



**Third Session — Thirty-Second Legislature**  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

---

**DEBATES**  
and  
**PROCEEDINGS**

---

33 Elizabeth II

---

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



**VOL. XXXII No. 19A - 2:00 p.m., THURSDAY, 10 MAY, 1984.**

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Second Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

| Name                                 | Constituency       | Party |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|-------|
| <b>ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)</b>        | Ste. Rose          | NDP   |
| <b>ANSTETT, Hon. Andy</b>            | Springfield        | NDP   |
| <b>ASHTON, Steve</b>                 | Thompson           | NDP   |
| <b>BANMAN, Robert (Bob)</b>          | La Verendrye       | PC    |
| <b>BLAKE, David R. (Dave)</b>        | Minnedosa          | PC    |
| <b>BROWN, Arnold</b>                 | Rhineland          | PC    |
| <b>BUCKLASCHUK, Hon. John M.</b>     | Gimli              | NDP   |
| <b>CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.</b>       | Brandon West       | IND   |
| <b>CORRIN, Q.C., Brian</b>           | Ellice             | NDP   |
| <b>COWAN, Hon. Jay</b>               | Churchill          | NDP   |
| <b>DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent</b>      | St. Boniface       | NDP   |
| <b>DODICK, Doreen</b>                | Riel               | NDP   |
| <b>DOERN, Russell</b>                | Elmwood            | IND   |
| <b>DOLIN, Hon. Mary Beth</b>         | Kildonan           | NDP   |
| <b>DOWNEY, James E.</b>              | Arthur             | PC    |
| <b>DRIEDGER, Albert</b>              | Emerson            | PC    |
| <b>ENNS, Harry</b>                   | Lakeside           | PC    |
| <b>EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.</b>        | Brandon East       | NDP   |
| <b>EYLER, Phil</b>                   | River East         | NDP   |
| <b>FILMON, Gary</b>                  | Tuxedo             | PC    |
| <b>FOX, Peter</b>                    | Concordia          | NDP   |
| <b>GOURLAY, D.M. (Doug)</b>          | Swan River         | PC    |
| <b>GRAHAM, Harry</b>                 | Virden             | PC    |
| <b>HAMMOND, Gerrie</b>               | Kirkfield Park     | PC    |
| <b>HARAPIAK, Harry M.</b>            | The Pas            | NDP   |
| <b>HARPER, Elijah</b>                | Rupertsland        | NDP   |
| <b>HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen</b>        | Logan              | NDP   |
| <b>HYDE, Lloyd</b>                   | Portage la Prairie | PC    |
| <b>JOHNSTON, J. Frank</b>            | Sturgeon Creek     | PC    |
| <b>KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene</b>          | Seven Oaks         | NDP   |
| <b>KOVNATS, Abe</b>                  | Niakwa             | PC    |
| <b>LECUYER, Hon. Gérard</b>          | Radisson           | NDP   |
| <b>LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling</b>     | Charleswood        | PC    |
| <b>MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al</b>       | St. James          | NDP   |
| <b>MALINOWSKI, Donald M.</b>         | St. Johns          | NDP   |
| <b>MANNES, Clayton</b>               | Morris             | PC    |
| <b>MCKENZIE, J. Wally</b>            | Roblin-Russell     | PC    |
| <b>MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)</b> | St. Norbert        | PC    |
| <b>NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)</b>          | Assiniboia         | PC    |
| <b>OLESON, Charlotte</b>             | Gladstone          | PC    |
| <b>ORCHARD, Donald</b>               | Pembina            | PC    |
| <b>PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.</b>  | Selkirk            | NDP   |
| <b>PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson</b>         | Transcona          | NDP   |
| <b>PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland</b>     | Fort Rouge         | NDP   |
| <b>PHILLIPS, Myrna A.</b>            | Wolseley           | NDP   |
| <b>PLOHMAN, Hon. John</b>            | Dauphin            | NDP   |
| <b>RANSOM, A. Brian</b>              | Turtle Mountain    | PC    |
| <b>SANTOS, Conrad</b>                | Burrows            | NDP   |
| <b>SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic</b>           | Rossmere           | NDP   |
| <b>SCOTT, Don</b>                    | Inkster            | NDP   |
| <b>SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)</b>           | Fort Garry         | PC    |
| <b>SMITH, Hon. Muriel</b>            | Osborne            | NDP   |
| <b>STEEN, Warren</b>                 | River Heights      | PC    |
| <b>STORIE, Hon. Jerry T.</b>         | Flin Flon          | NDP   |
| <b>URUSKI, Hon. Bill</b>             | Interlake          | NDP   |
| <b>USKIW, Hon. Samuel</b>            | Lac du Bonnet      | NDP   |
| <b>WALDING, Hon. D. James</b>        | St. Vital          | NDP   |

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 10 May, 1984.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

## OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding:** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . .

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

**MS. M. PHILLIPS** introduced Bill No. 7, The Central Trust Company Act, 1984; Loi de 1984 sur la compagnie du Trust Central.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before Oral Questions may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery. We have 38 students and four adults of Grade 8 standing from the Major Pratt School. The visitors are under the direction of Mr. Fowler. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

There are 55 students of Grade 9 standing from the John Pritchard School, under the direction of Mr. Kroeker and Mr. Penner. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for River East.

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

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### K-Cycle Engines

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

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Industry Trade and Technology.

I would ask him what kind of response he has, what kind of report he can give me and the House, as to the efforts combined by him and me to save the technology of K-Cycle Engines for Manitoba and not have it lost to this province? He must have an answer from some federal officials by now. At least I would hope he does.

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

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There was a reply just recently from the Federal Minister responsible indicating that he has passed on our concerns to the Federal Business Development Bank. Outside of that I'm not aware of any further developments with respect to the K-Cycle Engine.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, can the Minister confirm or advise as to whether he has had recent

meetings with Mr. Haakon Kristiansen, one of the principals, of course, with Dr. Gordon Trick and Barry Mitchell of the Minister's own department with respect to the possibilities of a loan guarantee?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have not had any further meetings with the individuals named, since the last time I responded to a question from the honourable member which was I believe in excess of three weeks ago, was the last time I met with Mr. Kristiansen. In terms of any further developments at a staff level, I would have to take that as notice and find out if there's been any further discussions at a staff level with him.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary, just so that I understand the scenario. Is the Minister saying that he still has not heard back from the Honourable David Smith, the Federal Minister of Small Business? Is that what the Minister is saying in his responses this afternoon?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** No, Mr. Speaker. I indicated in response to the earlier question that we did just recently receive response back from the Federal Minister indicating that he has asked officials of the Federal Business Development Bank to meet with our officials to discuss this matter further. I would be pleased to provide him with further information in regard to that response.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Because of the importance of the technical expertise developed through K-Cycle Engines and the importance of retaining that expertise and that technical capability for Manitoba, if at all possible, can this Minister pin the Federal Minister down to a time frame as to when officials of the two departments will be meeting to address this important economic subject?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Mr. Speaker, as indicated, we will do whatever is possible within reasonable limits with respect to that development to try to maintain that technology here in the Province of Manitoba. As I've indicated in the past, we are prepared to explore options with the individual involved with that technology. We are interested in looking at other alternatives, or other interested parties that may be willing to work on that technology here in the province. We are prepared to and have had discussions with federal officials and we will continue to do so, Mr. Speaker.

### Emerson, Town of - census

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

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Attorney-General and it relates to the Town of Emerson. The question, as related to the population census figures that were taken by the

town and a billing of \$41,000 for police services - which is substantial bill to the community - and the town having taken a consensus on their own, is the Attorney-General prepared to accept the population census that the town has taken on their own?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** I thank the member for that question. For some time now our method of assisting towns, villages, municipalities, and policing includes as one of its criteria, towns and villages having populations under 750 will receive policing free. In order to make that effective, we have used StatsCan data, but we're not wedded to that in the face of evidence to the contrary, and if in fact the town's population is below 750 that is what will guide us. I'm prepared and I'll consult with my colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, but we'll take some initiative in meeting with town officials to see what methods can be arrived at that are satisfactory to verify the population, and indeed if the population is under 750, then it will be eligible for free policing, so we'll certainly take some action on it.

### Careerstart applications

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I thank the Attorney-General for the answer.

I have a further question to the Minister responsible for Careerstart. I wonder if the Minister could indicate how many applications have been made under Careerstart and how many have been rejected, because I have many complaints that I'm receiving, Mr. Speaker, on people that have made applications and have been rejected.

For example, in the Village of Grunthal there have been four different applications, only four within the community, from community organizations and all have been rejected. I wonder if the Minister can indicate how many applications have been made and how many have been approved and rejected.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Employment Services.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, I will have to take the question as notice to get the precise number of applications received under Careerstart. I can advise the honourable member, however, that the program is more popular than ever before and we've virtually been overwhelmed with applications.

I anticipate us spending a larger amount of money this year than in previous years and hopefully creating more jobs than in previous years, but we have to live within fiscal constraints and there's a limit to how money we have and an effort has been to distribute the funds as equitably as possible.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Can the Minister indicate what the criteria is for applications under the additional \$5 million that was funded into the Careerstart Program?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Those criteria were the same as the criteria that we had for the initial allotment.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister.

In view of the additional funds that were allocated to the program, those people that have been rejected, can they reapply under the additional funding that has been made available to the Careerstart Program?

**HON. L. EVANS:** I'm afraid that we have allocated all the funds that we have now available.

### Gross domestic product

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

**MS. M. PHILLIPS:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Employment Services and Economic Security about the recent report from the Conference Board of Canada.

Is it true that the previous predictions for Manitoba's gross domestic product has been revised upward and where did those contributions come from?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

Questions should be on subjects that are within the administrative competence of the government. Perhaps the honourable member would wish to rephrase her question. The question was out of order, an answer to it would also be out of order.

### Payroll tax

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

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance.

The Minister of Finance has exempted businesses, agencies with payrolls under \$50,000 and some graduation above that and there will be refunds coming to some of those people, but it's my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the department has adopted the policy that they will not make the refunds until the end of the year. Would the Minister reconsider that decision and make the refunds as soon as the applications can be made and processed?

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

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Speaker, we're dealing here with a relatively small amount of money. It works out to, I believe, around \$30 per employer on average that has been paid in, \$30 or \$35 per employer.

What we have to keep in mind is that if we were to follow that procedure, we would have a whole host of employers who are in that position where they're not really sure whether they're going to be over or under, and there'd be some money coming back, \$30 coming back, to the employer and then at the end of the year the \$30 flowing back. It doesn't really make a great deal of sense to do that. We're using the calendar year and we believe that will make things simpler. It is not a large amount of money. It would involve a fairly extensive amount of administration to go through the process now and at the end of the year again. There doesn't seem to be any logic in that.

We reviewed that before we made the decision as to how to proceed, and we must keep in mind as well that this is an unusual situation in that we are providing for a retroactive decrease in taxation, so at the end of the year people will be able to do their accounting and will be able to see exactly how much is owed by us to them or by them to us.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, would the Minister consider an alternative then, and that would be paying interest on the refunds when they're made at the end of the year?

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** That's, I think, a reasonable request and something we will take under advisement.

### Jobs Fund - Dept. of Natural Resources

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Natural Resources. Last year, many departments of government were asked to transfer salary funds into the Jobs Fund. My question to the Minister of Natural Resources is, how many dollars were transferred out of his department into the Jobs Fund?

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

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable member for having given me notice during the course of my Estimates, and I indicated to him that I would take it as notice. I also indicated that perhaps it would be better to deal with all of that under the Estimates of the Jobs Fund, but I have no objection to dealing with the question now. It is true that during the course of negotiations with the Government Employees Association there was an agreement reached that the employees would forgive, turn back to the government, a substantial amount of money amounting to \$9 million government-wide that otherwise they were entitled to in respect to agreements that had already been reached with government.

Within the Estimates of the Department of Natural Resources, monies were provided in the '83-84 Estimates that were passed by this House for those salaries of staff of the Department of Natural Resources. Our allocation, the sum that was determined within the department to be therefore available to the Jobs Fund from the Department of Natural Resources was \$1,097,200.00.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, just so that I understand this correctly, this is in addition that the MGEA contributed into the Jobs Fund, that the government transferred \$1,091,000 (sic) out of salary allocations within the department, or is that part of the \$10 million?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, I want to correct what I said. I think I indicated about \$9 million. It was between \$10 and \$11 million. I thought I made it quite clear, I'll try it again. Of that \$10 to \$11 million, the allocation, the amount attributable to Natural Resources of Estimate money, including salaries that was appropriate to Natural Resources was \$1,097,200.00. So of the \$10 or \$11 million, \$1,097,000 was attributable to Natural Resources salaries.

### Peguis Indian Reserve

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

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to my friend, the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Speaker, I awoke this morning to a CJOB radio news broadcast upon which a Director of Operations, Mr. Clarence Daniels from the Peguis Indian Reserve, confirmed the question that I asked of the Minister yesterday in the House, that the Minister had indeed some time ago at a band council meeting advised the Peguis River Indian Band to burn down the bridge that they thought ought to be replaced. Can the Honourable Minister confirm for me as to whether or not he believes Mr. Daniels is telling the truth?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. That is surely an improper question for Oral Question period. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I change my question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. Was he telling the truth in the House yesterday?

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

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The purpose of question period is to solicit information respecting matters under the jurisdiction and administration of members of the Executive Council. I draw, Sir, through you, to the attention of the Honourable Opposition House Leader Citation 362 In Beauchesne which reads in part: "It is not good parliamentary practice to communicate written allegations to the House and then to ask Ministers either to confirm or deny them. It is the Member's duty to ascertain the truth of any statement before he brings it to the attention of Parliament."

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the member chose yesterday to ignore that citation, I would ask you, Sir, to ensure that he does not do so again.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable First Minister.

Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister, statements have been made by what I believe to be responsible officials of the Peguis River Indian Band that have suggested in a public way that a Minister of the Crown, an MLA for the area, has given them advice to burn down public property. I would ask the First Minister whether he would not consider that serious enough to conduct an internal investigation as to whether or not that transpired . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. H. ENNS:** . . . whether he's prepared to instruct some discipline . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. Order please.

The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. Order please.

If members can control themselves, perhaps we can hear the honourable member who has been recognized by the Chair.

The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, once again the member in his question brings allegations to the House asking a Minister, in this case the First Minister, to either confirm or deny them, and he clearly identifies in the preamble to his question that he has not ascertained the truth of the statement that he has brought to the House. In fact, Sir, he brings something from broadcast media and from third parties and asks that it be confirmed in this House. Mr. Speaker, that clearly is a breach of our rules for debate.

But more directly, Mr. Speaker, now in his specific question to the First Minister, I refer you to Citation 316 (e) and (f) which prohibit members in debate while speaking, it certainly applies to question period: imputing bad motives or motives different from those acknowledged to the member; or making personal charges against a member.

Mr. Speaker, the nature of the questions posed by the honourable member bring allegations to this House which he cannot confirm to this House in making them, and certainly bring to the style and character of debate in this House a new low, of a type I hope honourable members will not top.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside to the same point.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Yes, on the same point of order, Mr. Speaker.

I can't - and I'll check Hansard - recollect that I was making any charges. I was seeking information, information that came through to me legitimately from the public media sources and from people directly involved. Mr. Speaker, I wonder how much closer we would be to the truth of McKenzie Seeds operations had my colleague, the Member for Turtle Mountain, not been able to ask similar questions some time ago in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, my question is once again to the First Minister. Will he be prepared to examine the situation and take any disciplinary actions if they're necessary?

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very very clear that the Minister was asked this very same question yesterday by the Honourable Member for Lakeside; that indeed I want to support the comments made by the House Leader. It was abuse, the privilege of this House yesterday - was today. The Minister responded, very clearly yesterday and very honestly, no.

What does the Member for Lakeside want again, Mr. Speaker? - for a further denial of the allegations that were made. If the Honourable Minister wants to carry this on, I would suggest that he leave this Chamber and repeat the charges outside this Chamber.

### Education funding

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. Order please.

The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Honourable Minister of Education. Mr. Speaker, in reference to the Minister of Education who replied to my question on Tuesday regarding aid to private and parochial schools, she said, if the member opposite wants to talk about insults he might talk about what is insulting the people of Manitoba, members of the opposition who did nothing when they were in office, stand up in this House and ask for increased aid to private and parochial schools. Can I ask the Honourable Minister if she won't apologize, at least acknowledge the fact that in 1977 when the Schreyer Government left office, private and parochial schools were gaining some \$477,000 in advances to their school system? Over the four years of the Lyon Government, that aid to private and parochial schools in this province escalated to a figure of some .29 million. Will the Minister either withdraw her statement or apologize or acknowledge those facts, Mr. Speaker?

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. Order please.

Matters of historical fact are not subject to questions at Oral Question time in the House.

The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, then can I ask the First Minister or his Minister of Education if they are prepared today to search their souls once again and give us the facts of what kind of dollars this government is going to provide to private and parochial schools in this province in the year ahead?

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, the Member for Roblin-Russell obviously wasn't in the House when the Minister of Education responded to this very same identical question a week ago, and the Honourable Minister of Education responded very very clearly at that time that that announcement would be made along with the other grants that are to be announced by the Minister of Education during Estimates.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A final question, to the First Minister. Can I ask the First Minister if he has already acknowledged the 412 petitioners from the Roblin area who are patronizing St. Vladimir's College? Has he answered their letters? Has he answered their concerns? Has he phoned them,

and has he discussed any matter at all about their concern about the funding that school, an important school in this province, one of the great schools? Has he given them any indication at all to their request for what kind of dollars they can expect in the year ahead?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I thought that a few seconds ago, and I would rely upon your judgment, but only a few seconds ago I indicated the answer to the question, the answer to the petitions, would be delivered at the time that the Honourable Minister of Education deals with their Estimates in the House.

### Legislative Library

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River East.

**MR. P. EYLER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Cultural Affairs.

Last week the First Minister assured this House that his government would do everything possible to maintain public access to the Legislative Library. Can the Minister of Cultural Affairs inform this House what implications this has for departmental policy regarding the provincial library?

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

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the member for his question. I would like to point out that the government does not have any intentions of closing access to the Legislative Library to the public.

As has been indicated, we wish to avoid duplication of services which are available elsewhere. In line with our government's priority of fiscal responsibility, we are exploring means within the overall current levels of funding for my department, which would enable the library to maintain its services. This exploration is under way through an examination of the library's current role services and operations. I might point out that such reviews are ongoing activity within the department.

Although, we'll not be closing services to the public, adjustments may be necessary in order to continue efficient operations and to avoid non-duplication of services that may be available elsewhere. In the course of this work I will ask officials of my department to liaise with users of the library system, with university libraries, and other libraries to look at ways we can all work efficiently and effectively together to avoid duplication of services between various libraries in the province.

I should also point out, Mr. Speaker, that the Manitoba Legislative Library is one of a few that provides total access to the public across Canada in terms of legislative libraries. Let me reiterate that our government will ensure that there is public access to our Legislative Library.

### Tonn Report

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Urban Affairs.

In light of the Tonn Report which has recommended that the expropriation be halted on north of Portage until the development corporation comes up with more specific proposals, does the province plan to go along with the Tonn recommendations?

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

**HON. M.B. DOLIN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, the province is studying the Tonn Report at this time and there are certainly suggestions contained within that report that are meritorious and deserve a consideration.

We will be reporting to the public on our recommendations shortly, as soon as we have had the time to consider the report. It was, as you know, only delivered this week and it's a lengthy report and deals with many aspects of the case.

We will also be conferring with our colleagues who are also shareholders in the North Portage Development scheme.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, in light of the Minister looking at the proposal and the fact that it is indicated that if the expropriations don't go ahead, what then happens to the signing of the tripartite agreement?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The question is hypothetical as posed, perhaps the honourable member would wish to rephrase her question.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Mr. Speaker, all indications are that the development may well not go ahead if the government chooses to go along with the report, and in light of the fact that the merchants have had their expectations raised by the hearings, and that the Minister called the hearings, why would the government go through this charade when there is the possibility of having the expropriations turned down?

**HON. M.B. DOLIN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that there is a substantial threat to the existence of the North Portage Development Corporation. I don't believe that in our considerations of the report from the inquiry officer that there is a suggestion that the core of Winnipeg just be allowed to exist and deteriorate as it is. That is not the situation.

There are recommendations that have been made in the report and all of those recommendations may be made to fit very nicely together and the property owners and the tenants that were allowed to appear before the enquiry officer may be very pleased with the result. It will take consultation and there is a time allowed before the consultation must result in a decision. That's been put in place for an obvious reason. We will proceed as quickly as we can because we know that people are anxious to have an answer, but it takes time to appear before the enquiry officer, and then it takes time for the parties to determine the direction they will go having received the report.

### Legislative Library

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

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Cultural Affairs following on the previous question.

Is it not a fact that there is, in fact, little duplication between the Provincial Library and other libraries and that as much as two-thirds of the material available there is not available anywhere else?

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

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, as I indicated, there are materials that are in the Legislative Library that are not available elsewhere. There are other materials that are available in just about every major library in the City of Winnipeg, and it's our intention to look at the overall operations of the Legislative Library to ensure that there is a non-duplication of costly services, but on the other hand to provide that there is access to members of the Legislative Assembly who have first access and who are making use of the overall mandate and the first mandate of the Legislative Library, and also to government branches and to the public.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, in that consideration is the Minister considering a slight reduction in the normal working hours of that library rather than a closure?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, there is a review being undertaken of the operations of the library. I would expect some time this summer to have recommendations from that review in terms of how to continue the operations of the Legislative Library and to ensure that it is efficient and is not duplicating services where they may be duplicated, and until such time as I receive that report, I can't look ahead with some magic crystal ball and know what recommendations may be given to me by staff.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, since money is undoubtedly one of the main problems being confronted in the case of the Legislative Library, is the Minister going to curtail his practice of throwing around large grants, some as high as \$50,000, to some of Manitoba's multicultural community in an attempt to solicit support for the government's policies? Is he going to curtail that practice and use some of that money to keep the Legislative Library open?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'm rather shocked at the preamble to that question to suggest that money that is provided to assist various ethno-cultural organizations in the province, which I might add, is usually a very small part of the overall efforts that those broadly-based community organizations raise for purposes to provide services, to provide buildings, to suggest that money is being thrown around, I think, is an insult to the various community organizations that exist in the province, Mr. Speaker, to help their broader communities to be part of this great country of Canada, this province, and to continue with some of their own cultural heritage in this country. Because I think that while we are a country made up of various peoples and we have a Canadian identity, what makes us strong as a country and as a province is the cultural mosaic that we have in this province. I think that government has a role to assist

those organizations in a small way, so any suggestion that that money is being ill-spent, I think is an insult to those community organizations, Mr. Speaker, and is an insult to what all of us I think in the House - except maybe that member - endorse as government policy, that being the recognition of multiculturalism in this country.

### Grants - multicultural community

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask the Minister how he can explain, in view of what he's saying, the fact that only a few months ago he held an assembly here in this building for several hundred people from Manitoba's multicultural community, presented two extremely large cheques at that time and then treated everyone to a selling job on the government's French language proposals. I ask him whether he can explain the apparent attempt by him and his department to solicit or influence the multicultural community through large grants?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The question is of an argumentative nature. Perhaps the honourable member would wish to rephrase his question to seek information, rather than explanation or an opinion.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I simply ask the Minister if he can explain how it is on one hand he is handing out large cheques to members of the multicultural community, and at the same time making speeches in support of the government's French language policy, whether that doesn't look as if he's trying to influence friends and win support?

### Ice storm - clean-up costs

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. That is the same question.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Government Services responsible for Emergency Measures.

In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that he's committed the province to pay for personal losses, under the policy of the government to assist individuals in losses in the last storm, and in view of the fact that we, as members of the opposition, are continually getting reports of losses of livestock numbering up to seven head of cows and eight head of horses in individual's herds, Mr. Speaker, through suffocation of snow two weekends ago, will the government be paying compensation to those people who have had such tremendous losses?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**HON. A. ADAM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

First of all I want to reject the Member for Arthur's preamble when he said that I gave a commitment that we would be providing assistance for losses as a result of the recent storm. Mr. Speaker, I have, on numerous occasions, advised the honourable members that our



staff is now monitoring and attempting to find out the estimates of damages that have occurred from municipalities. So far we have had very few requests from private individuals.

The municipalities have been advised to forward their estimates of damage and once we know the extent of the damage that has occurred, we will then be in a better position to assess if it's of such a magnitude that it can be declared a major disaster. We know that Hydro has suffered substantial losses but we do not have all the information as yet, insofar as municipalities are concerned and insofar as private individual losses are concerned.

The latest information I have from my staff is, as far as losses by private individuals, that it's not that exorbitant, but that still can be changed as time goes on and until such a time as we can assemble this information and analyse it, it's pretty difficult to give a commitment as the members are requesting.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister is saying he's trying to accumulate the information, will he consider applications from those farmers and those individuals who had livestock losses through suffocation and that type of loss? Will he consider and allow those applications to come forward for consideration, Mr. Speaker?

**HON. A. ADAM:** Mr. Speaker, I think the normal procedure is for the individuals to contact their municipalities and advise them of the extent of their losses. They have been invited - and I have said it on a number of occasions and I'm prepared to say it again and I'll be prepared to say it tomorrow again - that we're inviting all those individuals and municipalities to forward their claims and if they are of such a magnitude that it constitutes a major disaster, then they will be given serious consideration, as they have in the past, in the usual manner.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, so that I'm clear on the record and can communicate with my constituents, would it be fair for me to ask the Minister of Government Services, would it be proper if my colleagues and I were to put out a press release saying to those farmers who had losses, contact the local municipalities, indicate your losses, and they will be forwarded to the Minister of Government Services, so that compensation can be considered? Is that a correct procedure?

**MR. SPEAKER:** I don't think it is a proper question to ask the Minister whether the honourable member should release or not release any press release.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I will ask the Minister of Government Services if he will direct the public as to how they apply for compensation due to the fact that they lost large losses of livestock in the recent storm? Will he be making a public statement, other than the bafflelegab he's giving us in this Assembly? Will he do it publicly and set up a procedure so the public understands how to get compensation?

**HON. A. ADAM:** Mr. Speaker, the assistance has been provided since 1950 in disasters that have occurred,

whether they be flood or drought or other disasters that have taken place since 1950, and that is 34 years ago. I'm sure that most municipalities are aware of the procedures that are followed. It is impossible for our staff, the Emergency Measures Organization which is only a very small staff, to canvass every farm in Southern Manitoba to find out whether they had any disasters. Mr. Speaker, surely one would expect if any individual has lost, as the Honourable Member for Arthur indicates, seven or eight head of livestock as a result of a storm and can be attributed to that, surely they will come forward and say, look I've had a loss. Mr. Speaker, they should certainly come forward and we invite them to do so and we will take under consideration all those claims that come forward in the usual manner.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

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

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

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order respecting question period today, particularly questions asked by the Honourable Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Speaker, during that series of questions, the Honourable Opposition House Leader displayed in his hand what appeared to be a cassette tape and since I know the Honourable Opposition House Leader would not improperly bring an exhibit into this House, I take it, Sir, it was a document in electronic form and would ask you, Sir, whether or not it is appropriate to ask him, in view of his reference to taping of a CJOB program this morning, . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** . . . if the honourable member is prepared to table the document which he displayed in this House, which I take it was not, Sir, an exhibit.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please.  
The Honourable Member for Lakeside to the same point.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, on the same point.  
I also have my wallet with me, a package of cigarettes. Goodness gracious, how paranoid can people become!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please.  
The Honourable Government House Leader to the same point.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, our rules and practices in this House are very clear. Exhibits are not allowed. Therefore Mr. Speaker, we can only assume that the object being waved by the member was a document in electronic form.

Now, Sir, if the honourable member is telling the House he has no such document I withdraw my point of order.

But, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member was implying to this House that he had something on a cassette tape which he was waving in this House, I think it is fair under our rules, and under our practices which require members to table such documents, to ask the honourable member the character of the document if he has one, and to table that document.

If the honourable member says, Sir, he has no document other than his cigarettes and his wallet, and a blank cassette tape I withdraw any objection and withdraw the point of order.

But, Sir, if he claims that he has a document that he waves in the House I think members have the right to ask to have that document tabled.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please.

If the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek has a point of order perhaps he would rise to his feet and speak.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside to the same point of order.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, speaking to the same point of order I can only ask you, Sir, to peruse the Hansard of the earlier question period to see whether there is absolutely any case that the House Leader is making, whether I made any reference to any particular material, or exhibit, or whatever, Sir. I simply don't understand what the Government House Leader is up to.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General to the same point of order.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture to the same point of order.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Honourable Member for Lakeside intimated during questions to me that there were tapes of a conversation that I had made, Sir. I went over after question period and asked the honourable member whether there were such kind of tapes, whether he had taped my conversation, or there were tapes alluding to the allegations that the honourable made in this House. He denied having any such tapes.

Today, Sir, in this Assembly, in his hand he held a tape intimating and alluding as he was asking the question, and casting aspersions on myself, Sir, in terms of — (Interjection) — well, Mr. Speaker, I answered the questions that the honourable member posed as I recall them.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member raised the question of tapes yesterday. He held a tape in his hand which I saw. Mr. Speaker, I ask the member to put that tape on the table so that all honourable members can see what is in that tape.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General to the same point.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the same point.

Members of the opposition appear to think that this is a matter of some levity. I would simply point out that

it is a — (Interjection) — well, since they don't understand levity, that it is a laughing matter.

I would point out, Sir, that on several occasions in this country it has been held in contempt of court for someone to stand up and do exactly that type of thing, purport to have an exhibit and address the jury, in this case the media, and then upon being questioned by the judge it was clear that it had no such exhibit, and was attempting to mislead. I'm saying what has been held in the halls of justice in this country, and with good sense, to carry out that kind of demonstration which it was obvious to all of us, and held up for the press to see. Then when being questioned about it by the House Leader to say, oh, I've got just a wallet, and a package of cigarettes, i.e. to say to the House in effect I deny I have such a tape, compounds the felony in my view.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside to the same point.

**MR. H. ENNS:** On the same point of order and to be of any further assistance to you as to whether or not there's any substance in the Honourable Government House Leader's request I certainly did allude to tapes.

I provide you, Sir, and the House with further information, and all the information that I have, with respect to tapes, that a tape was confiscated by the RCMP from Radio Station CFRW that had to do with the matter under discussion. I had to do with an interview by the Director of Operations from the Peguis River Indian Band about the burning of the bridge, Mr. Speaker. Now beyond that I made no further reference, made no further charges or use of the word tapes.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to peruse the Hansard of the earlier question period to see whether or not there is any substance to what the Honourable Attorney-General is talking about, or any substance to what the Honourable Government House Leader's talking about.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader to the same point.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

On the grounds of the explanation of the Honourable Opposition House Leader that he has made no reference to tapes that he personally has in his possession and therefore the honourable member has no tapes that he is prepared to table in this House, I can only conclude, Sir, that the honourable member was, against our rules, using the tape as an exhibit and that he has no document from which he is quoting.

Mr. Speaker, on that assumption - and I take the Honourable Member for Lakeside at his word - I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that in the future members desist from the use of exhibits in this Chamber unless they're prepared to table those documents.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please.

Since the House seems prepared to drop the matter and is not asking for a ruling it's not intended to be one, merely an observation. The Honourable Government House Leader is quite correct in saying that we have a rule against exhibits in this House. However, the word "exhibits" is not entirely clear as

to whether it applies to cups of coffee, magazines, newspapers on occasions, reports, maps and other things.

The honourable members might be — (Interjection)  
— Order please.

The material referred to has been called a letter in the form of a tape. Rule 29.1 referring to a letter says "Where in a debate a member quotes from a private letter, any other member may require the member who quoted from the letter to table the letter from which he quoted." I heard no quotation from any letter, or a citation, or that it had been cited.

Citation 327 Sub (2) says "It has been admitted that a document which has been cited ought to be laid upon the Table of the House, if it can be done without injury to the public interest. The same rule, however, cannot be held to apply to private letters or memoranda." Since nothing was cited from the alleged document, it would appear it is not necessary to table it.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### ORDER FOR RETURN NO. 1

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

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to request an Order for Return as it appears on the Order Paper.

I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, that an Order of the House do issue for the return of the following information:

(1) All costs incurred in establishing the Manitoba Beef Commission, including salaries and expenses of Commissioners.

(2) All costs incurred in operating the Manitoba Beef Commission from the establishment date to March 31st, 1984.

(3) The number of cattle marketed by the Manitoba Beef Commission from the establishment date to March 31st, 1984.

(4) The method used by the Manitoba Beef Commission to establish the price of cattle sold by it, and the names of those who have purchased cattle from the Manitoba Beef Commission since the establishment of the Commission.

(5) The premiums paid by farmers to the Manitoba Beef Commission and the pay outs made by the Commission to contract holders.

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

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, we're prepared to supply the information requested in the Order, subject to the normal caveat to Item (4) with regard to confidentiality on third party transactions. I understand from the Minister that he does not expect there will be any problem, however, providing the names, but that clearance of course should be obtained by the Minister before providing the names of people involved in commercial transactions. But I expect, Sir, and the Minister has assured me that there should be no problem getting that clearance, so I expect we'll be able to comply with the whole order, but subject to the caveat on the names in (4).

**MOTION presented and carried.**

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

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, would you call the debate on the referral of the Rules Report to the Committee of the Whole House, please?

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Honourable Member for Virden.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** May I have the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand, please?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Stand? (Agreed)  
The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, could you please call the Adjourned Debate on second reading of Bill No. 2?

## ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READING

### BILL NO. 2 - THE LOAN ACT, 1984

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance, Bill No. 2, the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I welcome the opportunity to make a few remarks on this Capital Supply bill. I would just like to take a few minutes to deal once again with a point that the members opposite seem to be making, and that is that they are attempting to blur the distinction that exists between money that's expended to cover operating costs and money that is expended to buy physical assets.

I would point out to the members opposite that if they will look at the Budget from Saskatchewan and Alberta, they will see that the bottom line in Saskatchewan and Alberta doesn't make that distinction. In fact, I don't even see on this page of Consolidated Funds, Statement of Financing Activities in the Government of Saskatchewan, where they make any reference to capital at all. It's just simply excess of revenue over expenditures is the way they treat it.

Alberta refers to it in a similar way on the bottom line, but on another page of the Budget Address they do show operating and capital, but then at the bottom they show budgetary deficit. They don't refer to it in any other terminology, other than a budgetary deficit. It happens to be \$258 million, and their capital item is listed at \$1.707 billion, so under this Minister's measurements, of course, they would be very much in balance.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the members opposite not just to get too carried away with trying to make that distinction, because if they will look - and I urge this upon any of the other members of the government opposite who have the time to look at Public Accounts

for the year ending '82-83 as an example, Page 4-49. They'll see the listing of capital items. If they go through that list, they will see that a great many of those items do not contribute anything to generating new revenue for the government.

I stress once again that what is important to the government is that they have revenue generated to pay for the assets that they buy. If they're simply replacing cars or doing repairs in somebody's office, that doesn't add a thing to new revenue of the government. If they're making a payment on the principal for something that's been expended on a hospital or a school, that doesn't add anything to new revenue because that hospital and that school have been there for some time, and any contribution they're making has already been taken into consideration.

I urge the members opposite to recognize the seriousness of the fact that there is a \$488 million going on \$493 million deficit, and that they are not doing a service to the public by trying to minimize that. Indeed they are doing a disservice to the public by trying to make them believe that is not significant, that somehow that money spent on capital really doesn't matter all that much. Well, there is a difference. I acknowledge there's a difference, Mr. Speaker, but the bottom line is that they have to generate revenue.

There are some capital expenditures, of course, that do that, and that is called self-sustaining. That is why we have this bill before us now; this is supposed to be money that is self-sustaining. If one looks at The Financial Administration Act - I believe it's Section 76 - it says that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may declare any provincial securities," in respect of which they list four items. Then it says, ". . . under ordinary circumstances, do or does not ultimately constitute a charge on the revenue division to be self-sustaining debt for the purposes of this act."

So The Financial Administration Act makes provision for capital purchases that will not reflect directly upon the day-to-day expenditures of the government. It is money that is going to come back to the government as a consequence of the type of investment or use to which the money was put. It may be money that goes into the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation. It may be money that goes to MHRC or to some other use where there is a self-sustaining aspect, so there is a very clear distinction between capital that generates revenue and capital that is a cost on the day-to-day operating expenditures of the government. That's one issue, Mr. Speaker.

The other is that it appears from what this House has been told by the Minister, who is the Acting Minister for the Jobs Fund, the Minister of Small Business Development and Tourism, that within the money before us there is indeed capital which will be a charge upon the day-to-day operations of government, and if that is so, then I say that's a violation of the act.

Now the Minister of Finance is indicating that's not so. I hope when he closes debate then, that he will assure us that indeed all of the money we are being asked to vote for here, qualifies under Section 76 of The Financial Administration Act because, Mr. Speaker, if it doesn't qualify under Section 76, I could not vote for that, because I will not vote for a violation of The Financial Administration Act.

So when the Minister of Finance has the opportunity to close debate, then I hope he will be able to stand

and give us that assurance that it indeed conforms to The Financial Administration Act.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Morris, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

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

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to, first of all, advise the House before moving into Supply that I understand there is a disposition on the part of members on both sides to dispense with Private Members' Hour today and would ask then that you, Sir, as part of the motion which I'll move by leave, agree that the House will sit in Committee of Supply through Private Members' Hour today.

I would therefore, Mr. Speaker, move, by leave, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty and that the Committee of Supply sit through Private Members' Hour today.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood on a point of order.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I want to make this point in general before granting leave, that I know it is not a requirement of the House to inform or consult with the two Independents in the House, but I want to say to the House Leader I think that he should, as a courtesy, inform and on occasion, consult with members who are not members of one of the two major political parties, because if he is going to ask for our co-operation, then it's a two-way street. I'm not asking him to hold negotiations with his counterpart in the Conservative Party and then come and negotiate with the Member for Brandon West and myself, but I'm saying the least he can do on occasion is to inform us, on occasion it might be advisable to consult or discuss with us, because if he chooses to do neither, then I assure him that as a matter of formality, we will deny leave when it is requested.

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the understanding that the House will dispense with Private Members' Hour this afternoon and will reconvene this evening at 8:00 p.m. in Estimates Committee, it is moved by the Honourable Government House Leader and seconded by the Honourable Minister of Employment Services that the House do now adjourn. Is that agreed?

The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** On a point of order, I did not move that the House adjourn, but rather that the House go into Committee of Supply and that we sit through Private Members' Hour in Committee of Supply.

Mr. Speaker, I would prefer to avoid moving adjournment of the House at this time. I believe that the House can appropriately adjourn at the conclusion

of Supply this evening and that because of the difficulty we ran into two years ago, Sir, when we first decided to try to move into Committee of Supply, not having passed a Supply motion, and then adjourn the House, we ran into a procedural difficulty.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that matter was raised at that time as a point of order by the Honourable Member for Charleswood and since that time we have avoided adjourning the House prior to going into Committee of Supply, the mechanism whereby we adjourn the House, Sir, while the House is in Committee of Supply is to adjourn at the end of Private Members' Hour, when the House is actually sitting during an interruption in the Committee of Supply. I'm not sure of the mechanics, Sir, to adjourn the House and then move into committee. I think the House has to move into committee and can only then, during an interruption, adjourn.

So if we suspend Private Members' Hour, I suggest, Sir, the committee continues and the House must adjourn at the conclusion of committee when the committee rises to report. Until we resolve that procedural problem and the mechanics of it, I have to abide by the suggestion made by the Member for Charleswood some two years ago, when we last proceeded in this fashion without Private Members' Hour, that adjourning and then moving into committee is improper.

**MR. SPEAKER:** In that case, will the honourable member then move that the Speaker now leave the Chair and the House move into Committee?

The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I will repeat the motion as I thought I had moved it.

I would move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Employment Services, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty and that Committee of Supply shall sit during Private Members' Hour.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair for the Department of Natural Resources and the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair for the Department of Highways.

## CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

**MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos:** In this section of the Committee of Supply, we'll be dealing with the Estimates of the Department of Highways and Transportation. We shall be given a statement from the Honourable Minister who is responsible for this department.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'd like first of all to express my gratitude to our staff who have done an excellent job over the last number of months in putting together the Estimates for the

department. I think the final results of the Estimates reflect and are consistent with the overall government initiatives and objectives.

We've looked long and hard at all our expenditures and service delivery, keeping in mind that we did not want to see layoffs or decrease service, but to be frugal with our increases and to accomplish greater efficiencies in our operations and effect staff reductions through attrition and redeployment where necessary.

This year our overall budget is down \$1 million, however our Construction Program is up.

We have accomplished this by having some of the services we deliver cost-shared by another sector of government which directly benefits from them, such as the Driver Education Program where the costs will be substantially funded by MPIC. In addition, the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation will be required to absorb a greater share of the administrative costs which are currently shared by the Motor Vehicle Branch and the MPIC. Jobs have been protected, services have been protected, expenditures are down. That is the reality of my department's Estimates.

I want to highlight a few of the major initiatives under the Estimates this year. First of all in terms of the auditor function, my department has created an internal audit section which will be responsible for conducting comprehensive audits of the various functions of the department. This activity will be limited to financial and compliance credits and will be expanded to include, among other reviews, the need for improved procedures and policy definition.

It will also include the identification of cost savings through automation and systems applications and generally recommend ways in which the service delivery units can become more cost-efficient and effective.

In the area of Computer Systems, our Computer Program activities will be expanded in a number of areas. One such application with a high priority is our equipment inventory management. Presently there are approximately 3,000 pieces of operating equipment that are monitored manually and with obvious inefficiencies involving substantial staff resources and paper flow that this entails. In addition, our Warehousing Automation Program will be continued and expanded and a Construction Program monitoring system will be explored, all of this to improve efficiencies in the department.

In the Air Services Division, a Fleet Rationalization Program is being undertaken. It is currently under way to determine optimum fleet size and makeup, as well as operations services and delivery effectiveness. As well we are now doing maintenance at the Western Canadian Aviation Museum where we rent space for our water bombers and of course we all know that the fleet will be expanding. This will save substantial dollars, approximately \$175,000 per year, because we will no longer have to go to Montreal to the Canadair Shop for inspections and repairs there, so we would save \$175,000 on that aspect alone.

In the Transportation Division, in addition to its normal activities in the transportation policy and research areas, the Transportation Division will be responsible for the two transportation sub-agreements signed recently with the Federal Government; one dealing with the Port of Churchill, the other dealing with long-term transportation planning and research in Manitoba, as

well as participating in the urban bus development sub-agreement that is yet to be finalized.

In the area of handicapped transportation, we are continuing with our Rural Transportation Program serving disabled and senior people in rural Manitoba. We are serving at this time approximately 20 percent of the rural population and there's been a major expansion of that this year, approximately 60 percent increase, reflects our priorities in that area for transportation for handicapped and elderly in rural Manitoba.

In the Capital area of our budget, our construction program was increased this year by almost \$3 million. Last year, we increased our pre-advertising program in the fall from \$18 million to just over \$30 million, and we will maintain that approximate amount again this year giving the construction industry an opportunity to plan their activities better and the resources that they will require giving them opportunity to plan in advance of the actual construction season. This move has been done in conjunction with the industry and has received their enthusiastic endorsement.

In our Capital Program, we have a new appropriation this year that will begin to address the problems associated with access to remote communities to better serve rural, particularly Northern Manitoba.

I should mention that covering all of the areas of construction, the total funds that were available in 1980 for covering the construction budget, aids to unorganized territory, we have some construction in the Jobs Fund and then also access to remote communities. Those are two new areas that came in this year and the Jobs Fund allocation last year. Our total spent in the construction area in 1980-81 was \$91.5 million; in '81-82, the total funds available was 101.2; '82-83, it was 105.1; '83-84, it was 99.4; and in '84-85, it's 101.1. We're just slightly up from last year on the overall construction budget.

In our safety theme, our highway safety legislation has been implemented, of course, seat belts, child restraints and helmets with some continuing some minor amendments to that legislation as we go, and as we see it in practice, we are going to spend a great deal of effort in the area of drinking and driving, a campaign against drinking and driving, tightening up the legislation and the enforcement, as well as providing information and educational programs to the public.

We have implemented a reduced speed limit in the construction zones to 60 kilometres an hour for safety purposes for both motorists and workers. We are increasing from three to four the number of vehicle inspection units on our highways, enabling us to maintain safer vehicles on our highways, all consistent with our safety theme. We are aware, as the opposition is, that this was reduced last year. It has been placed back to the same level that it was.

In the area of pedestrian corridors, we want to develop legislation under The Highway Traffic Act defining further the responsibilities of motorists and pedestrians with regard to pedestrian corridors, as well as regulations governing the physical design of corridors and the hardware to enhance their visual target value to the motorists. We are also working on an act to cover all-terrain vehicles.

In other policy areas, we are providing for regulation of the privately-operated commercial Handivans under the Taxicab Board, which will take place this year.

Shortly as well, I will have a review or I will be able to review a report from the Task Force on Motor Vehicle Regulations. I intend at that point to consult with the industry on the recommendations.

We are working in the department on rationalizing the secondary road system into two tiers and standards related to both of these that would make our dollars go further on our secondary road system.

We are looking at criterion standards covering local government district roads and bridges to attempt to make them more appropriate to the needs they serve. I believe that the opposition members would probably welcome that area in terms of the work in the relationship of the department to LGDs.

There are a few changes in appropriations, and I also want to provide the members of the opposition with a staffing breakdown for all appropriations. Before I do that, I just want to mention some of the changes in the appropriations if members would follow if they care to.

The Transportation of Dangerous Goods has been transferred to the Department of Environment and Workplace, Safety and Health, who are in the process of developing a Dangerous Goods Act. So that is one change involving three staff-years.

Our Transportation Division was formerly under our Administration and Finance appropriation. It is now a separate appropriation, which is more appropriate and more accurately reflects the service it provides, rather than being under Administration, under a separate appropriation, Transportation Division.

There has been a reallocation of Highway Maintenance and Winter Roads Program last year under Capital Assets, now under the appropriation for Highways and Airports, so that has been separated again, as it was in a number of previous years.

The work for other jurisdictions is now allocated under Appropriation 4, Highways and Airports as well, rather than Capital Assets. This again more appropriately reflects its maintenance function, rather than under a capital activity.

So those are the main appropriation changes, and I would like at this time, Mr. Chairman, to provide the members with the staffing reconciliation for the main appropriations, so that they have this information available to them to facilitate moving along and expediting the Estimates here, and we'll pass those out to the members that are present. That is my statement, Mr. Chairman.

I hope that we are able to expedite matters and work along and move through the Estimates as quickly as possible, in providing all of the information the opposition would like to see. We certainly would like to answer all the Member for Lakeside's questions in doing so.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Following tradition and practice and custom, the Chair now calls upon the leading opposition critic in order to present his customary reply if he so wishes.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all just a quick question. Could the Minister, if we are going to speed right along with Estimates, does the Minister have a copy of his opening remarks that he

might leave with myself and I could perhaps refer to it from time-to-time during the course of various departmental expenditure perusals?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I think we can provide the honourable member with that information.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister, I think opened his remarks by saying that overall government initiatives and objectives were being met. There was no layoffs, jobs have been protected, etc. He painted a rather, what I thought, fairly glowing picture of the high esteem this current government holds the Department of Highways and Transportation in. I guess I would correlate his opening statement to that timeworn adage that he was trying to make a silk purse out of a sow's ear, and it turns out the Minister is really not all that much of a seamstress, because, Sir, he has failed miserably.

I'd like to lay some facts on the table and I know under ordinary circumstances, with a Minister delivering this kind of a departmental appropriation, he should be apologizing to the people of Manitoba, but we haven't heard too many apologies from this government for mismanagement, etc., so we didn't really expect it. The government has talked about jobs, maintaining them, creating them. They've crowed about the Jobs Fund. I think it's \$220 million this year, they're talking about the Jobs Fund. The Finance Minister has spoken in glowing terms of capital deficits, that really deficit is good if it incurs a capital asset. He has made the clear indication that is good deficit spending, that it was good debt, and that debt so incurred is good for the province, and he specifically referred to, Mr. Chairman, in his Budget address, the road system, the highway system in the province. That has been echoed by the Premier on a number of occasions and other members of the government at various opportunities.

Well, I'd like to give members of the committee and members of the government side some of the real facts about this government and its treatment of the Department of Highways and Transportation; a department that I might say, Sir, is crucially important to rural Manitoba, and in addition, is extremely important to the Province of Manitoba as a whole, and particularly the City of Winnipeg from the role the Department of Highways and Transportation does in job creation in the private sector. A lot of those jobs, Sir, are in the City of Winnipeg, not only in the rural areas of Manitoba.

The jobs that are stimulated by capital spending, the very kind of spending and incurring of deficits that the Minister of Finance speaks of in glowing terms, the kind of deficit that is incurred in road construction, supports jobs in the heavy-construction industry of Manitoba, the road builders - there are a number of very worthwhile, worthy and good firms in the heavy construction industry that provide service to this province. There are jobs in the equipment-supply industry to provide the graders, the bulldozers, the scrapers, the loaders, the gravel-crushers, the asphalt plants, the mixers, to those heavy-construction contractors. There are repair suppliers that supply everything from replacement tires to air filters, all of them with jobs dependent on the heavy-construction

industry in Manitoba. There are material suppliers that range from gravel, a very basic commodity, to asphalt, to pavement paint. All of those provide jobs in the Province of Manitoba.

This department in its construction program is important to university students who have often depended on either direct employment with the department for summer jobs and their financing for next year's university, or jobs with the private contractors for summer work; jobs as machine operators, as flagmen, as gravel-checkers; all very important summer student jobs dependent on this department and its capital program of road building.

Not the least, is the service industry, the motel and hotel operators, the restaurateurs who provide the construction crews with meals, accommodation, entertainment; all of those create jobs in Manitoba.

Now, it would seem strange to an observer, given that the Department of Highways influences so many private-sector jobs in the province, and given that this government says they want to create jobs, that they want to fund the construction of lasting assets for the Province of Manitoba, and given that the Finance Minister, the Premier, and the government in general believe that capital deficits are good, because there's an offsetting asset, I guess the simple question is why have they abandoned the Department of Highways?

The Minister of Finance has told us that overall spending is up some 3.9 percent this year over last year, but if you take a look at this department which delivers capital assets to the people of Manitoba, you'll find that its overall spending is down two-thirds of 1 percent, so it's underfunded by 4.5 percent compared to other line departments.

If you take a look at what this Minister is giving the driving public, you'll see that the Maintenance budget is down. You'll find that Construction is slightly up.

It might be interesting now to go through some of the appropriation listings on Page 92. Spending on the Transportation Division is down; spending on the Motor Vehicle Branch is down; spending on Air and Radio Services is down; spending on Highway Maintenance and Airport Maintenance is down; spending on Planning and Design is down; Management Services and Engineering is down; Construction is up slightly, but you know what is up a lot more is Administration and Finance, just the kind of area of spending and prioritization that my colleague, the MLA for Turtle Mountain and others on our side have said. This government has added some 47 percent to the administrative cost of government, while reducing delivery of programs to the people of Manitoba. This department, Mr. Chairman, is a classic example.

Now even if we give that inflation is at 6 percent, which is a fair figure nowadays, the Construction budget just to hold its own in terms of last year's volume of construction would have to go up \$6 million just to deliver the same program as last year, but it's going up less than a million-and-a-half. So there is going to be less work done this coming year than there was last year, and that means fewer jobs in all of those industries that I mentioned earlier: the heavy construction industry, the equipment supply industry, the repair industry, the supplier industry in gravel, asphalt, fewer jobs for summer students.

The Maintenance budget, if it was going to keep up with an inflationary increase of some 6 percent, would

have to grow by \$3.6 million. Instead it's down by almost 200,000.00. Now once again, what does this mean? It definitely means there are fewer jobs, because if you haven't got the money to undertake the maintenance, then you're not going to have the people working for you. That falls directly against what the Minister and the Premier have said, that they want to maintain jobs. There are going to be fewer jobs in the maintenance of our highways.

What is a worse problem is that you're going to have roads that are declining in their safety value to the driving public, to the motoring public. You're going to have potholes; you're going to have surface breaks; you're going to have pavement markings that maybe aren't replaced as often as they should be, dividing lines, etc. etc., and that adds up to less safe roads to drive on. So I think it's fair to say that the government has misled us on two counts already. No. 1, they aren't spending money on capital assets in this department in the constructing of roads, and, certainly, Sir, they are creating unemployment in the private sector through less road construction.

Now if you take a look at just the salary component, and the Minister has delivered some SMY figures where they're down 30 jobs this year over last year, but I want to ask the Minister when we get to each department, how they justify the salary calculations because I've done a little bit of them and you find that the salaries are down to the equivalent of about \$1.5 million, given no increase and only factoring in the normal 2 percent that is generally there for increments that are just granted automatically in most cases. Well, a quick calculation of \$1.5 million on salaries at \$14,000 a year works out to roughly 100 jobs. We'll find out from the Minister how close the figures he gives in the salary calculations we'll work out.

So you know the Minister, in the tabling of his staff reconciliation, has already disagreed with his opening statement that they are - well, I'll read it to him. I think this is it now, "... consistent with overall government initiatives and objectives and they'll accomplish greater efficiency in our operations and effect staff reductions through attrition and redeployment." That hardly fits with the Premier's objectives of maintaining the job base and creating new jobs. I think, as we go through this department, we'll find out that the jobs at the administrative level have stayed the same, but the jobs at the repair crew level are the ones that are gone out of the district offices - out of the district offices that maintain our roads for the driving public. We'll find out.

Now all this is bad enough if - once again you know the motoring public has come to expect that this government is not going to spend money on roads. They expected it last year and they've come to expect it from this government and I suppose that wouldn't be bad enough or wouldn't be bad in general if the driving public weren't being used as a revenue source by the government. I guess this is where the shocking part of how this government treats the Department of Highways and the motorists in Manitoba really comes out.

Construction and Maintenance, if you lump the two together this year, will be up to \$161.8 million and that's up roughly 1.4 percent, but here's the outrageous fact that comes out of the perusal of the revenues of the Province of Manitoba; revenues from the users of the

highway system in gasoline tax, diesel fuel tax, licences, car licences, driver's licences, and other sources of revenue to the department will total \$186.8 million, up 8.8 percent this year over last year, while the department is spending only 1.4 percent more money. Motorists in Manitoba will be paying \$25 million more for the privilege to drive on Manitoba highways than they're contributing in revenues through licences, gasoline taxes, and other costs.

Now one might ask, why is this?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** A point of order is being raised.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Yes, I'd just like to ask the honourable member to give us a breakdown of what taxes he's talking about or provide me with his computations on tax revenues related to highway use, so that we could work from the same piece of information.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** May I point to the members of the committee that the staff have not yet been invited, and you are already asking questions at this point in time. I'd like to invite the members of the Departmental staff to come over and take their respective places so they can provide the figures.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. It is customary for the Minister to be able to stand on his own two feet until after the introduction of his Estimates. If he doesn't know what is in his own Revenue Estimates that were tabled by him and his government, then I suggest he should resign as Minister of Highways and Transportation right now, because these figures are pulled out of his own departmental revenues.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** A point of order, Mr. Chairman. I did not ask to have staff give the figures that we have. I asked the honourable member to supply the figures that he has, so that I would have them for my information.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, he can get them out of Detailed Estimates of Revenue of the Province of Manitoba for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1985, as presented to the Third Session, Thirty-Second Legislature, Government of Manitoba - there's no page numbers - but the first page, the fourth page, the fifth page, the sixth page and seventh page, and he can add them up.

Now, Mr. Chairman, may I get on with my reply to the Minister's statement?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Please continue with your reply.  
The Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you.

Now if the government spent the extra money they are gleaning from the motoring public on construction, they'd have another \$25 million to spend on construction and they wouldn't be spending \$100 million, they'd be spending \$125 million. Just as a small example, seeing as how the Minister is so curious about



where these figures are coming from, I'll quote him one directly. His total Highway Construction Budget is \$93 million. The total take that the Minister of Finance is going to take on gasoline tax alone, Mr. Chairman, is \$100.4 million. That's already \$7.4 million more than the Minister is going to spend on highway construction and that's only one source of revenue, Mr. Chairman.

So the problem they have in spending that extra \$25 million is they haven't got enough roads in the Minister's constituency to rebuild and if they spent that \$25 million, they'd have to spend some in Southern Manitoba. They'd have to spend some in Waskada to truck oil and to look after servicing of the oil rigs in my colleague, the MLA for Arthur's constituency. They'd have to even spend some in mine, heaven forbid. They'd have to spend some in my honourable colleague, the MLA for Lakeside; my colleague, the MLA for Rhineland; my colleague, the MLA for Portage; my colleague, the MLA for Minnedosa; my colleague, the MLA for Turtle Mountain; my colleague, the MLA for La Verendrye; my colleague, the MLA for Emerson; but alas, those are south of No. 1 Highway in the majority and there ain't gonna be any spending there.

So that's No. 1 reason why they cut \$25 million out of the user collected fees because they'd have to spend it in Conservative seats and the Schreyer administration started the tradition of no highway spending in non-Conservative seats and it's been picked up again.

Now the second reason, Mr. Chairman, is that they have stolen the \$25 million from the Highway's revenues to put into the Jobs Fund. That's what's happened to it, Mr. Chairman, the good old Jobs Fund. Now last year we called it the "fraud" fund." It's still the "fraud" fund and there's \$25 million coming out of highway user revenues that are going into the Jobs Fund. You see why we call it the "fraud" fund, Mr. Chairman?

Now recall the people who are employed in road construction, and bear in mind that there is \$25 million this Minister could be spending on highway construction and not have to go to the taxpayer for one additional nickel of it. It's there in revenues for this department.

As a matter of fact, it is interesting to note that this department in the revenues it's collecting comes within \$10 million of being a self-financing department. How many other departments in government are even close to that? It's closer than what it was last year. I'll just get my figures out here, because I think the Minister might be interested in knowing.

Last year under his colleague, the MLA for Lac du Bonnet's tutorship, they came within 16.1 million of being a self-financing department. This new Minister has given away more money, and they're within less than \$10 million of being a self-financing department.

Okay, employment for contractors, for equipment suppliers, repair and maintenance suppliers, gravel and asphalt suppliers, summer students, restaurants, hotels and motels, all those jobs could be there. The Minister has been given a copy of an evaluation done by the Road Information Program of Canada. This is prepared by TRIP Canada for the Canadian Construction Association to try to demonstrate to governments across this country what they are doing when they cut capital budget in highway construction.

They have used the example in Manitoba, and incidentally we'll get into it in the construction things. They have a very damning report. We have got a worse

road system in Manitoba now than all other provinces with the exception of Prince Edward Island. That's some kind of a record under a New Democratic Government that we've got. But at any rate, the Minister has read this document, but I want to point out a couple of things out of the Summary of Findings.

They say that, "An additional \$100.4 million a year improvement program in construction of highways would support an estimated 2,975 construction jobs and jobs in the related fields of equipment manufacture and supply, materials production and transportation." 100 million in extra construction would create nearly 3,000 jobs. That means that the 25 million bucks that the government has stripped out of revenues coming to the Department of Highways for the Jobs Fund has cost the Province of Manitoba 745 jobs in the construction industry - 745 jobs, Mr. Chairman. But we're going to have to bear and listen to advertising in the Jobs Fund as to how many jobs they've created. Well I wish they'd advertise that they stripped 745 jobs out of the construction industry in Manitoba by taking \$25 million out of the highway user fees from the Department of Highways and put it into the Jobs Fund instead of into construction of highways.

So if you want to add up the impact that this government and this Minister have had on the economy of Manitoba through the Construction Program which they have stripped back once again, we can come up with several glaring condemnations. The road system is falling into disrepair, No. 1; they are not even providing a maintenance budget which is holding its own, let alone a construction budget which is getting ahead of the needed reconstruction of roads. They have been presented with a documented analysis that if they spent 100 million more, and I'm not asking them to spend 100 million more on construction, but I am asking them to spend 25 million more which is simply what they're stripping from the Department of Highways and revenues that are coming to the Department of Highways, and put that into highway reconstruction and create another 745 jobs.

So, Mr. Chairman, when we hear these Jobs Fund ads this summer, as we will hear, ad nauseum, and when we hear Ministers stand up and say that there are 14,000 jobs created in the Jobs Fund, just remember that you could pick 1,000 jobs that this department cut from the private sector and from within the government itself. They are no longer there, because they pulled those \$25 million out of the Department of Highways, out of the Construction Program, and put it into the Jobs Fund so they could advertise what good fellows they are.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to tell you, they're not fooling anybody. They are not fooling the motorists. They're not fooling the heavy construction industry and the suppliers to that industry. They're not fooling the opposition, and they're not fooling the people of Manitoba.

This Minister, we had some hope that when he came in he could bring a new direction to the department and start making this department as the delivery vehicle by which the Premier could live up to his word, by which the Finance Minister could live up to his word, that they were going to spend money to create jobs to build capital assets. This Minister has failed. The

Premier has failed, and the government has failed. It's costing jobs in Manitoba, and there is no more additional money needed because the \$25 million is in this department already. It's being stripped from this department to create a \$220 million Jobs Fund.

So the jobs they're creating in the Jobs Fund, they are pulling out of the Department of Highways. They can't deny it, Mr. Chairman, because the people of Manitoba don't believe them any more.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** At this point in time, the Chair invites the members of the departmental staff to take their respective places, please.

The Member for Portage.

**MR. L. HYDE:** Mr. Chairman, it may be uncustomary at this time for me as the Deputy Critic to this department, but I would like to make a small report if I may, not crediting the present Minister of Highways, but the credit, Sir, goes to Ministers who have served this department for a number of years prior to when this Minister took over. I can refer to the previous Minister, the Member for Lac du Bonnet, the Minister of Highways in the previous government, the Member for Lakeside and I could go back I could say for a number of years that we, or I, and previous members who've served the constituency of Portage la Prairie have been working for many many years. I speak, Sir, to the project that is presently taking place on Saskatchewan Avenue in Portage la Prairie.

I'm pleased to be able to say, Mr. Chairman, that the progress is moving along quite well. At this time they are laying the underground pipe drain system that will eliminate some of the problems that the city has been faced with for many years back. I understand that the replacing of some of the underground service that has been looked at now has been in there from, I suppose, Day One in the history of the city.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Chair inquires if the member is making another reply.

**MR. L. HYDE:** Pardon me again, Sir.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Are you making another reply? It is customary that there's only one reply from the leading critic.

**MR. L. HYDE:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I thought as a critic of the department that I would have the opportunity to speak at this time.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Normally only the leading critic is given one opportunity to make the reply. When we go to the specific items and you have some more comments or remarks, then that will be the appropriate time to do it.

**MR. L. HYDE:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I certainly do want to complete my statement at some time. If you will not permit me to do it at this time, I will be doing it when I can at a later time.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The member will have that opportunity in fullness when we come to the Minister's Salary, or even before that, under Item 1.(b)(1).

**MR. L. HYDE:** Right.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Thank you. I thank the Member for Portage.

Deferring now the item on the Minister's Salary. We might as well go into deliberation starting with the first item of business which is Item 1.(b)(1) and 1.(b)(2). Executive Support of Administration and Finance, Salaries and Other Expenditures - the Honourable Member for Portage.

**MR. L. HYDE:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As I was saying, that the project is that now progressing quite well in Portage la Prairie to the point where they are laying the underground piping, that I understand replacing piping that has been there from, you might say Day One, as far as Portage la Prairie is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that this project, well, it's a major project, and an expensive project for the province. But it has, as I said earlier, been requested for many many years and finally is progressing to the point, Mr. Chairman, when this project is completed, Saskatchewan, our main street, will I'm sure be the envy of all main streets in the Province of Manitoba.

In concluding at this particular time, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I want to invite and will invite all citizens of Manitoba to visit Portage la Prairie and see the final upgrading of Saskatchewan Avenue when it is completed.

Mr. Chairman, with these few words of praise, you might say, for the Department of Highways, I certainly have other projects that I will not be quite so flowery, is the word, to the department at a later time.

Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Thank you.

Mr. Minister.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** I would like at this time, Mr. Chairman, to introduce the members of the staff that are here. Boris Hryhorczuk, the Deputy Minister; Jack Peacock, Assistant Deputy Minister, in the centre; and Bill Dyck, the Director of Administration, at this end; Siggy Goodbrandson, the Director of Operations, at the other end of the table; and Carl Procuik, whose seated at the back of the room, the Assistant Deputy Minister, Registrar of Motor Vehicles, in the Motor Vehicle Branch.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I think we can proceed into the next appropriation. I would just ask perhaps the indulgence of the members in terms of the discussion of the highways projects, I would hope that they would perhaps discuss those under the appropriation that deals with that. That is the expenditures related to Capital Assets. If we could discuss all Highways construction programs under that, I think it would save time, enable us to provide better answers and so on, to have the appropriate staff here at that time, rather than discussing it throughout the Estimates as perhaps has been done in the past. I'm just asking whether the opposition members would have any problems with that?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Is that agreed? (Agreed.)

We are now on Item 1.(b)(1) and 1.(b)(2). Are there any other questions?

1.(b)(1), Executive Support, Salaries—pass; 1.(b)(2), Executive Support, Other Expenditures—pass.

1.(c)(1), 1.(c)(2), Administrative Services, Salaries; Other Expenditures - the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, we note a \$55,700 increase in this expenditure item. Can the Minister give us some indication what that involves?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** The increase is where we've taken two SYs that were previously of lower classification and reclassified them for the internal audit manager position, and the communications co-ordinator, and budget co-ordinator that will be in place in the department.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Pass.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(c)(1), Salaries, Administrative Services—pass. 1.(c)(2), Other Expenditures in Administrative Services—pass.

1.(d)(1), Financial Services, Salaries; 1.(d)(2), Financial Services, Other Expenditures - the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** I'm trying to remember, Mr. Chairman, what the basic function of this division within the administrative structure of highways, what it involves. Is this the area where it deals with the contractual arrangements and so forth with the contractors?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** This does not deal with those. This deals with the staff and operating expenses to provide financial services to the department including providing departmental managers with financial information to enable them to manage their program, and processing and monitor accounts payable and receivable, preparation of Budget, cash flow and financial statements.

I will just find out, and if you wanted to ask about what appropriation deals with contracts it is under 2.(a)(1).

**MR. H. ENNS:** I appreciate that advice, Mr. Chairman.

I may just note for the Minister and staff that we would want to ask the department about that aspect of their relationship in the handling of contracts generally at a time, the economy being what it is, governments notorious for not being the prompt payers in the community at large, that always has been a problem, although I know the department has always addressed themselves to it, but I think it's even more acute at a time when everybody is being pressed harder for their monies, accounts that used to be allowed to run for 60 days or even 90 days, the suppliers of the contractors performing the contracts for the Department of Highways are being pressed in a way that I think it's fair to say perhaps wasn't the case a few years ago, and I would like to know from the department whether or not that has been recognized the department and what efforts are being extended to speed up the cash flow when contracts are successfully concluded or the kind of arrangements of

interim payments that the department makes from time to time, progress payments on the larger jobs.

Having put that on the record, Mr. Chairman, we can pass this item here.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(d)(1)—pass; 1.(d)(2)—pass; 1.(e)(1) Personal Services, Salaries, 1.(e)(2), Other Expenditures—pass.

1.(f)(1) Computer Services, Salaries; 1.(f)(2) Computer Services, Other Expenditures - the Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** All of us are getting more involved with computer technology and computer services. Is there anything particularly new that is happening with respect to use of computer technology in the Department of Highways that the Minister would want to make the committee aware of?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** I did in my opening statement mention that we are continuing with the warehousing, and, of course, expanding that to all of the warehouses throughout the province - Midland Street has pretty well been completed - as far as the system is concerned, but we are expanding that to Brandon, I believe, this year, as well as the annex at Midland Street and Wilkes Avenue location.

We are also beginning the program for equipment inventory, I mentioned that in the opening statement. There's approximately 3,000 thousand pieces of equipment that are now managed manually which is with a great deal of inefficiencies - not reflecting on the efforts of the people involved, but, of course, we all realize that if this could be moved to computer system that it might be much more efficient similar to the vehicles for the government, in Government Services, which have been put on the computer systems and allows us to monitor the use of that equipment and utilize it most efficiently. So that is a major move.

The other is in the area of contracts and tendering. We want to look at putting that on computer base as well. Those are some of the areas that we're moving into; construction monitoring.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm aware that the department some years ago was looking at some innovative uses of computer technology with respect to highway design. I think the department either contracted with or was involved in - I don't know whether you'd call it a pilot project - whether computer technology has to any significant extent, is it being used in the design branch of the department in assisting in the computing of the materials to be moved and the actual design and layout of the road systems?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is the case in a number of districts where computerization has, in fact, assisted with the design and layout of road systems and the department is currently looking at further refinement and newer technology to work with a more sophisticated system in this area.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** We are on Item 1.(f)(1) Computer Services, Salaries and 1.(f)(2) Computer Services, Other Expenditures—pass.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, before we pass the resolution I've just got some . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** We cannot pass the resolution because of the Minister's Salary, it's part of that resolution. We will go to the next major item.

Since we have already passed Item f(x)1 Computer Services, Salaries and Other Expenditures, we go to the next major item which is Management Services and Engineering, 2.(a)(1) and 2.(a)(2) together, Operations and Contracts: Salaries and Wages, Other Expenditures - the Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you. Just taking a little look at the overall staffing and dealing with the whole Management Services as a general observation. They are down some six SMYs - four of them in Traffic Inspection. The question I'd have is a general question so I don't have to repeat it every section.

All of the salary appropriations are down in 2(a) through 2(g), but yet there are only one, two, three of those appropriations that have fewer SMYs. Does this mean that the departmental staff in here took salary cuts?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** The 27th pay period has accounted for approximately \$1.5 million decrease throughout the budget overall and that is applied to each appropriation so that is reflected in the salaries throughout the appropriations.

Just further to that, that accounts for the fact that there is only an increase of about .5 million, I believe, even though there are 30 positions less overall in the department.

I didn't follow the question. The 30 positions would reflect half-a-million, and the other million dollars reduction in Salaries is from the 27th pay period.

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

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Do the Salaries line reflect increments from fiscal year '84 to fiscal year '85?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, where ever they're applicable.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** What is the percentage impact of increments?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I am advised that is in the neighbourhood of 2 percent.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Then we've got something going on here which says that Salaries are down. It's attributed to some staff reductions which is logical. You've got (g) and (e) and (b) all with staff reductions, and they have a major reduction. But just out of curiosity, let's just pick the Salary line on Survey and Titles, (c) - 772 last year, 747 this year. Now you have indicated that the 27th pay period is not included. I understand from questions responded to by your colleague, the Minister of Natural Resources, that you are not factoring in any salary increase.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** That is correct, from the September to March portion of the year, if that's what you are asking.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Okay, but from April 1 to September, there is a 1.5 percent increase in wages which on an annualized basis would be .75 percent. Would that be fair?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I'd have to get the information exactly how the 1.5 percent applies in the budget, as well as how the increments apply. The 2 percent that was indicated is on an annualized basis on average, but it could vary depending on the particular department or branch. I could get more information on that for the honourable member as to how that breaks down in the staffing figures for each appropriation.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** That would be appreciated, because if we follow the Minister's rationale, there are no staff differences. There are increments factored in which averaged 2 percent on an annual basis. At least, that's what it always used to be. We have got a contract with MGEA that we know is worth 1.5 percent over the first six months of the fiscal year. I think it was 1.5 percent for the first three months and then nothing for the next three, but I mean that factor would give you .75 percent over the year, so we've got 2.75 percent. We have only lost the 27th pay period, but yet a department like Surveys and Titles is down by \$27,000, and yet there is no reduction in staff.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I can only account for that on the basis of the 27th pay period causing that reduction. There is no fancy maneuvering of any figures there. They reflect the actual costs taking out the 27th pay period.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Now, Mr. Chairman, does the Minister expect that the department with the staff reductions that are here listed will be able to maintain their level of service?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I don't know if you want to deal with the overall staffing for the whole area, or that we should go through each appropriation and discuss the level of service. I think that would be the most efficient way to deal with that question. We're dealing with Operations at this point, and we'll be moving to the next section, Laboratory and Materials. I could explain at that point the degree of change in service that we expect as a result of one staff-year reduction, and then move on to Traffic and explain that and the four in Highway and Traffic Inspection.

So if the honourable member would agree to proceeding in that way, we could deal with them as we approach each of those appropriations.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, I have no question that Operations and Contracts can operate, because they're going to be sending out fewer contracts because the department's going to be doing less work to cut the budget. So there is no question that they're going to be able to do the job.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Chairman, just on that, the member should realize that we're dealing with only around 1 percent change overall in staff, so there isn't

going to be an appreciable change in service that one could look at and say there's going to be a marked decrease in any particular area. We can comment where there are some significant numbers of staff that are reduced, but generally speaking it's not going to reflect on the level of service. We hope it will lead to greater efficiencies in the operation.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** 2.(a)—pass, Mr. Chairman.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Could I just add - there was a question asked by . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2(a)(1) Operations and Contracts: Salaries—pass; 2(a)(2) Other Expenditures—pass.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** I think, Mr. Chairman, that I should answer the question that was asked by the Member for Lakeside with regard to payment for contracts. He was expressing his concern about the time that it takes for government to pay their bills, so to speak. I have information that currently our target is under 30 days, and we're averaging about 23 days for payment now, which I believe is excellent and certainly well appreciated by industry and by the people that we deal with.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Proceeding, we are now on Item 2(b)(1) and 2(b)(2), Laboratories and Materials: Salaries and Other Expenditures.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Hold it, hold it, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, the Minister was going to explain how this department was going to operate as good with one less person, and where that one less person was one less from.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Before we proceed to that item, the Minister wants to make an explanation again.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Okay, we're on Laboratory and Materials: Salaries and Wages, (b)(1). Is that right, Mr. Chairman?

That reflects a program reduction, slight reduction in testing that is done by Laboratory and Materials on asphalt, design and evaluation of concrete and so on. We feel that what this means is two less part-time people that will be hired, summer students, and would reflect then in slightly lower numbers of testing being done by the department without impinging on our ability to have the kind of information we require for our paving programs, the roads and gravel, they do testing on soils and so on. This all will be continued within the department at approximately the same level, as I said with some reduction in the use of summer help.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, there's two summer student jobs gone. Also there is testing that's not going to be done to maintain quality control in the few contracts the Minister is going to let this summer and my only observation - and it will be a topic of argument - so I'm just going to simply say that when I was Minister back in the good old days, when times were tough, money was short, if my memory serves me correctly we expanded the testing capability so we could make sure, out of these high capacity asphalt plants, that we

were getting a consistent sample, a high-grade product, and value for the contract. I was encouraged to put additional testing in place to assure that the taxpayer was well-protected in his purchase of asphalt pavements. Now it appears as if the government has decided that all is well. Now either the department gave me bad advice four years ago or the Minister is being forced to cut summer jobs from students and endanger, through lowered quality control, the sizeable investment that we're making when we let paving and concrete contracts.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** What's your pleasure?  
Mr. Minister.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** I would just like to comment, Mr. Chairman.

I guess I find rather ironic that the honourable member would make that comment about expansion four years ago. Perhaps he overdid it at that time. We will maintain - and I'm assured by the department - that we will maintain high quality testing when required, where required, and as required.

At the same time, the honourable member should realize that we're dealing with a number of pavement contracts and construction that would be somewhat less in terms of 1984 dollars than it would prorated in - whenever he was talking about - 1980 or so, when he overexpanded this area and that would make a difference as well. So we will be maintaining the testing.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** I mean we were spending like drunken sailors, remember, back in the good old days of acute protracted restraint, we were just spending like drunken sailors.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(b)(1) Laboratory and Materials, Salaries and Wages—pass; 2.(b)(2) Laboratory and Materials; Other Expenditures—pass.

2.(c)(1) Surveys and Titles; 2.(c)(2) Other Expenditures - Mr. Orchard.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Could the Minister just - he doesn't have to provide it now - but I'm very curious in this department with no reduction in SMYs, how we are accomplishing that reduction in Salaries with the same number of people? So if you could just provide a little written explanation after supper that would just be delightful.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Well, I am advised that that decrease is attributable to the 27th pay period and I've indicated that. If there's any additional information that would explain it, other than that reduction, I will do that but I am not advised that there is any other explanation.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Well, I wonder if I might make a request of the Minister. Could he just take this nice neat little department, with 26 SMYs, break it down into full-time, part-time, and go through the little page he's got, which shows what the salaries are going to be, so he can see what happened and that'll satisfy my curiosity. Because other departments with even staffing requirements don't have that kind of a drop

and maybe we're dropping a couple of part-time summer students. I don't know or maybe we're not paying as much for our part-time help - I don't know but something is wrong and if he just could provide a little clarification, it would be appreciated.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Chairman, we will attempt to provide any additional information. Of course, we don't want to get into long investigations that would be probably be of the Order for the Return kind of request, but I will look at whether there is any other explanation that could be made in that area, in addition to what we've given the honourable member.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(c)(1); 2.(c)(2)—pass; 2.(c)(1) Salaries and Wages, Surveys and Title—pass; 2.(c)(2) Other Expenditures, Surveys and Titles—pass.  
2.(d)(1); 2.(d)(2) Bridges—the Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Well, I realize, Mr. Chairman, that maybe bridges is a little touchy subject in the last year or two.

I know that under the general heading it covers bridge design; I wonder if he could tell me what's happening on the bridge design on Highway 250, north of Newdale, between Newdale and Sandy Lake. Is that bridge design under way there?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** I don't know whether we could have the honourable member's indulgence on this. We had asked about dealing with the overall construction program and, of course, Bridges are part of that; if we could deal with that under Capital Assets and then I could have appropriate staff to provide the detailed kind of information that would be required for those specific projects. If we could do that, it would facilitate our providing all of the information that the member might require.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** I have no problem with that, if the Minister can tell me what time of the day we're going to get to that, because I'm trying to watch something in the other committee too. It'll be this evening, I take it.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** I can't really predict that.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** If we move fast, we will go there soon.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** If you stay where you're to, I'll come where you're at.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(d)(1); 2.(d)(2) - the Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, a quick question to the Minister. Does he have a design for the Pequis River Bridge?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** As I said, Mr. Chairman, that we could perhaps deal with the detailed questions when we're under the Capital Assets without reflecting on the question at this time.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Well then, out of courtesy to the Minister, since we may get there tonight, could the

Minister undertake over the supper hour to determine whether he's got a design for the Peguis River Bridge, the one that was unfortunately burned. Would he try to find that out for this evening?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Certainly, I'll find out if there's any work that's been done in that area.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2(d)(2), 2(d)(1) Bridges: Salaries and Wages—pass; 2(d)(2) Bridges: Other Expenditures—pass.

2(e)(1) Traffic: Salaries and Wages; 2(e)(2) Traffic: Other Expenditures - the Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, what's the staff reduction here?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** It's part-time people minus 1.26 staff years, which is the reduction in part-time help that is required.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** How many part-time help?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Chairman, 3.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Three more summer jobs down the drain, Mr. Chairman. — (Interjection) — Yes, keeping track of them, three more jobs.

Mr. Chairman, under Traffic, I'm not sure whether Other Expenditures, this isn't where your signalling device, the capital cost is, that's in another appropriation, Mr. Minister?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** That's right, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Well, Mr. Chairman, with reluctance we'll pass this section with three more summer students unemployed.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Traffic 2(e)(1), Salaries and Wages—pass; 2(e)(2) Other Expenditures—pass.

2(f)(1) District Offices: Salaries and Wages; 2(f)(2) District Offices: Other Expenditures - the Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, there is no reduction in District Office SMYs. The salary reduction is roughly 5 percent. Is the Minister indicating that all of the - I've got to search into my memory for the term to use, the proper term - but the District Offices hire a lot of part-time and summer employment. Are there any people that won't be rehired through the District Offices this summer to undertake their various programs?

**A MEMBER:** Good job he's got a deputy.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** First I would, if I could, Mr. Chairman, just reflect on the question that was raised under Surveys by the honourable member. The 27th pay period - first of all in 1983, the salaries were \$772,000 under (c), Surveys and Titles (c)(1). The 3.7 percent of \$772,000 is \$28,564.00. If you subtract the two, you get \$744,000, and if you add on a few incremental increases that were required there, you get up to 747.3. So, that explains to the honourable member

exactly what the difference is in the Salaries for that appropriation. Nothing mysterious there, it's just quite straightforward mathematics.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Now, Mr. Chairman, I think he's not being very kind at all.

Mr. Chairman, the 3,400 roughly was the difference between taking the pay period off and then adding in the increments. Now if we've got a 2 percent roughly

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** 28,564 is that figure.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** . . . 2 percent of 772, last year's salaries, would be 4, 14, golly, looks like, is it right on? I might have to calculate this over the supper hour because I haven't got my trusty old rapid-data calculator here.

Now, the Minister was just going to explain how he was maintaining the staff from the District Offices, yes.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, the number of staff is the same, there's no reductions there. Any reductions in part-time people would come under the Maintenance section and Mechanical area of the Budget, which of course will be dealt with later.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2(f)(1).

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Well, now just a minute.

Okay, the District Offices, at one time we were plugging them into the ability to use the computer-designed program. How many District Offices are so equipped now?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I'm advised five or six are now utilizing the Computer Services.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** And they're portable, so you can go either five or six.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** If you want the exact answer, we can get it for the member?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, I think we could pass District Offices.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** District Offices 2(f)(1) Salaries and Wages—pass; District Offices 2(f)(2) Other Expenditures—pass.

2(g)(1) Highway Traffic Inspections, Salaries and Wages; 2(g)(2) Highway Traffic Inspections, Other Expenditures - the Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Could the Minister explain the reduction of four SMYs?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Yes, the four reductions there involve the removal of two vacant SYs in the roving inspection area, and two that were transferred to the Motor Transport Board, where they had been seconded and working previously, to traffic inspectors and now who are being allocated more appropriately to that appropriation where they were working. They had been seconded, I believe, about eight years ago and just

had never been transferred over to that appropriation, and now more accurately are placed under the Transport Board.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** That's very interesting.

So, Mr. Chairman, I take from the Minister's answer that there are two SMYs have been transferred from 15(2)(g) over to 15(6)(d)?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Yes, that's correct.

Then there's a reduction in two of the number of inspectors. So, there's effectively a reduction of two.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Was this reduction in inspectors at the behest of, for instance, the Manitoba Trucking Association?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** It certainly didn't reflect any requests that were made by the Trucking Association, no.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Is the Manitoba Trucking Association in full agreement with this reduction in traffic inspection capability?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** We haven't discussed it in detail. There are concerns, of course, about the whole area of motor transport regulations and we have, of course, undertaken the review there. I believe the Trucking Association would like to see a greater enforcement, however, we would like to look at that area when we are streamlining the process of the regulations and so on, and we very well could be looking at increases in inspectors in the future. At this time, we felt we could accommodate a reduction here, realizing that there are about 90 percent of the checks that are made by these inspectors.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, I recall in the Minister's statement that he was talking about I think an increase in inspection, I believe.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Chairman, that's under the Motor Vehicle Branch. I'm sure the honourable member is aware of that.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Can we pass this item now?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Well, I don't know. What do you think, Mr. Chairman?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I think so.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** So do I.

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

**MR. H. ENNS:** Do traffic inspection stations come under this item?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Yes, they do.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, there has been difficulty with the highway traffic station at the junction of Highways 2 and 3. It has lately and in the past had

some bad accidents on that site. It has been suggested to me that it's partially, I suppose, because motorists coming in after a long haul on No. 2, even though it's well-marked, but in some cases run the flashing red light that's on that location.

I think it would perhaps be advisable to consider redesign of the location of that station but, if that's not possible with current budgetary restrictions, then perhaps consideration of some of the warning mechanisms that are available to highway design, either the - whatever you call it - that alerts drivers that they're coming to a stop or to a red light. I raise it only because it's been brought to my attention by motorists who use that area. I believe just recently in the last storm, there was another relatively serious accident on that location. I would ask the Minister if that information coincides with the information he has, or whether or not he and the department are at all looking at that particular traffic inspection station in terms of safety and what can be done to improve that site?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** It hasn't been brought to my attention in that way, and I would certainly be prepared to look into the concerns that the honourable member is raising with a view to reviewing it in terms of safety, and reviewing the number of altercations or difficulties that have been encountered there.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Kirkfield Park.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if you could give me leave to ask a question that's not right on this, dealing with this item. I can't make it later, and I would like to ask a question on behalf of a constituent.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Do we have the permission of the Minister? Yes.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Chairman, if we're able to provide the answer, I certainly wouldn't mind.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** It's someone who is working for Greyhound Bus Lines, and they're very worried about a deregulation. I'm wondering what the Minister is contemplating in that line, or if the government is planning anything at all.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** If the honourable member is asking about regulations that apply to buses, we want to deal with that separate from the Motor Transport Regulations Review that is currently under way so that it will not be directly affected or part of the regulation changes that are made for the trucking industry. So if that answers the question, I know that we're looking at dealing with that separately. We haven't come to any recommendations on that area at this time at all.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** So you haven't started studying it yet at all?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Not as it applies to buses.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Thank you. 2(g)(1), 2(g)(2) Highway Traffic Inspection: Salaries and Wages—pass; Highway Traffic Inspection: Other Expenditures, 2(g)(2)—pass.

Resolution 96: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$15,385,700 for Highways and Transportation, Management Services and Engineering, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1985—pass.

We are now on Item 3(a) and 3(b) Planning and Design: Salaries and Other Expenditures - the Member for Assiniboia.

**MR. R. NORDMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I think that this is the place that this should be brought up. But some years ago the department responded to some concerned citizens in the Headingley area, and detailed a study of Highway No. 1 West beyond the Perimeter to Headingley, and subsequently Damon Smith came up with a diversion plan. I'm just wondering where that is at at this moment. I believe last year, we were supposedly landbanking some properties to accommodate that diversion. Is that still being considered?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Chairman, the overall program is still proceeding. What we expect to have is the plans in readiness for further consultation which was a commitment made at the time to the local residents. That will be taking place within the next month. Then we'll have to make decisions following that to the exact route and design that would be proposed, and follow that with acquisition once agreement was arrived at there. But we're at the stage now where we have the detailed designs, and we want to proceed to go out to the community and consult on that within the next month.

**MR. R. NORDMAN:** Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, you will be meeting with the people of the Headingley area?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Yes, we expect to do that, as I said, within a month or so.

**MR. R. NORDMAN:** But I might mention that the objectivity has kind of died down out there. The people are almost to the point, I think, where they are ready to take what they have now, rather than - this is the lesser of maybe the two evils. So maybe we could discuss this at greater length outside of these budgetary Estimates, but I am very concerned about the area. I know the people are very concerned about the potential diversion.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Chairman, we are aware that there has been some change of heart there, and we would like to discuss that further with the people out there to determine exactly what their feelings are at this time as a result of the information we now have available.

**MR. R. NORDMAN:** Thank you very much.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 3(a) and 3(b) - the Member for Pembina.



**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Minister what the status is and how far the design is on the Morden-Winkler corridor?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I'm informed that it's progressing satisfactorily.

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

**MR. H. ENNS:** I wonder if the minister could supply us with up-to-date traffic counts on that corridor?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** I believe, Mr. Chairman, that we have that information. If we could have the member's indulgence we could give the traffic counts on that area.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, while the staff is seeking that information, during the period of time in Manitoba when we had open government, that kind of information, which used to be relatively sequestered in the bowels of the Department of Highways and not allowed to see the light of day, there was a policy decision made to make that information freely available, at least to members. I think even the member sitting beside me, the former Minister of Highways, carried on with that practice, and it's a good practice, Mr. Chairman. I'm not suggesting that it necessarily receive wide distribution, but I know that particularly, rural members would be interested in receiving that report.

We are often asked to justify the priorities of the department. We want to ourselves, justify our own priorities in promoting improvement to a particular road, and so those figures do provide, I think, valuable, additional information for MLA's and I would ask this minister whether or not he wouldn't consider making that information available to those of us particularly who make a point of requesting it?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. chairman, we would certainly look at whether we can scrape up enough money to do that. We're a very efficient operation and we're attempting to become more efficient, but I will attempt to see whether we have enough, and I'm sure we can find it, to make the reports available to the members.

I just want to make the point, in specific answer to the question that was asked, the count is about 4,500 at that point; daily traffic count.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, now that they know where to look for these figures, my memory serves me that that is extremely high for a highway that is not a divided facility.

I would ask the minister, is there another piece of roadway in Manitoba with that kind of a traffic count that is currently not being considered for some major improvements?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** The possibility of that section of road being considered for dualing hasn't been abandoned at all. As a matter of fact what is going on is the studies that are required in order for this to take place, and the right-of-way problems and so on that the department is encountering in putting that design

together, so that is proceeding as I indicated earlier. As I indicated quite satisfactorily, I believe.

The honourable member may have some different priorities in terms of how fast that would proceed. Perhaps, the Honourable Member for Pembina would have, but at this time, I'm informed that it is being worked on and considered and has not been abandoned, as I indicated to the member.

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

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I do this on behalf of my colleague, the Member from Pembina, who is far too modest to make this kind of request on his own behalf, and who I know enjoys a friendly camaraderie with you in the House, sitting as you do, cheek to cheek, but I make it earnestly because I would not like to think that politics or the odd comment that may pass between you and the Member for Pembina, would in any way interfere with the urgency that that piece of road work needs attention. The traffic count speaks for itself.

I can recall another Minister of Highways who proceeded to his credit, with the development of No. 12 Highway, between Steinbach and No. 1, for much the same reason. The traffic counts spoke for themselves. Even though it hurt him to do that for a Conservative member, he did it because it was the right thing to do.

In this department, politics really should not be allowed to interfere in these kind of decisions, because we are talking about safety on our highways, we're talking about saving lives and I appeal to you, Mr. Chairman, as I said at the outset, my colleague would be far too modest to make that appeal on behalf of his constituency and I'm pleased to do that for him.

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

**MR. L. HYDE:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My query to the Minister is from Highway 16 north, on 242 to Lynch's Point. Just what have you planned for the redesigning of that few miles there from the highway to Lynch's Point?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Well, that is under active working right now, active consideration. I've asked the department to consult with the municipalities on the redesign of the jog where it involves two river crossings, and we're looking at that at this time in consultation with the municipalities.

**MR. L. HYDE:** Well, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I believe you have in your office, on file, protest signatures of all residents, north from the river, north to Lynch's Point. You have a protest on file there, sir, asking you to withdraw any developmental program on that stretch of road. I just haven't got the mileage there, but, it is a beautiful drive. The residents of the area are asking you, Sir, to withdraw that, once again. It has been withdrawn from the programs by previous Ministers. I do hope that you will consider the request by the residents of that particular stretch of road. They would not object, sir, to straightening out maybe one or two bad curves if is necessary, but to disrupt that beautiful drive from the river, north, to Lynch's Point and camp, they don't want it proceeded with.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to hear the honourable member make that request. It's not very often that we have requests to save money. However, we have to look at safety. When we combine with what the honourable member's colleague what was just saying in terms of traffic counts and design of roads in other areas of the province, we have to look at that. So, we will balance those two and consider the requests and wishes of the individuals of the people living there.

I should correct what I just said, that we're looking at the area south of that point, not north, so, we're not in the process at this time of active consideration of changes in the point where the honourable member was making reference to at this time.

**MR. L. HYDE:** Mr. Minister, it has been suggested to me by the residents of that particular area that they wouldn't mind at all, as I've mentioned earlier, that you make some corrections on some sharp turns that occur right there. But they suggested that you reduce the speed limit if you have to to save any lives that may be endangered there. It is a beautiful drive. I would hope that you and your department will consider their request.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 3.(a) and 3.(b) - the Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, just while we're on that subject. There is one other piece of road, of course, that stands out as being in need of attention. It requires I suppose the co-operation of the City of Winnipeg. I'm referring to that stretch between No. 7 Highway now, the Perimeter which is a double-lane facility, and the coming into Inkster Street reverting back to a single-lane, or a double lane-facility.

I would think, Mr. Minister, that particularly now that you have as your Deputy Minister somebody who may even recall some negotiations that took place with the City of Winnipeg some years ago, but that stretch known as Brookside Boulevard, I believe, it really doesn't make a great deal of sense now to leave it in the state that it's in.

The City of Winnipeg has done an excellent job, spent about \$12 million with the underpass, the main CPR lines off Oak Point Road, and double-laned it up to Inkster Street, and then it narrows to a single lane to the Perimeter, where it then again goes into an expensive, you know, \$10 million, \$11 million facility to Stonewall.

I would ask the Minister just in a moment or two whether or not he could have overlooked the fact that happens to be close to my constituency and consider it?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Well, I think the honourable member has referred a few moments ago about the fact that we have to look at safety considerations overall and not at political considerations when we're dealing with such situations, and we will indeed do that. I believe that Highway 7, intersection with the Perimeter, and then the follow-through of the road there is one of the higher priorities for interchange, if not the highest that would be coming in the future if we are going to be

building interchanges on the Perimeter. We will look at it in that light.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Before we interrupt the proceedings can we pass this item now by agreement? Okay, then we will not. 5:30 it is.

We are interrupting the proceeding of this committee, and we shall be returning to consider the same item at 8:00 p.m.

## SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

**MR. C. SANTOS:** In the section of the Committee of Supply sitting in Room 255 on Tuesday, May 8, 1984, studying the Estimates of the Attorney-General, Mr. Mercier moved, after 10:00 p.m., a motion that the Minister's salary at the budget item, Line 1.(a) be reduced to \$1.00. A voice vote was held before that section of the Committee of Supply and defeated. Members subsequently requested that a formal vote be taken. In accordance with Rule 65(9)(a.i) the vote on the motion was deferred until the next sitting of the Committee of Supply in the Chamber.

**MR. CHAIRMAN, P. Eyler:** Order please. Order please. It is moved that the Minister's Salary, at Budget Item Line 1.(a), be reduced to \$1.00. All those in favour of the motion, please rise. — (Interjections) — The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain on a point of order.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, I just raise the point that we were taking, in effect, the formal vote without there having been an opportunity for the bells to ring to summon the members. I believe the correct procedure would be to call for the voice vote first and give the opportunity to call in the members. We very much would like to see that the Attorney-General only gets the salary of a dollar, but we think that really justice should prevail and that he has an opportunity to summon his friends.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Government House Leader to the same point.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the request by the Member for St. Norbert in committee on Tuesday evening was a request for a count out which would require the calling in of the members. I'm not sure there's a requirement for another voice vote. I would think that on putting the question, Sir, it would be your duty to then ask the Sergeant-at-Arms to call in the members, and that only then should the vote take place.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Call in the members.

Order please. The motion before the committee is that the Minister's Salary be reduced to \$1.00. All those in favour please signify by saying aye; all those opposed signify by saying nay.

In my opinion the nays have it.

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** A recorded vote, please.

**A COUNTED VOTE** was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas 18, Nays 22.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please, order please.

I declare the motion defeated.

On the Main Motion, Resolution No. 18: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,684,000 for the Attorney-General Administration and Finance for the fiscal year ending the 31st Day of March 1985—pass.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Before proceeding, I would like to draw attention of members to the gallery where we have standing 70 students from Grades 5 and 9 from Miniota under the direction of Mr. Cornish. The students are from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Virden.

On behalf of all members I would like to welcome you here today.

### SUPPLY - NATURAL RESOURCES

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Natural Resources, Item 4.(a)(1) Water Resources, Administration: Salaries - the Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, since we're dealing with the Salaries item here under Administration, and the Minister was kind enough this afternoon in question period to provide me with some information about the transfer of funds from his department to the Jobs Fund last year, I have a couple of questions for him then that perhaps he could clear up.

Was this transfer that his department was asked to make based upon a percentage of the salary? That is, did every department contribute according to a percentage related to their salary costs as related to the overall salary costs to the government?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** That's my understanding, yes, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, was there in fact any reduced hiring within his department as a consequence of \$1,097,000 being transferred to the Jobs Fund?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** It's rather difficult for me to answer that. During the course of any Budget year positions are filled or not filled in accordance with requirements. There were positions that were unfilled that remained unfilled, and where those positions could remain unfilled, salaries that would otherwise be attributable to those positions were available to us to provide for that allocation of funds.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, I'm thinking also though of areas such as the Engineering Services where they hire a lot of people to do road work and so on in the summer time, and money was taken out of there. Would there not have been some cutbacks in the actual numbers from out of there? If the Minister doesn't have the information at the moment, if he would undertake to find out that would be good enough.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I'm not in a position to answer that. We'd have to check with the branch. We haven't dealt with that but perhaps we could, if you make it appropriate to say this section, we could respond to that. I don't have staff here.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** I appreciate the fact that he doesn't have staff here, Mr. Chairman, and dealing with it now, and perhaps we'll get the answers later. There'd be just one other question and this seemed an unusual way to me to raise this money. I had visualized that when the MGEA agreed to forego an increase, that would have resulted in money coming off the top of the entire staff cost of everybody, they would not have been taking an increase that would have been expected. What has happened here is that the government has raised \$10 million by making transfers out of departments based on specific jobs that are frozen and this sort of thing.

I'm wondering then what would have happened if the MGEA hadn't opted to give up \$10 million and that expenditure had gone ahead, what would have been the circumstance then if the Minister understands the point that I'm trying to make?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I don't want to speculate on a hypothetical situation. Perhaps it's unwise to do that, but there is always a certain amount of lapsing in any Budget, and I know that the honourable member having been a former Minister of Finance, would be familiar with that because of difficulties in setting up program or finding all of the program components early enough, and I presume that if this transfer hadn't occurred there might be some additional lapsing. But some of the work that was carried out as I indicated last year in '83-84 was work that, I believe some of it at least, was discretionary work that we would have carried through, that was then funded out of the Jobs Fund. It's discretionary whether we had proceeded with that work or not. I don't know to the extent that that occurred. It's 1983-84 and it's passed so far as I'm concerned. It's not germane at this Session.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, I don't want to flog the issue very long but I just point out then for the record that what this department did was - it was asked to raise a proportionate amount of the \$10 million. The \$10 million represented about 2.5 percent of the overall government wage bill. The department provided approximately 2.5 percent out of its wage bill and it did it by freezing various positions and I suspect - the Minister can contradict me later - but I suspect that there were cut backs in the hiring of staff, in areas like engineering services in order to find that money.

If the MGEA had gone ahead and taken the increase, that means then that the government was under-budgeted by \$1,097,000 and would have had to find that money somewhere, so they would have been faced with either going for a Special Warrant to get it, or making cutbacks in other areas if the MGEA had gone ahead and taken their full increase.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to argue with the honourable member's hypothesis, however I did want to make it clear that, in effect, what

the result of this was that we had within our 1983-84 Estimates certain calculations of salaries that would be expended. Because of the decision by MGEA to take less salary than what was provided for in the 1983-84 Estimates, all told, that meant that in Natural Resources 1983-84 fiscal year, we wouldn't be advancing by way of salary that money that was agreed not to be deferred, to be given up. Accordingly, it didn't reduce any program of the department, per se; it meant that within the total budget, there would be that much money that we wouldn't have to spend on salaries and therefore it was appropriate that that be assigned to the Jobs Fund. I don't think there's any problem with that.

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

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to ask the Minister, and I believe this is the correct spot to ask it, if he has any word on the Assiniboine-South Hespeler Report which is due this year? Is it nearing completion?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Finance.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Chairman, maybe while the Minister is getting information on that, I'd like to comment just briefly on that previous issue and to clarify. There appears to have been some misunderstanding that somehow departments were required to cut back on programming or staff, freeze staff hirings or that sort of thing, in order to meet this payment to the Jobs Fund. That indeed was not the case; that is, what happened was a couple of years ago there was a union agreement entered into with MGEA last year. After the Estimates were printed there was an agreement entered into, which altered that original agreement.

The original agreement, just for example, would have given an employee earning \$15,000 a year, approximately a \$1,500 increase in salary for 1983-84. The amended agreement took about one-quarter of that or just under \$400 off of that increase. That \$400 showed in the spending Estimates for last year in the Department of Natural Resources, but wasn't needed for that employee because the employee's union had agreed to cut down on the amount of wage increase. That just under \$400 then for that particular employee would have been transferred to the Jobs Fund and to the very specific trust fund under the Jobs Fund, not to the fund as a whole, but rather to the trust account which ended up having, I believe, just under \$11 million in it.

There were some departments who didn't particularly want to give up the money. There was some misunderstanding within departments about who was entitled to that money, but that was the intent of the agreement and that's exactly what was carried out by the government. — (Interjection) — Well you know the Minister of Natural Resources is a very tough customer in terms of wanting to make sure that if there is additional funding available, he will use any additional in order to enhance programming and from that perspective obviously there are sometimes some difficulties. But anyone who wasn't overspending their

original budgeting had no difficulty with the approach as presented.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I submit that what the Minister says is not entirely correct and if the Minister of Natural Resources will look under Engineering Services, Appropriation 12-11, C-1, he will see \$47.4 thousand was given up to go to the Jobs Fund and the justification was that there would be reduction in the number of field staff hired, (departmentally).

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Chairman, in each division it was entirely up to them as to how they were going to reach that \$400 or whatever the number was for an employee, and if people decided to keep that money within a specific appropriation; that meant that at the same there may have been a reduction of one area within the department, it also means there would have been an increase in another area within that very same department, because there were not transfers as a result of this between departments. So it may well be that there were incidents inside departments where there were cuts . . . (inaudible) . . .

**MR. B. RANSOM:** I'm sure those people at Engineering Services who lost their jobs, who didn't get hired . . .

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Who lost?

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Reduction in the number of field staff hired, Mr. Chairman. That means people who would normally be hired weren't hired because the money went and was put into some other pocket and the next we see then is the government putting out statistics they've created 21,000 jobs and they've got signs up everywhere of all the jobs they've created. That's nonsense, Mr. Chairman, because in some cases they reduced the number of staff they were hiring in one area and hired them in another and then try and take credit for it as a job creation effort. Nonsense.

**A MEMBER:** Quit misleading the public.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please.  
The Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I don't raise a point of order. I merely want to point out that the honourable member asked about an allocation of money from the previous Estimates. I really don't think it's germane to these Estimates, however I feel that I want to supply the information. The information was properly given. The other time we had engineering and construction Estimates for this year before us, I spent some time dealing with the concerns of members - and maybe the honourable member wasn't here at the time, I don't recall that, maybe he was - wherein I was able, I believe, to show that while the volume of work that engineering construction we're involved with is relatively stable, I have assurances from the branch, notwithstanding the reductions they're provided for in this Estimate, that reflects the job positions we didn't activate in 1983-84, that nevertheless we're going to be able to deal with work. I point out that I think our

branch did a terrific job in organizing that work and I pointed out that some of the initiatives were going to be taken locally instead of centrally and I explained all that the other day. I really think I've been more than fair with the honourable member in answering his questions.

I would like to get on and answer the Honourable Member for Gladstone's question. She asked about Assiniboine-Hespeler. As the honourable member knows, that's a very large study under the PFRA. It's a federal study. We have a direct involvement in it, staff is involved, staff time is involved, a series of studies come together. We had the Engineering Study that reportedly has been filed, but our branch director has not seen it yet. That has been filed in Regina apparently, because it had to meet a deadline. Then there are other studies that will be filed and then they'll all be brought forward. The deadline for all of those studies, I believe, is March '85. So we will be getting the whole assessment - just to use this expression - in due course. We don't have them now.

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

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Thank you. Is there any inclination on the part of the group to put out a preliminary report that would give people some inkling of what might happen?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The reports that do come forward are internal reports for evaluation. They normally wouldn't be made public, and I don't think we would in this case.

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

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, in dealing with the Water Resources Branch, I want to ask a few questions of the Minister, not lengthy but I have a few comments to make as well, and to ask him basically - these programs that were tabled by the Minister were ongoing programs or plans by the Department of Water Resources, for example, Polder III. Starting the work on it is a carry on of a commitment of a program that's been in the works for a long time; the LaSalle Enhancement which will be putting water from the Assiniboine into the LaSalle River, basically an ongoing development of the water projects that have been in place and been in planning works for some time. Is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I think that they're definitely worthy projects. However, I am a little disappointed, to say the least, that the targeting of the monies that are spent by the department have pretty much neglected a pretty large portion of the province where a lot of other work, I think, should be done.

The Member for Neepawa says they're all in southern Manitoba. Well, where would he want to spend all the money - in Northern Manitoba? I would like to spread it around as well, Mr. Chairman. I am certainly pleased some of these projects are under way. However, I do want to state my disappointment.

I know that the Minister did set up a group of people to try and bring some form of management to the Oak Lake-Plum Lake situation. I don't know to what stage that commission or that board is at. I know there are concerns of continued flows on the Pipestone Creek to recharge Oak Lake, and the concerns of the control of the Moosomin Dam where there should be a little better agreement, I believe, made with the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Manitoba so that the 50 percent of the water that we're entitled to doesn't all come in the spring of the year. When we need it in the fall and the winter, that's something that we just can't get. Maybe the Minister could report as to the rebuilding or the increasing the height of the Moosomin Dam and an agreement between Saskatchewan and Manitoba if there is anything new to report there. If not, I would hope he's continuing to work on it.

Secondly, I know there is a major concern about storing water upstream, and if there are any plans or current plans. This year, I see there aren't, but next year possibly to develop or to build the Cromer Dam so that again more sufficient water can be stored to help recharge both the Oak Lake-Plum Lake water aquifers, the open lake, and give water to the Pipestone Creek.

I know that the Souris River this particular year is not causing the kind of problems that it normally causes, but I would ask the Minister if he has an update as to the participation of the Province of Manitoba on the committee that was structured by the Premier of Saskatchewan and the Governor of the State of North Dakota to recommend or to work jointly on the Souris loop and the tributaries to the Souris, the Rafferty Dam which is to be built in Saskatchewan, what the Government of Manitoba's position is on that, as well as the development of clearing of some of the obstructions on the Souris which have been a controversial point for many people for many years. Jurisdictions such as R.M.'s locally there have requested reworking or recharging of the Hartney Dam so that it would not affect the flood situation. Of course, a good time to do it would be when the river isn't flooding rather than when it is.

Those are the kinds of projects that I would have hoped that I would have seen in this particular report. However, all I'm asking the Minister at this time is: is he still working on those projects, and trying to resolve some of the long-term problems? I'll reserve my comments at this point on one other subject which is a concern of mine.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I thank the honourable member, Mr. Chairman, for his comments and his questions. He is quite right in respect to the concerns that we have and, I think, have continued from previous years in respect to allocations of water from the Moosomin Dam. That is a muddy picture, if I can use that expression.

The dam was built by the PFRA. It wasn't formally turned over to the Province of Saskatchewan. The Town of Moosomin has more or less taken over administration of it without there being formal authority. They raised the level of the dam, got some good recreational benefits, and we are not satisfied with our portion. When we have written to Saskatchewan, they have pointed out there are these problems in the dam not having

been formally transferred. We hope they're going to get on with unravelling them and getting it done, because as the honourable member suggests we believe that we get too much of our allocation first thing in the spring and not enough later.

In the past, we have been enabled by just verbal contact to get some releases of water, but we don't think that is a good enough situation. We are continuing to pursue that, both with Saskatchewan. I've written the Saskatchewan Minister, and I have urged that we get on with PFRA to get them to solve or get the matter of ownership confirmed and supervision of the dam so that we can insist on our allocation being reasonably made.

In respect to the concerns of the member for further initiatives in respect to upstream storage, I continue to have those desires. However, as the honourable member knows, these initiatives are very expensive. We haven't had further discussions with the municipality in respect to the Cromer Dam, I'm advised. Certainly it is my concern where possible to effect more upstream storage, because I think it has a long-term benefit. But it is very very expensive, and it doesn't come easily.

In respect to the Saskatchewan-North Dakota committee, I have corresponded with Saskatchewan and North Dakota, and have not received any firm invitation to join in that arrangement.

I think - well, there may be some points that I haven't touched on. The honourable member referred to the Hartney Dam. The honourable member and I have had many exchanges in respect to that dam. The question of the dam and its appropriate level and so on was referred by me to the Water Commission, and I am awaiting a report on that.

In respect to the Oak and Plum Lakes, the Water Commission did make that study as I indicated earlier. A board has been appointed, and I believe are proceeding with their considerations of the use of the dam.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** I urge the department - I know that there are many water projects that have to be looked at, but I urge the department to continue to stress the need for storage in the southern and western regions of Manitoba, because of the historical dry patterns of weather that we've had over the last many years and the very problem that has been pointed out. The excess water in the spring that has to be flushed off or seems to have to be flushed off, and then we're looking for it some time later. I urge the department to do that.

There is another specific concern particularly that would support the Moosomin Dam in my estimation. That is the recreational and the fishing that is taking place on the Oak Lake, and the winter kill that has been a problem. I know almost every year I've been contacted by Bill Henderson, who has the resort, and who has spent quite a few thousand dollars of his own personally, and as well the R.M.'s there have done quite a bit of experimental work. I know they don't get along with your fisheries people, and the kind of results they're getting at some point because he does claim, and I think it's important to note, that there is quite a factor for fish surviving when the river or the lake heaves and provides some oxygen. When it doesn't heave, and pushes out the sides, then there is a tremendous

number of fish killed. I think it would be agreed that if a continual flow of water were allowed to come in out of the Moosomin Dam or the Cromer Dam, if built, it may alleviate some of the oxygen problems and help all the farmers along the stream as well as give fresh water to the Oak Lake.

So I want that on the record, and I think it's important that the department and the Minister take note of that because it has a multiple reward for the money spent.

I guess I might as well address it now, Mr. Chairman, and that is because the Polder III is here. That is the disappointment that I have in this Minister and the government in the handling of the Saskeram situation. I think that it's extremely unfortunate that we have a government that would bring in legislation, that would prohibit foreign investment, foreign investors from buying land from Manitoba farmers, and yet we have a government who would turn around and lease some 100,000 acres of some agricultural capability to a U.S. firm for \$1.00, restricting the people of the Pasquia area and The Pas from going in and using it for agricultural purposes, I am extremely disappointed that that kind of situation was allowed to develop.

I thought the Member for The Pas would have had more influence on his Minister, would have been able to speak more loudly for the people of the Pasquia area, and allow that community to expand its agricultural base, so there could be more machinery and services provided, more elevators encouraged to build in The Pas area.

Now again we've seen a tie-up. I guess it's 10 years the agreement is, or 20. I'm not sure. If the Minister wants to comment, fine, I'm not making a big issue out of it at this particular point, but I do think that the people of The Pas would have expected more from their member, from this government than they got. I have felt very strongly about that community. I've got a lot of good friends there and I believe that they deserve a little better shake. I think there should have been a better arrangement made for the use of agriculture in that community. I don't think it would have been at the expense of wildlife. I don't think it would have been at the expense of the storing of water. I think it would have been to the mutual benefit of everyone if that area could have been expanded and more multiple use made of it.

We struggled with it when we were in government. I will admit the lease time did not come up and I probably would have had to make a good case, but I think I was making that case. I think that we had good strength being developed for everyone's interest and not just for the lease with Ducks Unlimited. I'm not anti-Ducks Unlimited, I want that to be clear on the record, but I do think, Mr. Chairman, I'll say this - and I've said it publicly at every meeting I've been at - that I don't think we should continue to give our resources for \$1.00 in return for them investing several millions of dollars in dams and water conservation, that we should allow that kind of thing to happen, and then have the taxpayers turn around and have to pay for all the crop lost or the depredation that the ducks cause. I think that if the Ducks Unlimited community are going to expect to hatch their ducks. — (Interjection) — If the Member for Inkster would pay attention - as a farm person we take the responsibility of hatching young chickens or producing livestock; as they are young and

they grow up, we take it as a responsibility to feed them, and if you invest money in water and in production capacity for the ducks, I think that there should be money put in by Ducks Unlimited to the Depredation Program. I'm speaking on behalf of all the taxpayers, not just the farmers.

It costs Canada and Manitoba taxpayers a lot of money to pay crop depredation. I see nothing wrong with the company, Ducks Unlimited, coming into this country, investing money in infrastructure to produce ducks, sharing it with agriculture, but as well sharing the cost of feeding those ducks from the Depredation Program. I want that to be clear on the record and I have taken that position from Day One and I think it's a fair position.

I have another major concern and this is in the sharing of Ducks Unlimited land. — (Interjection) — Yes, I felt the same way when I was Minister. You can look at any person, talk to any person, when I talk I believe I was extremely fair and I think that's taking a fair position.

Again I want to make the point that I don't think it's fair that we should have given away that major resource base for \$1.00 to the United States-based firm when everybody else in society are restricted from dealing with foreigners in Manitoba. It's a two class system, or it's a two principled system that this government are operating under and I don't think it's right. I'll continue to make that point whether it's with colleagues of mine, or whether it's with the government. I want to speak on behalf of the people that I think rightfully should have that property on a multiple share basis, and that's the farmers of that community as well as the resource people and the Native community who use it for hunting and other things. It's not fair to tie it up for \$1.00 to trade if off to one group. It's been a long-term debate within our own group and it'll be a long-term debate as far as I'm concerned with the public in general, and as far as I'm concerned, where I come, I won't give up.

Mr. Chairman, I want to, as well, make the point that I would hope this coming year that some of the work that the government are doing now that these projects are under way that there would be a little bit more expansionary thoughts on their ideas to develop some of the water projects that are so urgently needed in the rest of the province, as well as those that they've identified this year.

I think that is all, Mr. Chairman. If the Minister wants to comment fine, if not he doesn't really have to.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the honourable member may not wish me to deal at any length with his submission. But one of the problems I suffer with is the fact that I'm such a nice guy too often. You know, I did risen't in my place on a point of order and say that we always backed, Mr. Chairman. The honourable member is dealing with a matter that comes under Crown Lands, or Wildlife. I didn't do that, I allowed him to continue. Despite the fact that one of my colleagues, the MLA for The Pas, had earlier spoken to me and said, Mr.- he didn't call me Mr. Minister, he calls me Al, and sometimes he calls me other things - he said I want to go on the record, and I want to talk about Polder III, and I want to talk about Saskeram. I said certainly I'll be prepared to answer your questions.

Now, not rising to object the Honourable Member for Arthur's lengthy submission about Saskeram, I'm going to be, I hope that the Honourable Member for The Pas doesn't consider that I have been unreasonable or unfair. Let me say, now that the honourable member has said something, and the Honourable Member for The Pas wants to go on the record. I think the honourable members will understand, they will not object if he makes his comments at this time, as well.

In respect to that issue honourable members will recall that, when the Grand Rapids Dam was under consideration there was concern about the Forebay area of the dam. Hydro was charged with negotiations for settlement of issues. Arising as a result of the much larger impoundment of water in Cedar Lake and the reduction of a wildlife area, and while there is still some unhappiness on the part of bands in respect to the Grand Rapids settlement that was achieved, I have indicated that if there is anything, any reasonable, further initiatives that we might take by way of some remedial efforts we will look at that. They contend that there is much more damage that they have suffered in respect to their traditional wildlife areas, wildlife propagation areas, both ducks and moose and so on.

One of the considerations that they urge, and there seems to be some significance to that, in the declaration of the Saskeram for wildlife was attributable to the extent that the Grand Rapids Forebay flooding took away wildlife lands that traditionally were trapped, hunted, and so on by residents of bands in that area. There seems to be some significance to that argument. I don't put a great deal of weight, but it is there, it's referred to in some of the correspondence between Hydro and members of those reserves. So there is a background to that that signifies that there is some understandings about the Saskeram that are very important to the Native people in the area, the Native communities.

I must say that in the dialogues that I had - I shouldn't use that word - in the consultation process I had, and the Honourable Member for The Pas was with me on a number of those occasions, we met with people not only from The Pas, the Wildlife Associations and Ducks Unlimited, but we also met with the Treaty Indian Band in The Pas, and there was very very strong concern about the retention of that Saskeram area for wildlife. Because of the previous understandings and the fact that the Saskeram to Native people in that area does not just represent a place where Ducks Unlimited can ensure a greater propagation of ducks, it also is a protection for moose in the area for the Treaty Indian people because it is excellent habitat for moose in part. Also, Mr. Chairman, it is a very substantial breeding area for muskrats and a very significant harvest of muskrats takes place in that marsh.

We listened very carefully to all of the concerns, and we did provide for a substantial increase in the agricultural area in the periphery of Saskeram. We did not make light of the concerns of agriculture in the North. What we did do, however, is indicate that where it was possible, we would certainly consider the further enlargement of the agricultural area in accordance with the commitments that were made years ago in respect to the development of the Polder system. We are actively looking - and the honourable member started with this item - we are actually looking at the development of

a further portion of the whole Polder system and that's referred to in the capital item, and that's Polder III.

The Honourable Member for The Pas is not being difficult with me, but he has urged me very strongly in respect to the concerns of agriculture in the North. He does have a great deal of sympathy for the agricultural base that's there that wants to have a significant expansion to allow that agricultural sector to be able to have more of the amenities that normally flow with an agricultural base, including provisions where there would be an implement dealer that would stock parts, further facilities in respect to fertilizer and the transportation movement of grain.

He has made strong arguments with me in connection with the need to recognize the role of agriculture in the North. I really should sit down and let him put that on the record, but I put that on the record. I am not saying anything, Mr. Chairman, that is not fact. He has been very very concerned about that, while recognizing the commitment that was made, the understandings that were made in respect to the wildlife. It has been a difficult matter for me as Minister. I submit, it's been even more difficult for the Member for The Pas, because he has to look at all of those factors.

One of the things that he has insisted upon is that in any enhancement of the wildlife area in the North, given that agriculture is there, that we provide for more effective compensation for wildfowl depredation. In our negotiations with Ducks Unlimited, and it's a 10-year lease with a 10-year renewable period, we insisted that there be a further compensation built in, in respect to the depredation of waterfowl. They have agreed to an enhancement of baits and lure crops and so on - maybe not lure crops - but bait stations in order to minimize the effect of any enhanced propagation for wildlife on agriculture in that area.

So I have not taken the arguments of the Member for The Pas lightly. We have exercised considerable concern in those arrangements with Ducks Unlimited.

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

**MR. H. HARAPIAK:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Seeing as I am in the House, I better get up and defend my position on the Saskeram. The Saskeram has been a very controversial area in The Pas for many years. I know the former Minister of Agriculture makes light of it. If he had been Minister when the lease was expired, he would have gotten more land for agriculture. I think the former Minister of Agriculture should speak to the former Minister of Natural Resources, who would say that there was too much land already going to the agricultural base. He said, if he was . . .

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Arthur on a point of order.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I don't know of any statement that a former Minister of Natural Resources of our government made that said, there was too much land already in agriculture in that area.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** That's a difference of opinion, not a point of order.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** If he can prove it, then I'll accept it.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** It's not a point of order. That's a difference of opinion.

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

**MR. H. HARAPIAK:** Mr. Chairman, that may have been a difference of opinion, but the former Minister of Natural Resources has made this statement to me. It may have been in a private conversation, it wasn't in the House here, but he had made that statement to me.

I would like to tell the House that there had been a lot of public meetings held over this controversial piece of land, and there were many presentations made, as the Minister has already indicated and really the trend was reversed. Under his administration, there was land that was being taken away from agriculture and then being put back into natural resources while he was the Minister of Agriculture. So he doesn't have to get up and make any bones about all the friends he has and all he has accomplished for The Pas area, because he didn't accomplish a thing for it when he was the Minister of Agriculture.

But there has been an agreement made. There had to be an agreement reached in that area. We haven't pleased many people with it, but the decision had to be made. The farmers are still upset because they felt there would be another round of negotiations before the signing did take place but now I think the Minister is going to have to have a meeting with the farmers from that area, and just explain his position.

One area the Minister has already touched on is in the area of duck depredation. I still believe that the area should be receiving a higher form of compensation because of all the production that is going on in the area and because of the fight that goes on in the area, there should be more depredation, but Ducks Unlimited is co-operating. They say that they will, if the Department of Natural Resources insists, they will put in feed stations for the ducks this fall which will take away from the depredation that goes on in the Pasquia Valley. They are also talking about putting in some lure crops in the Saskeram area, which would again take away from the depredation that does happen in the valley.

There has been a strong interest from The Pas Indian Band to also get into the agricultural field, even though The Pas Band themselves, the council at this stage does not see the wisdom of putting more land into agricultural production. There are Band members that do want to get into agriculture, and there is still pressure to get some of this land that is Crown land released to agriculture. So we get this from both sides to put some more land in there.

It was a difficult subject to deal with, but I would just like to ask the Minister of Natural Resources if there will be any of these pits established this year, so some of the depredation that does happen in the valley, if these pits will be established for this year's harvest season.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that Ducks Unlimited will pursue that,



because it's pursuant to the understandings we had with them to enhance the interest of the ducks outside of the agricultural area.

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

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Mr. Chairman, I don't want to say too much on this. I just want to state my disappointment in not seeing any capital works project in the western or the southwestern region whatsoever. With all due respect to my colleague, the Member for Arthur, the only drainage and water conservation work going on in my area is being done by Ducks Unlimited. They're spending several million dollars in my area this year, so we're certainly pleased with that.

I wonder if the Minister might just give me one comment in the absence . . .

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Who said I was against them?

**MR. D. BLAKE:** I didn't say you were against them. I just said I was for them.

But I wonder, in the absence of the Member for Gladstone, if the Minister might make some comment on the Whitemud Watershed area, if there's anything happening there. At one time, there was some fairly large drainage program being planned in the Big Grass Marsh area to provide further drainage and better control on the water level in there.

Has anything been happening on that?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** In respect to the Whitemud Watershed area, as the honourable member knows, the whole drainage basin is the basis for the Whitemud Conservation District. I must say they have an excellent board and an excellent manager that I've had the privilege of touring a good deal of the conservation area with, and they do have ongoing programs. They haven't got a plan yet.

It's one of my concerns that all the conservation districts have a full plan in respect to the operation, the future program of the district. I know that they have some of the concerns that the honourable member has indicated under their review. I know there are significant drainage patterns and problems that arise from those patterns that they are looking at, but it's expected that they will co-ordinate their activities for the long-term drainage considerations through the conservation district program.

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

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister a question specifically under the area of Water Licensing. Of course, we're all aware that a new Water Rights Bill was passed last year.

I'm wondering if the Minister could indicate at this time whether regulations have been filed under that act as promised during the committee hearings. What state is that present act at and the regulations that follow from that act, what is the present state?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I have been anxiously awaiting as well, the final production of regulations. They are

very much in the work. I am concerned to get those completed. The work has been termed to be more complex than I'd expected. I'd hoped that we'd have those relatively quickly, but the work is ongoing. I believe, that there is also a small amendment that's considered necessary, The Water Rights Act that I hope to include under The Statute Law Amendment Act. It will facilitate the concerns about some part of the regulations, I understand, so they are very much in the work.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Well, could the Minister indicate at this time whether his thinking at all has changed from the committee stage last year as to the 20-year limit and whether in fact every lease under the act would be renewed after five years - I believe he rejected that at that time - and whether every lease would be reviewed after the 20-year period? I'm a little vague on that, but I want to know exactly, specifically, what the present status of his thinking is on that particular area.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** We have looked at that and it has been under consideration. As the honourable member rightly refers, I think it was a 20-year lease, with a review period every five years. The department is of the opinion that in effect that makes it a 20-year licence and in effect we might as well go with the 20-year licence. There would be terms and conditions of all licences, and providing they are met, probably that is the most effective way to go.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Well, this isn't the place of course, to debate the relative merits of going one way or the other. I think we sufficiently covered that last year. I just wanted to know what the present status was on the Minister's thinking, specifically on that particular subject.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask some specific questions, regarding the detailed listing of expenditures related to capital assets provided to us by the Minister the other night, specifically the number of projects that fall within my constituency. I'm a little embarrassed at times when my colleagues remind me that a fair number of these projects find themselves right in my constituency. It really doesn't bother me an awful lot, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to, first of all, ask specifically a question regarding the Roberts-McTavish Drain, I believe the tenth project listed.

I'm wondering if the Minister could tell me the status right now on this particular project. Was there a major drain dug last year or was that to be done this year, and where specifically is that project done?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The present status on that one is that there has been no right-of-way required. It involves reconstruction of 7.5 miles. I guess that's in the note of drain and the installation of a new bridge on the CP Rail at the La Riviere subdivision. This work is anticipated to move forward this year and we have until September 30, 1985 for completion under the agreement.

**MR. C. MANNES:** My final question on this project, is that the entire involvement with regard to this

particular project, the reconstruction of the major drain portion, or is it specifically just the reconstruction of a single major drain?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** That's the major portion under the agreement. The municipality has agreed to do their portion.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move on to the No. 11 item. It seems to be a favorite pet project of the Minister's and mine and it is very close to home. As a matter of fact I think because of the new conflict of interest legislation, I feel like I should speak on it or at least I should declare that I think one of the laterals goes actually right through my farm, so the Minister can't hold that over my head anymore, Mr. Chairman, it's on the record.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister specifically how this project found its way again, and why it found its way again into the capital list, considering that he had such a strong desire to see it removed formerly?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The municipality, Mr. Chairman, agreed to do some of the laterals to the extent of \$80,000 to \$90,000 and we're doing the balance.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, was there any added pressure put on the Provincial Government by the Federal Government who wanted to see this project be completed?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I'm advised, not particularly, no.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, moving quickly through, as I look at these other projects, they are pretty well self-explanatory.

I would ask, though, about the Water Development Agreement, regarding the pumping of water from the Assiniboine into the La Salle. I heard my colleague make reference to it, but I didn't hear the answer given by the Minister. I would ask whether this project is to be totally completed in the year 1984?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** That's under the other agreement, the Water Supply Enhancement Agreement, and that is expected to be completed by September of this year - 1984.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** Does the Minister anticipate any problems in acquiring right-of-way? I am led to believe that there are some instances where property owners in the area are somewhat concerned and are presenting some problems for acquiring the right-of-way. I'm wondering if the Minister foresees any major problems in this area.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Thus far we've been able to acquire the necessary land for the structures that's approximate to the river. We are obtaining easements in respect to downstream portions of the system.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I would then ask about two or three other items not covered on this, but I believe two of them the Minister made reference in some remarks earlier.

First of all, he might want to tell me the status of the Almasippi Wet Sands Study. As he is well aware, I have some constituent problems north of St. Claude that are affected, to some degree, by water problems that seem to accumulate. I know the Minister has met with those same constituents and I would think that the department's decision whether it would help this particular group of people is somewhat dependent upon the results that are forthcoming out of the Wet Sands Study. I'm wondering if he could give us just a few brief remarks and a little bit more detail on that particular project.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, in respect to the Almasippi Wet Sands area the study that had been ongoing earlier was completed, and we are now looking under the new ERDA Agreement for a continuation of some parts of the study and a demonstration project.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** Well, could I then recommend to the Minister if he's looking for a site for demonstration project, he possibly consider the area north of St. Claude and maybe put to rest some of the concerns of the constituents of that area.

Mr. Chairman, there was another water-related problem in the Gainsborough area just south of the Assiniboine River just south of Portage. It had to do with tile drainage in a particular section of land. I believe that somebody either was in Agriculture or Natural Resources who was monitoring that particular situation over the last year. I haven't been in active contact with a couple of constituents in that area who felt that their domestic well water was suffering over the period of years because of tile drainage. I'm wondering if the department could share with us their latest results on the monitoring of that situation?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The department has studied the drainage systems that have been reputed to be affecting wells, and have come to the conclusion at this stage that the gravity drainage by the tile system poses no problem, but the pumping system does. They're of the view that licencing can probably proceed in respect to tile drainage systems that are gravity operated and not pump operated.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** Well, maybe the Minister or his staff can help me. This particular section of land that I'm making reference to, was that gravity or were there pumps involved in that?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The landowner affected believed that her ground-water supply, her well supply was being affected by these operations and the operations were partly gravity tile drainage and partly pump. As I've indicated, the department is of the view that the gravity tile drainage is likely to be no problem.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** Will there be any public statement to this end, will there be any requirement on the landowner there situated to remove the pumping portion of the tile drainage system that he has presently in effect?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Licence would be subject to terms and conditions and if those terms and conditions are not followed no licence is granted.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated the other night that this would be the appropriate section in which to pose a question regarding the engineering required to direct the La Salle River, or possible to put the forthcoming twinning of Highway 75 just south of St. Norbert, within the St. Norbert area.

I'm wondering if - I know we've asked this question on numerous occasions - he can report whether his department is presently at all involved in the engineering associated with, or in conjunction with, the city and with the Highways Department as far as leading the La Salle River under Highway 75?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The area in question where the drain flows or the river actually flows underneath the highway is within the jurisdiction of the City of Winnipeg and we have been working with the city in respect to that, we've had some input with it, yes, and we've had some input in assistance to the Department of Highways, but we're still discussing and negotiating that with the city.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm well aware of the process. I suppose my specific question is what stance is the department taking? Are they requesting something similar to what the municipality, particularly Macdonald, is in the sense that they would like to see more capacity offered to La Salle River as it discharges into the Red River within the City of Winnipeg limits?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** When the existing culvert system was installed back in the early '60s it was built to meet highway standards which, at that time, the guideline was a 2 percent flood. Since the '60s, there has been greater amounts of water, heavier flows, and in order to meet a 2 percent guideline today, we are counselling that the structure should be larger, and that's the position we're taking in respect to it.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Thank you, I'm glad to hear that answer and that certainly satisfies me at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister an unrelated question, and I don't know if this is the proper area or not. It's to do with the erosion of soil into government drainage ditches. Some municipalities, and my home municipality, as a matter of fact, has just passed a by-law whereby landowners adjacent to a municipal drain may be charged up to 50 percent for removal of drift soil in the year that event may occur. I would question the Minister at this time whether the department is giving any consideration whatsoever to adopting a similar regulation?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** It's an interesting commentary that the honourable member makes. I wasn't aware of that policy by municipalities there. Certainly I wouldn't be critical of that at all. However, we have been endeavouring to work through conservation districts particularly and also I'm advised that under the ERDA agreements we're looking at enhancement of that program to ensure that drainage ditches are not silted up.

It will provide for removal, etc., primarily an educative process as well under that agreement. I think, by and

large, the way we want to go is to get more and more people conservation minded about their soil, so that it's not a question of reacting after the soil is lost from the land and put in a drainage ditch, but trying to get individual farmers to adopt soil practices that will prevent the soil from being lost, because it's their loss. They lose two ways if they have to pay for the removal from the ditch and they've actually lost the soil from their land.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, I'm neither supporting or I suppose rejecting that concept. There are some cases where possibly the landowner is responsible and negligent. I can think of many others though, where even under good farming practices, situations arise where soil does move. I suppose I can see where any regulation or by-law, municipal by-law, that attempts to discharge some of liability toward the landowner, has some pitfalls in it also.

A final question to the Minister within this section is in regard to the diking of the valley towns. Could the Minister indicate whether the Brunkild Dike will be constructed this year?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** It's expected to be constructed this year.

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

**MR. H. HARAPIAK:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister in the area of Polder III area. There has been a lot of interest in Polder III, because the people in the Pasquia Valley are aware that there was a study conducted on the feasibility of bringing this land into agricultural production. Seeing as how the report is completed and it was favourable, the question is being asked almost daily of me, if there are any funds designated to bringing this project into place in this year's Estimates. I'd like to ask the Minister if there are any funds designated to the Polder III drainage ditch?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I thank the honourable member. I don't think I have received a copy of the capital items. Some members did get them earlier. I'll send him a copy. On the third page, there is reference to the Pasquia Polder III and an allocation near \$250,000, and the note indicates the purchase of materials in the construction of a portion of the Pasquia Lake drain.

In addition, the department is negotiating with the Federal Government to see whether or not funding of the development of the Polder III can take place under the ERDA Agreement, agricultural section of one of those agreements.

The honourable member says that he has received some calls or concerns almost daily. I wouldn't want to say the honourable member has talked to me about it daily, but I've put on the record that he's brought it to my attention many many times.

**MR. H. HARAPIAK:** Mr. Chairman, I'd like to also direct the Minister's attention to another area and that's the community of Carman which also comes under my constituency. They received a grant last winter to improve some land surrounding the south side of the

community for gardens. The project was very well supported by the members of the community and there's a lot of interest into really pursuing the project of the North feeding the North. They're having gardens built to meet their own vegetable needs. But seeing as that agricultural interest has been raised again, they are also enquiring into the possibility of lowering the levels of Cormorant Lake so they can recover some of the land that was in agricultural production in prior years.

I've been informed that the Myers family farmed in the area and they still own several quarters of land and they would like to bring this area back into agriculture. My question to the Minister is, if this land was lowered, would it affect the fishery industry that exists at this time in the Cormorant area?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I believe that I've just seen a letter that was drafted for me, a very comprehensive letter by staff, if I recall signing that letter - maybe it was today or the other day, I can't recall now - and in it a very thorough analysis of the problem is suggested.

It is a complex problem. The effect of the dam at the Moose Lake Narrows has been looked at. There is substantial drainage though from the drainage basin in that area - there's been higher flows in that area. The suggestion of providing a barrier and then to lower the levels of North Moose Lake and Cormorant would involve a very extensive amount of work in creating a . . . and then a pumping operation to lower the water of North Moose Lake. The guesstimate is something like \$750,000.00. It doesn't appear to be economically advisable. In addition to that, of course, although we're not certain of that, any lowering of water levels could affect the fishery.

**MR. H. HARAPIAK:** Are your studies available now or have there been studies carried out in the past dealing with this area? If there haven't been, what are the possibilities of having a meeting between all the different departments affected, the Department of Natural Resources and the Department of Energy and Mines, because of their involvement with Hydro and also the Ducks Unlimited who have a very big interest in this area as well. Is there a possibility of convening a meeting for the three parties to meet and resolve the problem that exists there?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I think such meetings are possible but given the nature of the undertaking, it would be necessary to affect significant land values. It doesn't look like it's very feasible. I can ask my staff to take note of that and perhaps officials can meet and exchange information on that because the study material is available.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Roblin-Russell.

**MR. W. McKENZIE:** Mr. Chairman, I just have one question. Could I be favoured with a map and a copy of the expenditures relating to Crown assets last year? I must have been out of committee. I likely will need it this weekend because I have some people coming in who have some bad drinking problems. They're going to be at my door Saturday morning they tell me and

I see there's nothing here, but I'll have the opportunity to show them the map. Can I ask the Minister - we discussed it at some length last year at committee - the water table in the province. The PFRA studies indicated there were some pretty grave concerns and that has escalated in our area. I'm told by the number of wells that are going dry. Has the department looked at it again? Have they upgraded it or where is it at?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I'm just looking, Mr. Chairman, for reports that I did receive on ground water within the province. As luck would have it, I didn't bring it with me. But generally speaking, there is reduction in ground water about a metre. If you want me to translate that, 38 inches, 38.3. So there is some reduction.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, H. Harapiak:** The Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We work on the basis of elimination, I suppose, in the House for getting somewhere gradually. I have some general questions. We're not trying to confuse the issue by dealing with some of the capital to some degree, because I understand that this is the department that basically does the background work and possibly the prioritization on drainage projects. Am I correct in that assumption? So that is why, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, we possibly have members on our side that are expressing concerns about certain flood problems in the areas.

The question that I have to the Minister based on this year's capital program that was forwarded, I assume quite a number of the projects evolved around the Value-Added Crop Agreements in order to complete them to get the federal funding in there. That's why these projects are being designated for this year. Would that be a correct assumption?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I'm sorry. I was momentarily distracted.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** He is distracting at times, Mr. Minister. The fact that we have quite a number of the capital projects - I think, seven or so, I should have checked more closely - are involved with the Value-Added Crop Agreement with the Federal Government. That's why these projects are on stream at the present time, so that we can make full use of the financial funding through the Federal Government. Am I correct in that?

Okay, the question that I have further then. How does the Water Resources Department establish the priorities in terms of requirements for capital projects for each year? Throughout the length and breadth of the province all members have various concerns that come forward aside from the political decisions that get made from time to time by the Minister. But I think possibly many people in the rural area have projects that have been there for a long time. How do the Resources people establish which projects will be coming on stream? Could the Minister maybe just clarify how that process works?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, it's a very involved process. Really, I suppose the initiatives start locally,

manifest through individual groups and municipalities, and representations to go directly to the department and through respective MLAs. Then when the studies or the representations have indicated there is merit to the concerns and there is a base for further proceeding, then we do look at doing those works.

Concern has been made with the kind of benefits that are likely to occur from the initiation of those works. You know, it's rather subjective at some stage as to the evaluation of benefit. When we actually get a study made, then we can refine the benefits much more closely.

As has been indicated earlier, all too often, people will ask for a study to be made of a significant drain or drains and then when the price tag is there, whether it be municipal or provincial, the people lose interest in it, because the perceived benefits as against the cost doesn't indicate that it should proceed.

We look at the province as a whole. In some parts of the province, we have a very sophisticated drainage system. In other parts, there has been very substantial drainage work, but it's still of what would be called a pioneer standard. Pressures result for more drainage in these areas, and we have to look at the overall benefit to the area from the point of view of the multipurpose of agriculture, and take into consideration any flood problems that may be associated with drainage as well.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, I fully understand that. Maybe to clarify some of the concerns with the municipalities when they ask for a study to be undertaken - I think the Minister interprets that correctly, that when the costs come in and if they're cost-shared, some of it would be provincial and some of it municipal, of course, very often municipalities are not in a position to proceed with it at that time.

However, under the Health Program that we have in the province - and I'm throwing this out as a suggestion - we have sort of a five-year program designated, a building program. Might I suggest to the Minister that possibly this is something that should be looked at, because there are many of these projects that have been - I'm talking of a capital construction program under the Health Program - there is projection, and many municipalities would like to know.

I wonder if, for specifically the two that I am aware of - one is the Rat River containment area. That has been in the mill for 20 years almost. When I was reeve at that time, there was a problem. There has never been a very organized pressure group on it during correspondence over the years, but I have to indicate to the Minister that the pressure is coming to bear because there are four municipalities involved and various community organizations as well as a farm group that are involved in this thing. But because it has never been synchronized properly, because it's within the LGD of Stuartburn, pressure has never really come down as heavily. It has been sort of neglected and put on the shelf for years on end, and it is a major problem.

I also want to refer the Minister to a case in point where people from the R.M. of Franklin, the Ridgeville drain, where the area engineer was out, met with the farmers and council members, and we looked at the project. It is not that major a project, but it involves provincial money. There was anticipation that that

program would be on this year's capital works and, as a result, is not. It creates a lot of concern for the municipal people and the farmers and people involved.

That is why I'm throwing out the idea of the possibility of having a projected program of areas that are designated for consideration. It may not even be necessarily in the next year, whatever the case may be, but so they know that these projects are under consideration instead of just being . . . they sit and wait until the capital projects are being issued, and don't know whether their projects are going to be on or not. It makes for very poor planning and difficult planning for many of the municipalities in this respect. Otherwise, if they could see a little bit more of a projection as to what was going on, it would make it a lot simpler for municipalities to do their planning.

I think it would also possibly enhance the planning of the department in terms of projects that are required, so if a sort of a prioritization was set up, I think it would be very beneficial. I wonder how the Minister feels about that.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, we have been enabled to do some multi-year programming, but not at any great length. Three-year programs seem to be the vogue with the Federal Government, so a good many of the agreements have been three-year programs. I think we would certainly consider the possibility of longer-term programming, but I think that the route to go in respect to a longer-termed planned program is through the conservation districts.

That's why I am so anxious to see those initiatives proceed, because I think through the conservation districts they can develop a plan for the overall development of the area, and work through that plan over a period of not just two or three years but decades, to provide for conservation of the resources and enhancement of them. That's the route that I prefer to see pursued.

In the short run, certainly we will work towards discussion with any municipality to look at the problems there, and try to work out the degree of assistance we can.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I might just suggest to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, that the concept of conservation districts, I think, does not always lend itself to the best interests in all cases, depending on the area. For example, if I look at the southeast area where we have the escarpment and we have a place like the LGD of Stuartburn which is feeding the water into the organized municipalities and into the plants, on the conservation districts there is a lot of concern about the people in the plants by getting involved in this because they feel first of all with their high assessment, they'll be paying the greatest portion of the costs, and the benefits will be mostly to the areas that maybe have a lower assessment.

That is the concern that is out there. I think if that is not the case, the whole system, I think, has to be much more of an education program done with municipalities and council members in terms of exactly what the benefits are going to be in terms of a conservation district, etc.

The other thing that I want to raise with the Minister is with the amount of staff that he has - we looked at

that the other day in the administrative end of it - is the Minister working on, let's say, a major water management program, a long-range program in terms of water conservation?

Talking of the total, the Minister has at times made statements about the concern of water being a very important resource and I certainly agree with them. I think in that direction his thinking is, you know, commendable.

Is the Minister working on a major program in terms of water management where there should be future dikes set up for control of water? Is there a major program that he's planning in that direction, a general direction?

I'm looking at something a bit more stable than just the year-to-year type of basis, something that regardless of whether or not they are government next time, the incoming government or whoever it would be with or a different Minister, that there would be a continuity in terms of water management programming in place.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Well, the honourable member raises long-range concerns and certainly I agree with him as to the concern to develop strategies to ensure the enhancement of water in the province. They're multiple concerns.

One of the directions I've indicated to the department is that while land drainage is important and must continue, we also must look at the enhancement of water supply by providing upstream storage where it is possible. So now when we look at land drainage, we also consider the options of storing water upstream where that's possible rather than simply providing for enhanced drainage. So we are concerned about water supply, water conservation.

We are looking at ground water conservation. One of the programs that is presently going on right now in respect to, it's under that Drought Proofing Program, is an enhancement of the ground water at Elie. We're monitoring that. We've been pumping Assiniboine River water into a recharge area for the Elie aquifer. — (Interjection) — It's cut off now? Oh. How did it work out? Thank you. It didn't work out very well, Jimmy. I'm just advised that what was an ongoing program has been cut off because in the monitoring process they discovered that the water quality has deteriorated - that Assiniboine water is not first-class for augmenting the Elie water supply. We've learned that, Mr. Chairman.

But we are looking at the multiple use of our initiatives in respect to drainage, water supply, resource conservation. One of the agencies that we are using to consider some of those very difficult problems is the Water Commission. They are presently looking at Lake Dauphin from the point of view of the preservation and protection of that water resource and its enhancement. The drought sensitivity studies will formulate a base for longer-term planning of water conservation within Manitoba.

The honourable member does reflect the concerns, I think, of a growing number of Manitobans that water use has to be planned over a longer term, and we're certainly, in all of our programming, taking that as a basis for our program efforts.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, to the Minister. Might I suggest a closer consultation system with some of

the municipalities? This would not apply in all municipalities but when I look at the LGDs of Piney and Stuartburn, just as an example where they have major swamps like the Sundown Swamp and these type of areas where the councils with not proper planning possibly are starting to proceed to drain some of these areas which maybe should not be drained. That is why I was asking whether the Minister is maybe working on a bit of a program along these lines so that they can give indications to councils before they get into some of these things as to, you know, the benefits of not draining certain areas. I always lean strongly towards the municipal people having been involved with them.

But I think they're the grass-roots end of it and I think if that kind of consultation started taking place, an awareness program maybe, more consultation with municipalities in terms of what the benefits would be for water management instead of just totally draining all the time. There are areas that should be drained but, you know, there has to be a program laid out and we're sort of walking in a wilderness at this stage of the game and I would hope that we could maybe move somewhere in that direction.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** He's quite right that the municipalities often are desirous of initiating drainage that will, they believe, accommodate their particular needs in their area. The problem associated with that is that there can be downstream problems occur as a result of that enhanced drainage upstream. He's quite right about that. We are able under The Water Rights Act to control any drainage, but the imposition of controls has to be not light-handed, but reasonable.

During the coming years we will be working out guidelines and then perhaps directives in respect to all drainage in Manitoba because we now have that kind of authority under The Water Rights Act.

**MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER:** The Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Moving on just briefly to another area within that section there. In terms of the Canada-Manitoba Flood Damage Reduction Program, is there any activity going on at the present time? There still is a need for it. Or do we need a major flood before we get considering further requirements because what happened is that the deadlines that were set in terms of flood reduction last time our province, or the people of Manitoba left money on the table at the federal level because they could not complete their projects. I'm wondering is there any activity, continued activity, to try and get some of this work finalized yet? There were a lot of people along the Red River Valley there who for various reasons could not take advantage of the program at that time. Is there a continuing consultation with the Federal Government for a continuation of that program?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** No, Mr. Chairman. I don't think the Federal Government has shown any interest. I think that question was approached last year in Estimates and I indicated that while there had been discussion at the officials level, the Federal Government hadn't indicated any interest in pursuing that.

Under that program, we still have the Flood Reduction and Flood Mapping Program, and that's ongoing. Some areas, of course, are not as enthusiastic. That's probably a gross understatement about that program but it is a very useful, we think, and important program and it is proceeding.

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

**MR. A. BROWN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Of course, one of the major problems that we have in the area that I represent is a joint problem between North Dakota and Manitoba, namely, the Pembina River. I wonder if I could have an update as to how negotiations are going to go. Has a plan been adopted regarding the Pembina Dam, the Pembilier Dam or an alternate plan? When is the last meeting you've had in that respect? And how are we coming along in resolving that particular situation?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** In respect to the Pembina River and the Pembilier Dam, that study was completed and was not recommended. The alternative, a floodway along the U.S. boundary, was completed by the United States Army, the Corps of Engineers. There has been no further action on it.

**MR. A. BROWN:** Has the Province of Manitoba objected to them shifting the criterion that was used? There used to be a one-to-one ratio as far as benefits were concerned, cost-benefit ratio, then the United States switched the criterion that was used and switched over to 1900 from 1940, I believe. Have we ever objected to that?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I'm advised that, Mr. Chairman, the standards are set by the U.S. Bureau and we can't interfere with those standards. It is their standards and we have no way of changing those standards.

**MR. A. BROWN:** Then has an alternate proposal been adopted? They were talking about building another drainage ditch right along the American Border, and so on. Has that been adopted?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, I'd indicated that the alternative to the Pembilier Dam was the floodway along the border that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers had completed, but there is reluctance on the part of local people on the American side to accept it and there has been no decision.

**MR. A. BROWN:** Has any agreement been arrived at between the North Dakota Government and the Manitoba Government regarding the Aux Marais and the South Buffalo Drain?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Nothing further, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. A. BROWN:** My question then is, are talks continuing? Are you trying to arrive at some kind of an agreement where we can start working on what is a very major problem in that area at the time of high water?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, I am advised that discussions have been ongoing, discussions as recent as a couple of weeks ago, with an official in North Dakota, and that official will be taking up with State Department to see whether or not full discussions can be resumed.

**MR. A. BROWN:** A study is being done into the feasibility of the Holland Dam and I wonder, could we have a progress report on how that study is coming along? That is supposed to be finished, I believe, in two years time.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairman, Hansard already has recorded an answer that I gave to the Honourable Member from Gladstone in connection with that whole matter and perhaps the honourable member could refer to Hansard.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (4.(a)(1) to 4.(g)(2) were each read and passed.)  
4.(h)(1).  
The Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Just a question to the Minister on the Canada-Manitoba Value-Added Crops Production. I understand the present program terminates the construction portion, the sharing portion of it terminates in the fall of '85; are there any negotiations going on at the present time in terms of a new program? The program terminated in '84 and I believe there's an extension to '85, are there any negotiations going on for a similar program for the future?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, under the ERDA Agreement I referred to earlier.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 4.(h)(1)—pass; 4.(h)(2)—pass.  
Resolution No. 123: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$9,081,300 for Water Resources for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1985—pass.  
Item 5.(a), Parks Administration.  
Mr. Minister.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** On the next item, Mr. Chairman, of Parks, there is a capital area - I don't know whether we have the material here - I'll see that material is with us shortly. I must also — (Interjection) — Whatever suits the Honourable Member for Arthur.

I want at this time also, before we move to another item, I had undertaken, Mr. Chairman, to provide members with some copies of the printed materials that the Communications section have put out in this fiscal year, and I will leave this with the Clerk and, perhaps, copies of them can be given to those members who indicate an interest in having copies. We can start with this, well perhaps we can go through it and then the Capital item we can deal with at the end if you like.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, does the Minister have any opening comments under this department? I have two specific areas that I would like to be covering on this and we're very close to the supper hour. I think either one, I'd prefer to maybe wait until right after the

supper hour to get into them. I might indicate to the Minister the areas of concern that I have.

One is the area of the Park Designation and the Mechanical Restrictions is an area that I want to pursue a little further. The other one deals with the Falcon Lake Park area, which is the El'nor Resort. I have some questions along that area that I would like to pursue, so I just want to indicate to the Minister that those are the areas that I'd like to pursue right after the supper hour.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman. I think I will forego any introductory remarks. I think the honourable members will recall that, by way of introductory remarks at the beginning, I did indicate some of the significant activities in Parks. I will leave

it at that and as we go through, if there are any particular areas, I may want to add to what I've said earlier.

I think, in light of the hour, if the honourable member agrees, then we should break. Do you want to go ahead? Go ahead, I leave it to you.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, I agree with the Minister. Rather than get halfway into one of my areas of concern, if the Minister is agreed we'll call it 5:30 and reconvene at 8, and then we can get right into the area.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Is that agreed? (Agreed) The time being 5:30 I'm leaving the Chair and will return at 8:00 p.m. tonight.