



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

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

31-32 Elizabeth II

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



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 59B - 8:00 p.m., TUESDAY, 3 MAY, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 3 May, 1983.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Order please. The question before the House is the Motion to go into Committee, and the Grievance debate arising therefrom.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside has 12 minutes remaining.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE Cont'd

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Prior to the supper hour adjournment, and the adjournment for Private Members' Hour, I left with the comments about the rather unique position that this government finds itself in, in the sense that we, in the opposition, although we disagree with members opposite on many specific and individual issues, but on the issue that has prompted several of us, the Member for Turtle Mountain, and myself, to expend our one and only opportunity that we have to express a grievance in this Chamber, to speak out on the grave and deepening fiscal problems that this government finds itself in. On that issue we are prepared to extend a hand of co-operation to this government, that, Mr. Speaker, I say I don't wish to arouse undue partisan reaction but, to a degree, that certainly wasn't extended to the government that I was pleased and proud to be part of just some short 16 months ago when we knew the kind of situation that we were facing.

Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to co-operate, as I said earlier in my remarks, to learn to live within our means, or reasonably close to it. We're not that ideologically bound, as members opposite are often to remind us, that governments cannot, under certain circumstances, live with some deficit financing. The Minister of Finance of the previous Tory administration came into this Chamber with a substantial deficit financing proposal in his last Budget.

Mr. Speaker, the action taken yesterday by financial institutions and agencies outside of this jurisdiction that will impinge upon our ability to raise the kind of monies necessary to keep a modern government going are serious enough that we put aside, at least on this issue, some of the heated partisan differences that have separated us. Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to co-operate, but we want it to be fair. We want it to be fair, Mr. Speaker, on the issue of wage settlements which really mean half of this government's expenditures. Let's be fair that when in the private sector workers are being asked to, at this time, accept no wage increases, to accept decreases, as I can recite chapter and verse of firms - Macleods, for instance, for one, their 2,000 employees accepted a 10 percent decrease in wages.

A MEMBER: The steelworkers in Flin Flon.

MR. H. ENNS: Steelworkers, Co-op employees, and this government accepts and signs a deal that guarantees a no-cut contract, 27 percent increase for civil servants. Mr. Speaker, I only say to the same civil

servants, I only say that this same government - I say this directly to Mr. Gary Doer, President of the Manitoba Employees Association - will come back to them as Mr. Levesque has done and ask for a roll back in wages. I want that on the record, Mr. Speaker.

I don't think that's particularly an appropriate way of doing it. Mr. Levesque did it because he had an election to win as these fellows had an election to win. Why not live within reasonable steps? Why not accept what most of the other nation is accepting, even a six and five proposal, or indeed as a private sector is being asked to accept. Schneider's workers were being asked to accept and accepted, after a long strike, reasonable wage settlements. Let's be fair about it, Mr. Speaker. The government has a responsibility to exercise some leadership in this respect. Mr. Speaker, let's be fair; we are prepared to co-operate. Let's be fair about the kind of increases in government expenditures that this government is undertaking.

When this government and some departments are expending an extra 18 percent, far and above what we are taking in terms of revenue, even with the new taxes introduced by this government, let's be fair at least in that sense. Don't pick on departments like Agriculture, like Highways, like Natural Resources and ask them to take a 20 to 60 percent decrease because this government doesn't get too many people elected from rural Manitoba. Let's be fair, Mr. Speaker.

Time doesn't permit me to remind the honourable members opposite that it is expenditures in that kind of basic infrastructure that are far more meaningful than supporting make-work projects, cutting grass in the City of Winnipeg at \$400 to \$600 a week. People are getting \$600 a week to cut grass in the City of Winnipeg; that's what this government calls a make-work project. I ask Deputy Ministers of Education, Directors of Education, as to whether they think that's fair and whether they think that kind of expenditure of public funds, when we are deep in debt, is making a meaningful contribution to the welfare of this province?

Mr. Speaker, let's be fair. We will co-operate with this government in trying to bring about fiscal responsibility in the affairs of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I've said this before in another speech on another bill, and I can now say that I've caucused it with my honourable members of my caucus. I hadn't done so when I last proposed it. No more promises about the fact that institutions like ManOil will enable this government to do all those things, to build the new schools, to build the new personal care homes, to pay for the 27 percent increases in civil servants' salaries without any increased taxes. Let's not make those kind of promises any more.

We, on this side, will not hold the government responsible for that promise. If this government backs off that promise, we won't chide them for it. We will simply acknowledge, yes, that is a responsible move on the part of this government if the Minister of Energy withdraws that bill that is now before this Chamber and says, "We will save the taxpayers of Manitoba \$20 million of risk capital," - \$20 million - that is as much

at risk as taking it down to Las Vegas and putting in on the wheel. I will do that, and if he wants to signal the investment houses, the people that we have to go to borrow our money from and say, "We are prepared to get a little more serious about our situation, we take note of the fact that you've reduced our credit rating yesterday, so we'll put away, at least for the time being." I'm not going to be that hard on my social friends opposite. I know they believe they have to do that, but the trouble is that is the urgency of the debate that we're in.

This government can still take some steps right now to make sure that our credit rating doesn't tumble a further point or two and cost us more millions of dollars, because I want those millions of dollars available for us to spend on education, on schools, on roads, in agriculture, on drainage ditches. I don't want to pay them to some money lenders in New York or in Zurich or in Tokyo and that's what these fellows are doing to us.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I said prior to the adjournment that on this issue this government has a unique opportunity to reach across the 30 feet that separate us in this Chamber, and in fact make peace on this issue. We will help them in a responsible way to try to preserve the reduced credit rating that we now have to ensure that it doesn't slide further, and if at all possible, do what Premier Schreyer did in 1975, increase the credit rating of this province. If Premier Schreyer thought that it was a noteworthy event, and he sat in that chair right over there and spoke about it in this Chamber - pardon me, I was on this side and he was there, I get these things confused because I've been on both sides so often, Mr. Speaker, I get mixed up - but nonetheless it was an important occasion for Premier Schreyer to comment on and to make a speech about. It's such a sad legacy that the successors of that government pay so little heed, so little attention to the issue that we are debating on at this time.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba will be the sorrier for it if they don't pay particular attention to this issue. The people of Manitoba will be sorry for it and the government will be sorry for it if they don't go back and reread the speech that my colleague, the Member for Turtle Mountain, made on the Budget on this same matter. Mr. Speaker, I only hope the contribution that we are making from this side of the House as it will be read and as I said earlier let's nobody fool ourselves, this debate, this discussion is being read tomorrow and the next day in New York and in other places, where within a few short months this government is going to go looking for an additional \$1 billion of borrowing.

My sad commentary is they'll read the Minister of Finance's contribution and they will have to try and judge and balance. How serious are we in Manitoba about meeting our obligations? How much of a risk are we going to be in the future in terms of extending multi, multimillions of dollars of credit to us?

Mr. Speaker, what I've heard today from honourable members opposite, what I see by the empty seats in this Chamber, with the Minister of Finance not being prepared to be in this Chamber to listen to this debate — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, I know that you are about to admonish me because I'm not supposed to make reference about members that are absent and I withdraw that remark.

But, Mr. Speaker, the issue is that important. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I only hope that I have contributed to the debate in a manner and a way that will stand well for the people of Manitoba in the future. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question before the House is the motion to go into committee. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? (Agreed) Agreed and so ordered.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - NATURAL RESOURCES

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

We are now beginning Item No. 5.(a)(1) - the Honourable Minister.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I haven't taken the initiative to indicate in a broad way the initiatives or concerns that we have in respect to each section. I don't know whether it's thought desirable by members of the committee, but I could indicate in respect to Parks here, because certainly there would be some interest in knowing the status of some of the park development plans. I could briefly comment on that and then anticipate some questions. If that is agreeable, I will proceed.

Mr. Chairman, we have continued with the consultation process in respect to the development of the Whiteshell master plan. Further discussions did take place, public hearings, further inputs were received. As Minister, and through the Department, we have received an extensive number of submissions in respect to the master planning process. I have had the benefit of visiting at Lake Mantario. I had an extensive amount of submission made to me there by people who are concerned about the proposed zoning. I have endeavoured to answer all of those queries, thanking both those who support the planned zoning in its present form or who wish some variation in respect to it.

In respect to Beaudry Park, we're continuing with the initial planning of the park area. Similarly, in respect to Hecla, once we complete the Whiteshell master plan, we'll be turning next to the Hecla natural park and developing a master plan for that park. We're in the initial stages, I believe now, of the Hecla master plan process.

Other than that, I think, Mr. Chairman, I will indicate that the Parks Program continues to be a very popular area so far as public usage is concerned. We anticipate that the same degree of activity or more will continue in this year. There have been slight changes in programming, but nothing of sufficient significance that I would want to take the time of the committee to highlight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Last year when we dealt with the Estimates we had some questions for the Minister concerning general parks

policies. At that time the Minister had not had an opportunity to make any changes in policies and we had asked him then if he would consider not making any major policy changes until we had an opportunity for further discussion. Now, here we are a year later and I just would like to ask the Minister now what changes in general parks policies that he has brought about over the course of the last year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can't indicate that there has been any significant policy change. As I indicated, we are continuing our consultation. Consultation process is effectively completed in respect to Whiteshell and the policy development that is encompassed in the master planning process will be complete in the very near future.

In respect to other park planning, as I've indicated we are looking at Beaudry Park from the point of view of an intensive-use recreational park to the west of Winnipeg and high priority will be given to that development and the policy position in respect to that park will be an intensive recreational-type park. In respect to Hecla, as I indicated, master planning will proceed. In respect to other parks policy there has been no major directive that I recall that I've signalled any significant change in the ongoing programming within parks.

We have indicated, as a part of the Whiteshell master planning process, that we are considering the ability of residents, those who own cottages in the Whiteshell, to be able to sublet or to rent out their cottage if they so desire. At the present time the policy contained - it's embodied in the leasing arrangements of all cottages on Crown land - is a prohibition from any subletting and we've indicated we're prepared to consider a recommendation to discontinue that because, quite frankly, I think we expect and believe, Mr. Chairman, that policy is not strictly enforceable nor has it been strictly enforced in any event.

One of the policy directions in respect to the Whiteshell, again arising out of the concerns of the master planning process there, is the determination that the extent of cottaging in the Whiteshell is such that pursuant to the overall planning process of the Whiteshell, we would not be developing or permitting any further extensive cottaging in that park. We have, as a matter of ongoing policy - it's not new to this government, it's a policy carried on for some years - made cottage lots available in areas that are considered to be recreational parks, and I refer to developments in Grindstone, Paint Lake and there was another one on the east side of Lake Winnipeg. In any event, those two come readily to mind, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Those are some of the specifics that the Minister has dealt with, Mr. Chairman, but what I am interested in is the policy that the Minister has towards parks. While I was Minister responsible for parks, one of the things that I was pleased to be able to do in that period of time was present a public

statement as to how the government would manage the parks and towards what ends the government would manage the parks so that the public, whether they agreed with or not, at least had a statement as to the objectives that the government was trying to attain and how they in general would go about the attainment of those objectives.

To the best of my knowledge, there remains then a statement of policy on the books within the Department of Natural Resources, unless the Minister has either repealed that policy or altered it. So the question for the Minister would be, has he repealed or altered the statement of Parks Policy that was in place when he assumed responsibility for the department?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the answer to that is no, there has been no revocation of existing policy statements - and I confess that I haven't perused the policy statements that the honourable member refers to - but what we have done, and I apologize for not indicating that at the outset, what we had done is we have commissioned within the department a review of our parks, to look at all of our parks from the point of view of developing an overall parks system, to confirm the kind of activities that we think appropriate and the appropriate classification for various parks.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that today some of our parks are categorized in a manner which really we don't consider is appropriate. For example, the Grand Beach Park is classified as a natural park, and obviously from the point of view of anyone that has been at Grand Beach would recognize that it's an intensively used recreational park, rather than a natural park. I would assume that most people would find that. So it is, Mr. Chairman, that we are within House, I don't know whether we have engaged anyone outside to do this. We have some outside assistance to look at all of our parks to recommend a parks system plan which would include classification and orientation in respect to use.

MR. B. RANSOM: I am pleased to hear that, Mr. Chairman. I gather then that follows from point 2.(b) of the Parks Policy which called for a developing of parkland classification system which will reflect the principle purpose of the parkland and which can be readily understood and identified with by the public. That was something then that was called for in the Parks Policy and is being pursued by the Minister.

HON. A. MACKLING: If that was the point, yes, certainly that is in keeping with our thinking.

MR. B. RANSOM: I recommend the policy to the Minister, Mr. Chairman. He should look at it. He should read it and see whether or not he concurs with it because I am sure that is the only public statement of policy I would expect that staff are likely even continuing to follow that policy unless the Minister sees fit to change it. I think it was carefully thought out and I think it would reflect the best interests of users of parks in Manitoba and if it doesn't in the Minister's view then I think he should change it in a public way and say which of the pieces of that policy he doesn't agree with then.

Just a question on the planning. There were a number of principles that were to be considered in the

preparation of master plans. The master planning, of course, was part of the policy as well and if I could just read to the Minister some of that maybe he can give me an indication of whether he concurred or not.

It said, the following principles will be considered in the preparation of master plans: (a) General parklands will provide where possible and feasible a variety and amounts of recreation desired by the majority of the users.

It goes on, parklands shall produce high quality recreational opportunities and there's a definition of "quality" there. All forms of outdoor recreation are recognized as legitimate and may be provided for in or on suitably designated areas of provincial parkland, consumptive uses, for example, hunting and fishing are as legitimate as non-consumptive uses in those parklands suitably designated, and emphasis should be placed on determining ways and means to commercially utilize natural resources that are not presently required for the provision of outdoor recreation opportunities which will not lessen the future recreational experience, and it goes on in some detail.

There are really four principles involved there:

1. That there be recognition given to the numbers of people who desire a certain type of recreational use;
2. That considerable attention be paid to the quality of the recreational experience that's being made available;
3. That consumptive uses of resources such as hunting and fishing are legitimate within designated areas of parks;
4. That the commercial utilization of natural resources would also be legitimate providing that it did not lessen the future opportunity for recreational experience.

Perhaps the Minister could give an indication then whether those four principles are still being pursued in the development of the master planning which is now under way?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I confess that it's been some many weeks or months since staff did review the overall park policy objectives with me and they don't come readily to mind. However, I do recall that the department has briefed me on the broad policy guidelines. I have no problem with the broad policy aspects. I think we have looked at some fine-tuning of some of the policy matters. In some areas I think we have to recognize that maybe the balance of consumptive as against non-consumptive recreation has to change. I point out that in some parks, for example, I've already indicated the Beaudry, this would be primarily a consumptive park if you consider recreation to be highly consumptive. It's consumptive of its intensive use, it will involve both commercial and natural use. When I talk about it that way I mean there is a high-people involvement in the use of a park like Birds Hill or Beaudry.

I don't believe there will be any major change in those broad policy statements. However, when we look at the study that has been made it may well be that we will want to have a further review of those principles.

MR. B. RANSOM: The Minister indicated that there might have to be a shift away from consumptive uses towards non-consumptive uses. Is the Minister making

that statement on the basis of some value judgment or is he making that statement on the basis of some quantitative information?

HON. A. MACKLING: No, Mr. Chairman, I'm just making that in anticipation that certainly when we have that study then we may well want to vary somewhat the policy statements that I made before. I really don't know. I would hesitate to say, oh yes, there'll be no change. For example, I know that in our consideration of Hecla Park at the present time we're looking at some variations in the consumptive use there so it will depend upon the study's finding and then an analysis of what we anticipate for each of the categorized park systems.

MR. B. RANSOM: What sort of changes is the Minister considering with respect to Hecla Island, for instance?

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, at the present time as the honourable members know up until this year, at least, we have a hunting capacity throughout Hecla Island and that is a moose hunting recreation. We are looking at some changes there in establishing a wildlife refuge on Hecla in part of the island to protect the herd of moose that is there so there will be consideration for changes in consumptive use if you categorize hunting and fishing as consumptive. Some consideration of other uses of park facilities where there is such an intensive use you can derogate from the natural habitat. For example, we know that the park system has had established roots for travel for hunting. We'll want to look carefully at the established roots and the use made of them in many of our parks.

MR. B. RANSOM: The Minister makes special reference to protecting the moose on Hecla Island. What indication does he have there that the moose population needs protection? Are they under some stressful situation at the moment?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't characterize the situation as one where the moose population on Hecla Island is under stress. We are concerned that on Hecla Island we have an opportunity to look at moose as a species of wildlife in a very limited habitat and environment. It gives us a unique opportunity to develop opportunities for viewing on the part of tourists and residents. It's an important resource from a recreational point of view in more ways than merely hunting, so we're concerned to establish a way of capitalizing on that resource which would include providing a protected area where moose could likely be seen by tourists throughout the year.

MR. B. RANSOM: The Minister's talking about establishing a portion of the park for that purpose, the purpose being then to build up a maximum number of moose in order that people are able to see them more frequently, as opposed to protect the herd of moose, which was the term that he used earlier.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, if the park is open to hunting, I admit it opens the park to hunting by Native people as well, and Native hunting can, although it hasn't threatened the moose population, there has

been a fair number of animals killed as a result of domestic hunting. We are concerned, not with the reduction in numbers as a result of that, but we do have a unique opportunity to ensure the protection of a herd there into the future for, not only hunting as I've indicated, but for other recreational use; the people who like to see wildlife and in the area on Hecla that we are contemplating establishing the refuge, we have a number of natural inducements for the moose, natural salt licks and excellent moose habitat so that the chances of tourists seeing the moose will be much greater than probably anywhere else in a park in Manitoba.

MR. B. RANSOM: But the Minister has no difficulty with the concept then of consumptive use of fish and wildlife in parks, providing it doesn't prevent the attainment of other recreational objectives as well?

HON. A. MACKLING: That's right.

MR. B. RANSOM: What about the developments east of Lake Winnipeg? Is there any thrust at the moment having to do with the parks there? For years there has been discussion about the possibility of a national park or a park in co-operation with Ontario or the province itself. Are there any new developments in that area?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have signalled to staff of the department my interest in seeing the area east of Lake Winnipeg, the area north of Nopiming, an area that encompasses the Bloodvein and Poplar Rivers I believe, the Leyond River to be considered for development of a wilderness park area. I know in the past there was interest on the part of the Federal Government in the development of a park, a national park in that area. Those interests apparently have not been pursued. I know that previous administrations have looked upon the unique character of that area from the point of view of development of a wilderness park area. I certainly share the interest that has gone before in connection with that area.

We have an area that is relatively unspoiled, very few developments of any kind in it other than the Abitibi timber operation, very few mineral deposits are under active consideration, so there does exist a very significant potential for a wilderness park and I have asked staff to develop some proposals in connection with that.

MR. B. RANSOM: Is the Minister speaking about an area that extends all the way from Nopiming north to the Leyond River, or is he talking about taking in specific rivers on the way up the east side of Lake Winnipeg?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, there are various alternative proposals that Parks staff have in mind, proposals which would involve impinging to a greater or lesser extent on other activities in the area, particularly the timber operation.

MR. B. RANSOM: Depending on what nature, what size of a park the Minister is looking at, if he's talking about going all the way up and taking in the Bloodvein River and Berens River and the Pigeon River, the Poplar

River, he is going to take in an awful lot of country. What sort of discussions has the Minister had with other interests to this point? Which of the communities in the area has he had discussion with? Has he talked to Abitibi, has he talked to Channel Area Loggers? Has there even been extensive consultation within his own department, with the other departments that have responsibility in the area of forestry, minerals and wildlife, etc.?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the other night when we were talking about a water development, Mr. Weber was here and we were wrestling with the appropriate words, a pre-feasibility terminology was used in connection with the Assiniboine-Hespeler proposed irrigation project. We're at a stage where we're merely looking at the feasibility of taking something further. I guess I could characterize the initiatives thus far that I have signalled to staff in the Parks Branch, in that category, an internal look at what might be considered possible before we signal that we would want to take any specifics, any proposals elsewhere to others to discuss. So, I am indicating merely that there is a look at the pre-feasibility of a wilderness park area in the general area that I talked about.

MR. B. RANSOM: This is strictly being done then by the Parks Branch, and it doesn't involve the resource allocation unit for instance in the Department of Natural Resources, or it doesn't involve the forestry, or lands, or fish, or wildlife, or the provincial land-use committee of Cabinet and those sorts of things?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, it will involve an integrated approach from a departmental position as to the pre-feasibility of such a park.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to ask one or two questions. I get a little apprehensive asking them when I see the Minister's Legislative Assistant running up giving him information because he'll be in more trouble than he can expect if he listens to too much of his advice.

HON. A. MACKLING: It's good advice.

MR. D. BLAKE: Just before I question the Minister, in my area I can encourage him to maintain the moose herd on Hecla Island because if he doesn't outlaw nightlighting he may require that herd for a basic herd to replenish the moose supply in the rest of the province.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister what the plans are for Lake Wahtopanah, the Rivers area provincial park for the coming year?

HON. A. MACKLING: I have to find out whether we're draining it or what we're doing with it. Just a minute.

MR. D. BLAKE: Just get the algae the hell out of it and it will be a great place, I'll tell you.

HON. A. MACKLING: Just a minute, I'll find out, Dave.

MR. D. BLAKE: Stop Minnedosa from dumping their sewage in it.

A MEMBER: Order, order, order.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, let's have some order here, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. D. BLAKE: I am waiting for an answer, Mr. Chairman.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I am given to understand at the Rivers Recreational Park, we established a sewage lagoon last year. That should improve the water quality, I guess, if there was any runoff, any outdoor places.

MR. D. BLAKE: No, that's not the problem.

HON. A. MACKLING: We are installing showers this year. We believe in people being clean.

MR. D. BLAKE: A few years back, Mr. Chairman, there were a number of locations down close to the lake that I know were originally set up for overnight camping, but that park is not overly populated on overnight camping. There was a lot of people from the Brandon area not too many miles away that took permanent sites in there. A few years back they moved them all up on a hill above the lake where there wasn't a tree or a stick for shade, consequently they lost 30 or 40 permanent summer trailer sites there. I understand last year a number of them were allowed to go back down to the sites that they had been able to book previously. I wonder what the situation was there now?

HON. A. MACKLING: I am given to understand that we are going to continue the practices that were employed in 1982. Presumably then those who were unable to park or camp closer to the waterfront will be able to do so this year.

MR. D. BLAKE: They will be able to do so this year?

HON. A. MACKLING: Same policy as was utilized in 1982.

MR. D. BLAKE: I wonder could the Minister give me any indication of what is being done this year in the way of stocking the lake with fish species.

HON. A. MACKLING: I am advised that will fall under the Fisheries section, but maybe I can get an answer here. — (Interjection) — We'll come back to that one, Dave.

MR. D. BLAKE: That's fine.

HON. A. MACKLING: You don't want the answer now?

MR. D. BLAKE: No hurry for it. As long as they put lots of fish in there, Mr. Chairman, because those of us that are competent fisherman are lugging them out

of there in fairly good numbers. We'd hate to see it depleted.

HON. A. MACKLING: Not over your limit, Dave.

MR. D. BLAKE: It has become a reasonably popular lake for fishing, in spite of the condition that the water gets into. It's amazing the quality of the fish that come out of there in spite of the fact you can't see them in the green algae late in the year.

It has also become a pretty popular waterfowling area. There are more geese nesting in that area, more geese staging there in the fall and it's becoming a very very popular waterfowling spot as well. I think with some care and proper water levels being maintained there, that the lake can become a pretty popular resort area in an area that's a little bit deprived for recreational spots even though we live in the parkland of Manitoba.

On roadside parks, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, Manitoba of course takes second place to a lot of areas in our province for roadside parks or rest areas, whatever they may be. I know we're on the general park area.

At one time there was a roadside park planned on Highway No. 10 on the by-pass around Minnedosa on the hill to the north of town - and the by-pass is across the river going up the hill - and there was a great objection to it. The Highways Branch would say you can't make a cutoff on a curve or on a hill. Someone who I speak to quite frequently that was a Minister of Highways at the time that by-pass came in tells me that it was designed specifically to have the cutoff there. There is an observation point on that hill going up on the highway to the north of Minnedosa and there's an ideal spot there for a roadside park or an overnight park that would look back over the valley on that beautiful Town of Minnedosa and would just be an ideal spot for an overnight camp spot.

I just wondered if there had been anything further done on it, or if the Parks Branch had anything in their plans for developing that roadside or overnight park spot.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am not familiar with it and I'd have to discuss the potential there with the department. However, as a general policy we try to look at the adequacy, the distance of travel between major points and the accessibility of facilities at a wayside park, rest stops and that sort of thing. Certainly I'd want to consider the area there, but we don't like to spread ourselves too thin. We do have 102 provincial wayside parks. I know this is an area where we're always looking at points where maybe we could consider one.

I know that - let's see it's off Highway No. 7 - I've looked at an area and suggested the department look at that for a wayside park because there's a long stretch between Winnipeg and Arborg and no wayside park. But we do look at those things.

MR. D. BLAKE: Yes, I'm happy to hear that, Mr. Chairman, but Highway No. 7 is not really going to help the people travelling Highway 10 that much.

HON. A. MACKLING: No, I know.

MR. D. BLAKE: I would certainly recommend as one of the beauty spots in Manitoba, I would certainly recommend that be looked at and seeing as this is Minnedosa and the rural municipalities around that area, this is their Centennial year. There would be nothing that would endear this government to the hearts of those people more than to announce the development of that roadside park at this particular time.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm delighted to learn of the Minnedosa Centennial, and of course that brings to mind the point that we endeavour where we can as a government, to facilitate local government in establishing facilities in an area too and certainly it would be open to the R.M. or if it's the town, to initiate something. Perhaps either through highways or ourselves might have some input to offer.

Now while I have the floor for a moment, Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that staff are not in a position to give the Fisheries answer tonight, or perhaps we could give it later if we reach it, but we don't have the information available right now.

MR. D. BLAKE: Well that's fine, Mr. Chairman, we can do that under Fisheries. I hope that I'm still here when we get to the Fisheries, then we can go under it there.

Mr. Chairman, I know there was a program announced recently. As you know my constituency encompasses Riding Mountain National Park. There are great problems encountered there with the wildlife in Riding Mountain National Park. I understand there's a great amount of land that's been purchased by the Provincial Government. There has been some compensation or funds available to those that are available to trap beaver, to control the beaver population, that causes the problems without that national park. Unfortunately the beaver can't distinguish whether they're in federal territory or whether they're in provincial territory and possibly the Minister could bring us up-to-date on that particular point of it.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the honourable member's concerns, although it might be more appropriate to deal with that under the Wildlife lines. I think I can indicate that — (Interjection) — No. I think I can indicate to the honourable member that — (Interjection) —

MR. J. DOWNEY: I'm just looking for a short answer, Mr. Chairman.

HON. A. MACKLING: Right. That there is a liaison committee that has been established. They have given advice and assistance in respect to development of policy and program. We have an agreement with the Federal Government in connection with a trapping program in respect to beavers. It's cost-shared and it's been working out very well.

MR. D. BLAKE: Yes just a final question, Mr. Chairman. The actual Rivers Lake itself has become an extremely popular recreation area for weekend visitors and weekend people that stay there for one and two weeks, and some for longer periods. The local parks committee has enjoyed government grants over the years in putting

in shower facilities and developing additional camping facilities.

I just want to encourage the Minister, when he gets requests from the area there for a further development to look favourably on it, because it has become a very very popular spot. We have an excellent 9 hole golf course and the Clear Lake golf course is becoming overcrowded. We're looking for visitors by the score in our 100th anniversary year this year and we welcome the Minister and any members of the caucus that he'd care to bring with him. I'm sure we could develop a foursome to take on any and all comers and show them our beautiful lake, our golf course and park facilities when he — (Interjection) — enjoys Minnedosa.

HON. A. MACKLING: Be happy to play with you, Dave. I'll even beat one of those orange balls that Frank wants to talk about or wants to hit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, dealing with Parks, I wonder if the Minister could tell the committee whether or not there's any plans by his department to open some new cottage lot sites in the Whiteshell.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'd earlier indicated in answer to I think a question from the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain that the decision in respect to that was, that given the thrust of the master planning in the Whiteshell and the proposals in respect to intensive use areas, that it was not our intention to open new Crown lands for cottage lot development in the Whiteshell.

MR. R. BANMAN: Is the Minister's department allowing people who have homesteaded lands and have lands within the boundaries of the Whiteshell Park to subdivide those properties and sell them?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, any cottage lot development, any residual cottage lot development would have to comply with the zoning that is provided for in the master plan and cottage lot development pursuant to the zoning, is only possible in the intensive areas and in the intensive areas to the extent that we're advised there is residual capacity in the lakes or in the lands to accept further cottaging.

MR. R. BANMAN: Would it be fair to say that there is a total freeze on any development in the Whiteshell Park?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't characterize it as a total freeze. I think there is some residual but it is a very limited one.

MR. R. BANMAN: In other words, there is a total freeze on and I think the Minister would, upon closer scrutiny of it and upon looking at the policies of the department, say that there's a total freeze on the Whiteshell.

Having established that, I wonder if the Minister could tell us what time frame he is contemplating for the implementation of the Nopiming Park.

HON. A. MACKLING: I didn't hear the last question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the Member for La Verendrye repeat please?

MR. R. BANMAN: Could the Minister inform the committee what time frame he is looking at to implement the creation of Nopiming Park?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, Nopiming Park has been established for some time. Let me go back to indicate to the honourable member that he continues to insist that what I have indicated is a total freeze on any cottage development in Whiteshell. I've indicated that pursuant to the master planning any development is open only in accordance with zoning and that would be in intensive areas and to the extent that there is any residual capacity in intensive areas.

One of the provisions is that there would be no further subdivisions. But if someone owned a parcel of land in an intensive area, I believe - and I think I'm correct here - that they would be enabled to put up a cottage.

MR. R. BANMAN: Let me pursue that for just a minute. Is the Minister saying that someone who has homesteaded a property in the Whiteshell and now wishes another member of his or her family to build a cottage, or let's say a home on that particular site, not necessarily a cottage lot site, that the Minister would okay that type of a transaction within a family or within the community such as, let's say the Seven Sisters area where there are certain people that have homesteaded properties, and now wish to build a permanent residence but currently, I understand, are not able to?

HON. A. MACKLING: No, Mr. Chairman, citizens of Manitoba or elsewhere are not encouraged nor are they permitted, under the present policy, to build permanent homes in parks.

MR. R. BANMAN: Even though, Mr. Chairman, many of them have homesteaded that property and have title to that property?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, if they have homesteaded the property and are still resident in a home on the property, I nor anyone else up to this point in time, including the previous administration, has evicted people from park property, but we are carrying on the policy that existed in discouraging people, by way of policy, from establishing permanent residence in parks.

MR. R. BANMAN: So the freeze is on for anybody who wants to establish permanent residency in the parks.

HON. A. MACKLING: All right, I'll go along with that.

MR. R. BANMAN: I would like to ask the Minister - he has floated a plan before the people of Manitoba dealing with the creation of a wilderness area in the Whiteshell - what kind of time frame is he looking at implementing that particular policy or plan that he has before him?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I have no particular time frame as yet under consideration because as I indicated to the questions put to me by members earlier, I have indicated that we're at an in-House preliminary revue stage and I have no time frame.

MR. R. BANMAN: What kind of assurance can the Minister give the people who own businesses, in other words, camps in that area, people who — (Interjection)

HON. A. MACKLING: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I want to correct something.

I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, and I apologize to the honourable member for interrupting him, but I was under the impression that he was talking about a time frame for the development of a proposed wilderness park. Yes, well there's some indication down here the interpretation was of the wilderness zone in the Whiteshell Park. Is that what your question was about?

MR. R. BANMAN: That's right.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I want to correct that then because I misunderstood what the honourable member was talking about. In respect to the zoning in the Whiteshell master plan, all of that zoning hopefully will be confirmed in a relatively short time. We've had the master plan process ongoing for some time. It had been under the previous Minister and I'm hopeful that in the relatively near future, that is sometime this year certainly, that master plan process can be confirmed which would include designated zoning pursuant to the proposals in the master plan.

MR. R. BANMAN: Just to ensure that the Minister and I are on the same wave length, is he saying that the government will deal with the matter of the wilderness park area, i.e. the particular stretch of the Whiteshell Park which will include a number of smaller lakes, Saddle Lake and a number of others, where they will be excluding any use of any power vehicles, or will not allow any trapping, or the taking of any timber, is that the policy that he's referring to?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I can't agree with the generality of the question which includes a number of observations. The master plan proposals do include provision for a proposed wilderness zone comprising an area approximately 12 percent of the area of Whiteshell, encompassing a number of lakes. The proposal does include, as I understand it at the present time, a continuation of the one trapline that is in the area. The proposals do include an elimination of motorized vehicles or instruments of any kind. Certainly all of that is under consideration as a result of the master plan proposal and all of that will be determined in the very near future.

Some aspects of the master planning may require some legislation or some alteration and so it might extend over a longer period, but I'm hopeful that relatively soon, and by that I mean in the next several months, we will be in a position to confirm the policy positions in respect to the Whiteshell plan.

MR. R. BANMAN: Can the Minister inform the committee as to whether or not an area such as

Crowduck Lake will be involved in the ban of use of motorized vehicles, units, airplanes, trapping and that type of thing?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I don't have the Whiteshell zoning map with me but as I recall it, and it's confirmed by staff, the Crowduck Lake area will be an area identified as a back country zone where consumptive uses including hunting, fishing, would be permissible, including the use of snowmobiles, aircraft, motor boats and so on.

MR. R. BANMAN: The Minister was asked by the Member for Turtle Mountain with regard to the possible establishment of a wilderness area on the east shore of Lake Winnipeg from Manigotagan running North into the Bloodvein area. Has there been any consultation in the last year between the department and the Federal Parks Department with regard to the establishment of this park?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I understand from staff there has been no consultation, apparently the Federal Government has shown no further interest in this development.

MR. B. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, that's the most encouraging thing we've heard all night. I think that from what we've seen happen at the Riding Mountain and other parks that are under federal jurisdiction I don't think that Manitoba or any other province will want to give up any jurisdiction within their area to the Federal Government because you lose total control of your resource in doing so.

I wonder if the Minister - he has increased the, and is in the process of increasing cottage lot fees, I wonder if he has within that policy determined what he is going to do with the permanent residents that live in an area such as the Member for The Pas' area just outside of The Pas at Clearwater Lake?

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, that problem has existed for sometime it's — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, I'll pass on the humour evidenced by the Honourable Member for Arthur but it seems to be characteristic of this department that some problems are of long standing and I can appreciate that they are because they have very difficult matters that embroil them but we have been looking at the question of permanent residences in parks. We have some areas that have much more of this than others and certainly the member is correct that in the Clearwater Park on Clearwater Lake we have a number of permanent residents. We are studying that matter intensively and we hope to be bringing forward some proposals to my colleagues in government to address those problems but I'm not in a position to give any specifics of the proposals at this time.

MR. B. BANMAN: Are any of the funds that will be collected now, some of these people will be paying \$500 a year in these parks, are any of those funds earmarked to help municipalities out for some of the services they are providing in the parks?

HON. A. MACKLING: No, Mr. Chairman. I do point out that municipalities are not obligated and do not provide

the municipal services in the parks. The question of school tax is another matter and that, of course, is tied in with the whole problem of addressing the obligations of people who live in parks on a permanent basis.

MR. B. BANMAN: I don't want to get into an argument with the Minister, I'm sure the Member for The Pas would because his council in The Pas is the one that is worried about the recreation facilities that they're using, about the garbage dump that they're using, and all these other things that the people in the park are using, so I won't get into that right now. But I don't accept the Minister's remarks that they are not providing services because they are and in many instances the parks people are providing very few services, really it's the surrounding communities that are.

However, having said that, Mr. Chairman, is there any way that the government will be allowing or will be dealing with additional cottage lots being opened up in the Falcon Lake, West Hawk, southern part of the Whiteshell area at all?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, first of all to go back to The Pas for a moment, I can assure the Honourable Member for La Verendrye that the Honourable Member for The Pas has spent some time with me indicating his concerns on behalf of the municipality in connection with the problem of permanent residents there and he has been a driving force in ensuring that this matter will no longer rest for many many years without any resolution. We will look at the problem and try to come up with some answer to it and he is in no small way the reason for our initiative.

I want to indicate that in respect to our Vacation Home Lot Allocation Program in 1983 we have arranged for lots on parkland and Crown lands to be allocated by a public draw in May and June of this year and if you like, Mr. Chairman, I could just highlight those.

In the Interlake region at Black's Point there are 8 lots that are up for draw and a further 29 lots at Little Grindstone Point; at Leaside Beach, 7 lots. In the eastern region, Beresford Lake, 3 lots; Longlake, 2 lots; they're isolated lots. Gronsdin Point 32 lots; northeastern region Eden and Birch Lakes, 43 lots; Paint Lake, 17 lots all told. Northwestern region, Wekusko Lake, 21 lots; Schist Lake, 19 lots. Western region, North Steep Rock Lake, 8 lots; Wellman Lake, 31 lots; Lake of the Prairies, 63 lots. Southwestern region Macs Lake, that's Arbor Island, 3 lots; George Lake, 37 lots.

MR. B. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I just have to say to the Minister and I guess it's the dilemma that every Minister of Parks faces. We have a certain segment in society which says we never want to emulate or do what we did at Falcon Lake with regard to building up a particular area because it's much too commercialized. When you look throughout the whole province and see where the values area, where people want to go it's Falcon Lake and there is a very small segment in society that want the true wilderness concept. A lot of people in this world feel that roughing it is watching black and white T.V. That's a fact. I would

say that 90 percent of the people that live in Winnipeg want to have access to a lake nearby which has a good road system. I want to say to the Minister that, I think, one of the biggest problems and we've all let it happen to us by the conservation types, by the people who feel that everybody is into flora and fauna. I think there are a lot of people that would like to have their own little 60 x 80 — (Interjection) — Well the Member for Inkster will know what I'm talking about because I'm sure he's up on this.

One of the glowing problems with this whole thing is that the Minister just read off the new cottage lots that we're having in this province and they're not where people want to go, they're not in the Whiteshell. I want to say to the Minister that I know it's not an easy thing to tackle and I know he's going to have a lot of heat put on him by the Naturalist Society, by his Legislative Assistant who will fight him tooth and nail every time he tries to — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, we see it right he's giving him bad advice again.

I want to say to the Minister he has my support. I see nothing wrong with another 100 cottage lots being opened in a townsite north of the Trans-Canada Highway at Falcon Lake. I see nothing wrong with that as long as the proper infrastructure is put in to make sure that the effluent and things like that are looked after, that there is not an environmental problem. But to curtail the number of lots that we can have in the Whiteshell when the infrastructure is ready, the roads are there, the shopping centre is there, the golf course is there, the permanent residents are there from the Inter-City Gas, to go the other way and now establish another area where you're not even going to allow any motorboats into just so that a few handful of people can enjoy themselves over there at the expense of 95 percent of the other population, is wrong.

If the Member for Inkster wants to go canoeing, my goodness, he can go up to Berens River. The member over here for Ruperstland knows where the wilderness is. There are some lovely canoe routes over there, but don't deprive the average person in Winnipeg, who has so few amenities of life in the summertime here, from owning something in the Whiteshell Park. I want to say to the Minister I will support any move that he makes that will in an orderly fashion secure that the environment is not hampered, open some of the cottage lots in West Hawk, Falcon Lake, all the way up into Brereton Lake and that area.

There are a lot of areas that can be developed; there are a lot of people that would like to build their little cottage on a small piece of property. The infrastructure is there and I would urge the Minister, instead of trying to freeze out more people out of the Whiteshell which really the master plan will do, to go the other way, provide some amenities of life for the people in Manitoba so that they want to stay here, that they want to work here and that they can enjoy a few of the things in society here, in Manitoba, that many of us have come to know and enjoy. Let not a handful of people who feel that they want to preserve everything, for who knows what, Mr. Chairman.

I don't know, the Member for Inkster just never ceases to amaze me. You know, he has the typical parks' philosophy. If we didn't have any people in the parks, we wouldn't have a problem with people messing them up. People cause problems in parks. If you keep the

people out, then we wouldn't have any problems in the parks. Well, Mr. Speaker, I happen to believe that the parks are for people, and to set aside another chunk of the Whiteshell where you can't go in with a motorboat, where you can't drive in with a skidoo, where you can't land your light aircraft, is absolutely ridiculous because it's not only going to hurt the average constituent in Winnipeg here, it's also going to have a severe effect on the camp operators in that area.

I'd like to ask the Minister one question. With the establishment of this park now that's he's talking about, where he's virtually frozen out everything except the Member for Inkster - and Mr. Chairman, I have to say to the Minister and he knows this - there are some people that have bought small camps in there, want to fix up these camps and want to put some capital money into this. I'm wondering, with this particular thing that's happening right now, will the Minister provide some compensation to the camp owners for the loss of business that they will incur because of establishment of this particular park?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to try and respond at any length to the honourable member's dissertation. I appreciate and respect the views of all members in respect to how we should order things in society, and each of us has a right to express his views fully and I will respect those views. However, there's no question but that in the development of the Whiteshell master plan, there has been a growing consensus of viewpoint acknowledging that most of the area of the Whiteshell has been the subject of intensive development.

The honourable member refers to Falcon Lake park staff, and I think people at Falcon Lake will confirm that there is very substantial usage of that lake. It's considered that there ought to be no further cottaging development there because the capacity is already used. To suggest that it's just an open end and we can continue to develop, without limit, does not accord with reasonable consumption of the park and reasonable use of the park.

I have not, or my government, established Whiteshell Park; it's been there for a long time. It's true that there are different arguments about how the park can be best used. I have literally received hundreds and hundreds of letters to which I've responded. I confess that I haven't drafted each letter, but I've read them, signed them. A lot of them have been very thoughtful, very concerned letters about different issues in respect to usage of areas in Whiteshell Park, but a great many of them recognize that it is possible and logical to zone use within parks so that we can get a broad spectrum of use within a park.

We can go from intensive use to really non-use, leaving things in a natural state, that both of those - if you can call them extremes - are possible in good zoning and I think we have to look at that. We have to recognize that there is a broad spectrum of use that has to be recognized and I want to say here at this public forum, if the Honourable Member for Inkster will permit me, that the Honourable Member for Inkster has been maligned by others as suggesting that he has used inordinate influence, he has been the voice of the naturalist, he has been a steady, consistent voice,

with me at least, indicating that we must look at compromises, we must look at individual use in various sections and that it is possible, within Parks, to have that broad spectrum of use that I've been talking about. To suggest that somehow he is an extremist in some ways, I think, is improper. — (Interjection) — Well, I have indicated your objection. So, Mr. Chairman, I really have to reject the general thrust of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye that the Whiteshell is an open door, and we can continue to develop without limit.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, there are two vested interest groups that deal with any further development in the Whiteshell, and the Minister will recognize that and everybody does. No. 1, the people, such as the Member for Inkster who don't want to see any more development and the one who would rather turn back the clock than move ahead, and the other vested interest group is the current cottage owners, if you're going to ask them they won't want any more cottage development either. But where does it leave all these hundreds and thousands of people that might some day aspire to having a cottage lot in the Whiteshell? I want to say to the Minister that is the problem that he faces.

I just want to ask a final question. Will there be any compensation when the Minister announces his plan in the fall? He's indicated maybe in the fall he's going to pass the master plan. Will there be any compensation to camp operators in the area of the proposed new wilderness area? Will there be any compensation to these people?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'm not aware that any rights will be expropriated from anyone in the establishment of the wilderness area, as proposed, is established. If that were that case, then I think we'd be constrained to look at compensation. I don't think that the planning, as is proposed, works to that effect.

MR. R. BANMAN: Would the Minister say that someone who is renting boats that go into that area, someone that has rented out cottages with the people that are renting those cottages, that are going out fishing in that particular area with motorized vehicles and are using that area that's now going to be designated a wilderness area, that those people that are deriving their major income from that wilderness area which now will be virtually closed off to them would have a legal or a legitimate claim on getting some compensation when the Minister passes this Wilderness Act?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, for the edification of the honourable member, the proposed area, the Mantario Lake area, does not have any permanent cottages in it. There is one cottage that was developed some years ago that's presently supervised by the Manitoba Naturalist Society; other than that there are no cottages in that area. There are some who have fished in that area; some who have snowmobiled in that area; and there are others who have flown tourists to fish in that area but, other than that, there is no intensive development in the area.

MR. R. BANMAN: I just want to point out to the Minister, and I hope he will listen to these people once that

happens, that there are people that derive their income and a proportion of their income from that particular area, and they will be affected should this particular thing pass, as he has indicated it will.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of questions dealing with the parks in the Provincial Expenditures dealing with parks. I want to say I think the people of the eastern region of the province, the City of Winnipeg, are fairly fortunate to have the kind of problems they have with the amount of water and the amount of recreation facilities that are available to them with the Whiteshell and the water lying east of them.

Dealing with the region on the western part of the province, one which I represent, there's been a continual request from the Municipality of Winchester and the Town of Deloraine dealing with a very very small section of land that is a municipal road allowance at Lake Metigoshe where, in fact, it is the only public beach on that lake. It is an area where public swimming lessons are held each year, and I'm sure if a health inspector went in there when they're being taken, that they would be shut down because of the water problems, the algae and the lack of a nice beach. There has been a request - I'm sure the former Minister of Natural Resources, first of all, built a road into that lake and I want to give him credit for it. There are signs and there are a lot of people in the southwest area, not only in Manitoba, but Saskatchewan and the United States, Brandon as well, uses the Lake Metigoshe area.

It's a well-advertised lake facility. There is no public beach, Mr. Chairman, there is a capability of having one. The local communities, both the Town of Deloraine and the RM of Winchester have continually requested that the province take over a certain piece of ground that could be maintained as a public beach and be a credit to the province and to that lake. However, there has continually been a rejection by the Parks Branch and the parks people in getting involved because they say that there is one adjacent to it at Lake Max.

Mr. Chairman, in my estimation, that's not acceptable because of the numbers of people that want to use Lake Metigoshe, as well as Lake Max. I think, without costing them very much money, the whole Parks Department wouldn't even notice it in their Estimates or their Budget, if they were made responsible or worked out an agreement with the Municipality of Winchester to rehabilitate and to maintain a public beach area at Metigoshe, would be something that I think would help a lot of people, particularly when there aren't many lakes in the southwest corner.

For example, there's one at Oak Lake which is full of rocks and, as well, when they're out there maintaining it, I wish they'd haul the rocks out so the kids wouldn't get all smashed up on them at Oak Lake. Bill Henderson and the province have worked very well, but that's one lake, and the other one, of course, is Metigoshe and Lake Max in the Turtle Mountain area.

I ask the Minister, again, to consider taking over a very small piece of ground that is a road allowance area from the municipality and make it into a public beach area. I just want the Minister to say, yes, and

then I'll wait till we get to Crown Lands for further questioning.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, of course I know that the honourable member will be unhappy to hear me indicate, but I think the opportunity is available to the RM, if the potential is there to develop the beach area further. We do assist rural municipalities in advising as to the type of development, how it can proceed, any way we can help; but to suggest that where some people deem that there is recreational potential that we must develop it because they see development potential there, is too difficult a principle for us to follow.

There is, as staff has indicated and the honourable member recognizes, in the immediate proximity of this lake Turtle Mountain Park, and within it, Adam Lake and Max Lake where facilities are maintained by the department.

MR. J. DOWNEY: That, Mr. Chairman, is very cold comfort to the people who are living in the Lake Metigoshe area, in cottages and in camp grounds, that want to use a public beach, if they have to drive, say, 5 or 10 miles to Lake Max or Lake Adam to use the provincial beach facility.

I again suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the same people that look after Lake Max and Lake Adam, in 15 minutes a day, could do the kind of work necessary to maintain the beach at Lake Metigoshe. I don't think it's too much to ask by those people; they got lots of advice, Mr. Chairman, they're long on advice; most people are in those communities who want to develop something. What they're short of is the kind of funds that the province could put into a public beach development and the maintenance with staff who, I think, could extend themselves a little further and maintain it. It's there, the whole setup is there; all they have to do, Mr. Chairman, is co-operate a little bit and get with it.

This master planning blarney that we hear from the civil servants and from all these people make me ill, to tell you the truth. Let's get down to a little common sense and take a down-to-earth look at it and get on with the job of providing the service that the Parks Branch can do without giving us this malarkey from master planning.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I have not indicated anything about a master planning at Mitagoshe Lake. I understand that there are lakes and facilities within reasonable driving range and the honourable member is concerned . . .

MR. J. DOWNEY: Get in your car when you go to your cottage and drive 20 miles to a lake, great fun.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I haven't had the privilege of visiting Metigoshe Lake, perhaps I will later this summer; but let me assure the honourable member that most people in Manitoba do not have a lake within five or ten miles, and they're very privileged to have a lake in a park facility developed within 40 - 50 miles of their residence. For the honourable member to insist that, because there are some people that want facilities within five or ten miles of their home, and that should

be our criteria, I think we'd be in very difficult financial circumstances if we tried to adopt that as a criteria.

MR. J. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman, the Minister has misread me. If you have a cottage at the lake, at least you'd like to have some lake surface. In most areas where there are public or cottage developments, there is a lake access provided by the province. They've done it at Oak Lake, there's an Oak Lake Beach; there are private cottages right in that area and the province have provided a public beach. I'm saying the same thing could be made available at Lake Metigoshe without a nickel of Capital expenditure, but use the maintenance staff that are there to go in and put a little sand on a road allowance, clean out some of the algae and make it so that there could be swimming lessons, and in fact, those people who have cottages in that community could use the lake.

Certainly I don't expect everybody to have a lake within 40 miles, but I do expect them to pay attention to a facility that is there and a little bit of maintenance time spent by the province could accommodate a lot of people with little input.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Finished.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, it is true that we maintain facilities at Adam and Max Lakes and we do maintain facilities at Oak Lake, but in all of those regions they are provincial parks; they are maintained as park areas and we've maintained beaches. We have . . . provincial parks for every little lake in Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: I'll defer to the Honourable Member for Roblin, without giving up my position on the list.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: I thank the Honourable Member for Lakeside. Mr. Chairman, out of the \$12 million can you give me an idea what's going to happen at Asessippi and the Duck Mountains this year?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, we do have some developments that I will review at both Asessippi and Duck Mountain, but I'd prefer to deal with them under the Capital item because that's where they come.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Can I ask one more question, Mr. Chairman?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Winter use utilization, there's been a tremendous demand the last four or five years for using these parts in the wintertime. The staffs are generally laid off and the parks closed. There was a meeting held in Roblin on the 20th, some of your staff were there, again demands from local areas wanted to come in and make use of these parks in the wintertime which, up to now, has not been the case.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman. We are anxious that Manitobans recreate in our parks both

winter and summer where that is possible. Certainly we have hundreds of miles of snowmobile trails; we groom cross-country ski trails; there are diverse opportunities for recreation in our parks and certainly we want to encourage that.

So far as winter recreation in all parks, of course, that does involve additional expense in staffing. Certainly we want to promote that and in keeping with the area, the kind of demand that's there, and the fiscal ability to look at that; certainly we would want to consider all of those opportunities in keeping with the conditions I have indicated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Portage la Prairie. One more question from the Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: I would ask the Minister, is he prepared to try one or the other as a pilot project. There is a lot of people in the area, a lot of Saskatchewan people who would come in and use, either one or the other, if we know that there's going to be a trial run and see how it works.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member's concerns are reasonable. I want to indicate that this winter we are considering, or we will be developing, cross-country ski trails at Assiniboine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. L. HYDE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and to the Minister. In your opening remarks, Mr. Minister, referred to the rebuilding of the Portage Diversion Park, and I must say that I realize possibly the original planning may have taken place when we were in government. However, my concern is that the area that was delegated to the handicapped people of the area, I think, was poorly planned.

I want to bring it to your attention, Sir, and hope that in the rebuilding of this park you will take this into consideration. There is an area, immediately downstream from the dam, that is very rocky; it's not suitable to the people who will be using the area, the handicapped people; it's not suitable for them to be trying to even cast their lines into the river. They get their lines snagged and it's just not suitable to their requirements.

However, it has been brought to my attention that there is an area, just immediately downstream, that would be far more suitable in relocation of the handicapped area. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that you will give some consideration to this suggestion and possibly move the handicapped site - it's only a matter of a short distance downstream - where they would have the natural area to their casting abilities.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I would like to elaborate just a little bit on the Portage Spillway Wayside Park. For those members who had an opportunity to see it before we had that very unusual ice condition, and it was not typical of our experience in respect to ice conditions on the Assiniboine. It was, as I say, very different than what had been experienced. That was a beautiful little park. I am given to understand that in the design of the park, the concern of the department

was to work very closely with the handicapped people, and through their association, so they were involved in the rationale and the technique of the structure itself.

In addition to that, of course, the department being a related department with fisheries, was able to get the benefit of advice as to where it was likely that handicapped people would get the best fishing, and the best fishing was immediately below the spillway. I know that maybe it would be less snaggy, and I happen to remember that when the honourable member and I were there at the opening, some of the handicapped people did snag their lines very quickly. But that can be overcome, I think, with perhaps regular dispositions of maybe a coarse aggregate or something in the bottom there, that could be looked at, I think; I don't think that's insurmountable.

In any event, I am advised that the deck and fence have already been put back in place, so that the park is not a write-off, it will be restored.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for The Pas. The member isn't finished yet. The Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. L. HYDE: Thank you. Well, Mr. Minister, I quite agree; we all make mistakes. I think this is one mistake that has been made, and I would like you to make this correction, if at all possible, because it is definite, in the opinion of many people who fish in that place, that there is a better site for the handicapped people to enjoy the fishing in the Assiniboine River and at the same time to please the residents of the Portage area.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, we'll look at the park, its use and the handicapped peoples' advice as to fishing. We'll even take into consideration what the honourable member has said. I say that, quite frankly, but let me put on the record that when I - and the honourable member was there when we opened that park - I acknowledged that park was in the planning before we took office. I gave credit to the staff of the department and to the previous Minister for having proceeded with the development of such a park, because I think, in principle, it is what we, not only have to do, I think we're obliged to do, to respect the needs of the handicapped people. I don't think the planning was bad. I think we had a very unique, unusual ice condition; it apparently did damage, but the damage cannot be all that great if we've already restored the deck and the fence at this time.

I don't fault the Planning. It may not be perfect, maybe we'll have to improve on it, but I don't fault the previous government and I don't fault the previous administrators and planners and the handicapped people who were associated in making final recommendations in respect to the structure.

A MEMBER: I've been fishing with the Member for Portage in ideal circumstances and he can't catch fish anyway.

MR. L. HYDE: Mr. Minister, I hope I've made my point. The point that you will reconsider the - I question whether that site has been re-established to the extent that you say. I was there last Monday, before I drove

into the city this week, I saw no action at all at that particular site. Now, I am convinced that there could be an improvement made there to better the whole situation, both for the handicapped and for the local fishermen of Portage la Prairie, the sport fishermen.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I invite the honourable member, on his way back to Portage, to call in and have a look at the deck and the fence. It's true that the park has not been fully restored, the washroom, the trail, those things have not been . . .

MR. L. HYDE: They went down the river for heaven's sake, now is your time to improve the situation.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'll pass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for The Pas.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a few comments on roadside parks and the area that I'm concerned about is along the Easterville road when you leave The Pas, there is a park about 25 miles up to No. 10, and then there's no other park until you get to Devil's Lake on No. 6 Highway, so it's about three hours drive where there's no service stations or no parks of any kind and on the Easterville Road, about 25 miles . . .

HON. A. MACKLING: We'll fit it up right away, Harry.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: . . . east of No. 10 Highway there's a place that's known as Oscar's Point and there used to be a cabin or a fishing lodge there at one time and, with a little bit of work, there could be a real nice wayside park established there. I'm wondering if there has been any thoughts to improving a wayside park along that Easterville Road?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that it is not immediately proximate to the highway, it is a little bit off the highway, it is a very beautiful site and the staff did look at it some years ago. Certainly we're prepared to take another look, but I remind the honourable member that the same conditions prevail. He says there isn't another wayside park for a considerable distance, that's the one factor, then; but the other factor is probable usage and our capacity to handle that from a fiscal point of view at this time.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: Another area I'd like to make a comment on is the Member for La Verendrye seems to think that the only place people want to build cottages is in Falcon Lake, and I would like to tell him that there are also people in The Pas and the northern part of the province who are as proud of their part of the world as he is of theirs, and there is a lot of demand for cottage lots in that area, too. When the Minister read his list of areas where cottage lots were coming available he read Chess Lake but there was no mention of Clearwater Lake or Rocky Lake and I'm wondering if they were missed off the list or are there no cottage lots coming open in those areas?

HON. A. MACKLING: No, there's no plans for lots coming on in that area, Mr. Chairman.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, it would be my hope to pass this section of the Estimates of the Department of Natural Resources. I would only want to be satisfied that (a) there's no truth to the rumour that the name of the Whithell Park is being considered being changed to that of a New Scotland. I would like to think that the Minister takes seriously the reservations and concerns expressed by my colleague, the Member for La Verendrye. Mr. Chairman, that is a continuing conflict that parks planners have to deal with, but they also have to deal with reality. The truth of the matter is contained very much in a lot what the Member for La Verendrye had to say with respect to parks.

There is one particular area that I'd like to ask the Minister before we leave this section, and that has to do with the ARC Agreement. Mr. Chairman, we've been exposed, in Manitoba, particularly, with a series of initiatives of federal and provincial nature. We're now being exposed again, of course, from the City of Winnipeg with a similar grand design and I recall, with some enthusiasm, some of the plans for what was termed the ARC Agreement, Historic Corridor Park Development, along with other features involving the river frontage of the Red River and parts of the Assiniboine.

I would ask the Minister to perhaps comment on what is happening in that regard, whether we are still more or less simply at the stage of land acquisition, or whether or not some physical work is actually being undertaken in this area, that is, the agreement covered under the ARC Agreement.

I also ask this question, I do this, if I may, just to indicate two or three of my concerns so staff has a time to provide some of that information for the Minister; what is this government's current position with respect to Hecla Island, and the request that the government faces as, indeed, my government faced, for the right of some of the original landholders to acquire some property, not necessarily their original but some property, on Hecla Island. Is that being dealt with by this government at this time?

The other final question that I have is, what is happening with the facility on Winnipeg Beach? We have a multi-hundred-thousand-dollar facility there in the form of a first-rate restaurant; it was built during the Schreyer years right on the shore at Winnipeg Beach. It regrettably has undergone a history of ups and downs and a fire, the Honourable Member for Concordia indicates, but I'm just asking, it is a major facility, there is a need for some utilization of that facility. When I met with the townspeople of Winnipeg Beach, the Council of Winnipeg Beach, and others that was one of their major concerns that this, otherwise, fine facility has been literally unused, stood empty, for far too long. Now, is the department, in lieu of another pending season, making any arrangements, either to man it even as it was manned as a program by government with training personnel; Red River Community students training in the fast-food industry, or as we had tried, and I acknowledge my own failure in that regard, to find suitable lessees to make that facility work for the people who utilize the day facilities at Winnipeg Beach.

So, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister can indicate to me something of what's happening in those three areas, the ARC Agreement, the position of this government

with respect to responding to a request for private land on Hecla Island, and the Winnipeg Beach facility.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, in that order, in respect to the ARC Agreement. This is an agreement entered into by the two governments, the Federal Government and the Provincial Government. It does involve developments right along the Red River, including developments within the City of Winnipeg itself. The administration of the program itself, the agreement falls under the Minister of Urban Affairs, however, by agreement, our Parks Branch is involved in assisting in developing sites at Lockport, Netley Creek, Breezy Point and River Road and will assume responsibility for operation of these sites after the development is complete. I understand they have been involved in the restoration of the old St. Andrews Church, I believe, the manse and there is a bank-strengthening program. Of course, the River Road is involved and sites along the river, as I pointed out I'm familiar with some of the initiative that's been taken at Breezy Point, the confluence of Netley Creek and the Red.

In respect to Hecla Island, it is true, the honourable member is quite correct that former residents, permanent residents from the island, primarily of Icelandic ethnic background, are concerned about their having some base from which, again, they can recreate on the island and they have requested that we consider allocating some land to them.

We have quite candidly deferred those requests, pending a review of proposals emanating from the master plan itself. We thought it would be inappropriate to start making piecemeal decisions about development in the park until we'd had a look at the results of a comprehensive review that master planning involves.

In respect to the Winnipeg Beach Towers Restaurant, as it's called, we recently had public tenders out in respect to proposals to operate the restaurant. A successful tender has been reviewed and staff are now negotiating with the successful tender in respect to an agreement to operate the restaurant this season.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, my colleague, the Member for Pembina, has some additional questions but I want to indicate to the Minister that it would be our intention then to pass this resolution, in total, subsequent to his questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, on the ARC Agreement, is development of the CN East Yards still part of the ARC Agreement?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I am not the lead Minister in connection with that but I'll see if I can get the information. We don't have the precise information as to the results of ongoing negotiations in respect to that.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Who is the lead Minister in the ARC negotiations then?

HON. A. MACKLING: Eugene Kostyra, Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Under Parks Maintenance, 5.(d), is that all your summer staff involved in the maintenance and the ongoing operations of the provincial parks?

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

MR. D. ORCHARD: Does the Minister have any requirement or necessity for bilingual hiring in parks personnel, any number of requirements for bilingual French employees so that they can communicate in French?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, only where, by virtue of the community, French is a language of extensive use, for example, the St. Malo Campground.

MR. D. ORCHARD: So that, other than if the local area has a sizable French speaking community, there's never been a need demonstrated to have bilingual staff?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, I believe that's true.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is the pleasure of the committee?

The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I just want to clarify a couple of things on the hiring of staff. Are the staff that go into the parks, the part-time staff, are they on a regular recall; in other words, the same people hired back to the same parks each year, or does the staff complement change significantly with student hiring, etc.?

HON. A. MACKLING: We have people who are temporary employees working for parks. They are laid off in the fall and they're recalled and those people have been in the system for many many years that way. We do have, in addition to that, a large number of student positions where we hire people for the parks and they are students.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Now under the Salaries Appropriation of (d)(1), does that increase reflect simply the increment in salary scales or are you hiring additional people this year?

HON. A. MACKLING: Which item is that?

MR. D. ORCHARD: (d)(1).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Park Maintenance.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that it's strictly a salary increase.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (5.(a)(1) to 5.(f) were each read and passed).

The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Just prior to passing the final resolution of some \$12,576,300, let me admonish the Minister and remind him that Parks Administration, the operation

of the parks, is one of the most visible programs that any government offers to, not only the citizens of Manitoba, but all those who come to visit us and we hope, of course, there are many. As such, and I'm very serious about this, in the maintenance, really make sure the bathrooms are clean because that is - yes, would he personally undertake to make sure of that - because it is something that comes to the Minister's desk and will come to this Minister's desk if they aren't.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 120: Resolve that there be granted to Her Majesty, a sum not exceeding \$12,576,300 for Natural Resources for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984—pass.

The Members are reminded that the other half of these committees are still continuing in the Chamber and if they wish they may go there, then the House will adjourn after they rise.

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: Committee, come to order.

We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Education, Item 5.(k)(1), Canada-Manitoba Winnipeg Core Area Agreement, Training and Employment Agency - the Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman, I understand there's been an agreement with the Minister and the Member for Tuxedo that we would leave this section until later and move onto Item No. 7. Am I correct?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Madam Minister.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 7., Bureau of French Education, (a) Division Administration: (1) Salaries - the Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, Mr. Chairman, does the Minister have a statement on this section?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, I don't think so, Mr. Chairman.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman, have there been any staffing changes and, if so, could she indicate what they are?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Reduction of one position, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 7.(a)(1)—pass; 7.(a)(2)—pass.
The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Under the Curriculum Development and Implementation, is that where we'd discuss the core French?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, you could discuss it there, Mr. Chairman.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman, in last year's Estimates, when we were discussing the core French, the Minister indicated that I think we're probably

realistically moving as far as we can in a given year, but indicating a commitment to get more information and to continue to support the increased demand and the program in future years. In looking at the Annual Report, there is very little touched on the core French, and I wonder if the Minister could make some comments on what is being done in that area.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, we are completing the third year of a pilot project, and the program has been going very well. A study was completed after the first year and the staff has continued to monitor the program over the subsequent years. There has been an increase in the numbers of students taking the program in each year with the original 12 participating divisions continuing to participate in the program.

The student populations have in the first year, in 1980, gone from 1,300 in 1981-82 to 3,500, in 1982-83 to 8,700. So the pilot project was not only continued, it was significantly expanded each year. I have been advised that I have report coming to me very soon on both the results of the three-year program and with some policy proposals that will be on my desk very shortly and I expect to be able to make a decision on in a very short time.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Has there been any increased funding?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Out of the 8,700 students in the project in 1982-83, 7,000 of those students are part of the pilot project. Numbers of students, the ones that we sort of accepted in as the increase this year, and they are being funded at the level of \$190 per student. The other 1,700 students are being funded at the \$50 level. I think what happened there - I think we discussed this last year - is that we allowed an increase in students each year which I think was a good thing to do. We could have actually done the pilot project, I suppose, on the original numbers and not sort of opened the door for 2,000 or 3,000 more students each year. But those numbers that we decided to increase the pilot project for were what you might call the legitimate numbers of the students participating in the pilot project through the 12 participating divisions, and they received \$190 per student.

The other ones were students where the school divisions decided to expand the programs themselves and go beyond the numbers that were covered under the pilot project. Although the \$50 looks small there in relation to the \$190 given to those legitimate pilot project students, it is better than nothing. The decision was that if students went from the conversational French into the core French program that we would allow them to use the \$50 that they would have received for the conversational French and apply it to the core.

So that school divisions that expanded did so, knowing that they had a certain number of students that were covered under the \$190 allocation, and if they went beyond that they did that knowing that there was not that \$190 allocation going to be made available for those students.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate where the extra students, or where the extra

schools were, or divisions, that they increased the pilot project?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I think we might need a minute or two to get that information. She might continue with another question while staff is preparing it.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to get into the record some of the concerns that were in briefs to Dr. Nicholls when he was doing his review. One was from the Manitoba Home and School Association, and they indicated that the conclusion of the pilot project - and this was the first year - was that the core French is more effective than our current conversational French program in developing French language competency; and that if greater linguistic competency is a desired objective, then the core French program was successful in having met this goal.

The funding by the department being reduced from \$190 to \$50 - and this was for students that weren't in the pilot project - they felt that the incentive for many boards to implement the program, the program had been removed, and that adequate funding is essential for this program. They were of the opinion that the funds allotted to the core French program must be sufficient not only for implementation in start-up costs, but also adequate for maintenance costs, and that the core French program allows all children in the English language program to obtain a basic level of competence in the French language.

It's easy to incorporate the program into the existing English system at much less cost to the taxpayer and to deny quality French instruction to those in the English program would be a serious inequality. Funding at the departmental level is critical at this stage, as the program is still in the process of development.

Then the Allard parents brought in a brief. I'm sure that the Minister is aware of the Allard situation, when the immersion issue was there, and the question for the Allard parents was not French, it was the dual track at their school. They said those of us that were dissatisfied with the former, meaning conversational French and French Immersion, and willing to embrace the latter, being French Immersion, were encouraged by the new core French program and they then in turn made presentations to the St. James-Assiniboia School Board to implement the core French, which the division did, right across the board at an expense then to the taxpayers in St. James not getting the full funding.

While the project was considered a pilot, they indicated that its excellence was shown, and they were asking that the funding for the core be realistically adjusted for the necessary implementation or start-up cost as well as for maintenance costs. To do other would indicate that the provincial Department of Education is saying that meaningful French language instruction should only be given in an immersion setting and to the Allard parents this was an unacceptable fact.

I'm just taking a few of these, but the Montrose Home and School Association had the same trouble with the core French. They were very anxious to have a good core French program started, and they were satisfied with the existing conversational French from

Kindergarten to Grade 3, but are convinced that the core French program was a necessary extension of this and an alternative to total French Immersion. We believe - and this is the Montrose Home and School Association - that these programs must continue to be funded. They went on to say, and I'm just giving a brief summary of their brief, the importance of French in today's society cannot be denied, but then should French be denied to a child whose parents have not chosen French Immersion? I think this is the point, time and time again, that I want to make to the Minister.

The last brief I just want to touch on is from the St. James-Assiniboia School Division. They started to say that the evaluators from the Research Branch of the Department of Education of the core French pilot program stated, and I'll quote, "Based on the student attitude data, the core French pilot project appears to have achieved its objectives of increasing student positive attitudes towards French cultural activities and towards learning and using French; that the core French pilot project was well planned and successfully implemented.

"On the basis of these research findings and the reception of the core French pilot program in St. James-Assiniboia, the core French program replaced the conversational program in all classes at the Grade 4 level as of September 1, 1982."

They went on to ask for further funding and that the funding be implemented. The additional funding required by the core French program now has to be made up by the school division from the Special Levy. The researchers of the Department of Education in their report noted and I quote, "Given the nature of the implementation of the core French, i.e. the increase of inservice, the port materials and the nature of the teachers selection, the relative differences between core and conversational student's attitudes must be carefully considered. If the Core French Program is implemented on a larger scale, without implementation procedures comparable to the pilot project, the attitudinal differences attributable to the Core French Program may decrease."

I would hope that the Minister would, and I know that she is, taking the briefs into consideration, but at the same time I realize she doesn't have a chance to read everything that is presented. I wanted to make the point very strongly on behalf of parents whose children are in a total English setting, that it's imperative that their children get the same level of French and that they get the commitment from the department because I think without the commitment from the department that you don't get the same programs, you don't get the same push or drive. I would like to know if the Minister can give us any encouragement at this time?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: First, I will give the Member for Kirkfield Park some information, then I'll give her some encouragement. The school divisions who went on to increase the numbers of students were Winnipeg, St. James, St. Vital, Assiniboine South, St. Boniface, River East, Seven Oaks, Lord Selkirk, Transcona and Agassiz. Just because we are talking a reasonable amount about one of the school divisions that the member from Kirkfield Park has both specific knowledge,

understanding and concern for and direct involvement is the St. James-Assiniboia Board, where they started out in 1980-81 with two schools, added another two schools in '81-82 and in '82-'83 went up to 22 schools. They received \$6,865 for the students that received the \$190 and received \$5,373 for the others that were outside.

I think I'll pick up on a couple of points that you made about the briefs and first of all I am pleased they participated, that they're interested in the issue, that they're coming forward and putting their feelings about the importance of a program like this that we're on the verge of making some decisions about grants and allocations and programs, that they're taking the opportunity to get their licks in, so to speak, and communicate how they feel about the importance of the program and they will be listened to.

I think when the Home and School made their presentation, and they suggested that the funding was reduced because it is a complex issue, I don't think they realized that the funding wasn't reduced, that in fact there never was an agreement to fund those additional students at the 190 level; that those who were on 50 were not getting reduced funds. They decided to put them into the program and accepted that they would only receive \$50 for those students outside of the program.

In general, I think the points that the Member for Kirkfield Park made about the response or the consequences, the effect of the core are true. I think the greater linguistic competency - and we could expect that double the time is going to have an effect, we would hope it would - and it also develops a more positive attitude that it is another effect. That effect probably is very important in terms of developing the competency, I think, how they feel about how valuable it is and what kind of positive feelings they have. So, that is clear. That information is clear and I think it is important information.

I guess we should just talk for a minute about the different programs that we have because we have the francais program, the immersion, the core and the conversational. I think they are very different programs, that they do have quite different goals and objectives, that people and school divisions at the present time are making some choices about which programs to go into and which programs to expand. There are some, while we're talking about the benefits of core over conversational French, you know there are others for whom the immersion program - they don't quite want the francais - but the immersion program is really ideal and suits their needs because the core doesn't given them enough.

So I think we have to recognize that we're offering quite a reasonable variety of both access and programs to meet the interests and the needs of a variety of students because to suggest that everybody that's interested in learning French has to go immersion, has to go in up to their neck of course, is not realistic. I think on the other hand to just say that all we need to do is offer conversational and suggest that it is giving them any real opportunities, is also not acceptable.

So my guess is that the francais program has been stable, has been a fairly stable population for three years. It's been in the 6,500, 6,200. So it appears that we're meeting the needs. We've got a stable population

of students there, taking francais, continuing in it and we likely are meeting most of the needs of students who are interested in the francais program because it is so stable.

The conversational French on the other hand has been staying relatively stable. It's been in the 72,000 to 77,000 range over the period of three years, so there is some stability there. The drop was this year. It went from 75,000 to 72,000 and that's because a number of the students moved from conversational into core, I think. There was a choice there to go into the core program.

Where there is considerable growth and change is in immersion and core, where we've gone from 4,000 in immersion in 1980 up to 7,500, almost double in two years; and in core from 1,300 to 8,700, more than doubled in three years. So this clearly is the area of the greatest interest and expansion. I think it is clearly the area that we now have to look at having both adequate programs and funding.

I quite agree with the point the Member for Kirkfield Park made about the importance of having adequate funding and clearly nobody would suggest that two levels of funding for the same kind of per full-time equivalent student, on the one hand at 190 and at the other hand at 50, is fair. I mean one couldn't suggest that is a reasonable level of funding. So we clearly have to rationalize that the level of funding, the grants that are going to be given to the Core - and I agree that they should be adequate to cover the program - I think the Ed Finance Review will give us information that will help us make that decision. So I suppose I am really supporting both her interest, her concern and the point she is making about the importance of both moving and making the decisions that are going to be made in terms of program, in terms of opportunities for the other school divisions who aren't participating and in terms of determining the funding level so that there is adequate support for all of the students that are going to be in the program.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I thank the Minister for those encouraging words. One of the other points, too, that I was made aware with the Core French that seems to be making a difference, is the students that are moving from elementary school where they have elementary and then they all move into one junior high and then on to high school, at one time, and with the conversational French, every school even was teaching at a different level of conversational French, whereas the core program is structured so the students are moving into junior high all at the same level. I think this has got to make a big difference because I think one of the reasons that so many students were dropping French in both the junior high and high school level is they were all dumped into a junior high and some have had a lot of French; some have had very little; there wasn't any degree of consistency at all.

I think that the core program is one of the areas that when students arrive in Grade 7, they are all at pretty much the same level. In that case not one is so much ahead, not one is so much behind and there probably won't be the same degree in dropping it. At the same time there seems to be a very great push from homes today, from parents that their children get into these

programs and that they stay in it. I think there's a much bigger commitment from parents to the core program as well as I know there is to the immersion which is the way you want it.

I think that in this case this program may turn out to be very successful moving into junior high and into senior high. In that way I think you will have more students coming out of high school with a good proficiency in French and if they need to do anything further, and wish to do anything further, they've got the skills to accomplish it.

The other thing I guess that I want to say is the big message coming through, that they really want a commitment from the department that the inservices, that the programs will all be delivered and that's a spot that they can turn to for guidance in this area.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I think I perhaps will just accept the importance of the points made by the Member for Kirkfield Park. I think that we know there are a number of important factors, and the advantages of the core I think are the structure, the entry points, the intensity, the teacher training. Clearly the involvement of parents you mentioned is very, very important in the success of any language program. We know that, the support of both the community and the parents.

We definitely recognize the importance of upgrading and professional development programs for teachers and the importance of maintaining support to them. So we are in agreement on a number of major points I think.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 7.(b)(1)—pass; 7.(b)(2)—pass; 7.(c)(1), Educational Support Services, Salaries - the Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes. Are there any changes in staffing in this area?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 7.(c)(1)—pass; 7.(c)(2)—pass; 7.(c)(3)—pass; 7.(d)(1), Administration and Bilingual Programs, Salaries - the Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes. Are there any changes in this area in staffing?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, Mr. Chairman.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I'm moving on to Other Expenditures.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 7.(d)(1)—pass; 7.(d)(2) - the Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes. In Other Expenditures I notice there isn't anything from 1983. There is a portion of funds in this year's. Could the Minister indicate what that is?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I'm informed that's just a transfer of an appropriation for operating the bureau when it was transferred from another appropriation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 7.(d)(2)—pass; 7.(d)(3) - the Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes. In this area is that money that is coming from the Federal Government?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Most of it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. G. HAMMOND: Has there been any increase or decrease in assistance from the Federal Government?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, not to date. We're awaiting final decisions on what the funding levels are going to be. We're getting about \$5.5 million Recovery out of about \$9.5 million of expenditure. That's for the entire programs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 7.(d)(3)—pass; 7.(e)(1), Library and Materials Production, Salaries - the Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes. Has there been any increase or decrease in staffing?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: There isn't an increase in staff. We have a transfer of eight staff in this area, Mr. Chairman. Last year we put the resource centre that was available for school divisions or that was providing service to about 11 school divisions in the province, was transferred into the bureau, and the required eight staff were there. They were put into the centre. This service, it is an additional \$60,000 to run the centre. The money comes back to the Textbook Bureau unfortunately, because of the way they allocate the money it does come back for the centre, but it goes into the Textbook Bureau; \$60,000 added to cover for the revenue and \$21.8 was a transfer from 7.(b)(2). That doesn't mean anything to you and right now it doesn't mean anything to me.

I think what is important to say here is that this centre is a very important resource now for all the school divisions in the province, that previously it was servicing 11, by incorporating it into the bureau and allowing the operating money for it, we are now providing a very needed support to all the school divisions in the province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 7.(e)(1)—pass; 7.(e)(2) - the Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I'd just like to inquire, is there a problem in getting books for the Sciences and the Maths in the French language to cover the programs?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I've been informed that there has been a problem. There still is a slight problem, but it's improving considerably in the last little while.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Could the Minister indicate if it's mainly in the elementary, or is it something that is in the junior high or senior high programs, or is it just in general?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I'm advised that the main problem area is senior high in the 01 courses, Mr. Chairman.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Have there been any studies done within the department to see if the lack of textbooks in this area has affected the students when they're graduating or as they're going through the program?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, we haven't done any studies on that particular issue. We know that our students are performing and competing and succeeding at not only an acceptable, but at a very good level of achievement.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: If there haven't been any studies done in this area, how can the Minister stand up and make that statement?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I said that we hadn't studied - she raised a point about being a little bit behind or having a bit of trouble getting curriculum resource material. I said that we had not and she related or interpreted that or suggested that might mean that our students might be having a problem. I said we had not done a study on that and that there was no reason actually to believe that was a factor or that you could make that assumption because our students, we do follow-ups on our graduate students and their achievement levels, and those studies are showing that our students are achieving reasonable results.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 7.(e)(2)—pass.

Resolution No. 59. Resolve that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,336,300 for Education, Bureau de l'Education Francaise, for the fiscal year ending the March 31, 1984—pass.

What is the will of the committee for the next item to consider?

The Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. It was my understanding in consulting with my colleague, the Member for Tuxedo, that the member had spoken with the Minister and that we could possibly deal with the Capital aspect of it to some degree now and maybe discuss the Ile des Chenes situation at this time. Is that agreeable?

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

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Then I would like to start off by possibly, as I indicated to the Minister the other day when I brought up this subject, there has been so much confusion with the school situation at Ile des Chenes and many problems over the years, and I'm wondering if many of the people haven't had the privilege of, let's say, having the communication that has taken place, the various letters to various groups, etc. I thought possibly if we could maybe do a bit of a background history on this and bring us up to date as to where we're at right now. It was in, I believe, August of 1980, when the previous administration approved a K-12 school for Ile des Chenes. Since that time many problems have developed in terms of the site location and enrolment figures, etc. I wonder if the Minister, for starters, could maybe bring us up to date, maybe a bit of a backlog will bring us

up to date of where we're at right now and then we'd like to follow that up.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I realize that this is an issue that has been going on for a long time, and there is a lot of interest and a lot of concern by all people involved in the community, and that it has a long history and sort of a lot of activity in the past. If the members will bear with me, I think it might be useful to take just an extra few minutes now and trace the history. I don't think it will take me very long to go through it, just point by point, without making a lot of comment on it and bringing us up to date. Then perhaps if there are questions based on the specific information I give, the members can ask me about that.

In September, 1978, the original Notice of Intent for a 10-12 Francais Regional High School was placed by the school division to the Public Schools Finance Board. In August of 1979, that Notice of Intent was denied by the Public Schools Finance Board; and in October 1979, there was an appeal by the school division to the Public Schools Finance Board and an appeal to the Minister at the same time. In July of 1980, the Government of the Day set up a committee composed of trustees, members of the Public Schools Finance Board and Deputy Minister established to review the situation. In August of 1980, the Minister's award of a K-12 regional school in Ile des Chenes was based on a compromise solution combining additional high school space which was originally slated for Lorette Collegiate with an anticipated addition to the Ile des Chenes K-9 school and created a revised approval for a 322 student K-12 school at Ile des Chenes with 167 K-9 students, 155 for 10-12, with a total of 322.

July and August, in 1981, there was public opposition to the site chosen by trustees. In January, 1982, the school division submitted sketch plans and the estimated costs were over the formula and the amount that had been allocated, so the sketch plans were not approved. At that time also, I believe, that the Public Schools Finance Board began to raise some concerns about the enrolment.

On February 2, 1982, Minister - which is me - meets with trustees, at which time the trustees appealed to me to proceed as quickly as possible with a K-12 school approved by the previous administration in August, 1980. The brief read in part as follows: The Board of Trustees have requested a meeting with the new Minister of Education in order to familiarize the Minister with two construction projects that our division submitted to the Department of Education. Both projects have encountered many delays for a variety of reasons. Our board wishes to proceed to completion - in other words, I guess this was the school board's confirmation to me that their original request still stood - with both the Ste. Anne School complex renovations project and the new Ile des Chenes School. We are appealing to you to intervene on our behalf in order that the proposed renovations to the Ste. Anne School complex can finally be approved and that the already approved new Ile des Chenes School proceed without further delays.

February 26th, 1982: Members of the Public Schools Finance Board voiced concern about the division's enrolment projections to the division at that time. As Minister, I wanted to respond to the division's appeal

to proceed in making a decision, but I also wanted to be certain that a school facility in Ile des Chenes was justified and I wanted confirmation that enrolment projections and differences of opinion about enrolment statistics were cleared up. I therefore established the Frechette-Nicholls Committee to review the board's request and submit a report to me.

May 7th, 1982: Nicholls-Frechette Report recommended support of a K-12 French Regional School in Ile des Chenes to serve the needs of K-9 Francais schools in Ile des Chenes and the 10-12 Francais schools students from St. Adolphe, St. Norbert, Lorette, and Ile des Chenes. I asked members of the committee to discuss their recommendation with the trustees of the division which they did at the end of May.

August 26th, I met with the division board to inform trustees that I was prepared to make a decision based on their appeal. However, if the board felt that any other alternative was preferable, then I would ask them to make their decision and to communicate that to me. We have, I think, received word informally that the board had a motion on the books that suggested they were now considering another proposal. I had an appeal on my desk at that time that still said they were requesting the K-12, so it was important that the board confirm their position to me.

September 13th, 1982: The division board makes a decision on a 7-12 facility at Ile des Chenes which received prompt consideration and approval from the Public Schools Finance Board and myself.

In summary, the 7-12 school honours the intent of the approval for a separate K-12 facility by the previous government. It provides a more modest and economical facility than one approved previously. It alleviates overcrowding at Ile des Chenes and eliminates the need to bus older students out of the division. The enrolment projections are: September, 1984 - this is for the 7-12 - 224; September, 1985, 239; and September, 1986, 253.

There was some concern and dispute about the school site and I'll touch on that. The school division purchased six acres in 1981 for \$40,000.00. The site was unserviced and located in close proximity to a pumping station. Site concerns raised in 1981 by Municipal Affairs, but they were never dealt with satisfactorily. In early 1983, Municipal Affairs raised similar concerns to the Public Schools Finance Board. The Public Schools Finance Board recommended to the division that a new site be selected, that they consider a new site.

Shortly thereafter, the new site of five acres was purchased in the Town of Ile des Chenes for \$45,000 and the site is serviced. The Public Schools Finance Board will pay for only one site, \$45,000.00. I think that the present status is that the working drawings are nearly completed and they are expecting to start construction about June. Perhaps that gives us a history and an overview that will allow you to allow us to discuss any of the details that you wish.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you. I appreciate the background history to the situation. As the Minister has indicated, there has been a lot of confusion about it and a lot of problems. Can the Minister indicate when

was the decision changed from a K-12 school to the point where the 9-12 French school was approved? Is it 9-12 or is it 7-12?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: 7-12.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: 7-12, which is an all French school, I believe. When was that decision made or the recommendation changed?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: That was a decision that the board made approximately late August.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: The school that has been approved at the present time, the 7-12 all French school, can the Minister indicate the amount of money that has been approved for the project?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: It's \$1.5 million. My recollection is that it's something like \$1.2 million for the facility and about \$300,000 for equipment and furnishings.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: It is my understanding that there are approximately a little over 25,000 square feet that have been approved. To try and get a cost factor on this thing, what is the normal cost per square foot in terms of, let's say, the new construction that is taking place in any of the schools that have been built?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Between \$50 and \$55 a square foot. It's my understanding that this school is the normal space and the normal building levels according to the guidelines of the Public Schools Finance Board. This comes in on all their regular criteria and levels of funding.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: There was some indication that the addition in Lorette, which I believe has taken place, that the cost of the addition worked out to approximately \$65 a square foot - at least, this seems to be the impression. Is that factual? Would that be above the norm then or not because that question has been raised?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: We don't have that information here with us tonight. We could get it if the member is interested. It is possible, when I said that they generally come in, in that range, it is also possible that you have to look at each individual school, whether it's an addition or a new building, and there could be elements to it that are peculiar or that do cause a rise, depending on the kind of space that they're building. I don't know if that one came in at 65.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: The reason I raise these questions, Mr. Chairman, is that these kind of questions are the ones that are floating around out there. When the figure of \$65 per square foot surfaces from the Lorette area, and we talk of 25,000-some-odd square feet, then we look at a possibly projected cost of the school of \$1.8 million. The Minister says that \$1.5 million approximately has been approved, the first thing that enters people's minds is who is going to pick up the difference? Can the Minister indicate if the cost is going to be higher than the \$1.5 million, that the School Finance Board

will pick up that slack or what happens in a case like that?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, the Public Schools Finance Board approves the amount of space and the amount of the dollars. They approve the dollars and the space that they are going to support.

To answer the other question, I think prices are down now, I think that construction may be coming in a little lower than it was in the past because I'm informed by the Chairman of the Public Schools Finance Board that the \$55 is the level that our projects are coming in generally, not just Ile des Chenes, but other projects, too. So that it's a possibility there that with unemployment and the lack of work is that they're bidding lower and the prices are actually coming down, so that we tell the Board that they have got approval for a certain size of school that will cost a certain amount of money. In this case it's 25,000 square feet and it's \$1.5 million. It is possible for a school to go beyond that, but if what they build is in the approved space, both the amount of space and the kind of space, because those are the two things the Public Schools Finance Board approves; if they come in conforming to that and the information is accurate about the costs of the space, then we would expect it all to be borne and covered by the \$1.5 million that is allocated.

Occasionally a school division makes a conscious decision to go beyond the space that has been approved; in other words they may want something in their school that the Public Schools Finance Board does not cover, or is not willing to approve. In that case, they knowingly go beyond, they know what is the additional space they don't have approval for and what the costs are and that cost will be borne by the taxpayers of that division. The school division is the one that has to answer to the people of the community for that decision that they make.

To our knowledge, there isn't any indication that in this area, or with this particular school, they're planning to go beyond either the kinds of spaces, the size or the amount of money that has been approved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Can the Minister indicate roughly what does the average cost per student, in terms of a new construction, would this vary dramatically? Is there a general ballpark figure roughly that could be used? I'm talking of new construction schools and I know it varies to some degree and the cost will probably vary, but is there a ballpark figure on a cost per student or not?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Not really, Mr. Chairman, we work it out on a cost per square foot basis. It actually depends on the kind of space that is being approved. There's a lot of difference between, for instance, a regular classroom and a science lab, or a resource centre, so that it really depends on how many classrooms and what kinds of what we call ancillary space, and how expensive that ancillary space is, but it would vary from school-to-school because the kinds of spaces that they have in the schools vary from school-to-school and school division to school division; we do not work it out on a per pupil cost.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Has the Minister any figure of the cost of the school that was approved initially to K-12?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, our recollection is that it was in the neighbourhood of \$2 million for the original K-12.

You must remember, and I just say this, it seems to me that there is some concern for the quality of space and the dollars that they're getting. It's not quite clear to me what the major concern of the member is, but I would suggest that it's hard to compare a school that was approved four or five years ago with the cost then that was a very different facility, with a school of a different size to meet a different student population in different times for construction costs. It would be very hard to compare those two.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: The reason the Minister says she doesn't know exactly which direction I'm coming at, the reason I raise this question is because we have an approval for a school here to the tune of \$1.5 million that will accommodate 7-12, all French; then we'll be running two schools. We'll be having the immersion school, as well, which will be K-7.

A further question to that. This new school that has been approved, is this considered a regional school? Will it have all the facilities, the lab facilities, the gym? Everything will be included in this school, am I correct?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is considered a regional school and it will have all of the facilities. It does have the gym and it would have all of the facilities that a school of that calibre would have.

It's just occurring to me, Mr. Chairman, that if there is such a lack of knowledge, both by the member himself and by, perhaps, I assume that he's communicating uncertainty and lack of information and knowledge by many of the people in the community, which is, I know, the reason he's raising some of the questions, is that I'm quite prepared to sit down with him and to give him the detailed information about the amount of space, and the size of space, and the kinds of. People should know if they're getting a gym, and surely, at this point, when we're on the verge of construction the community is entitled to know what kind of facility and what has been approved.

MR. CHAIRMAN, D. Malinowski: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Well I didn't have too many more questions in the area of the construction aspect of itself. I felt that by raising these questions which are out there, that if they're on record people can look at Hansard and acquaint themselves with it. We could maybe tidy it up a little bit more, because feelings still are not totally settled in that area, as the Minister is well aware.

I'd like to pursue the area of the enrolment, to some degree. I believe the projection for September 23rd, the Minister indicated 224. Could the Minister give a breakdown as the catchment area where these students will be coming from. I believe we have areas of Lorette, Ile des Chenes, St. Adolphe and St. Norbert.

Possibly at the same time maybe indicate those students that are going out of the Ile des Chenes area

now for their French schooling in, I believe, Precious Blood.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, these are the students that we're expecting to attend in September '83. The school is being built for students enroled in the française program in Grades 7-12 providing the school is completed and ready for occupancy in September; the following groups of students will attend; Grades 7-9 - all those students who are now enroled in Grade 6, 7 and 8 française program in Ile des Chenes will become the Grade 7, 8 and 9 students in the new school. There are 58 students now enroled in these grades. Grade 10 - the division projects that 45 students from the Grade 9 française class in Ile des Chenes, St. Adolph, Lorette and Noel Richot will form the Grade 10 class. This figure represents 90 percent of the total number of students now enroled in Grade 9 in these catchment areas, thus allowing for a 10 percent dropout factor. Grades 11-12 - the division projects that 54 students in Grades 10 and 11 from the four catchment areas now enroled at Louis Riel Collegiate or Precious Blood will form the Grades 11 and 12. A 10 percent dropout rate has been allowed.

Total September 1983, 157 students in 7-12. I've given the projections for the coming years; 224 for 1984.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I had a question. I'm maybe having too many at one time. How many students taking the French from that area are going to other schools, let's say, to the Precious Blood and St. Boniface College

HON. M. HEMPHILL: At least 75 non-residents right now, Mr. Chairman.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: These are students that are now taking the français courses in Winnipeg or in other schools. The question that I have then, if these 75 students get drawn out of the St. Boniface area at the present time, what happens to the situation with the St. Boniface School Division if they have a drop in the enrollment of 75 students in the 7-12 category?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, it is true that as the students come back home there will be a drop in St. Boniface. However, when we are making decisions and doing projections for school divisions, the projections are done by a school division basis. In other words we do not try, for instance, to beef up an area like St. Boniface that does have some declining enrollment factor preconditioned by building in and saying that their enrollment will be maintained by requiring the students from another school division to continue to go to an outside school division. School divisions' responsibility is for the children in their area. They submit Letters of Intent and proposal based on the needs of the students in that area and that is the basis upon which the decisions are made.

So the initial decision or the principle would be to accommodate students in their home division and only to go outside if there isn't adequate accommodation.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Is the Minister aware whether the St. Boniface School Division has made an offer to the St. Norbert School Division in terms of deleting the

tuition fees if the students would continue to come there? I am just asking if there has been any conversation on those lines, if the Minister is aware of it or not?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: They're paying the regular fees right now. I have no knowledge of the point that the member raised.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Okay, a further question that I have to the Minister then. Regarding the immersion course, kids that will be going from grades 1-9 in the immersion course and we are building a 7-12 French school there; where will these immersion students from 9-12 be going to school after they finish, or is there provision for these students? Where would they be going after they finish the K-9 in immersion?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that decision has not been made yet by the local board. I don't know if that's absolutely accurate. That's the sort of latest information and understanding that we have. However, the final decision on where they will go will be a decision that is made by the local school division.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: So there is that possibility, that even with building a \$1.5 million school in Ile des Chenes, and the school board will be operating two separate schools cost-wise, that there is that possibility that the students after grade 9 coming out of immersion will have to be transferred out of the area again to different schools in the general area somewhere I suppose, that possibility is there? Because we do not have the K-12 immersion going full all the way in the Ile des Chenes under the new proposal.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I guess I can only reiterate that the decision on how to handle the two different programs, the streaming and the separation is one that local school divisions make. I am not in a position to speak on behalf of that school division as to what decision they've made or what their approach is to handling that question.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I assume there was a feasibility study undertaken at the time when Mr. Frechette and Dr. Nicholls were doing a study on this and the recommendations that they brought forward. Did they deal with this question to some degree at all?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, Mr. Chairman, they didn't address that question. They addressed the question of the needs of the students related to that particular school. I can say that they would not be given additional space unless they qualified for the space. In other words, it is not unusual, or there have been cases before where school divisions have requested space because they wanted a new facility, they wanted to reorganize and they wanted a new building. If in the Public School Finance Board's opinion they have additional existing space with the schools that they presently have both to cover the enrollment, the numbers they have and the programs that they have, then whether they want an additional building or not, we do not approve it.

They would only receive approval if they cannot accommodate the students that they have with the existing space that they have. So each request will be considered on that basis.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Now I am sort of to the nub of it. I suppose the concern that people have with the cost of a new school being built and initially a K-12 was approved and now we're going to be building a French school from 7-12, we'll be having a different school providing the immersion course from K-9, then we still have that gap where the highschool students once they come out of grade 9 there is no provision for them at this stage of the game. I think the people have some concern, with all the planning that has been taking place and all the problems that have taken place over the period of time, they are faced with a costly project to some degree with the school division operating two schools and still not being able to provide the total service that possibly a K-12 that was approved before could have provided.

Now we have two problems that are developing. One is that the St. Boniface School Division will possibly be faced with some extra classroom space, empty spaces and a layoff of some teachers. We have students that will probably be looking from the immersion course, from 9-12, that will now have to be again transported out of the area. These are the questions, Madam Minister, that are being raised by the people in the area and create some concern.

First of all, costs of education is a very high priority in people's minds nowadays. When they look at this and they can't see the total picture, they get more concerned. It is for that reason that the group I think established themselves, I don't know whether they ran under an official name, but they were promoting the idea of withholding school taxes. They have had very very favourable support. Now to what extent they will carry that through I am not sure but it is because these kinds of things, these questions are sort of left open that this has been found relatively easy to sell the idea of withholding school taxes, using the aspect that it's going to cost a lot more money to run the two schools and still not provide the total service.

I had hoped that possibly with the studies that have been done, the feasibility studies and various other aspects that were looked at over a period of time, that this could have been maybe addressed so that these things would all be patterned properly, and the people could have a little better idea exactly where it's going to end up. At the present time they're still not sure, and I'm not quite sure either because that area of the immersion end of it leaves it a little open-ended again.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I can understand the concerns that the member opposite is raising. I'm not sure the concerns are a clear indication that there is going to be another school required. I think there is clear indication that they have some concerns about the amount of space that is needed and what the needs in the future will be because they don't know what it is that the board wants to do or is deciding to do.

I think that he is talking about a separate school in the elementary and it is my understanding that there are three streams in the Ile des Chenes elementary,

three separate streams, not a separate school, English K-6, Immersion K-6 and Francais K-6; also, that the K-12 school was a French school for francais students only, I think, in the original Letter of Intent. — (Interjection) — Yes, it was.

While I recognize some of the uncertainty and the concerns in the community over an issue that has been going on since, I think, 1978, and the effect of not having resolution over a matter as important to the community like this for a very long time, the costs have been high in this, and they're not just financial which we're all very concerned about today, but there are other costs and the costs are the uncertainty in the division by the communities. What I think is an opportunity for growing resentment or hostility or sensitivity by the various communities and members, the longer an issue like this goes on, of course, the costs of the two governments and the amount of time that we have spent examining and reviewing and trying to come to some resolution on this very important issue.

However, having said that, it is important that the people go to the school divisions for the answers that they need and can only get from school divisions, that I am not in a position to be able to either see through a crystal ball or to dictate or presume to know what they are going to do in those areas that are their jurisdiction. So while we can answer for the process and the decisions that we've made at our level, the school divisions and the boards are going to have to answer to the community for whatever the uncertainty or the information is that they need for the board's plans.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I just have one or two more questions. The concern that I have to raise, the School Finance Board approved the school for so and so many students, and if the new school would be opening up in September with possibly 157 or 165 students there is going to be a fair amount of ample space left, I assume, because it's built for more students to be coming in the future. At the same time, it is my understanding that the immersion students cannot go to this school. Am I correct in that assumption that it is strictly a French school and that immersion students will not be able to make use of this school?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, there will be some space, I might say, having been a school trustee who lived in a community that was growing by leaps and bounds and being put in the position of planning a school for 500 students and having it too small the day the school opened I know that we have to, when we're planning schools, build the amount that we know are going to be there for a few years down the road. It's absolutely foolish to build just for the enrolment projections for one year. So it is not unusual to build a school to meet the capacity of the enrolments that are projected for the coming two, three or four years.

The decisions on how to use space in a school division for all programs, whatever they are, how to organize, and how to use the facilities is totally in the hands of the school division. I do not, once again, either know or presume to tell them how they will allocate that space.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Thank you, I guess we're still talking about Capital Grants for Schools. I'd like to bring up one point which, I guess, appears every time there's a major expansion in the suburbs in Winnipeg and that's how we go about deciding about building suburban schools. I was, a couple of months ago, out in Linden Woods, which I guess is in Tuxedo, saw a map out there with a big empty space, and the real estate salesman said that that's where the new school is going to be. I asked her how she knew there was going to be a school there. She said, well, the school board approved it as soon as there was something like 200 students in the area. Something like this, I think, really goes a long way in creating unrealistic expectations in the suburbs for new schools. On the other hand, I'm not that concerned with Linden Woods. It's not my responsibility, but I am concerned with one suburb I've got, which is All Seasons Estates, which started out in the same pattern as Linden Woods where people moved in with the expectations brought about by the real estate agents that there would soon be a school. Of course, after a couple of years they had their hopes dashed.

The problem is now that there is real growth in the All Seasons Estates area. Right now there is about 500 students who are being bussed out of the area by the River East School Division. They've had to add a bus this year and they're looking at adding new buses next year and the schools in the area are already overcrowded. Maple Leaf School, which is outside of the neighbourhood, is looking at busing out its Grade 6 students or perhaps bringing in temporary classrooms next year. So there's not much outside classroom space to bus students from All Seasons Estates into, and now we've got the major building expansion which is going on in the province.

Almost 10 percent of the new homes which have built in Manitoba this year have been started in River East and most of those are in All Seasons Estates. There are about 250 new housing starts, which next year people are going to be moving into them, and there are going to be a lot of students who are looking for schools and a very great shortage of school space.

I've seen the Minister's three-year Capital plan, and I notice that it emphasizes rehabilitating older schools. It says that it's flexible on building new schools where there is real growth, but I'm wondering how the Minister will determine which areas are the real growth areas and which ones are the hype areas which have been created by real estate speculators.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure that I'm clever enough to differentiate between the two points that he raised. What our major concern will be is whether there are students for whom there is no school space. I think that is the bottom line, that whether the demand was created because a developer went in and decided to build homes and told people there would be a school. Then we are being put in the position of the school division and Public Schools Finance Board and the province, I suppose, of providing that school, doesn't matter much if the kids are there and there's no classroom space. While the three-year Capital plan does focus on renovation because we know that the previous decade, we were focusing on building of large new facilities in the heavy growth areas and we now have to upgrade our existing stock.

That doesn't preclude, for a minute, building schools where there is need, so the determination of that will be made with the school division who has to review its existing space and its capacity to handle the new students and the Public Schools Finance Board. By the way, they are supposed to be brought in on the planning stages of development plans, the school divisions are, so that they're supposed to know ahead of the development plans and the projections for the housing and the projections for the numbers of students, so they can project a bit in advance when they can handle it and when they can't.

Where there is real need, and by real need I mean, real live students for whom they don't have adequate facilities, we will approve additional facilities.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to pose some additional questions on the proposed Ile des Chenes School to the Minister if I could.

First of all, I'd like to ask the Minister, when the former administration considered the K-12 school, was that at all considered to be, or proposed to be, a francais school or was that to be an Immersion School?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: A francais school, Mr. Chairman.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I would then ask the Minister, and it's a follow-up question to the one posed by the Member for Emerson when he was questioning whether immersion students would be welcome in that school, particularly where it appears there would be excess capacity to hold them. I'm reading from a newsletter that went out from John Bulman, who I believe is the Superintendent of that School Division. It's dated January 17, 1983 and he says, in addressing a number of facts and figures related to the school, he says, "The new school, under Point C, who will attend?" and at the very end of that section, he has an N.B. underlined. He says, "The board wishes to underline the fact that any student who can function in a francais program and whose parents accept the philosophy of such a francais school, could be enrolled in this new school."

Specifically what is meant by that comment?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, my understanding of that is, that it's a program where they use French throughout the entire day, including extra curricular activities.

MR. C. MANNES: I would ask the Minister then, is that her feeling as to what the word "philosophy" means or is this school bordering on a segregated school, in a sense? What is the meaning other than that, or is there a deeper meaning than that?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I think the efforts made by school divisions who are offering the programs in the francais school is that they establish a francais milieu and in establishing that, that the students are indeed immersed, and I don't mean by that immersion, but are immersed in the French language all throughout the day and the French atmosphere in both their school programs and their extra curricular activities.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I ask the Minister, specifically at this point in time what is the status of the Ile des Chenes School, right as of today?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I think I did report on that. I said that the working drawings are nearly completed, that means they have to complete the working drawings and get approval. There are various stages of approval. When they're completed, they will receive approval. We are expecting construction if the working drawings and the procedures go as expected, to start between June 15 and June 30.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister if there would be any argument at all that would convince her that this school should not go forward at this time?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I think it's important to talk for just a minute about what my role is in this. I do not sit in my office and think about what would be an appropriate school or what would not be an appropriate school for a school division. I deal with requests. I deal with two things. I deal with Letters of Intent and requests from school divisions and I deal with appeals, so that unless there is a proposal from a school division on the plate, so to speak, or on our desk, I do not presume to get involved in determining whether or not they should or should not have a school. Once that proposal is on my desk, I can only deal with the information that is made available to me about the needs by both the school division and the Public Schools Finance Board.

I think that it's clear from the background information that I gave, that probably there has not been a longer, probably there has not been a tougher, probably there has not been a more sensitive, a more difficult issue that required a decision in terms of the building of a school anywhere in the province for a long long time, than there has been here. So it hasn't been easy, which is the reason that I took as much time and as much attention and as much effort to send the committee in to talk to - I mean they spent weeks talking to all segments of every community, the school board, all of the parents, all of the community, checked enrollment figures - we've taken as much time as can be taken in making a decision.

I still must have a request by the school division to deal with. They withdrew their original request or appeal, asking for a continuation of the K-12, submitted the 7-12 request, and the information that I had supported the need for a school of that size for those programs. I also must say that I do not believe there is a decision that could have been made on that school regardless of where it went or what size it was, that was not enveloped in controversy and difficulty. At the point we were at there was no decision that we could make that would accommodate and satisfy all of the people in the community.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you. I certainly can accept that answer. I can see a decision regarding that school and many others like it throughout the province as being very difficult. But I would question the Minister just like her colleague did, the Member for River East,

as to the criteria in building new schools. This is a Regional School. It's one that has all the facilities. I would then ask as to how many schools over the last three years have been built, and I believe, again quoting from that same source, that the September, 1983 enrollment - and this comes from the school division - is 157 students forecast for September of '83. I believe the Minister gave us a different number?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: 157 for '83; 224 for '84; 239 for '85; 253 for '86.

MR. C. MANNES: Fine. You didn't give them to us together and that's why I'm a little confused.

I would then ask the Minister to add to that question, particularly in light of the comment she made to my colleague that, indeed, and I think her words were, that the demand for francaise courses was staying stable. In view of that, where is the increase of Ile des Chenes to come from beyond the 250, as of September '86; particularly again, in light of additional information which indicates that there will be under 10 students that will be enroled in kindergarten next year taking the francaise course, starting in that stream?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, while I indicated that there was stability in the francaise program, I was talking about the provincial range and that does not mean that there isn't some variation, or the possibility of variation in individual school divisions.

In terms related to the question of where are the students coming from? I went through a very specific communication on exactly where all of the students were coming from that were in the original 157, where the catchment areas, the numbers of students, the grades from 7-9, 10, 11, 12. I think that question has been answered.

I might also say that in all the discussions and all the words that I have heard about this school, and there have been thousands, I have never once heard anybody suggest that we didn't need a facility. That never seems to have been the question at the dispute. Everybody has suggested that they did not have adequate space to cope with the numbers of student they had, and the only question and argument was where it would go, and what size it would be, and what kind it would be, but not that there would be.

MR. C. MANNES: Well I'll rebutt that a little later in a further question, Mr. Chairman, but I'd like to ask the Minister what new information came to light when the two-man committee studied the whole situation and made the recommendation to the Minister that, indeed, the K-12 continue? What different and new information came to light, in view of the fact that the former Public Schools Finance Board, I would say, over a period of a year previous to that, was terribly concerned as to the future enrolment?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, what was done, through the work that was done by the committee, is that we confirmed the need and we confirmed the enrolment.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can't accept that; confirm the enrolment. Is the Minister indicating

that the numbers the previous Public Schools Finance Board had submitted were in error, or was there something out of line with the other ones that were confirmed? What was the difference?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, what, in fact, happened is that we came to the same conclusion as the previous government; in other words, the previous government, when they looked at the enrolment projections and made the decision to approve the K-12, they had a joint committee themselves that they set up. We can assume that they confirmed the enrolment that was justified to approve a school for 322 students from K-12. I don't think there has ever been confirmation and, in fact, there has not been, that the concerns that were raised by the Public Schools Finance Board were borne out. This is not unusual. There often is a lot of discussion; a lot of exchange of information that go on between a school division and a Public Schools Finance Board when they are making final decisions about approval of a school.

It is not unusual for a Board to question enrolment, and we have some situations going on right now where there are proposals on their desks where they are questioning the enrolment. That doesn't mean that their questions mean the enrolment figures are not accurate. What it means is that they want the school division to give them additional information that confirms or indicates clearly where their enrolment projections are coming from. There have been numerous situations where they were uncertain about projections, then on going back to the school division and raising the questions, they received confirmation that is adequate to make them feel confident in the figures that they've been given. This isn't unusual at all.

The Member for Morris seems to be making a suggestion that because the Public Schools Finance Board raised the question, and said that they were not sure about the enrolment projections, does not, in fact, or has never been borne out, that those questions or concerns were in fact the case. The work of the committee that was done, subsequently, I believe confirmed that was not so.

MR. C. MANNES: Well further to that point then, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister whether that particular two-man committee report, is that available to the members of the opposition?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I think that report was one that was prepared to gather information to help both the school division and myself in making a decision that had to be made about the school, and that we have shared that report with the school divisions so they had all of the information that we had in order to make the decision.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is exactly the point. The Minister just 10 minutes ago was wondering why there seemed to be such a great degree of uncertainty throughout the area. I can tell her that maybe this is one of the reasons, because there have been an awful lot of figures bandied around, and the very decision report that obviously has helped the Minister make up her mind is not available to the division. I would ask why not?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, it is not usual. The relationship and the function for making decisions is between the bodies that bear some responsibility, and that is, the elected school division, the Public Schools Finance Board carrying out its role, and the Department of Education. A lot of information is required by all levels; by the school division; by the Public Schools Finance Board and myself in making those decisions. That information is normally not shared with the public. The school division is, I think, the closest place, and perhaps the most appropriate place, for members of the community to get specific information about enrolment projections in that area.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister just made a comment with which I have to take strong exception. The Minister seems to indicate that the ratepayers in that area really don't have the right to know some of the background information that has gone to making this decision. Of course, that's exactly the crux of the issue here; it's those very same rate payers who want to see a school, and really aren't terribly opposed to seeing the Province of Manitoba build it, but who realize fully well that in a very near future that they will have to support the operational costs of that school and they are terribly concerned. So I believe they have a very valid reason for wanting to know those figures, and that's why then I'd like to move into the whole area of operational costs.

Further to the report, titled "Facts and Figures," that came from the division office to all the ratepayers in the area, (f) 5, it says the additional operational expenditures for at least the first two years of operation - this is, with the Provincial Government has already approved the following expenditures. I would ask is this normal procedure for the Department of Education to pick up the operational costs of a new school two years beyond completion date?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that the approval that was given for giving some support for operational grants was done under a program that operates under the Bureau and that is there and has some flexibility and is a special grant that comes from the Federal Government. It is to give support in what might be considered to be special situations and that these are reviewed on an individual basis.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, can the Minister then tell me how many other schools, relatively new schools, that have been built over the last five years have been able to apply for this type of program whereby operational costs will be covered by the province for two years?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure that there has been any. We can check that and confirm whether or not it is so. If there are not large numbers that I can indicate, there also are not large numbers of just French language schools, so I think that this probably was considered to be a unique situation and was reviewed on that basis for funding and support by a special graph that was set up for those specific purposes.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, moving into a new area, I'm wondering if the Minister of Education is aware

that the Seine River School Division Board has passed a by-law, which I believe she has to ratify as the Minister of Education, that changes the ward boundaries of this particular school division.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I do have a request on my desk. I have a number of proposals in from the Seine River School Division and I think at least one other where they are requesting ward changes and asking for approval of a by-law. There is a section in The Public Schools Act that requires a school division to reconsider its representation and its numbers of trustees wherever there is a variation of more than 25 percent. It's my understanding that is the basis upon which this request has been made, that there is a variation in the population from the previous determination of wards and numbers of trustees that exceeds the 25 percent.

Where a board requests a by-law on that basis conforming to The Public Schools Act, and where the board's alterations conform or more closely meet the, I guess, better or what's fairer representation, more equal representation of the wards and the population, then I generally approve the by-law change. However, there is an option for residents of the community, should they not agree with any by-law change approval related to that issue, any 10 resident electors or more can ask in writing to have the by-law heard and to grieve against it before the Board of Reference.

MR. C. MANNES: Then I assume that there will be notice given when the appeal goes to the Board of Reference, I take it. I then ask the Minister if she would give some very serious consideration to possibly denying this by-law change at this time. It would appear to me that the ward changes smack of potential preparation to fall elections, because I would suppose that if the school hasn't started by the fall and a new board came forward that they of course would be within their right to veto the decision being made.

The reason I'm posing the question on ward boundaries is because it is my understanding that Ward 1, which at present has one trustee and includes the small towns of La Salle and Glenlea and to a degree St. Adolphe - the small towns of La Salle and Glenlea will now be included with St. Norbert, and there will be three trustees coming from that area. Of course, this conjures up some very strong possibilities of a slate whereby St. Norbert will have all the representation on the board, and that indeed the small towns will have none. I'm wondering if she would not concur with my feeling that possibly at this time, until the school has either started construction or has been vetoed, that it would not be wise or politically expedient to change the ward boundaries.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I accept the concerns raised by the member. If we can just talk a minute about the process, I think that one of the things that I would be looking at is whether or not there is in the changes, if they're beyond the 25 percent, there is equity in their redistribution and that I would have some concerns. I would be concerned about that. However, if it comes in within an equitable redistribution in terms of numbers of people and numbers of trustees,

and there is a dispute or concern or differences of opinion in the community about the change - because I do agree with the member opposite that this is an issue that is of much importance to the people in the community - that any time you're changing boundaries and numbers of representatives that they're going to vote for and who they represent, you have a very sensitive and important issue. It's one of the reasons, I must say, that I have asked the Board of Reference to look at the question of establishing a date beyond which a school division cannot apply for a by-law change because I think there should be full notice to a community about major changes that are taking place and they are presently considering that.

However, I think that the real examination or full examination of equity between boundaries, school divisions, communities and trustees can more fully and fairly perhaps be dealt with by the Board of Reference whose job it is to determine and make decisions related specifically to those issues, boundaries and representation and numbers of trustees; that is their territory.

The other reason that I think that is the fairest way, is that it involves a public hearing; it involves an open public hearing where any individual, or any numbers of people from the community, can come forward and state their case, so that whenever there is a request or a grievance against a decision, I always pass it onto the Board of Reference for a hearing and they must deal with the case. So that in cases where there are sensitivities and dispute, I think the Board of Reference, which is an open public enquiry of all of the elements related to it, is doing what it was supposed to do, and that is, setting up an objective outside independent public body to view this very important question.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, I certainly can't argue with the process, however, I would like to draw this to a close by stating the real concern of the ratepayers, certainly those of which fall into my constituency, those who are property owners and who are terribly concerned for the third year after the completion of the school, because nowhere has anybody prepared any type of an analysis for them indicating, specifically, what, under various increases, tied to consumer price index, if you will, as to the impact on, first of all, on their property bill. But more importantly, the impact that a very large school which has few numbers, which does not achieve the 250-plus students within three or four years, will have upon their livelihoods and upon their disposable incomes. I think their claim is quite justified. It begs the question, what is the rush?

When we see a letter dated December 10th, 1982 going to Mr. Frechette, the Chairman of the Public Schools Finance Board from John Beaumont, the second paragraph saying, the Board must open the school in September 1983. "We trust that your Board will approve a small modification to the normal procedures" and moving on - and I will table this, of course - the Minister probably has a copy. The target date is critical since the new school involves students who are now in Grades 10 and 11 in other divisions. If the school is not ready the division will pay another \$85,000 in residual costs in 1983. The school must be ready.

I question how \$85,000 and, of course, that number doesn't even make sense because looking at the Budget for the school division, which we passed last year, there was indeed some \$37,000 paid for non-residents, Seine River students who were taking *francaise* outside the division; some \$37,000 budgeted for 1982-83. Of course, it begs the question, is there a real necessity for the school, particularly when 40 or 50, or let's say \$80,000, within a very short drive there are existing classrooms, right now, that could accommodate them and which would answer another problem, as was mentioned by the Member for Emerson.

So, I think these are the concerns of the ratepayers who are my constituents. I think that they deserve to be addressed completely and, I think, that they haven't always received the information, as requested, from their own school division. It's the reason why they took time to write a detailed question letter to the Minister who chose only to answer, I would say, one-third of it because, indeed, these people are not receiving total and full and complete answers from their school division. I think when there are so many unknowns here, it is incumbent upon the Minister to be absolutely certain that she's following the proper course.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, a couple of points. One, in terms of the letter and the amount of response in the letter, is that I was only in a position to provide information on those things that I had information on that were in my area of jurisdiction. I regret and I am sorry that they are not receiving the information that they wish about things that are in the jurisdiction and the responsibility of the school division, including the responsibility to inform and communicate to the public.

I am just trying to think of the last point that was made; it was about communication and what was the other? I can't remember the other point. I think he made two points in there; one was the communication. Yes, it is difficult for us to respond to - I think that letter went out, that you quoted and said you would table, went out from the Superintendent. Yes, I don't know where he got the \$85,000.00. We can't confirm it here right now. It is difficult for us to respond to a letter that went out from the Superintendent with statistics and information in it that we don't know what the basis of his communicating those figures are, and aren't able to confirm or deny them here tonight, but I would be prepared to get that information for the member if he wishes.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, the Minister again has just reconfirmed my argument. The citizens and the ratepayers in the area also don't know whether there is substance to those figures and that's the reason, of course, they appealed to a higher authority. They appealed directly to the Premier and to the Minister of Education for some direct answers to some very direct questions. I believe that the Minister has, within her power, and certainly within the Public Schools Finance Board, has the answers to many more of those questions than she is offering, No. 1.

Certainly, No. 2, she could answer many of the questions specific to enrolment, or at least, by way of releasing that report, two-man committee report, it would have given the residents out there the same

rationale that was used by the Minister. So I can tell her, that's the reason why maybe some of the people don't really understand; and secondly, why they would like to reconfirm the numbers that are offered to them by their own division.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Radisson.

MR. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, I will resist the temptation of making any lengthy statement, although I very much feel that this calls for it. I sat here last year during the expenditures related to Capital assets and for over an hour there was only one school in question and that was Ile les Chenes School. Tonight, over the last one hour-and-a-half, this is all we heard again. I heard the Minister awhile ago state that there hasn't been any other school more difficult to build or to get through than this one. I beg to differ in this sense, there was another one, and it was Noel Richot School in St. Norbert. It's not by accident that there is one link of similarity between those two schools. Those are two *francaise* schools; one an elementary school and one, which is not built yet, which is intended to be a secondary school.

I might point out that the people and the parents concerned for *francaise* education for their children, in that particular school division, have started this process with studies and making requests to the Minister starting, I think it goes back to 1976. Throughout the years the justification and numbers was even greater than what it is now. Schools approved, and by every possible means and ways by making a political football out of it, and by still trying to make a political football out of it. We are the members across pleading to find ways and means of getting the Minister to intervene, even though the school board, itself, still has in the office of the Minister, in the Public Schools Finance Board, a request to have this school built.

There is a demonstrated need for it and still we're pleading, first, can the Minister deny it, can the Minister deny ward boundary change hoping that, as time passes, numbers will go down. There will be others into the picture who can turn this around again, and again make this into a political football.

I don't want to impute motives, but I don't know what the reasons are. I think I know what they are, but definitely not the ones that are stated here. If the members were so concerned about the ratepayers they would also question some of the empty classrooms that are in that same particular school division, and now used for other programs.

You had a school in Ile des Chenes, which has three streams in it, which is full to capacity. You have a demonstrated projected enrolment for 1984 of 224 students; 1985, 239 students. In the third year, when the taxpayers in that school division would have to start bearing the cost, and they would have to bear the cost; they bear the cost now of all the other schools, there's no question and no problem with regards to that; they bear costs of empty classrooms in other schools, no problems with that. But if it has to do with the *francaise* school, that is a problem.

Now in the third year, when they start to have to bear the cost, when there's 253 students in the school, that becomes a problem. Yet, how many schools in

Manitoba, how many secondary schools, have fewer students than that?

For almost - well it's going on now to seven years - there's been pressure; there's been requests; there's been problems; there's been demonstrations on both sides. The decision has been made; the school board has not asked for this school to be shelved, and yet I hear the members on the opposite side pleading to see this request being denied, to see this becoming a political football, again. The members across have the gall - it appalls me - to say what is the rush? Deny it for another year, maybe there'll be some other political figures in there, maybe we can get it scratched again. What is the rush? After seven years what's the rush. So many students have gone without it for these years and what is the rush.

Is there a real necessity for the school I hear the member across ask?

A MEMBER: Only he can answer that.

MR. G. LECUYER: Well he knows the answer to that. I would say the motives are clear. The motives of the members across are clear and they're on the record. That's all I'll say for now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Is there a motion? The Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNESS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know what I said previously that the Member for Radisson took so to heart, that he took such a personal slam against his person. I certainly wasn't directing any questions his way, although I can say, by his rebuttal, seeing he quoted some of my same words, it's obvious that he took exception to some of my remarks.

I'm glad he brought up the word again - why should the people be concerned with the costs, after all, they pay for all the other schools. That's exactly the point. The people there are paying for all the other schools. They know that Noel Richot has excess capacity right now and with a little work could handle the St. Norbert francaise schools; they know that. They also know that those same francaise students from St. Norbert, there's no guarantee that they'll go 15 miles out to the country for their high school education. There's no guarantee, that doesn't happen; that's not the real world. You don't drive outside of Winnipeg to receive from 10 to 12, and that's the concern of the ratepayers. They see these things and they know that they will be meeting the operating costs in years to come.

So I don't know what other motives the member says are behind it, but I can tell you the people that talked to me, who, by the way, are in great majority, French Canadians who are terribly concerned. Their concern is strictly economics and, if it hasn't been heard, I'll say it again; strictly economics. They know it's an open-ended agreement, an open cheque three years down the road and nobody, to their satisfaction, has shown or proven that there will be an enrolment above 200 people. That's why they're concerned and that's why they want the figures.

Well the member says there's 253 students. He takes that as a god-given number. How come the people out there don't accept that? They're asking for the rationale on the basis of which that decision was made. The Member for Radisson says it will be 253 because it's written on paper somewhere. That's not good enough. He will not be paying the bills out in that area unless he's a ratepayer in the Seine River School Division, but my constituents, and the Member for Emerson's constituents, are and will be furnishing the bill of supporting this school and it will be two or three times the cost if, indeed, this school is not economical.

So, Mr. Chairman, with those few words I would move that committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, requests me to report same and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

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

MR. P. EYLER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Pembina that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair will accept the motion for adjournment.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I move, seconded by the Member for Pembina, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is that agreed? The House is hereby adjourned.