



Second Session — Thirty-First Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS**

26 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Harry E. Graham
Speaker*



Vol. XXVI No. 30B

8:00 p.m. Thursday, April 27, 1978

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, April 27, 1978

Time: 8:00 p.m.

SUPPLY — HIGHWAYS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we have a quorum. Committee come to order.

When we broke off at the supper hour, the Member for Lac du Bonnet was asking some questions, but he is not here at present —(Interjection)— All right, we recognize the Member for Lac du Bonnet, formerly from Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, thank you for your indulgence, although I wouldn't have minded if you had proceeded with someone else. I was pursuing the question of Highway 228, 229, across the Interlake when we broke off and I wonder if the department has any comments to make on that?.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, there are several routes involving different combinations of different provincial roads that try to encompass that request or that idea of having one or two or another corridor established through that region east-west. There are some that favour a combination of 415, 416 coming up through the Shoal Lakes, there are those living in the Lundar-Oak Point region favouring a more northerly route. Then there's those that would want to see the extension taking place from 228. We are doing some work on 415, 416 I believe, and that's admittedly in the southern portion of the Interlake. Whether or not a future hook-up could be contemplated between 419 perhaps to 16 is, I suppose, a possibility but there are no immediate plans on which survey and design work, for instance, is being done in terms of the question raised by the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that the Minister of course needs some time to try to develop policy with respect to that question. We did have a policy and my interest would be in whether that is going to continue or whether it's going to be altered. If you look at the map, Mr. Chairman, I think you would readily see that any consideration of using 415-416 would not seem to be practical from the point of view of an east-west connection and from the point of view of people wanting to travel up towards Lundar, Eriksdale, and across the Narrows for that matter. It would be somewhat of a back-tracking situation if you were to come back south via 416-415, for through traffic in particular. Now, I don't want to argue with the Minister with respect to the need for doing any work on 415 or 416. I'm not trying to suggest that there should be an exchange between the two, but certainly I would hope that logic prevails and that we have somewhat of a shortest route possible across the Interlake at some point in time, connecting up with No. 9 and No. 6 at some point in the reasonable period ahead.

We've already got a section of that program built, namely, the portion from Inwood to Teulon, and of course the remaining part on the east side is to No. 8 . . .

MR. ENNS: Which is in this year's program.

MR. USKIW: Which is in this year's program — that's the portion, is it?

MR. ENNS: Yes.

MR. USKIW: It would seem to me logical, then, that we should pursue from that point on in a westerly direction, north-westerly direction, 229, that's a very logical approach. Now, I'm willing to . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, if I can interrupt the member, perhaps I misstated it, I was going from memory on where some work was being contemplated in this year's program and that involves 415 and 416 because of the conditions of those roads. I don't hold that out as being the alternate to that route, in fact, just taking a second look at the map right now, I would find myself not in disagreement with what the Member for Lac du Bonnet is suggesting, and that that would appear to be the more common-sense road that would service a greater part in attempting to complete that connection. I am simply indicating to the Committee that for the immediate future, and when the immediate future is, I'm talking about this year, we are doing that portion of 228, that is, on the east side. I think the Member for Lac du Bonnet will at least concur to this extent that that is at least a part of the link that he's referring to and it's certainly entirely within the hopeful realm of possibility that we would want to pursue that route.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, then, I want to take the Minister along the map to the area in Swan River, or near there, and inquire from him whether there is any desire on the part of the department to deal with either 268 or 366, and I don't know which it should be, but I believe there was some debate on either one of those two routes as being the route that should be upgraded, but not both. I can't

remember where the arguments were, whether it was the route to Lenswood or the route from Minitonas to Birch River, and I'm only speaking from memory, Mr. Chairman. I believe the former Member for Swan River mentioned one of those two routes and I don't know whether I was in agreement with him or not, but in any event I know that there was some discussion there.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I again take note of the member's remarks but would refer him to the specific program as published as being the works that are being undertaken in that part of the region, againn, in the immediate future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could inquire of the department whether there was some issue or some dispute over which of those two routes were to be slated for upgrading at some point in time. Perhaps I am not remembering correctly, Mr. Chairman, but I thought there was some issue there between the two' and whether that is stalling any decision or not?

MR. ENNS: I can only reply, Mr. Chairman, at this time the department hasn't brought that question to my attention and we haven't — doubtful on the question in the manner in which the member places it, that, you know, we are alternating between choosing routes. The Member for Swan River may be able to be of some assistance to me at this time as to his priorities in that particular area, and I would invite the Member for Swan River to indicate to the Committee and to my benefit, what he thinks ought to be done up there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Member for Swan River.

MR. GOURLAY: Yes, the road in question was No. 268 which runs from
10 highway to Lenswood, a distance of some 15 or 18 miles. It has been under some considerable discussion for some time now and it was that route that was being requested for upgrading.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to belabour that. I know that either of those two routes seem to be practical and I just thought that I recollected some discussion, that is some dispute about which way it should go since those two routes are so close together, and that which one would serve a greater public service. But at this point I am not pursuing it. Perhaps the department could advise us a year from now for that matter, no problem with that.

I then want to ask one more, then I will let someone else get up, Mr. Chairman. Highway 23, is it? I think it is 23, and it goes into Morris.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, as I recall the discussion over the last couple of years, there was some interest in upgrading 23, from highway 59 to Morris, and I believe that is not on the program, or is it? Is it on the program?

MR. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we are doing considerable amount of work on Highway
23 on several portions of the road, one in the south-central part from Holland west or Rolt, and wes pardon me, and then there is also the portion of 23, starting from Morris east. Rather substantial amounts of work are being contemplated for Highway No. 23 this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could spend a little time about reviewing the financing of the operations of the department, and I'd like to thank the Honourable Minister for giving me a breakdown showing the moneys carried forward from year to year from 1973-74 until the present. There are some figures that are not too clear to me and I thought I'd like to go into it at this stage and that's in order.

The statement confirms the previous oral statement made by the Minister to the extent that some \$65 million estimated was actually expended in the year 1977-78, as compared to the \$41 million that are shown in the Estimates sheet on the left-hand column. The \$41 million shown on that Estimates sheet is not clear to me. I wonder if the Minister could clarify how it was arrived at, since it is not the same as in last year's Estimates sheets. That would be under the Highway Construction Program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I will again attempt to explain that to the best of my capability and that of my staff. I should perhaps make it clear to the Honourable Member for St. Johns that I really would defer to the Department of Finance for that fuller, or final, or finite explanations of the manner and way in which capital moneys came to the department or were spent, or were shown at any given time. I say that not from a point of view of attempting to evade the question that the Member for St. Johns is

putting to me, but simply that neither myself nor the capable members of my staff, you know, run the Department of Finance. And, indeed, I would even put a caveat in it right now that we are, you know, satisfied that we are giving you the information to the best of our knowledge.

We are aware of what capital borrowing authority we have or haven't got, but that I would — as indeed has been suggested to the honourable member for the past week — that the Department of Finance and the Minister of Finance are, in the final analysis, the best party and the best persons or departments to direct the very specific kind of questions that he is directing at us.

We have the information that we have given to the committee the other evening, that the \$65 million that were spent last year on new construction program consisted of the \$41 million as shown in the left-hand side of the Estimate Book for the 1978, plus the \$27 million carryover of previous year's capital and plus a further \$2,400,000 involving the City of Winnipeg for a total of \$29,563,185 which brings that total up to \$149 million, again I am sorry, I am going back to the gross figures for the department, going to our Estimate Book at the bottom line, it bumps up that, on the left hand column that \$119 million figure, to \$149,510,000 as compared to this year's request for \$160 million in the gross.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the difficulty that the Minister has in relation to the financial aspects and the fact that he doesn't have the direct input in that, I understand that, but the Minister must also understand that we have on the record, in print, a statement from the Minister of Finance which is in direct contradiction, the way I read it, to a statement made by the Honourable Minister. The Minister of Finance said that the construction program is a third more than last year, whereas the Minister of Highways has said that it is seven percent, and there is such a tremendous difference that the Minister, I know understands, having been here through some of the debate in Agriculture, that there are certain items that have not been revealed to us. And I believe that the Minister of Agriculture attempted to be forthright and told us what he learned and knew, and I believe that the Minister of Highways will be, but I think we have a right to probe as to how the financing will be arranged, based on how it was arranged, just to make sure whether or not there is extra funds. So I go back to the statement which the Minister was kind enough to give me which deals only, I believe, with construction of provincial trunk highways and that seems to me in contradiction to the figures that we have just been given by the Minister, that's why I would like to run through it.

Now, dealing with the \$41 million that is shown on the left hand column under construction, I believe that \$41 million is made up of, and I would like the Minister to help me with this, of 25 to 26 million in current account shown in last year's Estimates plus some \$15,246.8 million which is shown under Capital Supply Bill column in the sheet he gave me, which comes awfully close to \$41 million. In addition to that there is an indication of a Capital carry-over of \$15 million that I didn't know about, which would now bring this to 41 plus 15 is \$56 million, I believe, plus on the same sheet a Federal contribution of \$12 million, would make it \$68 million which is exactly what it says, Total Construction Funds Provided.

Now, that is related to the \$41 million that actually shows in the Minister's statement so we know it has been ballooned up by the \$15 million Capital carry-over which is not shown and by the Federal contribution which is not shown. That amounts to \$27 million, which somehow is a different \$27 million, I believe, than the Minister spoke about but it is the same amount.

MR. ENNS: No, no, it is precisely the amount that I have spoken about.

MR. CHERNIACK: So it says here that \$68 million is funds provided; \$65 million spent, which will imply a \$3 million carry-over.

MR. ENNS: There is a \$2.5 million carry-over from the city allotment, which comes close to closing that gap between the 65 and the 68 that the member refers to.

MR. CHERNIACK: Can we get that \$2.5 million straight? Is that moneys paid out or received, to be spent? What is that \$2.5 million, city?

MR. ENNS: That was money in effect overspent, in the sense that the city had authority for \$10 million, and \$12 million was drawn down. We have to pick that up.

MR. CHERNIACK: Pick it up out of last year's allocation? Has that been paid?

MR. ENNS: It was, I am advised, taken out of last year's Capital.

MR. CHERNIACK: When was that done?

MR. ENNS: It was paid last year.

MR. CHERNIACK: Paid to the City of Winnipeg?

MR. ENNS: Yes.

MR. CHERNIACK: And drawn from Capital and therefore included in the \$15 million Capital Supply Bill amount?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I repeat again, I now do believe that you are asking the kind of questions that my departmental people are not necessarily equipped, nor am I myself, to answer. I say this again without any attempt to evade the questions, I believe that those are questions that have to be answered by the Department of Finance and will be answered by the Department of Finance. We have not the final authority in terms of how and where Capital moneys have been moved from one column to another column. The Member for St. Johns as a former Minister of Finance is quite aware of how that does take place and has taken place during his period of time in office and under other governments. I would suspect that possibly what this whole debate is demonstrating better than anything else, and certainly anything the government could do, is the wisdom of getting away from an obviously archaic and hard to understand system of accounting and to in fact go to the combined accounting system that has been adopted by the new government where at least a year from now we will not be repeating this debate.

But the accounts were always kept straight and the accounts here, I believe, will be straightened out as far as the cash flow is concerned except for — and the Minister knows full well what I am getting at — except for the fact that in the intervening period there was a change in government and the new government was full of protestations about improvident spending and tremendous deficits and a mess and a horror and the Minister, unfortunately — unless he enjoys it — is caught in that position of having to justify the extravagant statements made by his government. Therefore, we are in the position of trying to figure out how truthful were those figures. So when the Minister of Finance says, "Why, in Highways we are jumping from \$41 million to \$75 million, which is one-third over," we question that. Then we find out — for one thing we wondered whether this government had gone wacky on Highway programs when it was cutting everything else, social services, human resources — so we wondered, is are they really nuts, are they really prepared to forget the services been called to question from time to time by members — I remind the Honourable Member for St. Johns by members perhaps from both sides of the House, but I can indicate to the honourable member that the practice that undoubtedly was followed by that administration, by the previous administration and indeed by this administration, that certainly any Government Information Services bulletins emanating out of my office, under the Minister of Highways, requires scrutiny and initialling or signature for approval. I can assure the honourable members that that particular Government Information Services bulletin never was seen in the Department of Highways. It bears not the signature of my Deputy Minister nor my own.

Now, as to the greater question and, you know, we are satisfied and I am satisfied that the record of this committee will show clearly and succinctly the total moneys that Highways spent last year on actual road construction. And I remind the Honourable Member for St. Johns that you are speaking to a Highways Minister and his engineers, and his administrators, and his staff of the Department of Highways, and not the Department of Finance. And I simply ask once again, with some request for some reasonableness on the part of the honourable member, that he first of all accept the correctness of the figures that were presented to him the other evening as the actual amount spent on highways last year — that is the \$68 million — and as to the actual amount of new construction, we want to keep it to the area of construction that we are asking for on the right-hand side of the column to spend this year — \$75 million. And that there can be no dispute — at least between the members on this committee — as to the actual increase in Highways spending this year.

Now, I further ask the honourable member that the manner and way in which, through a transitional period, capital funds were carried over from not just the previous year but from three, four, five previous years, were accomplished that it is not an unfair request to make of the honourable members of this committee that those questions be directed to the Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I really understand the position of the Minister of Highways. I want to say this: That we gave him an opportunity yesterday to clarify this situation for the entire Budget, when he voted against a motion that would have cancelled and lapsed all previous capital authority and then would have made, particularly his statement, apparently, his Estimates, crystal clear. Since he has told us that there is no carry forward of capital moneys in his Estimates, then his would stand on their own feet without any fudging as occurred in the Department of Agriculture. And had he agreed to that, and I'm not blaming him for not doing it; well, I am. That's not true; I am blaming him. It would have been crystal clear.

So I will leave it at this: To point out to him that these are his Estimates, that there is a Reconciliation Statement on the first page of his Estimates which show a capital authority used in the last fiscal year totalling something in excess of \$25 million; that that has not been clarified to us. What he has clarified to us is a Capital Supply Bill of \$15 million. If he is not able to do that, then let's just leave it that he is not able to do it. But there is a tremendous discrepancy between the \$25 million, the two items shown in the Reconciliation Statement of his Estimates, and his own statement which he was kind enough to give me today, which showed a Capital Supply Bill of \$15,246.8 million and a federal contribution of \$12,088,000.00.

I point that out because I don't have that breakdown and I don't know why I have to wait for the Minister of Finance to deal with every department seriatim in order to explain to me the reconciliation they made.

Having said that, I am prepared to move on because it's a non-productive exercise to keep pressing the Minister to give answers to which he and his Deputy are not privy. So I am prepared to move on, unless he wants to respond to what I have said and then I'll move on.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to leave on the record the suggestion that the Minister and the Department of Highways are not absolutely clear with their position that they presently face financially within the department. And that is that there is no carryover capital. That, of course, is somewhat different than the situation facing this committee in the matter of the discussion of the Department of Agriculture, for instance. And I want to make that very clear. That's been made very clear to us by Finance, that we are in fact in the combined request for capital expenditures for this year in effect leaving no carryover capital in any accounts.

We are abundantly clear as to how and where the moneys requested for on the right-hand side of the Estimates — where they are coming from and precisely how much.

What we are not quite clear about, and what I am suggesting is not quite cricket to ask us to attempt to put us into the corner on, in terms of how, during the transition period, various previously voted capital funds — carryover capital funds — were handled by the Department of Finance. I think that is a legitimate request to make of the honourable members of the committee that that matter be dealt with on Monday, or at the earliest possible moment, with the Minister of Finance.

I might also add that I reject the statement that has been made, not just on my Estimates but to the Minister of Agriculture, that have been made just a few moments ago by the Member for St. Johns that this, in effect, was your last opportunity to raise this matter in the Department of Highways. It is not your last opportunity to raise this matter with respect to the Department of Highways, or any other department that you have dealt with. There are other opportunities open to members in the House, concurrence motions that are moved on the final consideration of Estimates and additional moments. If I had my House Leader here, he would undoubtedly indicate some other occasions where the matter can be raised specifically with respect to each individual department.

So members of the opposition are not losing an opportunity by deferring for a moment this information that really has become apparent to all members without, I may add, without a partisan bent to it. That obviously it's information that is being sought that can be given only to the satisfaction of members of this committee by staff and the Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, there is really no disagreement between the Minister and I. I'm sorry for that grammatical error; there is no difference between the Minister and me on the question of what he knows and what he is expected to know in relation to his Estimates.

I must caution my colleagues not to be entirely misled by him on the question of further opportunities. There are many opportunities that he and I can point out where you can make a speech, but this is the only opportunity you really have to talk to the Minister and expect an answer, and have an opportunity to press a question and he has the staff here with him to respond. So that this is the only real opportunity to do it.

Oh, I must also say that I don't believe that cricket is part of his cultural heritage, nor mine. So, I'm not sure that playing cricket is the way that he and I have learned to govern ourselves. The Member for St. Vital, that's part of his cultural heritage although I suspect that soccer is more like it.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, let's get to the \$65 million estimated actual expenditure. Now I want to know, was the money actually disbursed? Up to what date was it actually paid out? Now, that is within the knowledge of the department.

MR. ENNS: My information is that that was the actual amounts of moneys paid out by the end of our calendar year, March 31st.

MR. CHERNIACK: That means then that it does not include commitments made, contracts, work in progress, that none of that is included in that \$65 million?

MR. ENNS: In the Department of Highways, and we've discussed it at some length with the other members of the committee here, we have — and again it's admittedly perhaps confusing in the manner and way in which we have used the term "carry-over programs". I was asked earlier by the Member for Ste. Rose, were separate moneys set aside to carry on the carry-over construction program of highways. Well, when we refer to a carry-over program in the construction aspect of highways, it simply means that physically that road wasn't built last year for contractual delays or for weather delays or for other reasons because we didn't get the right to acquire the land, that that carry-over is put into this year's new construction program and the moneys allocated to it, is \$75 million that we intend to expend on this year's construction program encompasses both carry-over programs that weren't finished last year and new programs initiated this year.

MR. CHERNIACK: I understand that, Mr. Chairman, what I'm asking specifically is that work was being done somewhere by that department on March 31st and the next day, the next morning at 8:00 o'clock or whatever the crew reported back to work. I want to know whether this figure of \$65 million included payment for March 31st work and/or included payment for April 1 work?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, any payments made by the Department of Highways, commencing April 1st, come out of the new Budgets, out of the \$75 million that we are now asking for.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, then it is clear that this approximate \$65 million item is actual dollars paid out up to March 31st.

MR. ENNS: That is correct.

MR. CHERNIACK: And that means that there is no pre-payment of any kind for work yet to be done, is that correct?

MR. ENNS: I think if you refer to the list that I gave you, I speak to the Honourable Member for St. Johns, that the final figure of the actual expenditure in the extreme right hand side of the sheet which indicates some \$65,600,000, the letters "est." are in front of that. There is in terms of the final closing up of the books, you know, there could be another \$100,000 or minus \$100,000 in there.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm clear on the fact that the figure is not exact, but I am clear that I am being told that whatever the final figure will be it will be moneys that were actually paid up to and including March 31 and nothing beyond that.

Now, I have to come back and point out to the Honourable Minister, and I think that although he wants to defer all this for the Minister of Finance, he has to know this. I pointed out some discrepancies to him. I point out a further discrepancy to him, in my mind, and that is that he told us that the cupboard was bare, but the fact is that I believe there is still money in general purposes carried forward from previous years. Whether he will get that or not will be a matter for him yet to fight out, but there is money and indeed the money that he shows in his column entitled "capital supply bill", was not actually voted by the Legislature to the Department of Highways, but really allocated by Management Committee I assume and is less than the amount that was expected to be available to Highways. So I want the Honourable Minister to know that although he was given the impression — or maybe some decision was made — that he cannot tap unauthorized, un allocated capital availability, it is still there in my opinion, I've yet to get that information.

I also point out to the Honourable Minister that according to the unaudited nine month statement and his government is now producing quarterly reports and no doubt expects us to be influenced by what we learn, that in the Highways program in the first nine months of the fiscal year, over \$33 million was expended out of capital. I'm told that there is a recovery of \$1.5 million on that, so that would be in any event, in excess of \$30 million taken out of capital in the first nine months, which does not quite jibe with the figures that the Minister has given to us and I tell him that, because I think he will want to ascertain for himself how this bookkeeping has been carried out for his own knowledge even though he is not able to tell us that now.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to move to this year. The Minister knows that he is expecting to spend \$75 million on the highway construction program of which some \$24 million is work in progress or work planned in the previous year and he expects that this will be an actual expenditure, not just a commitment. Can he indicate — no, I won't go in that direction — can he just get the information for us, I assume that it's not available yet, what portion of the \$65 million was paid out up to say November 1st and what portion after November 1st, 1977, in the light of the fact that there are figures here that are already in the unaudited third quarter statement.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I would have to take that kind of a question as notice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Johns, or can we move on to another member?

MR. CHERNIACK: Not at this stage, thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Yes, Mr. Chairman, no doubt the Minister is having some problems in this transitional period that is causing some . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I am not having any problems at all, I've got \$75 million to build some highways in the province of Manitoba for which I'm very grateful and happy and I am going to do my best job at doing that, I've got no problems.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is having problems to answer questions posed to him which he states that . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: On a point of order. I'm not having any problem with questions that are appropriately posed towards me or the members of my staff. The kind of questions that are being posed are, as has been said before, more appropriately posed to the Department of Finance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, the questions that we are asking the Minister, he indicates should be posed to the Department of Finance and the problem that we have is that the Minister is asking us to pass certain Estimates for Highways and we are being asked to do this without having all the answers. I would point out to the Minister that in the Department of Agriculture they had at times, three members from the Department of Finance to assist the Minister of Agriculture to answer some of the questions that were posed to him, and I'm wondering why the Department of Agriculture could have staff here from the Finance Department to try and clarify some of these matters for us, and the Minister of Highways is unable to or doesn't want to.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, —(Interjection)—

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege. We have I know a financier from Minnedosa here but I wish he would ask you, Sir, if he wants to take the floor and make his contribution. Otherwise he should keep quiet.

MR. BLAKE: I don't understand it either, Peter, but I keep my mouth shut; I'm not like you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I just refuse to leave on the record that the Department of Highways is in any way presented with difficulties in understanding what they are about to do or what they are requesting this Committee to do. We are requesting this Committee to pass a total of some \$160 million to enable the department to proceed with its work in this construction year, of which \$75 million is for new construction composed of \$23 million or \$24 million, approximately, of carry-over work; composed of some \$80-plus million of moneys necessary for the maintenance of our highways. Now, there is absolutely nothing fudgy about it; there is nothing unclear about it and there is nothing that should be troubling the members of this Committee's minds in terms of their immediate responsibility in addressing themselves to these Estimates.

If you want to take issue with the fact that the Department of Highways or this Minister is not spending enough money then raise those questions. If you want to take issue with this Minister or the department that we are not spending the money in the right places, then take issue with the Minister or the department. Or in fact, if you think that we are spending too much money and we should be spending less money, then take issue with us on that matter.

But that surely is the purpose of the Committee at this particular time, to deal with these Estimates. And if you think that in these Estimates we have a disproportionate amount of moneys set aside for a particular part of the department; or if you think that we have too many administrators and not enough actual maintenance people; or if you think the Department of Highways is running too many vehicles; or what have you, that surely is the question before this Committee. Or if you think that the department is building lousy highways or using the wrong materials or building bridges where they shouldn't be built — these are the questions that the Committee wants to deal with.

I am merely pointing out and I want to leave on the record — and I have to make this kind of statement, I'll desist in the future — but the repeated attempts by individual members of the Committee to suggest that (a) the Department of Highways doesn't know what they are doing or that this Minister doesn't know what he is doing, simply are not correct. You may not like what we are doing and that is entirely a fair comment around this Committee. Members on my side of the House are not going to express total agreement with the manner and way in which the \$75 million of new construction money is being spent and that is fair game.

But you are attempting, and it is now becoming obvious that it is a deliberate attempt on the part of the opposition that they are not really concerned about the Highways programs as such; they are not really concerned about whether roads are being built or where they ought to be built. They are more prepared to keep repeating the question that is simply not appropriate for the Department of Highways to consider at this time. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(b)(1)—pass - the Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: I can't let rest on the record the statement by the Minister of Highways that we are not concerned with the roads, the construction of the roads, the location of the roads, the program itself; that is not true, not at all true. I sat here and I heard discussions and I even participated in my mind about the highway and I can tell the Minister exactly what highway I was considering debating except for the fact that he was amenable to a suggestion by the Member for Lac du Bonnet, so it is an untrue statement.

But, Mr. Chairman, let us get something else straight and that is the posture of this government, this Conservative government, of straightening out all the loose ends, cleaning up the mess, taking care of all the horrors — and incidentally, I have not heard any horror stories yet from this Minister on this department. But, Mr. Chairman, what we have to know is what moneys are being planned to be spent, and the Minister of Highways told us what he is expecting to spend. So did the Minister of

Agriculture. But it took a little while for us to find out that he was planning to spend \$3.5 million more, more than 10 percent more than his Estimates showed. And the reason that he was able to plan to spend it is because of unexpired authority of a Capital nature.

Now the Minister of Highways has told us that his program is \$161 million and that is what he is going to spend. But until we know and have an assurance that there is no money available to him under any Capital Authority in existence today, then we don't really have the assurance that that is all that will be spent in the department except what would be otherwise be raised by Special Warrant. And the problem is that the government chose to put it that way. And the problem is that the Minister of Finance chose to present it that way and say that the combined spending of the province will be kept to 2.9 percent, which we now know is not true.

Therefore, I have been pressing the Minister to the stage where I now am satisfied that he doesn't have the answer in that respect and I understand why he doesn't. I'm not saying that in criticism of him although he has been around the last couple of days and maybe he could have acquainted himself of the facts, but he hasn't and I understand that. But the fact is that I don't know to this moment how much, if any, Capital Authority is still available to be used for Highways. And he doesn't know that either; I believe that. If he knew it I think he would tell us. But the fact is that when we have the knowledge that as of March 31, 1977, there was \$27 million in General Purposes and another \$82 million was voted last year and we do not yet know how that money was spent or how much of it was spent, we can assume — and I think we can assume with a great deal of certainty — that there is still General Purposes money available to the government if it chooses to use it. I point out that his posture was combined spending as revealed here and we now know it isn't.

But when I gave the Premier who was here at the time — (Interjection) — Yes, he was. . . . and members of the opposition, I pleaded with them to speak and they wouldn't, and then we had a vote to say cancel that, get rid of that unknown, unrevealed amount and start from scratch and I believe that the Minister honestly plans that there will be no other moneys coming to him other than is in this department but he can't say it because his government has not made it possible for him to say it.

So let him not say we are not interested in this Highways program, nor what he is planning to build, nor how he is planning to build it. We are and we are debating that. But he cannot get out of the fact that we have a right to know how much, whence and what is being planned, and he doesn't know that.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I will again not attempt to go out of my way to continue this debate which by the Member for St. Johns own admission is proving not to be productive any longer. But let me not leave on the record his implication that the Department of Highways is aware of or has additional moneys under the table, up their sleeve, anywhere else other than those shown and requested from this committee, and I remind the committee members that that is the purpose of this committee. I am asking this committee to give me authority to spend \$160 million on Manitoba highways this year, combined. I must also tell the committee that I asked for more and the members of my caucus asked for more, but I can tell the members of this committee in as clear and precise a way as I can that the government of the day has seen fit to give the Department of Highways \$160,545,400 and not a penny more, and that there are no unexpended capital moneys that I can draw on or lean on. I have been advised by Finance that that is the situation and that is all I can do. Now, if the Member for St. Johns wishes to cast doubt or wishes to leave implications that somewhere somebody has more money coming for highways, then that question I respectfully submit has to be asked to the Minister of Finance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, we are still not in disagreement. I did not suggest that the Department of Highways has hidden under the table money available to it. I had reason to and proved that that was the case in Agriculture. I do not have reason to and I don't assert that that is the case in the Highways. I just want the Honourable Minister to know that it is my conviction that there is money available to the government to be used under the general purposes section of Loan Acts which could be used for Highways and it is not a question of the department being able to draw on it but it is clearly the possibility of the government drawing on it and allocating it to Highways. Now this Minister, I don't know what he will do if he discovers that he's got a good case to spend another \$10 million, the weather is good, the season is right and says to the Management Committee or to his own Cabinet, "I know there is \$10 million still in unused capital authority from 1976 or 1975, I would like it", and he could get it if he is persuasive enough. I would not fault him for it, except for the fact that he is making the statement so clear that this is all he is going to get on a combined spending basis.

The only problem is that in the Department of Agriculture we had that impression, we found it to be wrong and the other problem is that his Minister of Finance has confused the issue by statements he made. The only fault I attributed earlier to the Minister of Highways was that he apparently knew for some time that the report of the government agency, I don't know whether heads have rolled there yet, is incorrect, and he knew that for some time and didn't reveal that quite as quickly as he would like to think he did. That is maybe the only fault I have for him, I really don't blame him for not knowing enough about the capital structure of the government for last year, it's not for him to know. I don't think I've disagreed with him as to what he knows and what he is saying he knows and I'm not suggesting that he is concealing information from us, but he should know that there is, I'm quite sure, money available that could be allocated to the Department of Highways if the Cabinet sees so fit to

do.

Therefore I don't have the assurance that that is all he's going to spend especially since they refused to lapse all that capital authority yesterday and voted against it which means they want to have that nest egg. They want it to be available, that is the only interpretation I can give. If they want it to be available, then it is available, then the posture of a 2.9 percent only increase which has already been proven wrong continues to be suspect.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that I regret very much the utterances by the Minister of Highways that the Members of the Opposition are not interested in discussing the road program. We spent all afternoon discussing particulars relating to the highway program as distributed by the Minister of Highways himself and that discussion was of such a nature that it dealt with actual road construction. Now, for the Minister of Highways to over-react as he had this evening to questions posed to him by the Member for St. Johns, is simply because he doesn't feel all that secure in dealing with some of the areas raised and wishes to relate those to the Minister of Finance, and as a result thereof to suggest that the opposition party is not interested in his highways program only indicates to me that the Minister unfortunately is demonstrating an over sensitivity in this respect. I do wish that the Minister would withdraw his utterances because for the entire afternoon we've discussed the road program as per this booklet as was distributed by the Minister. We have posed questions to him. We dealt with the program in some detail and I find it very sad that after half an hour of the Minister discussing finances with the Member for St. Johns, he should launch into an attack, that the opposition therefore is not interested in his road program. I do feel that the Minister would like to correct the record in that respect particularly when the entire afternoon's discussion which will be recorded in Hansard indicates the very reverse.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Chairman, just further to the remarks of the Member for Selkirk, I feel that I should also contribute something to the record because while we did discuss the highway program this afternoon, it was pretty obvious the tack that the opposition members were on. The two former Finance Ministers were tied up with the Department of Education Estimates asking exactly the same questions that they are asking here, and they are hopping from one committee to another because they think they are on to something with the type of bookkeeping that is being brought into play. There is no question about it, the methods that they are using, try to embarrass the Minister on his Estimates because there is some little foggy area in the method of showing the capital or carry-over expenditures. Mr. Chairman, it is obvious what the two former Finance Ministers who are fully conversant with the method of accounting that is being employed and know the answers and they are just hopping from one committee to another and tying up the discussion on the Estimates. The Member for Selkirk can protest all he wants but he knows exactly what is going on.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege. If the Member for Minnedosa felt he was bailing the Minister of Highways out of the stream, he only succeeded in pushing the Minister in a little deeper.

MR. BLAKE: Nobody has to bail him out.

MR. PAWLEY: I can't speak for other members of the committee but it certainly . . .

MR. BLAKE: That's why you made progress this afternoon because they were both in there at the other committee, and you know it.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I do have the floor. I believe that it is not fair, it is not correct and it's unfortunate that the Member for Minnedosa should impute motives to those that entered into detailed discussion this afternoon in connection with the Highways Estimates. He knows that he is misleading the committee in his references and he is contributing not one iota to the enhancement of his own position in launching into such a harangue, and he has embarrassed I believe the Minister of Highways.

MR. BLAKE: The harangue has been launched by the two former Finance Ministers, that's where your harangue is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Minnedosa alleges that the discussion that we had with respect to the change of government accounting did not serve any public good or purpose. — (Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Minnedosa is suggesting that the opposition is trying to project an image that isn't there when in fact in the debate on Agriculture we found out that we were quite right, that there were moneys hidden, that the government was not honest in its presentation with respect to its intended spending and that that came about as a result of a change of bookkeeping which was not properly noted in the Estimates so that the Committee could properly

understand those Estimates. That came out after a great deal of questioning.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't think you can fault the Members of the Opposition for pursuing each department in order to determine how many additional millions of dollars that we might uncover that the government is spending without having shown in the Estimates. That's the exercise and I'm afraid that unless the government comes up with a statement for all departments showing how many dollars they intend to spend that are not in the printed Estimates, then the only way we can get at that is by pursuing every department individually. They could save a lot of time if the government was prepared to give us a statement saying, "These are the printed Estimates; these are the additional amounts we intend to spend that you have not seen on the Estimates sheets." And if that were done, we would not have this problem.

Now, the Minister of Highways indicates that he doesn't have knowledge of any additional funds that might be available to him. He didn't say that there wouldn't be any, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. ENNS: We could say we've got hope for a few more bucks certainly and I'll take every buck I can.

MR. USKIW: I think that's fair game; the Minister hopes that he might get more money for Highways construction. But, Mr. Chairman, there are sums of money available, as the Member for St. Johns has indicated, in General Purposes Capital voted in previous years but unspent, and it is quite possible that Highways may receive a portion of those funds for this year's program, additional to the proposed Estimates that they have illustrated for this Committee.

So I can't agree with the Member for Minnedosa that the opposition is unfair in pursuing that question department by department, unless we were presented with a statement by the government covering the whole government, all the departments and agencies, with respect to its total spending intentions. In the absence of that, we have no choice, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the Members of the Committee, I don't think the Member for Minnedosa said that the opposition was unfair. He was explaining what he thought their tactic was, in his opinion. — (Interjection)— Oh, it wasn't gentlemanly?

MR. ENNS: I don't think we should be having too much editorial comment from the Chairman, do you think so . . . ?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know that we are going to have at least an hour to three hours on that matter of finance on every Committee and as Chairman, I know it is coming and I'm prepared to accept it.
1.(b)(1)—pass — the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I have to also go on the record because of the statements made by the Member for Minnedosa where he imputed motives to the members on this side that they really weren't interested in discussing the Highways portfolio. Mr. Chairman, I for one sat here and I don't intend to come to Committee and waste my time. I was rather pleased with the response and the answers and the questions that are raised with the Minister of Highways in terms of the specific areas of program that he has presented. But the fact still remains and I raised it the other night where the Honourable Minister himself said, "Argue with me if I'm not spending enough." The fact of the matter is your Finance Minister in his press release came out and said that Highways Estimates were up and I will quote from the press release: "Highways spending as shown in the printed Estimates is up by one-third, from \$120 million in 1977-78 to \$160.5 million in 1978-79." Now we have the Minister of Highways, and rightly so, the other night saying, "Look, my Estimates are really not up by one-third; they are really an increase . . ." I think if I recall his words, it was, ". . . of somewhere around 8 percent."

So, I take him at his word. But the fact of the matter is that the method of presentation as made by the Minister of Finance has created a totally erroneous impression not only to the Members of the Opposition but to everyone in this province, saying, "Hey, look, they are going to build an awful lot of roads.

MR. BLAKE: It even fooled your leader.

MR. URUSKI: That is correct; it fooled everybody. And now the Member for Minnedosa wants to go out and suggest and say, "Look, you have no business questioning how these finances are," when in fact his own Minister of Finance came up and made a statement to the effect they were up by one-third and the Minister of Highways says 8 percent. Now, who do we believe? —(Interjections)— Who do we believe? The Minister of Highways comes in here and says, "Look, I am not building as many roads as the Minister of Finance said." You know, as a matter of fact, all his colleagues weren't sure of who to believe. They sat here dumbfounded the other night when I made the statement. I said, "Gentlemen, look, there are not going to be any more roads built this year than there were in the previous years." And the Minister of Highways agreed with that.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that the comments made by the Member for Minnedosa certainly are not to be treated seriously in the comments that he made because he certainly, I believe, really

didn't mean what he was talking about. And if he did, he certainly should apologize to the Members of this Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the Member for St. George finished?

MR. URUSKI: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister of Highways, in view of the fact that the questions have not been cleared up that were posed by the Member for St. Johns; in view of the fact that when we did sit with the Minister of Agriculture, Department of Finance officials were called in, and I must say, Mr. Chairman, they did an excellent job, I thought, of assisting us in arriving at answers so that when we left the Department of Agriculture we knew exactly, clearly and precisely what the true picture was — if the Minister of Highways himself would not wish to reconsider the approach he is taking. Because in the approach that he is taking, he is leaving doubt, he is leaving uncertainty. He is relying upon a premise that at some point the Minister of Finance is going to arrive and to resolve all these unanswered question.

But we don't need that if he would pursue the route that was followed by the Minister of Agriculture, and I would commend the Minister of Agriculture for the route which he took — I think it was a sensible one, a constructive one — if the Minister of Highways, in view of the fact also that that precedent has been established, if he would not call in the Finance officials so that we know before we leave this department exactly what the financial picture is, so that the Minister of Highways himself would know that he has dealt with all problems relevant to his own department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I now do have to take exception to the line of questioning that is being put to the Ministry. Firstly, and recognizing because I did sit in part of the Department of Agriculture's Estimates where the Department of Agriculture clearly indicated that he was in effect planning to use some unexpended Capital moneys, which then caused a considerable amount of debate and some confusion with respect to how those moneys were accounted for in his Estimates. But what the Members of the Committee now are attempting to do and it is a rather serious matter, you are now questioning the truthfulness of my statements when I and the Deputy Minister sitting beside me indicate to you . . .

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Selkirk, what is your point of order?

MR. PAWLEY: I don't recall at any time questioning the Minister of Highways' truthfulness. The Minister of Highways very clearly advised the Committee that he was unable to answer all the questions being posed to him by the Member for St. Johns. He begged for an opportunity to have those questions referred to the Minister of Finance and all that was suggested by myself, that he might wish to consider calling Finance officials to this Committee as soon as possible so that it could be dealt with here, not being left to the Finance Minister's Estimates. No one accused him of untruthfulness and it is unfortunate that the Minister apparently wished to throw a red herring into the discussion between him and myself in that connection.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, that is precisely the point that I am making and if the honourable member was listening, the situation that arose in the Department of Agriculture does not exist here. I have indicated to you clearly, with staff beside me, that these are the total expenditures being requested by this Committee to vote.

Now, the questions that are being raised as to whether or not they will be in effect the final figures — certainly there is the opportunity of, I suppose if for some unforeseen reason and for that very reason that mechanism is there, if we find out that in the end of our construction year that we have overspent by half a million dollars or \$200,000, then the requirement is there and the former Attorney-General is well aware of it — the Special Warrant is there to cover precisely those oversights.

But there is no attempt being made here, and it has been made very clear, to suggest that these are in total the figures that the department is asking for to expend on Highways. Now, that wasn't quite the same situation with respect to Agriculture. But the members are persisting to attempt to bring the same set of circumstances into this department's considerations of Estimates. We have indicated to you that the Department of Finance has indicated to us that we have exhausted any Capital moneys available to the Department of Highways in this current year and that these are the total moneys. Now, any other way that you want to cut it, if you want to persist on that line of questioning, leaving the implications that you are not being given the full information as to how much money the department requires for this year's operation, then there can be no other interpretation on it, that you are simply not accepting the veracity of the statements being given to you by the Minister

of Highways and by the Department of Highways.

I might also suggest, you know, that it has occurred to me that the devious manner and way in which funds were shuffled back and forth in the last eight years — (Interjections) — Well, where all of a sudden the Department of Highways found itself responsible for \$1 million to purchase buses, where we find ourselves shuffled into responsibility for providing funds for northern winter roads. More appropriately it should have been in the Department of Northern Affairs. Or any other way. You know, you fellows have had considerable experience in that area.

But I'm telling you and I am indicating to you that for not the first, second or third time but in fact when I said earlier — and I have no difficulty acknowledging that we did discuss the actual road-building program this afternoon — but I would want to remind honourable members of the Committee and the records would show it, if we took a look at the transcripts of the period of time spent to date on Highways, remembering the full evening several nights ago when we started on Highways, which was devoted entirely to the matters of finance and again tonight, the hour and a half spent to date has been devoted to finance — so, yes, we put in an hour on the road building construction. I let the record stand for itself with respect to any remarks that I made about the true interest that the members opposite have shown with respect to getting on with the business of the Department of Highways.

But I have to leave on the record and I refute categorically the suggestion that we have a difficulty here. You gentlemen are manufacturing a difficulty here, or attempting to manufacture a difficulty here where none exists. We are not indicating to you, have not indicated to you that we intend to spend some unexpended capital authority, in fact we have indicated precisely the opposite.

We've indicated to you that we intend to spend \$160 million this year. We've indicated where the \$160 million is coming from. We spent a good deal of time with that the other night and the Member for St. Johns accepts the veracity of the statements as to where the money is coming from. What you are speculating about is will I maybe spend more. Well, if you can't accept the statement that I will not be spending more then I have no other alternative but to simply accept the fact that you are not prepared to accept the Minister's statement as to what his spending plans are for the Department of Highways. I happen to have a reasonably high regard, a regard that was thrown in some disrepute I might say for the legislative process that when the Estimates are passed and finally passed in the Legislature that that is the authority that I have given to me by the people of Manitoba to spend in the departments that I've got the responsibility for, knowing that there may be contingency situations arising where using the tools available to any government, a Special Warrant may be required to cover unexpected nominal increases in costs. I can assure the honourable members opposite that the Special Warrant tool will not be used with such unlimited degree that was used in some of the years of the previous administration where upwards of many millions of dollars were raised in this way. That in fact the printed Estimates in the last eight years had a great deal of difficulty in reflecting the actual spending of the government. Certainly in the last year, the immediate past year of the previous administration didn't reflect the true spending intentions of the government when as late as in September of last year the Minister of Finance indicated a projected deficit which later proved to be so far from the truth, so far from the truth that it belies description.

So, Mr. Chairman, honourable members opposite are among the last to talk about their great concern that these spending Estimates as printed on the right hand side of the column accurately and totally reflect the spending intentions of the government. I will tell you one thing, we will be a hell of a lot closer than you fellows came to it just last year. When I say that, I do not say that with respect to the Department of Highways spendings, it has always shown a remarkable degree of being pretty well dead on in terms of their allotments of moneys received from the Legislature and their actual expenditures.

That was proven again by the statements that were made to you with respect to the actual spending of the department last year as compared to the request. So, Mr. Chairman, we can carry on the Debate, but I have no intention of carry it on any more. I leave very clearly on the record (a) that I have no difficulty in answering the questions that are indeed appropriate for this committee to address to the Minister and that are within the jurisdiction, within the capacity of me and my staff, to assist the committee in their search for answers and to provide those answers.

I reject the kind of implications that are constantly being left on the table that this department has to answer in total, because that's really what it amounts to for the operations of the Department of Finance and how the Department of Finance is raising and allocating dollars.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have three speakers. In order they are Ste. Rose, Lac du Bonnet and Selkirk. If one of them wants to give up his position in the cycle for the Member for Selkirk, that's fine. The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to leave on the record the statement unchallenged that the Minister made when he said that the opposition think that the Highway Department don't know what they are doing. I don't want to leave that on the record, Sir, that is not the case, that is not true. I want to get that straight. You know the Member for Minnedosa never ceases to amaze us because he makes a statement that two members of this legislative Assembly have no right to come in and ask questions of the Ministers. I think that's ridiculous. Particularly since we found in the Department of Agriculture that there was going to be an additional 11 percent being spent. That is not the worst situation, but the thing is that it took us 24 hours to wiggle this out. It took us 24 hours to find out that there was going to be 11 percent more.

MR. ENNS: On a point of order. I want to make this very clear. If it means spending 24 hours in this department to wiggle another \$5 or \$10 million dollars for my department to spend we'll spend the 25 hours. We'll spend the 25 hours. Any and all donations are gratefully received, right about here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Now, if the Minister of Agriculture decides to spend the whole \$5.134 million, that is a difference of 20 percent over his Estimates. Now, nobody can blame us for asking questions. The Minister of Finance indicates that the spending for Highways is going to be 30 percent higher than last year's Estimates. The Minister of Highways says it's only 8 percent, that's a difference of 22 percent.

MR. ENNS: On a point of order. Again there is this deliberate attempt being made — the Minister of Finance has never indicated that.

MR. ADAM: Well, it's right in his article.

MR. ENNS: That is not the Minister of Finance.

MR. ADAM: We can read it for your, Sir, if you wish.

A MEMBER: What date is that.

MR. ADAM: That's March 31st. "The Estimates tabled Wednesday by the Minister of Finance, Don Craik, call for combined expenditures of \$1,648,657,800 compared to \$1,602,539,400 for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1978."

MR. ENNS: Show me the Minister's signature on it please.

MR. ADAM: He indicates that there is a 30 percent increase in his article here for Highways, and so —(Interjection)— Yes, the million dollars of deficit that occurred in last year's account.

On the other hand, only a few weeks ago the Minister of Finance reluctantly had to reveal that there is more money coming from Ottawa than they had been led to believe. There was an upward revision. Therefore, you know, we can have a lot of fun talking about whether we are projecting accurately, or aren't projecting accurately and whether we are living within the bounds of any set of Estimates from year to the other. I think the best that can be said about the process is that everyone attempts to present a pretty fair picture as they see it at the time and many circumstances may arise that could change it, significantly or not significantly.

So really the Minister for Agriculture shouldn't put himself in that untenable position of telling us today that as long as he is involved in government and his government is there that they will not experience those kinds of problems because those are indeed the nature of the problems of government, and they must be for very obvious reasons, and that is that the government is really the body that has to deal with public problems and has to be in a position to respond. Whether they have current capacity, budgetary capacity or not.

You know, Mr. Chairman, a good example is the several millions of dollars that were spent on feed assistance in one year, unbudgeted for. There is an item in the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture of \$16,000 for Emergency Measures or assistance. Mr. Chairman, the reason there is an item in the Estimates is to allow for expenditures of any level, but that there is an item to cover the need. And so you could spend \$16,000 or you could spend \$16 million or \$160 million if that was the desire of the province, the government, the people of Manitoba.

And so that is the nature of the beast and we should not be faulting anyone for having to put up from time to time with either miscalculations of economic performance or emergency situations that arise from time to time.

The issue here is not that, Mr. Chairman, the issue here is whether or not we are receiving an honest presentation of the Estimates. That is the only issue and the Minister of Highways has indicated to us that his presentation is indeed accurate and that he does not intend to spend any more money than what we are voting on here in this Committee, which is a total of \$160,545,400.00. So I am prepared to accept that, Mr. Chairman, that that is his intention.

However, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Agriculture gave himself a little bit of elbow room in his comments when he said that if there was a need, of course there is always the Special Warrant provision and that they might have to use them but they would be reluctant to do so. Well, I may be wrong, Mr. Chairman, but it seems to me that if you have money under Schedule "B" Loan Act, General Purposes Capital, I don't believe that you have to draw a Special Warrant to use any of those dollars. I believe those dollars can be transferred interdepartmentally on the decision of Management Committee. I don't believe it requires a Special Warrant. Now, I may be wrong but I don't think so. And therefore it is possible that if this department wanted to seize on an opportunity to either complete a project or enter into one that was not planned for and they didn't have any money, it

is quite conceivable that they could go to their Cabinet meeting, the Minister could, and ask that he receive another \$10 million or \$15 million out of Unused Capital - General Purposes and that that be transferred to Highways. Now that is conceivable and I wouldn't fault him for it.

I want to know from this Minister whether he is telling us that under no circumstances is he going to draw or ask that moneys be drawn from General Purposes Capital and that the only procedure that he would employ in expanding his program beyond \$160 million is by means of a Special Warrant. Perhaps that would help us if he would tell us which procedure he would use, or if any.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat taken back by the Minister's long-winded response to a question which I posed to him . . .

MR. ENNS: I haven't said a word in the last half-hour.

MR. PAWLEY: But you did speak for the half-hour prior to that. I want to say to the Minister that the government is stewing in its own juice. It attempted to create the impression that it replaced a government which was excessive in its spending habits; a government which had piled up an enormous debt and on the other hand it was a government which was trimming down on expenses.

Well, Mr. Chairman, in the last month we have discovered that the deficit was \$40 million to \$50 million less than what had been projected, reluctantly acknowledged by the Minister of Finance. We found out in the Ministry of Agriculture that there was an over \$5 million expenditure which was going to be used which hadn't been indicated earlier, \$5 million more than this government was going to spend than what it was representing to the public of Manitoba. Then this Minister, this Minister before us is amazed and taken back and surprised that the opposition wishes to question him. Immediately he assumes because the opposition is wishing to question him, that we are questioning his honesty, his truthfulness. I don't recall using the word "honesty" or "truthfulness" at any point but what I did ask the Minister was if he would consider bringing forth, around him, Finance officials, as the Minister of Agriculture did, to answer the questions which were posed to him by the Member for St. Johns' which he chose not to answer.

I want to just leave it at that. If the Minister wishes to continue this debate, he may do so for the next half-hour, but the Minister, with his government, is stewing in its own juice. They have created the situation; the opposition will make no apologies for questioning Minister by Minister its expenditures because we are intending to demonstrate that there has been somewhat of a hoax being perpetrated upon Manitobans by the present government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(b)(1)—pass; 1.(b)(2)—pass; 1.(c) Computer Services—pass—the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: I wonder if the Minister could give us some information on the Computer Services. There seems to be an increase — is there 4 ½ or 5 ½ more SMYs than last year? There is a \$25,000 increase on both items, I believe, approximately \$25,000.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: On Item (1) there is an increase of \$25,000 as noted by the Member for Ste. Rose which provides for ½ additional SMY programming. It provides for a general salary increase and normal annual increment provision which again is not precise, but a percentage figure has been put in there.

MR. ADAM: This list shows 5 ½ SMYs more in Computer Services, or there is 1 ½ term less, is that it, the decrease? Yes, that's a decrease.

MR. ENNS: We have done a little moving between department to Computer Services and we end up with a net gain of ½ SMY.

MR. ADAM: Could the Minister give us an outline of what is happening in the Computer Services?

MR. ENNS: This division provides for staff, programmers, keypunch operators, etc., equipment and expenses for Highways Division computer systems requirements. Highways has their own remote terminal with printers and does their own keypunching, giving the department remote access to the main computer and better control over the programming in computer operation. Wherever possible, the department takes advantage of systems that have already been developed by other Highway jurisdictions, resulting in substantial savings in the development cost. How's that?

MR. ADAM: That's good. Do we contract any of this computer work out?

MR. ENNS: No, I believe that it is done all internally, not to date in any event.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)(1)—pass; (c)(2)—pass. Because of the Minister's Salary, we don't pass Item 66; we go on to Item 67 - Management Services and Engineering.

2.(a)(1) - Salaries and Wages \$527,000—pass — the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister to give us a statement on their tendering policies. There are a number of ways to tender for work to be done or for a product to be supplied and I am wondering whether the Minister can indicate whether there has been any change since the new government assumed its responsibilities in the tendering process?

MR. ENNS: I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that there has been no change.

MR. USKIW: Can I be then more specific, Mr. Chairman. A contract can be let or tendered either in whole or in several parts and of course the department could decide whether it wants to deal with several contractors who happen to collectively have put in bids that total up less, or a contract can be tendered in whole and then that contractor sublets to other people in the industry. What is the procedure of the department with respect to that question? Do they tender large contracts or do they allow small contractors to bid on portions? Is there an opportunity for small contractors to participate?

MR. ENNS: In most instances, partly in some instances because of rather stringent bonding provisions, the very small contractor finds himself not always in a position to tender. We deal in the main with the prime contractor but exert no further influence on whether or not that prime contractor then wishes to sublet parts and portions of that work to smaller contractors.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, if I could pursue it further, if we are going to tender out 20 miles of highway construction, I suppose one could have that go out in one block or one could invite tenders from two or three people who might do eight miles each, so to speak, and one would have to see the results of that tendering process to know which would be more economical for the province. Perhaps the department has experience in that regard and perhaps maybe they can indicate why they have chosen the route that they have taken, whatever it is.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, that decision is essentially made for us by circumstances that we face, depending on the kind of work that is being tendered, the kind of plant that is available. The number of, for instance, concrete paving plants within the province varies from time to time, contractors leave the province from time to time. That is a fairly general question, Mr. Chairman, that we find ourselves pretty well having to adjust our method of determining size of contract, and in the manner and way in which a contract is written up by (a) the knowledge that the department has of what is available out there to them, and to make these contracts reasonably attractive that will invite hopefully as good a number of tenders as possible. I may indicate that currently in the beginning of this construction year, indicators are that there is very active bidding for highways work and we are receiving upwards to 10-12 tenders or bids on relatively small jobs, \$60,000-\$70,000 jobs, which we believe gives, in the final analysis, the best possible protection for the public in terms of satisfying ourselves that the final prices having to be paid are pretty realistic.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe it's possible to either have several contractors on one project or one contractor on one project who then sublets to several other contractors. There are two ways to do this, and my question is, which way is going to come out cheaper to the province. If you preclude the possibility of a number of bids because of the size of the project being all lumped into one, then that takes away from the competitiveness of the tendering process. Now, there is the other question that arises in connection with that, and that is if you are going to grade and gravel a section of highway, you could break it down between the grading and the gravelling. In other words, one contractor could do the building of the road, any number of contractors could tender on the aggregate supply.

It may be that sometimes you will get a lower bid if it's all lumped together, and other times you will end up better financially if you had it split up between two or three who are in competition with each other. If a tender goes out where it is a requirement to not only build the grade, but to provide all the aggregates and whatever other services that go into the total project, you often find a situation where the parent company doesn't have too much competition, if any, in the tender and then tends to have other sub-contractors compete vigorously for those sub-contracts, and in essence the parent company. —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, I don't know what the joke is but I gather there is something here that is worth looking at.

It could often be that the parent company who has managed to have its tender accepted at a very high rate could end up with a very exorbitant profit position by brow-beating the sub-trades into very severe competition and in essence that is not in the public interest because it starves the little companies and does not provide for a low-cost project for the public. That's the reason I raise that question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the tendering process or the whole approach the project begins with our departmental people, our engineers placing an estimate on projected costs, and then using the experience, the knowledge that they have developed over the years as to what is available to them in the construction industry to sew right up their contracts to assure that the interests of the province are at all times maintained.

MR. USKIW: I would like to follow up on that question. Is the Minister indicating to us that there are additional funds in other departments beyond the \$160 million in this department for highway construction and maintenance or whatever?

Many of the examples that the Member for Lac du Bonnet referred to are in fact common practice. Quite often aggregate work is done by one contractor that has a crusher in place and for certain advantages can tender lower than the prime contractor. I think in general it is acknowledged and accepted as a basic principle by the Department of Highways that it is to our advantage to maintain as many, large and small, contractors in the business. It becomes a unhealthy situation when that's not the case and that by the way also to some extent enters into trying to develop an overall program in the terms of the expenditure of the \$75 million of new construction money to attempt, where possible, to see that a certain amount of concrete work is being done in any given year, a certain amount of asphalt work is done in any given amount a year, earth work or aggregate work, gravelling work, to keep the industry alive and ticking.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, just one last point of clarification, could the Minister give me a very specific description of the kind of a tender that would be let on say 20 miles of road building, grading, gravelling, paving? How would that contract be let, in one part, two parts, ten parts? What is the sort of normal?

MR. ENNS: The specific example used for the Member for Lac du Bonnet, in most instances would probably consist of three separate contracts. It's unusual that a contract would include the grading, the gravelling and say the surface, the paving treatment at one time.

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

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to ask a question on the tendering. Is the policy being changed with regard to the tendering for Northern Manitoba? Is that done away with where we used to or would that be under this department? All construction is coming under the Department of Highways, all highway construction whereas before there was Northern Affairs involved, Highways, Tourism.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, for the information of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, that has not, in effect, taken place although it has been talked about. The practice is, that we are now discussing, involvethe traditional Highway Department's approach, this program that's been outlined to you. The Department of Highways has not changed its tendering practices in any way. The tendering practices that are in effect, or will be in effect for the coming year that have been up to now, and perhaps will continue in the Department of Northern Affairs, those questions would have to be directed to the Department of Northern Affairs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)(2)—pass — the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm presenting the Estimates for the Department of Highways for which I have the immediate responsibility for. I know what the honourable member is after. It would be my understanding in all likelihood there would be additional funds, some emanating from , and hopefully, quite frankly, as a result of renegotiations with the Northlands Agreement, having to do particularly with additional northern roads.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, then let me pursue this. If other projects are undertaken that are not shown in these Estimates, would they be handled by this department or would they be handled by other departments?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I want to be very clear on it, it is a possibility. I believe some mention or recommendation of that taking place has been made by the Task Force for instance, but the members are well aware that those are recommendations to government to be acted upon or not to be acted upon. I can only indicate to the members of the Committee that no decisions have been made in that regard.

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

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The area dealing with the lab and materials, could the Minister indicate as to the surveys and the continuous checking being made for supply of aggregate, how is that proceeding, and I believe there is a revolving fund in terms of the purchase of material supply for a year in advance or at least to replenish the department. Could he give us some information in that regard as to the supplies of aggregate in relevant parts of the province. Are there any shortages, and how is the fund being used?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, this division deals principally with our capability of maintaining , you know, a constant cueck on various kinds of activities that involve design of concrete in asphalt pavements, inspection of production methods, advising on the testing of acceptance of materials. It

has a further responsibility of initiating plans and conducts reports on various research projects, investigates special problems and grade failures. We have different soil structures in the province, notably are the problems that we have in some of the river bank areas where we have failures and slides, bridges collapsing on us as a result of that; a geophysical engineer trains and supervises technical subsection which is responsible for locating and checking and testing and recording gravel deposits which I think is the principal question that the honourable member asked. Route locations, work and other projects with respect to gravel supplies, I believe that I have some information that I can indicate to him, but in general terms aggregate and gravel is not an endless supply in the province. Regrettably while we have some major deposits of gravel they are not in the right places, in terms of where many of our road requirements are.

I am advised that further down on the Estimates under 15.(a), we have the acquisition you know of the physical assets which involves the gravel pit accounts and that account has not been changed from previous years, standing at roughly \$100,000 which is included in the total amount shown in Item 8, totalling some \$16 million.

I can indicate to you that in the south-central part of the province we are getting extremely low on gravel deposits and it is affecting a cost production in terms of hauling and distances involved. We have substantial deposits of gravel in the north and hopefully some of them of course will be used for opening the north, but that is the general situation.

MR. URUSKI: So there are shortages then, Mr. Chairman, shortages in the vein where there are fairly long distances of hauling similar to what may be experienced in the future in the area of Winnipeg for example, where there is large scale home building going on on large gravel deposits which will over the next decade or so force the construction industry to move a greater distance and will add greatly to the cost of construction within the City of Winnipeg. You're being faced with that in southern Manitoba as well.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, while it's not within the jurisdiction of this department, but I can indicate to the honourable member that the Committee on Land Use was that was referred to earlier in the hearings or this sitting, the PLUC Committee, has and is dealing with that particular problem, about the zoning and use of that kind of land with underground deposits of gravel that future subdivision or development should not take place on these what are becoming more and more valuable resources.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)(1)—pass; (b)(2)—pass; (c) Surveys and Titles: (c)(1)—pass; (c)(2)—pass; (d)(1) Bridges—pass — Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister indicated that there is a large scale of funds remaining this year insofar as the highways strengthening which primarily deals with the bridges within this province. Could the Minister give us some indication as to the nature and how many bridges across the province do they anticipate working on in this year as part of the highways strengthening program. I don't want the particular location, but is there a rough guesstimate with a dollar figure attached to it?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, perhaps while my Deputy is supplying me with that answer I can only indicate to the honourable member that he will recall earlier on in the fall, the department having announced the increase in gross vehicle weights on several routes on the major highways, he is quite correct, the bridges very often are the bottleneck in our capacity to do this. We are carrying on with the replacement of those bridges, particularly on these routes that have been recently graded up to the 110,000 lbs. for instance.

I haven't got the number, but how much money? There in the programs individually listed in the pink report. I am informed, Mr. Chairman, that a total of some \$18 million is being spent in total for the highway strengthening program which includes bridges. The breakdown would have to be taken out of the actual program to determine what amount is bridges and what amount is highways, you know, improvement to the highway surface itself.

It is a substantial program and I would have to perhaps take this occasion — there may be another occasion to do it more appropriately to indicate that when the highway-strengthening program was signed by the Department of Highways, it was a very good and prudent contract in that they indexed it to take account for inflating costs.

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

MR. URUSKI: Could the Minister indicate whether or not the design section, I believe that's under this section of the department, is handling the majority of the designs on the bridges or is some design work being farmed out?

MR. ENNS: I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that last year with the exception of two particular structures in the north the rest of the work was done 100 percent inside the department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)(1)—pass — the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, we had a catastrophe in the last — two years ago I think on bridges. All

the bridges have been replaced now that were taken away by the great flood.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, there is one notable bridge that has yet to be replaced and that was in the constituency of my leader, Souris-Killarney, the Wawanesa bridge is still to be replaced. It is included in the program that is before you, but in the main I am advised that the bridges have been replaced. But that is a notable exception. We have some particular soil difficulties there that precluded us from doing it earlier, at least that's what I kept telling my leader.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d)(1)—pass; (d)(2)—pass; (e)(1) Traffic—pass — the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Has there been any studies made on traffic to put in — what do they call those things anyway? It's done in the States a lot to . . . Electronic — it's just like a radar that they put on bridges, underpasses, anywhere so that the motoring public travel . . . and they see what speed they are travelling.

MR. ENNS: The department is aware of these devices and has looked at them but to date has found them too expensive to use under our circumstances and have chosen not to do so.

MR. ADAM: Apparently in the States it's slowing down the travelling public. You know, they realize when they see the speed — they see it right on the speedometer I suppose, but when they see it registering on a traffic control, they slow down.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have chosen a different route to slow down the travelling public in Manitoba by going metric, and with the implied reduced speed limits there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (e)(1)—pass; (e)(2)—pass; (f)(1)—pass; (f)(2)— pass; (g)(1)—pass — the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, has there been any changes of late in the method of inspection. I recall that there were some difficulties experienced by the traffic inspectors using personal vehicles and the like while attending scales and having their own personal vehicles and then trying to apprehend so-called violators of people who miss the scales and keep on going. Are departmental vehicles being utilized and what has happened on this to date?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the practice has been, and it's in use at the moment, that yes, they are using their own vehicles in the course of their normal duties, but a government vehicle is stationed at the weigh scales that is used when a situation arises where it has to be used in pursuit of somebody passing through or has to be stopped down the road a piece. In other words, they are not using their personal vehicles in apprehension work.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (g)(1)—pass; (g)(2)—pass. Resolution 67: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$8,784,000 for Highways—pass.

The hour being 10:16 P.M. and in getting through Item 67, is it the committee's wish to rise?

MEMBERS: To rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise.

SUPPLY — EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to direct the honourable members to the gallery where we have the 82nd B. Company Girl Guides, numbering 11, with Mrs. Nemeth, from the Honourable Member of Osborne's constituency, just to my right.

I would also direct the honourable members to the gallery on my left where we have 18 students from the Steinbach Junior High School, Grade 9 student s, under the directorship of Mr. J. Siemens, from the Honourable Member for La Verendrye's constituency.

I would ask the members to please welcome our visitors.

I would direct the honourable members to Page 25, Department of Education, Resolution No. 41. We are under the Clause 1.(b)(1) Salaries — the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, firstly I want to congratulate you on taking on this portfolio. It is not an easy one and I speak from some experience because when I first took it over it was combined as it is now, and so I know that you are carrying a considerable load.

I was listening to the introductory comments that the Minister made the other day, and some of the comments today. And I was sitting back and listening and it seemed to me that there's constantly talk about change. But it's amazing to me how everything seems to stay the same, and the same in education is constant change. That's been the history in the educational field for decades. And I

guess in every generation there is a feeling amongst those beyond the educational system — that is the adults in the community — who feel that somehow the educational systems has changed and because they don't understand it, perhaps, or because it is simply different from what they had — whether these are adults from the 80s thinking about their educational system in the '30s, or those in the '60s thinking about their education in the '40s — that they become very uptight and very edgy and fear that somehow changes are taking place that are beyond their ken, they don't quite understand it.

So, the Minister is going to have to contend with that. And frankly, I was pleased to hear that he has rejected the kind of talk we heard for a couple of years certainly — not just in this House but in the press, the media, among certain groups in society, the Manufacturers Association, the Chamber of Commerce — where they developed a pretty regular constant theme on there is something wrong with the educational system. Not just in Manitoba; this is general I think across Canada and North America. The cry that something had happened and that things were going from bad to worse, and that we were bringing up a bunch of children of illiterates, and we should swing back to the good old days. And inevitably the good old days were associated with the 3 R's, reading, writing and arithmetic. And I'm pleased, if I heard the Minister correctly, that he has no intentions to just follow that course blindly and that he is well enough aware of the necessary changes in the educational system to continue to be relevant, to continue to meet the needs of children, that he isn't going to succumb to that sort of pitch, if I can call it that, to try to go back to something, to a day which is behind us and you can never retrieve.

When the Chamber, when the Manufacturers Association, when other groups of similar nature in our society start deploring the products of the school system, I have to accuse them of having tunnel vision and thinking purely of their own self interests, because what they are basically saying to the people in the field of education, this Minister of Education or former Ministers of Education or the system generally, what they are really asking for is for the school system to produce, whether it be K-12 or whether it be as graduates of secondary or graduates of post secondary, they want the system to produce for them a finished product who can be taken out of a classroom on graduation and fitted in to their particular industrial need. I can't fault them for it, it is very nice. If the state and public at large will train people to fit into their particular operation, be it an industrial, be it a service kind of business, whatever it happens to be, they would love that because of course it saves them the need for training the young person coming in for the first time. This is not new. This same kind of approach and this same kind of criticism has been heard for many many years and many decades and you know, the fact of the matter is that in today's society, the children going into grade 1 today, 1978, are going to graduate high school in 1990, and I think the Minister understands that you cannot go back to a period when you can somehow teach or impart to a student certain specific knowledge that 12 years hence on graduation, he will have acquired enough of it to stand him in good stead for the rest of his working life.

The changes in technology, the changes in our whole social fabric, are so rapid and so quick, with knowledge doubling every five years, that it is inconceivable that a school system can produce that kind of finished product. That in fact, and the Minister knows this, more and more people are recognizing that education doesn't stop with graduation and if indeed the person feels on graduation, be it high school or post secondary, that his education is complete and he can now sit back and simply work and earn money and earn a living on the basis of what he learned on graduation, then he is kidding himself, because the technology and the rapid changes are so vast and happening so quickly that there is a need for continuing education all through adult life and it is now projected that people will be having two and three careers in their lifetime and during their working life to age 65. A far cry from the 1930s, 1940s and 1950s, when someone could expect on graduation to fit into some business or some profession or trade and feel pretty secure that that will stand him in good stead until the time comes for him to retire and to call it quits.

So I think the Minister — and I hope I heard him correctly — is in fact turning his back and rejecting the idea that we simply go back to the days when students are going to be taught specific information which they will regurgitate every year in June, through central examinations in Grade 11 — it used to be in Grade 9, or Grade 9 and Grade 11 at one time and then it was Grade 12 — that he's rejecting that, and that in fact he is recognizing what is recognized everywhere, that what we have to do for our children and for the entire future generations is simply to — it's not simple, I shouldn't use the word simply because it sure isn't simple — is to try to help that child develop sufficient self-development, sufficient ability to develop to think for himself, to be able to think for himself, to recognize a new situation as it arises and learn how to cope with it. In other words, to develop his thinking abilities, his ability to analyze, to question, and his ability to adapt to changing conditions as they will occur; and they are bound to occur, not just in 1990 as I say, but probably within five years there'll be total changes again which, if they graduate tomorrow from the school system, will have to change in order to adapt and to fit into or else he, too, will be left behind as many have over the years. One of the reasons why there is such a need for re-entry into the Post Secondary level by adults today is because the schooling they got in the forties and the fifties and even the sixties was inadequate to help them keep pace with the changes in society that they've encountered as they've gone on. That's why there's a need for adult education all the way through, whether it be through Community Colleges, whether it be through local programs offered, either through the department itself or in conjunction with the school board. Because without that, there's no way that any child, becoming an adult and five or six years in the work force, can continue to cope with the realities of a changing world.

He indicated that in Manitoba that things weren't all that terrible, as a matter of fact, in the educational system and he, however, doesn't want to give credit to the former government. He says it

Thursday, April 27, 1978

was restraint practised by the teachers in the field who saved the educational system in Manitoba.

Well the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that it was the former government that made it possible for teachers in the field to have far greater flexibility in how they taught and in much of the programs that they taught than ever before.

Now, we didn't go as far as other provinces. We didn't go as far as some other provinces. But it was the Department of Education, through the administration, which gave guidance which allowed the school divisions and the teachers, therefore, the kind of flexibility that was needed. We didn't go as far as other provinces where the core program was considerably less than in Manitoba, we never went that far, and as the Minister, I think, has now acknowledged that in fact the core subjects taught in Manitoba — the basic ones — were still there. There was simply greater latitude left, allowed to the teachers themselves, in those subjects beyond the core and certainly the program of studies and the way it was taught was left a great deal more to the teachers so that they could respond to the needs of their students, depending on where they worked — whether it was a core city, or rural Manitoba, or northern Manitoba — where there were differences.

Now I recall, when we first took office, being told about remote schools where there were still signs which said that on these premises and in the school grounds no other language but English would be allowed. And you can imagine the cultural shock to a native student coming into a foreign school, literally, a foreign building, without any English if any, and suddenly being faced with a situation where they couldn't even — amongst themselves — speak their own native tongue. So you talk in terms of cultural shock. I suspect it was traumatic enough to not just turn them off school but to perhaps frighten them so that the going to school, which is required by law, was something that not only didn't encourage them to continue but probably would turn them off from any possibility of learning.

Now, of course, things have changed. And probably the greatest impact I would suspect in northern Manitoba is not the change in the school system but it is what I would call the parallel educational system, and that is the media — television in particular. And with television now becoming available throughout the north the impact on infants, native children, hearing the language in their own homes will have a far greater impact on their language skills and a far greater impact on their ability to join the mainstream — enter into the mainstream of the Manitoba community — than anything that the school can possibly do for them.

So that I don't quite appreciate, nor do I agree, that it was the department that somehow failed but it was the teachers who saved the educational system in Manitoba. Because, in fact, it was the teachers who were given far greater leeway, and many of them, frankly, were afraid of it and I think the Minister knows this. Many of them, when we said you don't have to stick to the prescribed number of hours per week for this subject and that subject, and others subjects, I recall getting letters saying, "Please tell us; should we spend 18 percent of our time or 14 percent of our time?"

Fortunately, those teachers are probably out of this system now, and there is less and less of them.

Mr. Chairman, with those few comments I would like to zero in on some of the things that the Minister brought out in his opening remarks. He referred to a change in the formula for financial support to the school divisions. I think he said that this year they would be switching to a \$260 per pupil grant, which would be a combination of the old \$125 per pupil and the previous maintenance grant, the supply instruction which was on a per pupil basis rather than on a per teacher basis. So is he now saying that in fact everything will be paid on a per-pupil grant? The number of children in a classroom will be used to calculate the grant and the teacher therefore, the fact whether they have one teacher or two teachers really is of no consequence here, it doesn't matter. So I want to ask him, whether in doing that he is therefore now departing from the formula and the principle which was that a teacher grant should be related to the qualifications of the teacher. If not, how is that going to be calculated, because if they're lumping all grants together into a per-pupil grant and saying it's \$260 per pupil, will that school division get \$260 for every pupil? If they have a thousand pupils, they get \$260,000 irrespective of the number of teachers they have, and irrespective of the qualifications of the teacher. Will they get it if the teacher is a Class 1 teacher, or a Class 3 teacher, or a Class 6 teacher, will the grant be the same?

I'm just posing that question because it's a question I think that certainly the teachers would be interested in. It is a departure from the previous policy which tried to encourage school divisions to hire teachers with higher qualifications, and in that way assure that by and large, the odds being what they are, that the most highly trained teachers would be in the school system and those divisions that have teachers with higher qualifications received the higher grant. I ask the Minister that particular question and perhaps he could answer that specifically.

He did refer to the staffing, and he indicated as my reading of it, that taking a snapshot in time — and I assume that's what he did, let's say March 31, 1977, versus March 31, 1978, whether he used that month or another month, but he used the same month, I imagine — that the staff man years in the department were in 1977-78, 1,695, but that there were 138 vacancies, so that left 1,555 people who were actually being paid. The fact that they were SMYs unfilled and because the former government had put a freeze on hiring and ordered a vacancy rate — what was known as the ten percent vacancy rate — that even though the SMYs were there, the fact is the positions were not filled, and therefore the money wasn't paid out. So that 1,555 positions approximately were what the former government was paying for.

This year, on other hand, I think he indicated that there were 1,542 positions which are budgeted for — and actually the funds are being asked for somewhere in these figures — therefore, as I

understand it, the difference is about 13. Now contract — he talked about today and I don't have those figures — so the difference of about 13 as between the number of people that actually were on staff at that snapshot in time in 1977-78 and what he anticipates for 1978-79. So the large layoffs, the large dropping of staff apparently has not occurred in these departments, in these two departments that are now one. I assume that we will probably find them elsewhere, but so far from this Minister I gather we can't see that.

Now, earlier on just before we adjourned, I asked the Minister whether he would get information with regard to the capital loan acts last year and previous years. The reason we are very concerned about it is this, I will be very candid with the Minister, because of the new format where everything is being combined both capital and current, there is no longer any such thing as capital and current, it is all current and what we are concerned about is that the authority, the authority which was voted in previous years under Schedule B and in the reconciliation there are two figures shown adding up to \$18,800,000.00. It's necessary for us in order to be able to make head or tail out of the expenditures, it is necessary to know to what extent that amount shown in last year's reconciliation has in fact been spent or some of it in the process of being spent. There are no vouchers yet, it would be in other words committed, everyone knows it is going to happen, it may even have started, whether it is construction or the acquisition of certain materials, technical vocational equipment and so on, but that in fact, the money has not been spent, but will be spent this year, in the coming fiscal year.

This is the kind of information we seek because to the extent that any amount of money at all is going to be spent in 1978-79 the figure, the total figure for the department should reflect the spending, even though the authority for that spending was passed by the legislature in previous years, be it 1974, be it 1975, 76 or whenever it took place. I know in the Community Colleges, for example, The Loan Act, the Community College's capital there was unexpended authority going back to 1975, as late as July of this year, pardon me, July 1977. So, it is that sort of information that we seek and I know we are entitled to and which I hope the Minister will be able to give us, if not tonight, then perhaps tomorrow.

As well, I would like to know the reference in the reconciliation. There are two amounts of transfers of functions. One I think I understand, and that is the \$6,500,000 to Municipal Affairs, that probably has to do with grants in lieu of taxes. —(Interjection)— Yes, okay. I find it interesting that there is no increase over last year but I won't ask you that, I will have to ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs about that. And the other is the \$2.9 million for Public Works. What is the nature of that transfer? Is it construction? — I don't know, the purchase of buses, I really don't know. Perhaps the Minister could tell us what they are and has that money all been expended particularly in the case of the \$2.9 million, has it all been expended, that is money spent and gone, not something that is going to carry over into 1978-79?

And if the Minister has that information I of course will gladly sit down and let him answer. If not, I could go on to something else.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister, I think incurred and recognized that they are not just in the core of Winnipeg but elsewhere throughout Manitoba, there are pockets, sometimes comparatively large as in The Pas, where there are problems of culturalization, where there are problems of people with different backgrounds coming into a school system and having to try to adjust to the mainstream of Manitoba life and that I hope he recognizes that they cannot simply be treated as just any one else, but in fact, every effort must be made to try to help those children, within their generation, to make the break and to adjust to a new society, a newer one than what they've come from.

And I am wondering whether in fact the Minister will continue to support programs like the nutritional program in the core schools, like the program whereby aides were made available with provincial assistance, native speaking aides in many cases or other foreign languages, in city schools where there are large numbers, if not majorities, but certainly large numbers of native children, of immigrant children, aides in the classroom to assist the teacher and to assist the children to make that easier transition into the English milieu which they now find themselves. And the same can be said in a sense for The Pas which has for many years had a problem because they didn't have the resources necessary to assist their own teachers, to give their own teachers the kind of assistance they felt was needed in the form of teacher aides and other assistance to help the teacher and give the teacher time to do what she is supposed to do or he is supposed to do, is teach, and at the same time work with the children to make them feel more at ease and more comfortable in the school system.

So, these are some of the questions I pose and some of the others I will leave as we come to the actual heading at the university, community college, where I may have far more to say, but at this point I would like to leave it because we are dealing with Administration and Athings I have talked about really come under the Administration because the emanate from the Minister and Deputy Minister's office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before I address myself to the remarks of the Member for Seven Oaks I would like to reply to a question from the Member for Burrows regarding the figure \$1.194 million under salaries in 1977-78. I believe the member had some question there as to how that figure was arrived at and I would go over that now. It is a bit complicated and I think this results whenever you amalgamate a couple of departments, but if he has a pencil handy we can go through

that at this time. Again, we are dealing with 1977-78, the old Department of Education, \$928.6 million, and for that old Department of Education, the G.S.I., the General Salary Increase allocation was \$30.3 million. The old Department of Continuing Education and Manpower \$243.8 million. And the G.S.I. there \$11.0 million. The total there would be \$1,213.7 million however, one must subtract two SMYs there that were transferred to Item 16(7) and so you subtract 19.0, giving an adjusted vote figure for 1977-78 of \$1,194.7 million which I believe is the figure stated here in the Estimates. And of course, the figure for 1978-79, \$1,142,800.00.

I must remark that I enjoyed listening to the educational dissertation of the Member for Seven Oaks. I know that he, at one time was the Minister of Education and gained considerable respect from many people while serving in that particular office. I find that generally there are few of his remarks that I take great exception to, and if I do take exception it is perhaps mostly in degree. He talks about going back is not the thing to do and I have to agree with him that certainly there is no going back, we must go ahead, and if there are people who advocate that we should go back in education it's because they think that's the only way that we can restore the skills of students that they consider so basic to the learning process. I suggest it is not necessary to go back to do that, we can go ahead and insure that those skills that people feel, and justly feel, are essential to the whole learning process are provided.

I would suggest to the Member for Seven Oaks in regard to his remarks on the per-pupil grant and on the teacher grants and so on that when we get to section 3.(a) which deals with the Foundation program and other grants which I am sure he is familiar with, that this would be a better place to deal with these, and if he will be present at that time I would rather leave that type of discussion until that particular time.

The Member for Seven Oaks, of course has alluded to the Reconciliation Statement, and the problem of Capital here under Transfers of Functions, and particularly the Public Works item of 2.9. My information on this item, Sir, is that this is money that was allotted to the Public Works for maintenance and renovation and so on at the community colleges, and that this money was expended. —(Interjection)— I'm not sure that it is classified as capital fund, but as operating money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(b)(1)—pass — The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to first try to elicit a little bit of information from the Minister where I should ask him certain questions. Number one, I would like to know under what section of the Estimates I could deal with the Equalization grants that are in current vogue with the City of Winnipeg, Public School Division No. 1 and the surrounding school divisions in the Unicity area.

Secondly, I think somewhere along the line we should have a philosophical debate on the Task Force report on Education. Now the Minister can either have it here or he can have it on his Salary, but one way or another we want to pick his brains a bit to see exactly how his philosophical bent agrees with some of the recommendations that we have seen come out from the Task Force.

Especially it's unfortunate that the Minister — he was here earlier this evening and I had wished to address a few remarks to the Honourable Minister Without Portfolio, the Minister in charge of the Task Force. Since the Task Force report was tabled in this House, and we have tried to elicit certain information from him of what people he contacted, or his Task Force contacted in the specific and main, since we're dealing with Education, with the people in the educational field in the province of Manitoba. There are some very serious recommendations and some very serious veiled threats to the local autonomy of school boards that have come through pretty loud and clear in the Task Force report. The Minister has said that he has not had time to really make a thorough study of the recommendations of the Task Force, but there is one section that the Finance Board should use Section 268(4) of the Public Schools Finance Board Act to withhold funds from a public school division for a more efficient operation.

I checked P268(4) of the Public School Finances Act, and it deals with withholding of grants, and states, "Notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other Act of the Legislature, the Board may delay payment of all or part of any grant payable to a unitary division under this or any other Act of the Legislature until the unitary division has complied with any requirement under Subsection 3." Well, Subsection 3 of the Act also states that reports, etc. from the unitary divisions, "The Board may require unitary division to prepare and submit to the board such reports and returns as the board deems advisable, and to submit to the board for any inspection, any contracts or documents relative to the affairs of the unitary division, and the board may make copies of such contracts or documents." But nowhere in that Act does it say this board is going to be the final judge and jury, that the board is not operating with fiscal responsibility. I think that it's a damn big slap in the face to the unitary division boards of this province.

Having been a member of the Winnipeg School Division Public School Board for six years, part under the grant structure that was set up in 1967, and part of my time was spent under the other method of financing education, I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, that that board, and I'm still certain to this day, practises financial and fiscal responsibility.

This board never, when it was the method of financing school building programs, never once — and I think if you want verification of that you only need to ask your Deputy Minister, Dr. Wes Lorimer, whom I had the pleasure of serving with when he was the Superintendent of the Winnipeg School Division — but never once did we have to stagger hours, run schools in shifts, and never once did the Winnipeg Public School system lose a school vote, which I think points out quite highly what the

citizenry of the Winnipeg School Division thought of their board of trustees, that they were fiscally responsible, and not irresponsible, which is what seems to come through from this Task Force report.

It states on Page 76: "Financing of the public school education is in a chaotic state and needs to be revamped." Well, it was the Roblin government that set up the situation, the method of financing. We never changed it in eight years of office. The Task Force believes that the present method of funding and raising revenues by means of local levies provides for little incentive for cost control in exercising rigorous and cost effective management.

Well, boards are only forced to go to local levies for things that they cannot get through the Public School Finance Board and their constituents ask for and want. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that school boards do not go out willynilly for frills and fancy ideas. I can speak with some authority because I say, I was a member for seven years on the Winnipeg School Division, and we took our responsibilities quite seriously. We tried to reflect the needs of the community. I know that the costs of education have risen; they've risen tremendously. The inflation has hit the school divisions the same way it has hit every other level of government, as it has hit every household. Inflation has been a tremendous cost factor.

But I resent very much, when I read in the Task Force report — and because they happen to be the lowest people on the pecking order in public office — the school boards in particular being singled out as being irresponsible and not showing fiscal responsibility. I think that I would like to hear the Minister who is, after all, the chief educator now in the Province of Manitoba, to get up and say that he feels that the boards of Manitoba have been acting in a responsible manner. If he doesn't, then let him say so and let him back it up. But for blanket statements to be made by the members of the Task Force — who incidentally from the information we could elicit from the Honourable Member for River Heights — really never met with too many people in the educational field in the Province of Manitoba.

It's true, there were some people who were on that Task Force that had been members of school boards. Mrs. Olga Fuga is one, she served on the board when I was there, but she left I think a year or so after I left the board. So her contact with the actual workings of how school divisions operate and how they operate here in the Province of Manitoba, will probably be no more up to date than mine.

So I think sometime, somewhere — and I don't care where the Minister answers this — but I think that he should in the days ahead, that we will be having the review of his Estimates, that he should maybe do a little late homework at night, read up the report of the Task Force on education and be prepared to tell us where they are prepared to go philosophically with education in the Province of Manitoba.

It's all very well and good to say we're going to practise restraint and you can practise restraint here by cutting grants and withholding grants because you might feel somebody is fiscally irresponsible, but you've got to prove it and you've got to prove it to this Legislature.

Therefore, I think it's incumbent upon you, Sir, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, that at sometime during your debates — I don't care where you make this decision before your Estimates are passed, hopefully when we come back to your salary — that you will make some tentative statement, one way or the other, about how you feel about some of the recommendations that have been put forth by the Task Force on education. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the first question of the Member for Logan was, I believe, asking where the equalization grants would be dealt with and I would suggest to him that that would be under 3.(a), the Foundation Program and Other Assistance, and we will eventually I suppose get to that item.

His remarks on school boards and so on, I found quite interesting. I should mention to the Member for Logan, I believe it was earlier today or perhaps it was yesterday, that I think spelled out quite clearly my feelings regarding school boards and their service to the people of this province, and my attitudes to that service. I won't repeat it, although certainly it would not bother me at all to repeat that statement.

As far as the Task Force report is concerned, I have not been party to that report in the drafting of those recommendations. As you know, these were done by independent committees. But I can tell the Member for Logan that in due time we will have the opportunity to sit down and give these recommendations careful scrutiny. They are only recommendations and after looking carefully at the basis for the recommendation and the type of situations that would support that type of recommendation, then we would have to make a decision as to the validity of that recommendation as far as implementation is concerned.

The extent of a problem that the Task Force may have seen that caused them to make such a recommendation, whether they're talking about one particular situation, two or three situations, 20 situations, I have no idea at this time until I've had the opportunity to examine the rationale for such recommendations. So any reaction at this time I think would be purely speculative.

As I've said before, I have made a statement during the early part of this Estimate process as to my estimation of the type of service and the quality of the service of school boards in this province, generally, and I think that statement can stand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before I begin with a longer exposition, I'd like to ask the Minister when the question of transportation grants — especially transportation grants to urban school divisions — might best be raised.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Once again, the transportation grants come under 3.(a).

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you. I didn't get a chance to speak before we broke at 5:30, but I felt a bit sympathetic for the Minister; he was sitting there squirming in, I think, very definite embarrassment having been saddled by some very wild grandiose statements by the Minister of Finance.

MR. McKENZIE: He doesn't look to be squirming.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, I saw him squirming before. I feel sorry for him, having been put in that position by a Minister of Finance who made wild statements and didn't have the guts to stick around here to back them up. We have that, not only in this committee, I might add, but we have it in the neighbouring committee. We have the Department of Highways meeting, and the Minister of Highways says that he can't really answer the questions' there's complications but he can't deal with them, we need the Minister of Finance. And he is squirming horribly. We need the Minister of Finance. And where is he? The question is, when we are debating the Budget and when we are debating the Estimates which are very critical items for parliament or a Legislature to discuss, where is the Minister of Finance, and I think in this instance, that's a very, real valid question to ask.

I'm sorry that the Minister of Education is put in that horrible spot, but he can appreciate that we are put in a very difficult spot as legislators by having what I think is a very irresponsible Minister of Finance, who has yet to prove any of his statements statements that he has made so far. I know that the Member for Roblin couldn't, but I think that the Minister of Finance should back his statements. The Member for Roblin is not part of the treasury benches, but the —(Interjection)— perhaps he should be, he's here —(Interjection)— they should make him acting Minister, yes.

MR. McKENZIE: You could have picked that one first. You could have had Finance before Education.

MR. PARASIUK: What the Member for Roblin doesn't understand yet, and I can understand why they removed him as Deputy Speaker, is that in the committee here in the House it's the government side that decides the order. It's the government side. But we have the Member for Roblin being bombastic, outstanding, humorous, and my colleague, the Member for Flin Flon has had some experience in judging the calibre of the Member for Roblin's remarks.

Now, looking at the overall budget estimate for this combined department I notice something quite striking. The department was combined as of April 1st, and I think that combination was quite deliberate because if you look at the overall estimates for this year, there is a fairly insignificant increase, and I think the Minister has raised that before. He said, "I've done my job, we only have an increase of some \$1.1 million." That wouldn't have happened if the departments had been kept separate. There has been some increase to the old Department of Education, but there has been a very definite squeezing and reduction in expenditure for the community colleges division, if you take into account inflation, and there has been squeezing to a degree at the university, but very much so there has been a squeezing with Item 7, and that's Manpower Planning and Development, which is rather shocking in the light of the level of unemployment that we have right now in the province of Manitoba.

It's also quite shocking in the light of the fact that people are arguing that we should in fact be promoting our community colleges more, and that we should be providing more and better alternatives to university education, that we should be providing better trades-oriented and technical training to people so that they would have a better chance in the marketplace to get jobs. While that is being said we find that the very programs that would provide these alternatives to liberal arts education at the universities are being cut by this government, and that's why I'm wondering whether in fact the combination of the department was made as of April 1st.

It's added a bit to the difficulty in trying to reconcile the past departmental expenditures with this new department's expenditures, but it would appear that perhaps it was done somewhat deliberately to confuse the fact, or camouflage the fact that in fact the community colleges division is being held constant and really, very seriously, the manpower development program has been cut back. And it's being cut back, surprisingly, when another department is breaking with past government policy in deciding to give what might be termed government welfare payments to firms directly, even though the Minister, when reviewing the Minister of Industry Commerce's Estimates, had said at that time, "No, we don't do that, we don't believe in that, we don't believe in direct incentives to companies. What we prefer is infrastructure payments, infrastructure development in the communities, we prefer putting our money into manpower and training, that's what we prefer doing." Two weeks after his Estimates go through we're given an agreement which indicates that this government, as a whole, is prepared to put money into incentives, direct cash grants to companies,

while at the same time, in this department's Estimates, is cutting back on those progs which they say are essential, namely more and better manpower training programs for people.

This is when we are having increasing unemployment, and frankly the unemployment will not be improving, the unemployment situation will be getting worse. So I'm interested — and I hope we'll have some time when we get to item 7 — in getting some description of what those specific cuts on the Manpower Planning and Development budget are.

Secondly, I'm very surprised that the community college division would actually get a decrease of something in the order of 8 percent, if you take into account inflation. That again is very, very surprising. We have still not heard a good explanation from the Minister with respect to the recommendations of the Task Force, and again, it's somewhat ironic that we have a Minister responsible for the Task Force tabling the report, which is full of a lot of contentious and half-baked proposals. They aren't totally hot air in that some of them are being implemented. And they're being implemented in what looks to be an ad hoc random manner, and yet if, after we finish this Estimate review of this department, in two weeks or three weeks from now, some of the very recommendations in the Task Force which the Member for Logan alludes to, are in fact brought in by the government, we don't have the same opportunity of discussing the government policy with respect to this department that we do right now. That's why I think it's not good enough for this Minister to say, "I really haven't had time yet to look at that Task Force report." We've had time to look at it, we've had time to see some of the contradictions that exist in that report, especially with the present Minister's policy, and it makes us wonder what we're really doing here when we're reviewing these particular Estimates when they are under a cloud.

I have constituents in my constituency who are members of the school board, who work very hard, who are wondering what their particular status and responsibilities will be, and if the Minister says personally, "Yes, I believe very much in the role of school boards," that's all well and good. I think I would take him at his word for that.

What does concern those members of the Transcona Springfield School Division, however, is the fact that maybe it's the Task Force that is more influential than this government, than is the Minister of Education with respect to educational matters, and that is the problem that exists with this present government, they are stuck with that problem.

People are wondering whether, in fact, it's the Minister of Education who makes decisions with respect to education or whether, in fact, it's the Task Force; whether, in fact, it's the Minister of Health and Social Development who makes the recommendations or makes the decisions with respect to Health and Social Development; or whether it's this outside group — even though the outside group has supposedly disbanded — a number of the recommendations are still being passed. And it might not be \$7.50 a day for a nursing home, it's \$7.00. That's still a step in the direction of the Task Force recommendation.

Just as when you're talking about taking away the powers of school boards, it might not go 100 percent with these recommendations, 50 percent is very bad — is bad enough — and that's something that the Minister, I think, has to do more forcefully than he's done to date, and that is disassociate himself entirely from the set of recommendations contained in this Task Force Report with respect to the Department of Education.

But he's trying to play both sides of the coin. If in fact he can throw out a trial balloon — or the government can throw out a trial balloon with the Task Force that might in fact be injurious to Manitobans and yet maybe there is some type of apathy on the part of the public or they feel they can get away with that action — they will proceed with it. If, in fact, there is a public outcry against it, they back off.

That's not responsible government. That's not government which provides for a clearer definite accountability. I don't know — and the Minister in his previous comments seemed to indicate that he doesn't know either — what is the rationale for these Task Force recommendations? We've never heard them.

A MEMBER: They won't give them to us either.

MR. PARASIUK: And we won't get them. We haven't been given them and I find that very very surprising. —(Interjection)— This is not a professional piece of work, it's amateur hour, and it's tragic that this type of work has to be held as a cloud over the Minister's head and certainly is held over our heads when we are looking at the particular Estimates relating to his department which may, in fact, not be relevant at all six months from now when these recommendations are reviewed by Cabinet. We've never yet received an indication from the First Minister as to when these recommendations are going to be reviewed.

Will we, in fact, get a summarized statement from the government indicating which Task Force recommendations have been accepted; which Task Force recommendations have been rejected; and which ones are still held in abeyance waiting for some better moment to implement that act, whatever recommendation that might refer to?

We haven't received that answer from the First Minister and it makes this exercise of Estimates Review a touch farcical because people are paying serious attention to it. I think they're going through it, but they're finding that what the Minister is recommending in the Estimates isn't necessarily what is being recommended to the government by this Task Force.

We know that given the power of the government organization Act, the government can in fact make decisions regarding these Estimates after we've passed the amounts in the Legislature. Three,

four, five months from now, decisions will be taken by Cabinet in line with the recommendations of this Task Force and we have no way of asking questions about them.

I'm wondering, therefore, whether in fact the Minister then will make a more definitive statement regarding the recommendations of the Task Force; when does he expect that they will be dealt with by Cabinet; when can I tell the school board in my constituency that they will have this dagger removed from over their heads?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, at this point on this item in the Minister's Estimates I wanted to raise three matters, but I will leave one for some other time. So at this time I would only deal with two.

One further comment regarding the Task Force Report, particularly as it relates to the Department of Education. During this Session we have heard comments from this Minister, from others, one, that the Task Force Report either is being reviewed by Cabinet or it has not yet been reviewed by Cabinet, but hopefully the review will be completed at some time in the future.

In fact I believe that the Honourable Minister of this department had indicated that he, personally, has not had the time to carefully peruse the recommendations of the Task Force as they relate to his department. But, Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind you of a statement made by the Honourable Minister yesterday in introducing his Estimates, and I would like to refer you to Page 1332 of Hansard, in the second paragraph of his opening statement when he said as follows: "As the year progresses, we expect to continue to look closely at our operations in the light of the report from the Task Force on Government Organization and Economy." We expect to look closely at our operations in the light of the recommendations of the Task Force.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let's just pause for a moment and consider what the Minister, in fact, had said. He did not say that the Task Force Report is still under review as had been indicated by its Chairman or the Minister without Portfolio who was its Chairman — because he indicated to us that the Task Force has been largely disbanded so therefore we could no longer refer to him in that capacity — but what the Minister is really saying, and I think it's quite clear that the message must have come down from somewhere that here is a Task Force Report with its recommendations and it's going to be implemented, and a directive gone out to every Minister to every department, to adjust and rearrange its affairs and its programs to comply with the recommendations of the Task Force; because the Minister is not saying that he is reviewing the recommendations of the Task Force to see whether or not he's going to recommend to Cabinet their adoption; but he is saying that he is looking at his department, he is looking at the operations of his own department in the light of the report.

In other words, here is a Task Force Report, there are the recommendations, and it appears from the Minister's statement — somebody must have given the directive — rearrange your department and your programs in a manner to comply with the Task Force Report.

So really, even though this encroaches onto the responsibility of another Minister, but it becomes very apparent, Mr. Chairman, that there will be really no point in debating the Task Force Report of that time because the interpretation of the Minister's statement is very clear that as far as the Department of Education is concerned, what the Task Force has recommended, that that is the manner in which this government is going to proceed. And now it's simply a matter for the department to adjust and rearrange its affairs in order to do that which the Task Force recommends.

I think, Mr. Chairman, we have to receive a clear, unequivocal response from the Minister to indicate to this House the exact status of the report. Is the report still being studied by someone? By the Ministers individually? By Cabinet collectively? If I am misinterpreting what the Minister said yesterday then I hope he would explain that, because as I've said, it's very clear, in much the same manner — well let me give another example, Mr. Chairman. I'm sure that last fall, I would presume not long after October 24th, the Management Committee of Cabinet of this government, sat down and decided on guidelines for the preparation of the Estimates. And those guidelines were sent out to the various Ministers. I'm certain that no Minister of any department in looking at the guidelines said to himself, or gave them to his department and asked his department, "Are we going to comply with these guidelines or not in the preparation of our Estimates?" The Minister said to his department, "This was a decision of management committee, this is the way management committee wants the Estimates prepared, and this is the way they ought to be prepared." So then the department took a look at what it had done up to that point in time and rearranged the Estimates' organization in a manner to comply with the request from management committee. I'm sure that the same applies over here, and this is exactly what the Minister is saying, that the Task Force report is there, and now he is proceeding to do that which he must do in order to comply with the Task Force report.

The other point that I wanted to raise at this time, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister, in introducing his Estimates, had made mention of the reorganization of the department, the amalgamation of the previous two into one, with a view to operating his department in a more efficient manner, in a better, I suppose, in a more efficient manner. In looking at the organizational chart which he did include in the Annual Report of the Department of Continuing Education and Manpower — I presume that's the one he was referring to, and I'm looking at page 6 of the report, when he said that that is the chart that indicates the organizational structure of his department as it had become on April 1st. I have a number of questions and some comments to make about it.

Starting near the top, in the Department of Continuing Education, formerly in the Department of Education going back to the days when it did operate as one department, and then more recently when Education operated out of two ministries, there was a position titled "Associate Deputy

Thursday, April 27, 1978

Minister" which recently was in Continuing Education and Manpower. I'm not quite certain from looking at the organizational chart just where the position of Associate Deputy Minister fits into it. I see a slot for Deputy Minister but not for Associate Deputy Minister. One further point, the reason why I raised that question is there is a Deputy Minister, it would seem that the position of Associate Deputy Minister will have to fit in to either one of the three squares on either side of the Deputy Minister, and if not that, somewhere beneath the Deputy Minister, not too much beneath that because then he might have a problem with others, not unless he intends to assign an Associate Deputy Minister to head up one of the blocks of programs and officials with some other title, some other designations to head up others, because looking beneath that there are five from School Program Division, Bureau de l'Education Francaise, Administration Division, and then Manpower Division and Community College Division.

That raises another question in my mind, Mr. Chairman. Will each of these areas be headed by a Director or Assistant Deputy Minister, or what?

When the Honourable Minister spoke of combining the two departments with a view to greater efficiency, it appears, Mr. Chairman, and I'm not going to argue this point at this time — let's assume that greater efficiency could be accomplished as a result of the amalgamation of the two departments — if that were true it would seem that two shops, one in each of the former department would strike me as being very logical to combine into one, would be the administration branches, the finance and administration branches. But I note that in the organizational chart that the Minister has given us there still continue three separate branches. There's a Finance Branch in the Department of Education which basically, as I understand it, will be responsible for the payment of grants and some other responsibilities; then administration support and that I understand, those are the departmental bookkeepers, as it were, and a couple of other responsibilities that aren't too clear to me at this time — Information Services and External Administrative Support Unit. And then there's a Finance and Administration Branch in the Community College Division, so really, Mr. Chairman, what has the Honourable Minister accomplished by way of setting up a more efficient operation when those shops are still continuing independently of each other.

The next question that I have, Mr. Chairman, there are two or three, perhaps somewhat minor ones. I note that between the School Program Division and BEF there's a dotted line which shows that there is some line of relationship between those two areas, and those two operations. That's quite understandable. I can see the need for that, but it makes me wonder why a similar arrangement isn't shown between the Manpower Division and the Community Colleges Division. Now I understand that one of the main responsibilities of the Manpower Division is the negotiation of the Federal-Provincial Manpower Training agreements, but it would seem to me that in order to do that there ought to be a close link between it and the community colleges, a direct linkage there which does not appear to be shown, not of the type as you find between School Program Division and BEF.

Then I note that under Community Colleges Division there's one square shown as programs — I'm not quite certain what that means, whether that means training improvement programs, and there is one other minor one shown in the Estimates, or does it mean something else?

I also wonder, Mr. Chairman, why the Inter-Provincial Training Agreements is put in the Department of Education section, as it were, under Administration Division, Finance, the last line, Inter-Provincial Training Agreements. Now not unless there are some new training agreements of which we are not aware, but if this means the Inter-Provincial training agreements that we're aware of, namely those for the training of veterinarians at the University of Saskatoon, optometrists at Waterloo, dental technicians, then certainly, Mr. Chairman, I think logic and commonsense would dictate that that ought to be on the post-secondary side and not the public school side.

I also note there's a fairly large operation shown within the Estimates under Program Development and Support Services, namely Curriculum Services, \$1,626,000 and that does not appear to be shown in the chart. Now this could be a typographical error, and if it is the Honourable Minister could point that out. I note under Program Development, the second slot, there is Curriculum Development, that appears in the Estimates, then it reads, Consultant Services. Perhaps it should read Curriculum Services, or Curriculum Services and the Estimates should read Consultant Services. I'm not sure but I would like the Minister to clarify that.

My third question that I had, or a third series of questions, but that relates to staffing within this particular branch that comes under this appropriation of General Administration, but I will leave that question until a later time.

One more, with respect to the organization of the department. I would be interested in hearing the Minister's rationale for including Youth Services under Manpower Division. I well appreciate that there are a number of programs that the Youth Services Branch, or what was formerly known as the Youth Secretariat, that it was responsible for, were of a nature that perhaps had a close affinity to the whole manpower area and what could be done under that umbrella. But by the same token it is also involved in a number of programs, particularly some of the summer programs for the core city children and that sort of thing, which it would seem to me really bear very little relationship to the overall range of responsibilities of the Manpower Division. So therefore, I would be most interested in hearing the Honourable Minister's explanation of his rationale for including Youth Services in the Manpower Division.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think I have stated two or three times during this process my position regarding the Task Force report. I won't restate that position for a fourth time. The Meer for Burrows has asked a question regarding the situation on this chart of the Associate Deputies. I can inform him at this time that there is one Associate Deputy heading up the School Program Division and one heading up the Community Colleges Division, an Assistant Deputy Manpower and Assistant Deputy of the BEF. The administration division has a director at this time.

The Member for Burrows has also questioned the placement of several items on the chart, as well he might. I think that in the reorganization of any department of this size, regardless of what organizational chart you may eventually evolve, there will be probably questions that can arise of that nature, saying, "Why isn't this here?" or "Why isn't that there?" In this case as far as the interprovincial agreements are concerned, I suppose personnel has some bearing on why this is in the particular area that it is in at this time, mainly because the personnel there have been working with those programs in the past and is continued in that area because, I suppose, of the personnel.

By the same token, of course, and maybe this is one of the strengths of amalgamation, is it necessary for us to compartmentalize every aspect of education into its own little compartments and say that there can never be any overlap between public school education and post-secondary; that this is something that is rather undesirable? I would suggest to honourable members that it is something that I see as highly desirable.

I think in the past perhaps there has not been enough articulation of this sort, and there has been a tendency for these different areas to be divided and set off by themselves with the idea that they never should get together and that the only way that there can be any articulation between these groups is if special committees are set up, that otherwise, this type of interplay which I think is desirable between these groups, would not take place. So the inter-provincial agreements are resting in that particular area at this time. A small point of course and a matter of wording, Consultant Services can be called Curriculum Services and recognized in that area.

The matter of Youth Services — why under Manpower? I suppose again if we are looking at Manpower as a highly employment oriented function, and I think that is the general way of observing it, then Youth Services does concentrate to a great deal on the whole business of youth employment programs, particularly, the summer youth employment programs. As a result, I think with the majority of their effort being concentrated in that area, the member can understand why Youth Services would logically fall under this particular heading.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: I have got specific questions I would like to ask. Has the Parent Council Grant been discontinued?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, that particular item again comes under 3.(a), and once again are we at this point ranging over the whole area of these Estimates, or are we going to deal with them Item by Item, and deal with these things where they belong? It doesn't particularly upset me to depart from that. I think that we have done to this point, but when we get down to these specific areas there are the proper places that they should be discussed, I would suggest.

MR. PARASIUK: I was going to, in fact, ask a number of specific questions from the Task Force Report because I think a number of the recommendations have, in fact, been implemented in the Estimates. So I will wait my particular turn when we come to 3.(a) or other sections in the Estimates to ask specific questions and I think we will find that a good 50 percent of the recommendations have, in fact, been implemented. I notice that the special programs in Project Branch has been terminated.

There was one large issue though that arose during the last campaign. It is a contentious issue in Manitoba, and it is one that I found the Conservative Party hedging their bets on. Surprisingly, even though it is a major issue facing Manitoba, it was not touched in this Task Force Report. Very precisely, I was wondering if the Minister can give the position of the Conservative Government with respect to public aid to parochial schools. What is the present position of the government with respect to that question?

MR. COSENS: That Item comes under 3.(a). Mr. Chairman, I will be quite prepared to answer it when we get to that Item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a) — the Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister is quite correct, that on three or four occasions he had responded to questions related to the government's position on the Task Force. But, Mr. Chairman, the unfortunate thing is that there is some variance in the answers which he gave, particularly as between the statement that he made in introducing his Estimates, and the answers which he gave following that. If I were to attach a greater degree of credence to any of those, I would be more inclined to attach a greater degree of credence to what he said in his opening statement, because I well appreciate that in replying to questions off the cuff, that on occasion — well as a result of a slip of the tongue an answer does not come out just exactly the way / the spokesman would want it to, but in his opening statement I presume that he had ample time to consider carefully what he

Thursday, April 27, 1978

wished to say to the committee, and drafted it accordingly. And I want to remind the Honourable Minister again that at that time, he said that he expects to continue to look closely at our operations in the light of the report from the Task Force on government organization and economy.

In other words, he's not saying, "I'm going to look at the Task Force report to see whether or not I'm going to recommend it to government to the extent that it may relate to my department," but what he is saying is, "Here is the Task Force report, this is the gospel by which we must live, and therefore all that remains to do is to take a look at the operations of our department and tailor them accordingly." That, Mr. Chairman, is what he said at that time, which is quite different from comments which he made later, when he said that he hadn't had an opportunity to review the Task Force report, when he said that the Task Force report is not yet government policy, and so on and so forth. And other Ministers have made similar comments, because here he is very definitely and specifically stating that he is looking at the operations of his department in the light of the report from the Task Force. In other words, there it is and we have to tailor the operations of our department accordingly. That's the way it comes out, Mr. Chairman, not any other way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1(b)(1)—pass; The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, under General Administration, I presume we can ask questions pertaining to Executive Assistants. I notice that there is in the chart a listing for an Executive Assistant to the Deputy Minister, and also there is some description or reference to Information Services. I would like to know, first of all, whether there is still the position of Executive Assistant to the Deputy Minister, and also could the Minister please describe what Information Services' function is carried out in relation to that position. Perhaps that's another position I can't get clear from the diagram, but I'd like to know to what extent this service duplicates, if any, services rendered by the Information Branch of the government as a whole.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding, and I think the Honourable Member for Brandon East can appreciate that Information Services provide information regarding the department and its activities and the different branches of the department to teachers and other educational bodies across the province.

MR. EVANS: Is the position of Executive Assistant to the Deputy still in existence?

MR. COSENS: Yes, we do have one person with that title.

MR. EVANS: Is that the function of that person, or is one of his functions to provide Information Services; or is this done by staff reporting to the Executive Assistant to the Deputy Minister?

MR. COSENS: It's certainly not a function of the Executive Assistant to the Deputy Minister.

MR. EVANS: I'm looking for some answers, then. How many persons are involved in carrying out Information Services, and could the Honourable Minister describe what sort of salaries they're paid? Also what types of reports and specialized information do they give, which I understand is over and above the more or less general policy information which is issued by the Information Branch, not the government as a whole? I wonder if he could answer those specific questions.

MR. COSENS: I can answer some of them, Mr. Chairman. There are three people, I understand involved in this particular function. I don't have their salaries available at this time, I can get them for the honourable member. One of the publications that they put out on a monthly basis, Education in Manitoba, is probably a publication that's familiar to the honourable member, and such other publications or bulletins that are deemed necessary to go out to school divisions, schools throughout the province, outlining the work of particular branches of the department.

MR. EVANS: If I heard the Minister correctly, then there are three people engaged in Information Services. Is that correct? Yes? Thank you. On the other side of the chart, there is reference to Education Administration Officers, and I find it very hard to understand why you would block off a group of Education Administration Officers; it's a very general description, you could put that description, Mr. Chairman, in almost any one of the categories; somewhere in the boxes below, I'm sure you could find Education Administration Officers. So I wonder if the Minister would explain who are these Education Administration Officers, why are they funnelled off to the side in a staff position rather than in a line position, and what are their functions?

MR. COSENS: I believe the Honourable Member for Brandon East is referring to the annual report of the Minister of Education, 1976-77. What is his page reference, please?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, it's on the inside of the front cover. This is the latest report I believe that is available.

MR. COSENS: The only thing I would remark at this time, Mr. Chairman, this report holds true until June 30, 1977. At that time I was not the Minister of Education, and of course this particular chart is no longer applicable either because we now have had the amalgamation, as I am sure the member is aware, of the two departments. I would refer the honourable member to the annual report of the Continuing Education and Manpower Division, where the schematic diagram outlining the organization of the department is available. I'm saying to the honourable member that this particular chart is no longer applicable to the organization of the department.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, do I understand the Minister to be telling us then that the organizational diagram in the Department of Continuing Education and Manpower provides the amalgamated scheme of organization for the amalgamated department?

MR. COSENS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I believe I made that statement in my opening remarks to the Estimates.

MR. EVANS: I looked through my reports' and somehow or other I haven't been able to find the report of that particular department. I could only find Education. But I'll look again.

At any rate, Mr. Chairman, I wonder, regardless of the particular organization, I wonder if the Minister can advise whether said education administration officers still exist, and exactly who are they and what are their functions — wherever they may happen to be.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, as far as I can determine, the people that the Honourable Member for Brandon East is referring to would now be found in 1.(d) in the Estimates. Under 1.(d) External Administrative Support Unit.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Then General Administration would include . . . Looking at the new chart that has been handed to me, in the Department of Continuing Education and Manpower the administrative staff . . . I'm not clear whether it includes references to finance, certification and records, administrative support. There is reference to that — subdivisions in the chart. But is that the same administrative division that we're looking at when we look at 1.(b) General Administration? Or are there other places to ask these questions? I see there is a sub-item on one of them. That is with regard to certification, but I'm not clear on others such as statutory boards and commissions. This is apart from administration, is it? —(Inaudible)—

I see it under General Administration, then, you have everyone w/ other than staffing related to the public schools finance board. Can we ask questions about the number of staff of the public schools finance board, the number of SMYs this year compared to last year, and so on, under this item? Yes, well then I wonder if the Honourable Minister could tell us how many staff are in the public schools finance board this year compared to last year, and generally what are their levels of grade or their gradings.

MR. COSENS: In reply to the question from the Member for Brandon East, the number of staff in that particular part of the administrative support services of the department is 16 SMYs, and I understand that is unchanged from last year.

MR. EVANS: Could we have some idea of the level, grades, and are there any senior officers, or are there any professional officers, how many clerks, and so on. There must be a breakdown of the . . . In fact, maybe the Honourable Minister could favour us with a complete breakdown of staffing. I believe the Minister of Industry and Commerce provided the members of the committee with a report — two or three page report — indicating the breakdown in SMYs by division or branch, comparing this year with last year, separating more or less normal Civil Service from contract people. Would it be possible, perhaps in the interests of time, for the Minister to undertake to provide us say, tomorrow or whenever, with that type of an itemization?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I have that information and I can provide it tomorrow to the honourable members.

MR. EVANS: Then, if we can be assured that we can get information on the staffing of the agencies, including the Teachers' Retirement Allowance Fund — I presume that's under General Administration item also, although I see the Universities Grants Commission also listed there. I presume that should not be in there because there is another item, I believe, on Universities Grants Commission, or there should be. Maybe not, or is that Universities Grants Commission item strictly for grants; the level of grants per se and not staffing?

MR. COSENS: No, everything in relation to the Grants Commission will be under that item, Mr. Chairman.

MR. EVANS: Just one other question, then. The Frontier School Division, is this under Administration, too, or — I haven't studied the Estimates in detail — do we find this later on in the Estimates, the Frontier School Division staff?

Thursday, April 27, 1978

MR. COSENS: It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that this item again is handled under 3.(a) and the bulk of the funding, and so on, for Frontier comes under that item. It would seem the most suitable place to consider it, at that time.

MR. EVANS: Well, then, I'm not sure whether my colleague wanted a follow-up on that particular item. But the other box, then, relates to research and I presume research is also included under 1.(b) General Administration.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I believe Item No. 2. in the Estimates Book under Education Estimates is entitled Research.

MR. EVANS: Well, thank you. It is so vague, I didn't see it. Okay, thank you very much. I'll ask my question when we get to that one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, re Frontier School Division. Is there any Frontier School Division staff included under 1.(b)?

MR. COSENS: No, there are no Frontier people included under 1.(b).

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, the heads of the . . . I'm not sure what the correct name-tag is of the various . . . I'm referring to the five areas School Program Division continuing reading along that lines. The Deputy Ministers, or Associate Deputy Ministers or Directors — heading them up. Are their salaries contained in some other appropriation or are their salaries shown under General Administration?

MR. COSENS: It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that they are under each separate appropriation.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, thank you. Now, with respect to 1.(b), could the Honourable Minister indicate the total number of approved SMYs. And in light of the comment which he had made earlier this afternoon that there are some SMYs approved but no appropriation for them in the Estimates, I believe Mr. Chairman, the committee would also like to know the number of SMYs approved and provided for in the Estimates, the number filled as of the first day of this fiscal year or the last day of the last fiscal year — whichever snapshot photograph the Minister has of that particular point in time, the number of vacancies, and the number of vacancies in view of the fact that he had also indicated that he does not expect to fill all the vacancies — the number of vacancies within 1.(b) that he expects to fill.

MR. COSENS: It will take us a minute to provide that information, Mr. Chairman. The other alternative, of course, is that I have mentioned to the Member for Brandon East that I will supply a detailed chart tomorrow that I think sets out very clearly the staffing of each section of each sub-department as it pertains to permanent, term, vacant, etc. And if that will fulfill the needs of the Member for Burrows, I would leave that until tomorrow.

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

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think that on this item I have to ask the traditional question that's asked year after year. Would the Honourable Minister please indicate the names of the boards and commissions that are funded under this appropriation. And the amount of the funding for each.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, a number of boards, of course, as the Member for Burrows I know is well aware. First, the Board of Reference and its expenditures estimated for 1978 — \$11,000.00. The Conciliation and Arbitration Board; I don't have the exact Budget Estimate at this time. I can get that for the member. The Collective Agreement Board — once again, I'll have to get him the exact amount budgeted there. We are looking at not a large amount of money, so when you start breaking it down according to the different boards, it is not particularly significant. So, it will take some time to get that information. The Advisory Board Discipline Committee, the English Language Advisory Committee, the French Language Advisory Committee and the Language of Instruction Advisory Council. I have that information regarding the budget allotment for each one of these.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Board of Reference budgeted \$11,000, the Advisory Board \$5,000, the Collective Agreement Board \$500, the Arbitration and Conciliation Board \$5.5 thousand, the Discipline Committee \$500, the English Language Advisory Committee \$500, the French Language Advisory Committee \$500, and the Combination Committee of the two — the English and the French — The Language of Instruction Advisory Committee \$500.00.

I might mention there is very little change in those from last year, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, with reference to the Board of Reference, I would like to ask the Minister a couple of questions and express a couple of concerns of mine, which I had, and of which I suppose I became particularly aware of during the last year or so.

That is this: As the Honourable Minister probably will recall the Public Schools Act allows anyone to make an application to a Board of Reference to have any property transferred from one school division to another. Basically that's what the section of the Act allows an individual to do. Well, it raises the one question that the way the section of the Act reads . . . Although fortunately we have not been faced with any frivolous applications for transfer from one school division to another.

But nevertheless, according to the literal interpretation of the Act, it would seem that I, a resident in Seven Oaks School Division, could make application to have my neighbour's property transferred to Mystery Lake School District — for whatever reason. Now, it's unlikely that the Board of Reference would grant that application, but the way the Act reads I think that the Board of Reference would have to hear it. You know, because there is nothing prohibiting an individual from making such an application.

All right, that's perhaps a frivolous type of application, which is most unlikely to arise. But what does arise from time to time, and this does concern me, is applications for transfer of land from one school division to another are made on the basis of the fact that some parent or some group of parents feel that the school program in the neighbouring school division is more to their liking, that a neighbouring school division offers a better school program. So they want to transfer their property and become taxpayers within it, and send their children there. And there have been applications on that basis over the years. I don't know if there are any before the Board of Reference at the present time on that basis, but if the Honourable Minister would check through the Board of Reference files, he would find that had been a basis for application. What worries me is that allowing — and I really don't have the answer to that, I'll indicate to the Minister at the outset, but I'd be most interested to hear what comment or advice he would have to offer on it — if you allow that type of application to be made, and if the Board of Reference allows the transfer to be made, what is there to stop the same group of parents, a year or two or three years later, to say, "We've changed our mind. What we thought was a better program, we have discovered is not a better program. We want to go back to the school division from whence we came." If it's a matter of a few parents, perhaps the problem may not be all that severe, but if it happens to be a fairly large area, an entire community, then it does create problems for the school division boards, both boards, and their administrative and teaching staff.

So I'm wondering whether the Minister has any comment to make on that particular section of the Act, whether he is reviewing it, whether he shares the concern that I have just expressed, and if he has any advice to offer on the course of action that he proposes to take or is contemplating taking with reference to applications to the Board of Reference for transfer of property from one school division to another.

Now, I well understand that from time to time, situations arise where there is every reason why a certain area of land should be transferred from one school division to another. For example, a new highway, the Honourable Minister of Highways is going to be building all kinds of roads. A new highway is built, and the route that it takes happens to divide a community, or a portion of a community in half. And suddenly it becomes — well, it may create a number of things. Either it provides a better road to another town which formerly did not exist, or it divides a community and it makes one portion of it more closely related to another one, as it were. In an urban community, a freeway is built and through some corner of a school division, and suddenly we find that there are 200 or 300 homes where it makes more sense to include them in another school division. That arises.

In fact, we have a problem similar to that in Winnipeg. I don't believe that that portion of Winnipeg has been transferred to the Fort Garry School Division, but I believe there's some arrangement down south of Grant somewhere — I've forgotten the exact location — but there's one portion of it, I think it's railway tracks or something that cuts it off from the Winnipeg School Division, but a Fort Garry school is more accessible to that community, and hence, an arrangement is made. Well, I could see that type of a situation, perhaps even leading to — I'm not saying that that will be the answer over there, but that type of a situation, could merit transfer from one school division to another. But it does bother me when people apply for transfer on the basis of their assessment of the quality or the content of the education program in one school division as compared with another.

In fact, it would seem to me that at least theoretically speaking, there could be a sequence of applications to the Board of Reference, with the ultimate result of the complete erosion of a school division. You could nibble away at the same school division, block by block, section by section, township by township, to one school division and to another, until eventually you have no school division left, and I don't believe that there is anything in the School Act that could prevent that from happening. There may be. And if there is, I hope that the Honourable Minister would indicate that, not only for the benefit of the committee and for what he and I may learn out of this, but I think this is something that may be of interest to the people of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, to the Honourable Member for Burrows, I had been under the impression that the Board of Reference operated very smoothly and it did not have to deal with frivolous situations, that problems of the nature that he mentions were not, in fact seldom encountered, and really the Board functioned quite smoothly over the years. Now, whether he is

dealing with real situations that he has encountered or whether he is probably anticipating those that could occur, I don't really know, but certainly up to this point, the information I have received from this board is that the type of cases they are dealing with are legitimate and deserving of hearing and really no problem at all has surfaced in this particular area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, perhaps the Minister missed the point that I was trying to make. I'm not concerned about the likelihood of frivolous applications being made to the Board of Reference. I simply mention that, just simply to indicate that according to my interpretation of the Public Schools Act, there is nothing to prevent a frivolous application from being brought forth. And if one were, I don't think that the Board of Reference would be able to say to the applicant, sorry, we're not going to deal with you. That is not my main concern. My main concern is applications for transfer from one school division to another on the basis of the applicant's assessment or evaluation of the quality or the content of the education program. I think if the Honourable Minister is unaware of cases of that kind, then perhaps he may want to take some time and check with the chairman of the Board of Reference, or the secretary and just acquaint himself with the type of applications that the Board has had to deal over the years, and we may be able to come back to this point when we deal with his salary, if another opportune moment should not arise earlier.

That is my concern. The Honourable Minister will find that there have been applications on that basis. In fact, some have even gone beyond the Board of Reference and gone to court, and that essentially was at issue. One example, in Seine River School Division, the application, that really was the long and the short of it, that was the crux of the application, that the applicants felt they wanted to transfer from the school division within which they were to another school division because they felt that that school division will offer them the type of education program that they would feel more comfortable with, that they felt would better meet their needs. —(Interjection)— Yes. No, I didn't say that. I said the applicants for the transfer. And that was the long and the short of it. It's that type of thing which has happened, and the Minister, if he will check, will find that that has occurred in many cases, and it's the fact that the present legislation allows for that type of application to be brought forth on that basis, and the Board of Reference may or may not grant it. There is an appeal provision. The appellant body, the court, or whoever it may be, may or may not grant it. But it may. And my concern is, you know, the ping pong effect that may arise. You transfer and you live in your newly inherited school division and send your children there for two or three years, then you say to yourself, "Well, the program here isn't as good as I thought it was, I'd rather go back to where I came from." And then the transfer back.

As I've said, if it's a matter, and the Honourable Minister will find that this has occurred too on occasion, the application may involve only one or two or three families, and for very valid reasons suddenly a new road appears on the other side of their farm and makes another town and another school division more readily accessible to them than where they were sending their children to formerly, all right, I can well understand that. But when you have large blocks making application for transfer from one school division to another, then it could create problems. That really is my concern, not the frivolous application. I agree with the Minister, we haven't had any yet and hopefully we wouldn't, but it's the one I've just described.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)—pass; (d)(1)—pass; (2)—pass; (d)—pass — The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could elaborate on the function of this particular unit as it's set up here. External Administrative Support Unit. It can mean many things, but I'd like to know precisely what function does it have. It looks to be new, I don't know. Maybe not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, to the Member for Brandon East. He is partially correct. He is referring to the External Administrative Support Unit that I alluded to in my introductory remarks. This is a group of people that we have put together from the present department. These are people who were employed by the department, some 13 professionals and three support staff, who will be fulfilling what we consider a rather vital function through the province. The basic function is one of liaison, but also beyond the function of liaison and appraising function, an analyzing function, and of course they would also be people that would be available to conduct reviews, either at the Minister's or at the division's request. They would be people who could perform or conduct special analysis and evaluation tasks from time to time as assigned by the Minister or his Deputy, and people who can assist school divisions and the schools in problem solving, or in any support activities which may be required from time to time by these same school divisions or the personnel of the divisions. And of course, also to assist parents if they encounter difficulties in their communication with their school system or have problems that can best be dealt with by the department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, is this sort of an updated, modernized version of a position

which at one time used to be known as a school inspector, or a revised, remodelled version of it?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the Member for Burrows, I would certainly not describe this unit in that particular way, any more than these are people who are out in the field, through the province, through the regions of the province, and if he identifies, if that's his checkpoint, then there is that resemblance that these are departmental personnel spread throughout the province. But I would suggest to the Member for Burrows that really this administrative support unit is not something brand new, it probably is something we could describe as an augmented administrative support unit. I understand that people performing these functions, some four or five have existed for some time. I believe there were one or two situated at Thompson, one at Dauphin, one at Brandon. I'm not sure if there was someone in Winnipeg serving a similar type of function. So actually what we have here is not something completely new to the department, but certainly a unit that has been added to, has been augmented, so that it serves the whole province.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Chairman, specifically are the persons who were previously classified as school inspectors to be found now working in this unit and being paid salaries of \$375,800.00? Are these persons those individuals who were previously classified as school inspectors?

MR. COSENS: The people who compose this particular External Administrative Support Unit, Mr. Chairman, to the Member for Brandon East, have a variety of backgrounds. I believe there may be two or three of the members although I am not sure of the number of the people serving in this unit who may have had a background that was classified in the way that you mentioned.

MR. EVANS: I heard the Honourable Minister's description of their function, but I'm still a bit puzzled as to whether this is, you know, a type of an appendix organization that could easily be dropped without hurting the functioning of the main body and I'm all in favour of additional decentralization and so on but meaningful decentralization — and I don't know whether one person here or two people there in various regional centres of the province really add much. I'm still not clear to what extent that this support unit is going to make the administration of this department more effective, more efficient. Can the Minister demonstrate that he is going to save money by this particular organization or can he demonstrate that he's going to get greater efficiency out of whoever he wishes to get efficiency out of in terms of the educational delivery system in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I think one of the main advantages to the people of Manitoba and to the students in the schools of this type of service, is that it brings the Department of Education directly to the people in the province.

There is a tendency, when you have a large office located in Winnipeg, that it has a tendency to become a bit remote from the people it serves. I think there's a certain feeling of frustration that can set in among the clients of the department in that particular way.

Having External Administrative Support Unit people assigned to different areas of the province and working in those areas does overcome some of that frustration of the clients of the Department of Education.

I would see that as one of the chief advantages. It also, of course, is a way in which the department can assess how successful some of its services that it's providing are in the matter of delivery. It can assess how effective the grants are that we send out to school divisions and so on. The assessing quality of this type of person, I think, can be valuable to the department in its complete operation.

It also, of course, has several other functions that I've mentioned. I think the feedback aspect to the Minister and to the department of what is happening in the schools and in the school divisions is possibly another of the very important functions. There is a tendency for the department to become isolated, I would suggest, from what is actually taking place in the schools and in the school divisions of the province, and by having people from the department out among those schools and among those school divisions, talking to the people who work in these particular functions, I would suggest, will overcome some of that isolation and should result in a much better delivery of services.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister's description sounds very good and it's very interesting. But assessment services very much sounds like inspection to me, you know, inspection by another name perhaps of a different type as opposed to going into the classroom and watching the teacher perform or what have you, of a different type of inspection, inspection of special programs perhaps, spending of moneys for special purposes and so on.

I'm a little perturbed though, at the Minister's description of helping to overcome isolation or a feeling of isolation in the field to remove remoteness and so on because it seems to me, other than perhaps applying some sort of therapy role, I don't know how such staff can overcome that unless they have an opportunity to make decisions. You know, it's fine to have somebody out there to complain to but if those persons aren't in a position to — if not make decisions, you know, have an important impact in the making of decisions — then their value and their role is rather limited in my view. And I say that, having some experience with large organizations, having a large bureaucracy in a central city and having seen how the field operation has tried to work. I appreciate the problem of

remoteness but I really wonder whether this specific function can be effective unless the individual person here who is doing the assessing, has the ear of the Minister or the Deputy Minister, you know, can influence policies or programs, and so on. I mean, otherwise their role is maybe that of a therapist going out listening to people's complaints and problems but doing very little to overcome them, within the organization.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the Member for Brandon East that, again, another one of the functions of people in this particular unit would be the interpretation of policy, and quite often this has been an area where I feel the department may have suffered in the past; where people working out in the divisions have not been clear on the actual meaning or implications of policy and have often laboured with a certain amount of concern that they are not moving in the right direction in relation to the policy of the department, and so on, and wondering exactly what it is.

In the small schools' area, in particular, there have been special needs and concerns that have been met by people doing essentially some of these functions, people from the department who have travelled among the small schools and have tried to work with them to overcome some of their problems. I would see again that this type of a relationship and this type of function is something that people living in urban areas may not find quite as necessary. They may not have that same feeling of isolation from those services. But certainly those outside the urban area feel a great need for this type of service.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Chairman, could the Minister explain whether the External Administrative Support personnel would be functioning or liaising with school superintendents? Essentially, I gather not, when he refers to the need to communicate with the small schools. Do they go around the school superintendents and go right to the school principal and school teachers or do they deal perhaps at two levels, with school superintendents and in other types of divisions, deal directly with the schools? I'm not clear. Who do they interface with essentially? Anybody in the school delivery system or is it superintendents or the principals or the teachers?

MR. COSENS: I think, Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned to the Honourable Member for Brandon East, school boards, administrators and I believe the superintendents there as the administrators, school staffs and parents. Not necessarily in that order but I would imagine that people in these units would be working very closely with school superintendents who are the main educational officers in the school divisions and the people who are most concerned — perhaps that's not the best way of putting it — but primarily concerned with the interpretation of departmental policies.

MR. EVANS: Just one final question on this subject then, Mr. Chairman. This is a relatively new part of the organization of the Department of Education or the combined department, will the Minister be monitoring the value and success of this particular unit? Will he be able to satisfy himself, let's say, a year from now that it is accomplishing more or less what he hopes it might accomplish? I appreciate it's very difficult to measure some of these things, very difficult, because it can be a very qualitative problem. It's not simply a matter of counting numbers, of how many visits were made to how many towns, how many teachers were spoken to, and so on. But can he satisfy the House or can he tell us that he will be evaluating this, let's say a year from now, to see whether this was a good idea or not?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, let me assure the Member for Brandon East that we certainly will be evaluating it and talking to the public that this particular unit will be serving in this first year, realizing of course that it is not staffed that adequately in the light of the financial parameters under which we work, the number of staff is not great. I suppose there could be some argument that there should be twice as many or three times as many people to do this type of job adequately. But we look on this, certainly, as augmenting the four or five people who had been attempting to do something similar in certain areas of the province in previous years. If four or five were attempting to do it in certain areas what we're now providing are a staff of 13 to attempt to provide this service in more areas of the province.

We will be evaluating it and I anticipate that a year from now that the Member for Brandon East will be asking me as to the reports on the performance of that particular group and I will be very pleased at that time to report to him the response that we received from the public that are served by that particular unit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Did I understand the Honourable Minister to say that in this appropriation he is going from a staff of 4 to 13?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, to the Member for Burrows. This particular unit will be made up of 13 professional staff. There were, as I understand, some 4 people in the Department of Education in previous years, who were performing a similar function.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that when the Honourable Minister brings a

staff breakdown as requested for the whole department, appropriation by appropriation, tomorrow that we'll be in a position to make a better comparison and analysis of the staffing changes which had occurred, because I'm still not quite clear about that, because looking at the dollars the Honourable Minister will note that for the fiscal year just ended there was appropriation of \$326,800.00. The increase is only something in the order of a bit less than \$50,000; \$375,000 and some odd dollars. This also brings another question to my mind. Well, firstly, in my own mind this doesn't square with the staff figures that the Minister had given us a moment ago, nor do the other expenditures seem to square with the increase in salary. The appropriation for salaries is an increase of something less than 20 percent, closer to 16 or 17 percent whereas the increase for other expenditures is about 75 percent, going from \$43,300 to \$75,000.00. So perhaps the Honourable Minister would want to explain that.

Now, just a comment or two further to the questions raised by my honourable colleague, the Member for Brandon East. This is one appropriation that, well, as the Minister has indicated, he will be monitoring very closely and I think that all of us will be monitoring this branch very closely. Because I would suspect that of all the branches within his department this probably is one of the most sensitive ones, a branch the purpose and function of which is most likely to be misinterpreted by many: by teachers, by trustees, by the community at large.

Where the Minister may have one objective in mind that he is hoping that his staff is doing, but what is happening in the field becomes misinterpreted. What the Minister may think amounts to nothing more than perhaps an information collection to enable the Minister and his staff to do a review and analysis of a program will in fact be interpreted as merit rating of a school division, merit rating of a teacher, merit rating of a superintendent, or merit rating of the overall performance of a school division, or whatever.

So we will be watching this very closely and perhaps one year from now we will be in a better position to have a more meaningful debate on this particular point, after the Minister will have had one year under his belt in operating in this fashion and be able to report back to us on his success and his accomplishments in this particular area.

One final question, though. If I should happen to stumble across someone employed under this appropriation entitled External Administrative Support Unit, how would that individual likely introduce himself to me so that I would know that he is employed under this appropriation? Would he call himself an external administrative supporter? An external supporter — no, that doesn't sound quite right, does it, Mr. Chairman. —(Interjection)— An intellectual supporter, as the Honourable Member for St. Johns suggests or the Honourable Member for Brandon East. Will he simply introduce himself as a school inspector? What are you going to call these creatures?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Burrows brings up two or three items. He has some apprehension, and I find this a little startling in that, as I have mentioned before, this is not a new concept to the previous government. They had four or five of these people operating in the school divisions over the last number of years, and I don't think we had people running around with the concerns that he mentions at this particular time.

I should mention to him in relation to the salaries — and I believe he mentioned some concern here — that the salaries that you find under 1977-78 for these people are the salaries that they were earning in their previous function within the department; and the expenses, I believe he reflected on the increase there, because these people of necessity will be doing more travelling because there is more of them than the four or five who existed previously. Of necessity the increase in expenditures exists in 1978-79 in the Estimates.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Can we take it, then, Mr. Chairman, that by virtue of what the Minister has indicated, although he still hasn't told me what these people are called — external supporters or what — can we take it then, from what the Minister has said, that it is not his intention to preserve the old position of school inspector which the Honourable Minister may know, and to refresh his memory he may read Hansard over the past few years, that I was of the impression that it was the position of his party to retain the position of school inspector. In fact, the honourable member may find, in reading Hansard and in reading through Votes and Proceedings, that on one occasion the position taken by his party was that either we employ school inspectors or we vote against the appropriation which would have paid the salaries of former school inspectors employed in more meaningful and relevant positions — more meaningful and relevant to the needs of the day. That when the debate ended on that particular appropriation, which covered the salaries of many who at one time were school inspectors, the position taken by the Honourable Minister's party was to vote against it, which had the vote passed then of course there wouldn't have been the funds to even employ those people in any capacity. That was how strongly the Honourable Minister's party felt about the position of school inspector. So I would like to know whether he feels equally strongly about that position, whether it is his intention to eventually reinstitute the traditional position of school inspector or is it not, but, as an alternative route, this is the route that he is choosing to proceed along.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I think I have outlined in some detail the functions of this particular unit to honourable members. If the Member for Burrows sees some resemblance there to the people he refers to as school inspectors, I will leave that to him. I suppose some of the functions that were performed at one time by the people who are called school inspectors can be found in this area although I believe if he goes back to his experience some number of years ago and I go can go back to

mine, one of the main functions of the people that were called school inspectors was the assessment of teachers.

I would assure the Honourable Member for Burrows that that is not the function of the people in this particular unit at all. That assessment is left to the local school division.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I am a bit confused. The Minister advises us that there has been a large increase in the number of staff and yet the numbers of dollars additional for this year compared to last year is not that great. I wonder if he could explain. Perhaps these were the salaries those people were paid elsewhere in the department last year, and they have been grouped together?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I apologize if I didn't make that clear; I thought I had mentioned that to the Member for Burrows. The salaries that you see under 1977-78 were the salaries that these people earned in their former positions within the department, and the 1978-79 are the salaries that they will be earning this year. Whether the difference is significant or not depends on the members interpretation. The GSI, of course, is added into the 1977-78 salary part, it is not added into the 1978-79, as he knows.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (e)(1)—pass; (2)—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I note that this item 1.(e) covers several different headings. I wanted to bring up a matter under the first heading there, Teacher Certification, and ask the Minister if there has been any change in the policy, or whether he is going along with the present one, or whether he has discussed it at all? I want to tell him quite frankly that I had a difference of opinion with his predecessor on this matter and I have a particular interest to see whether it is being continued or whether it has been changed.

Perhaps it would be easiest if I just outlined to the Minister my understanding of the situation, and he can tell me if there has been any change in the regulations or whether I am correct in my present understanding of it.

I am told, Mr. Chairman, that for a teacher to get a permanent teaching certificate in Manitoba it is necessary to be a Canadian citizen. For those teachers who do not have that citizenship, for example, landed immigrants, they can be assured a temporary or interim certificate — I'm not sure of the proper term — for a time of two years, which can then be subsequently renewed for a further two years and a further two years on top of that, making six years of teaching in Manitoba. And that at that time no further extensions are given, except in very particular circumstances. And that if a teacher has by that time failed to take out his Canadian citizenship he is then no longer able to continue his chosen vocation and has to look for other work. —(Interjection)— I don't want to get into foreign ownership of land, which a colleague of mine has just mentioned.

I tell the Honourable Minister that that is my understanding of the situation. If there has been any change, perhaps he would tell me, and I would invite him to comment upon this past policy and tell me whether there has been any change in it.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, to the Member for St. Vital, there has been no change in the policy in that regard at this time. I must assure him that I am surprised to hear that this is a great concern. It is certainly not a concern that has been expressed to me by anyone in the profession or outside of the profession, since I have taken on this responsibility. If there are concerned publics, I haven't heard from them to this point.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, do I take it then that the Minister is not inclined to change the policy unless he gets, you know, representation from people about it?

MR. COSENS: Well I have had the first representation this evening, Mr. Chairman, from a concerned individual and it is certainly something we will look at, but I was not under the impression that this was an areas of any great concern at all in this province.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When he says it is not a matter of concern, perhaps it is not now as much as it was. But I understand that when the policy was changed it affected some perhaps 1,000 or 1,100 teachers at the time. In other words, when the limit was put on on the number of new interim certificates that could be issued, I understand that about that time the Manitoba Teachers' Society was in agreement with that particular policy of limitation. But since that time, either last year or the year before, that there was a motion at their annual general meeting to change this policy and that was approved, I think, by a substantial margin.

I will, while I'm up, just draw the attention of the Honourable Minister to the Human Rights Act, which deals with employment and tell him just as an aside that when I looked into this previously I did have discussions with the Human Rights Commission, who further looked into it and sought a variety of legal opinions — one from the Attorney-General's Department which said that it was legal. I later spoke to the Legislative Counsel who told me that he was of the opinion that the Human Rights Act

would apply in this case.

I would just read Section 6(1) to the Minister. It says, "Every person has the right of equality of opportunity based on bona fide qualifications in respect of his occupation or employment, or in respect of training for employment, or in respect of an intended occupation." And then there is a little more done there not limiting the generality of the foregoing. And it ends up, "because of race, nationality, religion, etc., etc."

I suggest to the Minister that the word "nationality" there really means the same thing as citizenship. If the person has a nationality and of a particular country, he has the citizenship of that country.

One of the legal opinions that the Human Rights Commission was given was that the two words did not mean the same thing. Now, it was never explained to me just what the difference between nationality and citizenship was.

Another reason that was put forward in this case, Mr. Chairman, was that it was not the government that was hiring the teachers, in this case. So that the matter of certification for the teachers which was done by the government did not apply because the government was not employing the teachers, it was the school boards who were employing the teachers. So they could not be held responsible, and neither was the government responsible, in terms of the Human Rights Act.

But, you know, the legalities apart, Mr. Chairman, the Human Rights Act, the whole essence of it, the whole theory behind it, the intent of the whole Act, is to prohibit discrimination. And yet this is exactly what the government is doing. And it is the government that is discriminating in this case, by refusing to give a teaching certificate to a teacher after six years.

I would invite the Minister, too, to consider what other areas there are in society where the government gives a licence to a person to carry out his intended occupation, trade, or profession, where citizenship is a factor. Surely if someone is to be licensed to be shown to have reached a certain degree of competence, it is that degree of competence which should be the deciding factor and not the colour of a piece of paper in a person's pocket.

So, I would invite the Minister to read over Part VI 1. of the Human Rights Act — in fact, the whole Act — and maybe give this matter his consideration and, you know, consider what he is doing to those people who, for whatever reason, as landed immigrants do not wish to take out their citizenship or whom would lose pension rights in their country of origin if they took out Canadian citizenship. And this has been a factor in some cases I know.

Let me just add one further point to that, and ask the Minister whether he considers that our children would be somehow contaminated by a foreigner coming into to teach them in our schools. And, you know, maybe it could be put forward like that, that someone is bringing in foreign ideas and somehow subverting our children. But if that is the case, why is that teacher being given an interim certificate in the first place? I understand that the interim certificate is based upon his teaching qualifications, and that's all. And if the Board of Certification finds that his teaching qualifications are all right for two years, why not for two more years and two more years, and however many years beyond that.

I leave that with the Minister, and he can either respond to it now, or give it a little more thought and tell us later on.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I must tell the Member for St. Vital that this is an area that I have not been personally acquainted with and I will certainly take his suggestions under advisement and take a look at this particular area in the future.

He may be interested to know that the federal Department of Immigration will this year not allow teachers to come into Canada with a work permit, but only to come in as landed immigrants. So, this point again adds even further to the situation which he is highlighting.

MR. WALDING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make it clear that I was not referring to teachers in the country on any sort of temporary basis, or on a work permit basis, but to landed immigrants in Canada.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of questions. Yes, records comes under this appropriation. I believe, Mr. Chairman, though not unless some change has come about since October 24th, but prior to that there was an in-House committee' chaired by the director of our archives, and I can't recall offhand who else sat on that committee, but it was that committee that prescribed the guidelines and criteria for the preservation of records and documents, the destruction of documents — those which could be destroyed, just taken to the incinerator and burned, and those which should be microfilmed and then the originals could be destroyed — and that sort of thing.

The Honourable Minister knows that a department such as the Department of Education does accumulate all sorts of records over the years and, you know, I would suspect that if one digs around, one may find evidence of some honourable members in this House that failed Grade 1 art, or Grade 1 phys. ed., or music, you know, or whatever, and that still remains there.

So my question to the Honourable Minister is: What are the guidelines at the present time within his department governing the keeping of records? In other words, what records are kept, for how long, when are they destroyed, and that sort of thing? Because I do believe, Mr. Chairman, and I

would think that the Minister would agree with me, that you do reach a point in time when whatever value there may be in keeping certain records, it ends, it ceases and there is no point in continuing to keep that record or those records.

My other question to the Minister is . . . And I am a bit concerned about this, about this particular power that he has, because he may exercise it in a manner that may prevent me from getting back into the teaching profession, if I should ever decide to do that. The Minister likely knows that under the Education Department Act he has the power, he may make regulations . . . Yes, this is Section 6 Subsection (1) Subsection (l) "make regulations respecting the qualifications, including physical qualifications of teachers."

So the Minister may pass a regulation, you know, stating that those entering the teaching profession must be at least six feet high, weigh no more than 150 lbs., have black hair, and have all the physical attributes, be better looking than I, have all the physical attributes that I lack.

To draft a regulation in such a matter? Very simple, Mr. Chairman, very simple.

I'm just wondering, Mr. Chairman, whether the time . . . And I'm not being critical of the Minister. Perhaps this is something that we ought to accept some of the blame and ought to have taken a closer look at this. But I really do wonder about, you know, the wisdom or retaining that particular section in the Education Department Act.

In fact, if the Honourable Minister should think that I am speaking facetiously or in jest, I really am not. Certainly not in this day and age. And the Honourable Minister, I'm sure, knows that over the years, there has been an increasing number of physically handicapped people entering the teaching profession and doing a first-rate job. And, you know, I really do wonder how a handicapped person, suffering whatever type of physical handicap, how he feels knowing that in this education system there is someone sitting in the Legislative Building who has the power . . . Well, he doesn't even have to go to Cabinet, he can do this on his own, on his own initiative may pass a regulation prescribing certain physical qualifications that some individual may not be able to meet, and thus be deprived of his opportunity to practise his profession.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm allowing the Honourable Minister to answer the question.

MR. COSENS: Very well, Mr. Chairman, just very briefly, on the matter of records mentioned by the Member for Burrows. I understand that these records are kept now on microfilm, the teacher records, as well as the student mark records. And I can inform the Member for Burrows that I am not aware of any particular destruction schedule for old records that exists. It is something that I will certainly look into and see what has been the practice in the past years in this regard.

I am also interested in his reference to the particular legislation that has him rather apprehensive about what might happen, in his case in the future. However, apart from the jest, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that we hope to bring forward a revision of the School Act, hopefully next year. I understand that Ministers of Education have been saying that for some time. I would hope to go on record as one who makes it a reality. And matters such as this type of legislation that may or may not be out of date and no longer relevant, will come under consideration. And perhaps at that time the Member for Burrows will no longer have to fear that some legislation of this type would prevent him from re-entering the educational area.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I want to revert, in part, to what was said about the powers within the department to indicate the prerequisites or qualifications of teachers, as specifically to the comments made by the Member for St. Vital, to tell the Minister that I was not aware of this regulation within the department. I think it's just a ministerial decision, apparently; I don't think it has been passed in any way by legislation or even by Order-in-Council, although that may be the case.

I was not aware of that until fairly recently. We have started in our caucus to discuss this question, because the implications are very broad. We have, in government, the Department of Health and Social Development and the Department of Labour, which sets out very many occupations, the requirements and qualifications of people in very many occupations in the province. And there may be a special case that could be made for teachers because they deal with young and impressionable minds. I'm not saying that in a really serious vein. But I am saying that there should be some reconsideration given, and if we are going to get a new Public Schools Act and if, indeed, we are and this Minister is going to bring it, I think it would be a good idea for him to get maybe some of his backbenchers to work and start meeting and discussing this issue, which I think is a very large issue.

Mr. Chairman, some years ago — quite a few years ago — I made a study of various professions licenced by legislation. I found that a veterinarian had to be a British subject. A doctor did not. Apparently to treat an animal you had to become a citizen or be a British subject, but to treat human beings you had to have qualifications that indicated you had the knowledge necessary to treat human beings. I found that you could be a pharmacist if you had applied for citizenship, you don't have had to have it. In the Law Society, you must be a citizen. The reason is suggested that you are an officer of the court and to be an officer of the court you have to swear allegiance to the Crown, and I suppose you could swear allegiance to the Crown if you are not a citizen, but still there is that point.

Well, the whole question of qualifications, real or arbitrary, I think is a matter of concern in society, with the mobile society that we have. There is a big fuss raised now about whether or not universities should employ Canadian teachers or give preference to Canadian teachers. Now I gather that the

Federal Government is not permitting teachers to come on work permits. I suppose that's a protective measure, like tariffs, and is not necessarily a question of how you qualify a teacher, because the ability of a teacher surely is not influenced by whether that teacher is here on a work permit, or on landed immigrant status, or as a citizen. So really we are starting to, and have apparently for some time, considered that a teacher is inadequate or incompetent or dangerous unless that teacher becomes a citizen.

We know, Mr. Chairman, firstly, that citizenship is a status that one should desire to possess. I think that I would not encourage a person to become a citizen if that person did not have the community feeling of spirit, feeling of loyalty, feeling of desire to make a permanent home in Canada. I would not like to force a person to become a citizen. I would rather that person wished to be a citizen, to exercise the vote, to become an elected member of a body that serves the public, but to want to do it and not be forced to do it. I think that should apply in all cases, and I have grave doubts whether it's right to exclude people from teaching or exclude them from law, or exclude them from practising medicine — I don't think there is such an exclusion — but there ought to be a rationale about it, and the fact that the question hasn't been raised to this Minister until today, is an indication that it's not a pressing issue. But the fact that it's not a pressing issue doesn't mean that we ought to ignore it.

I must say, Mr. Chairman, that since I learned of this particular departmental decision less than a year ago, it's been sort of bothering me. I can't say it's been the overriding and dominant concern that I've had in that period of time, but it has bothered me that I have not participated in a real discussion about the rights and the wrongs of this kind of restriction.

The Member for St. Vital raised it, I think we will have opportunities to discuss it. I would suggest that those Ministers who have that responsibility, and I mentioned three of them, but I'm sure there are more that are involved in setting qualifications of various trades groups in the province, should take it on as a moral and ethical responsibility to consider that. Look at the fuss that is being raised in this province today about foreign ownership of land. Should there be foreigners allowed to own land, should there not? It's something that is a matter of principle to some extent and in other regards, it is a matter of economics.

So I would urge the Minister to start looking at this matter, not tomorrow, he may have something to do tomorrow. But I'd say within the next month, he should think about it, within two months he should think again. Really, I'm a great proponent of putting backbenchers to work. Having been both, I know that Ministers have a great deal of worrisome day-to-day responsibilities, and cannot undertake a long-ranging and almost a philosophical debate amongst themselves. I would urge the Minister and others Ministers who have that kind of responsibility to start within their Caucus to discuss this, and maybe eventually — and if they don't, maybe we should from this side — suggest that we set up a committee of the Legislature to sit between sessions, to discuss not specifically teacher certification but the general policy. Maybe the first thing one has to do, and resources have to be made available, is to do a study on what is the existing situation in various groups and professions. I have to tell you that I have started such a study and I have certain information which I would be very pleased to make available to anybody who is seriously prepared to study the overall question.

Now that the Minister has heard from at least two people and I think a third, expressing an interest in having this matter reviewed and discussed, I hope he will not brush it aside as being something that nobody has brought to his attention, but I hope I've convinced him and others of his colleagues who may have listened to me that this is a study that is worthwhile, that is morally right to review and to consider the implications as far as individual people are concerned. When we give somebody landed immigrant status in Canada, I do believe that that person is entitled to earn a livelihood within the country, and when we give landed immigrant status, that person is liable to go to war for us, he doesn't have to be a citizen for that purpose, so I think that there are considerations.

I am however, conscious of the fact that in teaching, above all, one has to expect certain dedications and loyalties and that's why I don't come down hard and fast to say, "I know the answer." I haven't studied it enough. But I think Canadians should be studying that and particularly the Minister of Education who has accepted the responsibility which involves certification to make sure that he doesn't just accept what was done in the past as being right because it was done in the past, but looks at it afresh.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, I would just like to add a word or two in support of the comments made by my colleague, the Honourable Member for St. Johns. I, too, would urge him to urge his Caucus to initiate such a study dealing with the matter of citizenship as it relates to qualifications, be it the practice of this profession or any other. I agree with the Honourable Minister that problems of this kind are not all that numerous, that it's unlikely that his office is flooded with complaints about this particular section wherever it is, that makes it mandatory for teachers to acquire Canadian citizenship prior to obtaining a permanent teaching certificate, but nevertheless, the problem does exist, and if the Honourable Minister had not heard of it, he did tonight, and the Honourable Member for St. Vital, and I am aware of it. I will indicate to the Honourable Minister that I had agonized over it and I well appreciate the position taken by teachers. The advice that the Honourable Minister may receive on this, the long and the short of what the Minister may hear is, well, what the hell, if a person wants to earn a living here in Canada, and all the benefits of the public purse, let him or her become a Canadian citizen, but if the Honourable Minister checks into the matter, he will find that there are many cases where the teachers will find themselves in in this predicament. There may be other

Thursday, April 27, 1978

people in other professions where there may be a citizenship requirement, who do have a perfectly valid and a justifiable reason for not wanting to become Canadian citizens.

The case that comes to my mind, it's one of a lady who came to Canada, commenced teaching under the existing arrangement, subsequently married, renewed her teaching certificate every couple of years — somewhat under protest because she wasn't convinced of the rationale for this requirement, but nevertheless she did it because she had a teaching job — then she had the misfortune of losing her husband not long after their marriage. She is at the point in time where she really is uncertain whether she wants to continue living in Canada or return to the United States. At the present time she is still in Canada, but she would like to keep her options open, perhaps for economic reasons too. It might be to her advantage to return to the community where she was born and raised in the United States at some future point in time. I think if she became a Canadian citizen she would be one of the finest citizens that we could have but there are these other considerations that she has in her mind that prevent her from taking the step to become a Canadian citizen and abandoning her American citizenship.

So the Honourable Minister will find, I'm sure he'll find numerous cases of that kind, and if he takes a look at them and sits down with those on the staff that deal with this matter and relates it to qualifications, other professions, and as the Honourable Member for St. Johns has suggested, I know the Minister is a busy man, perhaps this should be an assignment that the backbenchers could undertake and eventually, as he had indicated, lead to a committee of this House to consider and bring back recommendations on. I would like the Minister to consider that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (e)—pass; f—pass. The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it may be a good opportunity to ask that the committee rise. We will consider that Section (f) has not been passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Considering Section (f) not be passed. (Agreed) Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

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

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield that the report of Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned until Friday morning at 10:00 a.m.