnipeg, is one of the projects which figures in the "Wish List," if that's what we want to call it, of job creation projects which were submitted to Ottawa?

HON. S. USKIW: Did the member ask the question or make a statement?

MR. G. LECUYER: No, I'm asking whether it was part of that.

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think I'll have to get that information for this evening. I know there was a list put together. I'm not sure - I don't want to give the wrong answer - whether or not that component was in that list, but we can determine that for later on this evening.

MR. G. LECUYER: That in itself is not that important, perhaps the answer to this question is. Is it one of the projects slated to be undertaken or started this year?

HON. S. USKIW: No, Mr. Chairman, I think there would have to be a greater degree of forward planning, if you

like, and preparation than what we have at the moment if we were to launch that project. It is a very expensive component, I think, valued at some \$25 million five years ago, so it's probably a \$40 million component if we were to undertake it. The rationale for not having proceeded with the completion to date has been that the use of Lagimodiere Boulevard, if you like, would adequately serve that part of Winnipeg for the time being. Now the member may want to take issue with that for a number of reasons, which I recognize are there, and perhaps maybe he should. We might have the benefit of his views on it in that respect.

MR. G. LECUYER: Well, I most definitely do want to take issue with that because Lagimodiere Boulevard was never intended to replace part of Highway No. 1 or to be part of Highway No. 59. In fact, when I hear the Member for Pembina complaining of massive spending for highways - awhile ago, we just heard about the carry-over projects in Tory land which are being undertaken at quite hefty costs and are taking a major part of this year's pie for the highways. So I will just pretend I haven't heard these comments.

The fact remains that Lagimodiere Boulevard was never intended to be a major divided highway and that, I have to remind everybody around this table, happened after the residential area was built up there. In fact the establishment of CN marshalling yards was established afterwards as well. So, as well as having the noise coming from the CN marshalling yards, we now have a trafficked highway, which is as densely used probably as any or perhaps more than anywhere else in the area of the city. The reason being of course that the trucking industry has absolutely no other route to follow and the reason is of course very simple.

Most of the trucking warehousing is established in northwest Winnipeg, and all of the traffic coming in from Eastern Canada or going out in that direction now has no other alternative but to adopt that road and passing in some instances as close as 40 feet to some housing areas. I had sent a letter in September of 1982, to the Minister responsible for the Environment in this regard, because I wanted some noise level tests to be undertaken in this residential area. The complaints have been coming for many years now and tests were undertaken in February and March of 1981, which showed that the noise level was as much as 13 decibels and 17 decibels above the acceptable limits during daytime and nighttime respectively.

Tests were to be conducted at two different intervals afterwards and I don't know if they were. But I have personally myself received a number of calls from citizens living in that area complaining, because they had complained to the environment management, and even though the tests were taken actually nothing else happened. Of course the reason being that the Environment Control Division is not in a position to exercise any jurisdiction over the routing of traffic.

But the fact remains that the noise level is beyond acceptable limits and the only way it appears that it can be controlled would be by completing the Perimeter Highway. At any rate, I would assume that at the time the Plan Winnipeg included the Perimeter Highway, it was intended that this would be completed.

MR. R. NORDMAN: They change that every year.

MR. G. LECUYER: Well, someone says they change that every year. I am hoping that one year they will happen to decide to complete this highway.

I personally on two evenings went on the highway, parked there during the night for three hours the first time and for four hours the second time; counted the trucks and counted the number of trains that were marshalled on the track nearest to the highway; measured the speed of those trains that were travelling on the nearest track to the highway and it was easy to determine that the main culprit was not the Symington Yard. In fact, the reports . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The time is 4:30. The member may wind up this evening if he wants to, or if he wants with the permission of the rest of the members, he can continue.

MR. G. LECUYER: I will continue this evening.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's 4:30 and it's Private Members' Hour.

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Education, Item 2.(a), Planning and Research, Salaries.

The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: The Member for Tuxedo will be here in just a few minutes, he had to just go out for a minute.

MR. G. FILMON: I had undertaken some discussion in the Planning and Research Branch of the department with the Minister and the initial thrust of the questioning was to ask the Minister to explain what her goals and objectives were for the branch, what expectations she held out for them and whether or not there was a particular philosophy or direction that was being given to the branch by her administration. Could she give us some idea of those goals, that direction and philosophy?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I'll comment on a number of areas. I would say that I might comment first on what I consider to be the most significant directions for the coming year and that would be development and implementation of an internal planning process for the Department of Education, assessment of the data needs of the department and commencement of a co-operative effort by all branches towards an integrated data base system. That is, we want to start gathering information and having information available through the Research and Planning Branch that will give support to all the branches and all the departments in the education system and we wanted to give support to school divisions and other educational organizations because we recognize that in many cases school divisions do not have the capacity to develop information and data

that the Provincial Government does have or should have, and that we should be gathering this information and preparing to share it with them.

Perhaps it would be a good idea if I gave an example in terms of activities of each of the points that I'm making. For instance, the analysis of current and anticipated developments in fields of service, I would think the point I made last night about Special Needs falls into that area where there are major changes taking place in a major area of high need and it's important that we keep on top of those and that we know what is being done and the degree of success it is being done with, with the programs that we have in place.

I think analysis of trends in data such as enrolment and teacher supply which was one of the points that was raised by the Member for Tuxedo yesterday where, clearly, that kind of enrolment projection of both students and teachers is very very important for us to have, to do our planning at the Department of Education level in terms of funding, policies, programs and for that information to be available to the people in the field.

I think that we would be looking at developing some background papers on major issues that we need to bring in policy changes and programs. I think that a couple of areas I could identify were the Native Education Programs that I mentioned last night and our need to make some decisions on where to go in that area.

The question of accessibility for post-secondary education I think, is the big question across the province, not so much for people that live in the south who have access to the existing university and college institutions. But it certainly is a question for people across the province who have to come south presently to get many of these programs and I expect we will be looking at the question of accessibility.

I think that assistance to school divisions in a number of areas where they are both struggling and moving and the examples I would give there, I suppose, are help and support for the development of their Computer Education Programs. In terms of data when they're doing their enrolment projections - and we have all certainly had problems with enrolment projections in the last decade where for a long time we couldn't keep pace with the tremendous growth and numbers of children nor were we predicting that tremendous growth accurately and at the same time when the enrolment started to decline - it took us a little while to catch up to the degree and the depth of the decline.

We have found the allowance data that we have access to, that school divisions would not have and we would be making information like that that we have, that will help them with their enrolment projections. So I would say, in general, that we are going to be trying to anticipate and responding to emerging trends and issues instead of being three-quarters of the way through them before we try to figure out what to do.

One of the very good examples that demonstrates the need was the point that was raised by the members opposite last night when they were talking about the open area - and I made fairly lengthy comments about that question - but I can say I think that if the Department of Education had done a little more in terms of gathering information and data about how the programs had been handled and what had to be done

prior to bringing the programs in, and the experience that the other jurisdictions had when they instituted open area, and that we had taken a bit of time to gather that very important information, we might not have had as many difficulties or as many struggles with implementing it ourselves. So I think there are a lot of cases where there are major moves, major trends, major issues where we can do a better job, both at the Department of Education level and providing services to people in the field, by having better information on which to make those decisions.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister has spoken about the whole area of Research and Planning in generalities, giving some specific examples. She has utilized specific examples to justify why you would have this kind of expertise available. I don't think any of us would disagree with that, nor would we suggest that it isn't a good thing. But let's talk about, for instance, the open-area concept.

I think the Minister will acknowledge, as anyone who is in the field of education does, that education, as much as almost any area field of endeavour, seems to be subject to all of these wide-sweeping trends. There was a great trend towards open-area concept; there was a great trend towards the new math; there was a great trend towards the different method of phonics of learning the language. We've gone in and out of some of these trends and found that they were disastrous, so a Research and Planning component, obviously, will be just as subject to those trends. In fact, there was a very substantial research component to the Department of Education in the early '70s and mid-'70s. They were still subject to all of those kinds of swings and trends.

It seems as though the "think" tank that evolves looks for methods of justifying its existence and finds these new trends and new ideas and re-invents the wheel. Research, yes, is always good; planning, yes, is always good. Any business, any organization, must have that component involved with it, but to justify it on the basis of saying it's going to bring us new ideas or it's going to eliminate all of the mistakes that we used to make in the past is absolute nonsense. It never will. It will certainly provide something for the Minister on which to base her judgments and recommendations, but I am saying to her that was there in the past.

What I am saying to her is that she had a research component before. Maybe that research component did not have a broad enough mandate; surely, the mandate could have been broadened. Surely, more people could have been brought in with the kind of expertise that were required in order to broaden that mandate and others may be transferred into other areas. But what this Minister did was render that section redundant and replace it with a whole new situation, with a new title, presumably firing the existing director or removing him from the position and bringing in somebody new. So I am saying, what is the new wave? Why do we have the new wave and why do we need the new wave? What are the goals and objectives for the new wave in this department?

There must have been, surely, some greater justification on the part of the Minister then to continue to do what they're already doing, to simply broaden

their mandate, recognizing that we have computers now to deal with. Well, we've had computers for 10 or 15 years. Yes, they're in greater use in educational circles, and we're now finding them in use in every area, elementary, junior high, high school, etc., etc. People are beginning to use them almost as personal tools as opposed to the big machine that used to sit in some building downtown. Yes, there is all of that happening, but this is a continuous evolutionary process, and it would be incumbent on any government to partake in that continuous evolutionary process, to make use of it and to assist other areas of education through that process, but this Minister decided to wipe out what existed and replace it. I am saying that it's going to take more justification than that to convince me that was a necessary move.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I was debating whether there was a question there that I should be responding to, but I think perhaps there were a number of points made, whether they were in the form of a question or not, that I should touch on.

The first one is that the numbers of people and the people that were in the branch are still in the branch. There wasn't anybody fired, and that any of the changes that were made were made through open competition. The major change, what we have done, was broaden the mandate. I said last night it wasn't that some of the things that were being done; they were studying and evaluating some existing programs and the information we got from that was useful. But it wasn't and it isn't as important as our desperate need these days to have adequate information to make decisions on major issues, major policies and programs that we have to develop. I think that I expect this branch is going to be, as I said, supportive to the field.

The Department of Education, to date, had tended to leave school divisions on their own with sort of planning and information that we know that they don't have access to or have enough information to provide without recognizing that many of the things that they're dealing with are provincial issues and provincial problems in which the Provincial Government and my department carries major responsibility. So that we do have a responsibility to provide better statistics and information to both the Department of Education and to school divisions.

In terms of the trends, the point the Member for Tuxedo made about trends, and I think it the suggestion was really we're jumping on bandwagons. We sort of jump on this and try that and I agree with the concern that he's raising and would suggest to him that it's exactly because of that concern that is behind one of the reasons for extending and expanding the mandate of this branch so that we are not jumping on bandwagons and on trends just because somebody's idea or opinion thinks that this would be a good thing to do without supporting it with data, evidence, information and statistics that are available in other areas where these activities and programs have been tried.

We do not want to re-invent the wheel, and we do not want to make mistakes that have been made by other people who have gone in, done some of these programs and have learned from them and have learned

the hard way what shouldn't be done. Well, surely to goodness, we don't have to do that every time, and Manitoba doesn't have to go off on its own just jumping on trends and jumping on bandwagons without having adequate information on where the dangers and where the difficulties are, so that we can learn from the information that is available and what has been done by other people. We can make the decisions that we're going to make about issues that we have to deal with based on the best, the most adequate and up-to-date comprehensive information that we can gather.

It doesn't mean that we'll never make mistakes. It doesn't mean that we'll never bring in programs that we don't ultimately have to make some changes in because we've learned that there are some problems related to them. But it does mean that we will be avoiding obvious, I think, difficulties or avoiding developing programs and policies that are not adequate because they're based on inadequate knowledge and information.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, since the role, function and the responsibility of any government department and indeed the predecessors of this administration was to make the best judgments and the best decisions based on the best information available. I accept the fact that this is not a major change in direction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)—pass; 2.(b)—pass.

Resolution No. 54: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$470,700 for Education, Planning and Research, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984—pass.

3. Financial Support - Public Schools, (a) School Grants and Other Assistance.

The Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Since this is basically the major component of the entire Estimates, does the Minister have any opening statement on this or, if not, then the Member for Emerson would like to proceed.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, actually I believe that a fair amount of what I would say related to this major component of my Estimates was covered when I made my opening statement to the Estimates and I don't think it's necessary for me to reiterate those.

I did have one comment that I wanted to make at the beginning. Perhaps it is in the form of an offer as much as anything. There are 56 school divisions in the Province of Manitoba and I know that sometimes when we go through Estimates, some of the members opposite have a particular interest, just as we are going to find they have in the building program, in certain school divisions, might have a particular interest in getting detailed information about the budget, the expenditures, the allocations and the money that went a particular school division, I think the members opposite will realize that it is a fairly lengthy task for us to sit down and develop all that information on each individual school board when, in fact, they may not be interested in more than half of them, that it would be unnecessary work.

So I was going to suggest that, if the members opposite wanted that kind of detailed information about

any individual school division, if they would give us the name of the school division, a list of the names of the school divisions, we would prepare a summarized document on the budgeting and funding of that school division, because as we all know, the problems and the funding levels, the assessment base and the board expenditures vary from school division to school division and it's only when you see each individual one that you can really understand what the problems, difficulties or positions are of the school divisions.

I make that as a suggestion that we would be quite happy to comply with. We do have a few of the school divisions on hand but that's just sort of guessing at who might be interested in that kind of information.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I'll begin by saying that firstly I thank the Minister for having provided me with the composite summary of all the statistical financial data for 1982 budgets for the school boards. I recognize that this is not available until mid-summer when all the budgets are in so we can't use that as a basis for comparison, but there are certain specific tables that only have to do with the government's side of things. I have a list somewhere amongst all of my information of the specific tables that I believe are available now, that I wonder if the Minister could provide for this discussion, perhaps for this evening, whereby we do have the current government support on a comparative basis to previous government support. It has to do with the grants, it has to do with the specific, special grants that the Minister has come up with and I believe, since that's the government's decision and it's already been made and communicated to divisions, that you would have it, but let me just double check so that I know which ones I'm after.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: While you're checking I'll just respond. You go ahead and look while I talk for a minute. First of all, the report that the Member for Tuxedo has identified will, as he said, be available about June and we'll be glad to provide that to him again this year as soon as we have it, and if he can find his list of the specific information that he would like to have for tonight, if it's information that we presently have, we would be glad to provide it.

I might say that some of the school divisions, some of the municipalities have not yet finalized and we're awaiting final budgets, but if it's information that is with our programs that we're able to provide, we'd be quite happy to run them off and provide them to you this evening.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to express my appreciation to the Member for Tuxedo to maybe allow me some questions. The area that I want to deal with is the Seine River School Division and the Ile de Chenes School, which has been an agonizing situation, I think, for many people for a long period of time, government as well as ratepayers. I wondered if it would possibly be - and I'd like to raise some of these questions, maybe for the clarification of everybody, so we know where we're at with it so that we do not have the constant confrontation that seems to be within the area there.

I'd like to start off by asking the Minister if she could maybe give an update as to where we're at with this school right now and then have a series of questions, to follow with that, if that would be acceptable.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I think that first I would like to say to the member opposite that I'm both quite prepared and happy to discuss the number of concerns that I know he has or the number of questions in this area. I had thought that when we came into Estimates last night, and I discussed what was under 16.(3), the Public Schools Finance Board, and I communicated to the members opposite that it was divided into two areas and one was Grants to Schools, which is 16.(3) and the other is Capital, which is 16.(8), my suggestion or my request, I think, was that we cover the Capital under 16.(8) and while I'm not usually hung up on lines or on being prepared to discuss items when members are here to ask the questions, in this case I perceived that we had, since there was no negative reaction to my suggestion last night, that we were agreeing to cover Grants to School Divisions and the Public Schools Finance Board and Allocation of Grants under 16.(3) and Capital under 16.(8).

The only hesitation I have is that having thought that was the way we were going to go, I have not come forward with the notes and the information that I would expect to have on hand at the time I was expecting to go through these items. So I leave it to him to sort of think. There are a couple of possibilities. I would prefer to have an opportunity, since I didn't expect it now, to have the notes and the information that I wanted to have. We could do it tonight or we could leave it for all of the capital items under 16.8 which is where I had expected they would come.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, to the Minister then, one of the difficulties I have, I have a commitment for tonight and won't be around tonight. The questions are basically - I don't know whether the Minister would necessarily feel that they are capital or not - it's sort of on a general nature regarding the project, the school itself naturally, but some questions that remain in the minds of the people there; student enrolment to some degree, the projections and things of this nature. Now if the Minister feels that she would like to deal with that at a different time, I certainly am flexible in that regard as long as I can get these questions in somewhere along the line.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Well I must say I appreciate the flexibility of the member opposite. If he is indeed going into questions specific, like enrolment and projections, it is the kind of information that I would want to have on hand and that I do have, but I have not presently prepared myself for it today. I wouldn't want to bring it up at a time when he can't be here. Does he have any problems with leaving it when all the capital is handled under 16.8?

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I'm prepared to accept that and certainly want to be flexible in that degree, as long as I have the assurance from the Minister that somewhere

along the line, aside from tonight, that I could possibly raise these questions. I'll accept whenever the Minister indicates that I can deal with it. I'm sure that the Minister would somewhere along the line want staff around when they raise some of these questions, and to do it under Minister's Salary when there's no staff around, I think would maybe be not quite fair and probably wouldn't serve the purpose as well. So if the Minister can indicate when and where, I think I'll accept that.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Once again I'd like to thank the member for that willingness to accommodate. He is quite right. I think when he talks about the amount of information and having staff around, I think the Public Schools Finance Board does deal with a lot of very complex issues because you are talking about organization of schooling; you are talking about programs; you are talking about perhaps language programs; you are talking about enrolments; you are talking about dollars; and you are talking about two levels of jurisdiction of responsibility.

We will be dealing with any questions related to the approval of the building of schools under 16.8, and any questions that the member wishes to raise on any of those items or anything related to that school, I'll be happy to answer then.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Fine. I'll accept that then and possibly after today whenever I can deal with this subject, I'd be prepared to raise those questions. It would deal - I don't know whether that's within the prospective - generally with the Ile des Chenes school. As I indicated before there's a lot of confusion in the minds of people, the ratepayers, and it has been a real problem for many years. I felt that if we could maybe get some of these things clarified to some degree, that it would be beneficial to government as well as the to the ratepayers and the school board. That's why I would like to go through a series of these if acceptable, either tomorrow if we're in Estimates, or on Thursday if possible.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Is the member giving me a hint at when we're going to reach 16.8? No, I quite appreciate actually the opportunity, and I also agree that it has been a longstanding, difficult and sensitive issue, both for this government and the previous government, that it has a long history and is very complex. I think if he has a series of questions that will allow us all an opportunity to discuss what happened and how it came about and what the decisions were and what is in place now, that it might indeed improve the understanding of the people in the community.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Fine. Once again then, the Minister can possibly take notice of the intent of what I have in mind and can inform herself of the information that she needs, then when we get to that area I'd like to take the opportunity to pursue it to some degree.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: In reviewing my notes, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the pages that I would like to have are Pages 66 and 67 which give the breakdown of the

Education Support Program and the Other Support under Item 16.(3)(a) and I'm wondering whether or not those are available for 1983 at the present time.

I have in my notes Page 32, the Balanced Assessment Summary and I don't have Page 32 in this yellow book, so I'm wondering whether that is indeed the page that I'm looking for. If it is the balanced assessment on a province-wide basis, that's what I'm looking for.

Pages 18 and 19 which detail the Education Support Program and the Other Support on a division-by-division basis for the province, if those pages are available I believe that most of my analysis can be accomplished with that information for the present for these Estimates.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, our first reaction to both the numbers and the indications of the areas of information that the member is asking for is that most likely most, if not all, of that information could be provided tonight and we'll just confirm it and gather it between this afternoon's session and this evening's. Whatever we have we will give you.

MR. G. FILMON: In that case, Mr. Chairman, I notice the clocks are now correct because I thought perhaps our time had expired and we were going into Private Members' Hour. But we're now on the right time, Central Daylight time, so therefore we have another hour to go.

So my question to the Minister is to do firstly with the Public Schools Finance Board. Am I correct in saying that the costs are under the Education Support Program, the costs of operation?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. G. FILMON: The former structuring of the department called for the Assistant Deputy Minister of Finance and Administration to be the Chairman of the Public Schools Finance Board. That has now been split into two positions. I can understand why in this year when Dr. Nicholls is heavily involved in the overall analysis, review and study of the public school financing in the province, why one might want to reduce the time commitment in his position and put that in a separate situation. But I'm wondering whether or not the Minister intends to keep that separately and have a separate chairman other than the Assistant Deputy Minister of Finance and Administration.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the point that the Member for Tuxedo raised is indeed one of the reasons for the separation, that we were undertaking a major educational finance review that was going to require a great deal of time, thought and energy to be devoted to that. We were also at the same time making some fairly major changes in the policies and the activities of the Public Schools Finance Board as they relate to Capital. As I suggested earlier, they have two distinct, sort of, responsibilities, and one is the allocation of money to school divisions, and the other is the decisions that are made on the renovation, upgrading and building of schools.

As the Member for Tuxedo might remember, about three weeks ago we announced a major policy change

wherein the Public Schools Finance Board will be gathering information for the first time, putting the data on a computer base that tells us what condition the schools are in across the province and develops the criteria to determine where the needs are the greatest, and I'll give you an example. It's clear that health and safety would obviously be probably the top criteria and that this change is going to have us, as he touched on before in his opening statements, concentrating on renovations and upgrading of our older school stock although we will be continuing to build new schools where the demand is there. But we know clearly that there's a shift in priorities and a shift in need to renovating and upgrading the old schools.

The gathering of information is being done in concert with school divisions where we are going out together with them and doing the survey and gathering the data. The information that we get will not just be available to the Department of Education but will also be available to the school divisions to help them with their planning and their projections.

At the same time, we took away a major task of the Public Schools Finance Board that wherein they were required to approve all miscellaneous Capital and, I think, one of the examples is that you have the Public Schools Finance Board actually being put in a position of having to approve a request for shower heads, that kind of miscellaneous equipment. I think it was \$3 million. You can imagine how much work was required by the Department of Education to process the hundreds of applications that came in under miscellaneous Capital at that level to deal with \$3 million. So it was very time consuming, and work that I have clearly said should have been done and can best be done by the school divisions.

So there's been a major change in activity - on the one hand, gathering more information and planning; on the other hand, giving up a major activity. To make a long story short, what I'm getting around to saying is - I knew you knew it was coming - that I will be reviewing this. In other words, having the two is I think necessary right now because of the Ed Finance Review and the activities the Public Schools Finance Board has undertaken. I'm not sure that when we're through both of those processes and we have them in place that the requirements will be the same. We certainly do not want to have anything set up or any structure set up for a time that doesn't continue to be useful. So we will be reviewing and looking at the structure when we've done those two major tasks.

MR. G. FILMON: I must admit, Mr. Chairman, that I found it curious that the Minister did see that potential bottleneck and overload with the heavy responsibilities, additional responsibilities, Dr. Nicholls is expected to carry, whereas, on the other hand, these two boards both plug in at the same point on the organizational chart; that the Minister took the step of giving her overworked Deputy Minister who has, as I pointed out, a total of six different sections reporting to him in addition to administratively four Assistant Deputy Ministers and all their responsibilities all coming through his hands and yet made him Chairman of the Universities Grants Commission, a position which was not formerly held by the Deputy Minister of Education.

So I just found it curious that kind of administrative potential bottleneck was allowed to be exacerbated while the other one was relieved, and so I just leave it for the Minister's consideration.

Was the Public Schools Finance Board involved in the decision to build the regional secondary school in south Winnipeg or will it be involved in that decision? I might indicate that if there was a news release issued on Friday other than a press conference, a news conference, I still have not received it. If there was one, it'll be in my pile of things that I receive weekly at the end of each week, and so I'll get one next Friday telling me about it, I assume. Other than some sketchy details in the newspaper, I'm still not aware if such an announcement was made or any information about it, but that's another issue which we'll cover at another time. I'd like to know if the Public Schools Finance Board has been involved or will be involved with that decision?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, they definitely have been, Mr. Chairman. This is another area that is under the regular responsibility and functioning of the Public Schools Finance Board, so that I might expect we could discuss it to some degree now if he wants. We could also leave it until we come to Capital under 16.(8), because all of the decisions that are made by the Public Schools Finance Board are handled in the same way, and the South Winnipeg Vocational Centre was dealt with by the Public Schools Finance Board.

MR. G. FILMON: So we can expect that the numbers, the potential enrollees in this institution and all of the kind of statistical analysis that would be done in deciding to build a school of this nature, all went through the Public Schools Finance Board.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Absolutely, Mr. Chairman.

MR. G. FILMON: I don't want to get us sidetracked on this topic, but I just want to ask the question because I understand from talking to certain school board officials in the various divisions, which will be feeder divisions to this school, that the numbers have changed and that, in fact, despite a growing trend towards vocational education and a growing demand for it, the numbers today are not as great as they were five years ago for justifying the construction of this school.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Well, Mr. Chairman, that comment surprises me a little bit since this request has been on my desk for some time, a co-operative request from the three school divisions, and I must say we've been under great pressure by the school divisions to approve this school because of the need. In other words, we were being called frequently to say, my goodness, we have a real need here that is not being met and we would really appreciate a decision. So it would surprise me a great deal to find that the school divisions themselves are suggesting that the need is declining. If that is the case and the need and the numbers are declining, I am sure we have no wish to build a school that is not needed.

The latest figures that we have, that are the official figures on the Public Schools Finance Board desk, that

were received from the three school divisions, continue to support the need for a Winnipeg South Vocational School and the request has never been withdrawn. They have a Letter of Intent in, that it's a co-operative Letter of Intent by three school divisions, quite unique in their approach I must say, where each of the three divisions recognized they didn't have access to vocational programs for their students and also recognized the difficulties and the improbability of each being given a vocational institution of their own, so I must say their unique approach to developing a co-operative institution that they would share was one that interested me because I think we have to do more of that, especially with our highly expensive institutions and programs.

I don't have the enrolment numbers here because I wasn't expecting to get into this, but I can say that the request has been in. It has never been withdrawn. They are supporting the need for a school for the three communities and the Public Schools Finance Board responded to a Letter of Intent from three school divisions with the information they provided.

MR. G. FILMON: Let me rise quickly to say that as a representative of at least some of the area that's going to be feeding students into that school that, (a) I am pleased to have had the school approved so quickly under whatever circumstances, regardless of who is concerned about his or her re-election as a result of circumstances that prevail in the political scene as it is today; regardless of what the reasons behind it, I accept, and so do the people of the area that I represent and other areas who will benefit from having that school there.

What I am saying is that - before I go into that - I will also say that I am well aware of the process that was followed because I believe it was under our administration that the divisions were encouraged to get together, that process was set up by the former administration. A former Deputy Minister, I think, was assigned as a resource person to help them so that they could understand what different options they might have in getting together co-operatively for a Regional School that was the property or the responsibility of several divisions rather than one and so on and so forth. All of those things I believe were a good and proper process that resulted in a good and proper result.

I am asking if there was a change in numbers or a change in justification because that would affect, not the overall need, but whether or not a certain size and a certain type of facility resulted as opposed to the overall need. I am quite prepared to accept that the numbers justified the need. But there is a difference between having this type of facility or twice the size and a different mandate facility. I still haven't, as I say, got the information on it so I don't know which courses its intended to offer, or what vocational training it will provide and so on and so forth. So I am a little bit in the dark and that is why I am asking the questions in this vein, in a broad general vein rather than being specific. Maybe we'd be better off to wait until the Minister has all that information and then we can go into further discussion under Item 8.

To do with the Public Schools Finance Board and to zero in on some items there, there are a number of

issues I believe that are before the board at the present time or have just recently been dealt with that I would like to touch upon. One of them again has to do with an area adjacent to that which I represent and that is a request for some major renovations or repairs to the Robert H. Smith School. I understand that a group of interested parents has met with the Minister and have been told that that decision will be one of the Public Schools Finance Board. Is that the case?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am not altering or changing the procedure in any way that has been followed previously for the approval of schools. As the Member for Tuxedo, I think, realizes that the Public Schools Finance Board does have a role and a responsibility that they do review applications that come in from school divisions and respond to them both in terms of the amount of space, the amount of money and the guidelines that are their guidelines that they apply for the approval of schools. They have a responsibility to gather and to ensure that there is adequate information provided by the school division about the need and the requirements for the school and for the school division. After they have gone through that process, and it often takes a little while with a fair amount of discussions and meetings and communication between the Public Schools Finance Board and school divisions, do they then come to their final decision and pass on the recommendation to me.

What I was suggesting to the parents when I met with them is, that this was still presently in that process; that it was still in the hands of the Public Schools Finance Board; that it was my understanding that they had needed some additional information from the school division and had requested it and received it fairly quickly within about a week of their request and were then moving as quickly as possible to take the additional information that had been given so they could deal with it.

I am expecting that because it is a situation where children have been dislocated and moved and settled in other places, that we all recognize that this shouldn't sit on anybody's desk for any period of time. So whatever decisions are going to be made should be made. I expect him to move quickly on the information that he now has and to get it to me and I expect to move quickly when I get it.

MR. G. FILMON: So what the Minister is saying is that she will make the decision, but it will be on the recommendation of the Public Schools Finance Board.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I believe that is always the case, Mr. Chairman, where the Public Schools Finance Board does review the applications and does make recommendations to the Minister and forward the background, the justification and the reasons for those recommendations.

MR. G. FILMON: If the decision rests with the Minister, is there an appeal to anyone else?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I think perhaps where the appeal process sometimes comes into place is perhaps with the Public Schools Finance Board's decision. It has

been the case in the past and I want to emphasize here that the process that was in place now, is the process that has been in place for years. There has been absolutely no change in the procedure for approving schools. It has been the case, I think, where the Public Schools Finance Board has made a decision or a recommendation and the school division has not accepted the recommendation or the decision of the Public Schools Finance Board and has appealed that decision to the Minister. I can't just recall a specific school where that might have happened, so that is where the appeal usually takes place.

MR. G. FILMON: That is what I am trying to get at. I am a little confused. The Minister was saying that she would make the decision on recommendations from the Public Schools Finance Board whereas I understood the process to be the Public Schools Finance Board making a decision and only if people disagreed with it, did it then become a matter of appeal to the Minister. So what's going to happen at Robert H. Smith, that's what I am asking? Who's going to make the decision?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I actually think the point the Member for Tuxedo raises is a good one in that one would not expect if there . . . That has been in place for years. There has been absolutely no change in the procedure for approving schools. It has been the case, I think, where the Public Schools Finance Board has made a decision or a recommendation, and the school division has not accepted the recommendation or the decision of the Public Schools Finance Board and has appealed that decision to the Minister. I can't just recall a specific school where that might have happened. So that is where the appeal usually takes place.

MR. G. FILMON: That's what I'm trying to get at. I'm a little confused. The Minister was saying that she would make the decision on recommendation from the Public Schools Finance Board; whereas I understood the process to be the Public Schools Finance Board making a decision, and only if people disagreed with it, did it then become a matter of appeal to the Minister. So what's going to happen at Robert H. Smith? That's what I'm asking. Who's going to make the decision?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Actually, I think the point that the Member for Tuxedo raises is a good one in that one would not expect, if there was an agreement between the school division with their request and the Public Schools Finance Board, who we had set up to review and gather information, if they're in agreement, that you would just out of a clear blue sky decide to go against both the request and the decision. I can't see that happening, but it does happen that they do appeal a decision that they don't agree with that comes from the Public Schools Finance Board.

I cannot say what is going to happen to Robert H. Smith because I do not have the information or the recommendation from the Public Schools Finance Board on my desk. I don't know what their recommendation is going to be.

MR. G. FILMON: I'm not asking what the decision is going to be; I'm asking what the process is going to

be. Is the Public Schools Finance Board going to be making the decision or are you going to be making the decision?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I'll just quote from The Public Schools Act, '74, Page 41: "In the case of a building that is erected, enlarged or remodelled, the plans therefore have been approved by the Minister; and (b) in the case of a building that is to be purchased, the purchase has been approved by the Minister. The school board shall not purposely erect, enlarge or remodel school buildings, teacher residences, student residences, or any buildings on property owned or leased by the school division or school district or anyone or more of them or enter into a contract for any of those purposes unless . . ." and the (a) and the (b) say, "In the case of a building that is erected, enlarged, or remodelled, the plans therefore have been approved by the Minister, and in the case of a building that is to be purchased, the purchase has been approved by the Minister."

I think that the Act is saying that whatever plans, whatever buildings are going to be approved, although they may go through the Public Schools Finance Board, require Ministerial approval.

MR. G. FILMON: Recently a decision was made to pay an outstanding bill for repairs to a Smith Jackson School in Dauphin. I'm wondering how that came about. Was that on a recommendation by the Public Schools Finance Board or how did that come about?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to get too hung up on the area of questioning, except that we are getting a great deal into the area that we discussed which would probably more appropriately come under 16.(b), which is all of the decisions made by the Public Schools Finance Board related to renovations or the approval of buildings, and does he want to continue on this topic and I can only say then, in response, is that I was expecting after last night's discussion that these items would come up under 16.(b). I'm trying to do my best to sort of answer the level of questions that he has that are of interest to him without putting myself in the position of not having adequate information in some areas to respond to very detailed specific requests.

MR. G. FILMON: I'll try and stay away from any major Capital project kinds of decisions. It seemed to me that this was a relatively minor one, the tune of \$18,300 for some repairs, and it seemed to me as though that was a different matter. I'm wondering if the Minister can clarify for me what was the nature of that decision.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Although the Member for Tuxedo is suggesting that this is a minor matter because it only involves \$18,000, the dollar amount is small but, as he also knows, there are a lot of factors related to many of these issues and they're not always quite as easy to remember as it should be kind of easy because it's only \$18,000, so I'll do my best on this one, taking the option of providing any additional information should I not handle it adequately from memory.

I think what happened in the Smith Jackson School in Dauphin was that fairly early on, I think when I came

into office, I had a number of what you might call representations from boards where they had particular problems or issues with either the previous government or the Government of the Day, I suppose, and this was such the case with the Smith Jackson School. They were saying that they thought the - it had not agreed with the previous decision made by the Public Schools Finance Board in not considering - and I say this - not considering their requests for monies for what would be in the minor renovation category.

As you said, it's only \$18,000 over a period of years and that the justification - in other words, they sent in a request, I think two or three requests perhaps, over a period of years each year, saying they wanted to do this to Smith Jackson School to keep it up to date, to keep it renovated, which God knows, we are saying clearly it must be done, we have to do the renovations early so we don't end up with these major horrendous, structural defects and problems down the road. So I think they were doing the right thing in wanting to maintain their school, putting an application in every year, and were informed that it was not considered, not that it was rejected but that it was not considered, and the basis for the refusal, as I recall, was that they believed the school should close.

In other words, it's an older school and the feeling was that school was going to close and therefore was not wise or justified to put renovation dollars into it, even though they were small. Now, I think that a very important point here is that school divisions are the people, and school boards, who make decisions that schools should close or will be kept open and will continue to be a public school facility for years to come. In this case, the decision that the school was no longer useful or needed was not made by the school division. It seemed to have been made by the Public Schools Finance Board, so that they felt that they were not being allowed funds to maintain a school that they wanted to continue to be a school because of a decision from up above that it should close and shouldn't remain a school.

On hearing that information, I did communicate to the Public Schools Finance Board, because I think we have to sometimes look at policies and sometimes clarify policies under which boards operate, suggest that as long as a school division had decided that a school should be kept open and was going to continue to be used as a school and their requests should be considered. In other words, they couldn't refuse to even consider a request because of a decision that was inappropriately made that the school should close - not made by the proper body - and since these requests had been in, the division themselves had done the work. They had been - I suppose "conscientious" might be the word - conscientious enough to decide to maintain that school and do the repairs even without the support of the Public Schools Finance Board. In retrospect, it seemed clear that if those were renovations that were needed - and they seem to have been - and the school division was going to continue to maintain the school, they were entitled to have those small requests considered and funded, if they were legitimate.

I think in this case the issue was not as much an issue of money, because the \$18,000 didn't break either the school division or the Public Schools Finance Board, it was an issue of principle where they were trying to

keep their school open and maintain it as a neighbourhood school for some time to come and felt that their efforts were being thwarted by a decision by the Public Schools Finance Board that it was not appropriate.

MR. G. FILMON: So was this a matter of official appeal to the Minister by the Dauphin-Ochre School Division?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes. I might say I think it probably was a matter of appeal. Yes, it was a matter of appeal to me from the school division on a number of occasions, not only initially. At this point, I can't remember if the initial contact was by letter, but I did have a second contact with them when I was making my tour out in the country and in the North. One of the areas that I toured was Dauphin. I had a request by the Dauphin School Board to meet with them, and in that meeting they raised two or three very important issues to them and one was a follow-up to their original request for approval of the original requests they had put in for renovation. I thought they had a good point.

MR. G. FILMON: How far back does the Minister feel it's reasonable for her to go in reviewing decisions that have been made?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I don't expect it would be done very often or that you would go very far back. I think this was a very unusual, sort of unique situation where the school board had a legitimate beef and sometimes people do, and that where they do and they communicate it well and the information when you look into the situation confirms what they are saying, then I think on an important matter of principle, which it was to them, that we should be prepared to make amends.

MR. G. FILMON: Would the Minister not agree that where in this case a decision that had been made more than four years earlier by the Public Schools Finance Board as it existed at that time, resulted in the school board paying itself the \$18,300, and that this kind of turning back the clock and imposing a new ministerial fiat on that kind of judgment that had been made for better or for worse by the Public Schools Finance Board appears to be a straight case of political meddling? I believe that regardless of the logic and the justification, that's all it appears to be on the surface; to go back four-and-a-half years, turn back the clock and superimpose a ministerial decision to the tune of \$18,300 on a judgment that was made by a board that was in place at that time, a board composed largely of senior civil servants I believe. It appears to be nothing more than a straight political meddling.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Well, Mr. Chairman, it will be no surprise to the Member for Tuxedo that I don't accept that interpretation at all, nor do I think the school board would interpret it that way. I didn't run around and look for something to do and look for a place to put \$18,000.00. I had an issue put on my desk by the school board where they were identifying what they believed to be an injustice and what they believed to be an inappropriate decision, which I think we all recognize

is one that the Public Schools Finance Board does not make.

That has been reiterated in this House by both this side and that side when there are lengthy speeches or points made about the importance of allowing school divisions and recognizing their authority and autonomy under The School Act to make decisions about school closure, organization of schools, and maintenance of schools. I don't think any board's decision is perfect or that any is beyond reproach and where there is a identifiable injustice and they are asking for recourse, it's fair to give consideration to it.

I might also say that as long as that was not done, the belief would have been in the school divisions, in the school board's eye, because they told me this, it was business as usual in terms of the department's attitude toward that school continuing to be that the school should not continue to exist and stay open, but should close, which is clearly still inappropriate and a perception with which I do not want to identify myself or my government or the Department of Education.

I went through that school and it's a beautiful old school. It's as solid as the Rock of Gibraltar and they expect it to continue to educate children as it has done in the past, for a number of years to come. They wanted some indication and some statement from our government that we were not going to continue the same course by cutting off funds suggesting that the school should not stay open but were going to say to them the decision is yours and where you are going to keep it opened and keep it renovated you are entitled to put in requests for renovation money to maintain that school, as anybody else is in the province, and they will be considered and handled in the same way.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, can we then assume that since the Minister has said that it's the school board's judgment as to whether or not a school is viable and whether or not a school will have the required enrolment numbers to justify expenditure of public money, then what role is there for the Public Schools Finance Board if we're going to take the school board's view on these things? We don't need the Public Schools Finance Board then because you're saying the judgment that should be listened to is that of the school board, that they know best and if that's the case then we're just going to give free rein and we're going to pay for anything that the school divisions in the area tell us they want.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I'm presently looking for the appropriate sections of The Public Schools Act. This is not a whim or fancy or this is not something that I am sitting down making decisions about how it should be handled, this is the law.

The Public Schools Finance Board clearly spells out the right, the responsibility and the authority of school divisions to make decisions on the building of schools, the renovation of schools, the maintenance of schools and the organization and the reorganization of programs, so that the first decision must be made by them. After they have made their decision the request, as you will realize, the requests are varied that they each will use a variety of architects and expertise to develop their plans and proposals and that the plans

and proposals vary considerably from school division to school division and, indeed, from school to school. So it is important that the projects be monitored, that we also have enrolment projections. There have been times when there has been a difference of agreement initially on enrolment projections between a school division and the Public Schools Finance Board and they have had to hammer that out and come to an agreement prior to confirming or agreeing and making the decision on the level of enrolment and the size of the school, so there is clearly a role for both. I think what I was suggesting with the decision I made previously is that the responsibility and the decision should be made at the place that they belong.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: On the same subject, I wonder if the Minister prepared to go back and review all these requests that have come from the school board say, for the last five years and have been turned down and deal with them in the same manner the subject was dealt with in Dauphin. Is that a fair request for me to ask today, that you notify all the school boards in the province that you're prepared to review these improvements to the various schools in the province and treat them similar to the treatment that was expended to the Dauphin School?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I think in this case it's like the suggestion or the feeling that when you do something you're going to open some marvelous and tremendous floodgates that sort of deal with the same matter. In this case you've got a very unique situation that I doubt has been duplicated in any other situation where proposals were not even considered. You see, in most cases proposals are considered, decisions are made, information is given on the acceptance or the denial, but based on the processing of the request. In this case the really unusual situation was that their requests were not processed at all. In other words there was no attempt to make a decision on the appropriateness of them. They were ruled, sort of, out of order before they ever got to the desk and they were ruled out of order on a basis that was not justifiable and was not fair. I think with that kind of clear information, I think we should move.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I'm only asking the question to be fair to all the school boards in the province and I'm sure that any school division in the province can come up with a concern that they raised, or a matter of certain improvements that they raised over the past five years which again was turned down and now I'm asking the Minister, is she prepared to alert the school divisions in the province that there is a new policy of the government? They are prepared to review these projects or proposals that came from the various boards and take another look at them. I think if it's fair to one school division it should be at least alerted to the other school divisions in the province that this is the policy of this government.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I feel quite confident from my previous experience as both a school

trustee and the chairman of a school board for 9 or 10 years, whatever it was, and the experience that I've gained as the Minister of Education, that the school divisions are quite capable of presenting their case and, in fact, sometimes too capable. I mean, they are so able to present clearly their position, their request and support them that I doubt very much if there's anybody that is in a situation where they feel they have been badly dealt with, where they have not continued to press and continued to request that changes be made and where those situations exist I believe the boards are taking the action that they need to take and when they take the action and raise the question or put an issue on my desk, I look at it.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: I thank the Minister. My only concern is I'm not that familiar with any but when this matter came up I imagine if the school boards in the province were alerted to the fact that this a change in policy and you're prepared to go back and review some of those ones back that far, that they in all likelihood would have similar concerns as raised in the committee today.

The other matter that I have to raise, and it's again dealing with financing, is the meeting that some of the MLAs had with school boards and municipalities in Newdale some weeks ago and I wonder if this is the item where I should raise the concerns that were expressed at that meeting.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I'm sorry, it appears I have trouble doing two things at the same time, listening and reading. Could you repeat the question?

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Municipalities and school divisions in the western region of the province called the MLAs, I think we've all gotten their brief now, to come and listen to some of their problems that they would like to discuss with MLAs at that particular meeting. Some of us attended that meeting that day and they insist that some of their concerns be put on the record of this province.

I'm wondering if this is the correct place for me to raise the concerns about the school boards and municipalities under this item, or is there some other item in the Estimates where it should be raised.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I think it's quite appropriate that it be raised. This is the line that deals with money to school divisions and I imagine that it touches on the area of the discussion that took place at the meeting that he's talking about. I haven't seen the brief, so I don't know the specific concerns or requests that are raised in them. We may be able to answer them today. As I suggested to the Member for Tuxedo, because I know there is sometimes a very great interest in a specific school board budget in what they're getting and what they're spending and in mill rate increases and all the variables of each division's budget, I was prepared to provide a summary of fairly detailed information on an individual school board's budget on request, if you communicate to us in interest. You might think about what form it is your questions are going to take, whether or not you might like to give notice first and ask us to have on hand the specific information

about the budgeting and the funding to that or those school divisions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, Mr. Chairman, I daresay that the Minister has received her copy likely by now of this presentation that was made. I got my second copy in the mail on Friday, I believe it was. I understand in talking to other members of the Legislature that we've all been favoured with copies of this submission that was made at Newdale a week ago Friday, I believe it was, Mr. Chairman.

They were elected representatives of municipalities and school boards in the western part of Manitoba. They said that they wanted to express their concerns in four specific areas to us that day. Those four topics were the total cost of education and health care; the present method of financing education; the present collective bargaining process; and government deficits were the subjects that they drew to our attention that day.

I'll only deal with the ones this afternoon that's pertaining to education. The brief goes on and says that statistics show that the total cost of education in Canada in the past decade has tripled. We hasten to add that many other costs including health care have shown a similar increase and while health costs are of great concern to us, we place more emphasis on education costs due to our direct involvement in this area and the ever increasing property tax.

I'll turn the page over and read what they had to say to us that day regarding the method of financing education in our province, Mr. Chairman. The brief says, Mr. Chairman: "Our concerns are primarily in the area of education tax on property and assessment. The Union of Municipalities for some time held the view that there are two kinds of services; services to people and services of property. We believe that education and health care are both people-related services and should not be financed by a tax on property. The historic method of financing schools from the property tax base is in our opinion no longer acceptable, at least in its present form. However, due to the political and economic difficulty of implementing the total removal of education tax from property at the present time, we would be prepared to accept what we consider to be a reasonable compromise.

"We would suggest that the Manitoba Assessment Review Committee's recommendations, with some minor amendments, could provide the system with enough flexibility to allow at least some of the present inequities to be corrected."

Speaking now not from the brief, my colleague, the Member for Swan River, raised that matter again today and I wonder if the Minister in her comments could give us some idea when we're going to deal with the assessment problems in the province, which is part and parcel of education.

I read again from the brief, Mr. Chairman. They say: "An analyses in many rural municipalities . . ." - they've sent appendixes and this is Appendix A - "show that on average farmers are paying up to, in many cases, more than three times the education tax as their nonfarm counterparts. We believe that this is totally

unfair and unacceptable. If total removal of education tax is neither acceptable or advisable at this time, it would seem much more equitable to apply the education tax to residential property only. This is assuming that all farm residences would become taxable as in the MARC's recommendations.

"We would further suggest that all the residential land could be exempted along with other land and apply the tax to residential buildings only. Local autonomy is a concern to all of us, and as municipal officials and school boards, we would not wish to see any reduction in the present levels of autonomy in either. Any shift of the education tax on property has implications in this area.

"However, since school boards control only about 17 percent of their budgets and because of various provincial Acts governing school boards' responsibilities to provide education services to the public, it seems to us that the local taxpayer is paying very dearly for what little autonomy we do have. An increase in the control of finances by local school boards and taxpayers would be justified in our opinion.

Two areas where local autonomy could be exercised is in the area of collective bargaining and teacher qualifications and pay schedules. At the present time, school boards are required to pay teachers on the basis of qualifications of the the applicant rather than on the basis of qualifications for the position that is open. The results are increased costs due to having to pay for greater qualifications than are required."

That's the end of the section that they've related on financing education and, Mr. Chairman, I just put that into the record. They have other objections as raised in the brief and I'm sure the Minister will get a copy at the same time. No doubt, as a result of the policies that are being implemented by school divisions in that general area, and Pelly Trail is only one that comes to my mind as I speak; they have already cut back. There are concerns being recognized and raised by parents now in the Pelly Trail School Division that children in the Industrial Arts and Home Ec classes from Grades 9 to 12 are going to be cut next year, and they wonder what's going to happen to their children. So the problem is a difficult one and it's a complex one, but it's certainly, in my lifetime in the Legislature, the first time that I have seen school boards and municipalities at that level assemble in a group and jointly present a brief to which both sides were party and agreed. I think that we have to sit down and be taken very seriously and see if we can't come up with some of the answers that these elected people are raising in this brief, Mr. Chairman.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, the member raises a very large number of issues, some general and some specific. Since I'm looking at the hour and believe this is now the correct time and we will be going into Private Members' Hour, I thought what I might do is a little bit of overview about the issues that you've raised and suggest that perhaps the individual school divisions, this would be an area where it would be worthwhile looking at the funding, the programs, the budget, the expenditures and the assessment base of those school divisions.

Pelly Trail, particularly, I am very familiar with. They have some very unique problems and situations there.

They have made some judgments and decisions about how to handle it. I accept their right to make those decisions, but I also believe that we have to look at the whole question of the level of funding and the reasons why they're making the decisions to cut programs that they are making. So I'd like to do Pelly Trail in a little more detail when we come back to it.

First of all, in terms of the amount of money for education, I know there is a general sort of feeling that there is a great deal of money, but when we look at the proportion of what the government spends on education over the last, I think it's about five or six years - or is it even ten; I'm trying to remember the statistics that we had - it's been very stable. It's gone from about in the range of 19 to 20 percent but it's maintained or retained itself at about the 20 percent level. Now, that tells us something. It doesn't tell us that we're not spending a lot of money. It does tell us that with what the government has to spend, it is maintaining a stable level of support proportionately, a stable proportion of support to Education. That is not the case with Health; I believe that Health has been increasing significantly particularly in the previous years but Education has been staying fairly stable. I have no problem with having the municipalities and the school divisions get together to either talk or share information or to discuss the major issues facing locally elected representatives that each have an area of responsibility, each of which impacts on the local taxpayer in terms of services and programs, as the school boards and the municipalities do.

In fact, because the education system is so complex and so difficult to understand - the financing of it and all the ranges and disparities - I have made a fair effort to talk to municipal people myself where I went to their annual meetings and gave a very complex and lengthy and detailed explanation about the education finance, and I must say I was delighted with their response because they were not annoyed that I had gone into so much length and so much detail. It helped them understand the difficulties and the disparities and the differences in a way they hadn't been able to understand before.

So I think local school boards and local municipalities should be talking, because the problems are unique in each school division. In one school division the problem of the mill rate increase, the level of increase in the property tax, may have to do with the level of expenditures that the board brought in; may have to do with the level of funding by the province - they all have to do with the level of funding by the province - may have to do with serious declining enrolment; may have to do with serious disparity in assessment base and ability to raise money; may have to do with the fact that they have a deficit from a previous year that they've decided to pick up this year. It isn't until you look at each school division and look at all the factors that you can tell if they're having a problem - and I can tell you that most of them aren't because of the level of funding of the Provincial Government this year - but if they are having a problem, you can tell why they're having a problem and it's only when you do that on a school division by school division basis that you can begin to attack it or you begin to understand it, or you know where to go to complain about it. Because if for instance, the Provincial Government is

providing an adequate level of support, and I think the average was 11.3 percent to school divisions and is tremendously increasing their support to the most disadvantaged school divisions through the Supplemental Program that goes to those with the lowest assessment and lowest per-pupil expenditures, then you have to look at other places for the problem and see if its declining enrolment, see what the level of expenditures the board is bringing in.

I do have one other point I want to make on this general issue though, while I am commenting so positively on their getting together and sharing information. I do have trouble, and I said this to boards directly, and to MAST when we talk is that I do have trouble with what I perceive to be a contradiction in statements or positions where, on the one hand, they are asking and saying for local autonomy, it's our job, and our right to make these decisions and these decisions, and you even refer to that in their brief; we want local autonomy to continue. On the other hand, like the two major areas of activity which allow a board to retain its autonomy as its bargaining and its setting of board budgets. In the other provinces where they're taking away school board autonomy, those are the things that are removing. They're putting ceilings on and they're controlling board expenditures, and they are making provincial bargaining processes, or interfering, or telling them what they can do at the bargaining table.

Now, they can't have it both ways, Mr. Chairman. They can't ask for the hammer to be put by me in the tough bargaining. You know, I think boards are capable of bargaining themselves. They demonstrated that and they demonstrated it at the table this year. They reduced expenditures and they came to mutual agreements with their staff. The levels of salaries for teachers are determined by boards through the open negotiating bargaining system. The board expenditures are decided by school boards, each of which has the authority to make those decisions. I say to them that they cannot ask for local autonomy on the one hand but as to give it up when the tough decisions have to be made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for her comments.

This was a group, I would say, of about 120 elected school boards and municipalities; it wasn't a small group. It would cover the area from the Saskatchewan boundary down to, I would say, Minnedosa and skirting Brandon, so it certainly wasn't a small gathering of elected people.

I recognize, Mr. Chairman, some of their concerns because they said and they signed off the brief, "As municipal councils and school boards, we've made this commitment, and stand ready to co-operate and assist the Provincial and Federal Governments in positive long-term actions to restore confidence and stability to the economic and political future of the country." It's respectfully submitted by the Newdale Committee on behalf of Municipalities and School Boards in Western Manitoba.

I recognize from their brief that they don't feel that maybe this committee, or the Department of Education,

or we as legislators are not co-operating or meeting them at their level, or meeting as regularly as they would like us to meet. I just wonder that we had the occasion here not so long ago to see the Agricultural Committee touring this province twice on the matter of the Crow Rate. What would be wrong with the Educational Committee of this Assembly going around and sitting down with the municipalities and school boards in this province and to recognize, at least show them that we are concerned and that they have some real problems out there - and they are real.

As I said in my earlier comments, this is the first time in my 16 years here that we've had that kind of a gathering expressing concerns. If the Minister would consider it, that might be one solution to go out and sit down with the school boards and the municipalities and listen to their problems.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour is 4:30, time for Private Members' Hour. The committee will reconvene at 8:00 p.m. tonight.

IN SESSION

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: The first item on the agenda for Tuesday afternoon is the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for The Pas, Bill No. 36, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Pembina. (Stand)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert, Bill No. 41, the Honourable Member for Wolseley. (Stand)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, Bill No. 44, the Honourable Member for The Pas. (Stand)

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: The Honourable Member for The Pas had stood this, but I believe that there may be others that want to speak and by all means, they could go ahead.

MR. SPEAKER: Otherwise the matter will stand?

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, Bill No. 45, also standing in the name of the Honourable Member for The Pas. (Stand)

SECOND READING - PUBLIC BILLS

BILL NO. 56 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE BRANDON CHARTER

MR. H. CARROLL presented Bill No. 56, An Act to amend the Brandon Charter for Second Reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. H. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, this is a very very short bill. It's basically some simple amendments to the Charter of the City of Brandon. — (Interjection) —

Most of it would be housekeeping details, yes. One of the provisions in it has been covered for many years by another Act and they are just getting around to deleting it from The City of Brandon Act.

The most important section of this bill deals with Brandon's new Allied Arts Council Building. This building will be opening up very very shortly. It's a Library/Arts Complex. It has had support from the Provincial Government, from the Federal Government, from the outlying municipalities. In fact, everyone in Brandon is extremely proud of what appears to be a new complex. As I say, it should be opening up shortly.

We require an amendment to The City of Brandon Act so that the city can appoint a committee to properly administer this new complex and the gist of this Act is the setting out of the makeup of this committee and the purposes of this committee.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recommend this bill to the House. It meets the needs of the City of Brandon at this time. I can see no derogatory things coming out of it and much happiness in the City of Brandon.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?
The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that debate be adjourned, seconded by the Member for Roblin-Russell.

MOTION presented and carried.

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

RES. NO. 5 - FARM FUEL TAX

MR. SPEAKER: On Private Members' Resolutions, Resolution No. 5. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Pembina and the proposed sub-amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for River East. We took this matter under advisement last time we came before the House to render a decision for the House.

SPEAKER'S RULING

MR. SPEAKER: On April 13th, during debate in Private Members' Hour on the proposed Resolution No. 5 by the Honourable Member for Pembina, the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for River East, the Honourable Member for Pembina, when speaking to the amendment, proposed a sub-amendment.

The sub-amendment was complicated and I took the matter under advisement in order to gauge its admissibility. Careful examination of the proposed sub-amendment, although stated to be an amendment to the amendment, is only partially so and is also an attempt to amend the Main Motion.

Beauchesne Citation 441(2) says, "A sub-amendment must be relative to the amendment it purports to amend and not to the Main Motion." The sub-amendment is further defective by being an attempt to amend the member's own motion.

In referring to motions, Beauchesne Citation 414 says in part, ". . . but the mover himself cannot amend

his own. Paragraph 5 lacks any instruction and the mover's intent is unclear. Paragraph 6 is also lacking in clarity as the word "to" appears in three places in the amendment.

Beauchesne Citation 424(5) states that, "Any irregularity of any portion of a motion shall render the whole motion irregular."

Citation 428(2) states that, "When an amendment is irregular in one particular, the whole of it is not admissible and must be ruled out of order."

In view of the above, the proposed sub-amendment cannot be considered in order.

May I remind all members that the Clerk of the Legislature is available at all reasonable times to assist any member wishing to present a motion and will be pleased to offer any advice and assistance in drafting a properly framed motion.

Are you ready for the question on the amendment?

RES. NO. 5 - FARM FUEL TAX (cont'd)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the amendment as well as put a few thoughts forward on the substance of the motion unless you rule me out of order. It will be very difficult to speak strictly on the amendment, but I will try to confine my remarks pretty much to that area.

Mr. Speaker, this is the second year in a row that this particular issue has had to be brought to the attention of this government through a resolution; and the second year in a row that the government has seen fit to amend it or to try and deflect it into an area of unnecessary and, to a large degree, incorrect area.

The amendment that has been introduced by the Member for River East, I believe it is, again through his wording has indicated that the reason for the increase in costs of fuels has mainly come about, and I can quote directly from the amendment, "Has substantially raised the cost of oil and gas energy through increased private sector profit and through federal taxation."

The government of the day have a very difficult time in coping with that particular word "profit." Mr. Speaker, it seemed to put them into a kind of situation that one would expect an animal that was cornered, or going to be trapped, or having to deal with something that they are unfamiliar with. Even though, Mr. Speaker, I know a few of them on the other side of the House, the government benches, that are pretty much as individuals, as people who are interested in profitability of their own enterprises. But when it comes to the collective business of people or opportunities that this country has provided for people to make profits through the corporate structures, then automatically something becomes distasteful about it or sinful or just not desirable. For the life of me, I cannot understand why. I cannot understand why individuals, as I say, who have personally, through some of their own activities, and I know most of them have at least come from families probably or backgrounds, even though they themselves haven't participated in a way, in a profit-making venture or anything that had the possibility that they should at least understand that it takes that kind of profit to generate the enthusiasm and the desire to go ahead and do things in this country.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, they have deflected the intent of this resolution which, in fact, was pointing out what the basic problem is for the farm community today when it comes to buying of energy for farm operations.

Mr. Speaker, it was very interesting yesterday and I think this will be helpful to the House and the Assembly and provide some information that was provided to the Agriculture Committee sitting in Morden yesterday on Crow rate hearings. We had an individual, Mr. Speaker, who pointed out to the Standing Committee on Agriculture that it wasn't necessarily the increase or the change in the cost of transportation that was going to cause him so much difficulty but, in fact, the main problem he was faced with was the cost of energy, the cost of fossil fuels that he was having to buy for his farm. I'll give you a few figures that he presented to the committee because they are fairly important, Mr. Speaker.

In 1973, the cost of purple diesel fuel, which is the farm-used fuel - it's coloured so that if the people who in society are not farmers use it, they are subject to a provincial fine - but purple diesel fuel in 1973 cost 29 cents a gallon. The tractor this farmer was using used approximately 5 gallons an hour and cost him in 1973, \$1.45 an hour to operate his farm tractor. In 1979 - and that's a fairly interesting year, Mr. Speaker, because that's the year that the Liberal Party and the red rump of the Liberal Party, the New Democratic Party, which put Joe Clark out of office, Mr. Speaker, when he indicated there'd be an increase of some 18 cents a gallon for fuels in this country - in 1979, the cost was 67 cents a gallon, Mr. Speaker, that was an increase from 29 cents to 67.4 - but I'll round it off to the nearest figure - 67 cents a gallon in 1979.

But note this, Mr. Speaker, in 1983 the cost of that fuel has gone to \$1.60 a gallon from 67.4 cents in 1979, the year in which the New Democratic Party - and they take pride in this - moved the motion in the House of Commons to upset the Joe Clark Government and they joined with the Liberal Party to upset Joe Clark. I'm sorry, they're very sensitive about this. They want to take pride in the fact that they put Joe Clark and the Conservative Government out of office in Ottawa. They all stand up and make great things about it which, in fact, Mr. Speaker, gave every farmer an increase in cost from 67 cents a gallon to \$1.67 a gallon, Mr. Speaker, an increase of \$1 a gallon in four years, Mr. Speaker. And what did it do to this farmer using that same tractor at five gallons an hour, his cost went from 1979 on a per-hour charge to operate that tractor of \$3.37, to \$8 an hour to operate his farm tractor - an increase from \$1.45 an hour in 1973 to \$8 an hour in 1983, and the New Democratic Party - listen to this carefully - are proud of that, Mr. Speaker. That's the kind of government we have in Manitoba. They're proud of it, Mr. Speaker.

You know, Mr. Speaker, we've gone through a period of time, when oh yes, it's the big bad oil companies. It's the big bad oil companies with their profits. The amendment says, it's the big bad profits that the oil companies are taking.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Alberta, and I recommend it to each and every one and I'm sure they've read it, received copies of it, pointing out what the cost of fuel really is. Mr. Speaker, they don't deny that it's true, but it truly points out that the Federal

Government tax is 24 percent of the barrel price that is now paid by the Canadian consumers - 24 percent is federal tax. Mr. Speaker, the point that has to be made is it's the government and the high cost of government, the buying of PetroCan, and all those nonsensical expenditures by Federal Government that have put the taxes to where they are on farm fuels. Mr. Speaker, why doesn't this government get off their rumps, why don't they get with it, and support this resolution? It would immediately, Mr. Speaker, reduce the cost of farm fuel by at least 24 percent. That's a big reduction when you're using several thousands of gallons a year.

There's one further figure, Mr. Speaker, that I want to put on the record. The same farmer - this is his 1982 fuel cost for his combine, his tractor, and his truck going 20,000 miles a year - figured in at \$11.86 per acre - \$11.86 per acre, Mr. Speaker.

HON. S. LYON: Put it into hectares so they'll understand it.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, that's another cost that this farmer had to pay too, was the changing to hectares in the metric, and I don't want to get diverted into that one, because that's another 20 minutes of NDP support for the Liberal Party . . .

HON. S. LYON: Another NDP Program.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Another NDP Liberal supported party, as was spoken on last year by the now Minister of Consumer Affairs. But the point is, Mr. Speaker, that it's not the big profits that are taken by oil companies. It's not the big profits that anybody is taking. It's the misuse of taxpayers' money, taken away from the farmers, taken away from the consumers at large, to pay for mismanaged government, Mr. Speaker, mismanaged government in spades. And you know what? You know, it's really ironic. We now are paying \$800 a day to have the arsonist go around to see what started the fire in the Macdonald Commission, to find out what went wrong - \$800 a day. Well, I'll tell you, you can sit down in five minutes with any farmer who's been operating in this country for the last 10 to 20 years who have observed what has gone on and he would tell them pretty correctly and very quickly, Mr. Speaker, what the problem is. It doesn't matter whether you're a farmer; it doesn't matter whether you're a businessman; a businesswoman; whether you're a householder, whatever you are, you can't continue to spend more than you make, Mr. Speaker, and that's been precisely what is happening. We're spending as a collective group of people in government unreasonably at runaway paces. We've got a locked-in philosophy as Canadians or we've been forced into that, Mr. Speaker, that unless the Government of Canada or the provincial governments have an incentive grant or doing something with taxpayers' money to encourage us, that it shouldn't be done. What an ass-backwards way of developing a country! What a way to give incentive to people!

It's ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, to take it out of this hand, run it through a bureaucracy that are operating at 60 percent, as was indicated some two years ago in one

of the reports that came out of the Federal Government, a 60 percent efficiency government operating people and giving back how much at the other side of that operation? Mr. Speaker, we aren't going to last as a nation if we keep doing it.

That, Mr. Speaker, is why I'm so upset about this government and their lack of support for my colleague's resolution - the Member for Pembina - supported by all the members of this side. Why don't they get outside and request the Federal Government remove the federal sales tax from farm fuels? It's a principle they subscribe to in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker; they subscribe to the principle; I'm sure they do or they'd have reimplemented the provincial tax on farm fuels. If they don't subscribe to the principle then I wouldn't be surprised, and I ask any one of them to stand up and deny that they're not going to do it, I wouldn't be surprised if this government wouldn't reimpose farm taxes on fuels or provincial taxes on fuels. If they want to stand up and deny it, I would give them the opportunity to, Mr. Speaker, after I'm through speaking.

Mr. Speaker, if the principle is good for the removal of provincial sales tax on farm fuels, why doesn't it apply at the federal level? Why isn't that same principle adhered to by this government? Well, I can tell you why it isn't, Mr. Speaker, because they're a bunch of non-principled philosophical left-wing ideologists who truly don't understand that if you're going to get a plant to grow and a country to grow, you fertilize the roots and give them air and give them some room to move. But they don't believe in that, Mr. Speaker. They don't understand it and they don't believe in it.

They believe, Mr. Speaker, that you create a social problem for the societies and then you try and hire social engineers to resolve your problems, rather than dealing with the root and the base of the problem and giving opportunities for the people who are producers, not only farmers. It wouldn't bother me at all today if everybody in the industrial sector were given a tax break on federal taxes on fuels and I'll tell you why.

Mr. Speaker, our country is what? - some 5,000 miles from sea to sea. We've heard the argument and it came forward by many of the farmers' union people and the main supporters of the government during the last few days in Crow rate hearings that so many acres of land were given to the railroads to develop this country. It's an admission, Mr. Speaker, that there had to be a rail line built in Canada to tie this nation together and we're all proud of it. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, we've modernized and we have a nation that is now tied together with motor vehicles, transportation on land, not as much on steel, but on land and air.

Why, Mr. Speaker, can we not as a Federal Government dealing with people give the people an incentive to tie together by relieving them of the some of the taxes from the fuels that are burned, because it's essential that we travel in this country? It's not like the country that I'm sure many of you are familiar with, I haven't been there and I'm sorry I haven't, that's in the United Kingdom where you don't have to travel the multimiles that you have to travel to get anywhere like you do in Canada. You don't have the large farm operations in some of the smaller European countries. So, it is easier for them to deal with the distance there. But here we are strapped to using fuel, non-renewable resources, and I believe, as a nation, that we're going

to have to change our taxing policies to take it off the backs of not only farmers, but all the people in society. There has to be some way of dealing with it.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to continue to tax heavily the fossil fuels, whether it be in cars, trucks, tractors, any equipment we use that burns these fossil fuels, let us start reinvesting it or let the Federal Government start re-investing it in the building of highway links across Canada. Let's reinvest in that type of thing.

But, rather, what they would sooner do is invest in changing the country to metric when no one asked for it, Mr. Speaker. They spend their money dealing with, certainly in some cases, issues that are important, but not as important as those issues that you and I feel.

I want to spend the last few minutes, Mr. Speaker, again dealing with this whole issue of why we need Petrocan. I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, for one minute that we have gained one thing as a nation by having a big Maple Leaf sign hanging at a service station other than to better and promote the efforts of one Pierre Elliott Trudeau. I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that we would gain anything by removing Petrocan at this time. I don't see whether we would gain anything by removing it, because what would you do with it?

But let's deal with the real way in which we spend money. Let us build the facilities so that people can now travel on the roads from one end of Canada to the other. That would be a wiser use. If you were to put a road tax on, Mr. Speaker, a tax on fuel for road taxes and building of No. 1 Highway from one side of Canada to the other, a four-lane highway, because that's the modern-day traffic. There aren't many passengers who travel on rail anymore, but people do travel in automobiles and if you're going to tax people on energy, than build roads with those energy taxes. That's what I believe should happen and I believe it's a national responsibility to do that.

Well, we get back to why this government won't support us. I, for the life of me, don't know why they won't. We've had this Minister of Agriculture stand day after day after day after day and try to tell us they've done so much for the farm community. Mr. Speaker, they have done nothing for the farm community, and for those people in society who are worried about all the revenue that would be lost because farm fuels weren't taxed. For the record, there is less than 5 percent of all the fuel used in Canada used on farms. That is a very small amount of money to pay to make sure that the generators of the income from our grain sales from the multi-amount of millions of dollars that are imported to Canada in the balance of payments that we receive in grain shipments out of this country. It's a small price to pay for the kind of economic revenue that would keep Canada going. So I feel very strongly about this, Mr. Speaker. I feel very strongly about it as a provincial member. I feel that this government could at least stand in this Assembly and not bring in resolutions or amendments to resolutions that just try and say there is an unfair profit taken by the big oil companies.

Why did they shut down in Canada? Why did they all move to the United States, Mr. Speaker? It wasn't because they were making undue profit. It's because they were going broke, Mr. Speaker, and had to go where there was a climate for economic continuation of their companies. Mr. Speaker, they have come back

to Canada because they have felt that there is probably hope that it might turn around in this country, but I don't see any evidence of it.

In concluding, we have a national government who introduced a Budget some few days ago that put a measly \$100 million into the Farm Credit Corporation and they say to help get the farmers deeper in debt, Mr. Speaker; that's really what they want to do. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, rather than giving them the kind of tax breaks that they say are so good to them for those farmers who have made a lot of money in the last few years or hope to make a lot of money, why didn't they remove the fuel taxes from the farmers and give us immediate support for the farmers in Canada? That was an immediate move that could have been taken in last week's Budget. It is an immediate opportunity for the Member for Dauphin to get off his haunches and to speak on an issue that he could for his farm people, but he's supporting this amendment that says there is undue profit going to oil companies.

He never spoke in support of the resolution that the Member for Pembina brought in. He condemned it by associating himself with the amendment brought in from the ill-informed Member for River East. He is admitting that he doesn't understand where it's at. I would, as well, appreciate hearing the Member for Flin Flon speak on it. I'm sure he is from a farm background and if his family farm, if his brothers and his father who are now farming, would say to him, support this resolution, I would hope that he would give that some consideration, Mr. Speaker.

I think the government is showing an irresponsible action by bringing in the amendment they have and not supporting our resolution.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I think that it is clear that members of the opposition have grave difficulty looking at any economic thrust of government in a rational way. You know, they are torn in this, Mr. Speaker, because while they have Conservative Governments in power in oil-rich areas of this country, now both in Saskatchewan and Alberta, that entered into an agreement with the Federal Government, now they want to criticize the amendment that we make, which doesn't amend the resolve portion of the resolution, but focuses on the real concern . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: Do you know what you're talking about, AI?

HON. A. MACKLING: . . . that energy crisis in Canada now should be determined by an agreement that was entered into by responsible governments.

Now, as our party indicated when these discussions were taking place in Ottawa, we did not feel that the people of Canada should be held up to ransom by the oil producing countries in the world to have to pay the world price on oil and then, of course, the related gas prices that are based upon oil prices simply because countries elsewhere had decided they were going to extract a large measure of return from the sale of

those products. We had existing oil wells and oil fields and gas fields in Canada that had been paid for over many many times, and the profits to those people owning those facilities. Why should the people of Canada be held up to ransom?

You know, the members of the opposition have problems, because at some time they like what happens in the free market and sometimes they don't, but clearly, for example, the member who moved this resolution likes the so-called free market. When he spoke on March 17th, he said - this is well down the page - "So you can see how the workings of the free market system in the international pricing of oil has helped all Canadian consumers and, particularly, farm consumers by removing 13 cents a gallon." Mr. Speaker, he was talking about the collapse of the international cartel. Now, he refers to the international market there, but he doesn't refer back to the years, not just a few months, but the years in which international cartels held the whole of the western world, in fact the whole of the world, that was consuming energy up to ransom. That was the international pricing of oil. That was the so-called market.

What kind of a market? A controlled market. For the Member for Pembina, as long as it's international cartels, it's private companies controlling markets, there is no problem. That's, you know, the free market. There is no such thing, Mr. Speaker, as a free market anymore. That market was controlled for years and the whole of our industrial base was thrown in disarray by so-called marketing policies internationally that were far from free. We were captive to that system.

Governments in Canada, including the Governments of Saskatchewan and Alberta and the Federal Government, in light of those problems, did try to come up with a basis in which to address that energy shortage in Canada. Were we going to be forced into that controlled, that contrived market price in Canada? Governments said, no. Well, if the Honourable Member for Pembina had his way, the farmers in this province, the people everywhere in Canada would be forced to whatever the market was, the international market. That's what the Conservative Party in Ottawa is talking about, the world price. Let's go. Why should we have anything different than the world price? That was the thrust of their arguments.

The federal New Democratic Party in Ottawa said something different, and for the Honourable Member for Arthur now to refer to the New Democratic Party in Ottawa as the red rump of the Liberal Party, Mr. Speaker. The Conservative Party in Ottawa, as the Conservative Party in this Legislature, has been for international cartel marketing of energy. The federal Conservative Party has voted with the Liberals not once, Mr. Speaker, but 75 - now it's 83 times, my colleague confirms.

Let's really analyze who's who; who is in bed with whom in Ottawa. On every significant economic issue where the Federal Government has been turning right to accommodate what it perceives as a reactionary swing throughout North America, they have found a ready acceptance for those shifts to the right by the Conservative Party in Ottawa. Every time, Mr. Speaker, it has only been the New Democratic Party that has stood out and fought for reasonable government intervention in the marketplace to maintain reasonable

prices on energy in this country. That wasn't the record of the Conservative Party. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government, yes, at the instigation of the pressure of the New Democratic Party, did establish Petro-Canada. Why, Mr. Speaker? To give us a section, merely a small amount of the marketing of energy in this country and the people of Canada, in their vote, have indicated that they do not want public intervention removed from energy marketing in this country. Even Mr. Joe Clark, the former Leader of the Opposition in Ottawa for the Conservative Party - who certainly had the affections of most of the members opposite, or perhaps he still has; I don't know - he came out, Mr. Speaker, and he was going to sell off Petro-Canada.

A MEMBER: Not anymore.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, he changed his tune. Because people in this country, yes, are prepared to pay something additional at the pump so that they can own part of their energy system in this country. Why should we, Mr. Speaker, with all of the oil and all of the natural gas we have, have to be held subject to the decisions of private corporations who will tell us how much we have to pay for energy in this country? Decisions that are made in board rooms that are distant from this country.

Mr. Speaker, the people spoke out on the question of having something to say about energy pricing in Canada and the federal Liberal Government was finally forced to understand and accept that they had to move, they had to provide at least some intervention in the marketplace to reflect the will of the Canadian people, but Conservatives have fought that intervention every stage of the way. They would leave everything to private enterprise because they are blinded, mesmerized, by that ideal.

Mr. Speaker, we know that finally after a lot of tough negotiations, and you recall that the Premier of Alberta indicated, and they did shut off energy supplies. They held the people of this country to ransom because they said we are not going to agree to the prices that the Federal Government wanted to negotiate. Not at all. They forced the price up. They wanted world prices. They wanted to subscribe to the cartel arrangements and no member opposite was in disagreement then with their counterparts in Alberta. They welcomed that view. Now, they're singing a different tune. Or are they? Mr. Speaker, finally they come to an agreement and it was a costly agreement for everyone in Canada. Now what's happening with that agreement? We agreed, as a nation, on a formula - 75 percent of the world price. Well, you know, on the basis of that now, Mr. Speaker, our prices should come down. But what's happening? Who is in bed with whom now? Who has the ear of the Liberal Government? Who has? Premier Lougheed has, obviously. The Conservatives in this country have his ear, because we haven't brought the price of energy down in accordance with that agreement and that's a shame, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: They want it up.

HON. A. MACKLING: That's right. My colleagues say they want it up. Yes. The whole of this country presently

is captive to high energy formulas and that's what the basic problem is, Mr. Speaker. We have people in high places whose livelihoods, whose integrity, is based upon a continuation of high energy costs, and they don't want it changed. The Province of Alberta doesn't want that changed and they have the ear of our Federal Government - not the New Democratic Party, who's crying out for reduction of these energy costs - but the federal Conservative Party has the ear of the Prime Minister at the present time and there has been no following the law in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, that cartel arrangement was made by countries desperate, some of them, to bring their economies up to a reasonable standard compared to the western world. You know, as much as all of us must disagree with cartel arrangements that frustrate the so-called reasonable market, nevertheless, you can understand something of the concern. They viewed that energy had been far too cheap and it brought them very little and there was no reason, therefore, that they should not have gotten a better return. But what about our companies? Were they strapped? Were they in difficulty? Not at all, Mr. Speaker.

For decades, we have not only given oil companies fair pricing; we have given them depletion allowances, tax concessions. Our history of energy pricing in Canada is replete with the giveaways that we have occasioned to the energy industry in this country. Many of these energy companies have never paid a level of taxes commensurate at all with the kind of profits that they have returned.

Mr. Speaker, energy pricing and the attitude of governments in respect to that in this country is a blot on our history. Mr. Speaker, we know that energy is overpriced. We know that these companies can sell this energy far cheaper. At the present time there's an oversupply and they're prepared to see games played with the small retailers that are desperate to stay in business; and these gas wars that go on with the full knowledge and approval of the large energy companies, because they're happy to see that.

Mr. Speaker, we don't know what the real profits of these energy companies are. The honourable members opposite are never concerned about that, because that's good private enterprise. Well, you know, if that good enterprise didn't have all those giveaways, all those concessions, all those write-offs, we'd see how good that business was. The honourable member opposite, and I wish he were here, he hurls accusations across the floor about our attitude or our position on his resolution . . .

A MEMBER: Then he walks out.

HON. A. MACKLING: Then he walks out, that's right. I shouldn't reflect on that fact, Mr. Speaker, but he talks in terms that are highly critical of Petro-Canada. And then in that same speech, Mr. Speaker, he talked about the giveaway that Dome Petroleum, or the Dome Petroleum bail out he refers it to. Dome Petroleum.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Name a winner, will you?

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, you know, Dome Petroleum. What about Dome Petroleum? Is that a public

enterprise? Well, you know, it's wrong for the Government of Canada to assist a public corporation according to the Honourable Member for Pembina. Now, by golly, he's actually concerned about a giveaway to private enterprise - Dome Petroleum. Again that friendly government, that government that's been friendly to the energy industry in Canada, the Federal Liberal Government has undertaken to guarantee vast sums of money to Dome Petroleum, a company that everyone agreed is in peril.

What's happened, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Gallagher, now the former President of Dome Petroleum has retired, he's retired from the private company, but, oh, Mr. Speaker, guess on what terms he retired? He got \$2.6 million as a pension. How do you like that from that private oil company? We're guaranteeing that pension, and the Honourable for Pembina isn't concerned and annoyed. We are, Mr. Speaker. That private executive is getting over \$300,000 a year as a pension and we're guaranteeing that apparently through our Federal Government. The Conservative Party in Ottawa and the Conservative Party in Manitoba aren't annoyed about those arrangements. After all, that's to a good private company, Mr. Speaker, we shouldn't be concerned about that.

Mr. Speaker, yes we are concerned on this side about the high costs of energy to the farmers who produce food, who are caught in a price squeeze, and to suggest that our interest, our desire in respect to the farmers in this country is not sincere, is completely unfair.

The honourable member when he spoke he said that we have done nothing, we have done nothing to indicate our concern about the ongoing needs of agriculture in this province. Mr. Speaker, they had an opportunity to do something, to establish some measure of security in respect to beef production. They did nothing, absolutely nothing. Oh, they did, they talked, but they didn't produce anything. In respect to hog stabilization, they didn't have the funds, they didn't have the funds in the books.

Mr. Speaker, they are concerned about the high costs of interest for farmers. What did they do? They did nothing. We established some measure of interest rate relief. Yes, we never said we were going to save every farmer, we were going to guarantee everyone. — (Interjection) — No, we didn't. We said we were going to provide some relief for those hard pressed. We did that, Mr. Speaker. They had done nothing.

Mr. Speaker, actions speak louder than words. We acted. We acted to protect the beef industry, to ensure that there would be a processing of beef in this province. They did nothing. We acted to ensure continuation of hog production in this province. They neglected, Mr. Speaker, to provide the funding for that.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that the members opposite have a mind set in respect to private enterprise. Although they talk about government intervention, they call upon us to do things to help agriculture, really they have misgivings about even doing that, because the role of government for them is to do as little as possible. So while they try to placate the farm vote by saying we would do this, we would do that, we know that they do nothing, they do nothing, Mr. Speaker.

Now, they are full of talk, full of promise, but, Mr. Speaker, we know that when they had the opportunity

they did nothing. In the amendments that have been made to this resolution, we now have focused the concern of Manitobans on the real issue, and the real issue is that energy costs in this province, as they should be in the rest of Canada, should be based on a rational formula. They should not be based on the caprice of controlled and contrived world markets. That is the thrust of our amendment. That is a sensible proposal, Mr. Speaker, and I commend it to all members of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before calling on the next member, perhaps I could direct the attention of honourable members to the loge on my left, where we have a former member of this Assembly - the former Member for Inkster, Mr. Green. On behalf of all of the members I welcome you here this afternoon.

RES. 5 - FARM FUEL TAX Cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure for me to be able to join the debate at this juncture.

I must say that before I target my remarks specifically on the resolution that's before us, I would like to continue along on the lines of thinking that was being put forward by my colleague, the Minister of Natural Resources.

Specifically, Mr. Speaker, his contention that members opposite had any number of opportunities during their brief tenure as the government of this province to — (Interjection) — as my colleague says, the temporary custodians of the power in this province, they had ample opportunity to provide some significant forms of relief and provide some programs of significant benefit to the farmers in this province.

My colleague has identified a number of those including the Beef Support Program, the Hog Program, the Interest Rate Relief Program, and I think, Mr. Speaker, he indicated that the crux of the matter is that members opposite believe in a hands-off approach to government. In a previous speech I remarked that the hands-off approach often leads to one careening into walls and other objects in your path, that this government believes that a hands-on approach is the best approach.

Specifically talking about the problems that farmers are encountering today, we acknowledge that fuel prices play a role in the costs of production, that farm prices ideally, in an ideal world should be reduced. Because of their importance and because of the importance of the farm community, any advantage we can give to the farm community is an advantage that is justifiable in some sense because they are important to our economy and because the production of food is important to the world.

However, I don't think that members of this Chamber should tie the relationship of farm fuel prices to the

well-being of the farm community. There is not necessarily that simplistic of a relationship; it is not that clear cut of a relationship. There are many other aspects of the farmers' day-to-day life, to the operation of their farms, that relate as well to their longevity and their ability to survive particularly in tough times.

Mr. Speaker, what you have seen from this government is a number of specific programs that are designed to help the farmers stay alive during these difficult times. Members opposite, I think, are cognizant of the possibilities of a stabilization program. I think that from their knowledge of farm communities across this country, they recognize that the long term survivability of the farm depends on control of supply. That only farmers in this country, whether you're talking about fruit producers or vegetable producers or whatever, it would be only farmers in the long term that are going to survive because of the variabilities of interest rates, because they do not control ultimately the price of the goods that they produce, and because they ultimately do not control the costs that they are subject to - they don't control the costs of the machinery and so forth - that they are caught in a difficult position. The only way they can effectively control their income is by effectively controlling the supply, supply management.

Those two words, Mr. Speaker, I believe are the stumbling block, if you will, to members opposite coming to grips with what really is going to be the long-term solution to providing a stable farm community.

Mr. Speaker, I think members opposite should talk to those people, talk to those farmers who have supply contracts, not from the state but from other enterprises, whether it's supply contracts for sunflower seeds, potatoes, whatever you want to name. Those are the farmers who can go to the bank today and get credit. Those aren't the farmers that are coming to us, saying, we want more loan guarantees; we want this program expanded; we want this. Those are the farmers that have survivability. Those are the farmers that can get credit today, because they have contracts that indicate that their operation is stable. They are not placing themselves in the unenviable position of relying on the vagaries of the market economy, and we shouldn't kid ourselves, the market economy is a thing of the past. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Virden wishes to debate this issue, he is certainly welcome to join the debate after I've finished my remarks. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that we would all be enlightened by his remarks and I hope that he will contribute when he has an opportunity.

MR. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, I hope so, too.

MR. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Sturgeon Creek is mumbling from his seat, state farm, state farm. Mr. Speaker, supply management is not necessarily state farm.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of the viability of our farming community, it may be the only answer. Members

opposite, I believe, should talk to those farmers who have those supply contracts; who through one process and another can control the supply and demand process, if you will, to their advantage for a change.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Sturgeon Creek mumbles from his seat, penny ante. He simply cannot accept the fact that there are not that many alternatives for the farming community; that every so often as the cycle of supply and demand plays out its theatre on us, that we are obliged to play along with that theatre. Unless we take control of it, unless farmers have control of it, then we leave ourselves open to this kind of situation, we're in desperation, and farmers are in desperate straits these days. In desperation, they come to us for assistance.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if farmers continue to look to governments as they have from time to time for assistance, then I suppose it behooves the government to suggest alternatives; to say this is a more rational approach for both parties, for both industry and for the government because it is the only way that government can relieve itself of the responsibility of providing those ongoing subsidies in a very ad hoc way. It is the only way that the farmers can assure themselves of an income, assure themselves of a position where they can obtain credit for the continuation of their enterprise and in the long run it is a viable solution, not one that necessarily has to be shoved down anyone's throat, simply an alternative that has to be presented and presented in a clear and concise fashion, not using the histrionics of the members opposite, not using the red scare, the state farm tactics of members opposite, but in a clear and concise way.

Mr. Speaker, the day will come, and you can call me prophetic if you will, the day will come when farmers in this province have the kind of stability that any number of other farmers have who have benefits of supply contracts, who recognize that the control of the commodity that they produce is the long range mechanism that they need to ensure their survival.

Mr. Speaker, I was just warming up.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The time being 5:30, when this resolution next comes before the House, the Honourable Minister will have 11 minutes remaining. The Chair will accept a motion to adjourn.

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Subject to the committees meeting this evening, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Virden, that we do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved by the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources and seconded by the Honourable Member for Virden, that subject to the members reconvening in Committee this evening at 8 o'clock, the House do now adjourn. Is that agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

The House is accordingly adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Wednesday).