



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

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS**

26 Elizabeth II

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



Vol. XXVI No. 32A

2:30 p.m. Monday, May 1, 1978

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Thirty-First Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

<i>Name</i>	<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Political Affiliation</i>
ADAM, A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANDERSON, Robert (Bob)	Springfield	P.C.
AXWORTHY, Lloyd	Fort Rouge	Lib.
BANMAN, Robert, Hon.	La Verendrye	P.C.
BARROW, Thomas A.	Flin Flon	NDP
BLAKE, David R.	Minnedosa	P.C.
BOSTROM, Harvey	Rupertsland	NDP
BOYCE, J.R. (Bud)	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	P.C.
CHERNIACK, Saul M., Q.C.	St. Johns	NDP
CORRIN, Brian	Wellington	NDP
COSENS, Keith A., Hon.	Gimli	P.C.
COWAN, Jay	Churchill	NDP
CRAIK, Donald W., Hon.	Riel	P.C.
DESJARDINS, Laurent L.	St. Boniface	NDP
DOERN, Russell J.	Elmwood	NDP
DOMINO, Len	St. Matthews	P.C.
DOWNEY, James E., Hon.	Arthur	P.C.
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	P.C.
EINARSON, Henry	Rock Lake	P.C.
ENNS, Harry J., Hon.	Lakeside	P.C.
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
FERGUSON, James R.	Gladstone	P.C.
FOX, Peter	Kildonan	NDP
GALBRAITH, James	Dauphin	P.C.
GOURLAY, Douglas	Swan River	P.C.
GRAHAM, Harry E., Hon.	Birtle-Russell	P.C.
GREEN, Sidney, Q.C.	Inkster	NDP
HANUSCHAK, Ben	Burrows	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd G.	Portage la Prairie	P.C.
JENKINS, William W.	Logan	NDP
JOHNSTON, J. Frank, Hon.	Sturgeon Creek	P.C.
JORGENSEN, Warner H., Hon.	Morris	P.C.
KOVNATS, Abe	Radisson	P.C.
LYON, Sterling R., Q.C., Hon.	Charleswood	P.C.
MacMASTER, Ken, Hon.	Thompson	P.C.
McBRYDE, Ronald	The Pas	NDP
McGILL, Edward R., Hon.	Brandon West	P.C.
McGREGOR, Morris	Virden	P.C.
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin	P.C.
MALINOWSKI, Donald	Point Douglas	NDP
MERCIER, Gerald W.J., Q.C., Hon.	Osborne	P.C.
MILLER, Saul A.	Seven Oaks	NDP
MINAKER, George	St. James	P.C.
ORCHARD, Donald W.	Pembina	P.C.
PARASIUK, Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PAWLEY, Howard, Q.C.	Selkirk	NDP
PRICE, Norma Hon.	Assiniboia	P.C.
RANSOM, Brian, Hon.	Souris-Killarney	P.C.
SCHREYER, Edward R.	Rossmere	NDP
SHERMAN, Louis R., Hon. (Bud)	Fort Garry	P.C.
SPIVAK, Sidney, Q.C., Hon.	River Heights	P.C.
STEEN, Warren	Crescentwood	P.C.
URUSKI, Billie	St. George	NDP
USKIW, Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, D. James	St. Vital	NDP
WILSON, Robert G.	Wolseley	P.C.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, May 1, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed, I should like to draw the honourable members' attention to my gallery where we have Dr. Andrew Doman, Third Secretary of the Australian High Commission in Ottawa who is visiting in Winnipeg today. On behalf of all the members, we welcome you here today.

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

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. BILLIE URUSKI (St. George) on behalf of the Member for Brandon East, introduced Bill No. 17, An Act to amend An Act to incorporate the Brandon General Hospital.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister, really in his capacity as Minister relating to Dominion-Provincial relations for Manitoba, has the First Minister had an opportunity to be more fully briefed with respect to the reports that would indicate that Canada has made arrangements with respect to the sales tax that are unique to one province and apparently not available in similar form to the other nine provinces?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Premier (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition for bringing this matter to our attention the other day, at which time the question was founded on news reports. I did discuss the matter with staff members from the Department of Finance; I have not been further briefed since that time, but as soon as we have further information I will be happy to bring it to the attention of the member and the members of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. To take this opportunity to welcome back the Minister of Finance and comment on what was apparently, one could say, a successful, bond issue. Could the Minister of Finance indicate now whether there is anything, with respect to current movements of the Canadian dollar, that would in any way detract from the importance of this favourable bond issue.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his comments. I would say in answer to his question with regards to the relative value of the Canadian currency that the current feeling appears to be that the American dollar and the Canadian dollar have taken on somewhat greater strengths in the last ten days than what had been indicated prior to that time, but it would appear that in that particular arena that attitudes can change every ten days or so, and there is at least some degree of confidence and determination on the part of, not only the American government and American interests and Canadian interests, but in the European and other free world interests, to make every attempt possible to keep the American dollar in its present position of strength. And if that is the case, then I would suggest that the bond issue which has just been completed should be a very favourable bond issue for Manitoba.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: In the absence of the Minister of Health I'd like to ask a question of the Minister of Finance. He must be aware of this; if not, maybe somebody could take it as notice for the Minister of Health. The Federal Government has indexed the OAS and GIS again, as they've been doing for a while now. What is the policy of the Provincial Government? Will that be passed on to those receiving the Manitoba elderly supplement, or will that now be cut back, or included as added revenue?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

Monday, May 1, 1978

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to take that as notice for the Minister of Health. He's absent only today on ministerial duties outside of the city.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for Housing. In view of the disclosure that the Federal Government has prepared a new package of housing arrangements and has submitted these to the provinces, can the Minister indicate whether the province has given its acceptance to those proposals? And does the Minister intend to make any announcement or provide us with any indication of what the provincial role will be in the housing market in supplement or complement to those new proposals by the Federal Government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister responsible for Housing.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I know of no official announcement of the Minister in Ottawa to the Federal House. There is no doubt that we have had meetings with our federal people and all of the other provinces during the past couple of months. The proposals that the Federal Government are putting forward have been — some of them have been presented to us. We have looked them over and we have forwarded some comments to the Federal Minister regarding his proposals, with certain reservations which are this: That we are willing and ready and want to sit down immediately and finalize the whole thing, and we have made that request.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate that because the proposals include a substantial replacement of federal assistance to the municipalities replacing the Neighbourhood Improvement Program and the Sewage Program whether the province has yet met with officials of the municipalities in this province to determine how they would like to see this new Capital allocation be administered, and can he indicate whether the province has yet established any mechanisms on the provincial level to determine priorities or criteria for the transfer of these funds to the cities or municipalities in the province?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation were involved with the Neighbourhood Improvement Program, NIP Program, which ended on the 30th of March. The new program is Municipal Assistance and the Minister of Municipal Affairs is the one who has been dealing with the Federal Government regarding the new program.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Then perhaps I could ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs or responsible for Urban Affairs if he can indicate whether there has been any agreement reached with the City of Winnipeg and the other municipalities concerning the way in which the new Municipal Assistance Program will be administered in the province, and what kind of mechanisms or administrative arrangements will be made to established priorities or criteria for the allocation of these moneys?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I want to point out firstly that although there have been certain discussions with officials in various provincial departments, including Finance, Agriculture and Housing, there has been no discussion yet at the ministerial level and I have advised Mr. Ouellet by telegram and on the telephone that, in my view, a federal-provincial ministerial conference is required immediately — and I advised him of that over a month and a half ago — in order to implement this program.

It certainly is an important program, but there are a number of Ministers in other provinces, including myself, who would like to hold such a meeting prior to the implementation of such a program. If Mr. Ouellet and the Federal Government decide to proceed in their unilateral way, prior to obviously a federal election — whenever that's going to occur, but obviously perhaps in the short term — if they wish to proceed in that way we will have to negotiate with their departmental officials the best agreement that is possible. But that's where the matter stands at the present time. We have not yet been in a position to work out a formula or involve any of the municipalities in any consultative way with respect to this proposed change in a program.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona has had three questions. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just then address a final supplementary to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, that in speaking of unilateral approaches he hasn't really yet indicated what steps he intends to take in terms of discussion or consultation with the municipalities in the province concerning how the program might be allocated, and I would ask him whether he intends to do that in the near future, so that that criteria can be one that is fully developed with their consultation and their contribution, and can he also indicate, that as far as the province is concerned, that they would insist that one of the primary criteria for this allocation would be its application to the improvement and renewal of older neighbourhoods in these areas, and not simply to be used as

capital replacement funds for the cities.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, there is no question that one of the matters we raised the past election was the importance of rehabilitation and improvement of older homes and that would certainly be a component of any new program that would be adopted. Unfortunately, we are not yet in a position to engage in consultation with any municipality in the province until an agreement or an arrangement is made and that a decision is made by Mr. Ouellet as to whether or not there will be a Minister of Conference, prior to the implementation of any program.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you Mr. Speaker. My questions to the Minister responsible for the Rent Control Program.

In the light of the Governments announced program regarding rent decontrol, will the tenants in the 800 or so units that are demolished per year in the old City of Winnipeg area, be henceforth forced to seek shelter in uncontrolled rental suites, when they are forced to move because of demolition.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I'll accept the question from the Member for Transcona as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Supplementary Mr. Speaker. Since the vacancy rate in the old City of Winnipeg area is much less than 1 percent, will the government ensure that these people in rental suites which are being demolished, will be able to get rental accommodation through the government if forced to leave because of demolition.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, the premises that the member quotes as the basis for his question, I cannot accept. Nevertheless, along with his earlier question, I'll take it as notice.

MR. PARASIUK: Final supplementary. When the Minister is taking questions as notice, does the Minister have knowledge of any government program or programs, that will increase the supply of housing stock, and thus the vacancy rate in the old City of Winnipeg, to levels of 4 or 5 percent which are accepted by experts as being the minimal levels required before decontrols are brought in.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, the Member is now asking me for statement as to policies of the government with respect to housing and increasing the total stock. If and when the government has announcements of policy in that respect to make, they will be made in the House as we have made our policies known in respect to the continuation of rent controls.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister to whom the Manitoba Development Corporation reports.

I would like to know whether it is correct that the bus manufacturing company owned by all of the people of the Province of Manitoba was successful in tendering on 50 buses in the City of Toronto?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I think this is the Order that we have been waiting for. We haven't received final word from the City of Toronto. We were low bidder. I think that's the contract the member refers to. We hope that within the next couple of weeks we'll be notified whether or not we are, indeed, awarded the contract.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister can advise us whether the distinctive lack of adverse comment, with respect to this efficiently operating public corporation, has assisted the Board of Directors in bidding on outside product — I'm talking about the lack of adverse comment since October 11th by both the political people and the media — whether this has assisted the company in its bidding practices.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, as the member will appreciate, it's hard to evaluate something like that. I can inform the member that the company is very actively pursuing U.S. markets at this time and are hoping to gather some contracts in those particular areas.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, since public notice has not been taken of it, may I ask again, the Minister, to confirm that at the end of fiscal 1976, rather than a \$3 million projected loss that the company — the end of fiscal 1977, that rather than a \$3 million loss as was given as the worst projection, that the

company earned a profit and in doing so has run the last three years, running with a profit.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member for Inkster that that can hardly be construed as a question. —(Interjection)— Does the Honourable Member for Inkster wish to pose a question?

MR. GREEN: Yes. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, perhaps you misunderstood me. I asked whether the Minister can confirm that at the end of fiscal 1977, the company showed a profit.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, like the First Minister says, it's a matter of record. —(Interjection)— Well, that is the reason that I'm asking the question. There has been no formal notice to this effect.

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

MR. PETER FOX: Mr. Speaker, I see the Minister rose. I'll yield to him till he answers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think the member is referring to the last statement that will be presented at the Economic Development Committee meeting and at that time we'll discuss it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Labour. I wonder if she can inform the House whether the department's Conciliation Services have been involved in the negotiations between the Builders' Exchange and the Building Trades Council.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. NOA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): Yes, Mr. Speaker, they have all weekend.

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

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation and ask him could he announce to this House whether he will be proceeding with the announced program of increased benefits under the no-fault insurance portion of Autopac that was announced last fall.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, any changes in policy with respect to the operation of MPIC, if and when forthcoming, will be duly announced in this Chamber.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, in view of his announcement of policy, could he give us the government's policy or elucidate it somewhat because it has been kind of confusing about their position with respect to the drivers' insurance that has recently been in the media.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the same answer applies. If indeed any changes are to be made in the matter of policy with respect to the insurance portion on the driver's license having to do with age or sex, they will be duly made.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister responsible for the Gimli Industrial Park which, I presume, is the Minister of Industry, to ask the Minister if, given indications that the National Research Council's division of upper atmospheric research is in process of seeking to establish at Gimli the administrative and support centre for upper atmospheric rocketry and balloon-type atmospheric investigation, can the Minister advise us whether the Province of Manitoba is involved in providing whatever encouragement and technical support to NRC in order to help expedite their making that decision.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, we have been monitoring that particular move by the National Research Council. I think one of the areas as far as the leasing agreement, that's handled by the Department of Public Works, but as Minister of Industry and Commerce, we were concerned that we

keep that particular function in Manitoba and to that extent, we have been monitoring it and keeping in touch with the people to ensure that it stays here.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Minister's answer really bespeaks a supplementary question. It has nothing to do with leasing but rather with efforts that may have to be made in order to ensure, as much as it is possible for the province to ensure, that the NRC's upper atmospheric research centre is domiciled here in Manitoba as opposed to some other part of Canada which I am advised is putting on some political heat just at this time of the year and presumably before the election.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I was also apprised of the fact that some people were putting on the "political heat" to try and have that particular function moved. To that extent, we are monitoring it and trying to stay on top of the situation to make sure that that function stays here.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Attorney-General as Minister of Urban Affairs. When the City of Winnipeg approached the province for a grant for a new arena of the order of \$2 million, could he comment on who gave the Mayor the impression or the comment that they should "Go to hell"?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, there have been no formal discussions relating to . . . or those kind of informal discussions between the City of Winnipeg and the province, and I can advise that attending a function with His Worship Mayor Steen on the weekend, he regretted that he in fact summarized any discussions he had had with individuals in that manner.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, would the government be more receptive to a proposal for a smaller arena of the order of 15,000 or 16,000 seats?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the report of the ad hoc committee of City Council is only a report of a committee and has not yet been approved or adopted by Council to the best of my information and as soon as Council adopts a proposal in whatever form, we will then commence our discussions with the City.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary. Can the Minister indicate whether there are any funds available to the city for the construction of an arena either within the Department of Urban Affairs or in any other government department?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the proposal has just been made, the province has not budgeted in any way for any participation in construction of an arena but that does not necessarily rule out any consideration because, as I understand the report of the ad hoc committee, it deals with the construction of an arena for the year 1980 so it's some way off.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address my question to the Minister of Education. Can the Minister advise the House if the Residential Educational Centre at Gimli has been closed down?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that question as notice. I don't really think that particular function falls under my department.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce and ask the Minister of Industry and Commerce, in view of the pending sale of Morden Fine Foods Limited, would the Minister table the latest Annual Report of Morden Fine Foods Limited for the last fiscal year available, would he table it forthwith? I appreciate the practice of tabling it during the Committee of Economic Development hearings but, in view of the pending sale, could he table that report forthwith so that members of the House may examine it?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think the Economic Development Committee will meet very shortly and at that time I'll table it.

Monday, May 1, 1978

MR. EVANS: Along the same lines, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister whether he has directed the MDC to put up a reserve bid for this company inasmuch as it is under Part II of the Act whereby the Cabinet issues directives to the MDC, has he required the Manitoba Development Corporation to put a reserve bid up to ensure that it is not sold to any private enterprise for value less than the land, plant and equipment combined, as was the case in the Lord Selkirk?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, the same procedure is being followed with this particular company as with several others. We are asking for offers which means that if the offers are not acceptable to the MDC board, they don't bring them forward so that there is no need to have that particular clause in there.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could advise the House now whether the loss which he reported to the press, the loss Morden Fine Foods was supposed to have suffered last year, whether that loss was before or after payments of interest to the MDC.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, these are technical questions and I think we best leave them for when we meet in the Economic Development Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll direct my question to the Minister of Tourism. Can the Minister of Tourism advise the House if the Recreational Educational Centre at Gimli has been closed down?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. BANMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the recreation training facilities in Gimli have been closed.

MR. JENKINS: Can the Honourable Minister advise how many people were laid off or their services dispensed with?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, this was done at the time when a number of layoffs were announced; the exact number I will have to get for the member, to tell him that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: A Supplementary. Can the Honourable Minister find out how many have been able to secure other employment with the province? And is the building for sale, the facilities?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question as well for the Minister responsible for Tourism and Recreation. I wonder if he could confirm that the Provincial Government has cut back by close to 50 percent the number of lifeguards it intends to hire for provincial parks and lakes this summer?

MR. BANMAN: No, Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm that; again, I'll have to check the exact number that we'll be hiring, but I've been assured by my staff that the manning and the lifeguarding of different public facilities will remain.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Then, can I take from the Minister's answer that there in fact will be cutbacks on the number of lifeguards that will be available, and does that indicate, aside from the fact that the First Minister thinks the only right solution is to drain the lakes, or something, to save people, whether in fact that will mean a cutback in the hours allowed for swimming in these lakes so as to ensure a proper safety factor?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, the government isn't going to control the times and places that people can swim. If you're up in a remote northern lake we're not going to tell you you can't swim between the hours of 2:00 and 5:00. But Mr. Speaker, he's also assuming several other things; I will check to see the exact number of staff being hired for the different public beaches and I will report back to him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Tourism. Can the Minister advise whether the seminar facilities at Gimli, which I understand have been in existence for over 20 years and which have been used by many groups —(Interjection)— 30 years in the Province of Manitoba to establish conferences in. Can the Minister advise whether there was any consultation with the elected representative of the people to the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Manitoba for the constituency of Gimli before this facility was closed down?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think the member is well aware that the Member for Gimli is a member of the Treasury Benches and as a result is involved with the approvals of Estimates.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am quite aware that his approval is unnecessary. I am asking the honourable member whether it was necessary or not, whether the elected representative of the people for the area concerned, was consulted prior to the termination of this facility which has existed in that constituency for the past 30 years?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for St. Vital. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If the question, is out of order, I suppose we will debate the point of order. I consider it to have been a very valid question and I would say the same if it was an elected representative on this side of the House, but I asked —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think so, and we'll debate the question of order if the honourable member wishes to debate it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. There has been no point of order raised in the Chamber and if the Member for Inkster wants to raise a point of order I would like to know what it is.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, with the greatest of respect, obviously, my ears are better than yours, and I heard the First Minister raise this as a question of order, from his seat albeit.

I will proceed to the Minister of Tourism and ask him whether he would provide the House, since his Estimates are terminated —(Interjection)— oh, you haven't been through your Estimates? When the Minister is dealing with his Estimates, would he bring to this House a list of the groups in Manitoba that have used this seminar facility over the past 30 years, and will he be prepared to answer at that time as well where these groups are now being sent to?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to discuss that during the Estimates.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Has the Minister received any report concerning the impending layoffs at Co-Op Implements?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): No, I haven't, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WALDING: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, would the Minister be prepared to investigate to find out whether Co-Op Implements are planning to lay off a number of employees in the spring and summer?

MRS. PRICE: The only thing I know of, Mr. Speaker, is what I've read in the newspaper. I haven't been advised of anything, and if I do, I would be only too happy to get it for you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Tourism. Given the fact that the Minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I find it very difficult for both Ministers and members to make their questions known, and I would hope that members would keep their conversation down to a dull roar. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Tourism. Given the fact that he has had several weeks now since his deputy has returned to ascertain the facts behind the case where he has instructed his deputy to sign an agreement with the development company to develop 250 condominium units in the Whiteshell, would he undertake to present that report to the Legislature this week?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, I will be tabling it very soon, but I should correct the member. I think the document said 200, not 250.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

Monday, May 1, 1978

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour, and if she is not able to deal with it, as perhaps indicated by her previous answer, I would like to direct it to the Minister of Finance. Would a Minister or the government insure that the \$15 million in public moneys which have been advanced or guaranteed to the Canadian Co-Operative Implements Corporation, would the government assure that that money is used in such a way as to maintain employment and not to better the security position of those people who had previous investments in the company, including the Central Co-Operative organization. Is the government seeing to it that that \$15 million is used for public purposes and not merely to bail out the previous investors?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Tourism, and this is in connection with the report that he promised us a month ago regarding the Jarmoc affair. Can he account for the delay of one month in presenting to the House, as promised, a simple straightforward account of what took place with respect to that development?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned before, I will be tabling that report very shortly.

MR. PARASIUK: That wasn't the question, Mr. Speaker, I'll repeat it. Can he account for the delay in the Minister presenting to the Legislature as promised a month ago, a simple, straightforward account of what took place with respect to the signing of that development agreement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: A supplementary. Has the Minister sent back to technical staff in his department for re-editing the technical report prepared on this matter by his technical staff?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think that that question doesn't need a reply. I would just like to say that I will be making that report public very shortly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Minister, given that he has had some opportunity now of some months to review this situation, can he now make a commitment to this House that that project, that particular project which is 200 or 250 units — whichever, will be proceeding or will not be proceeding? Can he make a commitment that this project has been cancelled?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think that's why we are doing the review, and I think that will be part-and-parcel of what we will be dealing with.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to a question I asked on two previous occasions of the Minister of Tourism with respect to ascertaining whether or not the Province of Manitoba was transferring funds to the Manitoba Hotel Association to enable them to hire staff which could then in turn be laid-off by the Department of Tourism, for the purpose of facility rating and classification, the Minister indicated on previous occasions that he was having this checked out. Can he now indicate if in fact there is a transfer of funds from the province to the Hotel Association for the said purpose?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I checked with my department. I understand that negotiations are going on with the Manitoba Hotel Association. As I am informed to date, there have been no transfer of funds or no agreements made.

MR. SCHREYER: There may be no transfer of funds, but may I ask the Minister if he is completely sure that negotiations are still continuing? I would like to give the Minister the opportunity to answer

that, given that I am in possession of information which indicates that the staff have been given notice of layoff and that there has been confirmation to the Hotel Association that they will be funded for the purpose of carrying out this function.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I can re-check but the last information that I was given by my department was that the negotiations were still underway.

ORDERS OF THE DAY — ADDRESS FOR PAPERS

ADDRESS FOR PAPERS NO. 2: On motion of Mr. Fox.

THAT an humble Address be voted His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor praying for copies of all correspondence the Minister of Labour and/or the Department of Labour have exchanged with Simplot Chemical Company Limited and/or its solicitors and Hooker Chemical Canada Limited and/or its solicitors since June 25th, 1969.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, I accept it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Address has been accepted by the Minister of Labour.

GOVERNMENT BILLS — SECOND READING

BILL NO. 2 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE DISTRESS ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to proceed with this bill.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to Bill 2, I would like to first indicate that it is somewhat illustrative of the priorities of the government of the day that a bill such as this should be introduced, the first substantive bill of the session, Bill No. 2, a bill which could more correctly read, Mr. Speaker, an Act to amend The Distress Act in order to relieve the private bailiff.

Mr. Speaker, when we are dealing with a period of alleged need for restraint in the province; when we find that those in personal care homes are requested to increase the amount of per diem payment; when we find that those in hospitals are requested to commence to pay a per diem fee as they wait for personal care attention; when we find students that are receiving increases in their tuition fees to the extent of 20-25 percent, and worst of all, Mr. Speaker; when we have absolutely no action on the part of the government of the day to increase the amount of the minimum wage in Manitoba. Really, Mr. Speaker, it shows the topsy-turvy purposes and objectives of the Conservative Government of the day in the Province of Manitoba. That's all I have to say. When we see introduced before us a bill such as this.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that is quite unimportant. It is a bill that certainly does not require urgent attention by this Assembly at this time. We have lived with this bill since 1890-some, and then I believe in 1924 there was an amendment to the bill. We have got along all these years without the need for a bill such as the one that has been introduced in the Legislature.

I can't say that there is anything tremendously wrong with what the Minister is attempting to achieve. He wishes to attach, to have the matter of private bailiff fees for purposes of levying distress dealt with by way of regulation, rather than through legislation before this House. And I suppose that's an innocent enough request, Mr. Speaker, but it does gall one. It galls one, Mr. Speaker, when so many are requested to exercise restraint that this government, this Bill No. 2, introduces legislation in this House geared to provide this government with the opportunity, when they meet behind closed doors, to increase the fees for private bailiffs in this province, so that they can recoup more from judgment debtors.

It does demonstrate a philosophy — a philosophy of the government opposite — where their concerns, their objectives, their purposes lie. It illustrates, I think, very very well by way of this bill, in a way which probably could not have been demonstrated by a hundred speeches, just where the objectives and purposes of this government are.

I remember while I was Attorney-General, Mr. Speaker, only once that I can recall having anyone speak to me, or lobby me, about the need for increased private bailiff's fees insofar as the levying of distress is concerned on judgment debtors. And that request to me, urging that I consider, came from the present Member for Wolseley, who is not in his seat.

So, Mr. Speaker, I can see the great urgency and priority being given to this bill. I don't think the Attorney-General is that concerned about insuring that private bailiff's fees be dealt with by way of regulation. I don't see the Attorney-General handling it as a matter of topmost priority in the Legislature. But I do suspect, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Wolseley is concerned about the need for this type of legislation and some way or other that has provided the avenue by which the legislation has been submitted to the House.

Monday, May 1, 1978

Mr. Speaker, the timing is wrong; the priorities are wrong; the philosophy is wrong that at this particular juncture when we have a government opposite that is emphasizing restraint, tightening of the belt and the Minister of Labour saying people are spoiled in Manitoba, that one of its first acts in this Legislature is a bill geared towards the relief of private bailiffs.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I feel that I should caution the Honourable Member for Selkirk that there's a possibility that some of the language he used in his debate may be unparliamentary. I will check the record when it comes up and advise him later on.

The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances I think I will move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Kildonan, that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Would you call Bills 3, 4 and No. 9, please?

BILL NO. 3 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE PROVINCIAL JUDGES ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, this legislation is not of a very substantive nature. There are some minor amendments proposed. Insofar as the reference to 12 weeks being required so that a Judge may propose, may complete a decision after that Judge retires or resigns the only question which we would ask the Attorney-General to answer for us — and this can be done during Committee stage — is whether or not a Judge that resigns due to action that is brought against him before the Judicial Council, would also be given that 12-week period in order to complete a judgment. If so, then we would want to weigh the pros and cons of that having been a reasonable move. -- in instance in the case of former Judge Pilutik, I believe

For that there were no outstanding judgments that had to be handed down after his resignation; but if the resignation had taken place earlier, then there may well have been some judgments undealt with and I'm not too sure as to the principles that we should be dealing with in that respect.

Now, in regard to the question of the Judicial Council, we would submit that the two other persons appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor that are referred to in the bill, should in fact be lay people and not members of the Bar, because the Law Society at the present time is appointing lay members to their ranks, as benchers, and we feel that in view of the fact the other three members of the Judicial Council will, in fact, be lawyers or judges, that the two other persons referred to ought, by right, be lay members.

Now, I know the honourable member can comment that in fact we had appointed, in fact, one lawyer. But I do think that it would have been more valid in our instance, too, if we had appointed two lay members — and I think that is a principle that should be considered, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to invite the Honourable Minister to close the debate if he would.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Selkirk has raised two questions with respect to this. Looking through my material I note that this legislation is right on with the legislation in the County Court and the Surrogate's Court, relative to a Judge who resigns and there does not appear to be any reference to a Judge who might be put in a situation where he resigns as a result of a hearing for improper behaviour. So I think perhaps we can examine that question further in Law Amendments and deal with it there.

Secondly, the second question that the member raises is with respect to the appointment of the other two positions, other than the Chief Justice and the representatives of the Law Society and the Manitoba Bar Association.

I agree with the Member for Selkirk that where possible those members should be lay people, that it is important on a committee such as this that lay people be involved and people who are not involved directly in the Law Society or as members of the legal profession.

I think one matter that we should also look at in Law Amendments Committee, is whether or not there should be a Provincial Judge on this committee. Since introducing the bill I have received some information with respect to the composition of Judicial Councils in other Provincial governments, where Provincial Judges are members of the Judicial Council, and I think this could be another question that we could deal with at Law Amendments Committee.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I personally wish to Stand the bill, but I believe the Member for St. Johns would like to speak to the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, do you want the bill to continue to stand in your name?

MR. PAWLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have reviewed the bill and the comments made by the Honourable, the Attorney-General, and there is some doubt in my mind about the fairness of the proposal, which is designed apparently to reduce certain suggested onerous responsibilities of the police; because the Honourable, the Attorney-General, stated that both the City of Winnipeg Police Force and the RCMP expressed concern in that the present legislation requires the police to administer a test to a driver under suspension at any time.

He then says that they are concerned, the police concern, is that they would be required to forsake other duties and responsibilities while they attend to this demand. Mr. Speaker, I don't think that's a good reason. You know, I think we should look at the law and how fair it is to people affected by it and the fact that it may be inconvenient for somebody is not in itself a good reason, but I think that it is the only real reason that's presented by the Attorney-General.

He then says that under this proposed new subsection, the driver must forthwith — if he wishes at all — he must forthwith request and voluntarily submit to a test. Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm now speaking about a bill that has been discussed, but I'm not sure that honourable members are aware of the import of it.

As I understand it the law today is that a person who is driving a vehicle may be stopped and may be given a test of a lesser certainty than a breathalyzer test and if that test shows that this person has a liquor test called "Warn" rather than "Pass" or "Fail", then that person is not charged nor is it the intent of the present law that he be punished. As I understand the present law, it is that since it is a warning, not an accusation of being impaired and driving, therefore as a warning and for the safety of the driver and for anybody else that might be involved in an accident, his driver's licence or his licence plates are removed for a 12-hour period. Therefore, the intent is not to put the person in jail, not to charge him, not to fine him, but just because he fails that test to just withdraw his driver's licence to make sure that he doesn't drive the car while he is on the warning. That, I think, is sensible and it's not vindictive and there is a caution involved in it.

The present law apparently is that that person might say to the police officer, "I don't think I'm impaired; I want a breathalyzer test." Then, if he takes a breathalyzer test, that breathalyzer test determines whether or not he would be charged or whether the licence would still be retained or, indeed, that the licence be returned immediately because he may have passed the test and proven that that earlier test was inadequate or did not reasonably provide good reason or justification for the withdrawal of the driver's licence.

Now, the proposed change is that the person who is stopped and takes this test — I'm looking for the name of the test, the ALERT test apparently it's called — he takes the test and he is told, "Now, this does not say fail or does not say pass, it says warn," I'm going to take your driver's licence away." That person must immediately — on the spot — demand a breathalyzer test or forever hold his peace on this particular charge. Then if he demands a breathalyzer test then I believe he has to go to a place where it can be given, which I assume is a police station, and there he would take the test.

I don't know why the Attorney-General took the trouble to say, "The test would be administered at that time and the driver would run the risk of being charged under the impaired driving provisions of the Criminal Code if he failed a breathalyzer test." Now the Attorney-General seems to be saying, "Here is a warning; I'm going to take your licence away for 12 hours; you can come and get it in 12 hours time, but if you ask me to see whether or not you can pass a breathalyzer test, then buddy, you may end up being charged." I don't know if that's fair; I don't know why a person shouldn't be able to say, "You know I may feel a little gay, I had a couple of drinks; I think I can drive capably; I think I'm not a danger to the road. If you aren't sure because of this test, let's have a breathalyzer test and if I pass it, then let me go, give me the licence. If I fail it, then keep the licence for those 12 hours." But there's an implied threat: if you insist on taking the breathalyzer test then, buddy, you may be charged and a person may then be afraid, afraid of possible consequences and not ask for it. I don't think that the reasoning should be such as to make it easier for the police so they don't have to administer the test. I don't think that that is a good reason.

I suggest something else. I do suggest that the present law as interpreted by the Attorney-General seems to be that at any time during that 12-hour period and as often as the person likes, he can go and ask for a breathalyzer test and if that is the case, then I think the law should be changed. Therefore, my proposal to the Attorney-General is that on one occasion only during the period of that

suspension, that 12-hour suspension, that person shall have the right to go and take a test and get his driver's licence back if he passes the breathalyzer test, because I visualize, Mr. Speaker, that there are many people who may have attended a party or a reception or a cocktail party of some kind, have had a couple of drinks, be driving, be stopped and have his licence taken away and two, three, four hours later have sobered up enough — he wasn't drunk in the first place, Mr. Speaker, because if he were drunk he would have been charged — but he just had a warning and, let us say he could even be one of us who has some important business to do four hours from now. Why should we require that he makes his demand immediately or not at all when it seems to me that he should be able, in let's say three, four hours after that initial licence was taken away, to go to a police station, to the police station where the licence is, to ask for a breathalyzer test and having passed it, to have the right to get his licence back and go off to wherever he's going. He may be a person who uses his car at his business; he may be a person who lives out of the city or the town or wherever it is that he's been stopped; he may have an important reason to have to drive his car away from wherever he was and to keep it an arbitrary 12 hours and give him that only opportunity which is presented here as on the spot or not at all, I think is verging on punishment. That's really what I oppose because I believe that there is no punishment intended in this warning aspect, that all that is intended is to make sure that he does not drive when there is a warning on the test. So I would ask the Attorney-General to consider seriously making that change in the proposed subsection to see to it that a person whose licence is taken away may have an opportunity once — and I say once because I don't think that he should abuse the privilege and bother the process of the police to that extent. Having had that one opportunity at any time that he likes to go to a police station, have the test made, and if he passes the test to be given his licence back earlier.

The other is, I would really like to see a withdrawal of the implied threat of that choice being his. If you want to take the test, don't forget you may end up in jail. I think that he should be able to say, "Give me the test and keep the licence if I don't pass it," because, again, the design of this, I believe, is not to punish but just to take the driver off the road for a reasonable period of time.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 4 will be standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Selkirk. Bill No. 9, An Act to amend The Mortgage Brokers and Mortgage Dealers Act, the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Stand, Mr. Speaker, please.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Roblin in the Chair for the Department of Education and the Honourable Member for Crescentwood in the Chair for the Department of Highways.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY — HIGHWAYS

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Warren Steen: Committee come to order. We are on Page 47, Item 6. Construction of Provincial Trunk Highways, Provincial Roads and Related Projects, 6.(a) \$50,670,000—pass; 6.(b) — The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, without limiting the debate, which of course I couldn't if I wanted to, but I do remind committee members that we had a fairly good discussion on different aspects of the proposed road building program when we dealt with it under the first item, or the Administration. I just ask committee members to bear that in mind.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the Member for Ste. Rose, do you wish to comment on 6.(a)?

MR. ADAM: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right, then, I won't pass that.

MR. ADAM: Yes, on Regular Program Construction, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I realize the Minister did not get the amount of moneys that he sought when he went to Cabinet. I believe that's what he led us to believe and we certainly appreciate the amount that he was able to obtain. It appears

Monday, May 1, 1978

to be a ballooned program, but when you take a close look at it we are finding out that there is not going to be as much construction as last year — at least new construction coming on stream — and there will be a considerable amount of highway strengthening.

We will talk about (b) later, but I would like to ask the Minister what happened to the \$24 million that was carried over when this was transferred to other programs — that work that was left uncompleted from last year, programmed for previous years. When you can't complete a project, where is the money transferred to? What program? Because it appears to me that every program should have its allocation. Now, where does the money go when it is transferred?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I believe that we dealt with that the last time.

MR. ADAM: No, I didn't get a clear picture.

MR. ENNS: The actual construction that is undertaken by the Department of Highways in any given year is composed of those projects that are set aside as new and the completion of the carry-over projects. Over the years, staff informs me that this generally, has certainly in the last few years, been of the order of \$21,000,000 to \$24,000,000.00. In other words last year's program, for instance, consisted of roughly \$20,000,000 or \$30,000,000 of new construction plus the \$21,000,000 or \$22,000,000 of the carry-over from the previous year's construction. This should not be confused by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose in the same way that there has been some confusion with respect to capital carry-over dollars. We're talking carry-over of physical programs. Any committed moneys, contracts that are not completed are in the \$75,000,000 for the 1978/79 year. I think we established that point at the previous sitting of the Committee, that the Department of Highways pays out their last cent as against the voted allocation of the previous year on March 31st, and any new moneys whether they're part and parcel or hold-back or clean-up of previous contracts let in the previous year, any monies paid out by the Department of Highways as of April 1st, have to be included in the amount requested for the year 1978/79.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, I'm trying to clarify in my mind, you know, just how the capital carry-over from previous years. . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, that's a misnomer. We're not now talking about a capital carry-over, we're talking about a work carry-over. In the Estimates before you as indicated initially at the committee meetings, we're dealing with all current monies.

MR. ADAM: Yes, I understand that part. If we could have carried on with the work last fall, the work that was undertaken in the spring of 1977, if we could have carried out all the work that was — the money was there, allocated and everything, but that work didn't proceed to the amount of \$23,000,000.00. Now we find that there is no more money. How did that work out?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the Department could not have undertaken all the work that they had proceeded with and had indeed indicated they would in the last fiscal year, no more so than we can in this fiscal year. We've over-programmed to the tune of some. . .

MR. ADAM: Has to be \$24,000,000. 00.

MR. ENNS: Roughly 1.6 on a percentage basis.

MR. ADAM: Over-programmed then the amount that was left undone last fall, I guess, is that right?

MR. ENNS: No, we found that a necessary practice in order to expend and actually get the work out that we have the authorization for from the Legislature. In other words, if you're planning to spend \$75,000,000 on a highway construction program, you program work for \$120,000,000 knowing full well in advance, that's the experience of the Department, that for multiple reasons, some of them inability to acquire land, some poor weather, some of them running into contractors taking on too much work and then simply not being able to be in a position to carry out that work in a given year. Over the years experience has dictated to the Highways Department that in order to carry out X number of dollars of actual construction work, that they over-program by a certain amount. Now that over-program always forms a portion, or the major portion, of the next year's carry-over in terms of program. The original question by the Member for Ste. Rose was let's say if all conditions had been ideal and we would have had this kind of weather until March 31st of the last fiscal year, that all of the carry-over program that was in last year's program, would in fact have been done because the department would have run out of money prior to that, out of authorization from the Legislature prior to that and they would have had to stop, when they had arrived at the allocated dollars for last year's program, just as we will have to stop when we arrive at the allocated dollars, in the case of construction, at the \$75 million. We have programmed for more but that additional programming will make up next year's carry-over program.

Monday, May 1, 1978

MR. ADAM: The projects that were previously programmed will be completed this year, those are the first ones that come onstream, is that the usual procedure?

MR. ENNS: We certainly hope that that's the case but I must indicate to the honourable member that it's not unusual that carry-over programs can be of one, two, and three years' duration. There are some programs, I can remember that the four-laning of No. 7 Highway, for instance, was on the program for some five, six years and it's listed continually in these last five years as a carry-over project. We are now showing it as part of the carry-over work, part of the \$24 million. It will be shown next year as continuing as part of the carry-over.

MR. ADAM: What is the program for this year? We have \$75 million allocated. Is it \$100 million? This year, this year.

MR. ENNS: No, the actual programming that the department is allowed is in the pink sheets before you, some \$120 million worth of projects, roughly.

MR. ADAM: \$120 million.

MR. ENNS: But if this committee will agree this afternoon to let me proceed with building highways in this beautiful spring weather, noting the fact that every afternoon that we fail to have your approval, that miles, literally miles of pavement are not being paved and worked on, then we will not achieve our target date to spend \$75 million.

MR. ADAM: Are we talking about the highway strengthening on the \$120 million?

MR. ENNS: Yes, (b), it's all-inclusive.

MR. ADAM: All-inclusive, so then the regular programming would be \$95 million.

MR. ENNS: No.

MR. ADAM: Well, it's \$24 million for the strengthening and you're talking \$120 million so it should be about \$95 million or \$96 million.

One of the projects that was undertaken last year — I'm not trying to be parochial — but PR 276 is a road that leads to the community of Waterhen and connects with the road — I'm not sure whether it's 328 — leading to No. 6, Gypsumville ties in with Grand Rapids from the west. There are five or six tourist camps in that area and also it's a market agricultural road and it's also the road leading to the Gypsumville area and Grand Rapids. We have been under extreme pressure from the Duck Mountain School Division because they have to transport students all the way from Waterhen, Mallard, up to Winnipegosis and that ties in with PR 269. I notice that for next year, you know, there's no ongoing for this particular road and it seems to have come to a dead-end now. It's not on the new program for continuation and it's one that we have been extremely under pressure particularly from the Duck Mountain School Division who are having to trade their buses off every two years or so and that's one of the priorities that I had.

I wanted to ask the Minister if he received a petition from the Kinosota area in regards to upgrading in that area. I believe there was a petition. Has that . . . ?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, in response to the member's question, yes I have received a petition from the residents in that part of the province as I receive petitions from all parts of the province.

MR. ADAM: I believe that there is some work going on in that area.

MR. ENNS: The other matter that the honourable member raises is one, of course, that the Highways Department receives constant pressures from, namely the school divisions who have, regrettably, still in too many instances, too many rough gravel roads to travel on and transport children on at considerable expense in terms of the maintenance of their school buses.

MR. ADAM: There's going to be 18 miles, I think, done in that area — 278 — from No. 50 north. What is the policy, Mr. Chairman, in regard to the draining of farmlands into PR?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I recognize and I can await for some advice from the staff, but just from personal experience, I know that Highways are often (a) either accused of creating drainage problems and undoubtedly on occasion they do. Highways are often asked to solve drainage problems and there is, wherever possible, a degree of co-operation with the Water Control division of the Department of Mines and Natural Resources to enable this to happen. We have instances right now where we have, I think we discussed one of these particular instances with the Member for Selkirk on a previous sitting of this committee, where Highways has to date been reluctant to move in terms of road improvement until a satisfactory arrangement can be arrived at with the Director of Water Control to resolve related drainage problems that (a) either the building of the road would create or, (b) the building of the road should help solve, by proper placement of culverts, etc., the

likes of this.

But I would have to remind the members of the committee that the responsibility of Highways is principally building highways and it would only be natural that our first instance would be to build roads and do those works necessary that will insure a proper base for a highway. It is not our paramount responsibility to concern ourselves with the drainage matters. I think that responsibility rests with Water Control, but I think the Deputy Minister would concur that we have experienced enough situations over the years, you know, in the business of building highways, that we certainly are very cognizant of the difficulties that a piece of roadwork can cause, if all of these matters aren't taken into concern, prior to the actual construction of the road.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Well, I notice that in the last couple of years, there's an increase in ditching to the public roads, and I was just wondering what responsibility do we have in that matter. In some areas it's increasing, and I don't know whether any authority is given for this or it's just people ditching into the public. . . .

MR. ENNS: I'm advised that this would not be initiated by the Department of Highways, it would be done, (a) if it is the kind of drainage facility that would come under the responsibility of the Province by water control, or I suppose it could be done in some instances by municipal authorities, or even Agriculture, but, aside from raising suitable objections when the Department of Highways feels that they have to be raised in terms that it may endanger or hurt our highways, or roadbeds. . . .

MR. ADAM: This is what I'm getting at.

MR. ENNS: . . . that point is the only point where we would raise those objections or indeed enter those objections with other departments of government.

MR. ADAM: It seems Mr. Chairman, it seems that there are some lands that will never be drained by drainage, like a road drain, and I was just wondering where our responsibility is in that matter, because it's on the increase and I don't know. . . . What's the procedure? If I want to cut into the roadway, public road, can I just go in and do it?

MR. BLAKE: I hope not.

MR. SAM USKIW: Don't ask anybody, because then you won't be able to do it.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Lac du Bonnet has provided the answer privately to the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose and I'll leave it stand at that.

There is the other matter though, that whenever, and this has happened and we've had some bitter court cases throughout rural Manitoba on these matters, that when a person unilaterally without prior permission from either the municipality or the Water Control Branch effects a drainage that can create problems for somebody in other parts of the country, he is liable for that, and can be held responsible for any damages accruing as a result of changing the drainage patterns.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, what happens if somebody comes and cuts a 2 foot ditch there, 2 feet wide and 3 feet deep, into the highway, and a car lands in there, who's responsible?

MR. ENNS: The person that dug the ditch.

MR. ADAM: Well, if the Highways Department is notified and if he's responsible if they haven't, what happens? Cutting into public property.

MR. FERGUSON: Do you want your premiums raised?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the Department of Highways runs into frequent, you know, practices that are undertaken by individual citizens from time to time whether it's the building of an illegal access, or the putting into place certain drainage works, when the Department of Highways aware of these things happening, they will go out and the District Engineer will curtail that from happening, if it's a matter of concern to the Department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member from Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know just when the road restrictions are going to be removed.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, that's an age old question that bedevils Highway Ministers, it's a matter of Divine Providence, Mr. Chairman, having a great deal to do with the weather conditions between now and the ensuing month.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, to date we have not lifted any restrictions, have we?

MR. ENNS: No, I'm informed, Mr. Chairman as advice to the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet that, we are possibly right now in the most critical period where damage can be done to our roadways. The Deputy Minister informs me that in all likelihood we're looking at perhaps a period of two weeks.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, in that context then, would it not be true that we could debate these estimates for at least another couple of weeks, without holding back any paving.

MR. ENNS: Oh, now Mr. Chairman, we have anticipated this situation, and we have advised those contractors that have pre-advertised on \$18 million worth of work, to have their equipment in place prior to the restrictions going on, and I must indicate to the honourable member that this is precisely happening.

MR. USKIW: Well, but Mr. Chairman, isn't it true though that we wouldn't permit overweight beyond the permit now allowed on these restricted roads. You wouldn't permit constructions.

MR. ENNS: On roads that are under contract to be rebuilt restrictions don't apply.

MR. USKIW: I think I made my point. 391 — I notice there are seven new projects for 391, a lot of them having to do with bituminous levelling. I wonder if we can have explained to us just what is the logic or reason of these programs. I think I know why. Is this to do with the permafrost settling and so on, that requires an adjustment in the grade and subsequent resurfacing?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the Department advises that it is principally the problems encountered with permafrost, and not sufficient strengthening in the base that has created, you know, an unacceptable situation on the Provincial Road 391 or the road in question. What is being referred to in the description as levelling, really calls for all three kinds of highway reconstruction work in this area. Shoulder widening and strengthening, in some instances a substantive subgrade reinforcing, if you like, with rockfill, with blasted rock, then being in a position effective for the actual bituminous levelling on top of that new fill. In other words, there will be major reconstruction work undertaken on 391 as aside from the remedial type repairs that have been undertaken over the past number of years to keep the surface free of potholes.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, is the department in a position to indicate to us that once they have re-leveled the existing roadways that have been completed or paved or surfaced, that this would be the final touch, or is it a continuing problem? Do they expect it to be a continuing problem in that we may have to do this for a number of times in the future?

MR. ENNS: I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that while we hope that with the expenditures of these kind of moneys there will be substantial . . . We estimate in this year on this particular stretch of road well over \$1 million. Some of the new roadbuilding techniques that the department has acquired in building roads in the north will be such that it will be a basic improvement, but recognizing that you are building roads in the north presents special problems. The department is unwilling to say that it will, in finite, solve the problem.

MR. USKIW: Could the department give us an estimate of what it would cost per mile to build a road in that area that would stand up something comparable to the roads in southern Manitoba? What would be the cost per mile to do that, and what would be involved in having to achieve that objective?

Well, Mr. Chairman, perhaps I can elaborate on that. As I recall the discussions in the Highways Committee during the time of the previous administration it seems to me I recall a figure of a half-a-million dollars a mile, or is it a million — it's either a half or a million — if we were to do a job in northern Manitoba that would stand up very well compared to the road system in southern Manitoba. Would that be a ballpark figure, or would that be away out?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, my Deputy Minister asked me who chose that figure, leaving me to believe that the department isn't prepared to put those kind of figures on road construction because of the unpredictability that permafrost creates for highway building. We can predict with a greater degree of accuracy, for instance in southern climes, what we would have to do to prevent the kind of surface troubles that we have in applying asphalt or concrete in the Red River Valley. The department has been under some criticism from time to time that our concrete stretches of highway, for instance, aren't standing up comparable to, say, what is happening under similar soil conditions just across the border — the difference being that across the border they have been prepared to go to a substantially higher cost per mile factor, whether it's laying concrete or asphalt, by either adding five or six inches to the depth of concrete or asphalt, or to the base, aggregate base. We have found ourselves necessary to go to the lighter limits, recognizing that we will get a shorter life-span out of our roadways. We are budgeting in the area of, I suppose, \$200,000 to \$300,000 a mile in the north, as compared to \$150,000 or \$160,000 for a comparable road in the south.

We believe that with some of the new methods of using blasted rock fill . . . There has also been

the suggestion coming from the Thompson people and the department is currently already using some of the slab that is available to us for aggregate, that a combination of experience that has been gained in the rough, if you may say, by northern roadbuilders plus the experience that the department has, that we will be able to effect, with the improvements now being contemplated for 391, a substantially improved situation that will, in effect, provide for an acceptable level of road for that part of the country.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, could the department indicate to us, then, whether they erred in their judgment initially when the road was first built and the composition of it, the amount of aggregate base and so on, or the lack of removing permafrost and replacing it with aggregate fill or whatever? Does the department consider their past construction methods up there wrong or are they telling us that this is a fact of life that we have to live with and we will have to keep patching on that existing situation forever and a day?

In other words, is it financially practical to think in terms of a road system that would compare with southern Manitoba roads? Is it in the cards to even think in those terms in the terms of northern roadbuilding?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, just to go back to the earlier question asked by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, there was a figure but the department doesn't underline it thrice and in quotation marks, but if we were to build that road totally out of blasted rock fill with the appropriate amount of aggregate, the costs could conceivably run as high as \$1 million a mile.

But further to the main question being posed by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, it has to be remembered that in most of these instances, if not all of these instances, the desire and the request and the pressure is to build what you would call and the department refers to as a "pioneer" road. The situation that the department and the government, itself, faces — any government of the day — is that, perhaps as a result of a community opening up or a mine opening up, to get a pioneer road to get some means of access to that community. So that's the initial criteria, that the road is built, and the same took place with 391. With the development of the community of Thompson and the development of the mining facility at Thompson the immediacy was to develop, in effect, a pioneer road into that country.

What the department now is doing is going back and reconstructing it to considerably higher standards, and I don't mind indicating to the honourable members of the committee the hope is to reconstruct it to the standards similar to that of PTH 6 and, having effected that improvement along the breadth and length of 391, to then renumber PR 391 to 6 directly to Thompson.

To suggest that the initial dollars into the pioneer road development was a waste or money not properly spent, I think is too harsh a way of describing it, recognizing that that was the particular need of the community at that time and that surely had we commenced with a Cadillac route in terms of roadbuilding, Thompson now might be getting close to gaining access to southern Manitoba. I think members of the Committee would have to agree, just as members throughout rural Manitoba have to agree, that a dirt road is better than no road; a gravel road is better than a dirt road; and a paved road is better than a gravel road, and that's the natural progression of road-building in Manitoba, always consistent with the compatibility of any government of any day to build roads and to set aside that percentage of the revenue the government receives for this purpose.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, the comments made by the Minister are exactly what I had expected. It just leads me to question what all the ado was about the last several months. But we'll leave that for the moment, and I now ask the final question with respect to 391, and that is, we have a program yet to complete that was approved in previous years, some eight projects, we have seven additional projects listed for 1978-79, and I really would like to know what the department feels it will be able to handle this year on 391. Will they be handling the 15 projects, or are they going to be, perhaps, shelving some of the leftover projects and concentrating on their new ones, or what is it going to be? Because if it isn't going to be dealing with both the previous projects and the new ones, then really we are not going to have much change in terms of road programming in northern Manitoba.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I am advised by the department that we intend to proceed with all of them.

MR. USKIW: With the hope to complete the old program and add to it?

MR. ENNS: Yes.

MR. USKIW: It's conceivable, then, Mr. Chairman, that we will complete the old program and might end up with the new program showing up as unfinished business when we're here a year from now.

MR. ENNS: That's conceivable, except that recognizing the priorities that this government has placed on the road improvement in that area, it was one of the major items that we pulled out in advance and placed in our free advertising program for tender, and has in fact been awarded, and

work should be proceeding as soon as weather permits.

MR. USKIW: Okay, I'm through with (a), Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pass — The Member for Rupertsland on 6.(a).

MR. BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a couple of questions, one of general policy of the department. I gather, from public statements that have been made, that the Department of Highways is, or certainly will be very shortly, handling all road construction in the Province of Manitoba. Now, that would include some of those roads which, on the map, I assume from what I see on the map, are indicated as "other roads," they have no number as yet. Some of them were constructed by the Department of Renewable Resources and Transportation Services; some of them were constructed by the Parks Department, depending on their area of operation. They were supervised by one or the other of those departments as it was most logical to do so. I would like to get the Minister's comments on that in a general way to find out what the government's intentions are with respect to those other roads, and what role the Department of Highways will play in future, either in the construction of new other roads as such or with respect to the maintenance and improvement of those other roads that are now in place.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the Department of Highways is prepared to assume a greater responsibility for additional road-building in the province, or for all road-building in the province, but I would have to inform the Committee that no policy decision has been made in this regard, that is, with respect to assuming responsibility for park roads or for those other roads, or indeed for assuming the greater responsibility for northern roads. That has been, as the member noted correctly, that has been talked about. Statements of individual Ministers have, I don't think, been made to mislead any members of the Committee with respect to the future, that the department may well expand its activities in these areas mentioned by the member. But to date no policy changes have been made; the responsibility of the Department of Highways has not changed appreciably from those of last year's, and those are the Estimates that we are considering at this time.

MR. BOSTROM: Just for clarification, and as I gather from the Minister's comments that as far as this year's Estimates process is concerned, having gone through their first year of Estimates, the new government has made a policy decision as such to continue the old way, at least for the next fiscal year which we are discussing, that is, those other roads that were formerly the responsibility of the Department of Parks, those that were formerly the responsibility of the Department of Resources, will continue in this next fiscal year to be the responsibility of those respective departments and/or any other department which may have responsibility for the maintenance and improvement of other roads which are not designated as PRs or PTHs.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, that is essentially the situation. I don't wish to indicate to honourable members that some changes may well not be affected mid-term or some time during the year, but it's obvious if they are, then moneys or moneys allocated to other departments engaged in the business of road-building would have to be transferred to these sets of Estimates at the time any additional responsibility was taken by the Department of Highways. But the short answer to my honourable friend is that that has not been contemplated in the preparation of these Estimates, nor has there been any policy decisions made with respect to that happening.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to know, if I may, and I hope that the Minister can answer, what his position is on this and what his discussions have been with his departmental officials, if he sees this as something which is desirable, that is, that the Department of Highways should, either this fiscal year, or at mid-term, or whatever, or in the next years to come, that the Department of Highways should take over the responsibility for maintenance and/or improvement to those other roads.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the question is put to me on a personal basis as to what this Minister's attitude towards that is, and what the Department of Highways attitude towards that is? I think correctly we in the Department of Highways consider ourselves as having, over the years, built up the necessary experience, both in staff and in know-how, to build roads in the Province of Manitoba. We are all too often called in after lesser-experienced people are in the business of road-building to clean up the act. We also recognize, and I recognize, however, that the kind of standards that are generally applicable to, for instance, road-building in southern Manitoba, and are desirable and over the years are proven correct, have to, you know, road-building in some instances — remote parts of the province under a totally different set of circumstances, and that have a different initial goal in mind, perhaps the breaking of a pioneer trail into a remote community, the initial changeover from what was a winter road to a passable pioneer trail being conceived as being desirable that there are those in Northern Affairs or in the Parks Branch that think that Highways tends to approach these problems too rigidly and therefore aren't the appropriate group to be responsible for this kind of road building. I rather believe that there is the flexibility within the Department of Highways, if given that responsibility, to do the job and to do the job in such a way that in the long run public money is best spent. If that gives you an indication that I would welcome the additional responsibilities of building the other kind of roads, those roads listed as Others, then that's correct.

Monday, May 1, 1978

I still believe that in the long run departmental expertise and knowledge should not be fragmented into too many different departments. It brings about an area of duplication, it brings about an area of conflict sometimes within the levels of the Civil Service and I don't believe that in all instances the Manitoba taxpayers, whether they live in a remote community in Northern Manitoba or persons pursuing leisure by way of road building through parks are always receiving the best value for their road dollar. Now, what that will mean is that we would have to build into the Department of Highways, or add to the flexibility of our people in the Department of Highways, to acknowledge and to be able to cope with the somewhat special circumstances that differ greatly from those experienced in southern Manitoba where we have a pretty sophisticated group of contractors to deal with that know the name-of-the-game in terms of the tendering, the contracting procedures, that know how to work with our inspectors, that have access to and know how to put together their contracts and I'm referring now in the department's ability, in their tendering process, to work with community people that have shown a remarkable aptitude, in some instances, to be able to do and take on much of the road building on their own with some guidance. But we generally feel that that could be improved on under the direction of the Department of Highways and under the direction of the personnel in the Department of Highways.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. To become more specific now, one of the roads that I was hoping at one point would become the responsibility of the Department of Highways on an ongoing basis is the road which has been recently constructed to connect the community of Norway House. It is now on the map indicated as one of the Other roads. It was connected just recently, I don't believe the road has actually really been completed officially, that is, the last coat of improved traffic gravel I don't believe has been applied yet. Are there any any discussions going on between the Department of Highways and the Department of Resources that was responsible for initiating and getting that road under way to assume that responsibility on an ongoing basis or is it the intention for this fiscal year at least to have that road administered by the Department of Resources, whether it's Northern Affairs or Resources as it's called now?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member touches on a piece of road that he's asking the department to assume full responsibility for and indeed integrate into our provincial road system. That kind of integration has a lot that comes with it, the first thing being the very high level of expectation that the road be up to par, to provincial standards.

He also touches up the fact that when the department, as such, at least to-date, builds roads and integrates them into the provincial road system, we do so on behalf of the public and that the public shall have access on any provincial road, on any provincial trunk highway. We assume that to be taken for granted but if some of these original winter roads, and now pioneer trails, are passing through Indian Reserve land to which the Reserve band has not given the Department of Highways or the Crown the right of way, the Department of Highways, as it is presently constituted and as we see our present responsibilities, has difficulty in integrating that into our PR system without that right of way knowing, in advance, that access could be denied the citizens of Manitoba from the use of that public thoroughfare. So these are, I think, some of the policy matters that have to be ironed out and that are under discussion with respect to the consideration of the Department of Highways as such assuming a greater role in some of these areas that the member refers to as Other Roads.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the Member for Selkirk wish to participate on 6. (a) or can we pass it?

Just before the Member for Selkirk starts, I can inform the members of the committee that an agreement between the two House Leaders has been struck and we will continue on until 5:30.

Okay, the Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: I would like to just ask the Minister if he could outline the plans pertaining to Highway 9, Lockport and Selkirk, Provincial Trunk Highway No. 44 referred to in the notes. That's by Lower Fort Garry.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I believe contained in this program — unless somebody from staff nods their head otherwise — that we are proceeding with the improvement at Lower Fort Garry Fort with the additional lane, I believe it is, or two lanes to facilitate somewhat safer turning into the Fort. This is a program that — correct me if I'm wrong — that was undertaken, or this improvement was undertaken in conjunction with the federal authorities in their general upgrading of the facility from a tourist point of view. It was a commitment that we made to the Federal Government, I believe dating back several years, that that improvement would be made. That is in fact a carry-over program from last year. That work is being done on No. 9.

The other other question was with respect to No. 44, that is also I believe a carry-over program and is being completed. Pardon me, was it 44?

MR. PAWLEY: From No. 44 between Lockport and Selkirk so it carries all the way . . .

MR. ENNS: On No. 9?

Monday, May 1, 1978

MR. PAWLEY: . . . on No. 9 north from my reading of the road program. Acquisition of Right of Way.

MR. ENNS: Yes, what that signifies of course that we are, as one would expect, anticipating some difficulty in acquiring that right of way but the acquisition of right of way is proceeding which will enable us then to proceed with the upgrading of that piece of road when we have that right of way in hand.

MR. PAWLEY: Yes, I would just mention that — and Mr. Brako was concerned where my concern is — that the right of way that is acquired — and I recognize that some right of way may be required — but whatever is finally determined as what is necessary for a right of way there, not be unduly excessive. There was some question as to whether land was going to be required for bicycle paths and whatnot which sounds like a good idea except that there could be some disruption of a lot of private property along that stretch.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I and my staff will take note of that comment by the Honourable Member for Selkirk and I'm sure that we'll hear further representation from the people that are residing directly and immediately concerned with respect to that matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose and the Member for Rupertsland have both indicated they would like to say something more. Is that on 6(a)? The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Yes, I just had the one question. The department gave us assurance that all the pre-programmed projects they expected to complete this year, the Minister mentioned that some of it could be carried over for a number of years. I'm just trying to clarify whether that would include just the programs that have not been started yet or those that are half-finished and the contractor still has money coming to him. I would presume that those would receive a priority Is that correct?

MR. ENNS: That's correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ADAM: I'm just trying to help the contractors now . . .

MR. ENNS: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Yes, just on a specific item in the program, Mr. Chairman. On Page 15, you're indicating I believe off Highway 11, mileage of 8.7 miles PR 313 to McArthur Falls acquisition of right of way. I was wondering what is being planned here, a relocation or new road or what exactly is the . . . It's Page 15 — off Highway 11, 8.7 miles PR 313 to McArthur Falls. —(Interjection)—

MR. ENNS: Subject to other advice, but that would be the normal acquisition of additional right of way that will enable us to continue the upgrading of that road to the standard that it's at. There's no rerouting being planned in that area.

MR. BOSTROM: It's for future improvements then to the existing road.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.(a)—pass; 6.(b)—pass — the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, on 6(b), what is the explanation for such a large block of money under Highway Strengthening and none shown for last year. Did we not begin the program last year? Did we just talk about it last year? What really happened there?

MR. ENNS: I'm advised, Mr. Chairman, that the money that was spent in the previous year on this item, Highway Strengthening, was money that came directly from Ottawa and even though it's on a cost-sharing formula, we used Ottawa moneys first but in order for us to keep our obligations under the Highway Strengthening Program which are laid down in terms of actual roads and miles of roads that are done, this is why this has been bumped up that hard. I must take some note of the fact that the consequences of the action of the previous administration in using up the total amount of Ottawa's moneys last year means that Manitoba, to keep pace and to keep up with its contractual obligations under the Highway Strengthening Program, has to put in this rather substantial amount of \$18 million in the Highway Strengthening Program this year. .

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I thought that I would come to that position. That now explains the growth in the total Highways budget more fully in that it is really a commitment from previous years that we are now living up to and therefore the program, the Highways Department is not as dramatically upgraded as what my friends opposite had tried to make us believe.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Your friends opposite never claimed that. It was my friends opposite that claimed that, along with the lone Liberal member of the Legislature. It was never proclaimed loud and clear from this side. But what it also

points out, what it also points out is that the previous administration was quite happy to spend some money on Highways provided it was Ottawa's money.

MR. USKIW: Why not?

MR. ENNS: We've had to now dig into our pockets and come up with the \$18 million in cold hard cash from provincial sources.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure the Minister doesn't disagree with the way in which it was done because obviously to have used our moneys first would have meant some additional financial benefit to the Government of Canada, to our disadvantage, so I'm sure he's not quarrelling with the procedure in terms of using the federal funds under the program. I just wanted to point that out because it's obviously a part-and-parcel of the Highways Program that had to be carried forward no matter who the government was but that indeed explains, in large measure, the fairly hefty sums of money allocated to Highways for this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.(b)—pass — the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Yes, I would like to ask, does this Highway Strengthening appear in the pink slip?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Lac du Bonnet has just left on the record "a fairly hefty increase in Highways spending." Up to the last little while, the Member for Ste. Rose and others have been telling this committee that in fact the Department of Highways is spending less money on highways and for those honourable representatives of the media who are trying to follow this debate, it must be somewhat confusing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose, back to his questioning.

MR. ADAM: I wanted to know whether the Highway Strengthening Program, the projects appear in the pink slips here or is this mainly for reconstruction and replacement of bridges?

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Chairman, under the Highways Strengthening Program, specific highways and portions of highways have been designated by joint agreement for the upgrading and strengthening to permit the additional gross vehicle weight traffic to be carried. In many instances, in this year's program, it involves the improvement of surface such as the laying of an asphalt lift on the concrete on the four lane section of the Trans-Canada from Headingley to a point near Elie. It involves the ongoing strengthening work of the Yellowhead Route, provincial highway No. 4, is it, Shoal Lake to Foxwarren. There is a substantial amount also in here for the provision of bridges but it is fairly mixed up, Mr. Chairman, with a considerable amount of paving, actual strengthening of pavement being involved as well as the construction of bridges.

MR. ADAM: Does it appear in here, Mr. Chairman?

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

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister in his remarks indicated that all the federal funds had been expended but he does show an item of \$12.5 million as being recoverable in his Estimates Book. Is this the final portion of the federal funding where the province bumps in the additional \$6 million into the program?

MR. ENNS: As mentioned earlier at the committee, the program has, and was, very prudently indexed at the outset and we will get the benefits of that indexing next year.

MR. URUSKI: You will get the benefits of the indexing in this . . .

MR. ENNS: Recoverable item.

MR. URUSKI: So then you are going to be recovering that amount of money based on this year's construction costs.

MR. ENNS: That's correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.(b)—pass; 6.(c)—pass. Resolution 71: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$75 million for Highways— pass.

Item 7. Motor Vehicle Branch. 7.(a) Management Services. (1) Salaries. The Member for St. George, then Selkirk.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister, in his opening remarks, gave us a number of statistics in terms of the growth in drivers and the increase in motor vehicle inspection and many other items. I don't know whether he wants to deal specifically as we come to the item. I had several

Monday, May 1, 1978

questions insofar as the licensing and the merit system. Does the Minister wish to proceed in a total general discussion of the area and then we can just go through it?

MR. ENNS: I think we could go item by item on this account. They're fairly clearly delineated. We're speaking in this first instance just of the administration and then we come right down to the driver licensing and the vehicle registration which seems to be an appropriate place to discuss those matters that obviously are of interest to the member, or we can then deal with safety and the actions of the various boards, highway traffic board, if that's the wish of the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we usually stick to the subject a little bit better by going that route and it's a little more orderly. The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman, dealing with the administration of the Motor Vehicle Branch, we note in dealing with the cost sharing in the Task Force Report between the costs of drivers' licensing and administration of the drivers' licence system between MPIC and MVB. I would like to know from the Minister whether or not he can tell me, in his opinion, whether there is any subsidization between the Motor Vehicle Branch and Autopac in terms of the administrative costs of operating the drivers' licensing system.

I would also like to know whether or not it is contemplated by the government to increase the testing costs and fees in the road testing of the drivers in terms of people taking drivers' tests and the Driver Education Program, as well the fees in that area. As the Task Force has pointed out, I believe, these areas are not directly self-sustaining in terms of recoverable funds, are there intentions of the government to implement those additional fees to make them self-sustaining?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, relative to the first question, the members of the now opposition will well recall on numerous occasions discussions on the subject matter of whether or not there was, or is in fact, a degree of cross-subsidization taking place between the charges or the relationship of charges between the Motor Vehicle Branch and MPIC. There has been kind of an ongoing review of that formula, there is at the moment. Because of some difficulty in ascertaining to the satisfaction of either the Motor Vehicle Branch or MPIC that in fact a true division of costs exists and is acknowledged as such by both parties, a review is being undertaken by the Department of Finance to look at the related costs, the shared services, the shared services that Motor Vehicle Branch provides for Autopac and vice-versa, the information that Motor Vehicles Branch gleans from the operations of the MPIC that they require for their purposes, whether or not that division is fair and equitable. The Minister and the government has no opinion on that subject matter at this time. We await that review and that audit if, in fact, any changes are contemplated.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to follow that up a bit. Has there not been, or is there not an ongoing committee, I believe of Members of the Department of Finance and I believe even the Provincial Auditor who sit on the committee and analyze the ongoing or incremental costs that may be shifted one way or another between the two systems and once they did establish a base fee, I'd like to know whether the Minister now, since coming in, has accepted that system. I presume he's accepted that division because he has not changed it in terms of the original setting of the costs and if he is not accepting it, I'd like to know in what areas might he indicate his non-acceptance or desirability to change in terms of whether or not there is cross-subsidization.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, it's precisely because of the fact that I don't know that I'm not prepared to make any statement with respect to what my thoughts or views are on the subject matter or what I intend to do in this particular area. It's precisely for that reason that a current review is being undertaken. The committee that the Honourable Member for St. George refers to I'm advised was a committee that was set up for . . . it is not an ongoing committee, it was set up on a one-time basis to, at that time, accept and have a formula arrived at in terms of the sharing of these costs. That formula is being reviewed at the moment and subject to the outcome of that review, changes either will be made or will not be made and those changes will certainly be announced at the first opportunity.

MR. URUSKI: Well, could I ask the Minister as to the composition of that committee. Who is being represented on that committee? Are all parties besides the Department of Finance? I realize that you need a central catalyst in terms of the Department of Finance but are all parties being represented on that committee?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, there is a person from the Corporation, from MPIC, a person from the Motor Vehicle Branch and one person from Finance that are involved in this committee work.

MR. URUSKI: Very good. Could the Minister elaborate on the issues dealing with both the drivers' fees and the Driver Education Program?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that the cost of the drivers' tests are under review at this particular time and may well change or may be revised upwards in lieu of increasing costs but again,

no decision has been made in that respect.

MR. URUSKI: Could the Minister indicate as to what stage in the drivers' licencing program the area dealing with the merit system in terms of where that is at and I presume that's within part and parcel of the total redesign of the drivers' system, where is it at, when is it going to be coming onstream and are there any changes being contemplated from the original concept that was presented a number of years ago?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I think there are some very welcome changes contemplated in this particular area. I think all of us, from time to time, have heard the complaints of motorists who have exemplary driving records, who then find themselves being in the unfortunate situation of picking up one or two speeding tickets within short proximity of each other or an accident of which some fault is designated and demerit marks are earned. It's the intention of the government to change this system commencing September 1st that will enable drivers with good driving habits, to earn merit marks, in other words, the system will provide an incentive and an acknowledgement of a good driving record. To date, the practice of . . .

MR. ADAM: We have it now.

MR. ENNS: Not really. We start with demerits, you do not earn merit marks, you start with a clean record and any subsequent infractions and you climb the list of demerits. What is being proposed as of September 1st that a good driving year will earn you merit marks and that after subsequent traffic violations, your merit marks come down first prior to adding on to the demerit list so that you gain, in effect, some Brownie points for good driving. This program will be in effect starting September 1st.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for his comments and I would only like to indicate that what he is explaining to me today was very much in essence the nature of the announcement that was made a couple of years ago when dealing with the merit system that was envisaged initially. I am pleased to see that the Minister and the department are finally getting it onstream. I knew there were problems in terms of its implementation because of the redesign of the whole drivers' system that was undertaken a number of years back but by your statements here today you have confirmed that you are carrying on with the original intent of two or three years ago in terms of the drivers' program and that the merit system as it is envisaged, everyone does start with a clean record but what the merit system envisages is a banking of good driving, a banking of good driving points which will, in effect, could affect that motorist financially in terms of future surcharges in terms of insurance and demerit fee. So I'm pleased that that is going ahead and by your explanation that there basically is no change from the original concept, that it is going ahead in that manner and it will be onstream this fall. I presume that will be the point at which the entire drivers' system has been fully implemented in terms of its being put on the computer and its redesign has been completed. I presume that's the case. Is that accurate?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I welcome the comments and the support for the program from the Member for St. George. I can't help note in passing, however, that the legislation permitting this was passed in 1974 and why it took so long, or why in fact he allowed this Minister responsible for the Motor Vehicle Branch to acknowledge and to encourage safe driving in the Province of Manitoba — I'm grateful for that opportunity to do so to the drivers of Manitoba but I only point out the fact that the capability was there since 1974 to do this. But then, of course' perhaps the concern was for collecting surcharges and the revenue gained therefrom was of more importance to the previous administration.

MR. URUSKI: The Minister, I have to agree with him on part of it about the collection of surcharges. If a motorist is negligent in terms of observing the letter of the law, I think that if he's apprehended he deserves full well the penalties that are imposed on him. I, for one, am one of those that knows the full effects of the law that can be placed upon you.

The Minister indicates that he thanks us for the opportunity of being put in a position of promoting driver safety. I believe that the Minister himself, like any Minister of Highways previous or future, I hope that is just a very small part of his actions and his department's actions in terms of promoting safety on the highways because there is just so much more to be done and I want the Minister to give me some indication as to what moves he has made and even when I was Minister, had some dealings with the Motor Vehicle Branch and MPIC.

There were discussions going on in terms of making driver education part of an optional course in the high school education system for students. We know today that only about, I believe it's about one-third of our high school students who come out of our high schools go through a recognized driver instructional program so that two-thirds do not go through a program of any kind. They learn likely by the mistakes of their parents or someone who teaches them who inherently does have bad driving habits, although he doesn't realize it. I want to know whether or not the Minister has any intentions of furthering the driver education program and using insurance funds from MPIC to establish, through the high school system, with his colleague, the Minister of Education, a recognized driver education program in our high schools so that it would be a necessity for any young or new driver who wishes to obtain a driver's licence and driving privileges within this

province, that he take a recognized driver education course through our high school system prior to receiving his driver's licence.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I recognize that by my last comment I probably earned a demerit point or two as far as this committee is concerned and I will now work on the merit side of the scale by not making provocative comments to the committee. One can't really help but agree and concur with the comments made by the Member for St. George. I say that in concert with the fact that the Motor Vehicle Branch in Manitoba deserves commendation and acknowledgement of providing a climate on Manitoba roads that probably is second to none in the country of Canada in terms of being able to reduce fatalities on our highways and holding accidents to a negligible growth rate despite the fact, as has already been mentioned, of a 6 percent increase in the number of registered vehicles on our roads, despite the fact of a 4 percent increase in the number of registered drivers. I think that any steps in this direction ought to be pursued and will be.

I remind honourable members that in that particular instance, a small amendment to the bill as introduced by the Attorney-General is, in fact, a little step in that direction in terms of acknowledging and supporting the ALERT program with respect to alcohol related difficulties — (Interjection) — Yes, I know, but simply making the responsibilities that the law enforcement officers have with the use of that machine a little more clearer and taking away that provision of a two-hour wait period that was still left for motorists to debate the issue of impaired driving with law enforcement officers. I think that the suggestion of extending in a more universal way the provision of trained driving courses through our school system is one that will be seriously entertained by this administration in co-operation with MPIC as well as the Department of Education.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I am certainly pleased at the response of the Minister of Highways in this respect in terms of their administration entertaining it and in fact possibly putting into play a driver education system.

The Minister went on in his comments insofar as the ALERT Program. I would hope that every time we talk about driver safety that we don't always go back on the negative side and going back to the ALERT Program, it happens to be always on the penalty side of the coin rather than stressing the positive side. I do know the merit system in the driver system is a positive move towards encouragement of safe driving. The Driver Education Program would be one of those very very, I think, positive moves in terms of encouraging and promoting safe driving. I believe, whether my figures are right or wrong, that the number of students who have taken the Driver Education Course are involved in approximately one-third less accidents than those who have not taken the course. So I believe that it is a proven fact that this area should be expanded. But it remains to be seen whether the Minister's actions will prove what he is saying, because he is saying that they will entertain that and they will expand it, while at the same time they have now removed approximately — or are in the process of removing — \$7 million from the Insurance Corporation in terms of revenues. And if the Minister is talking about dealing with and expanding a driver education system, he has now, in effect, transferred \$7 million of insurance funds back to the province. I would hope that some of that \$7 million in those funds, then, if he is really going by his word, will be channeled at least into the expansion of a vehicle inspection system within the MVB, the expansion or at least the introduction of a Driver Education Program that he indicates whole-hearted support for, that some of those funds at least will be used in those areas that he is removing from the Insurance Corporation so they can be channeled into these areas — as well the area of vehicle inspection.

I know that the previous administration, I believe, did not do justice in terms of expansion. We did expand the vehicle inspection system, but not really to the extent that it should have been done. I know neighboring provinces of, I believe, British Columbia and Ontario have a much more stepped-up Vehicle Inspection Program, in terms of checking out the vehicles and I would hope that some of those funds will move in that direction that he is contemplating. I'd like to hear some comments on that.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, contained within these Estimates is, first of all, a restoration of the program to its pre 1976-77 level. The previous administration had reduced this program by one unit. We have four driver testing units in the province. In the last year's Estimates that was reduced to three. It has now been restored. Under the Driver Education Program, pardon me, not the Driver Testing Program. The driver education unit has been restored to its full complement.

I would encourage the Honourable Member for St. George to support me in attempting to have . . . From wherever the funds come from. Perhaps if we can expedite the removal of some of the basket weaving courses from the Department of Education why this course will gain its priority, its rightful priority in terms of the overall educational program of our young people. And I regard it as being highly important.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the Minister again rather than going on the positive side he wants to continually go back to the negative side.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: Pardon me, Mr. Chairman, if I may be allowed an intrusion. I think that at the outset of this last half-hour's discussion perhaps the most positive step taken, a step that was available to the

Monday, May 1, 1978

previous administration for a number of years, has been taken to encourage good driving and to acknowledge good driving by the capability of earning merit points. I think that was envisaged, and the Member for St. George agrees that that was envisaged with the initial legislation and he and I really concur with the advisability of moving in that direction.

I agree with him that there should be more of the positive nature in our approach to this problem than merely relying on the punitive and the negative finding, and the penalizing of our drivers. I apologize to the committee for perhaps ruffling feathers. It was a temptation I couldn't resist.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, first I can't help but note that the Minister of Highways and Transportation appears to be a little at odds with the Minister of Education, who only Friday during his Estimate review indicated that he and his colleagues may have misled the public about the 3 Rs and the fact that the 3 Rs aren't being taught in our public schools, and I think it is very interesting to note the remarks by the Minister of Highways just a few moments ago.

Secondly, I am wondering if the Minister of Highways could inform us as to whether or not a motorist that builds up a clear driving record for, say, the past five years would obtain a bank of merit points. Does that mean that if that motorist then is in difficulty with the law and has, say, a careless driving offence, that he would be able to use those merit points to offset any demerit points that would be introduced by his conviction?

MR. ENNS: That is correct, Mr. Chairman. That is precisely the intent of the changes that are being contemplated to go into effect September 1st. I am advised that each merit point is worth two demerits. In other words, it is not an even tit-for-tat kind of situation. One earned merit mark will wipe out two demerit points.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Minister, if I could refer to my personal example — rather risky — but a year and a half ago I was involved in a speeding offence — two demerit points. And knowing that I had those two points and if I again was in breach of a further offence that I would probably be paying additional moneys on my driver's licence, it caused me to drive damn carefully for the next year. Now, I believe that I had gone a stretch of three years prior to that, amazingly, without any demerit points. Are you saying to me that in my case I am presenting to you that I would have had three merit points which would have been offset by the two demerit points. I would still be one demerit point ahead, and therefore wouldn't have had any worry about another speeding offence.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the merit points earned don't come as quickly as the demerit marks deserved. It would take the Honourable Member for Selkirk two years of good driving to earn one merit point, and only one breach of an offence to earn two demerit points. So there is a built-in incentive there to . . .

MR. PAWLEY: However, I had driven three years prior to that, clear. So that would have been three merit points.

MR. ENNS: No, that's only one point. Half points don't count.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, maybe that's a dicey area for me to continue on, and my colleague, the Member for St. George, appears to be endorsing your program, though I must indicate to you I am not as enthusiastic as the Member for St. George.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, if the Honourable Member for Selkirk will permit, having a penchant for doing things in a voluntary system, I would consider discussing with the Registrar of Motor Vehicles the opportunity for motorists to opt out of this system, should they chose. If they feel that the older system has a better means of riding herd on their driving habits, we would would consider the possibility of drivers being able to opt out of the system that is being considered.

MR. PAWLEY: The problem that you might have is that all of your responsible motorists might remain in, and all your irresponsible ones opt out. Would that be a possibility?

I would like to ask whether or not, in considering merit points . . . And, frankly, I think it would make more sense if merit points were granted to motorists who were able to operate under certain conditions, and I would like to outline three conditions to you for your consideration.

One, motorists that wear seat-belts should, I would think, be entitled to some merit points, if you are not going to impose compulsory seat-belt legislation. There should be some consideration to a merit point or two for the wearing of seat-belts.

Secondly, what about those motorists that are total abstainers. It seems to me that the driving record will indicate that those that operate under total abstinence are involved in fewer accidents than those that imbibe. And I just wonder if the Minister would consider that as a basis for merit points.

And thirdly, the reference was made earlier about students. Now, I think the problem with the Student Program is that the responsible students take the courses and the irresponsible ones don't. And I'm wondering first if the Minister is considering a universal requirement that all students take a

Monday, May 1, 1978

driving course in the schools, or, alternatively, that those students that do take a course would receive these merit points that he has made reference to .

So there are three points there: Seat-belts, abstinence and student programs. Whether or not he would consider those criteria in weighing merit points.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I can't say it more sincerely that all three matters raised by the Member for Selkirk are very valid concerns that could well be, and perhaps should be, considered by the Motor Vehicles Branch.

I can think of an additional part of that . . . may want to think of it, although I raise it with caution in the sense that I haven't had an opportunity to research it. But certainly there seems to be some merit to, first of all, examining the possibility of encouraging by some recognition officially the wearing of seat-belts.

The question of acknowledging abstinence from alcohol, in terms of one's driving record, I believe there are jurisdictions where that, in fact, is being done. And data ought to be available to both the Motor Vehicles Branch and, indeed, MPIC, in terms of whether or not some acknowledgement and some encouragement of these factors couldn't be considered as being preferable, rather than the compulsory legislation.

The matter of students, again, I refer to the comments that I made to the Member for St. George. I would certainly place the concept or the idea of trying to expand that to a universal program within our school system as being one that I would like to consider as being very high on my priority list during the time that I have the responsibility for this department.

MR. PAWLEY: There is a question of a compulsory program, then, Mr. Minister, applied universally in the schools.

MR. ENNS: No, you see it's not a compulsory program because, believe it or not, there are still those in our society who opt not to drive or who have driven and realize that it's sheer madness to be driving in that throng out there and who turn in their licences and say no, I'll stick with the bicycle or somebody else's driving. But, you know, I'm being somewhat facetious right now. But the compulsory feature to attaining the privilege of driving — it is a privilege to drive — then that is being opted into by people who want to drive.

MR. PAWLEY: Well, another point I'd like to raise . . .

MR. ENNS: I just want to go on record, Mr. Chairman, that the member has obviously touched on a point that I have some sensitivity towards, namely, the question of seat-belts, for instance, the pros and cons of compulsory legislation versus perhaps some other means of encouraging the greater use of them. These are matters that I can assure the honourable member we'll be taking up seriously with the department in the next short period of time.

MR. PAWLEY: I'd just like clarification on another point. In dealing with the demerit points motorists outside the province, though I gather that we're unable to charge those points as against surcharges now for MPIC purposes until you've introduced remedial legislation. That doesn't mean that all those motorists that have collected demerit points outside the province had those demerit points now struck from the records, does it?

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Chairman, it doesn't. What it also does is it forces me into a position which most legislators, including the Honourable former Attorney-General, don't particularly like to be in and that of passing retroactive legislation, but I am informed by the people at MPIC and by the Registrar of the Motor Vehicle Branch that it is just an impossible situation to try to resolve otherwise.

MR. PAWLEY: Now, one further point I would like to say that I wish there was some way, and I've always felt this during the period of our term in government, that there were at that time, I remember Mr. Dygala showing me a surprising!large number of motorists who ly had 30 or more demerit points which seemed to be . . .

A MEMBER: And still driving?

MR. PAWLEY: . . . and were still operating a licence. Now I don't know, there was some difficulty because some of these points had been built up so high during their younger period and they still hadn't worked their way down but I'm wondering whether that is still the situation, that we do have many number of motorists with still with 30 or more or 20 or more demerit points in the province.

MR. ENNS: I'm advised that there are some. I'm also advised that in most instances these drivers retain their driving privileges as a result of actions taken by the courts. In most instances, our own Licencing Suspension Board and the appeal mechanisms that we have under the immediate jurisdiction of the department, in fact take away these driving privileges and then, in too many instances, to the point where it has caused concern of the department, concern to the extent that we are considering amendments to the legislatio8 that we are finding that the courts are putting back onto the road system in Manitoba the very drivers that you are referring to.

Monday, May 1, 1978

MR. PAWLEY: Yes, well I do know that . . . how shall I discuss this? I do know that it is a fact that under the present legislation, it is felt in a number of legal quarters that the board has, to some extent, gone beyond the wording of the present Act, that if hardship is shown and it's not contrary to the public good, that the licence be granted for restricted purposes and the courts have been tending to over-rule the traffic board in this respect so that there's a problem with legislation or, alternatively, it's a problem with the traffic board.

I want to say to the Minister that this does bring us back to the question of dual licencing and whether or not there should not be a dual licence that can be used for work purposes only, another licence that will be used only for pleasure purposes. I know the Federation of Labour, year after year, had requested the former government to deal with this and I believe there was some movement by way of the class of licence to see if something could be worked out in that respect because there is certainly a problem in a time of rising unemployment, hardship can be an important consideration. Most of the convictions, accidents that take place, take place during periods of pleasure driving, not during times of work driving. But sometimes, possibly, let me say that the board has been overly strict in taking a course of action which would take away a person's livelihood even though that person's demerit points may have all been accumulated during his pleasure hours rather than his work hours and if there is a family involved it can work extreme hardship. The courts have recognized this, I must say, to a greater extent than has the board. So I'm not too sure whether we should be critical of the court or whether the board, to some extent, has misinterpreted its role.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I suppose we can continue this discussion for quite some time. I think the real subject matter at hand though is safety and I think sufficient evidence can be shown by the facts and by the department that it is, remarkably, the very high incidents of traffic accidents, traffic fatalities caused by repeat offenders. Now if the name of the game is to improve the safety factor, then that's one set of circumstances. Whether or not it is to recognize how — and I think the courts obviously are recognizing it — that the ability to be able to be mobile or the ability to be able carry out one's work is often directly related to the privilege of being able to drive. That's a matter that, I suppose, will continually dog the department in terms of resolving that matter.

MR. PAWLEY: I would just like to pursue that a little further with the Minister because I know of a recent case, over-turned by the court, in which there certainly were no demerit points accumulated during the work hours at all and the board had refused to issue a licence for restricted purposes. The court saw fit to do so. I want to say to the Minister that the problem is that there are too many of these cases and too many motorists that are having to go to the court to over-rule the board, that all that's being done is the legal profession is being fed unnecessary funds. Now it may be felt that it's working an inconvenience to this motorist and therefore he's going to think twice because he's had to pay out legal expenses and delay and hardship and whatnot to proceed to the courts in way of appeal but if there's a pattern setting in, I think the Minister should be aware of it. If the Minister doesn't agree with the pattern then certainly it changes legislation, but before he does so, I think he should be concerned as to whether or not motorists are being unduly interfered with insofar as the use of their vehicle for work purposes.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm prompted to remark that if the lawyers would restrain themselves and acknowledge the period of restraint that we're in and charge somewhat less than the usual \$250 every time they take a motorist to court, that it may not cost that much but the problem of dual licencing has its problems too. For instance, if a commercial trucker was caught in an offence and had his driver's licence suspended while operating on business, he could then not . . .

MR. PAWLEY: Oh, then have no problem.

MR. ENNS: . . . he could then not get the benefits of the dual licencing system that you speak of. In effect, what we have under our Licence Appeal Board, the provision that always provides the motorist for precisely the reasons that the honourable member raises, the temporary permit, 45 day permit, that allows him and prevents him from losing his job because of his loss of licence and then, in effect, lets the court decide. That may be the route that we should be encouraging in that event although as has been noted, it's whether or not the attendant costs are fair and accurate.

MR. PAWLEY: I have no problem, Mr. Chairman, where the licence is removed as a result of one's misconduct while driving a truck or a cab but I, for instance, recently know of an incident of a hydro linesman who lost his licence during a period of pleasure driving only and had considerable difficulty reinstating it for his work with Manitoba Hydro.

Two points on the 45 day permit. One is that not all judges issue the 45 day permit. I know one judge that is very very reluctant to issue a 45 day permit so that it's not an automatic issuing, it's a judge's discretion.

MR. ENNS: I'm advised that if the judge doesn't, the appeal board can.

MR. PAWLEY: Well, again, the motorist is involved in delays and legal expense because that can't be set up immediately either. And the second area is that the hearings aren't taking place normally within the 45 day period and an extension has generally to be obtained. Now, it may be that there's

Monday, May 1, 1978

just too many cases, I guess, before the traffic board; there's a backlog developing I suppose.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I acknowledge that that is an area of concern to me and to the department that begs a question of whether we shouldn't provide the Licence Suspension Appeal Board with some added resources, either in some additional members that could sit more frequently. The time delay is one that is often brought to the attention of myself and as I'm sure to the previous administration from people that aren't necessarily quarrelling with the infraction that they've incurred. They quarrel with the time that's involved in getting their case heard. Very often they feel that they have special circumstances which will permit them to either get a temporary or a restricted licence to carry on with their work but, as the member correctly points out, that the time delay that sometimes occurred is a problem.

MR. PAWLEY: And I should point out to the Minister that during that 45 day-plus period, the motorist is operating his vehicle for pleasure as well as for work so that the pleasure driving isn't cut out until the traffic board has an opportunity to hear his appeal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just maybe before we break up, the Member for Lac du Bonnet says he wanted to ask the question which the Minister might want to use the supper hour to get the answer to. The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the department would be prepared to bring to this committee statistics on the number of drivers involved in accidents over the last year or any study period that they have undertaken so that we can get a breakdown by age, fatalities, accidents, etc., something that we can look at and compare from year to year. I would appreciate, if there's something available, to have that supplied to the committee. !

MR. ENNS: Can we add to that of political persuasion, too.

MR. USKIW: And I'd like to be on it at 8:00 o'clock.

MR. ENNS: . . . would like to know how many Liberals and Conservatives and NDPers get involved in that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, the hour of 5:30 having arrived, I'm leaving the Chair and returning at 8:00 o'clock.

SUPPLY — EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. J. Wally McKenzie: Resolution No. 42, 2. Research, (a) Salaries — the Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I thought that perhaps the Minister might want to respond to some of the questions that were asked of him. I believe there were some that were asked of him in relation to this item when the Committee last sat.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I believe the remarks that the Member for Burrows is referring to were of a philosophical nature, and I'm sure that I'll have the opportunity as we move through the debates to address myself to that general philosophy, so I would leave that matter rest at this time.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Up to this point in time in dealing with the matter of research, we're probably looking more specifically at research within the public school system. But in view of the fact that the department now has both the elementary, secondary and the post-secondary education under its jurisdiction, could the Honourable Minister indicate to us the nature of some of the types of research projects that he has in mind at the post-secondary level?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Member for Burrows, I believe the last day, under the discussion of the functions and role of the Research Branch, I went over the main headings that will be covered by our research department in the coming year, and in so doing I believe I also stressed the areas of post-secondary education that would be dealt with by the Research Branch. At that time I believe I informed the member that to become specific after the Branch has been in state for some one month, or some 29 days, is a little difficult at this time; but I think he's well aware of those general areas in the Manpower-community college-university areas that the research department will be dealing with.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I would have thought, Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable Minister must have some research projects in mind in arriving at the Estimate figure that is shown before us. Surely that is there to provide for some type of research activity. So therefore I am at a loss to understand the

Monday, May 1, 1978

Honourable Minister's response when he says that, this being only one month after the re-organization of the department, and it's rather difficult at this point in time to indicate the type of research activity that will be undertaken. He must have had something in mind or else he wouldn't have made provision for a research branch in his department.

MR. COSENS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I could very well go over those areas that we are going to be concentrating on for the Member for Burrows again but I think that would be merely repetitive. As I mentioned, if he wants specific projects, those are going to be forthcoming from within those areas. We have some general ideas in this area, but we have not refined these completely as yet, as he well knows. There are some ongoing types of research that are necessitated by the type of agreements that we have with the Federal Government, and these are being carried out at all times, and of course these are presently underway and being carried forth.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Salaries — The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to pursue a question of research which the department has undertaken and yet we have in effect heard nothing from the Minister on it. I asked him, I guess a few days ago, whether he had read the Task Force Report; I think he indicated he hadn't, or if he did, he just browsed it, he's been too busy — probably an argument against so-called rationalization that's taken place in the new administration on the basis that they are going to do without Ministers and double staffs and they are going to cut down. I think it's an indication the Minister may be overworked.

I want to refer to another report which I think has an ironic twist to it. It's the Fitness Report, and it's about 100 pages long, but in terms of the portion of it that is in prose, there's probably only 10 or 12 pages, and we touched on this last week. I understand this report cost about \$50,000 and I would like to know again, what the Minister intends to do about it? The irony is this, Mr. Chairman. This is Physical Activity Week; I don't know if this is a national or a provincial week, but it certainly is Physical Activity Week in Manitoba, and when one looks at this report — and I have been able to obtain a copy of it — one finds some very shocking statistics contained in it. For example, that the present curriculum is not being enforced. And then you get some of the specific recommendations, and I would like to draw attention to some of them, to the Minister and to members of the Assembly, and ask the Minister what he intends to do about them, because he is a professional, he has extensive experience, and I know that this will not be the first time this has crossed his mind.

But I ask him on the first point that in terms of the amount of time — I'm now quoting from the Physical Fitness Survey of Manitoba Schools, 1976-77, which the Minister has had in his possession since November. And I ask him, for example, first of all, right now, under a six-day cycle, elementary children are supposed to have 100 minutes a week of physical education; junior high students are supposed to receive 90 minutes, and 75 to 80 percent, according to this survey, 75 to 80 percent of Manitoba students do not receive the time allotments prescribed by the Department of Education. So that is the first question that I put to the Minister; what does he intend to do about the fact that his own guide, which was, I believe, established under the Roblin administration, a general guideline, or a specific guideline for schools in Manitoba is not being met. Many physical educators feel that the present standards are inadequate, but the present standards are not being met, let alone talk about expanding on them.

There are a number of other recommendations about encouraging students to participate, but I would go to a second section which I think is quite shocking and it deals with the question of nutrition and the statistics that most students are overweight. And this, of course, is a combination of exercise and nutrition and attitude. It's pointed out, quite accurately, that nutritional disorders are one of the most dangerous in our society, and it can lead to disease; obesity can reduce a person's life span, and so on, and so on. But here's really the shocking part of the report. The study discovers that more and more children are becoming overweight as they grow older, and that more girls are overweight than boys. Then they give this statistic, that at age 17, 74 percent of Manitoba high school girls are overweight. Well, three-quarters of the girls in this province in schools are overweight. That's a rather staggering statistic.

So the recommendation — so I say to the Minister, what is he going to do about the recommendation? All the suggestions about more physical activity, more timetabling, and also education in terms of nutrition and body weight control, what is he going to do about it? The recommendation is that there should be more instruction in nutrition and body weight control, preferably through more physical education. And it also recommends something that's fairly controversial, namely that they should restrict the sale of non-nutritious foods in the schools which add to an already serious problem. School cafeterias, where in operation, should inform students of the nutrient and caloric values of foods and beverages they provide or offer for sale. That's the old question of junk foods in our schools, and I realize there's a sort of a dilemma there. I asked the Minister, he's the man in the driver's seat, he's the one who jumped into that car, Mr. Chairman, you remember the old Western chapters, where in the last installment the stagecoach was headed for the cliff or the precipice, and here's the Minister, who's shoved out the other driver, seized control of the car, and he tells us that just in the nick of time he turned the wheel to avoid going over the cliff, or the precipice, as he refers to it. Well, I want to know, Mr. Chairman, whether the Minister is going to do something about that particular matter.

And there are many other recommendations, but I simply say to him again, in summary — and I

await to hear his comments — that these are the kind of figures that have been produced by a study team. I believe about half-a-dozen people worked for a number of months, went around the province, studied the various schools, examined the students, gave them tests, indoor and outdoor, of various activities, and they made recommendations. The Minister has had this report for six months and we have heard nothing. So I ask him what he's going to do, first of all, about enforcing the present curriculum requirements which are not being met, his own curriculum requirements, namely, dating back some 15-odd years, and secondly, what he's going to do about the other recommendations, particularly in regard to physical education and obesity and nutrition?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I think this topic could be perhaps better served under the proper appropriation, but we'll deal with it at this point. I think the Member for Elmwood wants to get away to the Public Works Estimates later.

I can't agree with his remarks on the Task Force Report. I believe just to clarify the topic, I mentioned that I had not had time to study all items of that report as they pertained to Education, it doesn't mean I haven't had time to read them. Reading and having the time to carefully examine in detail and look into all of the ramifications of a topic, I think, are sometimes a little different as he can well appreciate.

In regard to the Fitness Report, and I think he has misquoted the sum of money that was spent there — I believe it was \$150,000 rather than \$75,000.00. The thing that puzzles me, Mr. Chairman, is that how, with eight years in power, the previous government has allowed the fitness of our young people to deteriorate to this state that he has been telling us about, and I'm sure that during that time, they must have been aware that these things were not being taken care of, and so on, and really, I think he's standing there giving us a condemnation of some things that have happened in the past, and at the same time he's looking at two of his colleagues who, I believe, were Ministers of Education during that time. And I would say to him, or suggest to him, that I wonder what they did about this particular topic, and I take that as no out at all, Mr. Chairman, because that is not the question. However, I think it does bear some consideration. If things have deteriorated to this sorry state that the Member for Elmwood mentions, and I agree that there is reason for concern here when we have this many young people who are overweight, and I think we should be concerned with the number of older people we have that are overweight as well. But the point is this didn't happen in the last five months and as a result to change these things around is going to take some time. It is not only going to be accomplished by the educational system, but it's going to have to be accomplished by all sectors of our society, certainly lending themselves to these concerns that regard nutrition and fitness.

The Member for Elmwood refers to the fact that the phys. ed. curriculum has not been enforced; that people have not been following it. Once again, I'm shocked to hear that. After all I thought perhaps the previous Department of Education might have been doing something about that; that I imagine was one of their responsibilities at the time. I can assure him that we will do everything in our power to see that that proper time allotment for phys. ed. is met and I would hope that in eight years we are much more successful than what he suggests the previous administration has been.

I realize also that our department is taking a close look at all aspects of this whole area of physical education and health; and as I say, it would be better discussed under the topic of Curriculum Development, but we are bringing out a new curriculum outline in phys. ed. and health in the fall of 1979 and I would hope that we much more adequately deal with these problems in that curriculum outline than the one that has existed.

He also touches on the topic of nutrition, Mr. Chairman. I would suggest that that topic is one also that not only the educational system in itself will solve, but it is a much larger topic that again all sectors of our society are going to have to lend themselves to; and the medical people in our society, the scientific groups in our society, are all going to have to put their heads together and in some way try to change the eating habits and perhaps some aspects of our food processing. Maybe, Mr. Chairman, we almost have to change our whole lifestyle. Of course, that's a large order and I would hope that the Member for Elmwood doesn't expect that the educational system is going to do that single-handedly.

I mentioned to him before that certainly health programs and home ec. programs dealing with food preparation, have been dealing with this topic of nutrition and apparently in light of the report and what we find is that they have not been completely successful in overcoming the problem.

Now, when these young people become parents, I would suggest that the nutrition, that at that time, will improve and that some of the ideas and some of the concepts and some of the training that they have received will reflect in their children. I think that has to be one of the very positive hopes that we have for the future.

As far as junk foods are concerned, it becomes an almost impossible situation to regulate what young people are going to eat at school, during school noon hours and so on. In schools that have abolished the junk-food type of dispensing machines they find that their student population then moves out of the school and goes to the nearest corner store where they can purchase that type of material.

And I would imagine that the Member for Elmwood, who says I'm in the driver's seat and should do something about it, realizes that to regulate what these young people are going to eat is perhaps a very very large order for any government to start doing. After all, I can visualize his concept of the

Monday, May 1, 1978

people from the department monitoring what mothers are putting in their children's sandwiches and so on, to make sure that the right nutrition is being supplied. I suggest to him it's a big problem and one that's not easily solved. I'm not taking lightly his concern because it's also my concern. But I also suggest to him that in eight years apparently we have arrived at this — what he certainly describes and what the report indicates is a state that is rather deplorable. I can assure him that we will be putting all our efforts that we can find in this particular area in trying to improve the nutrition programs that are being taught in our schools; the health programs that might support these; and at the same time looking carefully at the fitness programs that now exist. And as well, of course, the time allotment, as he points out the report reveals, has not been followed in the last eight years in our schools and is something that we certainly will be looking at and looking at very carefully.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments on the comments. I am interested in the positive statements that the Minister makes because I think that the record shows that he is giving us some indication that he intends to attempt to make some improvements in the system; and we will watch with great interest as to what the Minister does, whether he in fact will not only say this but that he will do this. That is the important thing, as to what actions he will take. So far, of course, there has been no action. The Minister received the report six months ago. There, up until today, was no indication that there would be any action taken and perhaps now we are getting the first thoughts percolating in the Minister's mind about doing something about it.

On the negative side he, of course, debates me politically and I have to debate him back. He talks about reading a report and studying a report and obviously he knows something about semantics as well, as do I. But anyway, he has now I think indicated that he has in fact read the Task Force report but he hasn't studied it — he makes a subtle distinction.

I would then ask him if he could indicate whether he has read the Physical Education survey, if not studied it, if he has, in fact, read it.

As to the amount of money spent, my information is about \$50,000 — he indicates more. Whatever the correct amount is, what I guess components you include, what the salaries are, the point is, I think, that the government and the previous Minister or Ministers of our administration at least had the foresight to make a study and to approve of a study. I believe that was done probably about two years ago when you consider when this was put into motion, how long the study took and then finally the release of the report some six months ago, up until today. So at least some credit should be given to previous Ministers of Education for having the intelligence to make the study.

But the important thing, of course, is what happens now? The Minister says, "Well, you know, something should have happened the last eight years." The question really is, what happened before? It's sort of interesting, especially let's say from 1966 to 1969 or prior to that, but really what is important is what is happening now.

A MEMBER: The kids didn't get fat in the last six months, Russ.

MR. DOERN: No, that's right. They were fat when I taught in the early Sixties and so on. — (Interjection)— But we did our best, I mean. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm getting condemned now from my own senior colleague. So I'd better keep talking or he . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . he's making promises.

MR. DOERN: He is plaguing both our houses at the moment. But I say that the real question is what happens now? And the Minister at least has given an inkling. At least, he's put himself on record as saying that he's going to attempt to do something or to get the ball rolling. Well, that would be good because in six months the ball has been motionless and we're going to watch now in the next year, as to what he does.

But I would like to ask him a couple more questions. The previous Minister, Mr. Turnbull, indicated that he believed that there should be more time allotted for physical education than even the present curriculum, which is not being met. I have to go on memory, but I know it's contained in this report, I don't know whether he went for a figure of 150 minutes or 200 minutes per six-day cycle. The present standard is about 100 minutes per cycle, but the previous Minister . . .

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I think curriculum — if you permit me, the honourable member — could be dealt with on the next page of the Estimates: Curriculum Development, Curriculum Services.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can see how it's confusing to occasionally use the word "curriculum" here; but I would go back to my original point, that we are talking about a piece of research. We are talking about research. I am talking about a report which was a piece of research and therefore dealing with that point.

I asked the Minister if he could indicate what his view is of the present requirements, as to whether he is in favour of encouraging and also insisting that the school divisions and school boards meet the present levels that are required by the department, or whether he would go further and agree to an extension, because of the importance. I would like him to answer that.

Monday, May 1, 1978

And again, he gives us one approach to the sale of junk foods, namely, if you don't sell it to them, somebody else will, so you might as well sell it. —(Interjection)— That's right. My colleague says you could refer that to the case of marijuana, where perhaps since it's available on the street, maybe it should be available legally.

But I say that a better approach would probably be to outlaw junk food completely from the schools, all these chocolate bars and soft drinks and potato chips, and all this other stuff, it's doing nobody any good — just sugar products — bad for the health, bad for teeth and so on and so on. I think that would be a much sounder approach. —(Interjection)— Well, I'm opposed to alcohol being sold in the schools, yes.

So I wonder if the Minister could enlighten us on those particular points. You know, it's interesting to know what our government did. We know what our government did. We don't know what the new Minister is going to do and if he could point a few directions and then follow them up, it would be of some value to the House. So I would ask him if he could make some comment there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, at the commencement of the Minister's remarks he had indicated that he was somewhat surprised or amazed to find what, in his opinion, was not a solution of a problem with respect to proper nutrition and physical exercise with the view to proper physical development over the past eight years. I was about to answer him that question, but then he answered his own question because he then went on to say that, well, part of the problem is parents and how to get at the parents and all the other related problems that a Minister of Education has no control over and cannot cope with.

Well, my hope is, Mr. Chairman, that over the next four years when there'll be more parents out of the school system which was in operation during the past eight years, will become parents, that the Minister will have a more enlightened, a more receptive group of young parents to deal with and hopefully whatever changes and improvements he would want to make in the phys. ed. program would become that much easier; because the Honourable Minister will remember that the parents that we had to deal with were the product of the previous government and not of our government. So that was where our problem was.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I remind the honourable members we're dealing with Salaries under Research. The item is Salaries. Some of the items that are being discussed here can well be handled under Curriculum Development, Curriculum Services and things like that. I think if the committee would stay in the Research and the salaries that's involved, the planning and the policy regarding this, I think we could . . . The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Obviously, Mr. Chairman, you are having the same problem as a number of us on this side of the House are having because from time to time we have raised various issues with respect to research, and that was the Honourable Minister's response too, that he will be able to respond in greater detail when we come to Program Development and Support Services and the various items and sub-items under it, and other appropriations within the Estimates of his department.

So that brings me to the next question, and it's related to one which I had asked the Honourable Minister last week when I looked at the organizational structure of the department and saw where research was slotted, reporting directly to the Deputy Minister, if I remember correctly. So that brings me to the question: Could the Honourable Minister comment on the relationship, on the linkage between the Research Branch and the rest of his department. I think that it's important, Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable Minister do explain that to the committee; not only for our own information, but I think that the public at large would want to know. I think that the teachers, trustees and parents would want to know, and superintendents from time to time. I'm sure that requests come to the Department of Education that research in certain areas be done. And so, hence, the function of the Research Department ought to be spelled out very clearly and precisely so that, be it teachers, superintendents, school trustees, whoever, when they come to the Department of Education so that they know whether they ought to talk to the Research Branch or whether they ought to talk to the people in Curriculum, or to whom, rather than going to one office and being told, "Sorry, this isn't my responsibility. Go across the hall and talk to the guy over there." And then have him say, "Well, I don't really feel that it's my responsibility. Maybe you should go and have another talk with the guy from whose office you just came."

So, if the Honourable Minister would comment on that. Perhaps the Minister may have made some comment last week in explaining the role and function of the Research Branch which may have escaped us, and if that happened then I apologize. Well, no, I don't really apologize, because I think it says something about the Minister's teaching ability. This is a new reorganized department so I think it's very important that the Minister do take the time and make the effort to explain very clearly the role and function of the various branches in his department.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, might I suggest to the Member for Burrows that teaching ability is related sometimes to pupils' learning ability, as well. I have repeated, I think a couple of times, the

particular role and function of the Research Department. I am almost at a loss to expand on that anymore except, of course, I think I have spelled out very succinctly that it would be performing a support function for various other departments in the Department of Education. Beyond that, I don't know how specific he wants me to become. I think that suggests that the support role is one that it would be playing for those departments that require information and data on programs that they are bringing forth.

So I will just leave that at that point and move to the question of the Member for Elmwood regarding the time allotments for physical education and state once more to him that I would like to see what would transpire if these time options that have existed for several years in physical education were adhered to, what effect it would have on the student population, on the physical fitness and the emotional welfare, and so on, the general atmosphere of the schools if in fact that time table was followed, if that time allotment was adhered to.

So I would say to him at this point, rather than considering more time for physical education, I would like to see what the results would be if the present time allotment was adhered to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the Minister which group in the past did projections of future school enrolment for schools? You know, those types of projections that would have been needed by school districts in order to determine what size schools should be built in their particular school districts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to ask for a clarification. Is the Minister saying, then, that he is in fact going to enforce the present requirements for physical education in Manitoba schools, that he is going to go and make certain by directive and follow-through that the students will meet the standards that have been set and have been in effect for the past dozen or more years? Because he says that he doesn't favour an extension. He wants to see the results of implementing or enforcing the present standards. So I am asking him, is he then going to enforce the present standards and then, secondly, study those results?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order. May I suggest to the committee that that comes under Curriculum Development. I'm sure the Minister will advise the committee when he comes to that item that that's development of curriculum, as I read it, which comes on the next page of the Estimates. I am your servant, as you wish it. Carry on. Proceed.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I will bow to your ruling in that regard and certainly we have the opportunity to come back to that on a couple of occasions, I suppose. If we don't get to it in Curriculum, the member can come back to it in 1.(a).

In regard to the school projection question posed by the Member for Transcona, I am informed that this has been handled through the Public Schools Finance Board with the co-operation of certain aspects of the Research Department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Will that continue to be the case? Because there is always some confusion as to school enrolment projections in school divisions. And often I think the school districts come, and some of them have approached me, and they have been somewhat concerned about past projections — and I think validly — and since I am a newly elected member I would like to be able to find out who, specifically, will be doing the projections so that school districts aren't caught in the particular position of overbuilding.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, we will be following the same basic procedure that has been followed in the past, and hopefully with more success. As the Member for Transcona points out, there have been some problems in these projections. I don't know where you would lay the blame for this particular problem. I suppose he refers to schools that were built for 1,200 students and have only 286 students in them, and this sort of thing. I know that has to be a source of embarrassment to any government. I would hope that we would be able to be more accurate and not repeat that type of blunder.

MR. PARASIUK: Specifically in this respect, Mr. Chairman, I think the problem sometimes develops when school districts — and I don't know the extent to which the Department of Education has been involved in this — take projections regarding the pace of development in a subdivision development done by a major developer, land developer and housing developer, in Winnipeg.

A case in point is the Transcona School Division, where in Mission Gardens BACM and Engineered Homes have projected a fairly large subdivision development. Consequently, a very large community school was built — I think a \$4 million school — which really, in a sense, wasn't part of the community of Transcona. It was caught in the area between Transcona and Winnipeg. We find that that school had a projected enrolment of 850 and there were something like 120 students

attending from the surrounding neighborhood, and the students have to be bussed in from other areas.

I tried to do some checking on this and I find that the school district basically relied on the projections and assumptions of the land developer. And I would think that what's important here, and I will be getting to this when we get to the Transportation Assistance, is that I think it might be wiser to hold back a bit in accepting the projections of a developer, and possibly bus the students in a newly developed subdivision into an older school, that often is under-utilized, for a period of time so as to ensure that there isn't this over-capacity. Because I think it has not only been a problem in Transcona, I think it has been a problem in any new suburban area. —(Interjection)— Well, now we find that in the Maples it has been the other way around. It's just that this one does stick out like a sore thumb in Transcona.

The same company is undertaking a massive development, called The Devonshire Park Development, on the north side of Transcona and has been approaching the school division to have elementary and secondary schools built in this new subdivision where no houses exist right now, but where a lot of houses will be constructed this summer. So the School Board, itself, feels under some pressure and I'm wondering whether, in fact, we have developed sufficient expertise within the Public Schools Finance Board staff per se and within the research staff of the department per se, or whether in fact it might not be wiser to try and tap into some of the resources of the Municipal Affairs Planning Branch and determine what past experience with respect to subdivision developments has been. Because I really do think that we have to be a lot more careful. And this has not been a problem just over the last eight years; it was a problem that existed when I first came to work for Civil Service about eight years ago. At that stage, we had a lot of rural schools that had an excess capacity because people had done some very simple straight-line projections on population and they hadn't done a population profile of the community to determine how many people were, oh, under the age of 30, living in that community and whether in fact the baby boom bubble had passed through demographically in that community. And if you used straight-line projections, whether in fact you wouldn't run into problems. That has happened in rural communities and it has happened now in suburban communities.

I really don't see it in a partisan light. I think it is very much a technical problem and one, when people are talking about restraint, I think the important thing is to get the quality of care and the quality of education in the building, rather than building many monuments. And I think there has been a tendency in the past for people to build monuments, because they are there. They are visible and people can exert a lot of pressure on the school districts to get a school in place because they think maybe that will improve the quality of education when, in fact, often what is needed is a lower pupil-teacher ratio, for example.

So I am hoping that the Minister will consider looking at this problem very seriously, because I think our past performance over the last eight years and in the preceding eight years hasn't been that good. And I would hope that he might call on the resources of the Municipal Affairs Planning Branch and possibly of the city, as well, in order to get a better idea of the rate of development in new subdivisions.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the remarks of the Member for Transcona. He highlights what I find is a very very serious problem. Serious in several regards, but certainly at a time of restraint and fiscal concern, a time when we can't afford to make the type of mistakes that have been made in the past. I wasn't aware that eight years ago that there were many rural schools that were suffering from under-population, but certainly the last eight years has seen a drop in school population all over the province, with the exception of the move to the urban areas.

But I appreciate his remarks, Mr. Chairman, and I find generally that I am very much in agreement with him, and I appreciate his suggestions as regards some of the different considerations that people should take into their plan when they are looking at the building of new schools in newly developing areas.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I think it was Thursday, perhaps Friday, the Minister made reference to research funds, an activity. I think he said that the activity was better done by the division; I think he was referring to Winnipeg School Division 1, and that rather than do it in House, by the department, the funds were simply going to be given to Winnipeg School Division 1 because they were doing the work anyway. I'm wondering whether any staff went with that grant. In other words, I think it was a reference to \$200,000.00. All right, can the Minister tell us how much staff were involved, and if that \$200,000 is a grant, would that be shown under Research, or would that now be shown under Financial Support to Public Schools?

MR. COSENS: It's under Financial Support to Public Schools.

MR. MILLER: Can the Minister now tell us how much staff was therefore deleted from provincial and now would be part of the city's staffing?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I'll take a couple of minutes to get that information for the Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: All right, Mr. Chairman, while the Minister is getting the information. On Thursday last, before the 5:30 break, the Minister agreed to make available to us, to this side of the House, the schedule of Capital Authorities voted, Capital Supply Bills, of previous years. You may recall it just before the 5:30 break on Thursday, and you nodded your head. It's on Page 1381 of Hansard, and what I asked for was the amount of authorized allocated but not actually expended, and the actual amounts expended from Capital Supply Bills of both 1977-78 and 1976-77, and going all the way back. I wonder whether the Minister's staff has been able to come up with that information?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, in regard to that B Capital that I believe the Member for Seven Oaks is referring to, early in these Estimate discussions I assured the Member for Burrows that when we came to an appropriation where any of that Capital existed, I would make reference to it. We haven't come to one as yet; our first time that we will encounter that, to my knowledge, will be in 3.(a). If that's sufficient for the member, I would treat it that way. This was the obligation that I gave to the Member for Burrows, that as we move through the Estimates, and encountered that B Capital, I would make reference to what had happened to it.

MR. MILLER: Well, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister insists on handling it that way, fine. I think it would have been simpler and avoid this looking at it line by line, almost, because it's a simple way of doing it, simply to show the Schedule B Capital voted, what was expended, and what still remains, without allocating it to a particular line in this 3.(a) or (b) or (c) or (d), because under 3.(a) I'm not sure that it's going to be shown there, because most Capital for school buildings goes to Public Schools Finance Board, you see.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the Member for Seven Oaks' question regarding the transfer of staff that would go with the moneys and these programs, approximately five people would be involved, approximately five. That has not been definitely determined, but five is a good round figure.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Dealing with the Research Resolution. I was not in this room on Friday afternoon, I was busy elsewhere, and therefore I'm not sure whether the Minister described the allocation of responsibility within this Research Branch for specific programs. The general description is one which — there is a standard wording that anyone can provide — provides research and related activities. But I'd like to know what that Research group is working on now, whether it has any directions from the Honourable Minister, whether it is just there to support anybody who asks questions within the department, or whether it has a designated study and whether there's been any change in its role or in the program assigned to it between the two governments, because, Mr. Chairman, I have not yet become aware of the difference in philosophy between the two governments in relation to the entire Department of Education, and I think it's important to know the extent to which this new government, this Conservative government, looks on education as compared with the previous government. I must say, and I know it's not being terribly kind to the Minister but it's as kind to him as I have been to his predecessors, I am not sure that I fully understand that he's got hold of the department and is directing its activities, and I think that it's a very very difficult department to direct, because I think that it is inclined to be ongoing to service the continuing operations of education without any great amount of programmatic inputs, and that's not kind, I think. But, Mr. Chairman, I would hate to think that we accept the Minister of Education's description that he did, the answers he gave, in relation to what went on before he became Minister and what will go on since he's become Minister. If he wants to lean on the record of the past then I don't think that that's too much of a task for him. He could take on a few more portfolios if he wants to lean on the record of the past. I did not get an idea of his aspirations for the future to indicate that there's something dramatic and exciting in his mind.

Now, Mr. Chairman, at this moment we are receiving Friday's Hansard and the Minister might say, "Well, I talked about that on Friday," in which case, if you'll just give me the page numbers, I'll go to the page numbers, but failing that, I'll be up again to ask him just what is the exciting change that has taken place six months ago and today and tomorrow in relation to his role. I think, Mr. Chairman, you wanted to make a comment of administrative nature.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In accordance with Rule 19, Section 2, I am interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that there is no disposition to proceed into Private Members' Hour today, so if you will just continue on in Estimates until tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The Honourable Minister.

Monday, May 1, 1978

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, to the Member for St. Johns. I can assure him that on Friday — and I can't give him the page numbers this readily, but I know it's there — in answer to a question from the Member for Burrows, I think I rather thoroughly outlined, in some considerable detail, what I saw as the function and role of our Research Department if he is looking for a purely philosophical difference, and I think there is one, I would suggest to him that this Research Department as probably opposed, or in comparison to the one that existed, would be characterized by doing a purer form of research as opposed to the idea of operating programs, or an activity type of research, that I more or less have gathered was carried on under the previous Research Department. So I would make that distinction for the Member for St. Johns, that the present department will be characterized more by purer research, research supporting programs within the department and within the educational community, as opposed to research that operates programs.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I am just reading Page 1482, which seems to be the Minister's response to the Member for Burrows, and then described various education research, manpower assessment, program assessment, systems analysis, financial and educational planning, consultative and technical assistance, research co-ordination, information dissemination, and, he says, the list of activities is not exhausted. Could he also indicate to me, Mr. Chairman, and I thank him for telling me where to look for this material, where he has shown or whether he has shown the staff involved, the personnel, who they are and what their qualifications are?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Once again, I can provide that information to the Member for St. Johns. The staff involved I believe I have provided; the Member for Burrows has that information, I would hope, in front of him at this time. Identification of those people and their qualifications are something that I can provide, not immediately, it will take a bit of time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, about a week or so ago, his colleague, the Minister of Health, in speaking to some group, had called for a greater involvement of volunteers in the delivery of health services. I would like to ask the Honourable Minister of Education whether he is doing any research into the area of a greater degree of involvement of volunteers in the delivery of education services in view of the fact that the government appears to be and indicates that it is very cost-conscious, restraint minded, and so forth. So, if it's going to work, or if the Minister of Health hopes that a greater involvement of volunteers in the delivery of health services will contribute towards the reduction of the health costs, is the Honourable Minister of Education also thinking along similar lines and putting his research staff to work on the matter of a greater involvement of volunteers in the education field, with similar aims and objectives in mind with respect to costs and so forth, as the Minister of Health has?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure the Member for Burrows is well aware that there have been a great number of citizens of this province volunteer their time to help out in the schools of the province, not just this year nor last year, this has been trend that seems to have been increasing in the last five or six years, possibly, and I'm sure will continue to increase. I see it as a healthy sign that parents in particular have this interest in being in the school building and helping out in some of the functions in that particular building. I believe that education itself can gain from that type of assistance, and certainly the school system will be better off for it. There are several very very positive aspects to that type of participation by the community with the school. I'm not aware of all of the qualifications that my colleague in Health placed on volunteerism; I think possibly the hospital situation is somewhat different in some respects, but certainly in no way am I opposed to this type of volunteerism. I think it's a healthy sign and something that can only certainly support the school system.

MR. HANUSCHAK: But my question, Mr. Chairman, deals with increased involvement of volunteers with a view to reducing costs over and above the degree to which volunteers may be involved in school activity with the purpose of obtaining the self-satisfaction that they do by thus becoming better acquainted with what schools are all about. But I believe that the Minister of Health was speaking of greater involvement of volunteers with a view to reducing the cost of the delivery of health services. So, therefore, I put my question in the same light with respect to education, be it a greater use of volunteers in the classroom and thus reducing the number of professional staff that may be hired, perhaps in the area of transportation which is another expensive one, the organization of car pools or whatnot on a volunteer basis, and thus reduce the number of buses that the Minister would have to buy and the number of bus drivers that school divisions may have to hire.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the — I guess it's a proposal almost from the Member for Burrows — I have to assure him at this time that I have no plan to, or master plan as he seems to infer, to solve the financial problems of education and the problem by having volunteers take over all of these functions that he suggests, I think in some cases perhaps tongue in cheek, not at all. But as I've said earlier, Mr. Chairman, I certainly do salute and am pleased by the fact that people are volunteering their time in helping out in the schools, helping out in some of the functions that we would probably class as support functions.

These people coming into the schools, of course, are bringing with them certain qualities and backgrounds that I can see can do nothing else but enrich the program. But from a staff point of view, I think the Member for Burrows is well aware, that the school boards decide how they are going to staff their schools. I see the volunteers as merely an enrichment of the school program, by their presence, by their assistance. At this point I have no master plan or no indication, I can assure the Member for Burrows, for solving the financial problems of education in this way.

MR. HANUSCHAK: If the Minister has no master plan for solving the financial problems of education, and no master plan at this point in time, is he developing one? Could we expect him to come forth with a master plan within the next 12 months, come the next Session?

MR. DOERN: Well, you could say, is he pregnant with a plan?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, if the Member for Burrows is speaking of a plan that involves volunteers to solve the financial plight of our school system — and I don't say it's necessarily a plight; that is probably overstating the case but certainly solving some of the cost crisis that is occurring in education — I'd say no, if he feels that volunteers are the answer to solving that crisis.

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

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, could the Honourable Minister explain. . . I note that under the Salary item which we have just approved, there is a very significant reduction — and I believe that the Honourable Minister explained that — a reduction of \$245,000 or something in that order, overcent reduction, a 40 percent reduction as a matter of fact. On the other hand on Other Expenditures the reverse seems to have occurred, an increase of about 20 percent from 109,000 to 125,000. Could the Honourable Minister explain that imbalance?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Well, of course, there is an imbalance there, Mr. Chairman. In the one case as the Member for Burrows places before us, a figure of some \$240,000 in Salaries, that's the difference, as opposed to a difference of some \$16,000 in Expenses, so there's quite an imbalance in those two.

I would mention that the increase in Expenditures of some \$16,000 can be accounted for through provision for additional computer expenses that we would be encountering or feel we will be encountering in the coming year.

MR. CHAIAN: (b)—pass; 2.—pass. Resolution 42. RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$487,000 for Education; Research, \$487,000—passed.

Resolution 43, 3. Financial Support — Public Schools. 3. (a)—pass — the Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I believe that under item (a) School Grants, \$193 million, includes a whole host of grants of various categories, of various types. Could the Honourable Minister please indicate to us the types of grants that are included within this figure of \$193 million, please? And also indicate whether there is any capital in here?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the member's question on the Foundation Program and the grants contained therein, I could go through them for the member at this time.

First of all, the Salary grant covers the salaries of authorized teachers in the province. This amounts to some \$80,773,416.00.

The Transportation grant amounts to some 14,325,000. Under the heading of Capital Grants, first of all, for buses — and this covers the purchase of school buses in the coming year — some \$2.233 million.

Under the item of Debt Servicing — and of course covering the debentures on school buildings — some \$28.027 million.

Under the heading and still under Capital of Other — and this as honourable members opposite realize covers renovations and repairs to school buildings through the province — some \$5.500 million.

Monday, May 1, 1978

Vocational Equipment still under Capital — some \$750,000.00.

The Print and Non-Print Grant which amounts to some \$16.00 per pupil — 3.487 million.

The Vocational Grant per pupil — 3.039. The per pupil grant at the rate of some \$260 per pupil — this is an item of 54.805 million.

The Library Grant per pupil — this is at a rate of \$5.00 per pupil — 1.053 million.

The Small Schools Grant — \$485,860.00.

The Declining Enrolment grant — \$506,450.00.

The grant covering Transfers — \$6,263.00.

The grant covering the Administration Finance Board Salaries and Expenses, which fall under the Foundation Program — that item, \$339,000.00.

And the item of Interest Charges that also fall under the Finance Board — \$650,000; and

Special Needs Equipment, also under the Finance Board, \$40,000.00. And that, Mr. Chairman, totals 196.023 million.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I have two questions and the first one is a simple one. I'm sure the Honourable Minister must have an explanation for the discrepancy of some \$3 million between what he expects to spend and what is stated in the detail under 3. (a). The other one was that I'd like him to give us a definition of what he means by "Capital", I don't understand the word capital used in the context of the list he gave us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: It will take us a couple of minutes to get this answer on the 193 for the Member for St. Johns. Perhaps we could just proceed with a couple of other items. I'll also come back to this capital in a minute for him, if we could proceed with a couple of other items.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, by all means, I think we should take as much time as is necessary to get the information. But the other information I thought we would be getting — we were talking about cash flow — so let me ask him, what is the breakdown of last year's expenditures on the same items?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, under Capital for Buses, \$2.496 million; Capital for Debt Servicing, \$25.076 million; Other — as I've mentioned before covers most of these school repairs and small renovations — \$7.500 million; and Vocational Equipment, \$750,000.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, now I may not have heard the Honourable Minister correctly, but the figure that I have which he had given us the first time round — if I heard him correctly — was \$28.027 million.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. Johns asked for the figures for 1977.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I'm sorry. I'm sorry.

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

MR. CHEIACK: Mr. Chairman, I can't understand why the Minister is sitting. He didn't finish his listings.

MR. COSENS: I believe the Member for St. Johns asked for the figures under Capital.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, not knowing what the Minister means by Capital, then he can't say I really asked for figures on Capital. I really wanted to know what was spent last year in comparable figures, to what he indicates he plans to spend this year under this item. That's really what I asked. The question as to what does he mean by Capital has to be answered before we start talking about Capital.

MR. COSENS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Capital we are referring to here under Bus, Debt Servicing, Other and Vocational Equipment, comes under the Foundation Program and is paid out during the year by the Public Schools Finance Board to cover all of these different items that I have just mentioned — the purchase of school buses, the debt servicing on the school debentures, on the repair and maintenance of school buildings, and for vocational equipment.

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

Monday, May 1, 1978

MR. CHERNIACK: I am afraid I must repeat my question. The Honourable Minister, gave us a list totaling some \$196 million that he expects to spend this year under Item 3.(a). We are still trying to find out the discrepancy of \$2,985,000 — well \$3 million less \$15,000.00. We are still waiting for that. We are also waiting to find out what he means by capital, I still don't know that.

Thirdly, I was asking for a comparable statement of the last year's expenditures as it relates to this year's expected expenditures, which total \$196,000.00.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I apologize to the Member for St. Johns if I have not been very clear. I didn't quite understand what he was getting at, I thought he was looking for a comparison between the capital item and so on, but the total expenditures for 1977 voted as compared with the 196 that I referred to earlier was 186.651.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable, the Minister, has not broken down the \$186 million but that's not of interest to me unless some of my colleagues want it. I now understand that the previous fiscal year, \$186 million was spent whereas only \$175 million was allocated for that Item. Is that correct?

MR. COSENS: It is rather a unique situation here, Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, and not having been here I didn't experience it. But I understand that in the previous year under the Main Estimate there was voted \$167.7 million and then in this whole area a supplementary estimate came in with 7.4 million in it, which gives us the figure of 175.459. Now that still doesn't cover the whole area here, and also through Capital Supply I understand another 8.6 million was put into the Foundation Program last year, and that is an 8.6 under the B Capital that I believe the Member for Seven Oaks was concerned about, and went into the Foundation Program. Again I don't quite understand why that came about, but I understand it's a bit unorthodox, however it did take place.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister talked about 8.6 million, which I see under Education and the Reconciliation Statement which appears on 24. The Minister seems to agree with that. Is that where that figure went since, if he would bear with me and look at his Item 8, then he will see that last year's figures for Item 8 total \$18,891,400, which I believe will add up to the Reconciliation on his page 24. So if that Schedule B capital figure of some \$18 million is shown under Acquisitions, Construction of Physical Assets, then if we come back to 3.(a), is he saying that the \$8 million really belongs there and not under Item 8?

And then let me finish, Mr. Chairman, if that is the case, maybe the \$3 million that we are looking for is under Item 8.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I will come back to this one in a minute. The reconciliation of the \$193 million is something that I explained to the Member for St. Johns at this point. The figure of 196.023 is the total for the whole Foundation Program. Now, the 20 percent Foundation levy comes in at this point and if you subtract that figure of 39.204 it gives you a provincial share of 156.819. The Member for St. Johns will be checking my arithmetic. —(Interjection)— Okay. And to that 156.819 you add the other grants, another category beyond the Foundation Program, but also under the financial support, of 36.219 million, and when you add other grants, when you add those two figures together, Mr. Chairman, then they represent the 193.038 million that we have here.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that. So the 39 million is brought in from municipal taxes in the main, that's from municipal levies, and does not show as revenue anywhere in this statement, but then the figure is reconciled with 36 million which is not shown as a disbursement? Oh, no, no, no, I understand. He is limited in such a way that he has a figure of 156 million, I gather, which is being spent by Manitoba taxpayers for the Item 3.(a), which is called a Foundation Program, and another \$36 million which is being spent by Manitoba taxpayers, lumped together under 3.(a). —(Interjection)— That's right.

Now, let's get back to what happened last year, when the Minister spent 180. . . Well, he help spend \$186 million. I am still looking for the 8 million, and now I would like a comparable explanation for last year in relation to the Foundation levy, moneys that came in and the moneys that went out?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, last year it wasn't \$186, we go through the same process as we have just gone through for 1978 and the final figure that we come up with is \$184.056, by going through the same process that we have just completed for 1978, by subtracting the 20 percent from the total, that is the 20 percent which represents the Foundation levy, giving us the provincial share, and then adding on the other grants for 1977, we come up with a total of 184.056 for 1977.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, could we get the figure for the other grants in last year's. . .

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I will go through the process in much the same way as I did with 1978, so that the honourable member can compare if he so wishes.

We start off with 186.651, the Foundation levy was 37.330, the Provincial Share is 149.321, and then the other grants in 1977 are 34.734. The total, Mr. Chairman, is 184.056.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, I appreciate the information given by the Honourable Minister. Can we get

Monday, May 1, 1978

back and try and find where that \$8 million is? Because as I read it — let me repeat it — as I read it I believed that it was shown under 8.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, we will check this out a little more completely. The 8.6, of course, apparently was necessitated out of Capital Supply to go into the Foundation Program last year, to make up the 184.056 that I have just explained to the Member for St. Johns, and, of course, as a result of being in the Foundation Program would be expended to the different school divisions throughout the province.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I ask the Honourable Minister is that shown under 8.(c), and if it isn't, then where is it shown? Because the Capital Loan moneys raised of some \$117 million has been redistributed in all the departments and in order to reconcile them, and they are reconcilable, they add up, and in the Department of Education what I have seen is exactly the same amount allocated in the Loan Act to the department under 8. It is exactly to the dollar and therefore I have to ask whether that is it or not?

MR. COSENS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is found under number 8, along with two or three other aspects of Capital.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, all right, Mr. Chairman, we will have to wait for 8 then, because he said along with other matters, and I assume that the comparable one will then be the disbursement for this coming year. In other words, if we take 8.6 million off 8.(c), and I know we are not on 8 yet, but to understand it we have to talk about that, then there is approximately, I think it is \$2,800,000 that will yet be dealt with as comparing with, I assume, 8.(c). If that is correct, then I have no problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)—pass — the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to get a clarification so I fully understand it. Is it correct to state that the \$8.6 million last year, in General Purposes, Schedule B, that that was all actually expended in the fiscal year 1977-78.

MR. COSENS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding it is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)—pass; (b)—pass; (c)—pass; (d)—pass, (e)—pass; 3 — the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, there is a clarification that I'd like to get. There is an amount shown recoverable from Canada of \$11,662,000.00. Last year it was 6 million 5, something like six and one-half million. Could the Minister explain the substantial increase in the moneys recoverable from Canada?

MR. COSENS: Under 3.(a), Mr. Chairman, the recoveries from Canada fall into basically three categories: tuition fees for Indian children, some 8.346 million; under the bilingualism and without knowing the breakdown last year I would suggest this may be the area in which there could have been an increase — bilingualism was 2.900; and native paraprofessionals — \$365,500,000; and I have an item here called Sundry with \$50,000 in it, which gives the total of \$11,662,100.00.

MR. MILLER: What was the actual received last year? It was estimated it would be 6.477 million. Was that the actual amount received or was the amount received last year higher?

You see last year in the Estimates it was estimated the receivables would be about six and one-half million; this year you expect over eleven and one-half million, and you have given me the figures, but I am wondering what was the amount of accuracy from Ottawa; was there an under-estimation of the recovery or the amounts payable by Canada, or an over-estimation, or was it the same?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: I am wondering if I could ask the Member for Seven Oaks to speak into the microphone. I was having trouble hearing him, I'm sorry.

MR. MILLER: I'm sorry. What I am trying to find out is whether the moneys received from Canada in 1977-78, was it equivalent to the amount shown in the Estimates, or was it higher than what was estimated last year?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I understand it was slightly higher.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, then am I correct in saying this then, of the \$193 million in (a) that we just dealt with, that there was about \$5 million which flowed from — it is not an increase in grants per se, but there is a recovery of \$5 million more to be expected in this fiscal year than there was last year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: While the Minister is getting that information I think I should draw to my honourable friend's attention, I notice there were two or three other people stood up. That Item has been passed and I had no objections to the Minister seeking information if he did not realize that the Item has passed. But we are down now on Item 3. (e), that is the subject under discussion. Now if the Minister wants to conclude his questioning on this particular Item I have no objection to that, but I don't think that since the Item has been passed, that we should now open it up for a wide discussion.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the resolution itself has not passed and I was dealing with the recoveries only.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, to the Member for Seven Oaks, it will take a little bit of time to get that information for him. I will endeavour to provide that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, thank you. My question related to Item No. 3 in general, and I believe we have not yet passed that Item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: We are on (e). I believe that the Member for St. Vital had risen to speak on Item (e), which had just been called. Now maybe he was going to speak on the general item, I am not sure, perhaps he could tell me. In which case, if (e) is passed, then we are on the general Item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As we have not passed (e), we have not passed Clause 3. If it is was the Member for St. Vital to speak on Item (e) — the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just have one short question on (e), which is entitled Child Development and Support Services. I noticed on the following page under appropriation of 4. (j), there is an Item — Child Development Services. I wanted to ask the Minister if he could explain the difference in those two titles which sound very very similar.

MR. COSENS: I can appreciate the Honourable Member for St. Vital's confusion here, Mr. Chairman. The items do appear similar. The distinction is made in that number 3.(e), CDSS, Child Development and Support Services, deals with financial assistance to school divisions in the area of special education, whereas the Item in 4.(j) — was it (j) that you referred to — is dealing more with support services and personnel employed by the department working in the school divisions. So this Item that we are now looking at deals with financial assistance, grants to school divisions to provide particular types of service to children who may have some special education needs.

MR. WALDING: One further question, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to anticipate debate coming up, but I wonder if the Minister could tell me just at this time whether he expects to bring in a bill at this Session dealing with the certification of non-teaching clinicians in the school system?

MR. COSENS: It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, in answer to the Member for St. Vital, that there will be a regulation coming through on an amendment to that regard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Well, Mr. Chairman, on this particular (e), could the Minister tell me whether this includes the grants, or is this the area where the grants are paid to the school divisions for what we call Special Needs, dealing with Bill 58? Is this the category that they would be in?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, this particular category deals with the grants that go for institutional services Institutional Services, the Child Guidance Clinic, Regional Corps Support Services, and as the Member for Seven Oaks probably realizes there were two models providing this type of service to the province — one where the department administers it directly; the other one where we provide a grant. The Regional Corps Support Services are those where we provide the grants and the school division employs the support personnel. The Gladstone Program also comes under this particular heading in (XVI) 3.(e).

MR. MILLER: Then where, because I can't identify it, where would those grants to school divisions, planning grants, the initiation grants and so on under Bill 58, where would they come in?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I believe the moneys that the Member for Seven Oaks is referring to would be found in 3.(a) Other Grants.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister had indicated the nature of the grants that are paid under 3.(e). Are we to understand then, Mr. Chairman, that it is the intention of this Minister and the government to continue with that type of arrangement with those types of models that we had established for the delivery of services of this kind; namely, via the school division and the department paying the school division the grant for the provision of those services? Is it his intention to continue that system of operation or to change it in some fashion?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I can assure the Member for Burrows that as a person who regards himself as a rural resident, I have had some admiration, considerable admiration, for the type of service that rural children have been receiving under this type of program, and I would also assure the Member for Burrows that certainly at this point that we really anticipate no radical change in the type of delivery of these services except I would hope as financial resources become available that we could improve the services. I am sure that he would be the first one to agree with me that the services provided have been spread rather thinly over the province, but nonetheless have been worthwhile and well appreciated by those populations receiving them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (e)—pass — the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, then what the Minister is saying is that those programs like for instance the Hearing and Vision Screening, they would be under 3.(a). Is that right? Rather than under the Development? —(Interjection)— All right, then I will deal with it whenever we get to the general resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (e)—pass; 3.—pass; Resolution 4 — the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, am I correct? I am just taking a guess now, because I haven't got the figures, but in the general resolution dealing with the entire amount of 206 million, has there been any decrease in this year compared to last year, in what was known as the Special Needs Budget, it was paid through the Finance Board perhaps, but last year as I recall it was about \$705,000 dealing with planning grants, the initiation grants, the staff development grants, the screening program for the hearing and the vision screening program — I know that was done jointly with Health and Social Development. But has there been any diminution in that program, is it being maintained at the same level, it is being expanded as had been hoped, or is it simply frozen or is it actually decreasing?

MR. COSENS: I believe the grant that the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks refers to, Mr. Chairman, is the one dealing with certain aspects of special needs through the province and the school divisions. He mentions the figure, I believe, of 705,000 was it? In the Estimates this year under that particular heading is 300,000.

MR. MILLER: Oh, then there is a drop. There is a drop, a considerable drop, about \$400,000 less. Now I am surprised really because if there is ever a program that has to be supported, and I think when we were in government we were criticized because we weren't moving fast enough in this whole special needs area, and here I find that the Minister is standing up and saying that whereas 705,000 was allocated last year, this year they are planning to allocate only 300,000.

You know, the Hearing and Vision Screening Program is probably one of the most important because it belongs to Manitoba, to detect and identify in an early early age the problems that children have — hearing problems, vision problems, which in the past and unless the screening takes place are not identified until the child has become a learning problem, and has either been tagged as being a slow learner or some other phrase that is often used, when in fact the problem is that the child is suffering from a medical disability, which just hadn't been recognized before, and the child, of course, is unable, it doesn't even know that it is suffering from this particular disability.

So I am wondering how the Minister can justify a diminution of about one-half, cutting in half those funds for those programs which are so absolutely essential to try to bring children into the classroom to identify their problems, the professional development aspect of it, where teachers have often said that you can't blame them because they can't even identify the problems. They are not trained to identify the problems, and there was a Staff Development Program started whereby an attempt was made to assist teachers, not to cure it but to at least identify these children with these problems, particularly in Kindergarten, Grade 1, Grade 2, where it is still early enough in their development that some steps can be taken by people in the field of health to correct these inadequacies where there is as I say a hearing problem or a vision problem, or some other form of learning disability. I am concerned that there would be an attempt to drop or cut back on this kind of program, which I believe when Bill 58 was brought into the House, I think it passed unanimously. The criticism was it's not moving fast enough, and the criticism in the past was that, amongst teachers that were concerned, is that they really didn't have the training to cope with this. The criticism has been that we haven't been moving fast enough. In 1976-77 there was about 400-odd thousand dollars spent and last year there was 705,000, this year it is being cut down to 300,000, and for those thousands of children out there and parents of those children, this was one of the most important programs that had been undertaken or that had been launched in the last two years, and I am wondering why the government has chosen

Monday, May 1, 1978

fit to not just freeze it, but to really cut down considerably the grants paid to divisions for initiation, paid for staff development, paid for the screening and for the hearing and vision, and the special equipment that is very often required in the classroom when you have children with hearing problems or visual problems?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Seven Oaks, I am pleased that he asked the question. I would like to attempt to explain what would be apparent cutback in this particular area of the Special Education Budget. As he has mentioned, last year, and I believe the year previous, grants had been provided for development, initiation and planning, and I think some very excellent work went on among committees out in the school divisions throughout the province in this particular initiation, and particularly in the planning and the development field. I believe in that time that they have been able to identify almost completely those with special learning needs and in appraising this particular area, it is my conclusion that that particular part of the work had been done, and we can now pursue another phase in this whole area of special education.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, recognizing as I stated earlier, the very great contribution of those planning committees, who did, I think, some very commendable work throughout the program — committees made up of volunteers, I believe — the Member for Burrows will note that — so what we are pursuing now is what we hope is another worthwhile phase of this program, by providing moneys now to school divisions in the year ahead for extreme special need cases, because Mr. Chairman, in the short time that I've been in office, I have encountered several of these cases from divisions throughout the province where funding is not available to handle the extreme case, the person who is not able to fit into the facilities that are apparent in their own particular community, and as a result, probably will have to be transported or perhaps moved to areas where the particular type of learning situation exists.

So the funding I would say to the Member for Seven Oaks, that I mentioned to him, is funding for a different phase and certainly it is less, but we feel it will go a long way towards meeting these very extreme cases that have not been and that do exist one or two divisions of the province. I suppose again I'm referring more to the North and the rural divisions; there are children there with extreme learning handicaps that have not received any treatment, or have not been able to find a reasonable learning situation, and it is our hope that this funding would go a long way towards meeting those special needs.

I might just mention Mr. Chairman, while I'm on my feet, and we have a few minutes left, that the contribution towards this whole area of special education, or special needs as you may wish to call it, by the different aspects of government in the Province, not just the Department of Education, but the Department of Health and the Department of Corrections and local school boards, amounts to approximately \$15 million in total that are being spent by different government bodies to fund this particular area. I'm not maintaining, Mr. Chairman, that this is adequate; I'm not sure just exactly what sum of money would be adequate to meet the needs of children who have been perhaps less fortunate in many ways than others. I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that governments generally, whether at the provincial level or at the school board level are at this time and in the year ahead, will be providing some \$15 million towards children with special needs. I could give members the breakdown of that amount of money if they were interested in it; I even have comparisons. In the Foundation Program grants' area, where we provide moneys through the province to teacher grants, we provide moneys to the extent of \$4.162 million for resource teachers, teachers of TMH, EM8H, to special education co-ordinators and/or school psychologists. The province provides through the Foundation Program in the same way as it provides grants to teachers that sum of money.

3.(a), under the special needs area, I have just mentioned to the Member for Seven Oaks the amount of money we have there. He was also talking about special equipment. Some \$40,000 was provided, or spent last year, pardon me, in that area; we are providing \$40,000 again in the area of special needs equipment.

Then into 3.(e), the area we are presently in in the estimates, the institutional services, I mentioned the Child Guidance Clinic, the support for the special model of services in some parts of the province, child support services.

The Gladstone Oral Deaf program, in that area Mr. Chairman, along with the 3.(a) that I've already mentioned, we're providing some 2.038 million.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The time being 5:30 p.m. I'm now leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 p.m.