

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 7 April, 1981

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. ABE KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered certain resolutions, directs me to report progress, and asks leave to sit again. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie that report of Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Annual Report for the year 1979-80 for the Manitoba Department of Fitness, Recreation and Sport.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this particular time I would like to introduce to all members of the Legislature a distinguished guest, Governor Olson from the State of North Dakota, and with him are seven members of his entourage, Mr. Bob Kallberg, Press Secretary; Mr. John Smith, Chief of Staff; Mr. Richard Elkin, Public Service Commissioner; Mr. Ed Becker, Business and Industrial Development Organization; Mr. Vern Fahy, State Engineer; Mr. Murray Sagsveen, Attorney Associated with the Garrison Diversion; and General Murry, Adjutant-General of the National Guard.

On behalf of all honourable members we welcome you here this afternoon.

We also have 25 students from Red River Community College under the direction of Mrs. Braid. This college is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Logan.

On behalf of all honourable members we also welcome you here this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for Hydro. Can the Minister confirm that during the time space of the Tritschler Commission proceedings that he, as Minister responsible for Hydro, was approached by a member of the Hydro Board and advised as to the recommendations and legal opinion of Chief Legal Counsel for Manitoba Hydro, during that time space in question?

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

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, no I cannot confirm that.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, further by way of supplementary, can the Minister confirm that he was informed, advised, of the opinions and recommendations of Chief Legal Counsel for Hydro during the proceedings of the Tritschler Commission proceedings?

MR. CRAIK: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot confirm that.

MR. PAWLEY: Is the Minister, by way of further supplementary, indicating that at no time was he made aware of the legal opinion and recommendations of Chief Legal Counsel Steward Martin, during the Tritschler Commission proceedings, pertaining to the Commission acting in excess of its jurisdiction and recommendation from Chief Legal Counsel for Manitoba Hydro, that those proceedings should be crushed by an order in court?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the legal counsel that the Leader of the Opposition refers to was engaged by Hydro and was released by Hydro. At the time of his release I know that the legal counsel was disturbed by the progress or lack of, or whatever, events with regards to his client before the Tritschler Inquiry Commission. Whether or not it contained the items specific that the member refers to, I cannot confirm.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, by way of further supplementary, is the Minister indicating that he was not informed as to the nature of the concern expressed by the Chief Legal Counsel for Manitoba Hydro, Mr. Steward Martin?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the committee meeting this morning, on any number of occasions, since it was a very repetitious session we had this morning, that the legal counsel, the first legal counsel, one of the two that Hydro had retained of their own volition, was upset when he left about the progress of events. I was advised by Hydro that he was upset; I was also advised that he was ill and that he would not be available for their services any further.

Details beyond that are not available to me. It was the business of the Board at that time to deal with it as they saw fit.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister indicates that he was aware of the Chief Legal Counsel

quitting half way through the Tritschler Commission proceedings as a result of either (a) concerns, or (b) health. Is the Minister indicating to this Chamber that prior to this morning, he was not informed as to the nature of the Chief Legal Counsel's concerns and that those concerns were not at any time brought to his attention during the proceedings themselves of the Tritschler Commission Hearings?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition has made mention of something that transpired this morning. Is he referring to a committee of this Assembly that was meeting this morning? If so, I would suggest that those questions remain within the committee until that committee reports.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, let me point out to you that the questions flow from the proceedings this morning of that committee. They are not repetitious in respect to the items of this morning, but flow naturally from the proceedings this morning themselves and to that extent, Mr. Speaker, I believe the questions to be in order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that matters that are before a committee for consideration of a committee are hardly matters that are subject to debate in this House or questioning in this House while that committee is still meeting.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: If I could again speak to your point of order, these questions that I am directing are being directed towards the Minister, not towards the Chairman or the General Manager of Hydro, but towards the Minister who is responsible for Manitoba Hydro. That Minister is present in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, and it's of general interest to matters pertaining to this Legislature, to the Province of Manitoba, that the Minister who is responsible for Hydro be expected, in fact I suggest obliged to deal with questions of this nature during the proceedings of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Government Services on a point of order.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, on that point of order, I simply want to draw to your attention, in Beauschene's Rules and Forms, the Fifth Edition, on Page 131, Subsection (h)(h): "Questions that are not permissible during Orders of the Day are to seek information about proceedings in a committee which has not yet made its report to the House, which I think substantiates the position that you had taken earlier."

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

MR. PETER FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I believe that the Leader of the Opposition is seeking information not with respect to proceedings of what the committee is doing, but in respect to Hydro, which comes under the jurisdiction and auspices of the Minister of Energy and Mines. Therefore, I think the question is totally legitimate.

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

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in answering these questions, but I have to point out, Mr. Speaker, that with regard to the questions, they were asked on more than one occasion this morning and were answered and the questions in this House are no different than the ones then, and the committee will resume its sittings on another occasion; it has still not completed its work.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on the point of order.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order, the questions that are being asked at this point deal with the Minister's responsibilities as Minister responsible for Hydro and they do not relate exclusively to the proceedings this morning, but relate to the Minister's responsibilities, not the responsibilities of the Chairman or the General Manager of Hydro, but in respect to the political head, the Minister who is responsible for Manitoba Hydro reporting in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, if I could proceed then with the supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I point out to the honourable member that until this matter is out of the committee and the committee has reported to the House, I would prefer not to entertain any further questions dealing directly with the affairs of that committee as it does encroach on the privileges of this Chamber.

The Honourable Member for St. Vital on the point of order.

MR. JAMES D. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, the questions of the Leader of the Opposition are not dealing directly or indirectly with the hearings of the Public Utilities Committee. They are directed towards the Minister and asking of the Minister's involvement in a particular matter. It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that they are in order and should be so ruled.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines on the point of order.

MR. CRAIK: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. I want to repeat that I was available for the questions at the committee, as the Minister reporting for the utility. The questions were directed at me through the Chairman of the utility; I answered the questions directly on a number of occasions and I simply repeat that we have to decide whether it is here or in the committee that we are going to deal with this. We have already dealt with it in the committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on the point of order.

MR. PAWLEY: My question is a very straightforward one. Is it being suggested by the Acting House Leader and by the Minister, indeed by yourself in your earlier comments, that any questions relating to Hydro cannot be asked of the Minister responsible

for Hydro, solely because there are now committee proceedings pertaining to Hydro taking place in this building?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I point out to the honourable member that we do follow rules, the rules that the Chair did not lay down. Those rules have been set before and a matter which is presently before a committee is not a subject for legitimate discussion in the Chamber while that subject matter is before that committee. Is that clear?

The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that you are ruling that no subject matter in respect to Hydro can now be discussed, that's precisely what is being said. Now if that is not being said, then I am prepared to suggest to you, Sir, that the Leader of the Opposition proceed with his question, but if you are suggesting that nothing about Hydro may be asked of the Minister in this Chamber at this particular time, then I must challenge that ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I have been informed by the Clerk that those questions were questions that were asked this morning in front of a Committee of this House. Until that Committee reports to this Assembly, I would suggest that the subject matter is a proper subject for the committee to deal with and should not be repeated in this Chamber at the present time.

The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I know we cannot have a debate with you, but I would like to ask whether a member may now ask a question in respect to Hydro which was not repeated this morning.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Chair cannot anticipate the content of any question until after the question has been asked, so the Chair cannot rule out a question which at this point has not been asked. I ask all members to consider the rules of the Chamber and to govern themselves according to the rules that have been laid down, not by this Chairman, but by other committees of the Legislature that have set these rules long before today.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, further to the Minister responsible for Hydro, can the Minister advise whether or not he will be assuming a position in respect to the Chief Legal Counsel for Hydro being released, being waived from solicitor-client obligations in order that he may speak freely to the public at large, or to any member of this Chamber pertaining to recommendations that he made pertaining to his responsibility as Chief Legal Counsel for Manitoba Hydro?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the same thing applies as with the last question. It was dealt with at length in the committee this morning, and a position was indicated by the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro in that regard, and the question and the answer was dealt with on several occasions in this morning's committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister to whom Hydro reports would be able to answer the question, whether two-and-a-half to four is five to eight, whether two-and-a-half fifths is five-eighths, since the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro had to reserve on such an answer, could the Minister who is an engineer answer that question?

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

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, we have 25 guests from Red River College in the balcony. They can answer it better than the Member for Inkster, I think.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, apparently they can answer it better than the Minister of Energy and Resources. But, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that he has referred to the students who are in attendance, I guess he would confirm that two-and-a-half fourths being five-eighths could be classified as school boy arithmetic.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Speaker, in light of the weather conditions and the announcement that he has made in the last few days, can he assure that the measures he previously announced are adequate to deal with the recent predictions and that we will be dealing with cooperation in terms of inter-governmental affairs rather than jockeying for positions as we did last year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, there has been a sincere attempt to deal with all issues between the two different levels of government and the agencies and organizations set up to deal with the situations that develop, to do with the agricultural industry and one of those organizations is the PFRA organization which have got ongoing programs and are doing a drought-proofing study for this particular province.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I may also add that there have been discussions between the different levels of government and I am confident that those discussions will hopefully work out a longer term resolution to the working cooperativeness within the government to support, and that I think has to be the main objective that is sometimes forgotten by some of the politicians and the members opposite as well as some of those elected in Ottawa, that they appear to, at certain times, try to benefit their own political being instead of benefit the farmers of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the Minister is in his usual cooperative spirit in the way he is answering the questions. Mr. Speaker, is the government considering undertaking any long-term

programs and measures to deal with the erosion of soil that we have witnessed in the last few days, both in Manitoba and in Western Canada? What considerations are they undertaking in this regard?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, as the member is aware as most people within the farm community, yesterday was the first day in which we saw extreme soil drifting throughout Western Canada. We had seen some areas earlier on in specific areas, mainly the Portage area, where some of the heavier soils were drifting. One of the things, Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate at this particular time and that, of course, is the availability of the crop insurance program in which farmers have the opportunity to enter into to protect themselves on an all-risk basis. As far as the actual protection against soil drifting, there is very little that can be done other than some stirring up of the soils with fresh cultivation or with the spreading of barnyard manure or straw that may be available. Now I am sure that the farmers, being the type of people they are, will carry out those practices without the government directing that they do that and I would encourage that in fact that take place. But given a day like yesterday, Mr. Speaker, there is very little that anyone can do with the kinds of conditions that were created because of the severe winds that came from the Saskatchewan and Alberta boundary through to this part of the province. It has a devastating effect on the agricultural community; however, it has only been one day and I would think that if we're given any amount of moisture or any calming of the weather, which appears to be taking place today, we would hope that we wouldn't see many more of those kinds of days.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister indicate, in light of the severe cash flow and credit situation position that many farmers are in and the seriousness of the present predictions insofar as this year is concerned, can the Minister advise whether he is prepared to bring forward moratorium legislation?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I indicated last year our opposition on debt moratorium legislation. I felt that there was a good relationship built up between the agricultural industry and the banking industry, that in fact we did meet with the banking industry and indicated to them our feelings, that we did not feel they should put undue pressure on the farm community or in fact give them an opportunity to have some more time to pay their bills and their debts. The same policy, Mr. Speaker, was applied to the Manitoba Agriculture Credit Corporation and at this time, Mr. Speaker, I do not think it would be in the best interests of the farm community to bring in debt moratorium legislation. I think it would cause long-term difficulties for the relationship between the agricultural community and the banking industry, which I have indicated has been built up very well over the past few years.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MS. JUNE WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is addressed to the Honourable Minister

of Health. Can the Minister advise the House when Section 26 of Bill 85, An Act to amend The Mental Health Act, will be proclaimed? This section requires the Board to review the status of every patient in a psychiatric facility within 12 months after admission and at least annually. According to the Ombudsman's Report, this is not being proclaimed. When will it be proclaimed, please?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I can't give the honourable member a definite date on that. As discussed during my Estimates, we have machinery in motion at the present time establishing the mental health review boards and panels that have to be put in place, familiarizing certain personnel with the procedures that will be involved, looking for the psychiatrists that will have to be hired to serve in those capacities. There's a certain amount of money in my budget this year to provide for that initial development and until that's completed, we will not be proclaiming the section of the Act; it may be some months time yet, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Following up on questions put forward by my colleague from St. George to the Minister of Agriculture, since the Minister has suggested that farmers could avail themselves through the crop insurance in the event of the continuation of drought, I would ask the Minister if he could advise if all outstanding claims, last year's claims, under the Crop Insurance Program have been settled and have payments been forwarded at the present time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, no, I cannot, but I'll take that question as notice and get the specific details on the payouts. I have, however, been informed that the payout this year has been again adjusted upward and it would appear now as if it will be in excess of \$50 million, but I will get the specifics on that particular question.

MR. ADAM: Yes, a supplementary question to the Minister. I would ask the Minister if he could advise whether he is prepared to respond to the questions put to him during his Estimates in regard to claims under the Feed Program, where crops were insured under the crop insurance but were transferred to the Green Feeds Program, and later these crops were lost because of flooding? The Minister has not responded to these questions that were put forward in his Estimates. I wonder if he is prepared now to respond to that particular item.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I will check on the specific questions. I felt I had responded to the majority of them and I will take as notice his question and get the answers that he has requested.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose with a final supplementary.

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, to the Minister of Agriculture, to ask the Minister if there are any claims outstanding on the Green Feed Program, as well as the crop insurance? Have all those claims that have been rejected and appealed, if those claims have been satisfied to the people, the claimants, and also ask the Minister if he feels there will be a problem in regard to feed for dairies at this particular time?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I will also take the question on the green feed payouts as notice. I could indicate to the member that the dairy feed situation has not changed. We reported earlier on, I guess from last September forward, that in fact there were sufficient quantities of roughage available within the province but, in fact, the quality factor was of question for the dairy industry and they have indicated, as I have indicated to the public, that has been the major difficulty and that has been quality alfalfa feeds or feeds of adequate quality to get top milk production from the dairy herds.

So, Mr. Speaker, that hasn't changed, because we haven't had an opportunity to grow a new crop of alfalfa in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Health. Does the government have firm regulations in place concerning the disposal of unwanted drugs or medicines by doctors' offices, hospitals, nursing homes, pharmacies, or other facilities that stock drugs or medicine?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: I believe the answer to the question is yes, Mr. Speaker, but I'll have to take the question as notice.

MR. PARASIUK: A supplementary to the Minister. I would like him then to immediately launch an investigation into a situation that has arisen in Transcona whereby a school has sent parents a letter yesterday informing them that a particular medical group located near the school saw children rummaging in the garbage cans outside of that medical group and there was the possibility that some children may have taken discarded pills or medicines from these containers. In view of the fact that the Minister says he expects that they have regulations in place, could he please investigate this very serious breach of those regulations, if they do in fact exist?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will investigate the whole incident or alleged incident that has been raised by the Member for Transcona.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona with a final supplementary.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, I'll send the letter from the school to the Minister to help his investigations and I'd like him to immediately issue instructions. I would ask then if he would immediately issue instructions to

all health facilities stocking drugs or medicine, that if they have unwanted, unusable drugs or medicines that might be disposed of, that these not be disposed of through putting these things in outside garbage containers, whereby they might be raided by children or other people looking for drugs or medicines. Will he issue that immediate emergency instruction to these health facilities?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that the action that's called for in this instance is predicated on the results of the investigation that I will carry out. I took the initial question from the Honourable Member for Transcona as notice, which indicates, as all members know, that I cannot confirm that precise regulations are in place, but I believe it to be the case.

If they are in place, then I would think that makes the request that the Member for Transcona has just made academic, but certainly I will look into the situation and I will certainly investigate the specific incident to which he has alleged.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

HON. DON ORCHARD (Pembina): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Approximately two weeks ago, the Member for Churchill had made some inquiries as to when the Medivac Aircraft would be in service, and I'm pleased to tell him that we have had the aircraft functioning for the past week, or a little better and has made several medical evacuations and furthermore, Mr. Speaker, as I discussed with the Member for Churchill, upon final advice from the Department of Finance, we did not enter the lease arrangement as I indicated to him, but exercised the purchase of that aircraft already.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Education.

Has the Minister appointed his, I believe he called it "an advisory committee", to review the effect of his new education funding scheme, which appointment he had promised to make in his meeting with the Dauphin-Ochre School Board a couple of weeks ago?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS: (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, not as yet.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Could the Minister indicate when he plans to appoint the review committee?

MR. COSENS: Soon, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Could the Minister indicate what the terms of reference will be of the committee and whether it would be an in-house committee or appointed from the citizenry of the province.

MR. COSENS: That's why it will be soon, Mr. Speaker, we're developing those terms of reference.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Mr. Speaker, firstly I'd like to thank the Minister of Highways for the information, it was indeed welcome news.

I'd like to ask a question of the Minister of Labour and I would ask the Minister quite simply what action his department is taking in respect to the suspected cadmium poisoning cases of workers in industry in the city, cadmium poisoning cases which are suggested relate to occupational exposure of silver solderers in that industry?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, you'll have to excuse me, there was some talk around me at the time. Could you repeat the question please?

MR. COWAN: The question to the Minister was, what action is his department taking in respect to suspected cadmium poisoning cases among silver solder workers at an industry within the city?

MR. MacMASTER: I should be able to report what the department is doing in that regard within the next few days, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COWAN: If the Minister is taking the question as notice, I'd ask the Minister as well to check with his department to determine why it is it took over one year for the department to make any significant approach to the industry in respect to complaints which had arisen from workers at that industry a year previously? Would he as well check into that and come back with information as to why there was that significant and what would appear to be unnecessary time lag?

MR. MacMASTER: I'll take that question as notice and the suggestions that were made in it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COWAN: I would also ask the Minister if he is prepared to direct his Carcinogen Study Group within his department to investigate this situation, as there is some suspicion that cancer cases may be in fact related to occupational exposures at that particular operation. There has been one cancer case which has been confirmed and there is another worker there who has been diagnosed as having pre-cancer cells in her larynx which might be, might be and I emphasize that, associated with occupational exposures.

Is he prepared to direct the Carcinogen Study Group with the department to undertake an investigation to determine if there is in fact, any relationship in respect to cadmium exposure in those suspected cancers?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I can assure you and the House that when I have a report from my department I'll be in a better position to discuss it. I'm not in a position right now to discuss that particular incident.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Urban Affairs and ask him whether he has made a careful study of the impact of the new Education Support Program on municipal governments in general, and the City of Winnipeg in particular, especially because it may leave little or no tax room for municipal governments and secondly, may bleed the City of Winnipeg dry?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, firstly, let me say my responsibility as Minister of Urban Affairs is solely with respect to the City of Winnipeg, not with respect to other municipalities. Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased to go into the kind of detail the member is referring to during my Estimates.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the Minister whether he can indicate whether the government will be providing additional tax relief to Manitoba taxpayers by enriching their property tax rebates?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, that is a question which should be put to the Minister of Finance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood with a final supplementary.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister, perhaps he would answer this question; given the special needs and problems of the capital city, would he be prepared to provide Winnipeg with greater access to provincial growth taxes?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, they have already been given that access.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MS. WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Honourable Minister of Health, and follows some questions I asked him in April of 1980, relative to the drug Darvon. At that time I was asking, Mr. Speaker, about alleged dangerous qualities of the drug and in view of the fact that the United States Food and Drug Administration has now chastized the manufacturers for not adequately warning physicians of the serious injury or death that can follow if Darvon is taken with alcohol or other drugs or in excessive quantities, will the Minister be looking towards some kind of informational program with the Pharmaceutical Association or any other kind of information program, Mr. Speaker, in order to advise the public of the dangers of this drug?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, essentially this type of thing is being done now by the Manitoba Pharmaceutical Association and by the medical profession itself. The Manitoba Pharmaceutical Association has launched a program of its own for advice to customers and consumers with respect to non-prescription drugs and the Medical Association in concert with our Drug Standards and Therapeutics Committee is working very diligently to present the

message and make the case for presenting the messages as broadly as possible to the public that there are serious side effects from admixtures of drugs and alcohol. That effort is under way. Certainly we are trying to intensify and extend it as broadly as possible.

MS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that Darvon can be addictive and is also said to be second only to barbiturates amongst prescription drugs associated with suicides, I wonder if the Minister would give some special attention to this particular drug and make some enquiries among his department and the Pharmaceutical Association as to whether special attention should be given to this particular drug.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, I can certainly do that, Mr. Speaker. I would like though to reassure the honourable member that the policing, the assessment, the evaluation of prescription drugs and their use in Manitoba is very rigidly monitored by the Drug Standards and Therapeutics Committee. I think that this province is extremely well served by the kinds of judgmental decisions that are made in this field, but I can certainly ask a question about Darvon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. VIC SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Labour. Several months ago I brought to his attention the matter of Trojan Security treating some of its employees as independent contractors and he indicated about a month ago that he agreed that those people in fact were employees. I am just wondering what he has done since then to ensure that those people are being compensated at least on a minimal basis in accordance with our payment of wages and other employee laws.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, the last I heard of that situation was that it was proceeding to the Labour Board.

MR. SCHROEDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister. Can he advise as to what his department is doing to ensure that former employees who might be eligible for further wage benefits are being notified by his department of their right?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I think the outcome of the Labour Board decision should be heard first.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere with a final supplementary.

MR. SCHROEDER: Could the Minister advise as to the amount of wages that company had been paying to these so-called independent contractors, per hour?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, further to the questions posed to the Minister of Urban Affairs by my

colleague, the Member for Elmwood, can the Minister of Urban Affairs advise whether or not he has as of yet responded to the brief which he received from the City of Winnipeg pertaining to municipal taxation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, we have a meeting with the city's official delegation this coming Tuesday morning at which time that will be a matter to be discussed with city officials.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance whether the government will be providing additional tax relief to Manitoba taxpayers by enriching the Property Tax Rebate Program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, when we have assessed that situation and feel that some adjustment in property tax credit is required, the adjustment will be made.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, in the event of that occurrence, will the Minister be sending a letter to each and every Manitoba taxpayer indicating that any beneficial program is courtesy of the Progressive Conservative Party rather than the government?

MR. RANSOM: I thank the honourable member for that suggestion, Mr. Speaker, and he knows that it is my practise to be consistent with the facts.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I should indicate that the time for Question Period having expired we will proceed with Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources that, Mr. Speaker, do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Education and the Honourable Member for Virden in the Chair for the Department of Natural Resources.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY — NATURAL RESOURCES

CHAIRMAN, Mr. Morris McGregor (Virden)

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Mr. Len Domino (St. Matthews): I believe the Committee is discussing 5.(a)(1) — the Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister if he has any opening comments to make. He did indicate in one of his discussions last night that he would be providing us with details on the new and innovative and expanding initiatives of his department in each of the areas. Perhaps this would be an opportunity for him to let us know what, if any, initiatives he has in the budget, in his Estimates, in the area of park development.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, the easy way would be for me to refer the honourable member to my opening statement which indeed covered, in capsule form, some of the initiatives that the department is taking in the different divisions of the department, I would specifically refer the honourable member to that opening statement. But certainly, in part, I suppose the fundamental difference between this government's approach in Parks development within a particular park that has received a considerable amount of attention, namely the Whiteshell, and that of the previous administration, is that the honourable member referred several times in his comments about the Whiteshell implying that they had a plan for the Whiteshell.

Mr. Chairman, I am the first one to suggest to you that I do not come into office with a plan for the Whiteshell. I have charged the responsible persons in the department, namely the Parks Division, under the direction of Mr. Derek Doyle, to develop with the current park users, potential and future park users, a master plan for the full utilization and maximization of the opportunities within that great provincial park. That certainly is proceeding with; it has gone through several phases, but in each instance I want to emphasize, and I do this particularly because of the concern that a number of people and interested groups and parties have with respect to whatever decisions are made with respect to the Whiteshell, that they should be well advised that there is no accepted laid-down hard-and-fast plan that the administration to date has accepted with respect to the Whiteshell.

It is my hope and it was the hope of the department that this next phase of the recommendations or suggestions with respect to the Whiteshell would be available any time now. I am advised that that is still the case, that Phase 2, and my terminology may not be correct, further results of the studies to date will be made public within a matter of weeks. They will then be discussed again with interested parties as to further refinement and it's at that point where recommendations will be made to me, to the government, with respect to the adoption of specific changes to the park management, additions, in practice or whatever the plan calls for.

In addition to that, I think one of the more interesting ones, although perhaps overlooked by the honourable members in the opening remarks when I

introduced the Estimates, is the plans that we have for the development of what we call the Assiniboine River Corridor and a linear park along the banks of the Assiniboine River. Many natural and historical recreational features of the Assiniboine River could be woven into a recreational corridor through a series of trails, access points, resting areas. Initially the plan will focus on the Brandon-Spruce Woods sections, but ultimately Assiniboine-Beaudry Park will be connected to this linear water and trail parkway. Private sector participation at intermediate and destination nodes will be encouraged at providing services to travellers.

At the Portage Diversion, opportunities for outdoor recreation, in particular fishing and water sports, have been enhanced as a result of the earlier water control measures on the Assiniboine River near Portage la Prairie. These will be examined and work should commence later this year. Proposals under consideration include the development of a swimming pond, picnic and fountain area, as well as improved access for sail and power boats. This facility will be developed in consultation with local officials and in a manner which will complement opportunities available at Island Park and elsewhere.

One that is an initiative and is of interest to me and I'm sure to the Honourable Member for St. George, is that we have started in a very preliminary way to examine feasibility of possible developments on the east shore of Lake Manitoba. I feel particularly that water body has been underutilized from a recreational point of view. We have the one excellent facility of St. Ambrose, which is heavily taxed during the periods of summer recreation, but I know that the honourable member will pass on that information to his colleague the Member for St. George, who has an interest in what happens in or about Lake Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, I can repeat, but I would be breaking the rules of the committee that I studiously attempt to follow if I were to repeat and read into the record what has already been recorded. I only draw to the honourable members' attention to avail themselves to these very enlightening, educational opening comments that were made by myself at the time the Estimates were introduced.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, the Minister certainly provides entertainment, as my colleague has said from his seat.

The first point he is making about the planning in parks is not something which I think the P.C. Government should hold up to the public as a matter of success. The Parks Department has had to suffer under the three Ministers of the P.C. Government since they were elected. They have never had a consistent policy which the public could comment on. In fact, I believe this government has operated in a policy vacuum with respect to Parks. It has taken three years for the government to even get to the stage of nearing completion on the first master plan for one park and what I indicated in my remarks the other day in response to the Minister's statement is that the New Democratic Party Government had a zoning plan, something which the public could look at and comment on with respect to the Whiteshell Park. It was one which had been worked on by various government departments. It took into account various resource uses within the park.

Mr. Chairman, it's something which the present government threw out the window, I believe, and never did even bother to try to work with. It's something which has been detrimental to the development of parks, I believe, and it's no secret in the Province of Manitoba that people generally are very suspicious of the Progressive Conservative Government with respect to their attitude towards parks. There seems to be a pre-occupation with overdevelopment. That Jarmoc incident, I think sticks in people's minds as something which epitomizes the Conservative attitude towards parks, very little concern for the environment and more concern for the developer, very little concern for people, more concern for the private investor who wants to make a big buck off of our natural parks.

So, Mr. Chairman, I don't think that the Progressive Conservative record, with respect to park development, is anything to hold up and pretend to be proud of.

With respect to New Initiatives, I do not see any major new initiatives, other than promises which the government is making. I haven't seen any really new developments in park development over the last few years, and I would ask the Minister, with respect to one of his statements, in specific terms on page 6 of his statement, he claims that as a result of increasing demand for transient camping opportunities in the eastern region of the province, \$300,000 has been allocated for the construction of a campground. I'd ask him where this campground is to be located and what feasibility has been worked out, with respect to this campground. Has it been determined that this is something which is absolutely needed — page 6, the last paragraph of your comments on parks.

MR. ENNS: Are you referring to the Annual Report?

MR. BOSTROM: No, the opening statement.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'd advise that that would be principally in the eastern region, near Nopiming Park, and I would ask him if they are taking into consideration the concerns of the wildlife people, with respect to the caribou herd that's in that area, because there were some lakes that I believe, were considered to be off-limits for any kind of intensive development because of a caribou herd which tend to have their young in that particular area, and biologists at the time, several years ago, were recommending that there be no campgrounds or cottage development, or in fact not even an access road for vehicles into one or two lakes in that area because of that concern.

MR. BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, the second question with respect to that then and I believe the Minister indicated it is in the Nopiming Park, and I would ask him if they are taking into consideration the concerns of the wildlife people, with respect to the caribou herd that's in that area, because there were some lakes that I believe, were considered to be off-limits for any kind of intensive development because of a caribou herd which tend to have their young in that particular area, and biologists at the time, several years ago, were recommending that there be no campgrounds or cottage development, or in fact not even an access road for vehicles into one or two lakes in that area because of that concern.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I should indicate that is being very much considered. I am further advised that some of the sites in question are actually located outside of the park in what would be considered the Lac du Bonnet area, for additional campsites. But, Mr. Chairman, I am not particularly happy to leave on the record the general

condemnation made by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland about the Progressive Conservative government's record with respect to parks development. I appreciate the youthfulness of the member and I do not wish to put on the record my age, but there was probably no period, no decade, that saw more attention paid, more parks development undertaken by a Progressive Conservative government as occurred during the Sixties. To name just three major park developments, one that occurred at the time that our present Premier was Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, namely Birds Hill, very accessible to the half million residents of Winnipeg, the Birds Hill Park which was not an easy park to develop on settled land, as it were; the startup of the Spruce Woods Park which is blossoming forth into becoming a major park institution in the Province of Manitoba; and of course the developments related to the Shellmouth Dam Project in which a fine park facility, the Assessippi Park has been developed.

I need not be lectured, Mr. Chairman, about this government's willingness and its dedication to parks development and its appreciation of parks development. I believe a single incident taken out of context should not allow that record to be in any way marred.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister is reaching way back into the records to attempt to get some credibility for the present government. We are talking the present government, not the Progressive Conservative government of the Roblin era. The Minister may be correct in that some very useful and productive progressive work was done in the area of park development but that has not characterized the acute protracted restraint attitude and policy of the Lyon government. So I think we are talking about two absolutely different processes.

With respect to the Progressive Conservative government under Premier Lyon and his Cabinet I believe that park development has stagnated and, in particular, I think that there is a definite degree of mistrust that's been developed in the population of Manitoba toward the present government and their attitude toward parks. I think that the present Minister has to live down certain comments that he made with respect to cottagers who live and have cottages in the Whiteshell. When it was suggested in debate I think the Minister may recall that the cottagers in that area were concerned about the proposed development on the Little Whiteshell Lake impacting on a lake which is already considered to be pretty well developed, pretty well at the saturation stage. The Minister made the comment that I think he has to live with that the cottagers in that area were simply fat cats anyway and didn't have to be reckoned with.

So I think that is something that the cottagers in that area didn't take very lightly, and I think that the cottagers who, by and large, for the original builders of cottages in places like Grand Beach, the Whiteshell Park and other areas where, by and large, working people, people who went out on weekends and holidays and worked with whatever materials they could scrounge together and built themselves a cabin in the wilderness and were proud of their efforts. They take exception to those kinds of remarks from the Minister of Resources and take

exception to the government's attitude towards development in parks which tend to err I think on the side of overdevelopment. I think that's the fear that's in people's minds, and it's a mistrust and distrust which this government, if they expect to gain the confidence of people, are going to have to overcome.

I know I went to a meeting at the Health Sciences Centre where the present Director of Parks was making his presentation with respect to the park planning that's taking place in the Whiteshell, and there was a general feeling in that meeting, even though they respected and were quite pleased with the presentation that the director was making, there was still an underlying current of distrust as to the government's intentions with respect to the park development. I think they finally had to have another meeting after that before they were able to wring out of this government a definite statement that there would not be Jarmoc-type condominium development on that Little Whiteshell Lake; it took three years to get that kind of a backdown, a reversal in policy on the part of this government. I think that one incident epitomizes the problem that people see with respect to this government.

I think the Minister, if he expects to regain the confidence of Manitobans who want to enjoy the benefits of our parks, is going to have to come out with some pretty definite policy statements with respect to park development and not rest on his laurels and say one of these days we are going to come around with a master park plan for the Whiteshell and after that we will work on the next one. If this government happened to be around for 20 years, which I'm sure it won't be, they may end up with a park policy that people can understand but right now I don't believe the government has a policy which the people can really identify with and say, yes, we think the government is going in the right direction with park planning and park development. They are simply not convinced and they are certainly distrustful.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member is exercising his prerogative to express his concerns about the current management of parks policy within the government of Manitoba. I can only reiterate that we are working diligently to bring about a reasoned comprehensive parks program that will not necessarily always meet all interests, and there are many interests involved. The particular interests that he speaks about, the cottage owners, we are very aware of. They are probably among the best organized of the various interest groups relative to our park situation and certainly have had a very free and open access to departmental officials and to myself in pressing their views as to what they believe ought to, or ought not to happen in the context of Manitoba parks. We have assessed limitations of growth in all our recreational lakes. These will be adhered to.

A comment that the honourable member attributes to me, which is correct and I don't deny that I haven't made, but I also suggest to him that there is to some extent a certain feeling borne by those, who I don't deny perhaps had first access to some of these desired sites and lakes, and now wish to see no other development take place at all because they are in a position, a favoured position if you like, to enjoy that particular uniqueness of nature in a lovely setting in a Provincial Park.

I am satisfied that the direction that we're proceeding with, the kind of intensive staff work that's being engaged in, the very indepth consultative process that is occurring, that I can assure and have so assured, various different interested parties that there will not be any hasty action, any rushing into development for development sake, but a planned and well reasoned out program that will facilitate the many diverse interests and needs that Manitobans have come to expect and hope to enjoy well into the future. Certainly I intend to be around in the year 1994 to make sure that that's taking place.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, I think the Minister could easily be around. He might not be in a Minister capacity but he'll probably be around.

First of all I'd like to start out with one very specific question. I got a call from a constituent yesterday from The Pas and this person is a high school student who's trying to line up her summer employment, and she applied to the Parks Branch last year and she applied again this year, and the answer she got from them was, well we hire people from Winnipeg first. For some reason the branch hires people from Winnipeg first before they hire northerners, and there's some recollection in my mind that two or three years ago in the early stages of this government, there was a similar problem that I raised with the Minister at that time. I'm not sure how much the Minister wants to comment, but I would like him to investigate to see in fact, if northern people, northern students are getting preference in summer jobs with the parks branch and we're not bringing in people from other areas of the province up north, when there's people up north looking for these jobs.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would have to ask the honourable member for specific details of the incidents that he refers to. I simply cannot accept the fact that even without me being totally aware of it, that would or could be departmental policy.

If the person is qualified for the job, we would naturally want to give preference to the locale where the job site is being made available, thus if it precludes the department from having housing problems and additional costs associated with providing an outsider, if you like, to that job site.

Furthermore, I can assure the honourable member that living with the — as I have to — with the Honourable Member for Thompson, for instance, and from other rural parts of the province, that kind of Winnipeg-first policy simply wouldn't wash. Now, there may be a specific situation that the honourable member refers to where a person applying for a job is not qualified for the particular job and somebody applying for the job from Winnipeg was qualified for the job and that person was hired. But those would have to be the circumstances that would bring that kind of situation about.

I think throughout, not just in the Parks Branch but where possible, certainly whether it's from my previous experience with the Department of Highways and the Department of Agriculture,

particularly summer-type jobs, casual jobs, term employment jobs where available and needed in different outlying parts of the province, an effort will always be made to hire persons living in the area.

MR. BOSTROM: I'll give the Minister some specific details on that particular case. My recollection is that a few years ago one of the problems might have been that some preference was given to university students over high school students. Of course, since there is no university up north, it would prejudice people from the north in terms of getting that employment.

Anyway, I would ask the Minister: (1) I will give him the details of the specific case but I would like him to doublecheck with his department in terms of the overall hiring and what is happening in northern Manitoba.

The other part is that the Minister's opening statement doesn't mention any new developments or major developments in the north, I don't believe. I wonder if he could probably start in the most important area first and tell me what's proposed in terms of Clearwater Lake and also wayside parks on the new Easterville No. 6 and No. 10 road, which the Minister is quite familiar with from his previous portfolio; then if he could expand to other area in the north where there has been a requirement for wayside parks, especially on the new roads that were built under the previous government and the parks development hadn't kept pace with the rapid rate of construction that was taking place, and if there are any new plans or proposals in that regard.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, these kind of details, I would again invite the honourable member to seek directly from me or from my officials. I can indicate to him that a general upgrading, an addition to facilities at Clearwater Park are being planned with respect to additional trails, shelter-type globe shelters. There are some additional improvements to the Troy Lake facility being planned; some cross-country ski trails are being put in place at Clearwater, again; another shelter building at Hugo Bay. These kind of general improvements are being effected not only in the northern parks but in other parks as well.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for The Pas.

MR. MCBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, this information is normally available in the Minister's book in some detail in terms of what is happening, so I would ask if either he or the person beside him could glance at that page and see if there is anything specific planned in terms of the Easterville Road and then to go up onto the Lynn Lake Road and the Norway House Road and the Split Lake Road, and see if there are any specific plans on those new roads.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that there are no specific plans at this time in the coming year for the Easterville Road, to answer the member directly.

I should indicate, as I am just being advised, that the capital projects are covered under the final item of Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets in the Estimates, which includes as well the capital projects

which I was asked about yesterday, involving water resources, drainage programs throughout Manitoba. That list will be available — I think I indicated yesterday that it would be available sometime tomorrow, if we get into Estimates tomorrow, but certainly for Thursday morning.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: 5.(a)(1) Salaries — pass; 5.(a)(2) — pass; 5.(b)(1) — pass; 5.(b)(2) — pass; 5.(c)(1) — pass; 5.(c)(2) — pass; 5.(d)(1)

The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate what is happening with respect to the wayside park situation at the Fairford River, Mr. Chairman?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that a lease is currently being negotiated with a Mr. Warren to manage the facility and I would take it that the lease provision is such that it will also encourage him to expand facilities along with our assistance. Technically, the leasing arrangement comes under the Crown Lands Division. The wayside park is located on Crown lands.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated "with our assistance." Can he elaborate on that statement?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I perhaps was not correct in suggesting financial assistance, other than assisting him in the acquiring of the land lease.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, who will assume the capital investment that has already been put into the property that is already there? Is that going to be part of the lease rate since there was a wayside park; although there were no camping facilities, there was a picnic area that was there and access was not provided to residents beyond, or participants or users beyond a fence line that the department had fenced off for people who wanted to fish in the lake. There were many complaints when that area beyond the wayside park was leased and people were required to pay lease rentals when, in fact, the property was originally leased to one of the local farmers for hay purposes. Now, what happened to that lease? Was that lease removed from the individual who had the haying rights of that area? What's the background on that, Mr. Chairman?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, those further questions respecting the disposition of Crown leases, could perhaps best be discussed when we deal with the issue of Crown lands and more specifically to the questions of the situation with the lease that is being arranged for the maintenance in the carrying on of the public facility that is there.

My understanding is that the lessor agrees to the lease that he will maintain the public facilities at acceptable level and continue to provide and make them available for use by the general public as well as we're informed that he has intentions of adding private accommodations in addition to the public ones that are part of that lease arrangement.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the public facilities that are there, is the Minister

indicating that those facilities will be available to the public as they have in the past at no cost in terms of the picnic grounds and the area that may be set up for camping and tenting beyond this area would be subject to a rental fee? Am I correct in that assumption?

MR. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The area that's immediately adjacent to the highway has been the highway or the wayside stopping facility, camping facility, will continue to be available to the public on the same basis that has been the case up till now. Pardon me. I'm being advised not for camping opportunities but for use by the travelling public as a wayside park or stopping point; picnic area is perhaps the better description. The Member is correct that the camping facilities would then fall under the private jurisdiction of the lessor who would make them available, I assume, at rental rates to the motoring public.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate since the lessor already does have a site, I believe, a mile or so from the present site in terms of a tourist resort facility, why the province itself would not have expanded these facilities since there is already that same entrepreneur does have a facility in the area within that same vicinity. Why would we now allow the entire area to be handled by one individual? What's the rationale behind that, Mr. Chairman?

MR. ENNS: Well Mr. Chairman, I suppose if the public investment at the existing wayside park were to be developed in a more fuller and expansive way we would very likely cause the demise of the person's business you just described. It would probably jeopardize his business. It was deemed advisable to utilize his management capabilities, his expertise in running and providing the motoring public with two facilities in that area.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'd like it confirmed that there has been a problem with respect to the original site and that's primarily the reason that this was done. My understanding is that in addition to this site that the local band had, and I'm not sure how far it is, had planned a commercial facility in terms of motels and the like near the river which would add to the existing investment which, if it's going ahead, would shed some different light and a differing opinion from what the Minister has provided us in terms of the viability of the existing operator. The point that I'm making is if the operator presently was going under in terms of his original location, is that solely the reason that this was done, Mr. Chairman?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the department had experienced difficulties with the management of the wayside picnic grounds and indeed to try to resolve some of them the person involved was contacted and asked to assume the additional management of the public wayside facility as well as under the condition that we enter into a lease that would provide him with some additional lands adjacent to the facility.

I'm advised, Mr. Chairman, that his application for this bit of land dates back to 1974. Of course, it was

a policy of the then administration not to consider too kindly applications of this kind. It had to be government or nobody at all and that's simply not the policy of this government.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I ask the Minister since his application was in since '74 and since he's given us that information for the Crown land, what type of leases and who had leased the property in that area prior to that and for what length of time?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I would have to undertake to answer that question on another occasion and have the staff be given some time to get the necessary details.

MR. URUSKI: The other question, Mr. Chairman, with respect to this if the Minister is getting the details. I'm assuming that the land was being utilized for agricultural purposes and it's a water area, I believe it was a water resources right-of-way that we are talking about and it was leased for haying purposes for a number of year. Were alternatives provided to the lessor in terms of a different area for haying purposes once those leases were taken away or moved to the new individual, Mr. Chairman?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that the particular land involved was not under any form of lease. I won't quarrel with the Honourable Member for St. George who is more familiar with the area than I am. The land may well have been hayed but the member is also aware that us farmers and ranchers up there, we have a tendency once in while to hay on land whether we own it or not or whether we pay the Crown any lease for it. If we can get away with it, we'll do it.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'm not so sure that farmers of the Interlake and the Minister would want to probably change his statement or have wanted to get something for nothing in terms of the suggestion that the Minister has made if cattle should somehow stray and . . .

MR. ENNS: On a point of order. I already want to change my statement.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, how long is this land being leased to this individual now and what size of an area are we talking about?

MR. ENNS: I'm advised that the lease is for a 21-year period. The actual size is not yet determined.

MR. URUSKI: Is it a possibility that the lease will carry on along the north side of the Fairford River up to the property that the individual we are speaking about, now owns property. Is that a likelihood?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, at the start of this discussion I indicated that we were in the process of entering into a lease with this particular individual. The lease has not been completed, I'm advised by staff that the party involved will be approaching the department within the next few days, or weeks, to conclude and finalize the lease arrangements. The information I've attempted to give to the committee is not finalized at this point. It would be the policy of

the department to provide a 21-year lease, the actual size of the property to be described on that lease has yet to be determined, and I would assume that would involve the question as well, that the member just placed, as to whether or not it would involve land on the north side of the river.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, under what leasing arrangement did the operator run the property during the year of 1980?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, he was operating simply under an annual permit, with no long-term commitments made.

MR. URUSKI: So there was a permit issued in 1980 to give the individual authority to collect whatever fees, for whatever services he provided?

MR. ENNS: That is my advice.

MR. URUSKI: That's it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: (d)(1) — pass — the Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: I note in the Minister's Annual Report, for the year ending March 31st, 1980, that park entrance permits, particularly the seasonal permits, have declined substantially from 1976 and 77. In 1976 the number of seasonal permits were 49,077 or 47,698. In 1979 for the last year on record, the permits were down to 33,448, a decrease of 14,000 in number of seasonal permits for park entrance. Could the Minister please indicate what would be the reason for this rather drastic decline?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, while there has been a general 6 percent increase in the number of campsite permits throughout the year, the park entry was reduced by some 3 percent. The member need not be reminded that last season was a particularly disruptive one, an unprecedented number of fires, fairly restrictive travel restrictions that had to be imposed for reasons of fire suppression, did impact on the number of visitors to our parks. Park permits for that reason, I'm advised, were down.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman, what would be the reason for 1978 to be 14,000 lower than 1977 then, if that's the reason for 1979?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, while I wasn't the Minister at that time, but we had similar situations. Not to the same extent, but the member will recall that 1979-80 was already a difficult year in terms of fire and I would suspect that similar reasons occurred.

There may also have been, I'm not suggesting, I would have to check with general tourist figures, whether or not there was a general decline in the province as there was in many places across the country, as a result of increased travel costs, increased gasoline costs, whether that had an impact on our figures. I don't know if we have that kind of detail available.

Well, Mr. Chairman, my Parks Director confirms what I intuitively felt was the reason, namely that while there was a very substantial, in fact my Parks

Director who is even more descriptive than I, describes it as enormous growth during the period from early 1970-72 to 1978-79 and that growth has flattened out generally across the country, including the United States.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman, it looks more like a nosedive than a flattening out of growth, from 49,000 in 1976 to 33,000 in 1979 is not a flattening out of seasonal permits. And the park entrance permits, the number of daily permits, seemed to have also declined. I note there is a flattening out of the provincial totals, as far as the number of cars. But even if one looks at the comparative summary on page 127, which relates to the comparison of campground use, there appears to be a reduction there as well, from 125,000 permits sold in 1976 to 118,000 in 1979.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, you know there are a number of different ways of looking at the figures. For instance, we found a fairly substantial increase in the number of day passes being purchased, whereas the seasonal permits being reduced as the member indicates; one would have to analyze the statistics in greater depth to be able to ascertain precisely what took place.

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

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, just before we pass that, I wonder if the Minister could advise, in view of the nosedive we've seen on the permits, what are the fee schedules. Has there been an increase in park fees? Is that the reason why there are less people availing themselves to our parks because of the increase in fees that I believe was put in last year?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, in response to the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, there have been no changes in the fee structures last year and none are being contemplated for the coming year.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: (e)(2) — pass — the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, the Minister may be correct in what he has told the Member for Ste. Rose, however there must have been a fee increase since the P.C. Government has had administration of parks, because the statistics in the Parks Branch indicate that even though there's been a significant reduction in the number of seasonal permits issued the revenue hasn't declined that much. So can the Minister indicate if there has been an increase over the period of Progressive Conservative Government?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't have a ready answer for the honourable member other than to reiterate that I can categorically state with the support of staff that there have not been fee increases in the last two years. There are other factors of course that contribute to the downturn in park visitors, and I say quite seriously certainly the price of gasoline has had its impact on the amount of travelling by automobile that has occurred.

I know the honourable member has the annual report before him. He may wish to refer to page 124

which practically displays the total camping permits as well as the vehicle attendance in provincial parks which tends to support what I said earlier, the steady growth, substantial growth, from the early Seventies right through to about the year 1976, and then a decided levelling off in some instances in the vehicle attendance particularly which would affect the park permits or entry fees, indeed a decline.

MR. BOSTROM: It appears as though the graph does not indicate, because it lumps a lot of figures together I suppose, the significant decline in the number of seasonal passes. That's the part I was really questioning. If the Minister could find out from his staff if they have made any studies at all to find out why the seasonal passes have declined so drastically. There must be some reason for that, why there would be a decline from 47,698 for example in 1977 to 33,448 in 1979. That's quite a large decline in seasonal park entrance permits.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, could the honourable member indicate to me what page of the report he is referring to in reading out those?

MR. BOSTROM: Page 126, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ENNS: Page 126 — I refer the Honourable Member to page 114 which indicates for instance in the one area which is of course included in the revenue picture, where it is a comparison of angling licence sales and revenues, that there was a flat 10 percent increase in the angling licences that was put in effect in the years 1976, 1977, and that increase has been the only one that has held in place to the present year, and that accounts for some of the increase in the revenue that the honourable member is indicating.

MR. BOSTROM: I wasn't referring to angling licences, Mr. Chairman, I was referring to park entrance fees, and it's quite a different item.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, allow me to undertake to provide that information for the honourable members when next this committee meets and perhaps, Mr. Chairman, it would be an appropriate time now to pass out some of the information that I agreed to provide to honourable members as a result of their examination of the Estimates yesterday.

My only comment in passing them out is that they undoubtedly will cause some further questioning. I would invite that questioning to take place when the opportunity affords it, namely on my salary at the conclusion of my Estimates, or else we have to start something right back to square one on some of the answers that are being provided. I provide them to the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, assuming that he will pass those on to the Honourable Member for St. George, some of them that he may have asked about yesterday.

MR. BOSTROM: Okay, thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: (e)(2) — pass; (f) — pass; 5 — pass. Resolution 103, resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding, \$10,154,600 for Natural Resources, Parks \$10,154,600.00.

6. Lands — Mr. Minister, do you have a comment to make?

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Chairman, I think the position of the government is reasonably well known with respect to the administration of Crown lands. The policy of the sale of Crown lands is of course still very much in effect. It principally involves the land under agricultural lease, although there are some requests being received and considered for sale of recreational lands. I invite the honourable members' scrutiny of this section of my Estimates.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister by way of introduction could further elaborate on what he's asking for in terms of his programs and new initiatives in the area of lands administration, lands programs, for the fiscal year 1981-82.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the specific new initiative that is currently being considered and under active review — active review means that we found the file — that would hopefully satisfy more of the many requests and applications that the government is receiving for application to purchase Crown lands.

The government, I think, correctly and advisedly initiated the program with very specific conditions attached to it. I can reiterate some of them. There was of course a concern that nobody be placed in a forced position of purchase, that for many the option of leasing would continue to be one that in their estimation would be desirable. Furthermore, the concern for an orderly dispersal of these lands was of prime concern to the government and therefore only lands that had been under lease as of October 1977, over a five-year period, were being considered.

In addition to that, numerous other restraints were placed on the sale of land, subject to the concerns that other disciplines of government, namely, Wildlife; Department of Highways' concern for gravel rights; Department of Water Resources in terms of flooding implications on certain lands. All of these were hurdles, if you like, that a particular piece of property had to overcome prior to its being made available, upon application, for sale. It's the opinion of myself, and certainly shared by some of my caucus members, and I am being pressed as Minister at this time to review those conditions with the hope that without jeopardizing sound land management policy, some of the heretofore restrictions can be eased or removed to make more land available for sale. We have rejected a very substantial number of the applicants who have applied for purchase of land for the reasons I have just mentioned. That process is currently under review by what we refer to as the PLUC Committee, Planned Land Use Committee of Cabinet, and it's my hope that some changes to the guidelines which we are currently operating under that cover the sale of Crown land will be in effect before too long.

It may be of interest to the honourable members of the committee to have some idea of the scale of the program. In 1979, since this government policy was adopted, these are the kinds of requests and this is how they have been dealt with. To date, there have been some 1,244 parcels of land comprising of some 165,000 acres applied for. Of those, 201 parcels were rejected; 597 parcels were approved for sale; 446 parcels are in the clearance process; and

186 parcels transferred. Revenue to date from the sale of this land amounts to some \$1.4 million.

We have also, of course, embarked on a sale of recreational lots, and this refers to recreational lots outside of the provincial parks system. In total, we have some 6,400 recreational lots under lease; 5,250 of these lots are in provincial parks so by far the substantial amount of these parks would not be affected by any sales policy. There are some 1,150 on other Crown lands.

The department is in the process of registering subdivision plans in the Land Titles Office and appraising all recreational lots to determine current market value in order that tenants of long standing will not be penalized and in recognition of the developmental input that they have made, the sale price to tenants will be discounted, based on the length of time that they have held these leases. Again, this matter is currently before Treasury Board and a policy, when decided upon, will be announced in the very near future.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister can advise me if the rental rates have increased in the last two or three years?

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

MR. ADAM: There was no change at all in the rental rates? What are the rental rates? Are they different . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I am assuming that the honourable member is asking about agricultural leases on Crown land, is it?

MR. ADAM: No, I am asking about the one we were just referring to and that is cottage lots on the lakes. I believe that's . . .

MR. ENNS: The staff advises me that there has been no change, Mr. Chairman, and the rental rates vary from in the range of \$60.00, \$80.00, to \$100.00 per lot.

MR. ADAM: Is there a list available as to where these properties are, these lots are; we do have enquiries from time to time?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, they can be made available. There are computer printouts that can be provided to an honourable member if he should make that enquiry to the department.

MR. ADAM: Then I am submitting it now. Is that satisfactory?

MR. ENNS: To the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, your wish is my command.

MR. ADAM: With regard to other Crown lands, could the Minister elaborate on what is happening on Lake Winnipegosis in regard to the refusals there to sell Crown land because lake frontage Crown lands does cause concern to some residents where a

neighbour may be able to buy Crown land because he is maybe half a mile off the lakeshore, or a mile; and someone who has been leasing land for a number of years would like to purchase certain Crown lands that he had been leasing and is turned down because of some program that may be under way. Maybe the Minister has the information at his fingertips and maybe he can elaborate on what is happening there.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, there could be, of course, a number of reasons for a particular parcel of land being rejected for sale. I am aware that, particularly in the area he is speaking about, the Lake Winnipegosis area, I would suggest to him that the reason likely would be because of prior water right reservations that have been placed on those lands.

I would also want to indicate to the honourable member that these kind of lands are very much part of the review process and are undergoing that review process for reconsideration that I just mentioned a little while ago. I think a case can be made, in fact, we are pressing Water Resources to establish, with some degree of assuredness, whether or not those originally applied for reserves — and these are essentially Hydro reserves placed on lands — bordering lakes that somebody believed at some time in the future, and that's a fairly general application, Mr. Chairman, by the way, to many lands bordering on our lakes that years ago a general hydro water reserve was placed on them. It's my belief and a belief I think that is going conviction within the department that the current policy can and ought to be relaxed, that would allow for the sale of some of these lands.

However, as I indicated this subject matter is under review and again I would hope to be in a position to make some policy statements on this matter very shortly.

MR. ADAM: Yes, is there a study being undertaken in regard to Lake Winnipegosis, for the possible construction of a dam on the Waterhen River.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, there's no such study taking place at this time.

MR. ADAM: It would probably cause panic if we get an answer in the affirmative. Some of the applicants for Crown lands have been refused on the grounds that a study is under way in regard to water reserve and until that study is completed those lands are not for sale. Now we've heard about proposals for a dam on Lake Waterhen 20 years ago, 30 years ago, and we're looking at a dam possibly in 20 or 30 years from now, in the future and I left for a while to go down and see if I could find a copy of this letter, but I just couldn't put my fingers on it so, I'll probably run across it.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, firstly we are dealing with the question of sale of Crown lands and not returning to the debate on water resources as such, but I can understand and I can appreciate a farmer being left with that impression, that there may be some plans for some hydraulic construction or hydro requirements in or about that area when he receives a notification that suggests to him, or tells him that

his application for sale has been rejected because his land lies in a hydro power reserve. Just the wording of the letter can leave that implication. I want to completely satisfy the honourable member that does not in any way denote any specific plans, and I can categorically state to him that there are no plans and no study being undertaken around Lake Winnipegosis for these purposes. It is part of a general policy that was placed in effect many years ago, I suspect it dates back to the early twenties or the thirties where, in a general way, lands that might have at some point in time been considered for potential use for storage purposes, for reservoir purposes; that might have at some point in time contemplated the raising of particular lake levels, bodies of water levels that the Crown then had. It's an interest protected that would enable the Crown to proceed. That kind of a general restriction applies to much of the land that the honourable member is interested in, in and around Lake Winnipegosis, that particular policy of some longstanding that has been in effect, as long as I can remember, is being reviewed as to whether or not that is still realistic and ought to be binding or preventing us from the disposal or sale of some of the lands that are being applied for.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to make a comment on that. I'm glad the Minister brought up the information on the statistics regarding the sale of Crown land, that's a question that I had for him. I believe my colleague from Ste. Rose requires a bit more specific information, will be posing that question afterwards.

I'd just like to comment on the government's policy with respect to the sale of Crown land. I really do not see this as being any great benefit to those that have cottages on Crown land at the present time. The practise in the past has been for people who have vacation home lot leases to be able to sell their lot to whoever they may wish to sell their lot to, and because of the location of the lot more often than not the market price of the cottage sitting on a lot had included in it an implied value for the land, because it was the practise of the government to automatically transfer the lease to anyone who purchased the cottage which was sitting on the lot.

So that I don't think you would find very much difference between the sale price of cottages in, say, the Whiteshell Park that are on a waterfront and the sale price of a cottage lot which someone has purchased from the government on a location outside of the Whiteshell Park. If it were in similar aesthetic settings; that is, say, lakefront property, because people were really buying, not only the cottage, but they were buying the location, regardless of whether it was private property or leasehold property. So they are really six of one and half a dozen of the other. The only possible difference could be that it may make someone feel a little bit better and sleep a little bit easier if they had that title in their safety deposit box of their bedside drawer. I can see that emotional attachment and understand that emotional attachment to owning a piece of property. There's nothing really changed as far as the person who owns the cottage, other than

their being able to perhaps exercise the option of selling a little more flexibly than otherwise. As far as the selling price is concerned, I don't think they will have any great advantage.

In terms of the sale of lots, I was interested to hear the Minister's comments with respect to the 1200 or so lots that are outside of the Parklands which fall under this policy. I was not really clear on the statistics involved there and I would like some further information on that if he could. Exactly what number of those are now up for sale, that is where the present cottage lot-holders are applying for purchase of those lots. Is there a percentage that he can give us, or an actual figure in which he can supply the committee?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the best way to answer that question for the Honourable Member for Rupertsland is to indicate to him that the same problems exist in the sale, or in making possible the sale of these recreational lots, as exist with agricultural lands. That is that in some instances they lie within power reserves; in other instances we have a fair bit of work to do to provide the legal subdivisions prior to title being able to be made available for sale of the lots, and also I would imagine that there may be some other departmental concerns, from time to time, that may be registered against the sale of a particular piece of property. It could be for soil erosion purposes; it could be for wildlife purposes; roughly the same kind of conditions prevail.

Therefore, I cannot answer his question as to the percentage of that 1,150 recreational lots that are technically available for sale on a broad basis, I suppose they all are, subject to these policies being reviewed and some of the difficulties being overcome.

To answer his lead-in question, let me though make it very clear that the government is not imposing any sale policy either with respect to agricultural farm lands or in the case under discussion now with respect to recreational lots. If, to answer the honourable member's question, he sees no particular real change occurring and if no benefit is perceived available to a prospective purchase, he will obviously not purchase.

On the other hand the member is also quite correct that there are those who feel that they would like to own their property, and I happen to be one of them. If I were to believe at all in an entrenched Charter of Rights in our Constitution, I for instance would like to see the right to own property in that type of an institution, but I don't believe in an entrenched Bill of Rights, so I enter that argument in a lighter vein.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, one other question and it's related to Crown Lands Administration and that is, I would like to know what the Minister's policy is with respect to wild rice lakes and the leasing of same.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I must acknowledge that the whole area of wild rice is an intriguing one and one that I look forward to facing up to the challenges that this issue apparently presents to any number of Ministers in the past and administrators within the department in the past.

There is under review currently, serious consideration for some of the concerns that have been expressed to us by some of the rice farmers who have suggested to us that the lack of longer term leasing is one of the prohibitive factors that has discouraged the kind of development that apparently is required for a good and healthy wild rice operation.

I am advised that in the Province of Saskatchewan they have proceeded along the course by providing longer term leases to the rice farmers in that province, who then feel confident in doing the kind of development work including seeding and so forth that can considerably improve the production of wild rice.

I must indicate in a general way that there seems to be two distinct problems in the area of wild rice. One is the encouragement of its growth and harvest and the other one is its processing. There is no question that it would be desirable to ensure that the bulk of it should be processed within the province. Again, it provides employment opportunities and it maximizes the returns to our farmers.

However, there is, as I think the member is aware of, some difficulties particularly in the processing end of it and if the member is asking for the policy direction that I have provided to the department and the course that we are proceeding on is to try to solve one question at a time; that is to see whether or not we cannot bring about an improved situation with respect to the leases, the tenure of leases to the farmers and then tackle the processing end of it. That's the order of things on which I am approaching the wild rice program.

It would be my hope that for the coming season, individual operators will have made available to them a better lease arrangement that will hopefully encourage them, not simply to mine the rice patties as it were, but to encourage them to develop and enhance the growth and production of wild rice.

MR. BOSTROM: Just in reference to the Saskatchewan program, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister if he has also looked at the incentives which the Saskatchewan government have provided for wild rice producers.

One of the things which they are doing there, I understand, is providing literally seed money in the way of seed to the wild rice lake lease holders. They are buying the rice green from various producers and concentrating on picking up the best quality wild rice and providing that as seed, literally seed, to the wild rice lease holders in order that they can perhaps increase the production. I understand this program has been very successful in the Province of Saskatchewan and they are obtaining a much higher return in terms of production on those lakes.

At the same time they are looking at the question of processing and they are approaching it very cautiously as well because the processing area is one which is very complicated, and it is one which is quite difficult to administer because of the perishability of the product, and one which I believe lends itself to some centrally located processing facility of one type or another. There are one or two in Manitoba that do custom processing now so that there is no great urgency for that part of the question to be answered.

However, on the production side I would ask the Minister specifically if he has considered trying

something along the lines of the Saskatchewan program, providing seed to the farmers.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I welcome the comments by the Member for Rupertsland. I don't pretend for a moment to be fully conversant with all that needs to be done in the area of wild rice production and its management, but I have made it my business to have enquired about some of the things that are possible, and some of the very encouraging and worthwhile things that they are doing in Saskatchewan with respect to this crop.

We certainly acknowledge that we are underutilizing the potential in this area and that we could be well advised, particularly if we get our house in order so to speak, with respect to the lessee arrangements and the allocation problem sorted out.

There is a continuing concern that was expressed and carried out by members of the previous administration and is carried out by this administration, that there be every opportunity made available for our Native brothers to be fully involved or active in this, what might be described as one of the traditional means of securing some economic benefit.

We have to attempt to straighten out the situation to the extent that we have a healthy number of wild rice operators who have some security of tenure in their leases with whom then future developmental programs could well be considered and worked out.

I want to assure the honourable member that all of the suggestions that the honourable member makes that certainly we will be taking a look at what is happening in Saskatchewan. My information is that Saskatchewan in the last few years has had a very noticeable and encouraging increase in their production of wild rice and some of the specific suggestions, the provision seed, etc., would be the kind of things I think the department would certainly want to look at. I think first things first, we have to provide that base of a good group of operators who are prepared to invest their time and their money in the harvest of wild rice.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. MCBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, while we were on this section and since I may not be here this evening, I wrote to the Minister about the Crown lands and access to Crown lands where people have a licence or permit to have a fish farm, where they are using a lake for fish farming. The concern of some of the people that have been in or want to be in fish farming is that there is no way they can restrict others from coming into the area where they are stocking the lake to harvest for their own commercial enterprise.

In Southern Manitoba this isn't a big problem because most of these pot holes or small lakes are within private land so that people can restrict access to them. But in the North where the fish farming has been tried, or trout farming has been tried, most of it has been done in areas that are Crown land and a permit is given by the province. There is of course a problem, Mr. Chairperson, when somebody buys fish and stocks a lake and then others come in and angle in that particular lake. The Minister in his letter, I

don't think, really deals with the question, or doesn't deal with it adequately.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it would be in order for me to ask what I did say in my letter?

MR. McBRYDE: Okay. What the Minister says in his letter is that, "Trout farming is allowed on both private and Crown lands. Those waters which are in Crown land are open to public access. In most cases angling in these lakes is impractical because the food supply is so plentiful fish may pay no attention to the artificial bait. Usually the trout are planted in the spring and harvested in the fall, but in northern lakes where fish growth is slower the trout may winter over. When this occurs the lake may be best be used as a stocked trout water for use by Manitoba anglers, thus the only lakes which need protection from public access are those which can be best be used as stocked angling lakes. An example of this situation is Webster Lake which started as a trout farming operation and is now one of the best rainbow trout fishing lakes in the North".

I think it is from a general public point of view that's laudable, but from the person who bought the fish and stocked the lake, they are just not going to do that. It's a side line for people who are in the bait business and have other operations going, and the lakes that are stocked are normally ones -- I mean you stock a lake that doesn't have other fish in it -- so they are normally ones that are not productive for other reasons.

So, I wonder if the Minister would like to comment on that or whether he would like to look a little deeper into it and see if there is a way where a lake is suitable basically for trout farming or fish farming and not for much else, that there might be a way to restrict access so that the person could have the full use of the lake for the fish farming without having everybody come in there and harvest his fish for him.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I recall the original enquiry by the honourable member and there is a difficulty and as the honourable member suggests in his own question, that from a public policy point of view the end result may be laudable. I appreciate the concern that the individual who wants to enter into this kind of arrangement as a personal business to supplement income, it doesn't really provide the answer for him.

I would only suggest to the honourable member that I am certainly open to constructive advice in this instance. I can relate to the honourable member that I have empathy for his position. As a cattleman I lease Crown land, I don't mind having the odd one of Her Majesty's deer come and graze on my land, but I take exception to too many neighbours cattle coming on my land, if I have the land under lease.

It would seem to me that there ought to be some way, that one would have to look at it on a very individual situation with respect to the location and size of the lake before one considered granting those kind of tenants rights, if you like, to property that he doesn't own. I simply say we do that with Crown land on a regular basis and in this way I think the member has a point that there is some northern discrimination being exercised where this kind of fishery is being encouraged in Southern Manitoba where these bodies of water usually are found on

privately held lands, but that this same kind of activity is not available to persons living in areas where the land is essentially held by the Crown.

Let me undertake, Mr. Chairman, to review that situation and to see whether or not some solution to it can be found. My Deputy Minister advises me it would have to be approached possibly very individualistically, each individual application would have to be looked at as such so that other interests would not be precluded from the use of that, like to the detriment of the general public.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson it just sort of makes common sense, I guess, to me then and I think the Minister agrees, to see if there is some way where a permit is granted to restrict access to some lakes. As I said, I don't think this is a big problem because the lake would not have been a fishing lake up until that time. I'm not sure whether it's Webster Lake or not, but there was a northern lake that was stocked and fish farmed but then when people start to find out about it, over the years, then the sports fishing was so great in that stocked lake that the person just gave up; they just stopped stocking it. I'm not sure how many people are interested, there might be five or six people that would be interested in a small operation where they could use this as a side to another business and I imagine that it's sort of a legal; if the Minister agrees with what I'm saying then it's just sort of a matter of working out the legality of how you restrict access to that particular kind of small lake.

MR. ENNS: Yes, essentially that's what I'm saying, except with a reservation that the department would have to be in a position to exercise their decision as to whether or not that lake, in the first instance, could be used in such a manner. I might also suggest as an answer to your friend that finds himself in this position that perhaps a royalty on fish caught could replace that lost income.

I'm further advised, Mr. Chairman, that it does, particularly in the areas that my honourable friend is speaking about, in remoter northern areas, it does present an enforcement problem. Last night I was put under some criticism for the enforcement image of the department and I suppose I should be wary in inviting any new situations which would call for greater enforcement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour of 4:30 having arrived, Committee rise for Private Members' Hour.

SUPPLY — EDUCATION

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Lloyd G. Hyde (Portage la Prairie): I will now draw the members' attention to Page 47, Resolution 52, Item 3.(a) — pass.

The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have heard a number of speakers on the topic of the new Education Finance Program. Last evening two or three different members of the opposition spoke on this particular topic.

The Member for Elmwood came out with one of his ridiculous statements — he has made a lot of them but this one had to be the most ridiculous — he made the statement that the new Education

Support Program would bleed Winnipeg dry. Nothing could be more ridiculous, Mr. Chairman, than that statement. But of course he makes them hoping that someone in the media will think it's catchy and pick it up and if he is successful then he is very pleased. I say this is one of the most ridiculous of a whole list of ridiculous statements that he has made in the past.

If in fact he believes that this plan will bleed Winnipeg taxpayers dry, then I would like him to explain to the taxpayers of Winnipeg No. 1 why it is that this year they are seeing a 16-mill drop in school taxes in Winnipeg No. 1? Is that bleeding someone dry, Mr. Chairman? —(Interjection)— Hardly at all, Mr. Chairman. Let him explain to the taxpayers of St. James-Assiniboia if they are being bled dry when they see a five-mill drop in their school tax. Let him explain to the taxpayers of Assiniboine South if they are being bled dry by an eight-mill drop in their school taxes.

In fact, let him explain to the taxpayers of St. Boniface School Division, who see an increase of three mills, Mr. Chairman, certainly not a very significant increase at all, let him explain to them if they are being bled dry. If this plan had not come in, Mr. Chairman, the taxpayers of that division would probably have seen an increase of some 10 or 12 mills, but according to the Honourable Member for Elmwood, they are being bled dry.

Well, Mr. Chairman, let's proceed to Fort Garry where they are seeing a 10-mill drop in their school mill rate. Is that being bled dry, Mr. Chairman? We can go on. Norwood, where they are seeing a six-mill drop in their school tax, and I suppose the Honourable Member for Elmwood would say that's being bled dry.

Mr. Chairman, if anyone was being bled dry it was the people of this city by the old financing plan that had been band-aided unsuccessfully for a number of years, specifically by the gentlemen opposite when they were in government. Certainly if he looks at Seven Oaks, let him go to that particular area and that school division, let him ask them what has happened to their school mill rate and it's down some three mills. Is that being bled dry?

He makes the statement, Mr. Chairman, and I am sure he is very proud of it, that the people of Winnipeg are being bled dry by the new school finance plan. If he is going to make statements of that type, Mr. Chairman, he will lose his whole credibility in this House and, if he wants to risk that, then I guess he is welcome to go ahead and do it. In fact, Mr. Chairman, if he wants to use a blood example, if that's the metaphor he wants to deal with, let him use transfusion because that is what we are seeing this year, a \$70 million transfusion into the school system that is helping the taxpayers of this province; that's what it is, a transfusion, Mr. Chairman. Where is the bleeding?

Now, if the honourable member sees \$70 million of a transfusion as bleeding, then he certainly suffers as far as his biology, medical background, haematology, whatever it may be is concerned. He can't really discern the difference between the two, in fact, perhaps even common sense is one of the things that may be causing the problem here.

I wanted to address that particular point, Mr. Chairman, because although being ridiculous,

unfortunately sometimes people make these ridiculous statements and if no one refutes them they are taken as being the gospel and I wanted to take a minute to show just how absolutely ridiculous that particular statement happened to be.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Transcona entered the debate and made many statements. I certainly can appreciate the fact that he saw fit to rise and speak on behalf of the school division in his area; that's what you would expect of an MLA. He attempted to put forward some arguments in support of a particular position and then he made a bunch of statements, Mr. Chairman, which, again, I would suggest do harm his credibility.

He said the new Education Finance Program was political; that it was hurried; that it was a bad system. Well, I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, if it's political, where is it political? Let's ask the Leader of the Opposition what effect this new education finance plan had in his area, in the Selkirk School Division. I understand the mill rate there for schools will drop some 11 mills and in the Town of Selkirk, I believe it's 16 mills. Now, is that political? Did we bring in a plan so that the Leader of the Opposition would be harmed or gain by it? Not at all, Mr. Chairman.

Let him look at the other school divisions in this province that have gained by this particular plan; let him look at those that may have suffered some increase in their mill rate. The irony is, Mr. Chairman, just the opposite of what the Member for Transcona would like to suggest, I can think of the one rural area that has had some increase, Dauphin, and of course we are the benefactors in that case because the MLA from that area, of course, sits on this side of the House. Now, is that political? Did we design a plan that would supposedly not reward Dauphin?

We can look down at the Garden Valley School Division where, I believe, that's the other rural division that has some increase, Mr. Chairman, something in the area of two or three mills, not really significant, but there was an increase. Who is the sitting member in that area? The Member for Rhineland who sits on this side of the House, Mr. Chairman.

Let's look at all of the big gainers if you wish in the program, those who had very significant decreases in their mill rates. You know, an awful lot of them are represented by people sitting on the other side of the House, Mr. Chairman. For any member to stand up in this House and say the program is political, he is almost reaching the ridiculous state of the Member for Elmwood, who says anything, it doesn't matter whether it makes sense, whether it's logic, whether it can be backed up by the figures, just say it. You know, somebody may even pick it up on a radio clip, but say it. I'm a little disappointed in the Member for Transcona who I didn't think operated quite that way.

He also mentioned, of course, the fact that this plan was hurried, Mr. Chairman, you know undue haste in putting this plan into effect. Two and one-half years, Mr. Chairman, that we spent studying this particular plan; is that haste? Two and one-half years of consultation, study, research, talking to people across this province; is that haste? And when did we announce it, Mr. Chairman? In January, to give school boards plenty of time to consider budgets; to

have some time to familiarize themselves with the new plan. Is that haste? But the Member from Transcona, says, oh undue haste, not enough time spent on the program. How much time? Did they want to spend eight years, as they did looking at it and doing nothing? We spent two and one-half years of rather intensified work, Mr. Chairman, and I'm very proud of the final product.

Well, then the Member for Transcona says it's a bad system, a very bad system and he said, believe me, we will go to the people with this new financing plan and we certainly will be able to make great marks, because this finance plan is bad. Well, Mr. Chairman, if it's bad, why has it been able to do, in the majority of cases, what we thought it would do. If it's bad, why has it borne out what we figured it would do; that it would decrease taxes for a majority of the property taxpayers in this province; if it's such a bad plan, why has it done that?

If, in being a three year plan, it's going to provide the opportunity for school boards to plan for three years — and most school boards that I've talked to, some that have written to me, have certainly seen that as a very positive aspect of the plan — is that bad? But the Member for Transcona says, a bad bad plan, a bad system. Mind you, I haven't heard any other suggestion from him in three years as to a better system, but that's a bad bad system. He, of course, doesn't even like equalization across the province, although his leader does. His leader says the most positive aspect of the new finance program is the provincial equalization. The Member for Transcona obviously hasn't talked to his leader lately, in that particular aspect, and of course then the Member for Transcona started to refer to school division in his area, his constituency Transcona-Springfield, and he trotted out a lot of statistics. Some of them for 1980, the others I'm not sure where he was deriving them.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to also provide some statistics on that particular school division that may be of interest to the Member for Transcona because I think they're significant. Under the heading Total Expenditure, and I'm looking at school divisions in the urban area of Greater Winnipeg, increase in total expenditures from 1980 to 1981, the second highest increase in the urban area of Greater Winnipeg was Transcona-Springfield, Mr. Speaker, with a 15.9 percent increase; the second highest of 11 school divisions in the urban area. That is a statistic the honourable member didn't bother to mention last night, in fact I think he kept referring to statistics that are at least a year old now.

Then let's look at total expenditure per pupil increase from 1980 to 1981, and if we look at that, Mr. Chairman, Transcona-Springfield, the division he was referring to, has the highest percentage increase in the urban area, in the City of Winnipeg, 17.9 percent increase. I think another significant figure, Mr. Chairman. If we look at total cost per pupil for 1981, Transcona-Springfield stands in sixth place, in sixth place out of 11.

If we look at the percentage increase from 1980 to 1981 in operating expenditure we find that Transcona-Springfield is third highest in the city, third highest. Mr. Chairman, in percentage increase from 1980 to 1981, in total operating expenditure.

Well then let's look at operating expenditure per pupil, again for the same school division because the

honourable member's interested, and in operating expenditure per pupil the increase from 1980 to 1981, Transcona-Springfield is the second highest in the city, at 17.3 percent. Seventeen that's in operating expenditure increase. In operating expenditure per pupil, Mr. Chairman, it is fifth highest in 1981, out of 11 school divisions.

Well, again in the area of total operating expenditure, looking at the increase, Mr. Chairman, from 1975 to 1981, lest we think that there's been just something happened between 1980 to 81 — I think the honourable member was trying to infer that alone. Let's look at what has happened from 1975 to 1981 in operating expenditure, that's the total operating expenditure for the school divisions within the Greater Winnipeg area, and we find that in that case the increase for Transcona-Springfield was 118.2 percent, the third highest, Mr. Chairman, in the Greater Winnipeg area; the third highest out of 11.

I think those are rather interesting figures, Mr. Chairman. We could go on. In operating expenditure per pupil, if we look at the percentage increase from 1975 to 1981, the highest percentage increase in the whole City of Winnipeg at 130.1 percent was guess who? Mr. Chairman, out of all the metro divisions, Transcona-Springfield, and I thought that's another point that the honourable member would be interested in, and one that he could place along beside his other statistics that he was using last night.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member, of course, kept pointing to the new Education Support Program and said, well, it may be working other places, it's not working in Transcona-Springfield. I have to caution the honourable member and I have said it many times in this House since we brought out the program, that in those school divisions where their budgets were kept at a level in line with the CPI or very close to the CPI increase, they have not seen an increase in their mill rate. In those divisions that have seen fit — and again I stated, Mr. Chairman, it is well within their jurisdiction, well within their responsibility and it is their option if they so choose — to go beyond that level, particularly if they may feel they have some special project, or a once only program that they want to put in place. But if they do that, Mr. Chairman, then I think we have to be aware and the honourable member has to be aware, that they are doing that as an exceptional case, going beyond what is being provided to the basic program across this province.

I think the honourable member is probably aware that in this particular year the school division that he alludes to is receiving some \$16.9 million in provincial support. Mr. Chairman, that's about \$6.5 million more than they received in 1980.

If we go on with these figures, Mr. Chairman, and I think the Member for Transcona would be interested, we find some rather interesting things; that if this particular division had decided to keep their expenditures at the eligible expenditure level then their total mill rate in 1981 would have been 61.2 mills. Now, their mill rate last year, Mr. Chairman, was 69.7. If they had been able to keep their expenditures at the eligible expenditure level which takes into consideration the CPI increase, they would have seen a decrease in their mill rate in Transcona. Last year it was 69.7, following that particular

guideline it would have been 61.2. In fact, Mr. Chairman, in order to bring that mill rate in Transcona in line with last year's mill rate of 69.7, the Transcona-Springfield School Board would have had to find some \$810,000 in their budget.

Now, remember we are talking of a budget, Mr. Chairman, of some \$21.5 million, and of course that's a considerable amount of money, but school boards, Mr. Chairman, make those decisions. They determine their priorities; they determine what they will do this year; what they will defer to next year; what particular programs they will embark on in a particular year; what programs they may save for another year. School boards also, Mr. Chairman, have in the past, had the habit of building up surpluses in that operation and of course this was more necessary in the past than it is today because quite often under the old system they were forced to borrow great sums of money and many of them saw the accumulated surplus as a way around that problem of borrowing, but of course, we have removed the majority of the borrowing problem with the new plan. In the case of Transcona-Springfield, Mr. Chairman, as of 1980 their accumulated surplus was some \$846,000.00.

Now in some cases, Mr. Chairman, and again certainly their determination, school boards decide that they will use part, or all, or some of, or none of their surplus to lower the particular mill rate in their school division. They don't have to. There is nothing in law that requires them to, that is certainly their decision. But I only mention that point as another factor and another consideration in this particular case that the Member for Transcona has placed before us.

I'm informed that the Transcona-Springfield School Board this year, had an item for some additional capital of some \$280,000, Mr. Chairman. Now of course, I'm sure those are worthy projects but they are not projects that have been approved by the Public Schools Finance Board. They are projects that they have decided to embark on, on their own and of course, that is certainly again well there within their jurisdiction, it is their prerogative. But \$280,000, Mr. Chairman, in a school division where \$72,000 raises one mill is a considerable amount of money; again the school's decision prerogative, their decision, but it is over and above the basic support program.

I wanted to mention those points, Mr. Chairman, because I thought they do shed another side to the story that was being presented by the honourable Member for Transcona last night, when he was talking about the situation in his school division as he saw it and of course, I've spoken to the business of his concern about the abolishment of the Greater Winnipeg Equalization Levy. I'm always interested, Mr. Chairman, when someone speaks parochially in this House, when their scope only envisages their own constituency. When someone does that such as the Member for Transcona and he doesn't mention the fact that part of that same school division, the people living in Springfield Municipality, Mr. Chairman, paid 18.5 mills more than their neighbours in the Transcona School Division in 1975. How fair and equitable was that? But he didn't bother mentioning that, Mr. Chairman, he wasn't too concerned about those people.

I don't have that luxury that the honourable member has, Mr. Chairman, I have to be concerned

for all of the children in the schools of this province. I have to look at all of the taxpayers in this province whether they be in Churchill, Emerson, Virden, or Lac du Bonnet or in locations somewhere in between. It's fine for the honourable member to look at one location and say, oh, not being treated fairly, but he shuts his eyes to many other locations as well, Mr. Chairman.

He also mentioned something that I thought really had little bearing on the situation at this time. He complained that we had cut off funding for certain specific programs and he mentioned a couple of them, and I'm not sure that they even existed in the educational field, they may have existed in Community Services, but be that as it may.

He gave me the impression that he suggests that what government should do is not give school boards money in a block funding form at all, to spend as they see fit to provide programming for the children in their schools but government should go in with little bits of seed money and say to a school division, if you'll put this program in, we'll give you X thousand dollars. We won't say how long we'll give it to you but we'll give it to you for awhile and that is the way for government to act. Well, that's nonsense, Mr. Chairman, but it seemed to me the implication of the words of the honourable member for Transcona in what he was saying. He obviously by that statement, doesn't believe in the ability of elected trustees to make decisions as to where their support money from a central source should be spent. He would rather that it be spent by the central government. The state will decide that it'll be spent here, there and so on. Locally elected people will have little say in what will be done.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I could reiterate a couple of other points on the Educational Finance Program at this point but there has been some upgrading. Some budgets that were not finalized when we first started these Estimates have now been finalized by school divisions and I can report to honourable members opposite that the figures that I gave them yesterday are now out of date.

The number of divisions in this province with decreases or no increases now stands at 42 and the number of divisions with less than a 1 mill increase stands at 4, so a total of 46, Mr. Chairman, with really no increase that amounts to anything at all, or a decrease. Number of divisions with a 1 to 5 mill increase is now 3; number of divisions with a 5 to 10 mill increase is 1 and the number of divisions with over a 10 mill increase is 4, Mr. Chairman.

Now if the Honourable Member for Transcona can look at those figures and say this is a bad program, it's not doing what it was intended to do, we will certainly use this politically. We'll go to the people and we'll say to them, that program isn't working, it discriminates, it does this, it does the other thing. Well, he's going to have a tough time finding a sympathetic ear, I would suggest.

Again, I can give the honourable members other revised figures, and there are still two or three that stand to be revised, Mr. Chairman, that have not been finalized. But I said the other day, in talking about the mill rate ranges, that certain positive things have been accomplished there. I can now tell honourable members that the number of school divisions in the province where taxpayers will be

paying less than 70 mills now stands at 32 — less than 70 mills, Mr. Chairman. That is now 32 divisions. I think the last time I reported it was 31, and the number in 1980 was 18, Mr. Chairman. So these figures are even improvements over what I gave to the honourable members last day.

Mr. Chairman, I have to say to honourable members opposite who, it seems to me, are nitpicking on the program in spite of the fact, as I have told them, practically all divisions that I have talked to say, we think this is a good program, and I even heard that from some people in Transcona who said it's a good program, but . . . Generally, what I have heard from people across the province is the program is doing the job; it is a good program.

I have to say to honourable gentlemen opposite, let's look at it on a little wider scope than one particular division, one particular constituency; let's look at it on a provincial basis because it will assist two very important people in Manitoba. One of them is the student in the school, because it will provide additional supports to that student; and secondly, the taxpayer in this province. If the program is doing this, and there is every indication it is, Mr. Chairman, does that not speak for itself?

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you. I obviously have a few points to raise in response to the Minister's somewhat forced rebuttal of our comments on his plan of yesterday. His sensitivity makes me believe that we've hit home in this respect and instead of trying to take a look at his program, to make it better, he has retained the rigid inflexibility that he had when he first made public a program for education funding, devised in secrecy, which impacted negatively on certain school division, which is the point that we have been making.

I am astounded that the Minister gets up in this Legislature and criticizes me for being parochial when I bring to his attention, and I have brought to his attention in the past, the fact that this Education Funding Program impacts negatively on the area that I represent. I think that's the function of an MLA to do that, to come into this Legislature and say that this general program has negative implications for my area and I will in fact point out what they are and you say that my bringing that out is being parochial.

It is the Minister's responsibility to put forward programs and it is the Opposition's responsibility to criticize those programs where criticism is warranted. In the case of the Transcona-Springfield School District, in the case of River East, and in the case of some other school districts, this Education Funding Program impacts negatively. The Minister keeps trying to suggest that it impacts negatively, not because the Greater Winnipeg Education Levy was abolished but rather because the Transcona-Springfield School Division is to blame. The Minister is trying to switch blame away from his unilateral act, which reneges on an agreement reached in 1971 between the Government of Manitoba and the local taxpayers within the City of Winnipeg, Unicity of Winnipeg at that time. This is a renegeing of that agreement and the renegeing by this Minister impacts negatively on certain parts of the city, on certain local taxpayers within the city, and it impacts

positively on other local taxpayers within the city. There is no transition; there is no forewarning to the local taxpayer; boom, one minute they are caught in a very difficult predicament that appears as if it will get worse and worse into the future.

I asked the Minister yesterday, right at the end of my comments, if he would sit down with the Transcona-Springfield School Division that has prepared a very detailed brief and submitted it to the Minister, presumably in good faith, if he would send them a substantive, rational response to his brief. I asked him then if he would sit down with them and determine whether in fact they had any problems that indeed have been caused by a unilateral action on the part of the government; and that if they did have some problems caused by the unilateral act of the government without any forewarning, right at the end of the budget year, whether the Minister would be prepared to compromise, to recognize real problems and to act responsibly as, in my estimation, the Minister should.

His response is not to deal with that question; his response is to attack me personally for being parochial and then to trot out statistics saying that Transcona-Springfield are big spenders, a repetition of the statistics that he threw at my colleague, the Member for St. Johns, some two weeks ago. If you look at the statistics that I provided last night, statistics compiled not by myself, not by the Transcona-Springfield School Division, but rather by the Manitoba Association of School Trustees Cost Study of 1980 —(Interjection)— And that's an interesting year — the Minister says, "1980, right." Well, if 1980 is such a dirty year in the Minister's mind, why does he keep using it as the base year for the Education Funding Program of the Conservative Government of Manitoba? When I bring out 1980 the Minister says: Right, I'm not going to listen to you; I'm not going to listen to Transcona; I'm not going to listen because it's a 1980 figure. But the base year for his whole Education Funding Program is 1980. When did he announce the 1980 base year? In 1981. Why the delay? That's why I say that this is a blatant political document. The Minister was caught in a bind that he couldn't get himself out of. He promised that he would have that program announced by year-end and it didn't happen; it didn't happen. So I should be blamed; Transcona-Springfield shouldn't be blamed; River East shouldn't be blamed; we have to say who was supposed to get that document out in time? Who was supposed to consult? The Minister didn't. The Minister has to accept responsibility for that inaction. The Minister has to be accountable and the place for accountability first is in this Legislature and the ultimate place where he will be held accountable is out there with the general public.

Now, if you infuse \$70 million into an Education Funding Program after three years of restraint obviously people will welcome that; but if you do it unilaterally and change a whole set of rules when you do that, they impact negatively on people, the people affected will complain. The Minister says don't look a gift horse in the mouth; don't complain. The complaints put forward by the Transcona-Springfield School Division, by the River East School Division, are well-intentioned briefs that are the product of rational analysis. They haven't changed in their position for about five or six years, they have made

submissions. The Minister says, yes, I know, I have received submissions from the Transcona-Springfield School Division regarding the negative impact of the complete removal of the Greater Winnipeg Education Levy.

So they have done their job; they've indicated to the Minister that there would be a negative impact; they have tried to consult. But consultation to me, Mr. Chairman, is a two-way street; it entails a dialogue, the Minister has to respond back. Did the Minister respond back? No. He sat there silently with the briefs, past briefs of the Transcona-Springfield School Division, kept them quietly to his chest and then sprung this surprise package, this surprise Education Funding package, on the citizenry of Manitoba and on the local taxpayer within Transcona-Springfield School Division, and there are negative implications to it.

Again, I ask the Minister, will he recognize that he didn't consult, that there was no forewarning, and sit down with them and try and work out some type of a compromise arrangement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I would suggest to the honourable members that to be repetitious would be out of order. I would strongly suggest that the last 10 minutes of the member's speech has been repetition of what I heard yesterday. I would strongly recommend that the honourable member please take a different plan of attack, so to speak, rather than to be repetitious of the same thing. To me it sounds like I have heard this before. It sound repetitious and I would recommend to the honourable member that repetition is out of order and would he please take a different tact.

The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: I was responding to the comments of the Minister of Education who trotted out a number of statistics that he had trotted out in the past without being cautioned by the Chair at that time that his input to this debate was repetitious. But I'll in fact be prepared to follow the advice of the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I have allowed some repetition, repetition by repeating a second and third time, but when it becomes a third and fourth time I would have to rule it to be repetitious, to the Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: On the point of order, then, that you raised, Mr. Chairman, I have heard the Minister get up over and over again, and I'll pull out the Hansard when they are printed and show them to you, and point out the repetitious statements ad nauseum by the Minister, but as . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairman, I have the right to speak to a point of order without being interrupted by the Chairman. I am speaking on the point of order. Can I continue with my point of order?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, I didn't realize that the honourable member was speaking on a point of order.

The Honourable Member for Transcona on a point of order.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. My point of order is that in Estimates Debate you have people bringing out past arguments in response to each other; that is what debate is about. I made a point yesterday; the Minister responded today without dealing with the points that I raised yesterday. I asked him questions. I said would he meet with the Transcona-Springfield School Division. He didn't answer the question. Perhaps he forgot about the question that I asked; perhaps his attention was diverted. That's why I'm raising those points again, Mr. Chairman. I don't think they're out of order and I would ask the opportunity to continue to raise this very important point as to whether there will be consultation, dialogue, some attempt to reach a compromise solution to problems brought about unilateral change in the Education Funding formula. I certainly don't want to prolong the debate in here. I would like to see if we can use the debate as a means of providing a solution to the problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the honourable member.

MR. DOERN: On the point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I recognize the honourable member on the point of order, I think that I will respond to the Honourable Member for Transcona. I have not ruled the honourable member out of order. I have suggested and made strong recommendations. To the point that the honourable member was speaking on I had heard it three or four times and I did not rule it out of order. I think that for the sake of trying to be fair that I have bent over backwards to allow the honourable members the latitude that is required to investigate the Estimates. But it was just getting to a point where I thought that I should bring the honourable member's attention, that it is repetitive and would be ruled out of order if it was carried on.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, just briefly, there's an old saying that repetition is the mother of learning. I just want to say that we have made a number of points to the Minister which he has not replied to or chooses to ignore, and I think that it's incumbent on the Opposition and the privilege of the Opposition to try to require or force the Minister to answer, so we may do that by some repetition, we may do it by rewording, but I certainly don't think that the Opposition should simply cease and desist because the Minister chooses to remain silent on certain matters.

The other point I make to you, Mr. Chairman, is that this is one of the largest, if not the largest item, in the entire Estimates. This is a \$300 million item, which is 60 percent of this department and one of the largest items in the entire Estimates process. So I would assume that we have the right to debate it for a number of hours in our own way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I didn't realize the honourable member was speaking on a point of order and I had recognized the Honourable Member for Elmwood. — (Interjection)— At the point. Not at the time that I had recognized the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you. I would like the Minister to reflect upon the situation of the Transcona-Springfield School Division. This is only the second time I've spoken on this issue in debate, once last night, once this morning.

I would like the Minister to reflect upon the situation that Transcona-Springfield School Division found itself in, where last year as part of their three-year planning program, they made a decision in 1980, possibly 1979, that they would enter a three-year building program geared to vocational training, something very much needed in that part of the City of Winnipeg. We have a lot of industries in the city in that part. We want to provide greater opportunities for our young people, so the Transcona-Springfield School Division entered into this building program. There are costs attached with that in terms of a capital nature, in terms of a future operating nature, and one year after entering into that program the government unilaterally changes the rules.

Now that's the part I want to impress upon the Minister. Just like Trudeau. I mean this government gets up and screams about Trudeau unilaterally changing the rules. We say that Trudeau shouldn't unilaterally change the rules, he should sit down once more with the Premiers. We say that this government shouldn't unilaterally change the rules. It should sit down once more at least, with the impacted school divisions. We've got some consistency and I say 1980 is an important year because that's the year that Transcona launched into a program and prior to that period, they were not a big spending school division, and the Minister knows that.

The Minister knows that that school division did cut back, as many of them had to cut back between 1977 and 1980, when this government brought in acute protracted restraint but here they are, look how they're rewarded for holding back, cutting back. 1980 is taken as the base year and then the rules change and they are the ones who are hurt. No one is objecting to a \$70 million infusion; no one is saying that the 80 percent that is covered is bad. We're saying that with respect to the special levy implications, there have to be some changes to take into account these very major and substantial impacts on a very significant number of people, both children and taxpayers and that is the nub of the question. The nub is not to adopt inflexible positions.

My key question is, will the Minister acknowledge that there are some anomalies, some difficulties. Is he prepared to sit down and try and work those out? There are a whole set of other questions and concerns I might raise but that ultimately is the base question I want the Minister to deal with.

One final footnote, because I don't want to prolong the debate. I take some exception to the Minister saying, he's never heard me put forward constructive criticisms before, or suggestions. We still have the Minister not dealing with the whole question of providing adequate transportation grants to urban school districts, that are trying to save taxpayers money by busing children from newly developed areas to areas where schools may not in fact be filled, and that is what the Transcona-Springfield School Division has been doing because it's been acting responsibly with respect to taxpayer's money in this respect, while getting some flack from local

people who would feel that the best thing to do is to quickly build a brand new school, if you have some subdivision development. But they've been busing their children to the available classroom space, without assistance from the Provincial Government in terms of urban transportation.

Rural school districts get transportation grants but urban ones don't, even though they might be saving ultimately the taxpayers of Manitoba money because capital costs are borne by the Public Schools Finance Board. So I say to the Minister, is it not true that I've raised that concern for three years running now? Is it not true that for three years running, the Minister said, yes we'll look into that matter? Nothing's been done on that with respect to that problem, but that is a side issue. I just throw that one point out to the Minister in my rebuttal. I don't want to confuse the issue.

I don't want to divert attention from the critical issue facing us right now, namely, will the Minister look or has he looked at this brief presented to him in good faith by the Transcona-Springfield School Division, and supported by the way by members of that school district who are from Springfield? They aren't being parochial. They are saying, look, we believe that this impacts negatively on Transcona taxpayers, we know what the situation is, and even though we represent the Springfield portion of the school district, we back this submission. They submitted to the Minister in good faith; they would like to get a substantive response. I would like to get from the Minister a commitment that he will look at this carefully, determine what problems exist, sit down with the school district to try and come out with a workable solution. It is only that question that I would like the Minister to answer.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, there's always a danger of being repetitious in this House. Sometimes it seems that you provide an answer and people don't want to hear it. They ask a similar question or the same question, you have to repeat it again, they still don't want to hear that answer and I imagine the general ploy, Mr. Chairman, is to keep asking the question hoping that sometime you'll hear the answer that is most acceptable to you.

In this case, Mr. Chairman, facts are facts. I've presented them to the honourable member and he still of course is not prepared to accept them. He talks about the Minister of Education as being rigid and inflexible. I would suggest in this case that he perhaps is at least a match in that regard, and continues to state his case in spite of what particular information I have given.

He makes what I consider again, some rather outlandish statements to say that we've brought in this plan with no forewarning. Yes, it was a new plan, Mr. Chairman, but certainly we brought it in, in January. The school boards are still in the process of budget-making. That was the purpose of getting it announced in January, so that they would have time to gain some understanding of what the plan would do for them. They certainly received back an account of what the revenues would be in their particular case from the new plan. They then had time if they so wished to adjust their budgets, and many school divisions do this, Mr. Chairman. I understand this is common practice, to submit a preliminary budget, then in light of whatever revenues will accrue to that

budget they then take another look at it. In some cases they may pare some things from the budget. They may prioritize. They may defer. They may add, Mr. Chairman. All of these things are possibilities and all of these things are carried out by school boards in this province, and this is indeed what has happened here.

Now if the school board decides to add, Mr. Chairman, already knowing what the revenues will be, then I think they are well aware of what the ramifications well may be. The member seems to be critical of the idea that we have used a 1980 base and that we are adding to that base each year with the CPI of the particular year concerned. I haven't heard that particular criticism, Mr. Chairman, of the plan. He certainly doesn't understand the plan if he thinks that's the wrong year to use.

I suppose if you ask a particular school division, they'd say, well use 1978, that year we spent a little more for a certain reason, so that would be the best year for us. Or use 1979, that was the year where we had some additional expenditure, it was rather unique, use that base. Well, Mr. Chairman, we've used 1980 as the base for all school divisions in this province. Again I say to the honourable member when he seems to imply that school boards had no choice here, that they didn't know what was happening and so on, that he's misrepresenting the situation.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have looked at the particular brief. Yes, I have studied the brief and yes, I will be responding to the brief. I can say to the honourable member, yes, I'm prepared to meet with any school board at a time mutually acceptable to both parties, and to discuss problems. Certainly there is no problem in that regard at all. I would anticipate that in the coming year there will be ongoing discussions with certain school boards who have particular problems, perhaps in relation to the plan. I can assure the honourable member that we will be — and I hate to use the word because it's overused in this House, it's overused by all governments — monitor the plan but we will certainly watch the plan very closely. We will study it. We will monitor it.

Where there are discrepancies that are identified, if those discrepancies are such that they are not reasonable, that school boards should not be expected to live with them, then we will do something about it. This plan is not carved in stone and we are not inflexible. Certainly if there are changes that must be made, that have to be made in the plan, and these changes become evident as we study it in the coming months, we will make those changes. There's no inflexibility there at all, Mr. Chairman, we're quite prepared to take that particular look.

The member talks about cutbacks, and that's kind of a glib phrase that's used on the opposite side of the House for practically everything, Mr. Chairman. I don't know when he talks about cutbacks if he is referring to — was it 1974 — when the government of the day increased the school grants in the province by \$1.6 million. That's in the province, Mr. Chairman. I know that's six, seven years ago, but that really isn't that long ago when a government, that some honourable members belonged to opposite, decided that \$1.6 million was sufficient to increase the allotment to school grants in this

province. I don't know if that was a cutback that year or not, or whether that was a real cop-out. Well, if the honourable member wants us to check into those figures we'll find that the tax credits certainly didn't compensate for that particular discrepancy.

The honourable member, Mr. Chairman, also keeps bringing up the topic of urban transportation. I am sure that's a topic that has been brought up in this House for perhaps the last 15, 20 years, and he is very insistent that government should be providing funding. Certainly we have been looking at that particular topic, Mr. Chairman. There is more funding now for transportation within the urban area than there ever has been; it is not quite the type of transportation the honourable member wants to see. We are now transporting children from one division to another in the urban area and paying grants for it if they are taking immersion courses; they are going from one division to another to take vocational courses; handicapped children of course are being transported and government is providing grants for that program as well. We haven't got into the program to this date that the honourable member suggests. We have been looking at it, yes, that's quite true, as governments have been looking at it for a number of years.

He suggests that in the school division that he's familiar with that they are bussing children from one side of the division to another and I can't let that pass by, Mr. Chairman, because I am not aware of the bussing patterns in that particular school division any more than I am in any other, but I do know that the previous government built a school in that division that was, I think, proposed to have a capacity of some 1,300 students; I believe it opened in 1976. I don't think it has ever contained more than 300 or 400 students, Mr. Chairman, and perhaps what the school division has been forced to do is bus students to fill up what was a government mistake, a gross error by the government of the day in building a school of that type when the students weren't there. But if he is referring to a problem like that, I have some sympathy with a school board that is faced with a huge school and no students to put in it, particularly when it has only been in place for two or three years.

So I reiterate, Mr. Chairman, at the danger of being accused of being repetitious, to the honourable member, yes there will be a response to the brief of that particular school division, as we respond to all briefs; yes, I am quite prepared to sit down with school divisions and discuss particular problems that they may have; and yes, we will be monitoring the program; no, we are not inflexible, we are quite prepared, if there are glaring discrepancies in the plan that are causing undue hardship to a school division, to certainly look at those changes that would remedy those discrepancies.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister appears to have been developing a rather thin skin over the last several hours of this particular debate. I had talked to him about a month ago in the hallways and we were discussing the advent of the education estimates, and I indicated to him that probably this item, the new financing program, would be the one area that would be somewhat closely examined by the Opposition because we quite frankly admit, at least I admit, that I do not fully

understand it or all of the ramifications of the program; it is a complicated program. There are aspects of it of which we approve; there are aspects of it which we don't understand; there are aspects of it which I don't agree with. It would seem to me that the job of the Opposition is not to be standing here and spending hours telling the Minister what a wonderful guy he is. He can hear that at home; he can hear that at Conservative party conventions; he can hear about that in the Conservative caucus; he can hear about that in Fort Garry and those few divisions where it is obvious that tremendous benefits have been accruing to specific groups as a result of this particular change, but he shouldn't really expect it from the loyal Opposition. What we would like is some facts and we would like the Minister to reconsider some aspects of the program.

Just to begin with, I have been getting some conflicting information, and this is one of the things that I don't understand. I talk to my local school division and they tell me that the River East education mill rate is going up by some 12 mills on residential property; the Minister has a different and lower figure. I am wondering whether there is some explanation for it; I don't quite understand that.

Now last evening I talked for a little bit and right after I finished we heard the Minister and then the Member for River Heights saying that I didn't understand the fact that in fact commercial property is being used, or money from commercial property is being used, to equalize taxes across the province. Of course I understand that, it's been done at least since the old Foundation Program came into effect. Under the old program some 35 or 37 mills of commercial taxation were part of the Foundation Program, and there was about 5 or so of residential. This new program doubles the commercial input into the pot that will be distributed throughout the province, but at the same time it increases the residential input into this one pot by seven-fold. Of course it does a number of other things while doing that, and I am just wondering whether the Minister in looking at this program ever used a model of what would have happened, say in 1980, had this program been in effect without any changes in provincial funding whatsoever. Had you just had this program in effect, with exactly the same dollars into the program, who would have benefitted and who would have lost. I was just wondering whether that type of a calculation has been made because it would seem to me that any fool could devise a program that won't increase taxes for very many people when, at the same time as you are doing it, you are adding in about 25 percent extra beyond what you ordinarily would have put into the program.

I am also wondering whether the Minister has looked at what the likely effect will be considering that we will probably have inflation of somewhere in the area of 9 to 12 percent over the next three years unless something changes, and hopefully it does, but assuming we keep up with the current rate of inflation what will happen in the fourth year. That is what percentage of total education tax in Manitoba will then be attributable to the commercial rate, to the commercial tax, as opposed to the private residential? Will there have been an impact on total commercial taxation, and will there have been an impact on total farm and residential?

Under the old Greater Winnipeg Education Levy there were some serious difficulties developing, there is no question about that. When residential properties in Winnipeg No. 1 are required to pay at a higher mill rate than in my division then I am quite prepared to say that that is not fair and I'm quite prepared to say it should be equalized and we should have a somewhat similar rate across the city. When you now have the case where the commercial rate is being used for the benefit only for one portion of the city, forgetting about the Foundation portion, I see that as being unfair. I do not believe that it is fair that the residents of River East are required to pay, through their provincial tax dollars, for say the Convention Centre and, of course, through their municipal property tax they pay for the improvements for a place like that and then, when it comes to taking advantage of that place for their education tax, they are told, no, you are in no different a position with respect to the Convention Centre or the university or the airport or the Liquor Control Commission headquarters or the many other buildings, you are in no different a position with respect to those buildings than are people outside of the city, say, in Brandon, who didn't have to pay anything toward the infrastructure on those buildings. I don't see that as, I shouldn't say anything, I suppose as provincial taxpayers there were some inputs by those people but certainly not to the extent of other residents of the city. In fact other residents of the city, be they in River East or in Winnipeg No. 1 or in St. James, pay the identical amount toward the infrastructure for these buildings. So, I don't see it as being fair that our district is put into that position.

I would like the Minister to at least comment on or acknowledge the existence of the fact that when you have substantially different commercial rates, and commercial rates only applying as to their special levy for one district in Winnipeg as opposed to another, I would like him to comment on the existence of the fact, the possibility, that this will mean that different districts of Winnipeg will once again be competing for industrial sites, and that is competing with each other, rather than, as has been the case since 1971, the city councillors basically making a decision based on what is in the best interests of all the people of the city, where is the most logical place for industry or a commercial site to be developed.

Now, we are going to be in a position where River East will want that next industrial site because it will mean additional revenue into our education system, substantial revenue compared to what we had before under the old system. So, what I would like to know is whether the Minister in looking up this program, in the two-and-a-half years he spent and he indicated in his previous speech that it seemed as though that was all that was being done by some people in the department, well, did they try to come up with a program that would equalize the industrial taxes, benefit all of the City of Winnipeg to the same extent, from all of the industry of Winnipeg, without necessarily equalizing residential rates, for instance, and I'm just wondering what kind of calculation that would have brought us and would that have brought us more fairness? I tend to think it probably would have and that is not to say, again, that we do not recognize the certain special difficulties in Winnipeg

No. 1, that we would be quite prepared to fund on a special basis as we do transportation grants and other specific input into education; we have no difficulty with that at all. We recognize that education per student in River East will be cheaper than it will be in Winnipeg No. 1 and we also recognize that under a fair system that should not mean that we should pay less than Winnipeg No. 1.

On the other hand, once this program is fully in effect, what we fear is that we will be paying substantially more than Winnipeg No. 1. Well, the Minister is shaking his head, I'm just wondering what calculations for five years from now have been done. You know, here we are, we are in a position where on the provincial equalization you have only doubled, again only doubled the rate of industry into the pie, and you've increased the residential rate into that same pie by seven times, approximately six or seven times, and that's substantial.

I'm just wondering as well whether the Minister has made a calculation as to the amount of money Winnipeg would have paid into the old Foundation Program, in total, for the upcoming year — commercial and residential — and compare that to what they are now paying into it, as well as comparing what they would have taken out under the old system and what they are taking out under the new system. That would be just be to try to determine exactly what the impact has been between city and rural. That's not to say that there shouldn't be some shifts to make things fair for all taxpayers in the province. We don't have that much difficulty with a system that is fair, but we do ask that it be fair. That is one of the real concerns that we have here.

The Minister in poo-pooing what I said yesterday, in pretending that we didn't know that there was some equalization from the commercial base, suggested that Winnipeg is sharing far more than they used to. Well, I find that interesting, I find it interesting that Winnipeg and Fort Garry can share more than they used to at the same time as their rates are going down for the upcoming year. It seems to me that although it is true that they shared last year and the year before and many years previously, to a minimal extent, with taxpayers outside of Winnipeg, they shared substantially more with taxpayers within the City of Winnipeg. That is being eliminated by the program so I would hope that the Minister would look at a change to the program which would allow commercial taxation to be spread out amongst all of the citizens of Winnipeg, possibly on a per pupil basis, taking into account the special needs of Winnipeg No. 1 in addition. If there are any obvious injustices, with respect to the system, then I would hope that the Minister would be true to his word and be flexible and look at changes which will make this program more fair to all. Finally, I would hope that he would ensure that this program not simply be a hidden shift from commercial to farm and residential.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) — pass — the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, it seems like a long time ago when the Minister stood up, I guess it was an hour ago, and ranted and raved; he was in an angry mood at that time, I think he's cooled off since and in a fighting spirit making some nasty remarks

about members of the Opposition and indulging in a little bit of hyperbole, I assume, primarily because of the fact that he regards himself as the father of the new Educational Support Program and we're criticizing his baby. This is basically what is upsetting to him. Nobody likes to have someone say that their new baby is funny looking and it reminds me of a story, Mr. Chairman, of a lady who was on a train with her baby and she was bawling, bawling and bawling away.

A MEMBER: The lady or the baby?

MR. DOERN: Both, but the lady in particular. A conductor came up to the lady and said, "What is the matter, madam, why are you crying like this?" She said, "Well, a drunk came by, a nasty drunk, and he said that my sweet little pet was ugly, a hideous creature." The conductor said, "Oh, don't pay any attention to a drunk. I'll tell you what I'll do, I'll go out and I'll get you a cup of tea and I'll pick up a banana for your monkey." Well, Mr. Chairman, that's partly what we're talking about. The Minister is sitting there with his baby, proud as can be, and we on this side, sober as judges, that's the difference between truth and reality and we're criticizing his baby. We're saying that it's a funny-looking kid — (Interjection)— and we sent him a banana.

Mr. Chairman, that is the problem; that the Minister thinks he has created a masterpiece and the Opposition is pointing out some flaws. I want to say in passing to him that we've had three years of restraint and now the Minister is doing something in an election year which he thinks is going to be immensely popular, a jewel in the Conservative crown which is pretty tarnished at this point in time, he keeps talking about how this is really a significant breakthrough for 1981. He keeps limiting his remarks as I see them to the first year of the program and it's really over a period of time, it's really a question of whether or not the Minister's program will stand the test of time as to whether or not it is successful. I say to him that "one swallow does not a summer make" and that if he can crow about certain achievements that he thinks he's made, in spite of the fact that we have pointed out a whole series of difficulties, and in particular, pointed to a number of areas where the program is unpopular and apparently not working, then he is going to have to deal with that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister a number of questions and make some comments as well. The first series I want to ask him is for the 10 urban school divisions, whether he or his staff can indicate what the total budgeted dollars for each is; what the total Educational Support dollars are for each division; and third, the total Special Levy dollars for each? If he could come up with those three figures, the total budget, the total ESP and the total Special Levy for each of the 10 school divisions, I would like to have a look at that.

You know, we've talked a bit about consultation and communication, and it's already been mentioned by my colleague for Transcona that he feels that there is a parallel between what the Minister and the government is doing and what the Prime Minister and his government are doing in Ottawa. I notice that only last week the Transcona-Springfield School Division passed a motion to have their solicitor

consider challenging the government program in the courts. So the parallel becomes closer and closer. Talk about a Prime Minister and his Cabinet that acts in a high-handed fashion, doesn't consult, simply issues policies and directives, unilateral action. We're dealing with a question of resources and redistribution and taxation, now we're dealing here with court challenges. So one could make a pretty straightforward parallel between what is happening on the federal scene, which is deplored at every opportunity by the First Minister, and yet appears to be the manner in which he himself operates and possibly the manner in which the Minister of Education has operated in regard to this program.

I want to deal, when we get on to the next item or so, about the way the Minister acted in regard to a program that was developed for a number of years, I believe, in regard to a lifestyle course; how the Minister probably says that for two-and-a-half years they worked out this financing program and then brought it in, how a whole group of teachers and professionals worked on a course for the Minister only to have it torpedoed at the final stage.

Mr. Chairman, I have as I say a number of comments followed by a number of questions so I'll simply run through them and hope that the Minister will answer them either now or at some point this evening. It's my understanding and the understanding of some people that one of the problems with the Conservative proposal is that the assets of the various divisions tend to remain with them. It was pointed out to me that, under this program, Fort Garry's assets remain with the division and that Winnipeg's assets remain with the division. Now that appears to be contradictory but perhaps the Minister could comment on that. The Minister has said that he is replacing urban equalization with provincial equalization; I believe that is what he has indicated as being done. But it appears to be the case that he is enhancing provincial equalization and eliminating urban equalization. I ask him whether that is true? One of the most serious flaws in this program which I think the Minister has still not answered in a satisfactory manner is that the policy appears to reward extravagant spending and penalize efficiency so that, as a result, if that is true, it would deliver the most money to the divisions that spend the most money. Now that is I think a question the Minister must answer as to whether, by using 1980 as a base year and having his program cut in, he is not going to hurt certain divisions which are trying to catch up or get into the average or mainstream of educational spending and standards; whether he doesn't hurt those divisions and those that have already reached a certain level of maturity or enrichment or enhancement, whether they are not the ones who will benefit the most, and that consequently there's a built-in freezing of the present relationships to one another.

The other question, I don't even know if the Minister has even attempted to answer, is the fact that the balanced assessment per pupil appears to be the key to this problem that we are continually fighting. We're raising this on behalf of Transcona-Springfield, River East, St. Vital and St. Boniface. Mr. Chairman, the problem is, as has been said before, it's the ability to displace dollars which is the key; so

that every time Transcona levies to try to pay for what they need they can raise \$11,000 per pupil on balanced assessment; but when Winnipeg does the same, they get 23,000.00. So how do you rectify that situation? One division gets \$2.00 every time it moves in a certain way and the other gets \$1.00. It seems to me that situation will go on indefinitely.

Mr. Chairman, I have other questions but I would be happy if the Minister would answer some of those questions.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I have some of the information requested by the Member for Elmwood. He wanted the total expenditures for the urban divisions, I can give him those figures right now. Norwood, 5.3 million; St. James-Assiniboia, 37.2 million; Fort Garry, 18 million, this is for 1981, Mr. Chairman; Winnipeg, 103.4 million; St. Boniface, 19.9 million; Seine River, this is the part of Seine River in the City of Winnipeg, 10.3 million — pardon me, that's the whole division of Seine River, part of it lying of course in the City of Winnipeg — Assiniboine South, 15.1 million; River East, 33.6 million; St. Vital, 19.6 million; Transcona-Springfield, 21.6 million; Seven Oaks, 20.9 million.

The revenues that will accrue to these divisions from the province through the new Education Support Program are as follows: Winnipeg No. 1, 75.2 million; St. James-Assiniboia, 28.9 million; Assiniboine South, 11.9 million; St. Boniface, 15.6 million; Fort Garry, 13.6 million; St. Vital, 15.1 million; Norwood, 4 million; River East, 25.8 million; Seven Oaks, 16.4 million; Transcona-Springfield, 16.9 million and Seine River, 8.7 million.

I believe the honourable member also asked for the special levy requirements for 1981, Mr. Chairman, and they are as follows; Winnipeg No. 1, \$23.9 million — I'm rounding this off, I think the honourable member is probably satisfied with the rounded off figure — St. James-Assiniboia, 7.7 million; Assiniboine South, 3 million; St. Boniface, 3.4 million; Fort Garry, 4.5 million; St. Vital, 4.1 million; Norwood, 1.2 million; River East, 6.4 million; Seven Oaks, 3.9 million; Transcona-Springfield, 3.1 million; Seine River, 403.7 thousand. Those are the divisions and the information I think the honourable member was interested in specifically.

Then I believe there were some other remarks that the honourable member made. He was speaking about the program generally and he said you've replaced urban equalization with provincial equalization. Well, Mr. Chairman, I suppose that is correct to say that. If he in fact felt that we had urban equalization when we had a 40 mill discrepancy between the highest school division in the city and the lowest, a 40 mill discrepancy, if he calls that equalization then there was some urban equalization within the City of Winnipeg.

Yes, we now do have a provincial equalization across the whole province. He also asked the question, do I feel that this particular plan rewards extravagant spending, Mr. Chairman? Does it reward the division that, in his words, was spending extravagantly? Well, Mr. Chairman, what division was that? Could he identify the extravagant spenders in the province? Could he identify them? Could he tell us who they were? I think what he is probably saying, Mr. Chairman, is that some divisions had higher per pupil cost than others and he's regarding

that as extravagant spending. Yet last year, Mr. Chairman, I can remember the Member for Elmwood standing here and telling this House and telling the Minister of Education specifically, that a certain school division had costs that no other school division had and he was right.

He talked about all the special needs of the core area. He talked about the immigrant children. He talked about the programs for Native young people and he was quite right when he talked about them. But if he is now saying that in order to meet those needs a school division spends more and as a result can be labelled as being extravagant then I certainly take issue with that, Mr. Chairman. Certainly those divisions that were spending more in order to provide programs that were unique to their division, and we might use Winnipeg No. 1 as an example of that as it had many programs that perhaps are unique in the province because they had some unique problems, yes, as a result their base will be higher; their expenditures are higher, but I don't think the honourable member quarrels with that. I think he can see the logic of that situation, so I take exception. I think that's an unfortunate way to phrase his question to use extravagant spenders because I don't really believe that's what he meant, Mr. Chairman.

The balanced assessment per pupil is something that he's quite interested in and I say to him that really if he looks at the whole program the equalization aspect of the program takes care to a much greater extent of that problem that he sees as being paramount. The Educational Support Program itself this year takes care of some 85 percent of the eligible expenditures of school boards in the province. Some \$422 million, Mr. Chairman, in the Educational Support Program that is handled, not by local levy, not provided by local levy at all but provided by the ESP levy, the former foundation levy if that's what he's more familiar with, plus the provincial contribution. So the bulk of the financing is in that program. The remainder, Mr. Chairman, that comes back on local assessment through the local levy is some \$99 million spread across this province, in fact less than half of what we were faced with last year. So that problem that he identifies, that he seems to think is significant in this particular picture, has been minimized by the size of the total Education Support Program, \$422 million, Mr. Chairman, that is not handled by local levy at all, only the 99 million. Now he may maintain that the balanced assessment per pupil becomes a big factor in that 99. Certainly it is a factor but a much minimized factor, Mr. Chairman, in relation to what it has been in this province for many many years.

So I only point out to him that one cannot underplay the effect of the total equalization in this program, nor can one underplay what the ESP Program in total is doing, because it is providing the funding for 422 million, 85 percent of the eligible expenditures in the province. That is I think one of the most significant points, that is in comparison to a program last year, Mr. Chairman, the Foundation Program that was somewhere in the neighbourhood of half of this particular program and the local taxpayer through the local levy was faced with double the amount of local levy last year. Yes, in that situation the balanced assessment per pupil does become a bigger factor.

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

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have one or two questions of the Minister and I wanted to make a few remarks as well.

I had asked the Minister if I could get a breakdown of this \$290 million item under 3.(a). The Minister gave us some figures which totalled \$288 million and then told me afterwards that there was an additional amount for the private schools of 2.9 million. According to my arithmetic that comes to \$291.2 million, it still doesn't balance, Mr. Chairman. So the Minister might want to take a few minutes to just check that and perhaps he can make it balance.

I would also like to know what is included in the amount of some \$13.7 million that he listed under Other.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister in reply to some remarks made by my colleague, pointed out that this new ESP Program had in fact been many years in the making and that it was published in January in order to give the school boards ample opportunity to prepare their budgets. If that is the case then perhaps the Minister can tell me how many school boards in fact sent in their preliminary budgets under the format of the new ESP Program? And how many had in fact sent in their budgets under last year's format which was the old Foundation Program?

I suspect, Mr. Chairman, that the number actually using the ESP format in applying for their grant was somewhat low. In fact I would suspect there were very very few if any, who had been able to understand what was involved in this program, who were able to absorb the impact of each of these complexities on their own particular school division and to be able to fill in a meaningful budget to send in to the Public Schools Finance Board. In fact I have been told that most, if not all, of the school boards had sent in their budgets under last year's Foundation Program format and what happened was that the Public Schools Finance Board simply transposed the figures onto the new forms and shipped them back to the school divisions. That was the first indication that they had of the actual financial impact of the new ESP Program.

The Minister mentioned that all of the school boards he had spoken to had been quite pleased with the new ESP Program which comes as no surprise to me, Mr. Chairman, since the government is putting in another \$70 million under the heading of Financial Support to Public Schools, the amount for last year being \$221 million. So that would indicate to my arithmetic, an approximate increase of about 30 percent, almost a third of an increase in provincial government input in '81 over 1980. I wonder if the school divisions would have been any less pleased if the payments from the government had been made on last year's basis with a 30 percent increase.

I suspect, Mr. Chairman, that any school division in this province receiving an additional 30 percent in revenues from the government would not have been in a position to want to complain to the Minister. After all the last couple of years the increase has been in the region of some 5 to 8 percent I believe, just going from memory, of increases from the Provincial Treasury to school boards. The school boards in those two years did have some reason to complain to the Minister that provincial contributions

were not keeping up to inflation and of course they were correct. The Minister now comes in with a huge increase of 30 percent in one year which more than offsets those rather small increases of the previous two years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Five seconds.

MR. WALDING: If you're about to bang your gavel, Mr. Chairman, I will sit down and perhaps come back to this same topic when next we meet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour is 4:30. I'm interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour and will return into Committee at 8:00 o'clock this evening.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We're now in Private Members' Hour. Tuesdays the first item of business is Private Bills followed by Public Bills.

Bill No. 33, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan. (Stand)

Then proceed with Public Bills.

Bill No. 5, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Minnedosa. (Stand)

Bill No. 14, An Act to amend The Medical Act standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Rhineland. (Stand)

Bill No. 17, The Medical Act. The Honourable Member for Logan. (Stand)

Bill No. 19, An Act to amend The Veterinary Medical Act. The Honourable Member for Logan. (Stand)

Bill No. 23, An Act to amend The Condominium Act. The Honourable Member for Logan. (Stand)

Bill No. 24. (Stand)

MR. JENKINS: And also the other three bills that are standing in my name.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 28, the Honourable Member for Gladstone. (Stand). 30, (stand); 37, (stand); 40, (stand).

Bill No. 43, the Honourable Member for Inkster. (Stand)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 43. The Honourable Member for Inkster. (Stand)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 44. The Honourable Member for Gladstone

SECOND READING — PRIVATE BILLS

BILL NO. 44 — AN ACT RESPECTING THE BEAUTIFUL PLAINS COUNTY BUILDINGS

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON (Gladstone) presented Bill No. 44, An Act to Amend An Act Respecting the Beautiful Plains County Buildings for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple and very short bill. In 1906, the Town of

Neepawa and the Rural Municipalities of Langford, Lansdowne and Rosedale received title to the County Court Building at Neepawa, referred to at that time as the Beautiful Plains County Building. The four municipalities involved continued as partnership and ownership in operation of that County Court Building. Title was transferred at that time from the then municipal commissioner to the municipalities for the purpose of maintaining the said premises. By agreement with all parties involved the Rural Municipality of Lansdowne will divest itself of any interest in the said premises, leaving the matter within the jurisdiction and ownership of the Town of Neepawa and the Rural Municipalities of Langford and Rosedale.

The legislation is necessary to delete reference to Lansdowne in the 1906 legislation. Following passage of this legislation the Rural Municipality of Lansdowne will transfer its interest to the remaining three municipalities. This matter comes before the Legislature in the absence of any other mechanism for transferring title where the parties are in agreement.

That, Mr. Speaker, is a very brief explanation but also is a very brief bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Dauphin.

BILL NO. 45 — AN ACT RESPECTING THE TOWN OF DAUPHIN (2)

MR. JIM GALBRAITH (Dauphin) presented Bill No. 45, An Act to Amend An Act Respecting the Town of Dauphin (2) for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Dauphin.

MR. GALBRAITH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In 1934, the Town of Dauphin submitted to and received approval from the Legislature for special provisions respecting the rate to be added as a penalty for unpaid municipal taxes. The 1980 amendments to The Municipal Act increase the ceiling for such penalties for all municipalities. The Town of Dauphin now finds it necessary to amend the 1934 legislation bringing the town into line with other municipalities throughout the province. In that same 1934 legislation reference was made to the statute labour provisions under existing Assessment Act. These provisions being long out of date are repealed as well by this Private Members' Bill. The effect of this proposed legislation is simply to bring the Town of Dauphin into the same position as other municipal units throughout the province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

RESOLUTIONS

RES. 14 — EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES INNER-CITY

MR. SPEAKER: We then proceed to Resolutions. Resolution No. 14.

The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In speaking to this Resolution 14, Mr. Speaker, members will be aware that I've been working with Mayor Norrie and the Federal Minister, Mr. Axworthy, over the past months to reach agreement on a common approach to the core area of the City of Winnipeg. As Minister for Urban Affairs, and as a former city councillor I'm well aware, Mr. Speaker, of the many problems that exist in the core area and also of the opportunities that are possible in core area renewal and redevelopment.

The problems of the core area are complex and the tri-level approach now being taken is one which can look at the problems in a comprehensive manner. It provides the opportunity for three levels of government to work together and to coordinate their separate activities in a way which can compliment each other and strengthen the core area of Winnipeg. The coordinated and comprehensive effort required, not only on the part of the three levels of government but also on the part of the many business enterprises, community organizations and individual citizens who are concerned with the future of the heart of Winnipeg, can only be accomplished if there is a concerted effort by all concerned.

Since the time Mayor Norrie, Mr. Axworthy and I reached agreement on a common approach, as outlined in the Memorandum of Understanding which we signed on behalf of the three levels of government on September 22 last year, we've received over 165 submissions from interested groups, agencies, individuals and businesses who have provided us with valuable suggestions on the direction that the Core Area Program should follow. In January, the Mayor, Mr. Axworthy and I had the opportunity to hear over 60 public submissions at R. B. Russell School. The wide range of suggestions received in these submissions has identified many areas that need attention in the core area and has emphasized the need for a comprehensive approach to the core area of Winnipeg.

From the perspective of the Provincial Government, the core area functions as the economic and social heart of not only Winnipeg but also of all Manitoba. It includes not just the central business district, but it also contains the homes of one-fifth of the City of Winnipeg's population, and is the workplace of 37 percent of the jobs in Winnipeg, and it includes the location of the majority of our major commercial, entertainment, cultural and public institutions.

It is therefore imperative to keep in mind that the core area contains both our greatest successes and

our greatest failures. Side by side we find prosperous and exciting activities and, at the same time, some depressing physical and social conditions. It is imperative that the strength of the core area be expanded and that efforts be made to alleviate the disparities that exist within the core area.

In dealing with the core area it is important to remember that a concern for this area is not new, in fact, all three levels of government have been very active in building, programming and funding a very wide range of facilities and activities in this area, such as housing, health care, education, neighbourhood improvement and industrial and commercial development. The funding of the proposed Core Area Initiative is viewed as a strategic addition to the main body of public sector expenditures which is already committed to the core area to a very significant extent. The Winnipeg Core Area Initiative is being undertaken by three levels of government in response to the social, economic and neighbourhood conditions that exist in the core area.

I believe it is worth repeating the objectives of this initiative, as they were expressed in the Memorandum of Understanding last September, since they point out the varied approach that must be taken to core area problems if they are to be dealt with in an effective manner. The objective of this initiative is to provide increased employment opportunities for core area residents and to encourage appropriate industrial, commercial and residential development in the core area; and through the provisions of support services and facilities, to facilitate the effect of social and economic participation of core area residents in the development opportunities as they occur.

This will require the provision of expanded institutional and on-the-job employment training programs relating to specific job opportunities for core area residents; it will require that community improvement and home ownership, rehabilitation and rental programs are developed and expanded to provide housing and neighbourhood stability for core area residents; it will require the development of community-based facilities and services which will enhance the social, health care, educational, income support and employment opportunities for core area residents; it will require encouragement and incentive for industrial and commercial development in the core area.

My colleagues and I are very concerned that we find the right balance to ensure that core area residents have the greatest opportunity to participate in these development opportunities. We need to find the right balance between economic and social development priorities. We need to find the right balance between environmental improvements and individual development. It is important to provide neighbourhood stability through neighbourhood improvement programs which deal with the deteriorated housing stock and the physical environment. At the same time, it is important to ensure that there are adequate training programs and social services and support to ensure that residents can enter the job market and remain there once they have found jobs. It is necessary to find the right balance between public and private initiatives and investments.

If the \$96 million is to have the greatest effect then it must be used as a catalyst to encourage private

development in a number of key areas, such as industrial development, in the creation of new jobs, and residential development in the provision of additional housing. It is important to find the right balance between the interests of the core area residents and the interests of other Winnipeggers and all Manitobans. We must find the right balance between the prevention of further deterioration of the physical, social and economic conditions in the inner city in the cure of the present problems. And, of course, we must find the right balance between providing short-term results and providing long-term employment opportunities for core area residents.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is vitally important to tackle the task of stimulating industrial and commercial development which must form a key part of a balanced set of initiatives for the inner city; I believe it is necessary to revitalize the inner City of Winnipeg if we are to have a strong Winnipeg. For the Core Area Initiative to be successful we must encourage the development of long-term permanent jobs. The long-term problems of the Core Area Initiative cannot be solved with short-term solutions; they demand long-term solutions that will stand up in the long term and that will bring new jobs to the inner city and will stop the erosion of basic jobs in the inner city.

If the disparities that exist in the inner city are to be alleviated we must maximize the participation in these long-term jobs by inner city residents. This demands that we find the right kind of jobs, and attract them to the inner city and that we provide the right kinds of training programs so that core area residents can participate in the new job opportunities.

We must also provide the right kinds of social services, and the opportunity for local small business initiatives by inner city residents. Of course we must maximize the private investment that results from public expenditures. Public input should be regarded as a stimulus to encourage long term and ongoing renewal and private participation in the core area. Public investment should provide the catalyst for new industries and technologies to locate in the inner city and to provide for employment opportunities.

The pursuit of industrial and commercial development initiatives, and the pursuit of neighbourhood revitalization, and the provisions of support services and employment training programs which can provide opportunities will require a coordinated and comprehensive approach. Many urban centres have, during the past decade, seen the migration of industry to their suburbs, and it must be recognized that attracting industry to the core area will be difficult and a number of obstacles will need to be overcome. Nevertheless, with access to a work force, and energy cost factors related to transportation, there are new opportunities for certain industries to locate within the central parts of the city.

If we are to provide the employment opportunities for core area residents then we must build and strengthen our technological base. We must attract industries which have long-term potential and can provide stable employment with a wide range of jobs. In developing and strengthening our technological base we must develop appropriate sites with reasonable access; we must look at the

addition of new jobs in growth industries rather than simply the transfer of jobs from one place to another in existing industries.

It's keeping this in mind that the Core Area Initiative will provide for a major component of economic stimulation through key site development. This economic stimulation will be to attract industries that have long-term potential, are related to new technologies which will provide job opportunities in the future and which will provide jobs for a full range of skills and have the potential for upward mobilities for their employees. These industries will have to have employment opportunities in areas which have trainable skills and they will have to have linkages to other employment options in other parts of the private and institutional economy.

The initiative will have to provide a full range of training and social support services if it is to maximize the possibilities for people now having difficulty gaining access to the work force. It will be necessary to provide on-site integrated training facilities capable of working closely with new industries to ensure that the core area residents do participate in the new employment opportunities and in encouraging linking in support industries, the Core Area Initiative can provide for the stimulation of local small business initiatives.

If this economic stimulus is to provide opportunities for core area residents, then the Core Area Initiative will need to provide for extensive employment and training opportunities. Working with the Canadian Employment and Immigration Commission the Core Area Initiative will provide the opportunity for the coordination of training and employment programs within the City of Winnipeg in the core area.

A major component of the initiative will be the provision of funds, both inside and outside the agreement towards encouraging the provision of expanded institutional and on-the-job employment training programs. Providing the jobs is not enough. Efforts must be made to ensure that the disadvantaged core residents can participate in the development opportunities, but providing jobs and providing job training is still not enough. The core area initiative can provide for a variety of community facilities and services which will be made available to persons who are seeking to participate in the labour force in a permanent manner and who require special supports to ensure their successful participation. The overall emphasis here will be to support the initiative with existing programs, agencies and services, rather than to establish new programs. New community facilities which may be directed to the inner core area will be coordinated with the initiative to complement its objectives.

Winnipeg has been fortunate to have one of the most successful Community Improvement Programs of any city in Canada. The province has been an active supporter of the city's housing programs, and the province and the city have worked together to set up housing programs for the inner city. The cancellation of the Community Services Contribution Program by the Federal Government was a major blow to the community improvement programs in Winnipeg.

The age and condition of the Winnipeg housing stock has been well documented and the

Neighborhood Characterization Study done by the City of Winnipeg indicates there are a number of neighborhoods in the core area that need major improvements or rehabilitation. If the Core Area Initiative Programs are to be successful, then efforts are needed to revitalize and improve the physical environment of the core area as well as the economic and social development. Initiative will therefore place major emphasis on housing and neighborhood revitalization.

With support from MHRC and CMHC the initiative will need to include a variety of housing programs which can help to re-establish the inner City of Winnipeg as a viable and stable neighbourhood. This will require extensive rehabilitation programs to rehabilitate the existing housing stock. Forms of assistance to homeowners will be necessary to ensure that core area residents have the opportunity to participate in all these programs. Expansion of non-profit housing programs can provide additional rehabilitated units and new units for residents in the area.

The city, through its Community Improvement Program, has approached housing in the inner city as part of a total comprehensive community initiative and the core area programs can complement and support the city's efforts in the inner city. It will be important to coordinate the employment, industrial, commercial and social activities with the Housing and Neighbourhood Revitalization Programs and this comprehensive approach to core area redevelopment can provide for a renewed inner city and enhance the physical, social and economic environment.

An important component will be coordinated action which can have a stabilizing effect on communities, which can help to attract new residents to the core area, which can stimulate private and public investment and which can help to create expanded employment opportunities for core area residents during the next few years. Often in discussion of the core area of Winnipeg there has been a tendency to dwell on the negative aspects and to outline all of the problems that exist in Winnipeg's core area.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the core area initiative provides us with the opportunity to combine the resources and efforts of three levels of government and the private sector, and direct these resources towards the core area. The core area initiative can act as a catalyst to stimulate expansion of economic activities in the inner city and to provide employment opportunities for inner city residents. One should not underestimate the problems of the core area but I believe that there is now the opportunity for all concerned with the core area to make a positive contribution to Winnipeg's core area and its future, not only in Winnipeg, but its future as a focus and centre of our province.

Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the comprehensive approach to the core area of the city, I do have an amendment to the Member of Wellington's resolution.

I would move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Minister of Government Services, that the proposed resolution of the Member for Wellington be amended by,

1. Deleting the first, second, third and fourth paragraph;

2. By amending the fifth paragraph by deleting all the words after the word "for" in the second line and by substituting the following, "the City of Winnipeg";

3. Deleting the sixth paragraph and substituting the following: . . .

Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a typographical error. That should be "Deleting the sixth paragraph and substituting the following", and then in the written document that should be, "and by replacing it" — well that can be struck off — in the written document, I'll keep the original, Mr. Speaker.

3. Deleting the sixth paragraph and substituting the following, and then I would leave only the words in quotation marks underneath; and

WHEREAS Manitoba-Canada and the City of Winnipeg have agreed to co-operate in the development in the Winnipeg core area initiative; to provide increased employment opportunities; to encourage appropriate industrial, commercial and residential development in the core area; and to facilitate the effect of social and economic participation of core area residents in development opportunities.

4. Deleting all the words following the word "government" in the second line of the

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED clause, and replacing them with; "Consider the advisability of continuing to co-operate with Canada and Winnipeg in giving high priority to the stimulation of new long-term employment opportunities, particularly for residents of the inner city through the core area initiative and complementary government programs operating in co-operation with the private sector".

MOTION presented.

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

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, I won't say that I enjoyed the Minister of Urban Affairs presentation. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't so much the lack of substance or content that disquieted me but rather the lack of conviction and passion.

You know, Mr. Speaker, we've waited for four years for this ministry to take some initiative with respect to a very pressing and very important problem. We are the first to admit, Mr. Speaker, that it's a problem that has been with us for some time, it's not new but, Mr. Speaker, the way this government addressed itself to this particular problem in its first three-and-a-half years of office was really something to behold. Rather, Mr. Speaker, than picking up where we left off, rather than continuing the employment programs which I indicated during my first address on this resolution, would have meant a contribution of some \$12 million by this year in terms of the creation of employment opportunities in the core area; rather, Mr. Speaker, than continuing with our Winnipeg Inner City Housing Program, which would be now, Mr. Speaker, have put in place some \$30 million of core area housing; rather than investing those \$42 million in just those two areas, this government chose, Mr. Speaker, rather callously and neglectfully to traverse the first three-and-a-half years in office; passively resist any inclination to act or take any sort of interventive responsibility in the core area, then and only then, prior to an election call. This, Mr. Speaker, is why the

Minister of Highways is so upset and so irate when I suggest this because he knows that the public will not be fooled.

They wait, Mr. Speaker, having cut, having nullified and negated all these other programs of the former New Democratic Government, they wait till just before the election and then they announce that they are going to co-operate with the other two levels of government and they are going to invest \$32 million to replace essentially what would have been in two program areas over \$40 million of public investment. Mr. Speaker, it's a joke, it's a sham and a joke.

If one wants to look at this amendment I'll tell you what the meaningful words are. The meaningful words fall in the second part of the resolve and they are: Consider the advisability of continuing — and I underscore that, Mr. Speaker, ten times because that probably is the most significant thing that has ever been put on paper with respect to the core area initiative debate — consider the advisability of continuing to co-operate with Canada and Winnipeg, and we all know how this government just loves to co-operate. We have evidence in so many fields, Mr. Speaker, we have so much co-operation demonstrated by this government.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest and I do so respectfully at this time, that we may well have been served notice this afternoon of this government's intention but as per usual, Mr. Speaker, their real intentions will not be revealed until after the election and this is why I believe that there will be an election within the next four to five weeks, because they are running out of time. Too many things are getting too hot to handle.

Mr. Speaker, do we all remember the Uphill Neighborhood Program, do we all remember the attempt of this government to obtain a mandate, to obtain a mandate from inner city residents to put in place an Uphill Neighborhood Program? Do we remember those 1977 election promises? Mr. Speaker, those members opposite, rather than hooting and being derisive should be ashamed, they should be ashamed at their own hypocrisy for not having had the courage of their convictions to fulfill their promise to the people of the inner city of Winnipeg in the last election.

Mr. Speaker, we have no faith in this government to co-operate with anyone. We do not believe that it is in the nature of this government to affect that sort of compromise and conciliation that's necessary to affect co-operative relations with anyone.

So, Mr. Speaker, we call on this government to make some definitive commitment, not to give us the rather pious platitudes and righteous pronouncements that the Minister of Urban Affairs has presented this afternoon but rather, Mr. Speaker, to put on the table some solid policy initiatives, some solid declarations of intent with respect to the core area initiative. It wasn't too long ago, Mr. Speaker, that in response to a question the Minister of Urban Affairs, on his feet in the question period, indicated that he was somewhat dissatisfied with the sharing relationship between the three levels of government. He indicated that he thought perhaps that the Federal Government should double its commitment — this was in response to a question from the Member for Elmwood — he indicated that this was a contentious issue; that although, and he

says, Mr. Speaker, for the record, how do I feel about that? Mr. Speaker, it's not so black and and it's not so white.

Mr. Speaker, you know, the Minister of Urban Affairs always likes to put it on the Ottawa table and plate. RCMP services, which he, Mr. Speaker, I'd say, it's not being debated but he's bungled it. He's bungled it awfully by his lack of negotiation. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution is a travesty, it's a travesty. They threw out a Bill of Rights, members opposite threw out a Bill of Rights in their attempt to reassert and reaffirm provincial rights so they threw out what might be the final hope of citizens . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. I'm trying to find where the honourable member is relating this to the subject matter of the debate before us. I hope that he would continue to make his remarks germane to the subject matter.

The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to prolong that or attempt to beleague that point but it was only with respect to the relevancy and in order to demonstrate how this government approaches these sorts of situations. When they say that they are going to co-operate with any other government institution, Mr. Speaker, we on this side take that with a grain of salt. We'll believe it when we see it, Mr. Speaker, the record speaks eloquently volumes, chapters, in this respect. (Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Highways suggests that I should give him some gloom and doom. He has done an adequate job of providing that sort of information himself. I wouldn't presume to stand in his place in that regard. (Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Highways will allow me a few moments I'll continue. (Interjections)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. We can only have one speaker at a time. At this time I recognize the Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've always worked on the presumption that the louder they yell, Mr. Speaker, the more alarmed they are and the more frightened they are and it's probably true. Mr. Speaker, there is indeed need for a program of concerted co-operative action in this important area. I say that it is highly unlikely that we will realize anything from this. I suggest that, Mr. Speaker, because we all know that April 1 was supposed to be the deadline for an agreement and we remember the Minister of Urban Affairs — and he wasn't reading from a script that afternoon — holding forth at press conferences and we remember him telling people that by April 1 there would be a program in place, that there would be a working agreement and we would be able to proceed with dispatch with respect to various aspects of the Initiative Program. April 1 has come and gone and, Mr. Speaker, lo and behold and to no one's I suppose real surprise on this side, nothing has come of it. So if the Minister of Highways wants to know why we tend to dwell so often on the gloomy side of things and why we are compelled to be more cynical and pessimistic it's because so often, Mr. Speaker, these sorts of commitments and promises are broken. We will hear about it in the election just as we heard about the

Uphill Neighbourhood Program; they'll continue to tout it; they'll continue to make statements; they'll continue to tell us how hard they are negotiating and how many people they are talking to but we won't see anything in paper.

Mr. Speaker, just in case this program is realized, just in case it happens, I want to pass a few observations on things that I think would be useful for the Minister to consider if indeed he is still the Minister when the program does come to some sort of fruition. (Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, he says there is no question about that. The public will be the judge of that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member would accept a question.

MR. CORRIN: After my submission, I will.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, I would first encourage the Minister to liaise with the appropriate officials of the City of Winnipeg and consider the drafting of a comprehensive development plan for the core area. I think if anything meaningful is going to be done with respect to improving the environment and the socioeconomic milieu of the core, it has to be done on a sound structural foundation. I think that something must be done in order to include the participation of the residents of the core, the employers who are situated in the core, in the development process.

Mr. Speaker, I respect the Minister and the other two representatives who participated in meetings with members of the public for having done that but I encourage them to continue that process through the provisions of The City of Winnipeg Act legislation and create a comprehensive development plan for that area. That has never been done, Mr. Speaker, and I believe it is absolutely essential if anything substantive or meaningful is to result from this particular program approach.

Another thing that I would like to see done, Mr. Speaker, is I would like to see any programs that are put in place, any specific programs that are put in place with respect to this program strategy, become the subject of ongoing assessment and monitoring. Very often, Mr. Speaker, as we often see in the social service field, we find that, because of inadequate reporting or monitoring systems, that well-intentioned programs simply fail to produce the results that they were designed to accomplish. So, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the fact that this government talks so much about good management and all the rest of it, because they have failed in their own commitment in that regard, we have seen so little with respect to those management principles in terms of monitoring of their own programs. We heard in the first year when the task force on restraint reported, we heard about sunset legislation and we heard about every program being reviewed. Mr. Speaker, none of that has actually come to pass. Programs still go on the same old way they did

before and I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that there are programs that are excessively fat and should in fact be the subject of major cutbacks.

But this is the roller-coaster party, Mr. Speaker, the roller-coaster government. They go from Draconian restraint to excessive endowment and excessive waste, so we go from programs that were cut off to the extent of some 3 percent increase in 1978 to now programs that are getting 20, 22, 23 percent in 1981, Mr. Speaker. No rhyme or reason to it, just that perverse Conservative logic. I suppose it has something to do also, Mr. Speaker, with basic human nature and a sense of self-preservation. Too little, too late, Mr. Speaker, confused, mismanaged and bewildered. They are overcome by their responsibilities and they deserve to be turfed out.

Mr. Speaker, as well I want an audit proviso included in order that all beneficiaries of this program be required, if they receive money, to delineate specifically their programs, their program contributions, to the Initiatives' objectives. I want to see that sort of management policy put in place in order to assure that the hard-earned tax dollar of the contributing taxpayer not be abused by government officials full of good intentions but perhaps not full of good business sense. I want this government, Mr. Speaker, to put its money where its mouth is in that respect because, again, they so often talk about the need for a sound management and business approach to government administration but, in the final analysis, we fail to see that. So we want to beneficiaries of this program, corporations and other beneficiaries, social service agencies, whomever, accountable to the public and the public purse in this regard. So we'll look to this government to establish if they are in office and, by the way, Mr. Speaker, if we're in office this in fact will take place, there will be an audit proviso requiring full accountability in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to indicate that I feel that it's important to include the social service agencies of the core in any planning and ongoing program participation with respect to this Initiative Program. I believe that those who are beyond the citizens who I believe should be the first and foremost in the minds of government when they approach this problem and they seek advice. I think, Mr. Speaker, the second line should be the social service people who are working daily in the core area and who are fully familiar on an ongoing basis with the problems present in that area. I think it is very important that they be consulted and that their advice be given serious consideration prior to any positions being taken by the three levels of government.

So, Mr. Speaker, we recognize that there is a substantial benefit which could flow from the program; we feel that the government well could have continued our programs and also appended, after four years in office, such an initiative, but we look to the government to put something in place before an election and make specific advice in this regard known to members of the Legislature and of the public. Mr. Speaker, we call on this government to show some real commitment, as the Minister of Urban Affairs did this afternoon, not simply to go through the pro forma steps, just to go through the motions of showing and demonstrating interest in this important and vital program area. We don't want

Tuesday, 7 April, 1981

people reading speeches that have been written by bureaucrats, Mr. Speaker, we want a Minister who cares. We want a Minister who will do something and who is concerned and passionately committed to the needs of the residents of the inner City of Winnipeg.

QUESTION put on the Amendment, MOTION carried.

QUESTION put on the Motion as amended, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: I believe there is a disposition to call it 5:30, but I will move, seconded by the Minister of Finance, that the House do now adjourn and resume in Committee of Supply at 8 o'clock.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2 o'clock tomorrow. (Wednesday)