



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

**DEBATES  
and  
PROCEEDINGS**

26 Elizabeth II

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



Vol. XXVI No. 31B

2:30 p.m. Friday, April 28, 1978

# THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, April 28, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

## SUPPLY — HIGHWAYS

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Committee come to order. We have a quorum. Item 5. Assistance Programs. Does the Member for St. Johns have a question because otherwise the Member for Lac du Bonnet has been waiting patiently prior to the noon break.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Oh, I wouldn't want to interfere with his train of thought. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak on Item 5, I want to get involved in Assistance Programs.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** You will be next, after Mr. Uskiw. The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I was rather intrigued by the suggestion, and valid it must be, on the part of the Minister that there are no requests in 1978-79 for transit or bus grants. I find that rather unusual although I suppose it's possible. Is it that the Government gave no indication of its willingness to support applications for grants towards the purchase of additional buses, or is it simply that we've caught up with that particular problem and there are no new buses required for some period of time.

The other question I have is, where are we involved if any, with respect to subsidies on urban transportation, apart from the grants that were provided for the purchase of buses. Is there another item where they are involved by way of subsidy to the urban centres?

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

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, on the question of bus purchases and without meaning to be provocative, I think it is fair to say that the bus purchases were accelerated somewhat, perhaps for good reason — (a) to hopefully assist the Flyer Coach Industries in maintaining work force and my understanding from the City is that they agreed to this acceleration in placing the order for the last 75 buses from that firm which were all paid for out of the funds provided for the fiscal year 1977-78. There has been no indication from the City to the Government, not just to the Department of Highways, but to the Government that they required or indeed were seeking or budgeting in their budgets for any additional purchases of buses during this fiscal year and therefore there has been no provision made for that situation in these Estimates. I repeat again that is not necessarily the final and conclusive statement on that.

I have taken some exception to the fact that bus purchases were buried somewhere in the Department of Highways Estimates. I believe we have the Department of Municipal Affairs that deals directly with the City and with the municipalities, and that assistance of this kind is in the first place negotiated through the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Department of Municipal Affairs and if indeed future provision requires to be made, then it is likely, and I say it is only likely, I'm not saying that as Government policy, that future provisions for that kind of an item would more appropriately fall under the Department of Municipal Affairs.

With respect to the greater question of assistance in terms of general transit or in transportation assistance to cities and towns and villages, under the Item that we're dealing with I don't know, Mr. Chairman, whether we're dealing with specifically (a) of Resolution 70. The \$17,420,000 allocated or budgeted for or requested from this Committee for approval in this instance, consists of the traditional maintenance that has been given in aid of cities, towns, and villages in their street programs.

This consists of, in the City of Winnipeg, with the regular \$3,500 per mile maintenance assistance on their streets and roads, in the aids to the cities and towns and villages of some \$1,250.00. Pardon me, I'm sorry, I'm giving you global figures here which I was reading here as mileage figures. In the case of the City of Winnipeg, that assistance in street maintenance amounts to some \$3,500,000.00. In the cases of other cities and villages and towns, is additional \$1,250,000 included in this \$17 million figure. For the unorganized territories, a total of \$2,750,000, and for the urban transit assistance, or subsidy if you like from the Province, a total of \$9,120,000, which compares to \$7,220,000 that was voted last year. That is composed of a block grant to the City of Winnipeg to assist them in meeting the deficit of the Winnipeg Transit System. We have not spelled out to them in detailed form as to how that money should be applied. In other words, if they wish to make some alterations in some of the additional forms of transit that they have rather than just the straight, you know, the transit system — when I refer to that I refer to the Dash system, to the dial-a-bus system, to the handicap bus features — they are at liberty to do with this \$9,120,000 precisely whatever they want to do, within the Transit System.

I remind the Committee that that is an increase of close to \$2 million. In addition to that it does have a further \$800,000 that's provided for — the note here says innovative urban transportation — but in total that is a breakdown of the item under Resolution 70 of the \$17 million that we are asking for there.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether it's conceivable that whole or part of that \$9 million could be totally used up by the City of Winnipeg for new bus garages and construction work of that nature as opposed to maintaining lower transit rates in order to encourage greater use of transit as opposed to the automobile. Is there any way of knowing that or is the Minister telling us that the \$9 million can be used in any way the City feels it wants to use it, including that of buildings, infrastructure, etc?

**MR. ENNS:** Well, no, Mr. Chairman. This point that I'm making, we have, for instance, in the street maintenance grant, a prescribed schedule of the dollars available to them on that program. In the case of the City of Winnipeg, it amounts to some \$4,000 per mile. In other words, they cannot take an inordinate share of these moneys, and for instance apply it all to regular street maintenance.

In addition, this grant includes the purchases of buses that are required in the cities of Flin Flon, Brandon and Thompson. In the area of innovative urban transportation demonstration grants, a request was made in 1977-78 budget for \$800,000 — it is simply being repeated again to the same amount this year — \$800,000.00.

Program details, if the honourable members are interested in, for instance in the City of Winnipeg, the dial-a-bus service, had approved in their last year's budget, \$287,500.00. It is anticipated that they will request some \$212,500 this year. The City of Winnipeg has not indicated their desire to provide for any more of the moneys that were used for shelter design. I think one or two prototype shelter designs were built for some \$10,000 or at least were approved for construction in 1977-78. I am referring to the amounts that were approved or apportioned for in our budget, no moneys for this is being included in 1977-78. In the case of sub-urban, or the Dash service, \$120,000 was voted for in the year just past; \$132,000 is being requested in this year's budget. Handi-transit — \$225,000 was voted in last year's budget; \$250,000 is being requested in this year's budget, and if I may just pass on that one, it's my judgment that, of the innovative transportation programs, this program probably deserves in my estimation, the highest priority rating. However, it's not a matter for the Department of Highways or this Minister to do any more than comment on that, it's entirely within the hands of the city fathers to make those kinds of judgments.

Mr. Chairman, I've tried to indicate to the honourable member roughly how the transit systems of our urban centres are being assisted as a result of this set of Estimates.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, one last question then, on that point, and that is, can the Minister indicate to the Committee how we are deviating from past policy if any at all? Is there any change in policy with respect to the funding of urban transit and related items compared to last year?

**MR. ENNS:** No, Mr. Chairman, I would make only again, even with some trepidation with the presence of the Honourable Member for St. Johns, but I'm not aware and my Estimates don't reflect any deviation whether or not there has been any changes or changes contemplated that are being currently negotiated by the Minister more directly responsible, namely the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I'm not aware of them nor do they reflect in my budget.

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

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, Mr. Chairman, thank you. I am trying to do some reconciliation here and there's a slight change in nomenclature under Urban Affairs and you may wonder why I am relating it to this item now. Under Urban Affairs there was an item called Urban Studies and Projects. I am looking at the current estimates on Page 78, \$236,000.00. Under Urban Affairs last year, I believe the same \$236,000 was shown as Urban Projects and Transportation, so you will notice that the word "Transportation" was removed and the word "Studies" inserted as between last year and this year. The Honourable Minister spoke now about certain urban transportation experiments which were being financed and I had assumed that they had been financed by Urban Affairs last year and I am asking whether that function has now been taken over by this Department of Highways under this item that we are now discussing.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, neither I or my officials seem to be able to be of too much help to the honourable member on that question. We are aware of the assistance that we're providing to urban transit and transportation as is listed in our Estimates as I just briefly outlined. I am not aware of any major or fundamental change taking place.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well then, am I to understand that all the items referred to by the Honourable Minister just now, as to their description, the bus shelters, special services within transportation, that are being planned to be spent this year were also spent by the Department of Highways last year?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, it is entirely within the realm of possibility. I note for instance such things as in last year's voted Estimates, there were moneys set aside for such things as studies for the Sherbrook-McGregor route design, CP rail relocation study, monorail study, an uncommitted amount of some \$14,000, and I am referring to last year's vote in this area. These are functions for



Friday, April 28, 1978

which I show no appropriation in this coming year. Whether or not some of those functions are in fact being assumed by the Department of Urban Affairs or indeed whether they have been requested or required or completed is a question that perhaps the Minister of Urban Affairs can more appropriately answer.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I'm afraid, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister didn't quite hear me out. I am asking whether the items he referred to as being planned for this year — they referred to shelters and he referred to special services — I am asking whether they were paid out from this department last year.

**MR. ENNS:** They were paid out by this department last year.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** So that there is nothing that the department is planning to do this year, of this Aids to Transportation, especially to Research Projects, that was not also done by the same department and under the same appropriation last year?.

**MR. ENNS:** My understanding is that that's the case, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I mention that because I see that the Urban Affairs budget on that line that I've indicated has dropped from \$236,000 to \$110,000, and I have no right to assume now that that reduction of \$126,000 is a transfer of responsibility from Urban Affairs to the Department of Highways.

**MR. ENNS:** My understanding, and I fully understand the member's question now, that the projects that we have over the last number of years been responsible for in terms of urban assistance remain essentially unchanged, with perhaps the exception that certain studies that were of perhaps one or two years' duration for which moneys were requested and allocated from this appropriation, obviously, from the information that I have here, are not required in the coming year. It leads me to the conclusion that studies do come to an end.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Next question, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to have a global breakdown of the money spent last year under this appropriation.

**MR. ENNS:** Yes. The money spent under this appropriation last year, starting with Maintenance Grants to establish Metropolitan street system, last year the voted amount was \$3,655,000.00. The request for the Construction Grants to establish metropolitan street systems, the request last year was \$4 million.

The difficulty — and I should stop at this point. I'm talking about the voted amounts in last year's set of Estimates. I would have to find out specifically from the department as to the actual amounts spent; there's always been some difficulty in the city in some instances, particularly in the capital amounts allotted to the city, in spending their total amount. I will defer for a moment to staff and see whether we can't have the actual expenditure figures, if those are the figures that the Member for St. Johns is specifically interested in.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I should clarify, Mr. Chairman, I did ask for the actual, and I was getting the voted, but that's just the reverse order of what I was going to ask for, because my next question was going to be, "what was voted?" So may I invite the Minister to continue with the voted, and then we can put that against the Expenditure.

**MR. ENNS:** Well, if I can then continue, that on the item of the Construction Grants to establish Metropolitan street system, the vote in the fiscal year 1977-78 was \$4 million. The Aids to Cities, Towns and Villages requested for in 1977-78 was \$1,150,000.00. The work in Unorganized Territories and Disorganized Municipalities — that reads rather strange, Mr. Chairman, "disorganized municipalities" — voted and requested for in 1977-78 was \$2,650,000.00. For the Urban Transit Assistance, appropriation voted in 1977-78 was \$7,320,000.00. For Innovative Urban Transportation Demonstration Grants, voted in the year 1977-78, \$800,000.00.

Voted for the purchase of transit buses in the year 1977-78, \$1,200,000.00. Mr. Chairman that makes up the details of that expenditure in that item. Now, I am assuming that you have the request for the year 1978-79.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Yes, this figure tallies with a figure I have, but now I would like to know about the expenditures, the actual.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, that will be forthcoming.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, then while it's coming, may I indicate to the Honourable Minister that the total of \$20,775,000 is the exact figure which appears in last year's Estimate sheet under this item of 5.(a). If the Minister will look at his own Estimates sheet he will see that the item is shown for last year in his sheets under 5.(a) as \$16,790,000, a differential of about \$4 million less \$15,000.00. Well, we will wait till we get the actual to see what happened to that \$4 million.

Friday, April 28, 1978

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member has his pencil ready, in terms of the actual expenditures spent last year on the Street Maintenance, Urban Streets, the first item \$3,441,000; on Metro construction, \$10,900,000; on grants to cities, towns and villages, \$1,150,000; on unorganized territories and unorganized municipalities, \$2,100,000; on urban transit, \$8,382,000; on grants for transit buses \$6,442,000; on innovative urban transportation grants, \$750,000, for a total of \$33,165,000.00. I am advised that the difference between the list that I have just read, namely the \$22 million that the honourable member for St. Johns says tallies exactly with what I had read . . .

**MR. CHERNIACK:** \$20 million.

**MR. ENNS:** Pardon me, \$20 million — the difference between that and the actual expenditures, the additional moneys came out of Capital Supply of the previous year.

In some instances extra moneys were voted by Finance last year to provide for the shortfall in terms of the voted moneys and the actual money spent.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** That last statement, Mr. Chairman, if you don't mind, Finance has no authority to vote moneys. Possibly the Honourable Minister . . .

**MR. ENNS:** Possibly I should change that, Finance raised the money.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, it could only do it out of some authority and I'm guessing now it had to be out of a capital authority. I say I'm guessing, I don't know any other way.

**MR. ENNS:** I am advised that out of voted capital authority these moneys were allocated to Highways to meet the actual expenditures of that year in this appropriation.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, that suggests that about \$13 million in the Assistance Programs Expenditures, were taken out of capital. It is the \$33 million less the \$20 million.

**MR. ENNS:** Correct.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** However, the item as shown on your Estimate sheet shows it only at \$16,790,000, but what was voted under current was \$20,700,000 and the Honourable Minister already gave us an itemization of it. What I thought was the shortage shown of \$4 million now appears to be blown up to \$33 million. And whereas I tried to reconcile the left hand column for last year, and succeeded, I did it only by transferring \$4 million that seemed underused in this item of assistance to construction item and found that it fitted in very neatly. I thought I was going to get an answer saying that \$4 million was transferred from assistance to construction, but now I'm told that not \$4 million was transferred, but rather that \$13 million was borrowed, plus the \$4 million I would guess because the figure given by the Minister of actual expenditure is \$33 million, whereas the item here under 5.(a) is shown as \$16,790,000, which is a discrepancy of \$17 million.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether the Honourable Member for St. Johns sat in on the Estimate procedure last year, but . . .

**MR. CHERNIACK:** No, how could I, I wasn't privy to that. Backbenchers don't get there do they?

**MR. ENNS:** But the relationship between capital and current particularly in dealing with the city has always been a somewhat complicated affair in the sense that the city receives an authority from the province to expend X-number of dollars on capital projects. I am advised that last year with a carry over of \$6 million in the capital account, the request was for an additional \$4 million totalling the \$10 million that was actually spent. Pardon me, with the correction that for Metro Construction, there was a carry over of \$2,400,000, an additional \$6 million was voted in that year along with the \$4 million of current money that made up the complicated \$12 million that the city eventually actually spent.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, if you look down to Item 8 on the bottom of page 47, you will see \$10 million there. So, if you say there is \$2 million, I would understand it, but to allocate the whole \$12 million into the paragraph 5, what happens to the \$10 million you've already put into 8?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I will uhsmpt again, looking at the left hand column on the bottom of page 47, the \$10 million consists of the \$6 million of capital voted that year, plus the \$4 million of current and then a carry over of \$2,400,000, making up a total of \$12 million that was actually spent.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Where was the \$4 million voted in current?

**MR. ENNS:** And indeed it's that \$2 million that we speak about when the over-all global question was asked about how we came on that bit of information that I supplied the member, how we came from the 119 global to the \$149 million. It is made up of the \$27 million, plus the \$2 million — and this is

the missing \$2 million — that makes it up to \$29 million, that brings that figure up to \$149 million actually spent last year on Highways compared to the \$160 million that we are requesting this year totally.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I've reached the stage where that \$2 million is beginning to be a very small figure in my attempt to understand this whole concept. I'm dealing with paragraph 5. I find that last year we voted — all of us who were here last year — voted a \$20-plus million item under this program 5.(a) and for some reason or other we find that the Conservative administration shows it as \$16,790,000.00. Now, I'm told that instead of the \$16,790,000 which you show as being voted, which is \$4 million less than was actually voted in that item, actually you spent \$33 million, part of which was capital. What I am not yet clear on is whether that capital came out of 1977 vote or prior votes. I suspect it's prior votes because the 1977 capital vote has been distributed by the Conservative administration throughout these Estimate Books and therefore it's not in here. If it were 1977 it would be here, so it must be other than 1977.

We have been told under item 6, that that \$41 million which is an increase of about \$16 million, of last year's, you see in last year's Estimates, the vote was \$25 million, and now it shows \$41 million. We were told that the differential of \$16 million was capital money. All right, I understand that.

But once you've eaten it up there then I have to ask, was that \$33 million spent last year now showing as a tremendous reduction down to \$17 million to be spent this year? That's what I'm wondering about. If you spent \$33 million last year why are you only asking for \$17 million now in view of the fact that the cupboard is bare? Is there that kind of a tremendous reduction, like a 50 percent reduction in program?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that if you go to page 47, the \$10 million shown in the left hand column of the year ending, some \$4 million of that \$10 million was current that in effect, when added to the \$16,790,000 shown on page 46 in the same position, brings you back to the \$20 million that we are talking about.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I can understand that. I allocated it elsewhere, Mr. Chairman. I allocated it up to 6, but that's okay. But if we did that, then the question is still a valid question, except by a \$4 million item. You still say you spent \$33 million last year in this item and you are only asking for \$17 or \$18 million this year, so the question is still there, even with that \$4 million accounted for.

**MR. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I can find — it has been indicated to me some \$3,900,000 in bits and pieces. However, I think the member's question is valid and I am prepared to take the time and get a proper reconciliation of this appropriation but I would ask to take that question as notice as this time. There are such major items not included such as the \$1,200,000 for bus purchases which were part of the \$33 million that we talked about just a moment ago not appearing in this year's Estimates at all. An additional \$1.5 million of grants for other transit bus purchases that come under this account that could apply to the cities of Brandon, Thompson or Flin Flon — there was an accelerated Bus Purchase Program underway last year and paid for last year that is not being requested for and not being reflected in these Estimates.

But, Mr. Chairman, allow me the time to reconcile the figures that the Honourable Member for St. Johns is interested in and I will make a commitment to the Committee to provide those figures.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** By all means, Mr. Chairman. May I point out that just like the Minister was prepared to and did give us the cash flow of Highway Construction, Item 6, possibly the same thing could be done in 5 and any other place where Capital moneys were involved in addition to Current. Then we could at least get some picture of the flow just as he explained it before.

I still, Mr. Chairman, clearly I am still planning to get this information when we deal with Finance Estimates, but in order to know what questions to ask there, I have to know what the actual was here.

**MR. ENNS:** Agreed.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** You're saved by the bell. That's fine. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 5.(a)—pass — the Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** May I just add to it, since we are leaving now, I did therefore ask that the Assistance Program and any other item where Capital is involved, which I am sure includes Item 8, all of which I believe is Capital moneys.

**MR. ENNS:** It has been noted, Mr. Chairman, and the question will be looked after.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 5.(a)—pass; 5.(b)—pass — the Member for Wellington.

**MR. BRIAN CORRIN:** Harkening back, I believe to the former clause, the Estimates I have before me are just part of the Member for St. Johns' — I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. I have a very general question. If it is not the wish of the Minister to discuss it now we could discuss it, I suppose, until his Salary later. But I would appreciate if I could elicit a response this afternoon.

First of all, I was wondering whether or not the Minister has been sitting as a member of a body generally described as the province's joint delegation. This is the group that is representative, I suppose, of the government, and the Cabinet, and liaises with the delegation put up by the City of Winnipeg.

**MR. ENNS:** Yes, the answer is affirmative. I have sat in on one or two of those meetings. I must also confess that I have been absent from several of them as a result of other commitments. But I have had the occasion to sit with that group with the representatives of the city.

**MR. CORRIN:** In my past experience at the City of Winnipeg and I have to emphasize in fairness, as you are probably aware, that it was a limited experience in the sense that first of all it was only for three years and second of all, it was a participation that was not associated with the majority group and therefore I sat on no committees and never participated in any joint delegation meetings. But nevertheless it was my distinct impression from listening and participating through debate at Council itself that there was some frustration created by the joint delegation liaison process. Let's put it this way: There were always insinuations and allegations that there was undue leverage on the part of the Provincial Government. Not being there, I can't pass judgment on the veracity of the statements, but the statements were made. There were submissions by several prominent members of the Executive Policy Committee who were also members of the joint delegation to the effect that the province was somewhat insensitive to urban needs. They pointed out that provincial representatives often came from rural areas, although I don't think that was the case for the actual members of the joint delegation, but with respect to the new Minister of Highways, yourself, sir, that would be the case. There was constant confrontation on that particular point, people feeling that there was not sufficient depth of awareness on the part of provincial representatives to the immediate needs of urban people.

I was going to ask you, since you have had the opportunity to participate in, I believe you said two meetings of the joint delegation, what your impression was, whether you felt that you were in fact, in participating in that process able to relate well to the needs put forth by the civic representatives?

**MR. ENNS:** I can indicate to the honourable member this, that in those meetings that I did attend with the city, and I'm referring to one particularly that perhaps involved more at the officials level, the Department of Works and Operations from the city, that they indeed supported what the Honourable Member for Wellington has just indicated, that there was a degree of frustration and a feeling of a somewhat heavy hand that the province from time to time laid on the city, and particularly in their plans for major Capital transit improvements. I must also indicate to him that that situation existed primarily the last number of years during the reign of the previous administration. We haven't had the opportunity or built up the experience of any great length of time to be able to indicate to you in any affirmative way that that situation has completely changed or will completely change. I think the province will always have, in terms of the moneys involved, an interest . . . Well, I can indicate to the honourable member that this Minister and this government intends to allow the City of Winnipeg, as any other urban centre or rural municipality, an increasing amount of local autonomy, if you like, and local decision making, to the extent that that is possible within the area that we are talking about.

I can indicate to the member that one specific area where the province had refused to co-operate, if you like, or to move along with the city in the plans that they set out, has been resolved. I think the kind of confrontations or questions that involve the planning that's done by the city when it involves projects like the St. Vital Bridge, the improvement of the connection to Pembina Highway from Waverley or the potential major project of the Sherbrook-McGregor Overpass. I certainly do not see my role as being one of any imbalanced degree of influence. We will express our concern and our professional advice as afforded to me by the department and will express our concern about the dollars the province may end up being responsible for. I'm satisfied that the city can look forward to a relationship over the next number of years that will allow them to operate — well, perhaps interference is too strong a word but certainly with some greater latitude.

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

**MR. CORRIN:** I'm curious having found that the Honourable Minister is indeed a member of the joint delegation. For some time I've been curious as to the constituent members of the delegation, their identity. I was wondering since the member is privy to that, could the Minister identify the other members of the joint delegation?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I'm not aware (a) what the practice was of the previous administration, as the Member for Wellington would be aware having sat on the other side or being part of that committee or at least being aware of it from his City Council experience. I must indicate to the members, I don't believe that a formal committee as such has been structured with fixed and permanent members on it. I just know that I have attended two meetings to be precise, which involved understandably the Minister of Municipal Affairs, also the Attorney-General of course, myself and in one instance the Minister of Health. It would seem to me, and I'm not sure of my facts in this instance, that what really has occurred to date within the relatively short time and under the constraints and pressures of time that we've had to meet with city people on different matters, has been primarily dictated by the sphere of interest that the city has expressed or placed on the agenda for discussion



and the appropriate Minister with jurisdiction in that sphere of interest has attended these meetings.

Now, again that is a question that is more appropriately put to the Minister of Municipal Affairs whether it is not his intention to formally structure this liaison committee that the member speaks of, I can just say that I don't regard myself as having been selected to be a member of a particularly structured committee. I understood why I was there. We were talking about highways and transit problems and capital construction problems, but that may well be the case, that somewhere down the line a similar committee that the member speaks of, or has knowledge of, will be structured by this government.

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

**MR. CORRIN:** I'm particularly pleased to hear this Minister suggest that he and his government presumably are going to consider ways and means to increase the amount of local autonomy available to the urban centre of Winnipeg. I think that we both could agree and I conclude from his remarks that there probably realistically is a need for some better communicative format in order that there be a more rational and sensitive interchange of information as between the representatives of the two major governments of this province.

I was wondering in view of the fact that he didn't specify that a liaison committee had yet formally been struck, I was wondering whether he could advise us in what way, how his government — I won't ask him to speak for his government, because that is unfair — he, as Minister responsible for Highways particularly — urban highways as well as regional streets as we call them — how he would envision providing and facilitating this new spirit of closer communicative co-operation, how would he envisage this new autonomy being developed within his jurisdiction?

**MR. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, it begins with having, and I'm satisfied that it's there, a very close and co-operative working arrangement with the officials of the Department of Highways, the professional people in the Department of Highways, and their counterparts in the City of Winnipeg. I've had the occasion to sit down and meet with Mr. Nick Diakiw for instance and some of his officials in concert with my Deputy Ministers and senior people in the Department of Highways. I think that's a basis from which at least the technical aspects of the joint work that we engage in from time to time, that kind of basis of understanding and support and co-operation has to exist. If there is very divergent views on matters of a technical nature, divergent views on matters of how we approach the movement of traffic in the urban area, how we provide for built in safety features in our traffic facilities, then you have, even never getting to the political level you are working on a kettle that is boiling and you can expect difficulties to flow from that as you know each jurisdiction tends to support his department's point of view. I'm satisfied that that is not the case.

In fact, just the opposite is the case. I think if anything there has been some difficulty in the past with the province wishing to dominate to some extent the decision-making role. That is my view and I can speak for the government — essentially the responsibility of those elected officials that have the responsibility of the City of Winnipeg. I can only indicate to him in a very general way that that is our attitude and I don't think we will find ourselves encountering these confrontations that in the past have bedevilled the City to some extent, particularly when it comes to major construction works, and here I refer to my immediate area of responsibility in Highways.

What the city will have to understand and will have to plan and work with is the full and complete understanding of the extent and the capacity to which the provincial government can respond in any given year in terms of their capital program. In that regard, I remind the Honourable Member that we have responded I think very well in this year, knowing the nature of the construction program that the city is undertaking this year and knowing full well that their capital requirements will be higher this year, again, partly because of the nature of some very large individual projects that the request for capital moneys in this area has been increased to \$15 million.

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

**MR. CORRIN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again I respond affirmatively to what the Honourable Minister presents as his perception of the need in this respect. I might add I think it is somewhat elucidating to note that one of the reasons I found that people — one of the conflicts previously was that this government was often accused as having an urban bias. I mean to say and I think I can say, that this has been noted many times in the Assembly during the course of general debates on the Throne Speech and on the Budget. The point has been made many times, oft-times, that the previous government perhaps was somewhat negligent in that they didn't place enough emphasis on rural needs, and one of those needs stated in debate any way, was the need for a more highly sophisticated and integrated rural road system. So, the former government was often accused of manifesting an urban bias. I might say that from reviewing the Estimates, although I don't think one can make any conclusive statement, I would say that there is certainly the beginnings of — there is now the opportunity for other people, people perhaps of a different persuasion to suggest that this government is manifesting and demonstrating a rural bias in that it would appear that the emphasis with respect to highway construction will be predominantly rural.

**MR. ENNS:** Excepting, Mr. Chairman, if the member will allow an interjection, this year's Estimates don't bear that out.



**MR. CORRIN:** Without going into a close examination I would think though there is a possibility that some people might suggest that there is now a rural bias, and I cite in this respect the fact the Minister now, the Minister who is responsible is a rural person. I think that was the case before as well, but nevertheless, there may be various arguments put forward.

In this regard, I wanted to point out that it is problematic simply because the department for which the Minister is responsible is indeed divided and bifurcated as between rural and urban interests. You are not a Minister of just urban highways, you are a Minister obviously of both rural and urban interests and your department has similar responsibilities. You pointed that out in some of your remarks, and I'm wondering because there are differences in perceptions of highways. I might tell you that listening to debate, and participating in debate on City Council I found that for instance there was a marked difference in opinion just between suburban and inner city councillors and I think the Chairman, if he were to participate could bear this out when dealing with the question of highways at that level. Inner city people very often saw highways generally, or regional streets generally as being the enemy. They saw them as encroaching on urban living space and they saw them in effect reducing the amenity available to inner city residents. On the other hand, fringe people, suburban people saw them as a necessary aid in seeking the City centre and as a useful tool to participating fully in urban life. I wonder and I suppose it would be correct to say that very much the same sort of perceptive situation exists as between rural and suburban members, I haven't had an opportunity to hear other members of the committee speak on this respect yet but presumably some may wish to.

I am wondering as the Minister responsible for the department then, given the fact that there is at this point no formal mechanism established to deal with the broader nature of the transportation issue in view of the fact that you've indicated that it's been . . . I won't be unfair and suggest that it's being dealt with on an ad hoc basis but you did indicate that it was being dealt with on a situational basis.

I am wondering, again, whether the Minister could tell us how he envisages synthesizing the various aspects of his department, the various areas of his department with the appropriate and corresponding structures of the urban government and the other department responsible, the other two departments responsible for municipal affairs, the Urban Affairs Department being responsible for urban municipalities and the municipal, the so-called Municipal Affairs Department being responsible for the rural municipalities. I am wondering what he can offer us with respect to some outline of his view of future policy, present policy as well. I presume the problem has already begun.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the Honourable Member for Wellington's remarks. I think members of the committee and he himself would recognize that only time will tell in terms of how well the province and the city will work out these joint problems. I have attempted in my earlier remarks to indicate to him how, in a general way, this Ministry will approach those problems. I must just say again that I have no difficulty in accepting the competence and the urban orientation of those people that are working for and with Mr. Nick Diakiw in this regard in the City of Winnipeg. I can indicate to him again that the previous administration in the last voted Estimates provided for some \$10 million for assistance in them carrying out their responsibility in urban transit, these Estimates are asking for \$15 million. I can indicate to the honourable member only this that we believe that with . . . I will tie it specifically to the highways and the road, whether urban or rural matters, and that doesn't really change the pattern much whether you are dealing with a small town or village anywhere in rural Manitoba, or if you are dealing with a city the size of Winnipeg. The difference being essentially the scope of the problem and the dollars involved. But whether they are negotiating or contemplating a change in the pattern of a thoroughfare or perhaps a bypass around a community, the Department of Highways has over the years built up the experience and tradition to work with, negotiate with rural councillors or rural mayors and reeves in dealing with these matters.

I place a great deal of emphasis, if you are asking me just from a general point of view, that there be a very free and very frequent exchange of opinion between the city engineers and highways engineers in this regard and the administrators in this regard, that sufficient lead time is given in terms of the kind of planning that is involved and in terms of the kind of fiscal planning that is involved to allow the city to run their affairs and the province to respond to their legitimate requests and needs in a way that the province at any given time can, but we, let me reiterate again for the second or third time, I don't believe that it is the intention — certainly it is not the intention of this Minister, nor have I felt it to be the intention of the senior administrative people within the department to take over the responsibilities or to, in any heavy-handed way impose, you know, their will on the city in this respect. I invite the honourable member to let a year or two of experience take place in this case and he will then be in a position to judge me and the government as to whether or not this situation is working.

I must tell the honourable member that from my experience dating back, I don't particularly hold too high a regard of a formally-structured committee that tends to become rigid, that tends to reflect in some instances the individual personal concepts of those members of that committee. I don't see a somewhat looser arrangement as being in any way detrimental to the kind of co-operation that the member and I both want in this regard. In fact I hold out the thought to him that it likely could be the reverse. In other words, I don't see it as my business to sit down with the city in a formal way, once a week, or something like that, and knowing that I have substantially more funds available to me than perhaps they have, and that some kind of a relationship develops, one of subservience to some extent

if you want to describe it that way. I think that we do our job in the province. We sort out our fiscal pie in the way we think it is appropriate, and we will be judged by the people and by the people both in rural Manitoba and in the urban centres. But beyond that, other than the kind of understandable professional co-operation between bridge builders, between highway contractors and construction engineers, I don't see my role as being one of constant attendance when and where the city makes its plans.

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

**MR. CORRIN:** Then I might conclude, and if I conclude erroneously, please tell me, Sir. I might conclude then that you will decide as to whose needs are legitimate. You said that you would have to make decisions with respect to legitimacy of needs and I would suggest, and I ask you if you want to make rebuttal or response please do. Are you suggesting that you then will make decisions on the basis of your own prioritization of need?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman . . .

**MR. CORIRIN:** Well, I'm not trying to push you. This is not a cross-examination, it's rather a bit . . .

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, why is the Honourable Member for Wellington after, you know, speaking so reasonably in his first attendance at this committee, now attempting to slip a hooker like that into me. That's not at all what I said. I will prioritize and impose my will and influence in those matters where I legitimately have to do that, and that is around the Cabinet table, around with my caucus colleagues, as we decide what proportion of funds of the fiscal pie that is available to Manitoba and the Manitoba government can be apportioned to highway construction for instance. I then will further prioritize with my departmental officials as to what portion of that pie should be dedicated to northern Manitoba, should be dedicated to rural roads, should be dedicated to villages and towns and communities throughout the province of Manitoba and will also decide what amount we see in our judgment. And that's the extent of where I see the responsibility of the Minister and the Department of Highways to say and we will set aside what we see, given the dollars that we have, that we can set aside for the City of Winnipeg. I repeat again for emphasis, that in this first go-around, the City of Winnipeg has a great deal of reasons to look forward with a high degree of hope in the coming years because in this first Budget in the year of restraint, we have found an additional \$5 million to provide in this area and that's where my prioritizing and imposition of will ends.

I will not now go that one step further that was implicit in the member's final question, that I will now decide whether SherbrookMcGregor Overpass will get these \$15 million or portion thereof, or the completion of the St. Vital Bridge or whether just additional amounts ought to be used for repaving of badly needed pot-holed city streets. That, Mr. Chairman, is the decision that the City of Winnipeg and their capable people are quite capable of making.

**MR. CORRIN:** Yes, first of all, Mr. Chairman, I won't apologize, I certainly won't apologize to the Honourable Minister for any of my observations albeit that they may have been incorrect. I might tell him that I wouldn't presume to think that I could outfox him. Most certainly an old experienced hand like the Honourable Minister would not fall prey to any of my so-called hookers. But I might say that I have always felt that there is an important need to review the communicative mechanisms and the decision-making process with respect to these sorts of concerns. You see, the problem always has been that those who think that their needs are legitimate don't necessarily communicate with those who think their needs aren't. As a result of that there is what some people might call a communicative breakdown and that leads to what might be termed by the academics to be a disfunction.

I might say that when I was with the City of Winnipeg, and this is I suppose by the by but it is important that the Minister be aware of this, I suppose, because it is in the context of our discussion and it becomes quite important for him, I think, to know where I stand because I am not ashamed of my position. I always felt, and I might say that this was not necessarily in full accord with all the members of my party that sat on Council, I always felt that there was a need in Manitoba for a broad communicative form, something I called the trilateral liaison committee. There was a need for a forum whereby all the representatives, rural and urban, provincial as well, could participate in an open process of decision making. I thought that if there were such a forum, there would be the opportunity for representatives of the various different regions of our province to not only make their points and try to gather the support of the provincial representatives, but also strike a more conciliatory position vis-a-vis the other municipal representatives at the meetings. I felt that in the long run, in view of the fact that it is very obvious that the real property tax base is not only diminishing continually but also is becoming apparently and increasingly regressive in nature, I felt that this would lead to some breakthroughs with respect to new fiscal arrangements as between the various levels of government. I thought that this would serve all the citizens we represent in a much more efficacious manner.

I suppose, in questioning the Minister, I was hoping — and I say to you, Sir, I am importuning you now — I was hoping that you would elicit a sympathetic response to that. I didn't want to put words in your mouth though; I didn't want to throw hookers at you. I was hoping that you would feel as I do,



that there was a need for such a new approach. I didn't like the former approach; I didn't like the way it was done, quite frankly.

**MR. ENNS:** I appreciate the dialogue that I have just had with the Honourable Member for Wellington, except that it also affords the opportunity to underline and demonstrate a very fundamental and basic difference between he and I as we approach our responsibilities. The suggestions that he makes about the need for a better communicative system, trilateral groupings of peoples where you bring the diverse problems of urban, rural and others into interplay, of course can't be disagreed with; it can only be supported.

But there is a fundamental difference in the approach that my honourable friend makes when he takes it one step forward because he several times said that this body is also the decision-making body and that is where I differ with my honourable friend. Because I suggest to the honourable friend that that is where things get bogged down; that is where the clarity of responsibility begins to get lost in a morass of talk and communications; and that is where somebody is bound to feel, and it is usually the lesser party in terms of power and money, feels that he is being pushed around. I have no such difficulty and I do not want to be part of a decision-making process with the city in that regard, in this light.

Communications, certainly, and the need for better communications, certainly, and my earlier remarks about expressing some concern about a formally-structured committee that rides herd on these kinds of joint problems is blurring the lines of responsibility. I accept the responsibility for whatever actions we do as a provincial government and whatever I do within the jurisdiction of the Department of Provincial Highways. I would object if I had to sit down with some city representatives or rural municipality representatives and have them be a part of the process of decision making. Advice-giving, communications, information gathering, certainly, but I see my role very clearly. The role is that of accepting the responsibility that the people of Manitoba gave me. I accept the same thesis for the councillors of the City of Winnipeg and so I must depart from my honourable friend's comments that this same liaison communications group that he speaks of as being desirable, and I agree with him, ought also to be the group where the important decisions are made and I find difficulty in accepting that.

**MR. CORRIN:** I didn't mean to make that point. If you thought I did, I didn't. I suggested that it would effect a more communicative decision-making process rather than that being the forum where the decisions were made. We have to remember that all the people there are elected to set priorities with respect to public policy and by the way, when I talk about trilateral I should have also mentioned that I include the Federal representatives as well because they are a very important component in any decision making in this country and could become a greater component if they wished to be more responsive to the needs of this particular region.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 5.(b)—pass — the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. MR. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't think we should let it remain on the record without challenge the comments of the Minister of Highways with respect to what he so often uses, the term "heavyhandedness" on the part of government over lower levels of government. I think that it should be noted that over several years, there has been a fairly decent relationship between the urban governments, municipal governments and the Government of Manitoba through regular communicative channels established to the mutual benefit. I think, Mr. Chairman, that probably the best example of that has to be that despite, from time to time, differences of opinion on certain things, that in the final analysis, you know, it is on the public record that the Mayor of Winnipeg has quite openly and publicly endorsed the former Premier of this province as his preference in the office of Premier.

So, for the Minister of Highways to indicate that there was some sort of a hostility between the two levels of government, it certainly doesn't square with the reality of those facts, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. BOYCE:** I was very interested in the Minister's response to the Member for Wellington. It is indeed enlightening to know that Machiavelli still lives because, you know, from what the Minister has just told the Member for Wellington and this committee, he intends to arrive at his decisions in a like manner to Machiavelli and that it is difficult to listen to people and arrive at a consensus. But nevertheless, to suggest that the relationship between the City of Winnipeg and the province has been anything but fruitful and that discussions were long and weighty and I would like to know how the Minister intends to avoid the necessity of referring matters to the provincial-city tripartite committee which does exist and will continue to exist. The Minister may not want to participate but it will continue to exist because there are some decisions which involve the three levels of government, which he has no other alternative but to refer to this committee. So perhaps the Minister, in light of the remarks that he just made that he is going to operate with a heavy hand. . . It is always interesting to listen to people who talk about people operating with a heavy hand and then they go along and show how heavy handed they are going to operate. Perhaps the Minister can enlighten us on how he intends to avoid this tripartite committee which he must refer certain matters to.

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



**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I just don't believe that I can enlighten the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. BOYCE:** A typical answer from the Minister when he hasn't got any answer. He said earlier on that he is inclined somewhat to interject his rather droll sense of humour into the proceedings. But he has no answer of course; he knows full well as everyone on the Committee knows, that there are certain matters which must be referred to the committee.

But nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, implicit in the Minister's remarks is that he is going to global budgeting on Highways. He is going to turn over to the City of Winnipeg a certain number of dollars and they will decide how these moneys will be spent.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 5.(a)—pass . . .

**MR. BOYCE:** Well, Mr. Chairman, it is rather an important point because if he is going to do this with the City of Winnipeg which are elected municipal authorities, and it is a provincial government, or is this just going to be one program for the City of Winnipeg and then a different ad hoc arrangement in the rest of the province? So is the Minister going to go to global budgeting? He said that he was going to argue with the Cabinet and his colleagues in caucus, as a matter of priority how much money the province was going to spend on Highways; and then he was going to turn this over to the City of Winnipeg. This is what the Minister is advising us, I believe.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I am getting some conflicting advice right now. If the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre is suggesting that I should use a heavy hand and tell the City of Winnipeg where and when they can build a bridge and when they can't build a bridge, where and when they can repair a road and when they can't build a road, you know, that is hardly in keeping with the advice that I just received and I might say I received very moderately and just as a general observation from the Member for Wellington.

What I am suggesting to the honourable member is, yes, in effect the City of Winnipeg has always received their Capital from us in a block funding type of a way. What seems to have been suggested by the Member for Wellington, that in the recent past there has been some, you know, I won't describe it or I won't put an adjective to it, but there has been some difficulty in terms of allowing the city to proceed with its priorities as they see fit.

Now, to say that the interests cease the moment that we pass these Estimates and the city gets their \$15 million, that of course simply is not true either. Having built up a relationship with the staff of the City of Winnipeg and the staff of the Department of Highways over the years, common sense prevails that as we are making major changes into particularly egress and exits out of the city, that there is a very close degree of co-operation with the city in attempting to dovetail these major construction programs together. In other words, if we are contemplating in our plans to make and expend large sums of money to provide for an access route into the city, that we wouldn't do that without consultation with the city as to what will happen to the traffic when you have dumped it in. And we will defer our plans by a year or two years, or change them, to the point in time when there is a mutual agreement as to how the pattern of traffic can be handled as it enters from a fast-flowing, free-flowing trunk highway system into a built-up urban area.

We have examples of that constantly, and vice versa, the city will not go ahead bull-headedness in its own priority-setting program to plan and build a major exit route out of the city, for instance, unless there is some countervailing facility that can accept the outpouring of thousands of vehicles at any given time onto the provincial trunk highway system, without consulting with us. So that there is, by very nature of the work involved, this kind of coming together and sorting out timing and priorities as to when major capital projects are entered into. I am only indicating to the honourable members of the committee that I see that as a normal function, one that certainly has worked reasonably well in the years when I recall, in fact even the years that I had brief responsibility in this matter and worked with the city in this matter in 1968 and I hope to continue that kind of work in the years 1978-1996.

**MR. BOYCE:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the more things change the more they stay the same. The Minister has just advised the committee that things aren't going to change at all. He just likes to use the terms that what is normal procedure by the former administration was a heavy hand. But he is going to use his heavy hand to make the same kind of decisions against the same criteria as the former administration because in the final analysis he has the dollars. If he doesn't approve of the particular plan he won't fund it. And he is not going to take the \$15 million or whatever the total figure is and write a cheque as soon as the Estimates are passed and forward it to the City of Winnipeg. He is going to follow the same group of advisors as the former administration employ and by the way they serve you well, they serve the people of the province of Manitoba well because the problems that you have just enumerated are the problems that they advised the former administration.

So that albeit the Minister, for strictly political purposes, Mr. Chairman, tries to give the impression that the heavy hand of government, that we interfered, but the Minister has just reiterated that he is going to do the same things, in the same manner with the same people, but the moneys will be voted and if his advice is such that it — the egress routes aren't of a caliber to allow for the outflow of traffic then — and the local politicians of the City of Winnipeg are pushing for a particular route for their interests that the decision would be made, on the same criteria, the same basis.



Friday, April 28, 1978

So, it should be underlined, Mr. Chairman, that my friend the fellow politician from Lakeside, the Minister of Highways, is trying to leave the impression that the relationship between the City of Winnipeg, who by and large once again, Mr. Chairman, were Conservative aldermen who are on the various committees. It is rather strange, Mr. Chairman, that when I had the pleasure to sit on the urban affairs committee of Cabinet, that we always met with Conservatives but they called themselves ICEC or something like that, they weren't Conservatives. But nevertheless it . . .

**A MEMBER:** Icelanders eh?

**MR. BOYCE:** A bunch of Icelanders is right. So, Mr. Chairman, it is going to be very interesting to see my good friend the Minister of Highways use his heavy hand. As he says, the decision-making process is a heavy hand, but he will do things no differently, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 5.(a)—pass — the Member for Wellington.

**MR. CORRIN:** I feel motivated to belabour the subject even further much to the chagrin of my friend from Emerson, is it, who apparently feels the need of nature. Nature I suppose compels him to leave the room.

I should point out to the Minister, and this is probably one of the few area where I probably could provide this sort of assistance, practical experience to him because I have, in this case, had experience that I don't think he has and that's of course sitting on the city council. It has been a problematic area for past provincial governments and it's been an area of concern. It's been a critical focal point and a hot spot so to speak, for years, so I think I should point one thing out to him and I think that the Member for Winnipeg Centre could probably relate this as well.

The City of Winnipeg is a democratically-constituted area and when I said that their representatives have the same concerns as the Honourable Minister, that was representing their citizens in the formulation of public policy, I think I made an accurate statement but I should also point out that the — as I think I tried to before — that the concerns of all the citizens of the City of Winnipeg are not consistent, one with the other, and by the very nature of the word system existing in the city governmental structure there is a bias inherent and favourable to the suburban areas. I would like to point out to the Honourable Minister that sometime in the future I will predict that he will be confronted with demands. He will be confronted with demands that will be favourable to the bias evinced by suburban-oriented council members, and that bias will be pronouncedly and remarkably towards a freeway-type system, a mass transit system that will affect interchange of population between the various regions of the city.

I'm quite concerned to hear the Minister suggest to the committee that he is going to approach things on a global budget basis. That he is going to allocate sums — I must say I thought before he was saying just the opposite. I thought that he said that he and his government would establish the legitimate needs within legitimate fiscal constraints, but now I hear him saying that there will be, in response to the Member for Winnipeg Centre, that there will be a global approach and that moneys will be appropriated as between the various municipalities on a global basis and they can allocate what they wish, where they wish.

Well, I can tell you that that means that the inner city residents, having a minority of councillors, a minority of councillors of all different stripes who tend on this one issue always to vote together, be they Conservative, Liberal, NDP, Communist or Independent. They seem to have consistently since at least 1968 or 1970 on a Metropolitan — well, no, I can't say that, because the Metropolitan Government is different, say since 1971.

**A MEMBER:** . . . That's part of the price of Unicity.

**MR. CORRIN:** Well, but they have been — the inner city members have been voting consistently — in a consistent pattern, and that has been to discourage the growth of the regional street system to the extent that it would become a freeway type transportation system. I would suggest that the Honourable Minister is going to find himself betwixt and between and in a very difficult position if he continues to maintain that he will allow global budgeting, and that he will not intercede or intervene, because I don't think that is being responsive to the needs of the various people that his government represents. I don't think for instance that the minority members of his government who are from constituencies located in the inner city areas and I'm thinking of constituencies such as St. Matthews and Wolseley, I don't think, knowing the voting pattern for instance of the present member for Wolseley when he was an inner city councillor in Winnipeg, I don't think that there is going to be a community of interest if this global approach is presented in the face of these sorts of demands. I would suggest that although the Minister is right, and only time will tell, I would suggest if the Minister is going to take that sort of irresponsible and I don't want to be unfair again, but I'll say the word "simplistic" approach to the problem, and I appreciate that it's a complex problem, I don't think things will work out well. I would prefer to frankly deflect the problems before they are upon us rather than have to deal with them in a crisis-style fashion two years down the road, pardon the pun.

I suppose I would ask the Minister to give serious consideration to what I have suggested, the imposition — not the imposition, because it wouldn't be an imposition on the City of Winnipeg — of a trilateral liaison-style committee or group. I should note, Mr. Chairman, that the City of Winnipeg has already voted favourably in support of the creation of such a group. Matter of fact the present

Minister of Urban Affairs has in a recorded vote, voted affirmatively in that respect. I presented that motion to the city, it was one of the last things I did before I left, I presented a motion to the city council, asking them to endorse the trilateral approach and they did. I wrote letters to a variety of municipal representatives and although some didn't respond, some as important as the Mayor of Brandon did and I might tell you, Sir, that the Mayor of Brandon wants a trilateral committee. I will show you his letter.

So, there is indeed a favourable response to this idea and I think it's the only rational way, the only sane and sensible way to alleviate the possibility of — I should say the probability if I understand the Minister correctly — to alleviate the probability of crisis in the transportation planning in the future. I might point out that the Minister several times made reference to Mr. Nick Diakiw who is the city's Works Commissioner. Mr. Diakiw implements policy, he is responsible for program. He is not responsible for the formulation of policy. It is Mr. Filmon, I believe, who is responsible for the formulation of policy and the person that would relate and correspond to the Minister's position with the province. I would suggest that in view of the fact that Mr. Filmon I believe is a member of the same party as the Minister that there would be every available opportunity both formally and informally for him to sit down and discuss matters —(Interjection)— Well, in any setting they choose, a local convention or whatever, to discuss matters relative to transportation planning in order that a much more sensible approach can be worked out.

The former approach was a good start. The idea of a joint delegation was a good idea and I think it was a brave, bold new venture into an area that had hitherto been neglected. But for all the positive aspects of joint delegation communication, it didn't meet the need. It doesn't have the effect of convincing the rural taxpayer that the city's demands are legitimate. It doesn't have the effect of showing representation for instance under the presently-constituted government of inner city people, and I would suggest that there is a need for something now more sophisticated and more responsive to all the needs of all the people including the people of Emerson, even though the Member for Emerson is not evidently much interested in the proposal. I would prefer that at least he would listen as opposed to taking the approach he did, but it is at his discretion to do as he pleases of course. —(Interjection)— Well, I wish you'd participate, if you'd participate more often and listen less we would have something between us.

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

**MR. MCGREGOR:** Yes, seeing we are going into assists for small towns and communities, my yearly question is to do with access roads off of PRs. We know you have the policy off provincial trunk highways but not so off of PRs. Is there a policy? I think a couple or three years ago the Minister was very close to coming down with that decision. Restraint held him at bay. What is our intent? I can think of a community, very close to my home town of Lenore that lives about a half or three-quarters of a mile off of a PR, the other communities bigger or smaller do have access roads but this community doesn't. I am thinking of one, and I'm sure there is other towns across Manitoba as I look at the map here, I can see, that are caught in that kind of a bind. I would just suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, to your Minister, that maybe for a start, start off of a limited two miles, towns two miles and less off of PRs.

If it is too big a program to go across the province now — I was going to wait till the next item but it might be next week or the week after when we get to that next item so for what it's worth, maybe I will wait until the Minister comments.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I take those additional comments from the Member for Wellington as stated. I think I've expressed my position on them and we can keep on the merry-go-round I suppose on that one. I think it will remain to be seen how, particularly in this first construction year, matters work out as to whether or not he believes that the general approach or the method or my attitude is such that would work any of the hardships that he described on the inner core of the city.

Further to the comments made by the Member for Virden, I appreciate his bringing this matter to the attention of the committee. I think the continuing program — and this very often involves the smaller communities, most of the major communities that are located on our provincial trunk highway systems have over the years received this kind of service. It was accelerated of course with the taking over of the main market road systems from the municipalities in the year 1965 and turned into the provincial road system, and these roads of course, have been you know 100 percent responsibility of the province since that time.

Now, I can anticipate and in fact have begun to receive, as I received from the Member for Virden, the kind of pressure and constructive advice about as our PR road systems get upgraded in many instances, final surface treatments given to more and more of the secondary roads, if you want to call them that way, but these roads that happen to service so many of our smaller communities. I think it is a legitimate area of expansion for the Department of Highways to consider in the future and I think while we have not formally announced a program in that direction, you know, I invite support from the members of this committee and the Members of the Legislature generally that that be considered. Certainly this Minister and the department is prepared to consider it.

I will attempt to work out with the departmental officials what the implications of any general program means in terms of future demands, in terms of dollars and cents. It may well be that we would have to put some arbitrary limitation, as the member suggested — two miles, three miles or five miles — recognizing always that when you put an arbitrary line down that there will always be a



community that falls just outside of the limit and then feels, understandably so, unfortunate for having had the situation where an arbitrary line was drawn.

I would like to think that if the necessary dollars can keep coming to the Department of Highways that the amenity and the comfort and the safety, when you consider the problems that here is where you have — in rural Manitoba — the problems of safety perhaps more focussed than anywhere else, on our rural roads, and to have dust and gravel conditions that currently prevail on many of our access roads into smaller villages and communities, certainly I as the Minister would want to do everything that we can to alleviate that.

We are doing, in this program before you, several access roads into communities where we are concurrently doing work on a provincial road, where we are laying down asphalt or other cover onto a provincial road. The department has in the past and will continue in the future to, wherever possible, work into the same contract that mile or two or three miles of access as we are in the vicinity doing major work on a PR road.

Now, what the member is requesting is perhaps to have that program reinstated to a greater degree and to be made as a matter of policy for the Department of Highways. The Minister will take note of the suggestion and we'll have to consider the implications of that program in terms of dollars and cents.

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

**MR. MCGREGOR:** Mr. Chairman, I see by the new program that you do have 2.6 going through the Assiniboine Valley that will be very close to that community of Lenore. If it indeed could be geared in, it would certainly be appreciated on this community alone and I'm sure there are others. So I'll leave it at that.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 5.(a)—pass — the Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** I have one or two questions. I would like to know whether there is going to be any change in policy as far as culverts access?

**MR. ENNS:** I would ask the honourable member to explain that a little bit further. Do you mean in terms of the cost figures that are attached to individual property owners when they request culvert placements?

**MR. ADAM:** Yes.

**MR. ENNS:** None is contemplated at this time, Mr. Chairman and not provided for in these Estimates.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 5.(a)—pass; 5.(b)—pass. Resolution 70: Be it resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$18,320,000—pass.

On Page 47, Item 6 - Construction of Provincial Trunk Highways, Provincial Roads and Related Projects. 6.(a)—pass — the Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** Mr. Chairman, I think we will probably spend some time on this. In trying to get these figures that we see on the left-hand side of the Estimates and the right-hand side, it appears to me that the Strengthening Program will take up a good part of the increase, I believe it is \$24 million.

I would like to know, on the contracts that were let out last year for last year's Road Program, how much — have the contractors been paid for the work done to date, or do they get paid when the job is done?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, there is of course a policy with the Department of Highways that involves some holdbacks until final inspection is made that the road work has in fact been done to the satisfaction of departmental people. But the answer given to the similar question last night was that as of any moneys spent after April 1, if there are some amounts of money that because of a holdback arrangement or simply because the actual dollars haven't been paid to the contractor for work done on March 25 of the previous fiscal year, any moneys paid out after April 1 have to be paid out of this fiscal year's Estimates.

**MR. ADAM:** Therefore, there is no situation anywhere where there is any prepayments for work uncompleted under the contract, so that any work to be completed in this year and 1978-79 will have to come out of the new Estimates?

**MR. ENNS:** That is correct.

**MR. ADAM:** It appears to me that, looking at the \$50 million Road Regular Program for this year, if we take out the \$24 million that was actually allocated last year, we would be doing approximately \$26 million or \$27 million of new construction in addition to what was undertaken last year, outside of the Highway Strengthening. Is that correct? Is that a close estimate?

Friday, April 28, 1978

**MR. ENNS:** That is close, although I think at the time that I gave the figure of \$23 million or \$24 million as representing a carry-over program, that that was an estimation. The department assures me that that is reasonably close.

**MR. ADAM:** That would be, then, about \$10 million less than what the program was last year, is that correct?

**MR. ENNS:** No, Mr. Chairman, I know what the honourable member is trying to say . . .

**MR. ADAM:** No, I'm just trying to get a clear picture of what is happening, that's all.

**MR. ENNS:** If the honourable member, for instance, was not interested in having the department complete the carry-over work, say, in his constituency or any of the carry-over work that comprises of these \$24 million, then of course we would be spending the \$50 million on the new program. There really is no magic in these figures. We are spending or proposing and asking permission to spend \$50,670,000 on our Regular Program in the coming year.

The same situation prevailed in previous years. If there was a carry-over of \$24 million from last year in the actual building of roads, I can assume without even asking the department that there was likely a \$23 million or \$24 million carry-over from the year before, in that area. Really, it is a matter of interest, and the only matter of import is the actual spending request for the construction of new roads, new programs and I reject the words "carry-over" in a sense. I am sure that your constituents would reject that description too. When a road is finally built, it is considered new road. When asphalt is finally laid on a piece of 10-mile stretch that has been maybe on the program for two years, it is built in that year that it is paid for, in the year that it is built, and while we use the terms "carry-over program," and "new program" merely to delineate the difference, that these are programs that have an ongoing nature; these are programs that were planned by the department a year, maybe two years or three years ago, and will be completed in this year.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** To the members of the committee, I have been asked if we might close the committee down five minutes early today because the Honourable Mr. Ed McGill, by leave, has a statement to make regarding Rent Controls. So all members are asked to go back into the House. Committee rise.

## SUPPLY — EDUCATION

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I should like to direct the honourable members' attention to the gallery. We have 51 students from Grade 9 standing of the MacKenzie Junior High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. McCallum. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Dauphin.

I should also like to direct your attention to 35 students of Grade 4 standing of the Bannatyne School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Wadge. I see one male adult up there also. I would like to say that they're under his direction also. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, Minister without Portfolio, Minister responsible for Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation.

I would like to also direct your attention to the Speaker's gallery directly in front, where we have eight students from Grade 11 standing of the Windsor Park Collegiate School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Osinski. This school is located in the constituency of Radisson — my constituency. I left the script a little bit.

On behalf of the members of the Legislature we bid you welcome.

I would direct the honourable members to Page 25, Department of Education, Resolution 41. We are on Item 1.(f) Inter-Provincial Training Agreements. The Honourable Minister.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, thank you. After the rather extensive discussion we've had on what I imagine is a preview of the Health Department Estimates I would hope that we can now carry on with the Education Estimates. I was pleased that the Minister of Health reaffirmed the obligation of the government in the area of childrens' dental health and explained the general direction that his department and this government will be proceeding in the year ahead.

As this particularly applies to the Education Department of course it is dependent on the number of dental nurses that are in training in Saskatchewan and I would draw the members' attention to the fact that we have provided in the Estimates for the coming year for the training of the 40 young ladies, and perhaps gentlemen I'm not sure, who entered that course last fall, so the provision has been made to see them through the two years of that particular course, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. MILLER:** Mr. Chairman, then the fact the Minister doesn't confirm that although the training for those who were enrolled a year ago will be concluded, they'll continue the course, they won't be prevented from finishing the program itself. There is no new intake and therefore that will be the end of the program unless the government decides to crank it up a year from now. Whether Wascana will



be able to accommodate them of course is a question because I know there was considerable negotiation with the government of Saskatchewan in order for Manitoba to be able to place students there. Saskatchewan had sort of co-operated, because it is a growing program and they are anxious to get as many dental nurses as possible out into the field.

So what the Minister is now confirming is, the government has put an end to the training of dental nurses in this program and confirms my worse fears that the net result must be that at the end of the program of studies for this group of 40 there will be no further development of paraprofessionals of that type available to Manitoba, unless we go out and hire them from other provinces; that the dental health program will in fact be turned over to the private dental profession working on a fee-for-service basis, as they like to do, and they usually do, and is therefore moving away from the concept that the paraprofessionals would be paid for through government funds and not be simply employees of the dentist, who would pay the salaries of the parodontal staff, the dental nurses; and since they work for him, he would of course be entitled to also make a profit on their efforts as well. That's why we indicated a higher cost, because if the dentist is employing the person he is entitled to determine his salary, but in addition is entitled to make some money on the fruits of his labour, as it is in any business.

This is the difference between an entrepreneur private business versus a public program paid for through the society as a whole as is done, let's say, in the case of running a school system. There is no such thing as the individual teacher working for the principal, who then includes in his claim on government so much for all teachers on his staff, as if they were his employees. And that is what we object to in the termination of this agreement, because this, as I see it, is a termination and an end to the program which was started under the former government to bring dental care for children ages 5 to 12 in Manitoba; and an attempt by this government to somehow move to the private dental profession, the Dental Association, through some negotiations, to seek some accommodation whereby the services again can be provided but having to deal with the association directly on a fee-for-service basis to make this service available, and we all know what fee-for-service can lead to, because we have the experience in Medicare.

So I am simply pleased that the Minister is confirming that, in fact, the program is being phased out, albeit not chopped off, because they recognize the moral commitment of the 40 students who are mid-term, half-way through their program — even the Conservatives could not have been that cruel as to cut them off after they, in all good sincerity, entered into a program encouraged by the government.

So it is with a great deal of regret I find that the Minister is agreeing that this is the end of the program.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of rehashing the preview of the Health Estimates we had this morning, as the Member for Seven Oaks appears to be doing.

As that particular dental program applies to my department, I think I have made eminently clear the path that we will be following there, the one-year suspension of intake of new dental nurses does apply to my department, and, of course, that is where my concern happens to be. As I mentioned before, we have made provision to see these young people through their second year of training. I would hope that would clarify the particular issue in this case.

**MR. MILLER:** Mr. Chairman, I wasn't rehashing the debate of this morning. I was simply thanking the Minister for confirming the fact that, as far as his department, under Section (f), they were at this point in time now serving notice that they would no longer continue to use the facilities of Wascana to train dental nurses, except to complete the education of those who are mid-stream in their program, and therefore this is the end of the program that was developed by the former government.

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

**MR. JENKINS:** Mr. Chairman, I just have a couple of questions that I would like to ask the Minister. Has the Minister had any indication from the 38 to 40 students who are in their first year and will be, hopefully, as the Minister said, returning this fall for the second semester — has he had any indication from these people how many will be returning this fall?

The second question I have is: if the course had been onstream, I know that's hypothetical, but has the Minister had any applications of new students who would wish to enter the program if it had been in effect? Has the department received any applications in that respect?

**MR. COSENS:** Once again, Mr. Chairman, I have no indication of how many will return in the fall. There are 38 presently in the course, and I would be optimistic that, barring some type of unforeseen circumstance, that those 38 would carry on. I have had no indication from any of the students in the course — I believe the member is enquiring if I have — and I have had no indication that any would be considering termination. I believe they consider that they are receiving a worthwhile course, and as a result will continue in it.

As far as new intake is concerned, once again I believe any applications in that regard would go to the Department of Health, and I have received none in my department.

**MR. JENKINS:** I thank the Honourable Minister for that reply, and I can only echo what my colleague, the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, has said, that it is with regret that we on this side



of the House see that the policy of the present government at the present time is not to continue this program. I don't want to start the debate all over again that we had this morning. I think it was a useful debate because we really weren't getting the answers to the questions that we were asking, and we have had the answers. They may not be satisfactory answers and that is something we have to accept as members in Opposition. But I want to assure the Honourable Minister that that is our function, that is a function that we intend to adopt in this House, to ask and enquire and find out the information that we require. As I said we weren't getting them this morning and I must say we now have formed a pretty fair picture of where the present government stands on the Denticare Program here in Manitoba.

If I might just reiterate what the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks has said, that if somewhere down the line you decide to reinstitute this, well then you are going to have a two-year lag of getting graduates in the course of dental nurses and if the program is to be speeded up, well then we are going to have to hopefully try and hire them or lure them away from someone else. That is unfortunate, but you are the government and you have made the decision. We will have to accept that and the people of Manitoba will have to accept that. But I can assure you that in three and one-half years time when we are the government again that we will certainly look at the program in a much different light than what the present government is looking at it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Minister could advise re the terms of the agreement with Saskatchewan for the training of dental nurses, whether there is a penalty clause involving some additional costs from the Province of Manitoba, because this program is being terminated, or because the agreement presumably is being terminated? Is there some additional costs, and if so, what is involved? In fact, what is the total cost, what was the total cost of the program in the last year, one full year?

My other question is: Is there a penalty invoked for terminating this, because it seems to me that the Wascana College, or whatever it is called, in Regina has probably undertaken certain expenditures in order to accommodate the training of these nurses, I would imagine, and there may be some additional costs that they have to incur because of Manitoba's withdrawal from the program.

**MR. COSENS:** Yes, to the Member for Brandon East, Mr. Chairman, the cost in 1977-78 was some \$500,349.00. That takes in the total not just of, pardon me, that's the total for all three — the veterinary medicine, the dental nursing and optometry. Let me go back to dental nursing — \$219,077, Mr. Chairman. That was 1977-78.

In reply to the Member for Brandon East's second question there is no penalty clause as he mentions with Wascana and I must state at this time that we have very much appreciated the co-operation and the working relationship we have had with that particular institution and the officials there.

**MR. EVANS:** Well, I thank the Minister for his information. Well I'm glad that there is no penalty clause in the termination of this agreement. However, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that although there may not be any direct cost in withdrawing from the agreement nevertheless there is a cost in the long run and ultimately to the people of Manitoba, to the taxpayers of Manitoba, in the present termination of the program or in the present decision, the decision to hold up any further extension of the program throughout the Province of Manitoba. The fact that the Minister of Health told us this morning that they are now reviewing this situation, the jury is out, he hasn't, as I understand it, he hasn't got a closed mind on the matter and the government has not ruled out an extension, continued extension, in the future of this program by one method or another but, nevertheless, the process is being reviewed. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if there is a decision to go back and continue the program that was started by the New Democratic Party government of Manitoba that there is going to be a cost involved just in re-establishing the process of extension. It seems to me that there is always a cost involved when you stop a program and have to start it up again.

Of course, if the Minister does decide, if the government rather does decide to eventually opt for the private dental scheme as opposed to the scheme that was developed by the New Democratic government, a scheme using the public school system and the dental nurses. There is no doubt in my mind from information I had last year when we were in government and my understanding of it, and even now the information we're getting it seems to me that it's not at all proven that it will be cheaper to use the private dentists. As a matter of fact, every indication is that it's going to cost the taxpayers more money if the Government of Manitoba decides to go along the route of using the professional dentist to do a lot of work that can be done by well-trained para-medical or para-dental personnel.

The Minister of Health said this morning that the jury is out and he is re-examining this and the government will make a decision. Mr. Chairman, I'm afraid that the jury is out but I'm not so sure who is on the jury and I'm not so sure that there is going to be a fair trial conducted. As a matter of fact, I think what's really happening here is that this whole program has ceased, the extension of it has ceased, a most worthwhile program and, incidentally, a program that probably the benefits in rural Manitoba in many ways may be greater than the benefits in the urbanized parts of this province simply because in many rural parts of the province — and certainly in the north — there are not these facilities available so that children's teeth do deteriorate simply because of the lack of dental care and, of course, also because of the very high costs involved.

**A MEMBER:** No fluoridation.

**MR. EVANS:** No painting of teeth, no fluoridation in water, yes, that's another factor as well. The fluoridation of water that happens in Winnipeg and Brandon as well, I believe. So I really think that what is happening is that if the program is at all extended, it will likely be extended using the dentists of Manitoba. I know we have some very fine dentists, I have nothing against the professional dentists of Manitoba, they're good people, they're very qualified, they do a very good job.

But also I must be concerned, as the Member for St. Johns is concerned and expressed it very well this morning, that there may be a much greater cost involved in using professionals to do a great deal of work that can be done by para-professionals, by dental nurses, that we're talking about.

I'm afraid that the ideological bias of this government is going to outweigh the rational decision that should be arrived at from looking at the costs. I'm afraid that the ideological bias is going to mean that any extension of the program, private or public, will be done very very slowly. Conservatives don't usually throw things out overnight necessarily. The approach of the typical Conservative is to slow it down — (Interjection) — Just Deputy Ministers, pardon me, I take that back. Deputy Ministers are thrown out. — (Interjection) — Yes, they'll two-bit it to death, that's a good expression. They'll make this program so insignificant — that is the extension of the program — that virtually there will be really no increase in dental health services in the Province of Manitoba, whether they follow the private or the public route. But I'm afraid if they do extend it, they'll follow the private route and we're all going to be paying more on that account, all because of the Conservative ideological blinkers that are covering the eyes of the members opposite, particularly the First Minister and members of the Cabinet.

I think that although the Minister of Health is a very fine person and I know he is very sincere and so on and he wants to do a good job — he is doing his best — nevertheless I am very suspicious that in this case we are not going to see an improvement in dental health care in Manitoba such as has occurred in the past year or so with this program; but that we are going to reach a standstill and that the people of this province, the children of this province, are going to be the worse off therefor.

I repeat again that particularly many people in the rural area are going to be hurt by this. I know from having talked to people around the province there seems to be a great deal of interest in it and many are wondering why it isn't proceeding. Some of the people have asked me — I don't know what their politics are — but they have heard of the program, they think it is a needed program and particularly in the small towns and villages where there just aren't qualified dentists around and this is one way of ensuring that at least the children will get a start through proper care and perhaps prevention of tooth decay.

But because of the bias, I am afraid what is going to happen is simply zero; that we will see very little action in this respect and I wouldn't be surprised if in next year's Estimates the Minister of Education — I would be very surprised if the Minister of Education came next year and asked us for some dollars because he was going to reinstitute the program, training dental nurses in Regina — I would be very pleasantly surprised but I don't think that I will have that opportunity to be pleasantly surprised because I think we are going to find that nothing will happen.

So I would say, then, the only way that something will happen, I'm afraid that certain people have got to the Minister of Health and — although he professes otherwise — I really believe that we've got a stacked jury — or whatever the expression is — and that we are not going to see the good work continued that occurred under the New Democratic Government. The only way we are going to get the job done, the only way that we are going to move into this one area, the very important area of health care delivery that there has been a lack of — there has been a hole so to speak in the comprehensive health delivery service in Manitoba — and that great hole is dental care for children particularly in remote areas and particularly in rural areas where there are no dentists, and particularly where the people do not have the money, in the low income categories.

So I am afraid that the only way we can plug this gap in health care services for the people of Manitoba, is for the people of Manitoba to make up their minds that what they need is a new government, a government that is conscious of the needs of the people of this province, conscious of the needs of this province, a government that does care about the sick and the needy and the aged and the poor. Although the First Minister had professed his great concern about such people, I am afraid it is those people who have been shafted in the past six or seven months. It is those people who have been shafted and those people will not forget.

So I think they will come to the conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that the only way in this area of dental care, the only way we are going to re-establish this program, the only way we are going to have a Minister of Education sign a new agreement to train dental nurses, is to change the government to a government that cares about adequate health care for the people of this province.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. BOYCE:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I really hadn't intended on entering this debate until the Minister's remarks. — (Interjection) — The Member for Roblin is making his usual speeches from his seat.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Minnedosa. Well, maybe he wants to table his Hydro bill.

**MR. BOYCE:** No, he won't table his Hydro bill. But, Mr. Chairman, may I make a suggestion to the



Minister for next year. I would transfer this line to the Department of Health; I wouldn't even have it in my Estimates. —(Interjection)— Well, I listened earlier on some of the debates.

But nevertheless, one of the remarks of the Minister concerns me somewhat — and I don't know whether he just dropped it in some relief that perhaps he is going to get off this item and onto something else — the esoteric arguments of nature and nurture and man we can leave to his Salary. But nevertheless, he said that the schools are getting out of it and it seemed to be implicit in his remarks that he sees the whole Department of Education being somewhat divorced from the people in their community. Now, the reason I have read that into your remarks perhaps, was that the First Minister chose to quote Jimmy Carter as saying there has to be a *reprochement* between the government and the people. I'm not too familiar with the Minister's philosophy on government or education per se, so I have to ask him this question because when you see the need for *reprochement* between the government and the people, that implies that there is a difference and I really don't see the difference. I see the institutions being the servants of the people.

I have to go back a little bit in the educational history in the province where we, in the interests of health, put public health nurses in schools because there was an educational process involved. From reading some of the things, and I don't want to be unfair to the Minister because having had the benefit of the insight of the local press into something, sometimes they take what we say and it doesn't come out what we intended. I'll be that kind to the press, it may have been what we said, but not necessarily what we intended. What seems to be coming through in the press is the Minister's philosophy that the old picture, you know the inculcation of youngsters with values is all the schools are about.

The Minister is not aware of my bias in educational philosophy either, so perhaps it would be only fair if I mentioned that I am old-fashioned in this regard. In fact I am more old-fashioned than all the Conservatives over there, I think the state should be as far removed from education as possible, the responsibility should still be vested in the parents. But over the past thirty, forty, fifty years, the state has moved in more and more so that the parents have actually given over this responsibility to the state. I would suggest that this is one of the difficulties that we find in our society, that the people who attend our school systems come there with an attitude that isn't one to engender learning, it's a process that they are required to suffer by the state more than a developmental, enjoyable process.

If the Minister's philosophy is different, that he sees the role of the school in developing attitudes other than to the 3 R's, then I hope he will correct me, because it does concern me.

For an example how important some of these things are, we hear much about the cost of health and at the same time we hear how bad shape the citizenry is, including myself, somewhat overweight at the present time, but nevertheless, if we are going to make inroads into health, it is not only the provision of the services, it's not only the processes that are important, it's the changing of attitudes, the development of attitudes, which are conducive —(Interjection)— My colleague from Seven Oaks, if he put us in one container and shook us up to get us divided in two, we'd probably be better proportioned. But the development of attitudes is, in my view, part of the educational process, or should be part of the process, that youngsters go, in their developmental years, to the only source that they have outside of television, the only state interest, because this is what we're talking about, especially when we have state funded programs in Medicare. I say this while I stand here sucking on a cigarette. I wish I had never started this smoking.

Nevertheless, this kind of thing has to be developed through the schools.

A number of years ago, even the involvement of the private sector in helping people learn, Metropolitan Life years and years ago used to sell policies for two-bits. Two-bits a month, and they figured out the actuarial probability of people dying and they charge their two-bits and they give you a certain policy relative to their expectations, and they made a profit on it. So to increase their profits they hired nurses to go around the countryside telling people about such things as rubella and the rest of it, and as a result of that the incidence of rubella decreased, the people lived longer, the company made more money, but there was a public interest in that, in that rubella almost disappeared from our society.

So that when the Minister says — I can appreciate him being rubbed a little sore on the debate over which he really has not that much administrative control — the provision of the service. But I said that what concerned me was the apparent implication, at least my interpretation of what he said, is that he sees the school system as being educational factories. That's a very crass way of putting it, I'll agree. Then we couple this, I just want to underline it because it seems to be the tone that the Minister has set in my mind, and if I am wrong I wish he would correct me, because when he says that he is going to reimpose the inspectorial services in the school system, in other words, there's going to be more central control of the system, then this, too, is going to have the effect of removing the community relationship to the school. The Minister, I know, remembers the days when schools closed at four o'clock and the janitor chased everybody out and that was it.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Chairman, I again rise on a point of order and I ask you to tell me how the remarks that are now being made by the honourable member relate even remotely to the item that is under discussion at the present time.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I would like to remind the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre that we are discussing Item (f) which are agreements. Would the honourable member make some reference to Item (f) in his debate?



**MR. BOYCE:** Mr. Chairman, I don't want to try your patience. It's been probably tried enough today, but I said I was relating my remarks to the remarks that the Minister made, and no one objected to the Minister saying what a great relief this was that this was going to be taken out of the school system. The Minister made the remarks and I think on this particular time when he's made such remarks, I'm entitled to find out what his philosophy is as a result of that particular remark. I said I would leave the esoteric arguments to his salary, which I intend to do, but the House Leader is wont once in a while . . . You know, my friend the House Leader, he can make any kind of an argument he wants, little red hens and all the rest of it, that's fine. I'll make my arguments my way, Mr. Chairman, if I may, and everything in the universe is causally related.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Chairman, on that same point of order, I have no objection to my honourable friend making whatever remarks he wants to make. All I'm asking is that he make them under the item that is under discussion at the present time. The item under discussion at the present time deals with inter-provincial training agreements, and if my honourable friend will relate his remarks to that subject, he can talk all he likes. All I ask is that he be relevant to the subject under discussion.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I'll make one more remark before I recognize the honourable member. This morning, I did allow quite a bit of latitude, possibly in error, too much latitude, and I would hope that maybe with some direction, I would ask the honourable members to please make reference to under Education, Clause (f), Inter-provincial Training Agreements. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. BOYCE:** In the inter-provincial training agreements, one of which is the dental program, which is provided through the school system — I'm not talking about the program itself, the provision of that particular program, I'm talking about the educational process which takes place relative to that program, and the provision of it within the school system, which is the function of the Department of Education in the province of Manitoba, unless this government has changed it. And this is what I want to know, Mr. Chairman. Is the government today seeing the school as a learning factory with absolutely no other responsibility to the community, and all its responsibility is going to be focussed on Broadway.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (f)—pass.

**MR. BOYCE:** Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Minister wanted to reply.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, very briefly in reply to the Member for Winnipeg Centre, I appreciate many of his remarks. However, I do feel that we have had quite a wide-ranging discussion under I.(b) and we will have that same wide-ranging discussion again, I would hope under I.(a) when we come to that at the end of these Estimates. I think his remarks are basically philosophical and I would be quite prepared to go into them at some length when we come to those sections where that is applicable.

I would suggest that in my estimation that relationship to inter-provincial training agreements is rather tenuous in this circumstance.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (f)—pass — the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. BOYCE:** Mr. Chairman, I would agree it is rather tenuous but it is not only philosophical; there is immediate pragmatism in this subject. Because when the Minister himself said, you know, it's not in the Department of Education, it shouldn't be in the Department of Education. I will quote it back to him later in the debate rather than belabour the point, because I have the feeling that this is the only answer I am going to get from the Minister at this time. So I will raise it later, on his salary.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (f)—pass. I will direct the members to Resolution 42, Clause 2. Research. 2.(a) Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for Burrows.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Yes, with reference to Resolution No. 42, and this relates to it as well as, no doubt, to resolutions following. And I am referring specifically to the document which the Honourable Minister was good enough to provide us with earlier today, with the staff man year approval for the various programs.

The document that I have before me is for the 1977-78 fiscal year, that is the four pages. — (Interjection)— Well, mine reads 1977-78 and on the first page the year written in is 1977-78 in ballpoint ink on the 1977-78 adjusted vote, and then the second page reads 1977-78 adjusted vote continued.

Let us just set this matter aside for a couple of minutes, Mr. Chairman. It may be that the Honourable Minister . . . I wish to apologize; it may be that we do have, if not all, most of the information which we had asked of the Minister. There were two documents distributed, four sheets

in each, and I was of the impression one was a duplicate of the other. But apparently it isn't. One is for 1977-78 and the other one for 1978-79.

So, if we do have all the information that we had asked for, I wish to thank the Honourable Minister for it. And if we do not, then we will certainly indicate during the course of the debate what further information we require.

Now, in dealing with Resolution No. 42, namely Research, I would like to start off by asking the Honourable Minister one basic question and that is I would like him to outline to the committee the types of research projects, or research activity, that this particular branch is and will be engaged in during this fiscal year. I would be very anxious to know, as the Honourable Minister had said in his opening statement, when he said that I should like to stress that this group will be doing down-to-earth feet-on-the-ground work with both feet on the ground, and whatever other parts of the anatomy near to the ground.

Well, I would like to know what is that down-to-earth feet-on-the-ground type of work that his Research Branch will presently be engaged in. The Honourable Member for Logan had another expression which he had suggested, it might be relevant but I will reserve that for later, after I hear the Honourable Minister's response. And in the event that the Research Branch has nothing in particular to concern itself with at this particular point in time, may I direct the Honourable Minister's attention to a memo, a copy of which we were provided with this morning, from his colleague, the Honourable Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs. And I am certain that if the Honourable Minister were to read it, he would agree with me that there may be need to do some survey, some study of the literacy level, of the effectiveness of the education program at some point in time, even prior to 1969. Because you will agree with me, Mr. Minister, that no one who had enrolled in school in 1969 is now of an age to be employed by the Civil Service to write memos. So whoever drafted this memo must have been a product of a school program of the school system prior to 1969.

There is one sentence here, "The mass choir, comprising of a total of approximately 900 voices . . ." I wonder whether "comprising of a total" is really correct or not, and I am told that the Honourable Minister is an English teacher. I think that "comprised of a total" would be more correct, if that is a correct expression. No, if something is correct, how can it be more correct? No. "Will sing a couple of selections during the ceremony, as well as performing." Now, it will sing as well as performing. I think "as well as perform" would be the more correct expression.

So the Honourable Minister may want to check into that. But really, that I am saying somewhat with tongue-in-cheek. I well appreciate that in drafting memos that on occasion one may not have the time to be as mindful of proper grammatical structure as one should be. But my basic question is, at this point in time, if the Minister would indicate the types of research projects that his branch is involved in at the present time and that the Minister plans that it will be involved in during the forthcoming year.

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

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, I wanted to see if I could elicit a clearer response from the Minister. I asked him the other day about two two research reports that he had and that he had not acted on. He indicated, I believe, in regard to the province-wide testing that he was about to release that report, that it was an expensive report, over \$150,000 I believe, essentially dealing with mathematical skills of Grade 10 students. I believe he said that he was, in fact, on the verge of releasing the results, but I don't believe he answered the other side of that question about the physical education report, and I wanted to ask him what he intends to do with that? That is something that has already been done. That is a \$150,000 study that the Minister has had in his possession. This is one of those basics of education and maybe it's even under-pinning the traditional three R's. And we know — those of us who have been in the profession — that there have been and still are school divisions or schools that are in violation of the department's requirements in regard to n, physical education that they do not allocate the required time for physical education.

All of us, too, are aware of the fact that some of our younger students are not in very good shape and that when it comes to, I suppose, running and walking and performing certain skills of agility that they are deficient.

Mr. Chairman, I would cite an early and old example from my own career, way back in 1960, when we had minimum physical education drill at Emerson High School I think one of the local tests for students was to jump three feet in the high jump. Now, three feet is not much, an average junior high, high school student can walk over that; but a large number of the girls in that day and age — well, some of my colleagues say they're not so sure they could make it now — but they are not spring chickens. They are chickens but not spring chickens, or roosters perhaps would be more appropriate, and I'll stop there. I recall that some of the young girls couldn't make it three feet over the bar. Now, you know, styles have changed. I said to the female Phys. Ed. teacher, "Why can't they?" And she said, "Well, they don't want to take off their girdles." Well, of course, I don't know if these garments are still worn in contemporary society, but at any rate I would like to know, from the Minister, about this report.

A few days ago one of the men, a Mr. Gutoski, from Kildonan East which is in my end of Winnipeg, was commenting on this report on the 24-Hour show. A lot of study went into this. I suppose the results will come as no surprise to a lot of us, but may shock some of our citizenry, that a lot of young people may be well fed, may appear to be in good health, but yet cannot pass certain basics of physical education. So I would like to know from the Minister, what he is doing in terms of that report;



what he intends to do with that report? Because at the moment it's gathering dust in his office.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. COSENS:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, first of all to the Meer for Burrows who would like to know the particular functions and activities of the Research Branch that are planned for the coming year and I would, of course, suggest to him that I may not be quite as specific as he would like to see in actual topics but I will attempt to give him the overview that we have at this time of the functions, and it's divided into the particular areas of the departmental function in the global aspect.

Under Education Research, one of the activities, the functions, will be to identify priority research and information needs of the department, to identify them; to initiate and conduct experimental and pilot project research activities; to undertake needs assessment and market surveys in the public schools and postsecondary sector; to prepare enrolment demand analysis and forecasts; to conduct studies on specific problem areas.

Under Manpower Assessment — and I know that the Member for Burrows, because of his previous experience in government and in the Cabinet, is well aware of the functions here but the Research function would be to assist with the development of Manpower and employment outlook information, a very vital function of that particular area; to prepare occupational forecasts and I'm sure we would all agree a most timely activity in our society today; to assess Manpower skills' requirements in the province; to assess imbalances between educational supply and labour demand; to undertake specific occupational industrial Manpower studies and of course these, as the honourable members realize, are linked very directly to the AOTA Agreement that we were discussing last week and will, no doubt, discuss again when we get to that appropriate section. To undertake specific occupational industrial Manpower studies to prepare annual training submissions to Ottawa, again a basic part of that particular activity.

Under Program Assessment — the Research Branch would assess outcomes of educational programs; would review programs to assess cost effectiveness; compare program performance on an interprovincial and an interprogram basis.

Under Systems Analysis — conduct demographic analysis; analyze shifts in stocks and flows from the educational system into the labour market; analyze the impacts of proposed federal and provincial policy changes on the education process, on the education system; assess the impact of social, economic and demographic changes on the educational system.

And under the area of Financial and Educational Planning — The Research Department through the support in analysis function would co-ordinate planning in the department. Of course, it may sound rather simple and basic, Mr. Chairman, but nonetheless a very vital function; the Research Department would develop departmental guidelines and procedures for planning; it would assess the results of planning in context of policy objectives; it would provide an integrated analysis of proposed funding from the province to public schools, universities, colleges and Student Support Programs in co-operation with funding agencies.

And in the Consultative and Technical Assistance area the Research Branch would provide consultative and technical assistance in such areas as research methodologies, evaluation and assessment projects, statistical and quantitative methods.

And in the general area of Research Co-ordination and Information Dissemination — The Research Branch would co-ordinate research and related activities in the department, serve as a focal point for liaison with the Manitoba Bureau of Statistics, Statistics Canada, Council of Ministers of Education, and other agencies. And lastly, and certainly not least important, it would communicate the results of these research projects.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that that list of activities is not exhaustive, and it's certainly based on a very initial assessment of research and planning needs, because as honourable members realize, this particular research branch of the department has just come into being as of the 1st of April. However, it must be understood that as needs and priorities and situations change, it may be necessary to delete, add or change those functions or activities that I have just outlined to you. However, Mr. Chairman, those, as far as I can provide at this time, are the particular activities and functions of the Research Branch.

The Member for Elmwood has made reference to the Phys Ed report that was conducted last year. As Minister of Education at this time, I had no bearing on the guidelines and so on that went into this particular report, or in the structuring of the objectives or goals. However, I realize that a great deal of money went into this report and a great deal of time. I have had some time to peruse the report and it contains a goodly amount of information. Certainly, the recommendations that are drawn from the report are something that few can disagree with. There is no one in this House, I am sure who would disagree that we would like to see our young people, and in fact our whole population increase their health level. There is just no argument on this at all. That's a motherhood issue, and I'm sure that is not even a debatable topic.

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, I know that members of this House were not surprised to find that in our society today, we not only have young people, but some older people who are a little bit overweight and who are not exercising enough — present company not excepted, or myself certainly — except that chubby fellow from Seven Oaks. However, Mr. Chairman, more seriously — and it is a serious matter — the report does bring forward recommendations that have, I would say, very heavy implications for the educational system. What it is suggesting, of course is that more time be spent in the area of physical education, in the school system. It is suggesting along with that that we require



more personnel, and it is suggesting in many cases, more facilities. Once again, I am sure there is no one on either side of this House, at least I would expect that there are very few, who would argue against that particular type of recommendation.

The problem that I would suggest to my honourable friend from Elmwood, is, where will we find this time in the educational system? Would he like us to take the time away from Language Arts? Should we be spending less time in the area of Science? More time in games and physical fitness activities? This is one of the problems that we are grappling with at this time.

Personnel — certainly there is no one in this House that is opposed to the idea of having more trained personnel in the area of physical fitness, but more personnel, ladies and gentlemen, cost us money. And Mr. Chairman, I'm sure the members on the other side of the House know the problem that exists there. Of course, facilities also cost money.

I think it is a wonderful thing to have goals and objectives, long-term goals and objectives in relation to the amount of financial support that we can garner, but to release reports with recommendations that build up the expectations of the public, I think is a rather cruel type of direction to take, because immediately people say, "oh, we're going to do this and we're going to do that." And if government doesn't have money to meet those expectations, as I suggested, is a rather cruel type of activity to become involved in.

I know that the overweight problem is not just a matter of exercise, and certainly the report deals with the overweight problem at some length. As I said before, it is a lengthy report, and I would suggest well done. That it is not just a matter of exercise, Mr. Chairman, but also a matter of nutrition. We are all victims of the society that we live in today, I suppose as far as our own nutrition is concerned. We live in a world of fast foods, and perhaps a fast world, and as a result the type of foods that are being consumed by adults and by young people generally would seem to be contributing to this whole problem of overweight. So the area of nutrition that is dealt with in the report, and I think it's a very apt area to be dealt with, certainly bears heavy consideration. I think that in our school health programs, in the programs of our Home Economics departments dealing with foods, that this whole area is being highlighted, that more than ever before, nutrition is something that students are studying, that teachers are providing a great deal of information in this regard. As they do this, of course, they are battling the other elements of society that may not be quite as concerned about nutrition, but are perhaps more concerned about the marketing of the type of food that does not necessarily contribute to that level of nutrition.

So to sum up, Mr. Chairman, the Phys Ed report, I think is certainly a lengthy report. It reflects the amount of time, and I would hope reflects the amount of money that was spent in its development; its recommendations are something that very few of us can quarrel with. The implementation of those recommendations have a bearing to a large extent on the amount of funding that is available, and I would hope that as the months and years go by, that we can move towards many of the recommendations that are made in that report, and we will move as funds become available. I would hope that this overview of the report on my part will in some way have answered the questions put forward by the Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, I am having difficulty with the Minister. He is very fast, if not on his feet, with his words, because he just sort of gave us a negative look at the physical education report and then all of a sudden ended on a positive note. I'm having trouble following his logic. The conclusion was not contained in the premises which he seemed to put forward, and I know that the Minister is, I think, somewhat of an athlete himself. I don't know his particular areas of expertise, but I know he is a renowned curler, and I don't know whether he participates in other sports, but I know he was a big shot-maker in the Stonewall area and was frequently seen in his curling sweater which he has exchanged for a three-piece suit. I don't know if that is a step forward or not.

I would remind my honourable friend, the Minister and former colleague in the profession, that I think there was considerable input in that particular report, that in addition to people in the department, and teachers, and I suppose MTS people, there were doctors, I believe, involved, and dieticians, etc. I have the impression that he may in fact withhold the report. Now he says that he won't and I am pleased to hear that, because I, you know, believe that there was a public input and a professional input and that it would be really just literally throwing money away not to make some use of that report. I share his concern for raising expectations because he is correct in saying that sometimes people expect action, etc., but surely the least we can expect is that the Minister will at some point release the report and engage in a dialogue and engage in a debate with people in the profession and people in the community, to see what direction they would like to go. I believe this is the correct approach to take. I think that all of us will agree that this is certainly one of the important skills that people should have, first of all as young people and secondly, I suppose ultimately as a life skill, something to continue on for the rest of one's life wherever possible. The old, I guess, Greek saying or objective of a sound mind and a healthy body, that certainly is one goal that all of us can subscribe to. On the other hand we don't want the strong back with the weak mind and we don't want people who are bright but fat. There has to be, in deference to some of my colleagues, bright and skinny. We must have people who are in physical condition and one of the conclusions, I understand, in the report from one of the authors of the report that was broadcast on television the other day, was an apparent statistic indicating that people in good physical condition also tended to be better students. I know that some of us will have differing views on that about people who spend too much time in athletics, not enough time studying, etc. But I take the Minister at his word that he indicates that he will not suppress the report, but that he will in fact release the report and give some thoughts



to its recommendations and to the considerable amount of effort and the considerable amount of money that went into it.

I just have one other point I would like to make, Mr. Chairman, and that is, I would also like to know about another study or another report, that the Minister has. I have already listed two that are I gather both going to be released. One, the testing in mathematics on a province-wide basis; secondly, the physical education report. There is a third one, which cost several hundred-thousand dollars and there may be more. These are only three that I am aware of. The third one is the course on Co-ops, and I would be interested and I am sure a lot of my colleagues on this side of the House have a keen interest in what happened to that. There are two departments involved — the Department of Co-op and the Education Department spent a great deal of money, developed a course in Co-ops, printed the material, and I gather that the material again is shelved and sitting somewhere in the department. I think it would be the kind of course that would present some balance in some of the thrust that is taught in our schools, and I believe that it is one that I don't think that should only be supported by members on this side of the House, but I think can be and should be supported by members of the government. So there again, I simply ask, what has happened to those course materials and all that effort and all that money that went into developing it?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Is the Honourable Minister rising on a point of privilege on being accused of being a curler of some doubt? The Honourable Minister.

**MR. COSENS:** No, Mr. Chairman, I will accept that charge on the part of the Member from Elmwood, and I would like to respond to some of his statements.

It was not my intention to leave a negative type of reaction to the phys. ed. report at all. I merely was outlining the problems that certainly stem from trying to implement some of the recommendations at this time, and I want to make that quite clear. Another recommendation and theme that runs through the report and one that I certainly condone and am a great exponent of, is the idea that the report emphasizes the use of career sports as opposed to the great emphasis that we place on team sports in our society. I would suggest to honourable members that there is a place in our educational system for both types of athletic activity. However, I also suggest to honourable members that as far as the career sport, the individual sport, this can be carried on through life to some considerable age, whereas there is a tendency with some of the team sports, for a person's activity in that area, whether it may be football, Mr. Chairman, or basketball, the activity in that area drops off rather early in one's life. So I certainly do support and certainly would be quite prepared to help advance what I think is now a developing trend, by the way, in our physical education programs, a trend towards the lifetime sport, rather than the team sport alone, and I would like to make that exceedingly clear at this time, Mr. Chairman.

I think the reference to the Grade 10 math test, I believe this is what the Member from Elmwood was referring to, that was conducted last year, I touched on that earlier and I will come back to it again at this time. I have received a report on it and through the discussions during that report had asked the Committee if they would go back and bring in final recommendations. These recommendations were not contained in that report and I am awaiting those final recommendations before I make a public release on that particular program. I would expect them soon.

The course on Co-ops, again material that I inherited, and the Member from Elmwood is quite correct in saying that this particular course cost hundreds of thousands of dollars. The exact figure I don't have at my fingertips, but one-half a million dollars, perhaps, was the amount of money that went into this particular venture. This material has been sent out to teachers through the province. They have had this material available to them, and we have made it apparent to all teachers in the schools of this province that this material is available as supplementary curriculum material, and they may use it to enrich different courses on the high school curriculum, or indeed the elementary school curriculum as they see fit.

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

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Mr. Chairman, a comment or two on the last point made by the Honourable Minister with respect to the program dealing with the principles of co-operation because it deals, and I am sure that the Honourable Minister will agree with me, that it deals with much more than just merely the structure of co-operatives, the history of the co-operative movement, the functioning and the operation of a co-operative, be it the producer or consumer co-operative, or credit union, or whatever else. It goes much beyond that, but it deals with the whole broad concept of co-operation as opposed to competition as a way of life, as a way of dealing with the problems of life and resolving them, and coping with them. I think that it should also be mentioned at this point in time, Mr. Chairman, that the program, if we wish to call it co-operative education or co-operative principles, has been recognized and accepted even far beyond the boundaries of the Province of Manitoba, that a number of other school authorities, school jurisdictions in other provinces have expressed an interest in it, and in fact have adopted it and have incorporated it into their own education programs; namely, a number in the Province of Alberta and Saskatchewan and not to exclude some post-secondary institutions; namely, I believe it is Harvard University, which looks upon the program developed in Manitoba as a very very worthwhile one.

However, I would like to get back to the question which I had posed to the Honourable Minister earlier this afternoon, when I asked him to outline the types of projects, of research projects that this branch will be involved in, and he did do that. Could the Honourable Minister indicate to the Committee those research projects which the research branches of the Department of Education and Continuing Education may have previously been involved in, which have been discontinued by him and new research activity that may have been initiated by him in his government.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. COSENS:** I don't have that list available at this time, Mr. Chairman, of the — you are asking for the new research activities?

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** If I may, Mr. Chairman. There were two parts to my question. I want to know what research activity has been discontinued by the present Minister, and I believe that he did make reference to that in his opening remarks, and that is one part to my question, what research activity has been discontinued? And the second part, what research activity has been initiated by him? Now surely, Mr. Chairman, he shouldn't find it too difficult to answer that question. He would know what research activity he and his government has been responsible for initiating and what research activity he has been responsible for terminating.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I can, of course, deal with the initiating part with some ease. It will take me a minute or two to deal with that that we have discontinued, but I can at this time go ahead with some of these, and I hope I will not omit anything.

There were several programs of research, I believe they were called, that were conducted by the department although I have some difficulty in understanding these as research projects that took place. Some of them in the City of Winnipeg, such as the Migrant Program; the CAP Program, the Community Assessment Program; the SUN Program, Schools for Urban Neighbourhoods; and the Urban Education Program. . . These programs had a variety of funding that accompanied them. A great deal of the funding from my observation, seemed to be used up in the administration. However, these programs . . . I might inform the Member for Burrows negotiations are currently underway to arrange the transfer of these programs to Winnipeg School Division where they were taking place. Because rather than a straight research function, it seems to me these are programs involving some actual activity rather than pure research. So we feel that these would reside much better with the school division than in, what may be called, a Research Department — or may have been called a Research Department. I believe some \$200,000, Mr. Chairman have been set aside in that particular area in those programs which were located basically in one area of the province.

The School Nutrition Program also fell under this area, and we will be discussing that when we come to 3. (a) in the Budget. That's where the money has been provided for that particular area, but this also was under Research, Mr. Chairman, which in one way puzzles me a little bit that it should be located there — a program which seems to be basically activity oriented rather than research as most of us would understand it.

The Immigrant Program that also resided within the Research area of the Department of Education, has been transferred to Program Development and Support Services and we can discuss that at more length if the honourable member wishes when we get to (XVI)4.

The Internal External Evaluation Program — I understand this was a two-year program that had been carried out in a number of school divisions and this is winding up. This particular type of function has been transferred to the Program Development Branch and it, of course, will from now on include the services of the External Administrative Unit, who will be dealing with divisions who desire to conduct some assessment of their system in that way. As I say, that's under Program Development Branch and we can discuss it in (XVI)4. at greater length also, where the budget is provided for it.

The Student Assessment Program also existed under this area, as the honourable member knows. The budget that applies there, of course, will also be found under (XVI)4. We certainly intend to carry on with student assessment; and at this time are examining different programs in this area, to try to come up with what we feel can be the most effective and operate within the parameters of the amount of Estimate money that we have available to us for that purpose. As the honourable member realizes, this can be an expensive type of venture. The math test that the Honourable Member for Elmwood referred to, had a budget of some \$150,000, not all of it expended of course.

Other programs such as The Teacher Induction Program and the Teacher Education in Rural Manitoba, these have been transferred — the responsibilities in that area have been transferred to the Administration Branch and we are looking at new patterns in that particular area. We may be terminating these programs. I understand they were pilot programs that had been brought in in a small area, in some cases, involving a small number of teachers and carried on; and we will look at the evaluation closely of those programs. We have money budgeted to carry on programs of some similarity and after a careful evaluation of what has been happening in these areas, we would hope to carry on in — whether they're similar directions or not — at least working in this particular area. The amount of budget that has been set aside for that particular area is found in Section 3.(a) in Other Grants.

The Parent Council Grants — This I can advise the Member for Burrows, these were also found under Section 3.(a) but I can tell him before we get to that section that we have terminated that particular program. I believe it was brought in last year for the first time. The details of the program I



would be glad to discuss at the time we get into 3.(a) where these particular grants resided.

I can tell him at this point that a large number of the grants were not even applied for. The program certainly did not meet with as great a reception as I'm sure the innovators had hoped.

So those particular projects that fell under the area of Research, Mr. Chairman, are some of the projects that we have either moved in to other departments or are moving to the school divisions where they apply and moving them with funds, to that school division, so that they can administer these if they so wish.

As I said before, it's probably a basic philosophical position, but we feel that if the school divisions have need for this type of program, then it should be operated by the school divisions. We have some concern that as a department we not start coming in with little bits of money and, more or less, suggesting that divisions become involved in this program or that. We would much rather respond to a particular need as expressed by the division.

I hope I haven't left out any programs or projects that existed under Research that have terminated. I can mention, I think, from my review of the Research Projects that were being carried on — of course there were some areas that I would call pure research — the type of research that we think of as being practised at universities and educational institutions. Some of these have terminated, naturally. They were short-term types of research and they have reached the end of their life span and the results are now available to educators and other interested parties in the province.

As far as the programs that we would hope to follow in the year ahead, as I have mentioned to the honourable member, Mr. Chairman, the Branch has existed for — what is it — some 28 days now and they are merely starting into assessing the types of Research Programs that they will be pursuing during the coming year.

In several areas, as far as the Manpower Assessment and this type of thing is concerned, this is rather cut and dried. It's an ongoing type of yearly annual research that is necessitated by the federal agreements; it's necessitated by if we are going to make the fullest utilization of our community colleges.

So, if the Honourable Member for Burrows desired a list of projects that we have initiated under Research and are being carried forward at this time, I'm sorry I can't provide that right now. I would hope in the next few weeks that that type of information will be available; and as soon as it's available, of course it will be no secret, we'd be quite proud of any type of Research we're carrying on and, of course, most concerned that the results of that research become available to all interested parties.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** I wish to thank the Honourable Minister for his reply to my question and I think that it should be noted, Mr. Chairman, that there are many projects which had been initiated under this appropriation, and during the days of the previous administration, and which now are in fact being continued but are being continued within other branches of the department.

Now the Honourable Minister had indicated that he was somewhat at a loss to see the relationship between the nature of some of these projects and the role and function of the Planning and Research Branch. But the Honourable Minister should recall that in the Department of Education — and I'm going back to the days when it was two separate departments, Education and Continuing Education — that this branch was known as Educational Research and Planning. Yes, Educational Research and Planning Branch. So, therefore, it was quite logical for that particular branch to initiate certain projects as a sort of a research project, being new, not tested and hence the need to try it out, to test it out before it would be transferred into the regular ongoing operations of the department or wherever else.

So I'm indeed pleased to hear that most of the projects, which had been initiated by this Branch, are in fact continuing. There are a couple that have been discontinued and I would think, Mr. Chairman, that there might be a more appropriate time to debate the merits or demerits of discontinuing those particular projects.

The Honourable Minister did indicate to the Committee that a number of the projects, particularly those closely related to the operations of the Winnipeg School Division, to the inner core city area, that he and his department is now negotiating with the Winnipeg School Division for the transfer of them to the school division. So, therefore, that raises the question in my mind, in negotiating such a transfer, is the Honourable Minister also negotiating with the school division the provision of some support funds to enable the school division to continue those particular activities?

Yes, I think I'll pause at that and if the Honourable Minister would respond to that question.

**MR. COSENS:** My answer, Mr. Chairman, to the Member for Burrows is, yes, and the amount of those funds, I think will become evident as we move into 3.(a) where they reside.

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

**MR. WALDING:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I had a question for the Minister, and it refers back to the list of Research Projects that he read out to the Committee a few minutes ago. He went a little too fast for me to take note of just what he was saying, but I wonder if he would refer back to that list and early on the list, about the second or third item there, I thought I heard the Minister say that one of the functions that the Branch would be undertaking would be Market Assessment Surveys in the schools. Now, I wonder if I can ask the Minister if I heard him correctly and what it is that's being marketed and what sort of assessment is being done; perhaps he could enlarge on that a little for the committee.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, in answer to the question of the Meer for St. Vital, I think if you look at the word — I believe the words Market Survey were the words that were giving him some difficulty. Here we're talking about the needs as expressed by secondary students in the area of, say, careers or employment that are being expressed, the particular needs that these students may express as to information, and so on, and to a number of openings in certain employment areas. I would use Career Education as the prime example of an area where this type of research can save young people from perhaps moving into areas in post-secondary education where the employment opportunities are very limited. It is that type of market research — if we're talking about market here, it is the employment market and the post-secondary training market.

**MR. WALDING:** I thank the Honourable Minister for making that distinction clear to me. I really didn't understand what the term "market survey" meant, when he read the list.

I'd like to change the topic a little bit, if I may at this stage, Mr. Chairman, and refer to another matter which has a strong research component in it, I believe. I saw a television program that was carried by CBC about a couple of months ago. I'm not sure whether the Minister saw it or not. I found it very interesting and very disturbing at the same time, if in fact it was true. I believe it was on The Fifth Estate, or it could have been Newsmagazine. The program was dealing with adult illiterates in Canada and it gave some figures which I don't immediately recall but it was in the numbers in the hundreds of thousands, or possibly over a million — something in the range of 15 percent of all adult Canadians were actually illiterate.

Now, I suppose the first reaction to information like that is that, "Well, we have had a lot of immigrants in who come from non-English speaking countries." But it didn't apply to that at all, Mr. Chairman. Those people were specifically excluded, and the people that they were referring to were people who had been born and educated in Canadian schools — or not educated in Canadian schools. And, of the people that were interviewed and referred to on the survey, most of them were over the age of 35 or 40, some of them up to pensionable age, which would indicate that they went to school in Canada in '40s and maybe the '50s, the '30s, perhaps even before that.

If the figure of a million people is accurate, it would indicate on a pro-rata basis that we probably have something like 50,000 people in that category in Manitoba. I would like to ask the Minister if he has any knowledge of this, whether the research department has produced any information on it, or whether they intend to? Because if the information is true, it's a very disturbing and shocking situation. Since these people are adults and all in the workforce they are, according to the program, very embarrassed to find themselves unable to read a telephone directory or to read a menu. They are unable to fill in a job application form. Some of them are unable, even, to sign their own names. The program went on to show the difficulty in finding such people and, in fact, dealing with them. For example, you cannot put a notice in the paper asking them to call a certain number, because they can't see the number.

When the Minister talks about Messiahs coming in with, you know, fancy new ideas in education, and when his party accuses the New Democratic Party of bringing in all sorts of new and untried ideas, it's not those ideas and those Messiahs — whoever they were and whatever they were — that were responsible for, if we can believe it, a million adult Canadians who cannot read and write.

I invite the Minister to respond to this and let us know his thoughts on the subject, whether he has any information on this matter and what he intends to do about it.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I thank the Member for St. Vital for mentioning this topic and I appreciate his comments on it. I, unfortunately, was not able to view the program that he mentions. I find that I don't have as much time for TV viewing as I had some six months ago. However, the topic is a rather serious one and I share his concern in this area, as well. And I think it has all sorts of implications for Continuing Education, as well as our basic public school educational system.

I would be interested in seeing the statistics as they apply to Manitoba. I don't feel that these are available in our department at this time, although I haven't had an opportunity to check that. I have seen different reports at different times on studies of this nature in the United States of America, and in some cases, Mr. Chairman, they are absolutely shocking. Certain segments of our citizenry seem to be affected more than others and I just wonder if the Member for St. Vital would mention that there are certain cultural groups in our society who were more subject to this than others. I think of perhaps maybe the native people in the northern part of our province who, until recent years, did not have that availability of education that now is available to them. And perhaps a certain number of this 15 percent that he mentions of the citizens of Canada do fall into that category.

I know one of the greatest shocks that I ever received in my life was working on a construction gang and finding that one of the members had to have me write letters to this wife and, in turn, read her letters when she wrote back to him, because he had, in his lifetime, never been to school other than two or three months when he was very very young. I would hope that we have moved beyond that era when that type of condition existed that people, either through lack of availability or for a variety of other reasons, did not attend school.

I would be very concerned if reports of this nature showed that we have young people today who fall into this category. And of course there are different types of illiteracy that exist and the definition varies from type to type.

But nonetheless, without pursuing the topic, Mr. Chairman, to greater length at this time, I do appreciate the fact that the Member for St. Vital has brought it to the attention of this House. I think it



is a topic that those of us involved in education have to well aware of, and I think that the point that he mentions that these people in fact, in many cases, are very hard to identify, for a variety of reasons, is significant.

There are, of course, directions being taken, and have been taken in the last number of years to try to meet the needs of people who may or may not fall into this category, certainly the Adult Basic Education courses that have been offered for a number of years. And before that we had other courses of a similar nature; I forget what they were called. Was it Basic Training for Skills Development, or words of that nature? But these were basic skill courses that would pick people up who had a very fringe education and attempt to bring them along, particularly in the basic subjects.

So, there have been efforts made in this area, and perhaps the efforts have not been meeting all of the needs. Obviously not, if we have 15 percent of the total population of this country who are illiterate, as defined by the CBC program that you refer to.

I would thank the member, once again, for bringing it to my attention and certainly it is an area that we should look at in our own particular province.

**MR. WALDING:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the Minister for his concern. If in fact he does not have any information that is available within his department and is prepared to look outside for it, from wherever, I would certainly be very interested to see what would come up with it.

A couple of points that I wanted to respond to from his remarks. I believe that the 15 percent figure was not a total population; it was an adult population, which of course would reduce it over the total.

He mentioned whether or not there was a cultural aspect to it. As I recall the program, that was not a factor that was brought up. One particular issue that was brought forward goes back to the construction camp that he mentioned. The program brought out the point that many of the people who were illiterate felt uncomfortable or were unable to function within towns and cities, for obvious reasons, and tended to gravitate towards, you know, more distant construction camps and lumber operations, and things of that nature where there was little or no reading or writing to do. They mentioned that whenever a person whose circumstances — or frequently so — was offered a promotion or given another aspect to the job which required reading and writing, rather than admit that they were not able to do it, they would simply quit and go and look for another job somewhere else.

At the conclusion of the program, as I recall it, they gave a phone number for people to phone in for further information or to obtain help of this very basic kind that the Minister has mentioned. They reported as a follow-up program a couple of weeks later that their switchboards were absolutely jammed with phone calls following the program. They tried to do an assessment of how many people had responded to the program and what the demand was involved in it, and they extrapolated some pretty substantial figures, both in numbers of people and amounts of money that would be needed to tackle the problem, and also just in people to answer the telephones for the number of calls that came in.

They went on to show a positive aspect of it, where a couple of instances were cited where people had made the effort to overcome this illiteracy — people in middle age in their forties and fifties who hadn't been able to overcome their natural reluctance to go to any sort of adult education institution or to a school, but had managed to find someone who would be prepared to sit down with them on a one-to-one basis and start right at the beginning and explain phonetics to them and the sounds of each letter, and gradually bring them on.

The conclusion of the program was that this was a very necessary service that was needed. It would have to be done on a one-to-one basis. The program expressed hope that this would be done in various provinces, but there was always the caution there that it was a very labour-intensive proposition and there were lots of dollars involved in it.

But I do appreciate the Minister's response and I will look forward to hearing more from him on the topic.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. MILLER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have listened to the Minister with great care this afternoon. This is my first entry into this aspect of the debate and I find some of his comments interesting when you put them all together, and I get a picture which I feel is valid in the light of what he said.

He used the phrase that it is cruel to raise expectations when money is not available to follow-up on those expectations. And he used it in the context, I think, where he said or he implied that the problem with some of these studies that have been undertaken and the recommendations that inevitably flow from studies, or evaluations and so on, that the problem with them is that they raise expectations.

I am really surprised that he would make that kind of statement, because the educational system, as I think he indicated, is not simply to train people to perform certain functions, factories, to fit into our industrial society, but rather to develop people's ability to think for themselves, to broaden their horizons — broaden their vision of what the world is all about. And so when he says that it is cruel to raise expectations, I disagree with him. I think the education, whether it's post-secondary or the public school system at that level, at all levels, it should be to help children of various ages to perceive the world they live in, to perceive the flaws in the world they live in, to question the world they live in, and to develop beyond today. Otherwise we are perpetually maintaining the status quo.



So I disagree that it is cruel to raise expectations, because what you're saying by suggesting that it's cruel to raise expectations, is that the department should take a very passive role. It should sit back, and he gives an example. He says that there are certain studies or evaluations of what he feels are more of an applied nature rather than pure research which are being performed under the aegis of the department, but they were for a particular division — I suspect it's probably Winnipeg Division No. 1 — and that since it's their problem, that the staff and the dollars, I believe are being transferred to them. So he reduces his Estimates by those dollars, but the dollars will nonetheless be spent. He'll have less staff man years, but the dollars will be spent, but by the division itself, because he says, rather than the department generating ideas and questioning the school system and seeing whether it can be improved and where its weaknesses are, that the department shouldn't take the lead, but rather should, I think he said — they should respond to the need. If a division feels that it has a problem because of the changing nature of our society, that to cope with that problem, it feels it has to do something, then he says the division should come up with it, with the problem, and the department will respond.

I'm sorry to hear that, because I think the Department of Education should take a leadership role. By leadership, I don't necessarily mean, take them by the hand and force them, but certainly it should take the role of highlighting, identifying, and working with the school division, as had been done in that particular program, to make it available through resources of the department, to work in that school division, to help them alleviate and overcome some of their problems. Because, as I indicated, surely the concept of education is not simply to sit back passively and say, well let's not have a study, let's not have an evaluation, because if you hire people, whether they be in the province, out of the province, or wherever they may be, if you ask somebody to undertake a study of a program, whether it be a Language Arts program or a Mathematics program, or a Social Studies program, or what have you, or simply the problem of the high turnover in various schools that are occurring in the core city, the truancy rate, the young people are being turned off by a school system. How do you cope with that? What do you do about it? To simply say, well, let's not hire anybody, let's not open the book on that, let's leave it under the carpet, let's hope that if anything is done, maybe nobody'll notice it. Let's not do anything about it ourselves, because if we do something, somebody is going to sit down, somebody's going to look at the situation, and somebody is going to say, this is not good. There's a weakness here, and this should be corrected.

The Minister says, that's cruel, because that's raising expectations and we shouldn't raise their expectations, because after all, there is a question of funds. Well, Mr. Chairman, I strongly feel that the obligation of a government, the obligation of a Department of Education, particularly the Department of Education, is to show the way, is to use its resources to guide the school divisions, the teachers. They are the ones who should be trailblazers, not wait for a division to say, we've got a problem, what are we going to do, come to the department and try to convince the department that they've got a problem and they maybe get a few dollars to help them resolve that problem.

I deplore that kind of attitude and I hope I'm wrong, because certainly that kind of statement that he makes is contradictory to the opening remarks he made and subsequent remarks he made where he indicated that there should be strong, central direction from the department out into the field. Surely the strong central direction should not just deal with administrative matters of how a school system should be best run, or working with the school superintendents on some technical matters or administrative matters, but should deal basically with, what is the direction of education, is it fulfilling its functions, are we preparing young people for the 1990s and the turn of the century? And if we are not — are we or aren't we? And we should constantly have studies to evaluate and to see whether that is being done and whether the system is relevant, and continuing to be relevant.

Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid that I am right in my analysis, because I find that in this department, there's a substantial decrease from \$717,000 last year, to \$487,000 this year. I don't know of any venture in any field of endeavour, private sector or public sector, where less than 1/10 of one percent of a budget is spent for research. In this day and age, with the rapid changes in society, with the rapid changes in technology, with knowledge doubling every five years, if you simply slow down your research capacity, the infusion of new ideas, the infusion of ideas of how to modify, update and change, if you slow that down, then down the line within a very short time, the educational department, the Department of Education and the educational system certainly, will suffer as new ideas are not developed, new approaches are not developed. The result can only be, I feel, a diminution in the quality of education that's being offered to both the children in the public school and in the post-secondary, and particularly at the community colleges where it's absolutely essential that that kind of work continue and be kept abreast of current needs.

At community colleges, certainly, the whole question of manpower, you know the Minister read off a ream of things that have to be done, and a lot of it is community colleges. But I know, and I wish him well, because I know he's not going to get the statistics he needs to try to match market needs and his educational programs at community colleges, because they don't exist world-wide, not just in Manitoba. I'm not being critical of him on this. But I have found it disturbing that the Minister would get up and say, I am averse, I am questioning the need for some of the research that was done because really, it's not right to raise expectations, it's cruel to raise expectations because there's no



funds. I say that the job of the Minister of Education, as the leader in Manitoba, as the man who is at the pinnacle of an educational system, it is his responsibility to state loud and clear to his colleagues, to members on this side and to the public of Manitoba, that education cannot stand still. And whether it's cruel to raise expectations or not, you have to say it.

It may be cruel to say to people in the field of health, don't do this, don't tell the people about the lack in nutrition, the less they know, they may be better off, because if we tell them how bad it is, we're going to have to do something. And that's going to raise their expectations. Governments should raise expectations. They shouldn't just follow, they should lead, and that is what I find lacking in the Minister's comments this afternoon. Where is that leadership that I feel is absolutely essential to education in Manitoba? To sit back, and say, we are a government of restraint, we have been elected on the basis that we're not going to spend money, if we can possibly afford it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. The time now being 4:30, and in accordance with Rule 19(2) . . . The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

**MR. MCGILL:** I believe there is some disposition on the part of the House this afternoon not to proceed with Private Members' Hour. I should advise the members that when the committee rises, it will be my intention to seek the unanimous consent of the House to revert on the order paper to Ministerial Statements, so I give notice of that intent, Mr. Chairman.

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

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

### IN SESSION

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

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

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I would have unanimous consent of the House to revert to Ministerial Statements at this time.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. MILLER:** Mr. Speaker, we're prepared to give leave, providing we don't hear any more of this silly matter from the Member for Roblin.

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to read a statement of government intention with respect to the Rent Control Program. The required number of copies are available for distribution.

Mr. Speaker, it is our intention to continue the Rent Control Program in its present form until September 30, 1978. On October 1, gradual changes will commence. These recognize the special continuing needs of low-income and elderly tenants. Indeed, our program of controls and monitoring will be with us into 1980 and possibly beyond. Guideline increases will be announced for two further phases of rent controls, extending to June 30, 1980. Monitoring will extend beyond that.

The next of these phases, Phase 4, will cover the period October 1, 1978 to September 30, 1979. Guideline increases will be announced, but subject to certain conditions, the guideline increases do not apply to the following:

- (1) Residential rental units located outside the cities of Winnipeg and Brandon.
- (2) Residential rental units in Winnipeg and Brandon, located in buildings for which an Occupancy Permit was first issued on or after October 1, 1973.
- (3) Residential rental units in Winnipeg and Brandon where the rent payable for the unit is allowed under the Act to reach a level equal to or in excess of \$400 per month.
- (4) Residential rental units in Winnipeg and Brandon which are voluntarily vacated by the tenant in possession after September 30, 1978.

The guideline rent increases to be announced will apply to all other units in Winnipeg and Brandon during Phase 4. Another guideline figure will be announced for a Phase 5 period, October 1, 1979 to June 30, 1980. After that date, no guideline figures will be announced, but having consideration for market conditions and rent trends at that time, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-

Friday, April 28, 1978

Council may extend the rent review process that is to accompany a monitoring program. I shall make reference to that later.

Concern has been expressed that with any change in the program tenants may be unable to collect moneys due to them under orders issued by a rent review officer or the Rent Stabilization Board during Phases 1, 2 and 3.

Release from guidelines for units outside Winnipeg and Brandon will be automatic, except that tenants residing in those rental units may inform the Board of non-compliance with previous orders until March 31, 1979. As long as a landlord fails to comply with a previous order, the premises will continue under the program and any rent increases will be limited accordingly.

With respect to units that may be freed from the guidelines in Winnipeg and Brandon, landlords will have to apply to the Board for release from the guidelines and in doing so must state that they have complied with all outstanding orders. If they cannot do so, their rental units will remain under the program and the Board will seek compliance before granting a release order.

With respect to Brandon or Winnipeg units that may be freed from the guidelines when the premises are voluntarily vacated by the tenant, the landlord will have to apply to the Board for release from the guidelines, upon receipt of a tenant's notice of intention to vacate. In doing so, he must supply a copy of the his application to the outgoing tenant. If after receiving the application copy, the tenant claims that the landlord has used harrasment or intimidating tactics to encourage the tenant to leave, the tenant may submit an appropriate statement to the Board. The Board will investigate and should the tenants' statements be upheld, the rental unit being vacated will not be released from the guideline restrictions.

Furthermore, if as a result of the landlord's actions the tenant proceeds to vacate, the Board may award compensation paid to the tenant by the landlord.

The responsibility of the Rent Review Agency and the Board will also extend to monitoring rent increases in those units that are removed from the guideline restrictions. Upon request by the Board a landlord shall supply to the Board information on rent increases imposed after release from the guidelines. Where, in the opinion of the Board, a rent increase is excessive, a landlord shall be required to justify the increase to the Board. If the landlord is able to do so, the Board will take no action. Where the landlord is unable to do so, the Board may mediate between the landlord and tenant with a view to arriving at a mutually agreeable rent level. Should a mediation be unsuccessful, the Board may withhold or cancel a release from the guideline order. In this case the premises will continue to be subject to the control program.

It has been observed from time to time, Mr. Speaker, that any form of economic control is difficult to discontinue once it has been started. Nevertheless, the Rent Stabilization Act was introduced in this House in 1976 as part of federal and provincial efforts to curtail inflationary forces. It is my recollection that members of the Assembly at that time understood and agreed that rent controls would be a temporary rather than a permanent program.

In fact, it was related to the life of the Anti-Inflationary Board which commenced its withdrawal as an economic intervener on April 14 of this year.

In developing our plan, we studied proposals under consideration in a number of provinces and we particularly noted the announced programs in Alberta and Saskatchewan. As well, we have leaned on the experience of the Rent Stabilization Board and, of course, have received advice and suggestions from interest groups representing both landlords and tenants.

In arriving at the program that I have just announced, recognition has been given to the fact that controls cannot be totally abandoned at this time, but that a start can be made this fall.

Above all, I wish to stress that the concern of low income and elderly tenants have been taken into account, as shown by the very nature of the selective phase withdrawal process I have described.

We have also endeavoured to ease the general apprehension that once rental controls are lifted rents will increase inordinately. Essentially therefore, this program relaxes controls but at the same time ensures the presence of a monitoring and rent review function.

I would also remind members that landlords must still comply with the requirements to give tenants three months notice of a rent increase. They must also limit increases for a continuing tenant to one increase in any twelve-month period.

My purpose in making this statement at this time, Mr. Speaker, is to put all landlords and tenants on notice of these intended changes. I consider this timely because notices of rent increases to be effective on October 1, 1978, must be given on July 1, 1978, and I wish to provide sufficient lead time in order that landlords and tenants may prepare in advance for these changes.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the House that the Rent Stabilization Act is currently under review to determine the amendments that may be necessary to give affect to these program changes. An amending bill will be introduced as soon as possible.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. MILLER:** Mr. Speaker, in response to the Ministerial Statement, I am pleased that the statement has now been brought forward because I know that there has been great concern expressed by many people because there was simply lack of clarity as to what was going to happen. And I know from personal knowledge of tenants who were faced with having to sign a lease at substantial rents not knowing whether they should sign or not sign and that they did sign, were they bound by it, and so on, and it was very upsetting to them.

With regard to the statement, itself, Mr. Speaker, it is a very lengthy statement and I am not a very



fast reader and therefore I don't profess to fully comprehend everything in here.

However, from what I gather, there will be an opportunity both in the Question Period in the House, but certainly when the amendments are brought in, when further clarification and information can be sought.

But there are certain things that strike me, and whether I am right in that analysis or not I don't know, the member says guideline increases will be announced but subject to certain conditions the guideline increases do not apply to the following. In other words, the increases which will be announced will not apply to certain types of accommodation and they will be free to move as they will. And that is residential units outside of the City of Winnipeg and Brandon, and I suppose that is because the vacancy rates there don't warrant controls and maybe that's why they are being freed from any controls because there are alternatives, and that's always the key. If I find my landlord has increased my rent beyond my ability to pay or desire to pay then I have a choice. I have somewhere to move to.

I have to assume that the government is satisfied that outside of Winnipeg and Brandon that in rural Manitoba and in northern Manitoba in fact such a situation exists, that people will not be trapped but in fact will be able to say to their landlord, "I'm sorry. You are jacking me up \$100 per month. I can't pay that." And they will have somewhere to go to. They simply will not be out on the street.

So I assume that is the evaluation, that is the calculation that the government has made and in their wisdom, that's what exists outside of Winnipeg or Brandon.

In Winnipeg and Brandon, as I understand it, they are removing the rent controls on anything with an occupancy permit, I think that's the term used, the occupancy permit was first issued on or after October 1st, 1973.

Now, we know that the present legislation — I forget the exact date — did not cover new construction. I think it was 1975. Now they are going back two years. They are rolling it back and they are going to be freed from controls.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned, because what is basically being said here is that if you live in an apartment block which came on stream prior to October 1st, 1973, then no longer are you in any way protected by rents. Pardon me, anything built after 1973, you are no longer protected after October 1st, 1973.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what bothers me is this — the very comments I made with regard to rural Manitoba. Someone is living in an apartment which was built and occupied October 1st, 1973, and after that and they are paying a rent which has been controlled for the last three years. And the landlord now says, "Now I'm free to move as I will. I want to raise your rents \$75, \$100 a month." And that person then is faced with a choice — if you want to call it choice, I say it's Hobson's choice — of either paying that money, which you may or may not be able to do, or finding other accommodation. And where is he going to try to find accommodation? Where is he going to find accommodation? He is going to try to find accommodation from stock which exists prior to October 1st, 1973.

Those older apartment blocks which we know, particularly in core Winnipeg, have a vacancy rate which is not very low. I know that there is a fairly good vacancy rate in apartment blocks with \$400, \$500, \$600 and \$700 rental. There is, and there is no problem there. But certainly, if a person is in a block built in 1973, 1974, 1975, 1976 or 1977, what choice has he got except to pay the rent or to try to find some other accommodation. And where is that accommodation going to be found? If they can't pay the rent, they try to move out, then more people are going to be added to that group that are seeking accommodation in that lower rental scale.

For example, let's say that \$250 is the scale that people can afford and suddenly they are faced with having to pay \$325.00. Then they start looking for something at the \$250 level, and more pressure is applied on that very group and those units which today have a very low vacancy rate because people are not moving out. And we know that the Housing Program of the government has pretty well ground to a halt. What's coming on stream is what has been started in 1977 and 1976. So the program for elderly housing — they are opening new buildings but these are all started under our administration. The low income people — again these are projects started under our administration but there is no new ones coming on stream. What is going to happen to them? They may be living in accommodation now where it is controlled and still controlled. But I can tell you that as people living in somewhat more expensive accommodation are forced to look for alternatives, they are going to add to the pressure on these units which today, as I say, have a low vacancy rate.

There is a clause here. There is a paragraph here referring to leaving voluntarily. You know the word "voluntary" is an odd word. There are many ways to make life miserable for a tenant; by not painting, by not doing things that should be done. And finally, in desperation, a person leaves voluntarily. But once it's done voluntarily then it's not harassment; nobody told them to move. You just don't do certain things and the result is he voluntarily moves. The moment he voluntarily moves that unit is freed of controls. That unit is then permitted to rise to whatever level the landlord thinks he can get.

So although I welcome the fact that the Minister finally made a statement, I am not sure in my own mind at this point whether in fact the people in Manitoba who are renting are adequately protected and whether the government didn't move too precipitously to change the program.

For all its weaknesses . . . And I know there are weaknesses, and I am always one of those who stated publicly that the answer does not lie in continuing control. The answer lies in new construction, and that's why when we brought in legislation new construction was not covered by controls. They were not bound by controls. And the result is that in the year 1976, I believe it was, or



**Friday, April 28, 1978**

1977, we had in Manitoba a very high percentage of apartment block construction. We were above the average nationally, even though controls were already in place and people had talked gloom and doom. Nobody was going to invest in apartment blocks. But we had very good construction in Manitoba in those fields.

But this is a step back which I think is premature, which will create hardship on people, which will create a great deal of concern to people, and which I think in the long run will make the relationship between tenant and landlord even worse than it is, if it's possible. Because the desire of the landlord to have that suite vacant will be very great and although it has to be voluntarily vacated, there are, I suspect, many ways whereby the tenant can be made to feel so uncomfortable that in exasperation he leaves.

Another factor, Mr. Speaker, is the question of the administration of the program, and as I see it here, the appeal mechanism, the fact that one can go to the Rent Review Board. A tenant may submit the appropriate statement to the Board, that tenant if he didn't leave voluntarily or if he feels he has been harrassed can make a complaint to the Board.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that we are going to be inviting a great deal of administration, that is, it's going to require a great deal of administration as these individual complaints start pouring in, and will be followed up individually, and yet they have cut considerably, by \$200,000, the amount of money for this year's Estimates to deliver the program under Rent Stabilization.

I suspect, unless the government doesn't intend to do anything, that this is just so much rhetoric, but if they're going to try to meet these objectives, if they're going to try to really police it as they imply here, if the tenants in fact, are going to have access, ready access, immediate access, in order to be able to have their case taken up, then they're going to need administration. They're going to need, I think, far more administration than was required before under the existing system.

So Mr. Speaker, again, this is off the top of my head, and with the assistance of my colleague from St. Johns, we were able to spot, as the Minister read through a five-page statement which is somewhat lengthy, —(Interjection)— short for him, yes, but I am not happy about this because I feel that this is not the answer to the problem of stabilizing rents. The problem is in a more aggressive housing program by this government, to encourage the private sector and the private sector building for government, sufficient units so that we enjoy a four to five percent vacancy rate. Then and only then, I think, can we be assured that with the elimination of rent controls, people have options and alternatives, the kind of options and alternatives that I think are available in rural Manitoba. I don't know too much of rural Manitoba, so I can't speak for them. Maybe we'll hear more about that during the bill itself. But certainly in the City of Winnipeg, those alternatives today don't exist, and those alternatives are not going to exist in the next few months or the next year, and the options available to people, I'm afraid, are simply going to boil down to, pay more rent, period.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that this House do now adjourn.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.