

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, 14 June, 1985.

Time — 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Presenting Petitions
. . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again. I move, seconded by the Member for Concordia, that the Report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

ORAL QUESTIONS

Nebraska and Iowa - hog imports

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier. It follows upon earlier discussions this week about his trip to Nebraska and Iowa with respect to the chloramphenicol ban. On what basis were those two states selected as being places to go to talk about the ban?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, it was basically a matter of convenience on a mutual basis of being able to ensure appointments that would be required involving the governor, the secretary of Agriculture and ourselves in each of those two states.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to have been able to have visited the Governor of the State of South Dakota, along with the Secretary of Agriculture in the State of South Dakota, because it is the No. 1 state insofar as hog imports are concerned from Canada, with Iowa being No. 2. But the Governor of the State of South Dakota was in Europe. My office is making arrangements for a meeting with that governor just as soon as can be arranged upon his return.

MR. G. FILMON: I wonder if the Premier got any recommendation from the Manitoba Hog Producers' Marketing Board with respect to the states that he should visit in regard to this ban.

HON. H. PAWLEY: What we had received by way of Mr. Vaags, the chairman of the Hog Marketing Commission, was a desire that we, as a Provincial Government, do in fact visit the governors of the different states. In fact, Mr. Vaags made that comment last Thursday after it appeared that efforts at the federal level were not leading anywhere.

Mr. Vaags is invited to be present with us. He was in Ottawa the particular day that we were able to arrange for meetings in Nebraska and in Iowa.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that, according to my information, Nebraska has not imported hogs from Manitoba or Canada for a considerable length of time, well beyond a year, was there any purpose in going to Nebraska at this time to talk about the ban with a state that hasn't been importing our hogs?

HON. H. PAWLEY: As I indicated last Thursday upon my return, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition may have missed my reference. The State of Nebraska imports a great deal of cattle.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, is chloramphenicol used in cattle?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Turtle Mountain were here, he could tell us what happened in respect to a shipment, I believe involving his brother, of cattle into the State of Nebraska some time before. But, Mr. Speaker, the Nebraska ban is important; the governor has indicated that he is going to examine the prospect for lifting the prohibition in respect to livestock, I understand there are some hog imports into Nebraska, small compared to Iowa and South Dakota, but that can be further checked out.

The important thing is that the State of Iowa is moving along, in fact, I received word yesterday that there was speedy progress being made in respect to the resolution of the problem involving Iowa, subsequent to our visit, and I am very pleased indeed with the follow-up information that I received yesterday.

MTS - responsibility for from Minister of Labour

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my further question to the Premier: does he intend to remove the responsibility for the Manitoba Telephone System from the Minister of Labour? In view of the fact that the Manitoba Telephone System is in the midst of a work dispute with its staff that has the potential for strike action, and the Minister is both responsible for the management of the MTS, and for the labour relations in the province and, as such, would be the chief arbitrator and the decision-maker with respect to any arbitration, this appears to be a conflict of interest. Does he intend to remove the responsibility for MTS from the Minister of Labour?

HON. H. PAWLEY: I'm really puzzled by that question and I don't know whether it demonstrates some untoward research being done insofar as the honourable member's research caucus allows, maybe we should increase the caucus research allowance insofar as the opposition caucus is concerned. We might want to take that under consideration.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour is a Minister of Labour that is responsible, not just for labour, he is responsible for the bringing together through the good offices of the Ministry of Labour, relationship, understandings that will minimize the potential of work stoppage in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to, in fact, commend not only this Minister of Labour, but the previous Minister of Labour, for ensuring that Manitoba has the second best strike record in all of Canada.

MR. G. FILMON: So that the Premier understands, Mr. Speaker, yes indeed, he is responsible for the balanced co-ordination of labour relations, both on behalf of labour and management in this province as Minister of Labour, but he is also responsible as chief administrative person for the Manitoba Telephone System. As a manager, does he not believe that he ought be taken away from this conflict-of-interest position in the midst of a labour dispute?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. A question seeking the approval or opinion is not an appropriate one. Perhaps the honourable member would wish to rephrase his question.

MR. G. FILMON: To avoid the prospect of a conflict of interest with respect to his responsibilities for the Manitoba Telephone System, will the Premier take away the responsibilities of MTS from the Minister of Labour during this labour dispute?

HON. H. PAWLEY: As I indicated yesterday, and it was in respect to the language issue of the last 18 months and the number of mistaken positions taken by honourable members across the way, but if I could add up all the mistakes by honourable members across the way and equal one mistake for one hog, and get each of those hogs across the border, representing all the mistakes that honourable members have made during the past two years, we'd have no problem in respect to ensuring that our hogs cross the border into the United States.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Status of Legislation

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

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Government House Leader. I won't try to add up all the mistakes of this government, but on our Order Paper there are 31, 31 bills that this Legislature cannot deal with and proceed with, including such important

bills that we have already passed, like Bill 2, dealing with extra billing; the pension bill, that this government and this Minister of Education had sent notice out to all teachers, encouraged them to take early retirement. We can't deal with any of those bills. I ask the Government House Leader how he expects to conduct the future business of this Legislature?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased that the opposition House Leader, and I hope other members on his side of the Chamber recognize the seriousness of the Supreme Court decision as it applies to the operation of this House, and recognize . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

If members wish to conduct a debate, would they kindly do so at another time. This is Oral Question Period.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The imperatives of the decision yesterday with respect to most items in the decision were referred to by the First Minister, but with regard to how it affects our House procedures and the status of legislation, I'm pleased to answer the question.

Basically, the position of members opposite with regard to our legal liabilities were completely repudiated in that decision yesterday and the interpretation we had as to our liabilities was completely vindicated. We had been following a procedure adopted by the Conservative administration in 1980 which was supported in part by Bill 2 of 1980, An Act respecting The Operation of Section 23. We modified that procedure at the beginning of the 32nd Legislature, First Session, in 1982. The court ruled yesterday that those bills which were passed even in bilingual format by the previous administration were invalid and that the only laws that are valid in Manitoba today are the ones that were passed by this administration in this Legislature at the '82, '83, '84 and '85 Session.

Mr. Speaker, I am appalled that members opposite would purport to give us advice on how to pass legal legislation. We will bring in revised bills during this Session, which will be in bilingual format, which will address the court decision. Mr. Speaker, I'm surprised the members opposite didn't even contemplate this could happen. I think they should read the decision and understand that even the bills they passed in bilingual format were declared invalid, as well as their mechanism for doing so, Bill 2. I am not going to take advice from the Opposition House Leader on how to get properly constructed legislation through this House.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable members opposite really do not learn. If they want to begin the debate again, God bless them!

But my question is: what are 57 legislators supposed to do when we cannot deal with the Order Paper? We have no business before us, very little business before us, the most important business. That was my question; I was not attempting to — (Interjection) — regurgitate an old debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I would draw the attention of the House to the fact that there are two full pages of debate on second readings all of which could proceed to the end of second reading. I would expect that the opposition, to accommodate the demands of the court decision, would expedite all legislation when it is reintroduced in the court required format to the stage at which it had been in its unilingual format. I don't think anyone would suggest the opposition would want to play games with that, but would expedite that. Although I have discussed that in detail with the Opposition House Leader, I'm sure that I would get that assurance. He has always been reasonable, Mr. Speaker, on matters respecting House business at least.

But, Mr. Speaker, all of those two pages of debate on second readings are standing in the names of members opposite; a good number of them have been debated at some length.

Mr. Speaker, we also have on the Order Paper some other items which have not been called for some time because they won't proceed, because they have been stalled in the House, such as the Rules Committee Report. Is the Opposition House Leader suggesting that we should call that report today and debate that and pass it because he is prepared to pass that today?

Mr. Speaker, legislation is on the Order Paper so members can debate it but, more importantly, Bills 12, 14, 16, 36, 37 can all be debated today, can all be passed. We could debate the others up to second reading and then hold the bills at that point, then move them through to that second reading in minutes and call committee stage once the bills are in the format demanded by the court. So I don't see a problem.

The only difficulty, of course, will be the time required to translate and put into the new format. We don't know what that will be, and I will be advising the Opposition House Leader and the House after consultation with the Attorney-General with regard to what the options are in terms of time frame. But we have lots of work to do and, Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of giving any members on this side or the other side a holiday until the work is done.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order.
The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Government House Leader for that information. Wouldn't it simply have been easier just to give that information? It was

a question about how we deal with bills that I was after. It was genuine House information that I was interested in, we didn't particularly need the lecture. If the Honourable House Leader would have provided us that information, and for my clarification . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . is the Government House Leader indicating to us that he is prepared and asking our cooperation in debating bills that are unilingual to the point of committee stage? If that is a question, I think that's a question that I have a legitimate right to ask.

HON. A. ANSTETT: No, Mr. Speaker. The short answer is, no. The bottom line is that we do not yet know what all the implications are and what the time frame is. I expect that, if necessary, the House may recess for a period of time, but certainly we have enough work to do to finish Supply and debate all the bilingual bills before the House. If translation takes a little longer than we would hope, maybe a recess will be necessary, or it may well be that the bilingual format bills can be introduced within the next couple of weeks, or that some can be and others will take more time. But certainly there is no need to recess the Legislature today and give honourable members opposite a holiday.

Once all the options have been reviewed, I'll be discussing them with the Opposition House Leader. I told him that privately yesterday, now it's on the record, but we've got lots of work to do. There is no need to give members a long weekend or several weeks holidays and spoil our summer, we've got work to do.

Import tariffs - Manitoba hogs

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the First Minister. Mr. Speaker, I am aware that over 2,000 hog producers in the Province of Manitoba are innocent victims of the tariffs imposed on exports to the United States. In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that they were not participating in the stabilization program, and the reason for the tariff imposition was, in the words of the U.S. Commerce Department, because of the stabilization programs in this country, will the First Minister, on behalf of those 2,000-and-some hog producers who are in extreme financial difficulty, will he waive the entrance requirements for those producers to now join the Manitoba Hog Program back to the 1st of April so that they can receive the loan from the province under the Hog Stabilization Program? Will he waive the requirements for entry of the Manitoba Stabilization Program so they can participate in that program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm extremely disappointed in the question presented to me by the Member for Arthur. In fact, I'd have thought after the very articulate and clear response that the Member for

Arthur received just the other day from the Minister of Agriculture that he would have had a better grip of the issues that are confronting us with respect to the issue of the duties being imposed in regard to hog importation to the United States. Mr. Speaker, it is not the position of the Federal Government in Ottawa, not the position of the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Wise, nor of this government, that the duty that is being imposed is a legitimate duty by the U.S. Commerce Department, Mr. Speaker.

In fact, I have instructed my Minister of Agriculture, and in fact I may very well attend with him to appear before the body which will be dealing with the question as to whether or not that duty be continued or not. Mr. Speaker, that duty has been imposed because of problems introduced, and I received this message very clearly just the other day as a result of the differential and the American dollar as against the Canadian dollar. The precarious position that puts the mid-western producers in, insofar as competing with Canadian hog producers in Canada, Mr. Speaker, they are looking to Washington and the policies that are presently being pursued in Washington as being responsible for the situation that they're in.

I would ask the Honourable Member for Arthur not to side with those who want to continue that duty, not to give comfort to those who want to impose duties upon the hogs from Canada into the United States, because what the honourable member is doing is undercutting the hog producers of this province as well as all across Canada.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order.
The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I ask you, Sir, and you've many times told this House that you would request direct questions and get direct answers.

I directly asked, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of some 2,000-and-some hog producers who are not now participating in the provincial Hog Program, will he waive the entry requirements for those producers to participate in the provincial Hog Program back to the 1st of April so that they can get, Mr. Speaker, fair treatment from the Province of Manitoba? Will he waive, Mr. Speaker, the entry requirements?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, two days ago, the Agriculture critic for the Conservative Party in this Legislature asked the Minister of Agriculture to abolish the board. Mr. Speaker, today the Honourable Member for Arthur would turn hog farmer against hog farmer in this province. Mr. Speaker, in an opportunistic drive on his part, and obviously he represents the opposition across the way in the Legislature, to undercut what I expect to be responsible representations that would be made by the Federal Government through the auspices of the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Wise, and our own Minister of Agriculture, and possibly myself, toward the end of this month in order to undo the duty that's been imposed for their own particular reasons, unrelated to those reasons being presented by the Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, why will the First Minister not support the majority of hog producers in this province? Why has he been running around chasing straw bogeymen, dealing with chloramphenicol, which is not the real issue, Mr. Speaker? Why is he trying to mislead this Assembly and the people of Manitoba, going to the wrong states, Mr. Speaker, that don't even import our hogs? For his irresponsible action, I ask for an apology from him, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The honourable member should not accuse another member of misleading. If the honourable member wishes information, would he ask for it without making a speech out of a question?

The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member made certain representations in the House that left implications that were quite untrue in this Chamber. I would refer you to Page 2895, in fact, in which it was the honourable members across the way that first raised the issue of our making . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . asked, Mr. Speaker, that we do visit the governors in various states across the border. I responded to the Member for Lakeside that I thought that his proposal was a constructive proposal; I would carry through with that proposal.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, it was honourable members across the way that first suggested that this government ban chloramphenicol. We responded two weeks ahead of the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker. What we are hearing from honourable members across the way is such opportunistic dribble that it's unbelievable this morning.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. That was not a point of order.

Manitoba Hog Stabilization Program - waive of entry requirements

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, a direct question to the First Minister, why will he not waive the entry requirements so that some 2,000 hog producers can participate in the benefits of this last quarter of the Hog Stabilization Program?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, very very simply, we will not undercut the hog producers in this province or in Canada; we will not undercut the Hog Stabilization Board in this province; we will now bow to the weakness being displayed by honourable members across the way by which they would capitulate to the actions on the part of the U.S. Government, rather than make

submissions which we will be doing against the imposition of the duty, submissions also, I gather, that will be joined by their federal counterparts in Washington. Mr. Speaker, their weakness, their opportunism, we will not share.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Enforcement of maintenance payments - change in policy

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: My question, Mr. Speaker, is for the Attorney-General. It's dealing with the automatic enforcement of maintenance payments. I have had two separate complaints that the enforcement is not happening. In the Family Law in Manitoba, 1985, it says: "Where there is a failure to make a payment under an Order of Maintenance, the designated officer will automatically take steps." Could the Minister tell me if there has been a change in this enforcement policy?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Not at all, Mr. Speaker, in fact, its effectiveness is increasing remarkably to the point where we were able, in the last fiscal year, to collect on behalf of spouses, mostly women, in receipt of or the beneficiaries of a maintenance order, several million dollars. Indeed, to have that system which we have in place more than pay for itself.

If, in fact, the member has an instance where, in her view or the view of the person contacting her, the system is broken down, I would invite her to please let me have the details, rather than wait for them, so that we could immediately look into it and do something to remedy the problem.

The system continues in force as an automatic system, pursuant to which every order for maintenance is recorded in the computer. At the time that happens, if the payment isn't made into court, then the computer shows that and the enforcement officers contact the person obligated to pay. If the person doesn't pay, then the province at its cost provides a Crown Attorney who will bring the person to court to get a court order to make sure that the maintenance payments are made. It continues in force as the best system of its kind in Canada, in fact, it has been emulated by other provinces and has been praised by all provinces and by the Federal Government.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I thank the Attorney-General for that answer, Mr. Speaker. I certainly agree with him, it was our government that brought it in.

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I will send one of the complaints to him, but the other does not want it brought forward to the Attorney-General. So my question is: would the Attorney-General undertake to check out to see that the system is working? Women are getting phone calls

- one of these women was getting two phone calls, asking if they wanted to proceed and, of course, they did. So would the Minister undertake to check out and see that the system is actually working?

HON. R. PENNER: The system is working very well, and I have had no calls whatsoever to my office that it wasn't. I have had no official advise me that there was a problem or that the computer went to sleep for a day or anything like that. If the member wants action, she shall have action on that problem without doubt if she lets me know what the problem is. I can't deal with or try to effect a solution to a problem which exists only within the private knowledge of the member, that's ludicrous.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Speaker, I am asking the Attorney-General - I will give him one of the instances. I'm asking him if he will check with the designated officers and make sure that they are not phoning women to see if they want to carry on with the maintenance enforcement, that they are doing it automatically; that is all I am asking of them. I don't think that is a big undertaking, so will the Attorney-General please find out?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Bilingualism in Manitoba - translation costs

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney-General and ask him whether he has had any meetings with his — (Interjection) — counterparts . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. DOERN: . . . Mr. Speaker, whether the Attorney-General has had any meeting with the Minister of Justice or the Secretary of State in the new Federal Government concerning the Manitoba language question?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am responding to that because there was a discussion that was held last night by the Prime Minister with myself by way of telephone in which the Prime Minister at that particular point had not had an opportunity to read the judgment. He indicated he would be reading the judgment later that evening. I raised with him the continuing concern on our part that there be federal resources, and I received a sympathetic response from the Prime Minister that they would be looking at the entire area of providing resources to the province.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, in that regard, did the First Minister ask the Prime Minister for 100 percent cost of the translation costs?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I only wish that a few months ago the honourable member had been as concerned as he is now appearing to be in respect to costs. If he had been as concerned as he appears to be this morning, that concern one year ago, he would not have been taking the position that he did in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker.

What we expect from the Federal Government is a continuation of the commitment that was made some one year ago, year-and-a-half ago, that they would provide financing which would be equivalent to approximately one-half of the costs . . .

A MEMBER: Eighty percent.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Eighty percent of the costs of translating the statutes. We expect that commitment to be continued even though the costs of translation now will obviously be much higher than what was anticipated a year ago. We expect, despite the additional costs, for that commitment to continue.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question back to the Attorney-General and ask him whether he has made any appeals to the new Conservative administration to making a significant financial contribution to the ongoing costs up to this point in time of translation since 1979-1980?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I indicated yesterday there have, indeed, been approaches made. There has been favourable response insofar as assisting us in regard to this very large financial outlay that will take place. That, again, was confirmed by the Prime Minister in general terms of their recognition that there is a financial obligation on the part of the Federal Government, although it is of course much higher than what would have been anticipated both federally or provincially.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. In 1983, when he tabled his proposed constitutional amendment in the Legislature, he indicated that to proceed with translation of all of the statutes and regulations I believe there was a difference of approximately \$2.4 million in translating everything compared to translating a limited number of those statutes. Is that estimate of costs still an accurate estimate of cost?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I indicated yesterday that there will be calculations that will be made insofar as the precise and actual costs of translation. There are a number of factors that will be involved in undertaking that calculation, and all we can do at this point is accept any questions as notice in respect to costs of translation in order to ensure that we provide accurate information.

There is a great deal of uncertainty as a result of the Supreme Court decision as to the extent of spent

statutes, for instance, that we will have to translate. We have no idea, Mr. Speaker, whether that means several spent statutes or hundreds of spent statutes at this point. So any answer at this point in respect to the costs of translation would be highly irresponsible.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, my next question to the Premier is: a number of questions have been placed to the Attorney-General today who was very involved, directly involved, in the past constitutional language amendment proposed by the government and I was asking him a question with respect to information tabled in the Legislature. Has the Premier prohibited the Attorney-General from speaking on this issue?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member gives me a great deal of credit that I don't deserve. I have never found myself in a very successful way of necessarily shutting up any particular member of the Treasury Bench, Mr. Speaker, and I find it rather amusing, the Member for St. Norbert's suggestion. This is a matter that relates to federal-provincial relations. The matter of the cost-sharing of translation, it is a matter that falls under my particular jurisdiction as Premier of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Attorney-General. The Attorney-General tabled on July 4, 1983, Exhibit 4, as part of his constitutional language amendment proposal showing comparative costs and it showed with an agreement the total cost was \$5.3 million minus a federal contribution of \$2.3 million for a net cost of \$2,950,000.00. Without the agreement, and that is translating everything, shows a cost of \$5.4 million - a difference of approximately \$2.45 million. Was that not an accurate estimate of costs that he tabled in the House and it indicates was prepared by Mr. Roger Turenne, senior advisor?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: The Premier has said that we will take all questions relating to the costs of translation as notice. The reason for that is, if one reads - and I appreciate that the member opposite may not have had a chance to read the decision of the Supreme Court - there are passages with respect to the statutes which require a great deal of thought in terms of the spent statutes. Because where a statute of 1892 might have in fact been replaced by a subsequent statute - let's say a society was incorporated and then there is a successor society - we may still have to translate the 1890 or '92 statute if it conferred any rights, because there is a passage in the judgment which indicates that all rights that have flowed from statutes are only temporarily protected until the appropriate statutes are translated. That is why there is an element of uncertainty, and that is why the Premier has said, in fairness to the House, we want to - and we've got our people working on it - be sure of the exact dimensions. Any other information would be incomplete and potentially, although inadvertently misleading.

Growth in retail sales and housing starts

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask a question of the Premier in regard to the latest statistics on retail sales and housing starts. I wonder if the First Minister could communicate some very encouraging developments in these two particular sectors to this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I am pleased to finally have received a bread and butter question, Mr. Speaker; it may be only the second or third such bread and butter question this week in the Chamber. Mr. Speaker, we have received, in response to the Member for Thompson's question, the figures pertaining to March which show that Manitoba has led the nation by way of growth of retail sales.

Mr. Speaker, honourable members might be pleased to receive these figures, because I think we ought to feel some sense of appreciation of the extent of growth in retail sales in Manitoba in comparison with other provinces. In March, Manitoba 13.2 percent increase, ranked 1; Nova Scotia 11.5, ranked 2; Ontario 10.6, ranked 3; Newfoundland 8.7, ranked 4; New Brunswick 8.5, ranked 5; Alberta 8.2, ranked 6; Quebec 8 percent increase, ranked 7; Saskatchewan, Conservative Government, 4.7, third from the bottom, ranked 8; Bill Bennett's British Columbia 4.7, ranked 9; and Prince Edward Island, unfortunately, lost by way of negative retail growth, minus .3, ranked 10.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The time for Oral Questions has expired.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: May I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where there are 28 students of Grade 6 standing from the Winnipeg Beach School under the direction of Mr. Larry Moore. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Housing.

And there are 30 students of Grade 5 standing from the Elmdale School under the direction of Mr. Walter Kampen. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, would you call the debate on second readings the following bills in this order, Nos. 12, 14, 16, 36 and 37, please?

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

MR. H. ENNS: On a matter of order to the Acting House Leader. I was given to understand that the government may well wish to proceed with debate on principle at second readings with the bills as listed on the Order Paper.

HON. R. PENNER: Not necessarily, you can call them in the order . . .

MR. H. ENNS: Okay, that's fine, I just want to indicate there were two or three bills that we were prepared to speak on; on Bill 7 particularly, my rural members are here and I just want to indicate that we're ready to speak on it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable members can so indicate when we reach those particular bills.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Community Services, Bill No. 12 - the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: Stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Community Services, Bill No. 14 - the Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Culture, Bill No. 16 - the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand. Order please.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 36 - the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: Stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Education, Bill No. 37 - the Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand.

The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.
— (Interjection) — Order please.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, there is not much point in going through the list again and waste time, so I would like to move that Mr. Speaker now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Thank you Mr. Speaker.

I rise on a matter of grievance concerning the Provincial Government's handling of the French language question over the past number of years, and again now, when we have a ruling from the Supreme Court of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, we just listened to some remarks by the First Minister and we will be watching very carefully and closely in the next number of weeks, and particularly in the next 120 days, as to exactly what the proposals of the government are in terms of their response to the Supreme Court of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, it was because I think of the ineptitude and the bungling of the government in the first place that the Bilodeau case went so far. I think there are many people who argued in the first place that if that had gone to the courts and if, at the same time, the legislation pertinent to that case, The Highway Traffic Act and The Summary Convictions Act, had been translated that that case would have been thrown out; Mr. Bilodeau would have paid his speeding ticket and the matter would be resolved. Just as right now, if that matter came to the court today, Mr. Bilodeau would lose his case and he could continue practising law in New Brunswick, to which he has fled.

Mr. Speaker, I now detect, after all this time and after all the debate that has taken place, a reluctance on the part of the Provincial Government to go to the Federal Government and ask for and demand full costs of translating the statutes of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the First Minister just said to me a few minutes ago, well where were you when we were debating this particular matter and this being a major expense. I want to tell him, first of all, that his proposals would be far more expensive than what are faced with right now. They would be, not only more expensive in a monetary sense, but they would be more expensive in a multicultural sense and in terms of the harmony that exists in this province today.

Mr. Speaker, it's very difficult to put a price tag on some of the proposals that the Pawley administration put forward. But we know, for example, that official bilingualism, in itself, would have created a great deal of disharmony in this province, and we know that they were prepared to print and publish everything that was produced by the government, every last pamphlet, every annual report, anything at all, by this section in their proposals about the right to communicate. Therefore, the cost there alone would be in the many millions of dollars.

Now, in addition to that, they were prepared to make the Civil Service bilingual - start small, start with 400 positions and then see what happens. Gary Doer made an estimate at one time, when he looked at this legislation, that if it wasn't tightened up he suggested that 4,000 positions could be made and designated as bilingual in the Manitoba Civil Service. Now try to estimate, Mr. Speaker, the cost of that.

I saw yesterday the Leader of the Official Opposition give his estimate of just on 100 positions, by way of

example, at \$30,000 a year - if you're talking a 100 positions at \$30,000 a year, you're talking \$3 million a year ongoing, every single year. But we're not talking about 100 positions, we're talking about 400 positions. So we're talking \$12 million a year in perpetuity and that's starters. We all know, we've all been around here long enough to know that once a program is implemented that it will expand. Then you'll have somebody with two employees, and then he'll need an assistant, and then they'll get another employee, and then they'll need a supervisor and we all know how the Civil Service works. We know the Peter Principle, we know the perils of bureaucracy, Mr. Speaker.

So, if you compare the Pawley Government's proposals and put a dollar figure on them, you're talking significantly more than what has come out of the Supreme Court, plus — (Interjection) — Well the Minister of Health doesn't like it, he doesn't like it. And, Mr. Speaker, I would be very interested to hear his estimates. I would like him to give us his dollar figures, if he doesn't accept mine. But the biggest concern of official bilingualism, Mr. Speaker, is the divisiveness that would go on forever, and would not be to the benefit of the Honourable Minister of Health and the very people that he likes and loves so much, the French-speaking community of Manitoba. It wouldn't help them; it doesn't benefit a person to gain financial reward and to lose his soul, or to lose his friends in the process. To get official bilingualism at the expense of causing a split and a rift in the province would be the worst of all possible worlds, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to focus on the costs of translation and the responsibility of the Federal Government to pay for those translation costs, and I want to also say to members opposite and to the Minister of Health and to the Ministers on that side of the House, that I think that they have an obligation now to go forward and demand, on behalf of the people of Manitoba, the full costs of translation to be picked up by the Federal Government. Because, Mr. Speaker, they not only have to fight for the rights of minorities, which is something that they are very fond of talking about, they have to fight for the rights of all Manitobans. They don't have to just tell us about justice for French-speaking Manitobans; they have to fight for the justice of all Manitobans. They have to make sure that tax burdens are not imposed on our citizenry and that there will not be a . . . problem as a result. Because what we're going to get now is we're going to get the translation of thousands of statutes, and we're going to do that for the benefit, the real benefit, of a handful of French-speaking lawyers.

There's a few people in St. Boniface who would find it convenient in the practice of law, and perhaps the odd chartered accountant, perhaps the general accountant, who would find it useful and helpful to be able to go to the statutes in French; the same person, I am sure, speaks perfect, fluent English, but it might be a preference. It will not help the people in St. Boniface and St. Pierre and the French-speaking Manitobans wherever they live in this province. They will not benefit from the translation of laws; they will not benefit from Manitoba becoming officially bilingual either. But all taxpayers are now going to have to contribute, under the present system, Manitoba taxpayers, and pick up the tab for this particular exercise.

Mr. Speaker, the First Minister enjoys, delights, thrills with putting the boots to the feds, doesn't he? I mean this is his favourite pastime, coming into this House with his cheering section and making a speech attacking Ottawa. You know, Mr. Speaker, one of these days the government's going to blow the ball game and the First Minister's going to lose his cheering section, and it's going to be called, as they once said about Woodrow Wilson in a book, "after the cheering stopped", and he's going to be puzzled because when he speaks now he has this section that automatically applauds or claps or approves of what he says.

Mr. Speaker, that reminds me very much of a movie I saw years ago starring Bob Hope. It began with Bob Hope sitting in a radio studio with a chat show, something about talking to the public and playing records; that's what he was, he was a disc jockey, I suppose. He had with him a machine and there was one dial on that machine of applause and one dial on that machine of laughter. So he would tell a joke and then the laughter would go up, and then the applause would go on or vice versa, either way, and it sounded great. If you didn't know what was happening it sounded like you had a successful and popular comedian.

That's, of course, what the First Minister thinks he is. He thinks he's a popular Premier, because he's not familiar with the outside world. He is only familiar with the sound of applause coming from behind him and all around him by his 31 boosters.

So I'm saying to the Premier of this province, the First Minister of Manitoba, here's your chance. You like to put the boots to the Federal Government. I'm giving you an opportunity, I'll second the motion. Take your delegation; get a delegation consisting of members of both sides of this Assembly, take the Conservatives along, I'm sure they'll join you, and go to Ottawa and ask the Mulroney Government to pick up the tab of translation.

So I mean, why isn't the First Minister doing that now? There has been a little hint that they might get some assistance. Well we're not talking about freeing up a few federal translators here; we're talking about a massive task. We're talking about a task of getting available translators from across the country, and we're talking about a significantly expensive bill. So I say to the First Minister, here's your chance to put the boots to Ottawa, why are you pussyfooting around?

Mr. Speaker, I also want to say to the First Minister that, going back to 1980 in the month of April, when we were debating the Lyon administration's legislation - which I think was good legislation - when that was being debated all of us in this House, I believe - I'm subject to correction, Mr. Speaker - I believe it was a unanimous vote. Now maybe I'm wrong, maybe it was an overwhelming majority with a few dissenters but, in effect, the Conservative Government put the vote and the majority, or most, or all New Democrats supported the legislation.

But, Mr. Speaker, some of us expressed concerns at that time, and I expressed concerns at that time in the month of April, and said at that point that the Federal Government should pay the full cost of translating the statutes and legislation into French.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we see what has happened recently. We see that the SFM, that sterling example of militant, French-speaking Manitobans, people who

purport to speak for all French-speaking Manitobans in Manitoba, what are they interested in? No sooner does the judgment come down than they say, well we really didn't want this anyhow, we really didn't want it. We were just kind of putting you on, but we're willing to trade what we really didn't want for what we really do want, which is, services and jobs and, in particular, positions for people like us and people who have been on the federal payroll for a long time; that's what they are interested in. They want to trade, again.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the answer to them is, no way. There is nobody in this House, nobody on this side who's going to start playing traders and negotiating with the SFM. We've already done that, there were negotiations with the SFM. They were playing in a poker game with the New Democratic administration, Serge Joyal, Mark MacGuigan, Pierre Elliott Trudeau and the SFM, and they outmanoeuvred and outsmarted these guys in a game.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Did they ever!

MR. R. DOERN: Did they ever, says my friend for Roblin-Russell.

Mr. Speaker, there was no contest. The government thought they were playing cards with one person, but they were playing with everybody and they were playing against a stacked deck.

So, all of a sudden, we hear the SFM saying, well having achieved this, we now want to immediately negotiate. Mr. Speaker, we will remember, and the people remember, that it was the Liberal Government, the Federal Liberals with their political arm in Manitoba, the SFM and the NDP which got us into a terrific mess in 1983 and 1984.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to listen to them anymore, assuming we listened to them in the first place. I don't believe, I have never believed they speak for French-speaking Manitobans. I have always believed they speak for a small element in the community, and are really the militant wing. There are other more moderate voices in the community.

So, Mr. Speaker, here we had a situation where they were pressing this government and this nation, pressing and crying and pleading on television, for all these services that they need, and want, and all this suffering that has gone on all of these years. Mr. Speaker, I do not accept that line of argument, the line of terrific suffering on the part of French-speaking Manitobans for the last 100 years. I think that's a pure myth. It is one that is used as leverage, but it contains very little, if any, truth to it.

They were going to provide us with hundreds of positions in the Civil Service. I made the statement once before that the result of that would be a bunch of people sitting around gathering dust and covered in cobwebs. So now that's out, and now they are going to get, as a result of the ruling, the translation of a bunch of dusty and musty statutes. As Herb Schulz once said, some of them have probably been eaten up by the mice in the meantime.

But that's what they want; that's what Bilodeau wanted; that's what Forest wanted; they got it. It's like Brer Rabbit, they didn't want to get thrown here, they got thrown into the briar patch; that's what they got.

Mr. Speaker, there are going to be some interesting points, some interesting fall-out as a result of the Supreme Court decision, because one of the big questions is where are we going to get the money from to pay for the translations. If we are talking about \$20 million, which isn't my figure but it's a figure that is gaining currency in the last 24, 48 hours - I don't know what the amount is, but it's in the millions. If it's 20 million or 10 million or 5 million, where are we going to get that money from?

Well, it's either going to come out of higher taxation; it's going to come out of a bigger deficit, the favourite pastime of the Minister of Finance; or it's going to come from reduced services in Health, or Education, or Highways, or Community Services, because you are going to have to decide, as a government, where that money is going to come from.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are two other areas it could come from. One is to reduce some of the bilingual services that exist now; one is to cut out some of the money that is being spent on bilingualism at present and dedicate that to translation. The other, Mr. Speaker, is, of course, to get it from the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am also saying that we have to be alert in this province to backdoor bilingualism. It is backdoor bilingualism that has been going on for quite a while as well. Continuous extension of services, new positions being declared French preference, etc. A lot of money in education is being wasted on immersion and in French language courses, it is just ridiculous the amount of money and the attention being given, Mr. Speaker. I just want to say that the case is very strong, very strong, for saying that the Federal Government should pay.

Mr. Speaker, let's just look at what the Federal Government did in the past couple of years in regard to Manitoba. Well, first of all, they funded the Forest case, didn't they? They decided that they would put up money so that Mr. Forest, an insurance salesman in the City of St. Boniface — (Interjection) — well, now my honourable friend is disagreeing with me and I hope that he gets into this debate because I would like to see him get up and defend the government. Then I would like to see him get up and make that same speech in his riding. I'd like to see him tell the people of his riding who are of Polish descent, and Ukrainian descent, and German descent, and every other descent that this is great stuff and run on that platform.

Mr. Speaker, Georges Forest went to court with federal money. Now that was a setup if ever I saw one. I forget the amount, was it \$40,000 or \$50,000 that he got? They gave him a little lump of money and he hired himself a lawyer and he went down and he fought the case. It was great fun from the lower courts to the higher courts, public expense and, finally, he won his case, that the law of 1890 was invalid. Well, Mr. Speaker, we were now beginning to cook. The temperature was starting to rise. That meant that there would have to be a reaction to that and the Lyon Government reacted and brought in its legislation.

Mr. Speaker, that wasn't good enough so along came little Roger Bilodeau and Roger Bilodeau went to the Federal Government and they gave him, what? - \$60,000 or \$70,000 and he went around in the courts - it was good practice for a young lawyer - and finally made it to the Supreme Court of Canada and he won

his case. His case, of course, was that he was challenging - well, I shouldn't say that, I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I'm getting ahead of myself. He was putting the case in Manitoba; he lost every case in Manitoba, and then when he got to the Supreme Court, of course, he was put on hold, put on hold, it's still on hold, and he was questioning the validity of English-only laws.

Mr. Speaker, if anyone wants to know where to point the finger of blame in regard to the costs of translation, I know where to point it. You point it first at Mr. Forest, then you point it at Mr. Bilodeau, and then you point it at the people who were behind them, aiding and abetting and pulling the strings and directing traffic - the Federal Government of Pierre Elliott Trudeau. That's where, that is where the finger goes, Mr. Speaker, The fickle finger of fate points at Pierre Elliott Trudeau and his brilliant policy of bilingualism for this whole country, and Serge Joyal, and some of their supporters - Richard Hatfield of New Brunswick, remember him? Bill Davis who was very supportive on this particular issue for the good of Ontario, and so on.

But the fact of the matter is that two local French-speaking Manitobans, Forest and Bilodeau, challenged the validity of our laws, said that the English-only law was invalid and argued that the laws were invalid unless translated into French, so you go and tell them. I will tell them and I'm telling them right now that they have cost this province a great deal in terms of millions of dollars required to meet what they have demanded that will do no good, no good at all, to the French-speaking Manitoban. It will be of completely no value to the average French-speaking Manitoban who lives in Winnipeg or in the rural areas, who pays his taxes, who likes his neighbor and who goes to work. The affect on him is going to be negative, rather than positive, or no affect, rather than a positive affect.

Mr. Speaker, then the Federal Government wasn't satisfied. They gave extra money to the SFM. The SFM now gets \$627,000 a year-plus, they give them extra money for legal advice. They can hire the so-called best lawyers in Canada, although that is a bit of a laugh, if you ever saw Joseph Magnet in action, after his performance - and he has been hundreds of thousands of dollars, hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Remember when Magnet came here, Joe Magnet? Well I saw Joe Magnet in the Supreme Court of Canada and, would you believe that he stood in front of the Chief Justice and the court and offered 10 reasons why full costs should be given to the SFM, because Joe was worried that he wasn't going to get his legal fees, and he made that case. I want to tell you that if you ever saw a dirty look coming from a judge, Chief Justice Brian Dickson, that was it. He made this appeal and, as he was making it, I was sitting there saying, "What is he talking about?" He was giving 10 reasons why costs should be awarded and, all of a sudden, the Chief Justice looked over his glasses and said to Mr. Magnet: "Are you requesting costs?" Mr. Magnet said, "Yes, I am, m'Lord," and the Chief Justice just, you could see his brain almost jam, he didn't know what to say. He was going to give this guy a blast. All he said was: "That is a very strange request."

Mr. Speaker, you could see that not one penny would flow, not a penny would flow to the SFM for their legal costs; and how much were those costs? Well the media - I'm talking about one year ago today, it was one year

ago yesterday I was sitting in the Supreme Court, and after he made that request all the media ran up to Mr. Magnet, who bears a startling resemblance incidentally to Jerry Calonna - Jerry Calonna who Bob Hope's sidekick. They went up to him and they said: "Mr. Magnet, how much money are we talking about, Sir?" Mr. Magnet said: "The legal fees of the SFM in the past year or two have been between \$500,000 and \$1 million." Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government was paying the SFM, who was paying Joe Magnet to do this.

Now there's a case across the street, which I won't get into, but that's part of that same continuing saga. Not only then did they fund Forest and Bilodeau and the SFM and give extra money to fight the plebiscite, there was money going into Manitoba 23, there was money going into this phoney committee for a constitutional amendment, etc. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government of Pierre Elliott Trudeau, funded this whole turmoil; funded the people who took these cases to Court, and then acted as an advisor and a partner and a puppeteer, in regard to the SFM to then make an out-of-court settlement.

It's like what they did in the Yukon and the Northwest Territories, threatened them with compulsory official bilingualism and then say, well let's not do this, let's talk out of court, we'll give you a deal, we got an offer for you.

So, Mr. Speaker, if those are the facts of the matter - and I say that they are - then I say, that's fine; Ottawa brought us to this state of affairs, let Ottawa pay the bill.

MR. W. McKENZIE: Pay the piper.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, we have to have and, as my Honourable friend for Roblin-Russell says, pay the piper. And that's exactly what I say, Mr. Speaker, there's a reverse on the old saying there, and that is, if you want to call the tune, then pay the piper. That's how it works. Don't call the tune and then ask some other guy to pay, because when he pays he wants to give directions to the kind of music that he wants the piper to play. Mr. Speaker, we want justice for everybody in this province.

We don't want to whole focus of attention going on to the small so-called hard done-by French-speaking Manitoban, we want justice for the people who are of Ukrainian descent, and Polish descent, and German descent, and Icelandic descent; and the Phillipino people who have just come here and the Vietnamese people who have just emigrated to our nation. We want it for everybody. We want it, not just for a handful of malcontents or a handful of fanatics, we want justice for everyone.

So when you're considering it for a small minority consider, as well, the ramifications upon everyone, on all the ethnic groups and on all the taxpayers, Mr. Speaker. I'm saying it's been very interesting to follow what has gone on; there have been some lessons learned. The CBC didn't learn any last night when they repeated their show "The Poisoned Chalice." You know, Mr. Speaker, I saw that program a year ago when they put it on and boy, if that wasn't propoganda, I don't know what was. That was one of the worst shows ever

done by the CBC, because it was completely biased. You had some old priest on there, groaning and moaning, and talking about this and complaining about that. Mr. Speaker, if he drank from a poisoned chalice, it was probably because he bit his own lip, because the poison was coming from his own system.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier said the other day, well you know, he thought that most Manitobans were nice. Now that was an improvement. He was talking last night, looking very worried. You know how he can look real worried in that sort of hang-dog fashion. He looked very worried, like a bloodhound. He said most Manitobans were nice - well, we all think that. But isn't that the same person, isn't that the same government that a year and two years ago, was saying that all these bigots, 78 percent bigots voted against their legislation. Well, at least they've learned a few things, at least they say that they've learned a few things.

Mr. Speaker, when this matter came up just yesterday, the ruling and so on, I thought that what we should do, and I speak to both members of the Chamber, is to give the Federal Government a chance to fully participate in what is going on, to give the Mulroney government a chance.

And I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have some reservations about the Prime Minister because I know that the Prime Minister is a keen supporter of official bilingualism on a national basis and, Mr. Speaker, I was there, as well, a year ago at the Holiday Inn, when the Prime Minister came in and made a very strong statement to the local Conservatives and other people, since the meeting was open, but it was largely a Conservative meeting, and in effect, used Manitoba to get applause in Quebec by standing up to Manitobans and telling them that he wasn't going to bend.

I was also at the Quadra Club meeting, which was a very mild and friendly affair, but some people were not overly thrilled at the Prime Minister speaking English and French. If I were his advisor on that occasion, I would have suggested that he say a few words in Ukrainian or Polish or German or Dutch, that would have gone over a lot better, Mr. Speaker. So I say that the Prime Minister in Western Canada is a little suspect. His record in office is just beginning to emerge; it is not fully formed at this point in time. The suspicion is that he is an easterner and the suspicion is that he is, of course, most concerned about the Province of Quebec. So I say that we should give me a chance to demonstrate his concern for the people of Manitoba, and invite him to fully support the costs of translation that Manitobans are now being faced with.

Mr. Speaker, having said that, I made that suggestion yesterday through questions to our First Minister, Lloyd Axworthy. You remember Lloyd Axworthy, the last of the big-time spenders, the friend of Pierre Elliott Trudeau and Serge Joyal, he suggested that the Federal Government should significantly participate in the translation costs. These are not his words, I don't know his precise words, but he asked Eric Nielsen in the House of Commons whether the Conservative Government should participate, to what extent I don't know he meant, and Mr. Nielsen responded that they would participate. Now none of us know what was meant by that, whether he was thinking of sending translators; whether he was going to offer some limited assistance, Mr. Speaker, or what. But there is an opening, Mr.

Nielsen appeared receptive. The Prime Minister is obviously interested and I think that what we should do, if there's going to be legislation brought in, is that there should also be a companion bill or request or resolution asking Ottawa to pay the full cost of translation, whether it's \$5 million, or \$10 million or \$20 million.

We don't have to have these translators come here; we can send them the legislation. We can put it in a crate and ship it down there Via Rail, or Air Canada, or if this would please my honourable friends, even CP Air, I'd even go that far. Ship it down there, let the translators stay in Ottawa and they can work on this around the clock.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it's time, once again, for a bipartisan resolution, or a bipartisan delegation, to go to Ottawa to put the case to Ottawa that they fully fund the translation of our statutes. Even though the Mulroney Government is not to blame for the fiasco that occurred in Manitoba, it was its predecessor that was. So the full weight of blame goes on the shoulders of the Trudeau administration. The appeal of Manitoba and of this Legislature and this government should be to the new Prime Minister to ask him to fully fund the costs of translation which are largely the result of the activities of its predecessor.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION put, Motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair for the Department of Education, and the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair for the Department of Energy and Mines.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - ENERGY AND MINES

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: Committee, please come to order. This section of the Committee of Supply will be dealing with the Estimates of the Department of Energy and Mines. We shall be dealing with the statement of the Honourable Minister responsible.

Mr. Minister.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

I welcome the opportunity to present my department's spending Estimates for the 1985-86 fiscal year.

I would like to provide a brief overview of our accomplishments over the past year, along with some insight into our plans for 1985-86, first dealing with energy.

ENERGY

The Province of Manitoba continues to be a leader in energy conservation initiatives. Although the Federal Government has terminated the federal-provincial cost-shared Canada-Manitoba Conservation and Renewable Energy Demonstration Agreement effective March 31, 1985, some joint federal-provincial initiatives will continue and Manitoba will fund initiatives to develop and demonstrate new technologies to exploit renewable resources, conserve energy and use energy more efficiently.

One of the initiatives for the new fiscal year will be the installation of central energy computer control

systems for 10 school divisions in the western area of the province. It is planned that this initiative will be jointly funded by the school divisions along with Canada and Manitoba and will reduce energy consumption for the divisions by some 30 percent. We shall also continue to fund demonstration of energy saving construction techniques for homes and institutions. Testing methanol as an alternate vehicle fuel will also continue.

Manitoba for the past year has run the Manitoba Commercial, Industrial and Institutional Audit Program which replaced the federal-provincial National Energy Audit Program. This program identifies opportunities to reduce energy costs by improving the efficiency of energy utilization and encouraging conservation initiatives. During the past fiscal year, 262 audits were completed, and \$3.185 million in potential energy savings were identified. We shall continue to operate this highly valued program during this coming fiscal year.

A number of conservation programs were funded by the Manitoba Jobs Fund during the past fiscal year and will be continued in 1985-86. These programs not only aid in energy conservation, but also stimulate employment in the retrofit and building trades industries.

Under the Cut Home Energy Costs (CHEC) low interest loan program, approximately 5,800 loans worth about \$4.6 million to assist homeowners to make their dwellings more energy efficient were approved in 1984-85. It is projected that for the fiscal year 1985-86, about 6,300 homeowners will borrow \$5 million from CHEC to undertake energy conservation retrofits.

The Home CHEC-UP Program which provides homeowners with impartial advice on energy conservation retrofitting has been very well received by Manitobans. During the past fiscal year, over 3,700 energy audits were completed and it is projected that over 4,000 Manitobans will avail themselves of this service during 1985-86.

The Business and Community Cut High Energy Costs (CHEC) Programs provide matching grants up to \$15,000 for materials and labour for qualifying businesses and community institutions which can show that their conservation initiatives will reduce energy use by at least 20 percent. During the past fiscal year, grants were approved for 165 applications totalling over \$1.5 million. These programs, which help provide the needed cash flow for smaller businesses to undertake energy retrofits, will be continued in 1985-86.

These and other Jobs Fund conservation initiatives with community groups such as the Age and Opportunity Centre, the Canadian Association for the Mentally Retarded and Native people, round out our energy conservation programs. We believe that energy conservation benefits the people of Manitoba not only by making their energy future more secure, but also by increasing disposal income through energy dollars saved and by stimulating and sustaining employment in the retrofit and building trades.

In the field of renewable energy, staff of the Department of Energy and Mines have been assisting the Manitoba Energy Authority in exploring opportunities for hydro-electric sales to utilities outside of Manitoba, as well as initiating discussions with aluminum interests about developing facilities in Manitoba. Of course, the activities of the Manitoba

Energy Authority have been discussed fully in the Public Utilities Committee of the Legislature.

The Manitoba Energy Council, the citizen advisory group, has been active in providing input into the development of energy conservation programs. I look forward to their continued interest in these matters during the new fiscal year.

MINERAL RESOURCES

Turning to the Mineral Resource Sector, the mineral industry of the province continues its slow but definite recovery. The value of Manitoba's mineral production during 1984 increased 11 percent over 1983 and there were no production interruptions. But perhaps a more significant indicator of renewed confidence by the industry is the level of mineral exploration. Expenditures on mineral exploration in the province increased 66 percent to \$27.6 million from \$16.6 million in 1983. Results of this increased level of exploration are manifest in the announcement of a number of new mineral discoveries, including a nickel deposit by Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting which the company feels offers the prospect for a new mine, this is at Namew Lake.

Encouraged by gradually improving metals prices and depleting inventories, Manitoba mining companies have, therefore, resumed mine development and stepped-up exploration. Inco continues development of the new Thompson Open Pit, which on completion is expected to cost approximately \$87 million. Production from the new mine is expected to commence in early 1986. During 1984, Inco's Manitoba Division began processing nickel concentrates from an Ontario Division mine at Shebandowan. About 13 million pounds of nickel will be produced annually at Thompson from this source. Further, during 1984, equipment from the Port Colborne, Ontario refinery was relocated in Thompson for nickel "rounds" production. This has resulted in a significant change in product mix from this complex commencing in the fourth quarter of 1984. After 13 consecutive quarterly losses, the company announced a return to profitability in the fourth quarter of 1984.

Meanwhile, Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting has stepped up exploration in the Flin Flin-Snow Lake region while maintaining continuous mining and processing operations during the year. The company is planning to reopen its Centennial mine and is very optimistic about its new nickel discovery.

The problem area in the mining industry of this province continues to be the Lynn Lake-Leaf Rapids mining belt. With Sherritt expecting to close the Fox Lake Mine permanently in the fall of this year, the community of Lynn Lake is facing a serious threat. The sustenance of that community at a reasonable level depends heavily on a production decision for the Agassiz gold mine, which is expected to go before Sherritt's board meeting sometime in June. Since the closure of the Farley mine at Lynn Lake in 1976, the government has given top priority to programs in the Lynn Lake region to stimulate the search for new ore bodies there and will continue to do so. Both the Department of Energy and Mines and the Crown corporation Manitoba Mineral Resources Ltd. have been concentrating their efforts in this area.

In order to stimulate exploration for new orebodies in the region, the government, through our department

has embarked on an intensive mineral investigation program in the region. The results of these investigations have been incorporated into a large number of reports and maps which have been released to the industry and which have provided new insights and new approaches to exploration in the region. In the 1985-86 fiscal year, \$600,000 will be spent by the two levels of government on continuing programs in the Lynn Lake region under the new Canada-Manitoba Mineral Development Agreement which extends from 1985 to 1989 and in which strong emphasis is given to Lynn Lake.

In addition, the Crown corporation, Manitoba Minerals, has spent \$3 million in exploration activities in the region over the past three years. An additional 1.5 million was spent over the same period by private exploration companies attracted by Manitoba Minerals in joint ventures in the Lynn Lake region. Manitoba Minerals holds a number of properties in the area, and 1.5 million has been budgeted this year to continue active exploration.

Between August, 1983 and August, 1984, the province contributed over half-a-million dollars to the NEED Program with Sherritt and the Federal Government for exploration and evaluation of the Agassiz gold deposit near Lynn Lake. This program, and continuing work done by Sherritt, will hopefully lead to a production decision by the board of Sherritt which will go a long way to providing a continuing economic base for Lynn Lake when the Fox mine closes in the fall of this year.

Finally, a total of 1.05 million has been spent from the Manitoba Mining Community Reserve Fund in Lynn Lake to offset shortfalls in municipal revenue, in job creation projects, in sponsoring the Lynn Lake seminar, and in hiring an Economic Development Officer, among other things. The government remains steadfastly committed to working closely with the people of Lynn Lake through this difficult period.

The Ruttan Mine and the dependent community of Leaf Rapids have survived the worst period and seem set for some stable years ahead. Assisted by a \$10 million loan from the government, Sherritt is proceeding with development of the extension of the Ruttan orebody to the 860 metre level. This development, which is scheduled to be completed in the early fall of this year, will permit Sherritt to increase production and employment, improve ore grade and significantly reduce production costs.

Members of this House are aware that in 1984 the Government of Canada and Manitoba signed a five-year Canada-Manitoba Mineral Development Agreement under which \$24.7 million has been allocated for activities designed to strengthen and diversify Manitoba's mineral industry. I am pleased to advise members that a total of 85 projects were undertaken by the two levels of government during 1984, the results of which have, either been released as reports or communicated to industry at my department's annual open house, and at a number of national mining industry meetings. Activities during this first year of the agreement were mostly geoscience programs, strongly focused in the Lynn Lake region. This year, 112 programs will be undertaken, including a number of mineral productivity and processing improvement studies and mineral development and market analyses.

The government continues to pursue vigorously the development of Manitoba's potash resources. These

efforts are directed to the high-grade deposit held by Canamax Resources in the Russell-Binscarth area. A number of engineering and economic studies have been completed by both the province and Canamax under a Letter of Intent extending to June 30, 1985. These studies are very promising and Canamax is continuing its development programs through 1985 and into 1986. Intensive marketing activities are now being undertaken by both Canamax and Manitoba and additional partners are being sought for the project.

Interest and activity in the petroleum sector continues at a high level. Last year there were 246 wells drilled with 89 percent completed as potential oil producers. Oil production increased by 8 percent with approximately 5 million barrels produced, valued at about \$170 million. Sales of Crown oil and natural gas leases set a new provincial record generating over \$2.5 million in revenue. A further \$20 million was collected by the Crown through royalties and taxes on oil production. Two other significant developments were the construction of Manitoba's first natural gas plant at Waskada, and the construction of a 90 kilometre oil pipeline connecting the Waskada oil field to the interprovincial pipeline system southwest of Virden.

Petroleum activity levels this year continue to look promising as evidenced by drilling to date and the recent sale of Crown oil leases on May 8th when \$2.1 million was collected setting a new Manitoba record.

COMMUNICATIONS AND COMMUNITY RELATIONS BRANCH

The Communications and Community Relations Branch of the Department has been active in informing individuals, businesses, service and community groups about the programs and activities of the department. A main source of information is the Energy and Mines Info Centre which has dealt with 17,300 enquiries in 1984. The branch has also prepared and distributed reports and manuals in connection with CREDA and other conservation programs, as well as, information relating to mining and petroleum activities in the province. In addition, branch personnel have prepared and staffed displays at exhibitions, schools and home shows.

This brings to a close my introductory remarks. I would like to take this opportunity to thank all of the staff of the Department for their efforts during the past year and I look forward to a productive 1985-86.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

The Chairperson now calls upon the leading critic of the opposition party to present his reply to the opening statement of the Minister.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I believe on a nice Friday morning we shall proceed right into the Estimates.

I ask the Minister, just prior to his formal statement, the most obvious item that immediately strikes you in looking at these estimates are the substantial reduction in the total cost set aside for the department from \$13,748,100 to 11,373,800. I am given to understand that is as a result of the ending of a federal-provincial agreement. If the Minister simply wants to go over that and indicate that is the case, then we don't have to pursue too deeply where this Minister and where this department is spending \$2 million less money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before the Minister answers, I would like to cordially invite the members of the departmental staff to kindly take their respective places.

Deferring the budget item No. 1 relating to the Minister's Salary as the last item for consideration by this committee, we will begin our deliberation right away on Item No. 1.(b)(1); 1.(b)(2) Administration and Finance; Executive Support: Salaries; 1.(b)(2) Other Expenditures.

Mr. Minister.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Yes, I'd like to deal with the general question raised by the member. The big reductions are in 2.(b)(2), that's on your program side. Then your other reduction would be on 4., Expenditures Related to Capital, where again you've got the reduction from 2.3 to 1.3. This is related to the federal-provincial program which generally has expired. There are a few carry-overs. We're having some discussions with them under our ERDA.

We're not quite sure, because what we are trying to determine from the new federal administration is the extent to which the Federal Government will, in a sense, continue to direct-deliver in provinces, or the extent to which they might do something jointly with provinces. As the member no doubt recalls from his time as a Minister, one of the ongoing debates with the Federal Government was how much should the Federal Government be direct-delivering, and how much should it be doing possibly through joint programs, especially with the province delivering since the province is the closer government to the people.

We are starting that discussion, and we'll see where it takes us over the course of the next year, but we certainly haven't budgeted for it. We knew that it would take about a year for the new administration to, in a sense, determine its position on these types of things. I would expect that, now that the Federal Minister of Energy has reached an oil accord she may have more time to deal with matters of this nature.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, in dealing with this Resolution 59, it's obvious that there is not much change in the administrative level within the department, but perhaps the Minister would like to, however, take this opportunity to introduce members of his staff who are not all known to us, and indeed indicate at this time - and I'll pass this resolution if, in fact, there have been any other changes in the senior administration within the department. That's all I have to say.

HON. W. PARASIUK: I don't have them all here, because I had a bigger cast the other evening. Charles Kang is the Acting Deputy Minister of Mines. Henry Mordarski is in the Administration section. Dr. Sobhoram Singh is in the Mineral Policy section.

We have had some changes over the course of the last year. My former deputy was appointed Chairman of Manitoba Hydro and Chairman of the Manitoba Energy Authority and Executive Director and those are full-time duties.

I had appointed Mr. Chenier as an Acting Deputy Minister in the department. Mr. Chenier then went through some reorganization, and we made some administrative changes. Mr. Puttee, who was an

Assistant Deputy Minister of Energy, has gone over to the Manitoba Energy Authority.

Another Assistant Deputy Minister position on the mining side was declared redundant at the Civil Service staff level, and the incumbent in that position, Dr. Haugh, is on special assignment to me as Minister dealing with the question of single enterprise communities, and will be doing some work in relation to the matter of, in a sense, a review of legislation, because we've had various forms of legislation that, in a sense, have been put together, so that will be undertaken.

Then Mr. Chenier took ill and has, in fact, not come back into the department, but is rather on a TAP assignment with the aegis of Executive Council. The government has appointed Mr. Kang as the Acting Deputy Minister within the department. So those are the executive changes that have taken place over the course of the last year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(b)(1)—pass; 1.(b)(2)—pass.

1.(c)(1) Communications: Salaries, 1.(c)(2) Other Expenditures.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on Communications, Salaries, I note an obvious drop. It would appear to me that this Minister may have given up one of his communicators within this level. Is that the case? Has he transferred that to the Premier's office? The Minister will note that subject matter has been causing some debate in the House, the number of communicators this government has hired. I'm referring especially to (c)(1) Salaries. Last year, you had an item of \$70,800, and this year it is \$46,400.00.

HON. W. PARASIUK: One position was just cut under that team project that the member is aware of, and that took place in Pinawa and Stonewall. So there has just been a cut. We certainly haven't transferred anything.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(c)(1)—pass; 1.(c)(2)—pass.

1.(d)(1) Financial and Administrative Services: Salaries, 1.(d)(2) Other Expenditures.

1.(d)(1)—pass; 1.(d)(2)—pass.

There will be no resolution on this budget item because of our deferral of the Minister's Salary.

Item No. 2(a)(1) Energy, Policy Planning and Project Development: Salaries, 2.(a)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, in the Minister's opening statement, he makes specific reference that, although the Federal Government has terminated the federal-provincial cost-shared Canada-Manitoba Conservation and Renewable Energy Demonstration Agreement effective March 31, 1985 - my question is, we often hear the announcement of a new federal joint agreement of any kind. We don't always pursue the ending of these agreements.

My general question to the Minister simply is: what, in the Minister's opinion, has the agreement achieved? Can he give us some information with respect to the total amounts that were expended on that agreement that has now, in the Minister's words, come to more or less a conclusion, although I appreciate there might

be some carrying-on activity that is taking place? But, inasmuch as the Minister made special note of its ending, what have we demonstrated of value to the taxpayers of Manitoba and, indeed, Canada with this Energy Demonstration Program?

HON. W. PARASIUK: I think that I've got a list here of projects. I just want to make sure I get my numbers correct.

This agreement was negotiated by the previous administration; we picked it up. One of the things about the agreement, if I could just give a general statement and then get into some of the specifics, is that it was an attempt to see what types of projects might be done. I would call it not disparagingly, a shotgun approach. You say, well, we've got some money here. What does the community, what do different people in the community have in their minds as possible demonstration projects? With something like this, it took a while to get the agreement under way.

There's always a lag time. There is always a lag problem with agreements that are of a tighter nature, say, like the Mineral Development Agreement where you've got an amount of money allocated; you've got a department in place; you've got a federal department in place, and you try to get some movement on it. There's always a type of lag. But when you're talking about the general public and how do they participate in demonstration projects, then there's a lag.

So what was originally authorized was something in the order of \$8.3 million. What was spent to date, and there are still some expenditures I think to come in, \$6.6 million and - sorry, this is the provincial share. It was \$8.3 million that was authorized; \$6.6 has been spent. In cumulative terms, this is 50-50.

What I have here is a list of projects and rather than read them I can just maybe give you a list of them that you could have for your records. But I'll just give you an interesting summation of the types of things that have happened. We've been able to get groups. The approach was: how do you try and disseminate information out there?

One approach would be to, in a sense, try and deal with what I would call the more esoteric signs, research-oriented type of activity at the university. A lot of knowledge is already known with respect to energy conservation. It struck us that the big challenge was how do you take that knowledge off the shelves or out of the university and actually get it applied by people and by groups?

So we did 120 home retrofits. We have people apply, and we made sure that they were spread out geographically around the province. They received grants for their retrofits, but as a condition of their grant they had to have open houses in their areas, and we would advertise that there would be an open house taking place. Just to give you an idea of the interest that I found, I can recall - this was two years ago, and the member can certainly recall the heat of that summer when everyone was debating French language issues - this one in particular, because that was the first evening that we were going to have, after a long debate, hearings on that bill. It was right in this room.

After many long, hot days, that night there was a shower. I went home for the supper break, and I was

told that there was a demo home or a demonstration home in my constituency, so I popped in to see who was there and who might come out. I didn't know if many people would show up because it was raining. I was there for about one hour, one-and-a-half hours, and I think that there might have been probably between 80 and 100 people, just as a rough judge - there were some people I knew and some people I didn't know - with only one little ad placed in the community newspaper, a little wee one. I then came to this committee meeting and I found that we had about 60 to 75 people.

The next day, the press was proclaiming how interested the general public was obviously in the hearings. What was unsung was the fact that in many of these home demonstrations, open houses, there were groups in the order of 50 to 80 to 100, 120 people showing up. So it shows that there is that interest on the part of the population in energy conservation, in a sense, in the do-it-yourself type of knowledge.

I think that people felt that they got burnt with UFFI, and no one wants to leap into energy conservation unless they feel they're doing the right thing. Also, some people have done some things with energy conservation. They've, for example, put a lot of insulation in their attics, and they've got leaking windows and leaking doors. They find it doesn't make that much impact, and they get a bit frustrated with that, so it's important that people do find out the best type of thing they can. So I think in that sense we have found a tremendous increase in inquiries from communities out there and from individuals.

We then wanted to deal with groups. We got people working together on the recreation program that we talked a bit about yesterday in the Public Utilities Committee. Again, we had recreation associations apply. Not all of them got it, of course, but we made sure that there would be a recreation association from each one of the regions in Manitoba, again with the provision that they have a type of open house so that they share their information with their peers. We're finding that's a good way of people sharing information. It's not, in a sense, coming down from on high, from a university milieu - not that the university isn't important in energy conservation development, but not at that stage.

We've done that with the hospitals, and we've worked in conjunction with the Manitoba Health Services Commission. Again, the co-operation there has been very good. We're working with the schools right now; we're working with the businesses. All of these groups are finding that they're trying to reduce their operating costs, and this is one way of doing it. So I think we have developed a great deal of knowledge within our own department as to what works, what doesn't work, what can be applied, what isn't applied that well, where people run into problems. This is being reinforced as well, through our CHEC experiences.

I know that there are some evaluation pieces. There are evaluation reports on virtually every one of the projects that is put out. That was a requirement of the agreement. That was one of the reasons why we had a fair number of people actually involved who were disseminating these reports. Every one of these has to be evaluated; every one of them has to be reported. We're not at the stage yet where we've completed, I would call, the overall assessments, so I am only

speaking really off the top of my head when I give these types of assessments. But I think that in a sense going to the applied side was the good thing to do.

I spoke at a conference at the University of Manitoba about nine months ago. I guess one of the fellows who had been an advisor to the Federal Minister of Energy when this program was first developed came up to me afterwards and said that he had attended a number of these across the country. He had found that we had made a lot of progress, you know, right on the ground, because we had taken the approach of trying to deal with people at the ground level to get people to apply known knowledge, rather than trying to make new breakthroughs.

There is a bit of work being done at the university, and people are doing work on methanol, for example, and then work is being done on ethanol, and those things are being done. But we think that we can have a tremendous impact on energy conservation by trying to influence the mundane decisions that people make, but those decisions are so numerous. You've basically got 400,000 householders. If they can all make some decisions of a positive way, they will get a bigger bang for their energy buck, so that's the approach that we have taken.

I think we've got a good base in this province as a result of it. I think we've got a good base when we conduct our evaluation. I might be going back to my Cabinet colleagues next year and saying, now I think that these things work, we should be expanding some of it. Now that's all subject, of course, to the Estimates process as to whether we get enough money or not, but that's the approach that we will take.

Within a year, I would expect that we will have a more formal evaluation done because that evaluation is still in progress.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I would be interested, at another sitting of this committee perhaps, to have that information provided to projects undertaken as the Minister indicated, at the Minister's convenience.

I also ask the Minister, just in the examination of Estimates, it could maybe be useful if we have latitude with the entire resolution?

HON. W. PARASIUK: I have no problem. I like that.

MR. H. ENNS: We can have it a little more of a cohesive discussion, rather than line-by-line.

In that case, just so I understand. I notice, for instance, in the (d) of this same resolution, the program, CHEC, is specifically isolated. What the Minister is talking about, is that not to be confused with the CHEC programs? Those are separate programs, or are they part of the program demonstrations that the Minister just described.

HON. W. PARASIUK: No, CHEC actually is an implementation. We had, for example, with the home retrofits, we had 120 home retrofits. That was under the Demonstration Program that was cost-shared. Under CHEC, we have a home CHEC-UP by a person. Then the person undertakes a \$1,000 loan, 9.5 percent from Hydro and tries to make the best possible energy conservation investment for their residents. I indicated

the numbers there. They were in the order of - last year, we had 5,800 loans worth about \$4,600,000 million, which means that not all of them were for the maximum of \$1,000.00.

That is an ongoing program that is being run and administered. What we wanted to do with the Home CHEC-UP Program though was try and make it more efficient by ensuring that people do get a bigger bang for their energy bucks spent. That's why we have the Home CHEC-UP people going out there doing the audits. I don't have my list of letters with me, but I have been very pleased at the response that I've been receiving from homeowners who have had the Home CHEC-UP program who sat down and talked to the audit person, talked about the option, the pros and cons, and undertaken investment decisions which they have to repay with respect to home energy. The response I've received from the general public on this has been excellent.

What I think we have to consider, frankly, is whether in fact a \$1,000 limit or a \$1,000 ceiling is not becoming too low. There is inflation, and I think this program started off years back within the Department of Finance, probably about 1977. It was switched over to the Department of Energy and Mines, I think, about 1981 or 1982.

We have made the change of trying to make it more efficient by having the people do an audit before they make that investment decision. It costs them \$20.00. If they show some interest, if they make an investment decision with respect to energy conservation, they get that refunded. But what we were trying to do is just make the program more efficient.

I think what we have to look at now is whether, in fact, we should be lifting the ceiling. A thousand dollars doesn't go as far today as it did in 1977.

MR. H. ENNS: The department is involved in installation of a central energy computer control system for school divisions in Western Manitoba, 10 school divisions, I understand. Is that involvement financial, as well, or is it primarily information?

HON. W. PARASIUK: It's going to be both. It is being done under the community CHEC Program, where community groups can apply. We thought this was a very good opportunity by having 10 working together, rather than some things happening in isolation. We're trying to have the ripple effect. One hopes that the concentric circles, if one drops a rock in the pond, will go out rather than sort of contracting. We're hoping that this will be a good lead for other school divisions to look at in the future.

MR. H. ENNS: What does the installation of a central energy computer control system really entail? What kind of hardware are we buying? Who's making the purchasing decisions? Are the school divisions making the decisions? Is the department providing the hardware for the system?

HON. W. PARASIUK: I will have to take that question as notice because, as you can see, the people that are here aren't with that section. I, frankly, didn't ask all of the staff to come over here because I didn't think

we'd be going through with such speed. When we went into the grievance or when grievance was called, I thought we might spend more of our time just on the first item.

But from my understanding of what had been described to me with respect to the project, the school districts work in conjunction with the Department of Education and with us. It's the schools that decide; it is the schools that undertake the investment decisions, but they do have the opportunity of receiving matching grants of up to \$15,000 from this community CHEC-UP Program. But that decision is made by the schools after consultation with people that we have in the department who are expert at it and people within the Department of Education and, I think, with people in the Manitoba Association of School Trustees, and people who are in the business of trying to, in a sense, work out a system whereby, by having these small types of computers, you can actually regulate your furnaces, regulate your fans and regulate your thermostat settings through the course of a school year, because there's a lot of downtime or empty time in a school. That's the approach that they are taking. That is, admittedly, a superficial description of it.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I know the Minister has a number of fine vans that his energy auditors travel the countryside with. How many does he have, 20? I recall some ceremony at the front of the steps of the building here not so long ago.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Right, I was waiting for that one. I must say, I inherited two vans from the previous administration which I'm thankful for. These are very finely outfitted vans. They're quite expensive; they have computers in them, and they go out and they do specific checks, and there's a stationwagon as well.

There was some debate, I think, with the Federal Government as to whose vans they were. We have decided that they're our vans.

MR. J. DOWNEY: What did they decide?

HON. W. PARASIUK: I think they have agreed that they're our vans as well. I think they are a good long-term investment. They go out and they do audits, and these are usually more complicated, sophisticated audits for larger either public institutions or private institutions. I know they have done the circuit of the province for some time now and they do it on an ongoing basis. They try and arrange appointments so that if they go into a community they will have more than one audit to do, and that is done on an ongoing basis. There are also 24 cars, Home CHEC-UP cars, that our Home CHEC-UP officers are using.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Portage.

MR. L. HYDE: I just would like to refer back to the Central Energy Computer Control System that you referred to, Mr. Minister. I gather from what you were indicating that you will select the communities or the school divisions or will they make the application to you?

HON. W. PARASIUK: The school divisions are making applications to us and a centralized computer system

for one is a fairly expensive proposition, but 10 went together. Ten went together and they are going to have one computer. They are hooked up via telephone radar and they can then get the economies of scales. So there are 10 school divisions in Western Manitoba who have come together and we think it is a very interesting way to proceed. I would hope there will be other school divisions in the future that will be doing the same thing as this get knowledge of this. Certainly, since MAST is involved, that type of information will be disseminated through the trustees and through the school divisions and I would expect that we will be receiving more applications in the future.

MR. L. HYDE: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)(1) - the Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I want to again address the entire resolution. I would have to say that in the main, because I do have some first-hand experience, particularly in the community of Stonewall, as one of the community projects that have quite successfully worked with the department in the area of energy conservation.

I don't doubt for a moment that in the department's effort we have really just begun to bring energy conservation to the people of Manitoba. I would encourage the Minister in this particular instance, particularly with some programs coming to an end, to press for the application of what the department has learned, that more and more people, businesses and community organizations, whether it is hospitals or schools, are learning to press on with the cause of energy conservation in this province.

I am a conservative by politics and by nature. I would not want to urge this Minister and this government to recklessly and irresponsibly expand their budgets, but I can't help but note that in this particular item there is virtually a stand-pat situation; the overall expenditure of the resolution is virtually unchanged.

In fact, there is a reduction from the 3.9 or virtually the \$4 million to the 2.8 which the Minister has to some extent explained. I make the observation, partly from experience as well, that all too often the dollars are there with respect to research, with respect to studying, with respect to staff costs. Very often the staff costs are continuing, whether or not the dollars allocated to the department are eaten up in the staff and complementary costs, whether it is vans and cars, the assistance to the delivery program. The Minister alluded to it by acknowledging that perhaps the \$1,000 limit in the one area, the CHEC Program, ought to readjusted. I am simply saying that if the Estimates stay as they appear to be staying, and if you are referring to the line-by-line, it would become very obvious that new money isn't being put into the program, nor is there money to even account for the admittedly Mulroney inspired low rate of inflation that we currently enjoy.

But I gather from the Minister that there is no diminution of staff, nor am I recommending it. The operation of the 22 vehicles involved in this particular area, those costs would of course rise with petroleum energy costs rising, etc.

I think the Minister understands what I am saying. I, in fact, encourage the Minister to make sure that if additional funds are not available that to reasonably monitor as to how much from within the allocation that we are talking about; how much of the \$2,880,600 can be applied directly to energy conservation programs that are covered in this department area of his responsibilities. And, if need be, particularly as some of the demonstrations, by the open-homes demonstrations, that the department has undertaken successfully, one would assume that there are more people who are now knowledgeable about what is available. One would hope that in the future the need for government staff to advise and to encourage conservation at the home level or at the arena or school level should decrease the demand to have some assistance, perhaps, and providing the energy conservation measures would increase.

Those would be my comments with respect to this resolution.

HON. W. PARASIUK: I would just like to give a response - a short one - in that the member did indicate that what we are trying to do is change attitudes more than anything else. That can be a slow and difficult process and that does take people to do that. I think that the attitude, that there are changing attitudes out in the general public. I think there is a response. I think the response out of both Stonewall and Pinawa, for example, indicated that people will look at this.

That's the positive thing that is taking place with respect to energy conservation. I think we have to determine whether in fact, say, the \$1,000 is a constraint, and whether we shouldn't be upping it because we may have people undertaking - you just don't insulate half-a-house or half the attic. That may be a constraint in people actually undertaking more.

There has also been an elimination of the federal CHIP Program, and we are trying to determine what the fall-out from that will be, so this is that type of transitional year. We also have the end of the program, so it's a transitional year. I would rather move prudently in that sense and make the case based on solid substance and solid need.

The one thing that's happening out there that is possibly making people hesitate a bit - we'll determine this over the course of the next year - is that in a sense energy prices are stabilizing. People do tend to respond in part through sort of a purposeful decision that they want to make a good longer-term investment on their own part, and at the same time they tend to respond to what they think the future will be with respect to energy prices. Right now, they think that it has bubbled. I think ultimately, five years from now, that bubble will burst, especially with respect to oil, but that is something that we certainly will take into account. I'd like to indicate that the province's share has not decreased; we've kept our share fully in there. The decrease is the federal share.

Certainly, on our definition of how good these programs are or our determination of how good these programs are, our determination of what we think that need is - and we do go out and try and cultivate the need. We have advertised. We have put things out saying, look, we think it is important that you do these

things. So I do admit that this is one program where we go out and actually try and drum up clients in a sense. I don't apologize for that; I think it's the right thing to do. We will determine next year whether we should be going for more in terms of Estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

A MEMBER: You've got to be fair, Mr. Chairman. You've got a member over here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thanks very much, Mr. Chairman. I'd just like to, since we are on Conservation, add a few words and some personal experience as well, I guess.

I would like to commend the Minister and his department. I think, in particular, the staff that he has, the Energy Conservation Group, I have had an opportunity to meet and discuss with some of them. I hope to undertake and get some projects undergoing in the not too distant future on a better energy analysis of how much energy and money we are saving over what we did a few years ago and future projections, so the public, when they have an opportunity to undertake some initiatives in energy conservation, they realize both their contribution to the nation as far as the net reduction in energy consumed, as well as savings in their own pocketbooks.

As a personal example, in my little home presently, I did some insulation work and put in just a regular furnace, replacing an old, very inefficient oil furnace back 10 years ago. Just this past year my heating bill has equaled what it was in 1975. The furnace, I guess, was about \$700 or \$800, and I put \$300 worth of insulation in my attic and, far more importantly, in the basement, plus trying to insulate my old storm windows a little bit better. So without spending that, say, \$1,000 in 1975, it would have cost me probably close to \$1,500 or \$1,800 in additional heating expenditures in the period since then.

I think as that sort of information is getting out more to people and with the new technologies that are coming on - I am presently building a new home, and I expect my heating costs in my new home, which will be over twice the size of my present small home, will be two-thirds approximately of what my small home is presently - in a new one that is over twice the size. So the technology has improved dramatically in the past 10 years.

In the CHEC Program that the department started up, one of the critical aspects of that program that should be extended to all conservation efforts is that before any work is done that it should be checked, the house should be inspected or whatever other industry or whatever, so that the people who are doing the work do the work that is most effective.

That has been the ultimate failure of the federal, I believe it is, Canada Home Insulation Program - I believe its acronym was CHIP - in that most of the people who had work done, it was, quite frankly, fraudulently done. The people were robbed. They had contractors come in and blow in some cellulose fibre for a high price but, since the Government of Canada was paying for most of it, people didn't really care. So they did the

most ineffective thing to reduce energy costs, and the government subsidized it. The Government of Canada's monies could have been probably five to six times as effective had they had in place a program like the Minister of Energy and his department brought into Manitoba, the CHEC Program, of a pre-audit before you start the work.

Following that, and I still get the odd complaint of people who have contractors coming in and doing inadequate work, I think that both in home insulation side of things, industry and also in a Critical Home Repair, which is not your responsibility, that we need much better bonding of companies that are going out and doing the work, because a company can come in, basically take the money and run from the family under the auspices of a government program. They think they are getting good work done and it ends up not being anywhere near as good, especially a year or two down the road when some of the cosmetics they may have done have exposed themselves, I guess, and the work starts to fall apart. So I think we probably need even better bonding provisions and qualifications of who can apply to do the work.

We now have the department also expanding in education programs to teach more contractors what kind of techniques have been developed, which ones are most appropriate for our climate, and which ones are the best.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The time being 12:30 p.m., we are interrupting the proceedings of the committee for Private Members' Hour.

Committee rise.

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: Committee, please come to order. We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Education. Item 3.(a) School Grants and Other Assistance - the Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, the Minister in a news release dated November 13, 1984, Page 2, said and I quote: "To consider sources of funding to divisions, the Minister said that a joint committee has been formed by Manitoba Education and the Department of Municipal Affairs to co-ordinate the recommendations of the Manitoba Assessment Review Committee with recommendations from the Education Finance Review. In addition, Manitoba Education, the Department of Finance, will study the implications of limiting the universal portion of the property tax credits as was recommended in the report". Can the Minister tell me where that study is at the particular point in time and when it will be reporting?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that study is presently under way and we expect it will be finished in early fall, perhaps by September.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, I'd like to know a little bit more about the terms of reference of the study, Mr. Chairman; is it just simply removing the universal aspect of property tax credits? Have there been certain hypotheses that have been directed into the study?

Could the Minister tell me more as to what it is that's being considered?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, the scope of the committee is to examine all of the things that were in the Nicholl Report, all of the recommendations related to the raising of money, nothing related to the expenditures or the giving of money, but the raising of money. So any of the recommendations of the report are under the purview of that committee.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicates it's more than just looking at the tax credit, then it's looking at the whole area of securing resources in one fashion or another. I would ask the specific question because that is highlighted within the press release. Obviously, some major emphasis is being given to this whole area of property tax credits, and I'd like to know what direction has been given in the study. Is it just an attempt to see if various groups, or people in various types of income standing, have it removed, what specific directions have been given with respect to the study of property tax credits?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, they're looking at, as I said, all of the recommendations related to raising of money, all of the recommendations related to the assessment review and tax credit, and removing Education from property taxes. They're looking at all of those questions.

MR. C. MANNES: If property tax credits were removed, can the Minister tell me how much additional tax revenue would be raised in the Province of Manitoba?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Approximately \$70 million, Mr. Chairman.

MR. C. MANNES: Does the Minister of Education consider those tax credits in place, does she consider that as an offset against taxation associated with Education, municipal taxation, or does she care to draw distinction between the two?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, the reduction would be total property tax, which includes Education, municipal and Education.

MR. C. MANNES: I realize that, but I'm just trying to get a feel as to whether the Minister today distinguishes at all as to whether these property taxes really have been directed toward municipal service taxation or to Education. I know it's just a net deduction from the property tax bill, but I'm wondering if the Minister considers it more of a, because the credits are in place, a loss of revenue to Education, or does she distinguish at all?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, we don't distinguish in terms of having exact figures. I do know that, over the years, there has been more money going to municipalities and less to school divisions over the period of years. So it is becoming less and less a pure Education tax, but we're talking about both.

MR. C. MANNES: If it were all removed, how much of that present \$70 million or \$80 million does the Minister feel should accrue as an extra source of revenue in support of Education?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, those are things that aren't being decided by me. We're waiting for the examination of the Review Committee to come forward with information and recommendation. So, until I see the information, until I see what they're coming up with, I have no preconceived ideas about what it should take. It would then go into Consolidated Revenue, the total thing would go into Consolidated Revenue. The funds would come from Consolidated Revenue instead, and I'm waiting to see what the information is from study.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'd love to move into deeper discussion on some of the terms of reference provided to the study, but I suppose there isn't an awful lot of use.

I ask the Minister whether support for the Frontier School Division comes in this area. I take it, it does, Mr. Chairman, and we must have covered it last night - no, we didn't in detail.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, we did cover it. When I gave the Other Support and I read through a fairly long list, I think Frontier, there were a couple of school divisions, Frontier and Gypsumville, were the two that I named with the dollar amount for the extra grant. It's the Special Levy Reduction Grant that just those two school divisions received. I can find it in a minute. Yes, it was the Special Levy Reduction figure of \$403,826, with \$444,000 going to Frontier School Division.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, the cost of running that division has to be greater than that. There's got to be something in addition to that.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, I didn't realize the member was asking for the total budget. Would that it were that one of the biggest school divisions in the province with a very large budget be run for \$144,000.00.

No, this is the Special Levy Reduction Special Grant and I thought you were perhaps asking about that. The rest of the money that goes to Frontier comes to them through the regular support program, through the program funding, and we're getting that information.

The total revenues for Frontier School Division from the government is \$17 million. I should give the whole thing perhaps: 17 million from the Provincial Government; 9 million - these are rounded out - from the Federal Government; 2.5 million from opted-out Indian bands; private organizations and individuals, tuition fees, etc., would be 2 million. The Special Levy offset which is 35 mills is \$460,000.00.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated in a release, October 19, 1984, that she had offered an opportunity to communities in the Frontier School Division to increase local control over education. I'm wondering then, is the Minister saying that those particular communities that wish to take advantage of the new program, will they now have total control to spend the resources that will be allocated in some

fashion to their community? Do they now have total control of spending the resources as they see fit?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: They will, Mr. Chairman, when we finish the process. What's happening right now is that we have a resource team from the department that is available to go out to any communities that are interested in moving toward local control. We anticipate that most of them are going to wait until the next set of elections which, I think, is about - is it two years down the road? I think it's about two years down the road. What they will do is take that period of time to prepare themselves and get ready so that they are holding regular elections when the normal election of school trustees comes about.

If some school divisions wish to go earlier and feel that they're both ready and able we're prepared to let them go earlier. It would require a by-election. What is happening is that the resource team will go out and meet with them, and they will discuss the transition. It isn't necessary that every individual community will end up having its own school board and become a school division. In a number of cases, there might be several communities that's logical to join together.

The financial terms, we've explained to them that when they become a local division they will then not be under the auspices of the official appointed trustee, which is the case now. They will be an elected board, and they will have all the authority that all the school boards in the province have with a budget that they are entitled to, depending upon their number of children and all the criteria that are available for funding. They will have the same authority as any other school division for the expenditure of those funds.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that the Federal Government today is helping, through some processes of instruction, helping band communities begin to have a better understanding of all these matters with respect to local representation and local financing, and the responsibilities that flow, of course, in having control locally of one's education. Is the government doing anything in support of the communities outside of the band where schools are shared? Is the Provincial Government doing anything in support of those communities who also would like to have citizens from their numbers also have the opportunity to become more knowledgeable with respect to schooling matters?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would say that we do, although it isn't a specifically designed program for helping people with local control. What we've had is a process that has evolved over a number of years with community advisory boards from every community to the Frontier School Division. This is, in effect, really a training ground for community members. It has been for years, and it's very effective.

It's like electing a board, except they don't have the authority of the board. They work in an advisory capacity to the official trustee but, in fact, they are given authority and responsibility over budgeting and over staffing and a fair number of important matters to a community. They have professional development workshops. We bring these advisory people - I think there are about

100 of them, there is a Parents' Committee for each school - it is close to about 100 people that are sitting in that position. They have an annual meeting where they deal with both advice and information and learning about how to do their job, which is part of all programs like that, and meet to learn more about the system.

So I would say that's been very effective. My guess is that a lot of the trustees eventually will come from those ranks, maybe not only those ranks, but it certainly has been a training ground for community people in Frontier to learn about the system, to learn how to manage the system and to begin the running of the system with a lot of support and help. Also, Frontier has a membership in MAST, so they have access to all of the programs put on by the Trustees' Association.

MR. C. MANNES: I was up at Norway House late in 1984. I was led to believe that, after the Minister's announcement, some strife was occurring within the communities, because there was a belief amongst the non-band communities that, if things didn't come into a harmonious relationship at the beginning, there might be a greater move for the band-controlled schools to put into place, not only former graduates off their own Reserve, but also bring in curriculum that might not be totally acceptable by the community as a whole. Has the Minister had representation with respect to these matters? If so, how has she replied to those concerns?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I don't recall representation on the particular matters that the member is raising. I do recall having some communication and information that people were concerned about the process or about the transition or about how it would take place. I guess there is always concern, when you're moving toward what you might call the first democratic elections, about numbers and representation, and what the area is, and where people would be elected from. We've had a little bit of those concerns raised. I haven't had any concerns that I can recall about an inappropriate curriculum being put forward by one part of the community and group that is not acceptable to the larger community.

But, whatever the concerns are for the change and the transition, they will be raised with the resource team. That team should be dealing with whatever the problems are of making their transition in each area, in each community, and coming back with advice and recommendations on how it should be handled and what the difficulties, if any, there will be. I imagine that what we will end up with is a number of things that are common to all the changes and then some that are unique to the uniqueness of each of the communities and the regions.

MR. C. MANNES: Quite obviously, the tax base within the Frontier School Division, or those local districts or school divisions that will emanate because of the Minister's announcement, because that tax base is obviously quite low. What freedom will the new school divisions have with respect to providing for themselves, funding or programs beyond that which the government provincially is prepared to fund?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, in the case of Frontier where, because of the low tax base, as the

Member for Morris is indicating, we fund about 99 percent of the costs of education there now. If their tax base doesn't change and stays the way it is, then I think there will have to be some negotiations and some agreement that recognize that the governments have funded and given the increased money to Frontier for years. I don't believe that just because they are taken over by elected school boards those obligations would necessarily change. We would have to look very closely at what they received through the program, and what they were entitled to receive with the additional support of government.

The only part that's raised locally out of the \$17 million now is \$460,000.00. So there would have to be some accommodation and some negotiations and agreement whereby there was some way of tapping in with the additional money that was made available to Frontier, recognizing the low tax base, with some way of a formula for sharing.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, that ends my specific questions with respect to finance matters under this appropriation. However, I would like to say, in closing off this one section, at least from my point of view, although I see some, I'll use the words, good developments and favourable developments in the area of finance, Mr. Chairman, I still have to remain critical in three or four major areas.

In no particular order they, of course, remain firstly, the increased taxation load that property continues to carry. Even though the Minister has held in a state of freeze the provincial levy over property for the last three years, I think by her own words property taxes have increased significantly over the last four years since this government has come into power.

There was a promise that the government had offered to the people of Manitoba before the election in 1981. It was also a promise that something would be done in the whole area of assessment, and nothing has been done at all, Mr. Chairman. So I don't know if there is much use belabouring that point, but I have to put on the record again my strong criticism that the Minister in some of her press releases would attempt to leave the opinion that, in fact, property taxation has been decreased.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to private schools, I think the Minister has not as yet fulfilled her responsibility to the Federation of Independent Schools who have now for some three or four years asked, pleaded, for some commitment to a formula, some long-run commitment so that they could do proper planning, so they would know where they're going as a school system, outside of the public school system, fulfilling a very real need to a large number of students within the province.

Although the Minister may feel somewhat happy, somewhat relieved that she's been able to provide some greater support, I still believe that she has not, and the Government of Manitoba has not, provided any long-run answer to a group of people who want to know whether there will be any support next year or the year following. The support they have received has been very piecemeal. It hasn't even been introduced or announced to the group in question, other than through, I understand, the Estimates process here. The

Minister disagrees with that, and obviously my source wasn't aware of that.

But the point being, Mr. Chairman, every year we ask the Minister over and over again her commitment to the private school system, and she refuses to tell us publicly. More importantly than telling us, she refuses to tell the private school system whether or not they will be part of a formula, supported in part by a formula which is understood by them. I can't understand, in all honesty, the government's reluctance to be a little bit more forthright and candid with respect to its future intentions in support of the spending within the private school system.

Mr. Chairman, the new formula in support of public school spending, I had an opportunity to review it. I think there are some improvements; I'll give the Minister her due, there are some improvements. There is an attempt to quantify some of the shortcomings and some of the differences that exist from school division to school division.

Yet, in spite of all that, in spite of the attempt to bring forward a greater degree of equalization, the Minister still cannot explain to me why special mill rates vary to such a large degree from school division to school division. Obviously, there has to be some variation. I understand that, but I posed the question last night as to why the variation was so great. The Minister said she would provide an answer and, to this point, has not.

So, Mr. Chairman, those are my final remarks. Unquestionably, school divisions in this province take their responsibilities very seriously in the area of finances, in the area of trying to provide the best programs possible. I would hope that the Minister would continue to be cognizant of, not only their arguments on finances, but indeed would continue or improve, because my sources tell me that the Minister hasn't always been quite as open with school divisions as they probably had hoped a time earlier.

So with those final remarks, Mr. Chairman, unless somebody else has something they wish to contribute, I am prepared to pass this item.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, D. Scott: The Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a few comments I would like to offer on this particular line. Like the member who has just preceded me, I have a few concerns about the grants for independent schools this year. I realize we have done a great deal to assist them this year. I know that in my area, the Kelvin Christian School, for example, is viewing this more or less as, I suppose, a good news budget for this year anyway. They realize that they are getting a significant increase. The non-deductibility of the shared-services grants will of course help them considerably, as well as the increase in the per capita block funding.

The major problem which remains, of course, is that there is no commitment yet to a formula for funding for the independent schools. I remember that the Nicholls Report, which came out a few years ago, reports: "The review does not wish to become involved in the issue of aid to private schools. It accepts the fact that a decision has been made to provide financial

assistance to private schools, that there have been few suggestions that aid be withdrawn, and that the concerns are now primarily those of how much and on what basis."

That is the issue which faces the independent schools today. They realize that funding is increasing, but on a very ad hoc and year-to-year basis which makes it very difficult for them to plan their budgets. The Catholic schools, for example, have some elementary schools which are just hanging on by the seat of their pants, as it were, and going on a year-to-year basis, never sure of whether or not their schools really are viable or not viable depending on what the funding agreements are for the year to follow.

The problem, I think, is that we probably have forgotten where we have come from, on private schools. Back in 1977-78, when the Schreyer Government was setting its Budgets, the independent school system was given a block grant which was roughly 53 percent of the funding which was provided in block grants to the public school system. Of course, since then it has become eroded somewhat. The block grant was frozen during the Lyon years, and it's only started to increase slightly in the last few years.

But the problem now is that we are increasing this year from 22 percent to 24 percent, so you can see that we have declined considerably in relation to the public school funding. I know that the opposition is on record as favouring increasing grants to the independent school system.

I notice that the Leader of the Opposition sent a letter to the President of the Manitoba Federation of Independent Schools, saying, "As I indicated to you in our earlier correspondence, the Progressive Conservative Party has a very firm position in favour of greater support to independent schools in our province."

The Leader of the Opposition also wrote to one of my constituents concerning: "... our continuing support towards the golden objective of providing a fair and more equitable level of support for independent schools. We continue to support their efforts to improve the financial aid available to their schools."

The policy of the Conservative Party, therefore, has definitely changed in relationship to what it was under Sterling Lyon as the leader. However, it basically seems to be no different from the policy of the government at the moment. I have seen nothing from the Leader of the Opposition which commits him to a formula.

I would suggest that I also would like to see some commitment made to funding the independent school system. I suppose that all members in this House have their areas where they have special concerns. I'm sure we realize that the Member from Wolseley would like to see commitments made in the area of day care, and I'm sure that the Member for Inkster would like to see commitments made in the area of environmental protection, and the Member for Thompson would like to see money spent in Thompson, etc.

I am concerned with this particular issue of grants to independent schools. I would certainly hope that we could see in the very near future, if not this Budget year perhaps next, a commitment to a formula of some sort, perhaps not the 80 percent of the block grant which the Federation of Independent Schools is requesting, but perhaps something such as 50 percent

which certainly is in the realm of historical reality. I think that it would be the only fair way of dealing with the independent school system, given the present circumstances which surround the uncertainty of their planning on a year-to-year basis.

I would just offer those comments to put them on the record, and to let the members know that there are people in this House who would like to take a firm stand on that issue.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: 3.(a) - the Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I had a question about the financing. Maybe the Minister could explain. The divisions that are not under the formula and that are this year grandfathered, at what stage do they come into the formula? Like next year now, if they are raised up to what they had last year, that would be a zero increase, I take it. Then next year, what happens to their funding? I'm just not quite sure how they fit in from year to year, and if they ever do kick into the formula.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, one of the things we did was try not to force everybody into the same formula too quickly when it would end up with a number of school divisions being in a disadvantaged position. We brought in the variable block that guaranteed that no division would get less than they were getting under the old program, so that out of the 56 divisions nobody is getting less than they were getting under the old program. A number of them are getting more, because they are benefiting from the new formulas in the government support program.

There has been no decision about the variable block. In other words, what we are doing is seeing how it works out this year and what problems, if any, are related to it. We will be studying it over the summer and the fall and talking to school divisions. We have not yet decided that the variable block will be removed. What I have said to them when they have raised their concern is that, since bringing in the program, we moved in a very strong way to make sure that nobody would get less than they were entitled to under the old program. It was not likely that we were going to handle them in an arbitrary, quick way that would put them in a disadvantaged position.

In other words, I think we will continue to examine what happens with the application of the GSE on the school divisions and, if the process of transition takes - it may take more than one year and the variable block. In fact, I think it's likely that it will take more than the one year for transition. I knows there's a bit of uncertainty, but there shouldn't be any alarm, because we've told them clearly that there wouldn't be any action taken that would put them in a seriously disadvantaged financial position from what they would normally expect to be in.

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: When will the divisions be advised that are outside the government support, when

will they be advised of their funding. If they get the same amount for this year, does that mean another year of zero increase? I have a problem understanding this.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we expect to have that information for them early in the fall, by the end of September I would hope.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(b) Miscellaneous Grants - the Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I'd ask the Minister to review this area and tell us specifically who are to be the recipients of those grants?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there's no change in the amount of money for this grant, I think it stayed the same over the last few years - this is the one I started to explain last night and I was explaining the wrong Miscellaneous Grant - this is the one where we give support to a number of educational groups and organizations.

I will list a number of them. This is where the Manitoba Association of School Trustees get a grant of \$16,000; the superintendents; the Manitoba Association of Student Council get \$12,000; the Science Symposium, we fund that, we support the Science symposiums that are put on in Manitoba every year; the Manitoba Speech and Debating Association gets money from us; we support a couple of students at the Lester B. Pearson College every year and that's been ongoing I think since the college opened and we have \$15,000 for two students to attend there; the United Nations we fund; also the Canadian Education Association, CEA, the national educational body which has the administration, superintendents, I guess people from all categories in Education belong to that organization, we give support to them every year in terms of \$36,000; the Council of Ministers, I'm looking for the Council of Ministers, it's about \$48,000, this is where the Council of Ministers of Education get their support from the provinces for the work that is done by the Council of Ministers and ours is funded through the Miscellaneous Grants and it's \$48,000; we also support the Fort Whyte Centre for Environmental Education, they have a very, very active school program and have thousands and thousands of students going through their program and it's one way where we can get, sort of, supplemental programs for the school on the Environment by just tapping in and giving a little bit of support to them. So basically, there isn't any major change in either the groups or the amount of money.

MR. C. MANNES: The Minister indicated some \$48,000 was directed toward the Council of Ministers, Education Ministers, can the Minister tell me what the province has derived in the form of benefits from that type of infusion to that body?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Well, yes, Mr. Chairman, I suppose any benefits that are gained by an organization or a group of people from across the country, we do a number of things. One is that we share information, and I guess that's useful for Council of Ministers who

have a lot of different programs and activities going on in their province, to have some platform or medium for sharing that information and finding out what's going on in other provinces.

We work together as a Council of Ministers in negotiating and discussing agreements and arrangements between the Federal Government and the provinces. A lot of the bilateral agreements are negotiated through the Council of Ministers. We identify each year a number of educational issues that the Council of Ministers chooses to take on and it could be anything from access to post-secondary education to looking at foreign students; we look at finance; look at special needs, so that each year we select a number of topics. They have a staff and the staff studies and reports to the Council of Ministers. I suppose because it's provincial jurisdiction, we don't always end up doing the same things, but we end up sharing a lot of the same information and bringing the collective thoughts of all of the Council of Ministers on educational issues of the day.

MR. C. MANNES: How often do the Ministers of Education across this country meet, and is the host province responsible for funding the total costs associated with those types of meetings once that event or activity comes to, let's say, Manitoba?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, they meet a couple of times a year and when the host province hosts, I think most of the costs are picked up the Council of Ministers, although the host province usually puts on, as I recall, one dinner and one evening to host the Ministers that are visiting.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, the format of the meeting, I'm curious to know whether there's a set program, does it take on a seminar type of meeting, or is it all the Ministers coming around a table and just having a discussion following some agenda?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: it's very formal. Sometimes we have some periods where we can meet and discuss things, but that's usually outside of the formal agenda, over lunch or dinner.

There's a very formal agenda and it's agreed to by the Ministers usually at one meeting when they're setting up the next meeting. There's a lot material and information that is gathered by both the departments in the provinces, the Deputy Ministers and their staff, and the Council of Ministers' staff. So that on any given meeting, if we meet for a day or two, there will be a full agenda with background discussions and information to deal with each subject and some of the staff from each province go and attend, depending on the area of discussion. If it is post-secondary, it would be somebody in post-secondary, and the Deputy Minister usually attends. Some of them are on the agenda for information and some of them are on the agenda for divisions if it is an area of decision-making by the Council of Ministers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pass.

3.(c) Assistance to Schools in Remote Settlements—pass.

Resolution No. 49: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$379,604,700 for Education, Financial Support Public Schools, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

Item 4. Program Development Support Services; (a) Division Administration: (1) Salaries - Madam Minister.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I do have one answer I should have slipped in earlier, but I'll send it over and I'll just read it into the record. It was the one the Member for Morris referred to about equalization. His question was: if each division's supportable expenditures were its actual expenditures, and if we had pure equalization of 100 percent equalization, would not every division have the same Special Levy Mill Rate? The answer is, no, because equalization is based on balanced assessment per pupil, rather than the balanced assessment per division. In order for the Special Levy Mill Rate to be the same across the province, the supportable expenditures per pupil and the actual expenditures per pupil would have to be the same for all school divisions since we are equalizing on balanced assessment per pupil basis. I'll send that over so he can read it and reflect.

Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise.

Would it be the will to wait for the other committee to rise to call in the Speaker?

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has met, passed a certain resolution and begs leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Member for St. Johns, that the Report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The time being 12:30 p.m. and time for Private Members' Hour - the Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance, that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. on Monday.