

8 p.m., Monday, May 3rd, 1976

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN: I refer honourable members to Page 19, Resolution 47(a) Salaries. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Chairman, when the House rose at 5:30 I was attempting to outline the difficulties that we in the western world seem to find ourselves in as a result of our persistence and insistence that we can continue to pursue a course that can only lead us to disaster. And I was quoting from Marshall McLuhan who as I pointed out, is not and could not be recognized as an 18th Century reactionary in our day and age, Marshall McLuhan has been recognized as one of our more forward thinkers, and yet in this article that I was quoting from, he has gone on to point out that our education system, is as he describes it, "pathetic crap", and he goes on to point out further the reasons why we are in the mess that we find ourselves in. He says, "Since we now have access to mysteries and technological power but still refuse to understand and control the power, we have clearly decided to be its victims. Groundless, we sink deeper into our own self-made slumberland." And that is so true. What is happening in education, it is happening in so many other areas, is our refusal to recognize the mistakes that have been made; our refusal to recognize that areas that we have moved into unthinkingly and without considering the consequences, have created problems for society and have created problems for humanity.

I'm suggesting, Sir, that instead of compounding those difficulties, instead of continuing to pursue a course that can only lead to disaster, that it is incumbent upon us to reconsider from whence we have come, that is important that we recognize and admit the mistakes that have been made and retrace our steps and then attempt to correct the mistakes that have been made and pursue policies, not only in education but in many other areas, that will put us back on track again. I'm afraid that there is a tendency for those who have been responsible for making the mistakes - and that includes those in the civil service as well as those in government - to believe that they can cover up those mistakes by suggesting that we just simply go further, that we continue to build upon the errors that have been made in order to correct the mistakes that have already been made, and I suggest to the Minister that it will not work and it will not wash, but we've got to reconsider our position in the light of what has been our experience in the mistakes that have been made, and in doing so the Minister will have contributed some valuable service to this nation. But to refuse to admit that we have entered into an error that can only lead to disaster, to refuse to admit that the mistakes have indeed been made, and to refuse to acknowledge that we must retrace our steps will only lead to further disaster, and I urge the Minister not to be afraid of admitting mistakes, but rather to start from here and attempt to develop a system of education that is compatible with the knowledge that we now possess, the knowledge that has been gained not only here in this country, but knowledge that has been gained in other parts of the world as well, based upon the mistakes that have been made, and if we can do that, if we can admit those things, then we chart a new course, then perhaps we can retrace our steps, then perhaps we can avoid the disaster that lies ahead of us. I hope the Minister recognizes that very simple philosophy, I hope the Minister can see that what he's done to the children and to the students of this country and of this province, is not helping society, is not helping the students and it's not helping the possibility of this nation remaining the great and free country that its destiny prescribes. If only the Minister could admit that he has been wrong, if only the Minister can recognize where our future really lies then I think we've gone at least some way in assisting him on the path to making this country the kind of country that we all want it to be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, some of the points that were raised by the Honourable Member for Morris are the very thing that this branch of Evaluation Research and Policy Analysis is all about. When he calls upon me to admit mistakes having been made in the past and indicate a willingness and a desire to retrace our steps and correct them, I've mentioned this time and time again in the course of this debate over the past week, the fifth day of actual debate of my Estimates, and this had appeared from time to time and it appears throughout the balance of my Estimates. We've admitted the

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) mistake of new maths of sometime ago, we've admitted the mistake of shutting down small schools and to arrest the continued trend towards the shutting down of small schools. I can't disagree with Marshall McLuhan when he suggests bringing technological power under the control of mankind, of course, and hence the need to take a real close look at a further continued expansion and development in our technical, vocational, industrial arts program. So none of this, Mr. Chairman, could I dispute, I agree with the honourable member. Whether it's absolutely essential in all cases to retrace ones steps, on occasion it's possible to find the direction in which to move without necessarily retracing ones steps, merely changing direction of course of action, which may lead to a solution to the problem, or if not to a solution to the problem at least to avoid ending up a disaster course that many critics of education seem to think that we're on today. And here again I would agree that if we were simply to proceed blindly in the development of our education program just simply to do what is done elsewhere, bring about change for changes sake, keep up with the Jones as it were, that that would lead us on a disaster course. So, the long and the short of my remarks, Mr. Chairman, is that the very type of approach, the very type of analysis and review and scrutiny of our education program and planning for the future that should be done today is in fact being done by this branch of my department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to add a few comments to the Minister's reply and comments of the Member for Morris who just spoke before me. The Minister seems to indicate that everything is being done that can possibly be done as far as he is concerned as the Minister, and I take him at his word for that, I take the government at their word for that, I accept that, but in the meantime it raises a lot of questions amongst the people that I represent and before we pass this item I would wonder why the Minister would do an internal and an external evaluation of a school division and not come out with what was the result of that study. The study was well done, I have no quarrel, it was a very thorough and exhaustive study, but surely the end result of the study, that we in the opposition, especially the MIA, myself, who represent that area, the people, the taxpayers, and the parents, deserve some kind of, what did you find, is it as bad as I'm trying to tell the Minister, Duck Mountain School Division, or maybe it's not, but I would think that the Minister, if you're going to do that kind of a study at least you finalize it.

Mr. Chairman, I also must express concern of many other people in this province, and let's refer to Marjorie Earl and some of her comments which are quite well known in this city and across this province, on basically the same concerns that I'm expressing and the people out of my constituency, of this certain statement that Dr. Orlikow made to the Winnipeg Division, and some of these questions certainly deserve answers as we're going through the Minister's estimates.

I think I'm satisfied over the years, and I've made the three score, that basically a good formal education with an understanding of something about the business community and something about mathematics, to be able to understand your fellow man and make a living, that's what gives this province and most of Canada one of the greatest places in the world to live in. We've historically done that, and I'm trying to tell the Minister tonight that we've deviated that much away from that point. But some of the comments that are coming out from the Deputy Minister's office, and the Minister hasn't in his Estimates up to now changed my mind that he's not supporting the Deputy Minister, that we don't need that approach to education, that there's an easier way, so we have to go and follow that. Well I hope the Minister will stand up and once and for all say that he doesn't believe with the Deputy Minister, he doesn't support his concept and that maybe he shouldn't have him as a Deputy Minister, because we can't have it both ways that we've had it in the Minister's Estimates up to now, he's saying one thing and the Deputy Minister is saying another thing.

I'll just ask the Minister some of the questions that concerns me and a lot of people. And maybe it's not the Minister's fault, and maybe it's not Dr. Orlikow's fault, but it's surely somebody's fault when we're asked to spend several hundred millions of dollars of taxpayers money in these estimates, that you can't come out loud and clear,

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) this is where we're going and this is a policy of the department. And you as the Minister have to make that statement. We can't support the Deputy Minister, he is not in this political arena, the Minister, he's the Deputy Minister, but you, Mr. Minister have to make the statement.

Now let's look, and maybe we've been reading Dr. Orlikow wrong, maybe myself and a lot of the people in this province don't understand him. --(Interjection)-- that's quite possible. But I surely hope that the Minister before we finish his Estimates will make us clear.

Now the results of the Chamber of Commerce study, was that wrong? Did the Minister and his staff go through all those figures, study those statistics, are they using them as part of their formula as we re-evaluate or evaluate the department, where we're going? If the Minister will stand up and say, we're not using those statistics, we don't believe in them, that's fine, then we'll have a better understanding of the Minister's approach to it.

But the other one, Mr. Speaker, the one that seems to concern a lot of people is just what do you expect of a student today when he graduates? Does the University of Manitoba need a student to come there with a certificate saying, I have passed these courses and I am ready for a university education, or are you going to let students continually come to university, so they went through the school system, they've had some several courses, and I don't know what the courses are, but the university has to re-evaluate those students. And now I understand from some of the conversations that I've had with the university that they figure it's unfair. Either you're not doing your job as Minister or else we're going to have to lower the standards at the university level in this province. And I don't think we've ever had to do that in our history in this province, I think if anything, we should have to raise them up.

So if you can explain to me, Mr. Minister, how we're going to handle this, or in fact, if you're satisfied that students can come through the system and arrive at the university door with some kind of a scroll in their hand, at least they can evaluate them and have an understanding of where these students can go through the university system, but it's my understanding at the present time they don't have that, so they have to re-evaluate them when they arrive at the door there. And that's some of the concerns that's being expressed to me by people in my constituency, that either we've got to lower the standard at the university to meet where we're going in the department, or let's leave the standard where it is, and re-evaluate the students at the school system. And maybe we can't get them up to the level that the university is asking for, but I sure hope the Minister would give me some of the answers so I can take them back to the people of my constituency.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make certain that I understand the last question put by the Honourable Member for Roblin. Is the honourable member suggesting that my department prescribes the admission requirements to university and set the standards for admission, that my department tell the university which student it should or should not admit? I just want to get that point clear, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, surely the Minister can't be that naive. He went to the university of this province. He knew the rules of application and the Registrar system in the days that he went there, he knew he had to qualify to be accepted in the university. Now if he doesn't accept that, that's fine. But I'm telling him I just would like it to be something close to the days that he studied at the university and he had to meet certain standards when he arrived there, have a scroll in his hand, I've done something through the system and here I am wanting to further my education. If the Minister tells me we don't need that anymore, fine I'll sit down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, that hasn't changed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

MR. MCKENZIE: Maybe we should tell Marjorie Earl then that her article is unfounded, the statistics that she's gathered and others, that it's just a bunch of hogwash, windowdressing and basically shouldn't be discussed at all on the Minister's Salary.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I have no justification . . . to tell Marjorie Earl that, I seldom read her column.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 47(a). The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, one of the many changes that has occurred in the administrative staff of the Department of Education during the last six or seven months is that of the Director of Planning and Research. And incidentally at this stage, I'd like to thank the Minister for providing an update on the names of those people in his supervisory and administrative staff. We had an opportunity to compare them with earlier lists and it looks like about 21 of the administrative people have changed during the period of the last seven months. That's out of 120-odd. Looks like a turnover of about 17 percent in that staff. I am told in the administrative and supervisory in the last seven months

--(Interjection)--

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education state his point of order.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, I would like to know whether the honourable member is presently debating 21(2) or is he back to 21(1)(b) which I believe was passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are now under Research Policy Analysis.

MR. MCGILL: Yes. Mr. Chairman, my question is essentially about the new appointment to the directorship of the Planning and Research Department. In doing this, it is one of a number of changes that have occurred, and I am pointing out to the Minister that there were quite a number of them in addition to this one.

I am also told that within the Department of Education there's an inside joke going around these days - it's the definition of an optimist. And the people in the administration staff of the Department of Education define an optimist as a member of the administrative staff that comes to work in the morning carrying his lunch. I think possibly the size of the turnover gives some understanding of the humour that is contained in this new definition.

Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister perhaps to tell us about the recent appointment to the directorship of the Planning and Research Branch. Could he outline the background of experience and qualifications of this appointee, particularly in the field of administration and in research in education.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. She's the former director of the Canadian Association in support of native peoples, and prior to that was the Educational Co-ordinator for the same organization; nurse, university training, over twenty years of experience, not necessarily in her most recent capacity prior to being employed by us, but in related fields, and one who has had many many years of experience in the design of innovative projects in the field of education for the benefit of the underprivileged; and we advertised, people applied, the applicants were interviewed by the Civil Service Commission and she was recommended.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would indicate whether the main experience of the appointee is in the field of nursing or whether he would consider her major experience and training has been in research in education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: In Education, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MCGILL: Well, Mr. Chairman, in connection with the sort of special grant receiving projects that have been evaluated during the past year, I'd like to ask the Minister if he's satisfied that such measures as teachers' questionnaires, and school sentiment index, and self-appraisal inventory, these are some of the special grant receiving projects that have been undertaken. Does he consider such things as self-appraisal inventories and school sentiment index as more important than cognitive tests for basic skills? In your reports the cognitive tests receive rather scant attention. Are you satisfied completely with this state of affairs?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 47(a). The Honourable Minister of Education.

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

MR. HANUSCHAK: I'm not quite sure what state of affairs the honourable member is referring to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 47(a). The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, if I might explain. The types of grant receiving projects that I mention are those that receive more attention in reports than the basic tests of cognitive skills and I'm wondering if this is really where the emphasis is intended to be by the Minister.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I never suggested that's where the emphasis lies.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 47(a)--pass. 47(b) - the Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I'm still on 47(a), I believe. I was asking some questions about types of grant receiving projects. There was another experiment that was reported on and that was the differentiated staffing experiment, and there are one or two quotations from that report on that experiment that are interesting, I think. One reads, "By the end of the second year there was unrest and confusion among the staff and virtually no direction for the program. The staff tried to operate a model that had shown itself unworkable."

MR. HANUSCHAK: . . . Mr. Chairman. The honourable member, I believe, he's quoting from some report and I would like to answer him and hence I would like him to identify the particular article that he's quoting from.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I can only identify these as reports on differentiated staffing experiments. These are comments that are contained. --(Interjection)-- Well, these would be comments by the research person, Mary Blakesley and the quotation is, "By the end of the second year there was unrest and confusion among the staff and virtually no direction for the program. The staff tried to operate a model that had shown itself unworkable. Although the project must be deemed a failure, much has been learned." If the project is a failure, what specifically are the things that have been learned from this differentiated staff.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, what has been learned in that one a number of differentiated staffing projects, is that that one was not successful, hence discontinued. But there are others that were extremely successful, namely in River East.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I'd ask the Minister then what would be the effect on the school children involved in such an experiment when the experiment itself fails?

MR. HANUSCHAK: As far as any negative or adverse effect on the children, I'm not aware of any; but as I've indicated, when it became apparent that the project was not successful it was discontinued, as it should have been, because I'm sure that the honourable member would have been even more critical had an experiment which had every sign indication of being a failure if we were to have continued it.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, the report of the Minister's department on the progress of differentiated staffing projects, projects for which special grants were made, states that "The gains in attitudes indicated that the Grades 3 to 6 level in differentiated staffing schools may have been at the expense of the development of basic skills." "The gains in attitudes indicated that the Grades 3 to 6 level in differentiated staffing schools may have been at the expense of the development of basic skills." Does the Minister agree with that report on differentiated staffing?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, as the author of the report herself indicates, she does not state so with absolute certainty that the teaching of basic skills suffered, but merely raises the question that that may have occurred; and I repeat again, that that one was discontinued but others that were successful were continued. And not knowing which project it is that the honourable member is referring to, I cannot answer him with any greater degree of precision than that. --(Interjection)--

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. MCGILL: Well, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, this is a report of a particular experiment. Do you consider this a typical result of special projects under your department?

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I don't know, because it well could be that the reference is being made to a Minneapolis project.

MR. MCGILL: We can certainly, Mr. Chairman, put the Minister straight on this. This report is one that was made in your department about a differentiated staffing project in your schools, it doesn't come from Minneapolis, and it states that there may have been a loss of basic skills in conducting this project. Now what effect does that have on the students and is this the kind of typical results you're getting from these projects?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, for the umpteenth time I will reply to the honourable member that he is making reference to one particular differentiated staffing project, one which was not successful. There are many successful ones and many successful projects in various fields of education, including some in Swan River, and I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, that the school boards which were equally partners in most of these projects, are mature adult responsible people, as are the teachers, mature, adult, responsible people, and if at the conclusion of any experimental project there should be any evidence that something in the education process had suffered, then I'm confident in our teachers that the necessary steps would be taken to rectify that. If that in fact happens.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 47(a). The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would dwell a moment further on that subject and try and fill me in and the Members of the Committee, what steps were taken to rectify that study?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Not a single step to rectify the study.

MR. MCKENZIE: Could the Minister advise then what happened to those students, did they fail their year, or where are they today as a result of that program?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Alive and doing very well, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 47(a). The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Maybe the Minister can tell us where it actually took place and what school it was involved in?

MR. HANUSCHAK: The honourable members colleague, from Brandon West seems to have that information, I would suggest that the two of them caucus.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Resolution 47(a)--pass. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I was just noting some figures here in connection with travel expenditure in what used to be Planning and Research and is now Evaluation, Research and so forth. From public accounts we note that in the last year for which we have these figures, the travel expenditure was \$103,828.67. This seems like a rather staggering sum for one branch of the department. This sum exceeds the total travel costs of the Child Development Services Branch, the Professional Development Branch and the Field Services Branch. Can the Minister comment on that, what is the major travel expense in connection with Planning and Research and how much is he projecting for travel for Evaluation and Research in this current estimate?

MR. HANUSCHAK: With respect to the second part of the question, I will attempt to . . . Last year I want to indicate to the honourable member that that figure also included Native Education Branch which necessitated considerable travel in the north. For the forthcoming year, Native Education is being transferred out of Evaluation, Research and Policy Analysis, hence the travel expense appropriation will be reduced considerably. For the forthcoming year we have \$25,000, for travel. Insofar as travel expense for the past year is concerned, I would suggest that if the honourable member wishes that information that would be a proper subject for an order for return.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, surely . . . we have the Minister here and his staff, we ask a simple question and he says put in an order for return. Absolutely ridiculous! The millions and millions of dollars that we're spending of taxpayers dollars with that Minister heading that department we ask a simple question, by the Member for Brandon West, and he says put in an order for return. Can you believe how the department is being run, Mr. Chairman and members of committee, it's absolutely a farce, absolutely ridiculous, that Minister with the hundreds of people he has on his staff, we

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) come here and ask him a simple question and he says put in an order for return. Mr. Chairman, I hope that goes into the record of this committee and this government, because if that Minister can't run that department any better than that and justify the expenditures of taxpayers' dollars then he should be removed from office.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, when I suggested an order for return I pre-
faced that request, perhaps the honourable member for Roblin did not hear, or did not understand. I gave him the reply to the second part of the question and I said, if the honourable member still wishes the details of the answer to the first part, that I cannot provide him now but perhaps at some later point in time during the debate of my Estimates - and we have plenty of time - I cannot provide him with that information today, but later in the week, or next or the week after, as the debate of the Estimates progresses, I may be in a position to give a detailed breakdown of the total amount spent by this branch on travel, and all the details of it, but I cannot give him that answer now, at this particular point in time, and if, to the Honourable Member from Roblin, if that is unbelievable well so let it be to him, but I cannot do the impossible, Mr. Chairman, I do not carry the accounting department of my department around with me in my hip pocket and hence I cannot provide him with that information right now at this point in time.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, let's get the record straight. Members of the Committee, this is the first Minister in my years in office representing the people of Roblin constituency who has ever come before the committee with a staff in front of him, all the records there, and in a reply to a question says, put in an order for return. I hope the record spells it out, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I heard differently from the honourable member. The Member for Brandon West asked for details of \$100,000 in travel expenses, and I have not . . . perhaps because of all your years in office you've never heard a member ask for details of a \$100,000 in travel expenses, that you've never heard a Minister say I don't carry it around in my back pocket. Well there's a first time for the question and a first time for the answer. The Minister says he will give the details later on or in response to an order for return, but details of \$100,000 in travel expenses, and it's a legitimate question, the Member for Brandon West wants to know why this expense is higher than in, I think he mentioned several other areas, the Minister says he will give him the details but he doesn't have them now, and if that is unbelievable to the Honourable Member for Roblin, it only is an indication of his capacity to use that process which believes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Honourable, the House Leader for his comments on the subject matter, and let the record again be straight, that during these Estimates and other Estimates over the years, certainly Ministers have said, I'll get the information for you, but that's not what this Minister said, Mr. Chairman; this Minister said, "put in an order for return" and the record will speak for itself.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. Now the honourable member is getting repetitious in debate and that is against the rules of the House. Resolution 47(a). The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I gather from the exchange that has taken place that the details of this amount are not available at the moment. I wonder if the Minister could indicate that this rather impressive sum of \$103,000 - odd, includes travel beyond the boundaries of Canada, possibly includes travel beyond the boundaries of continental North America and if so, what percentage is included in travel extra continentally and beyond the borders of Canada.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I promised the Honourable Member that I'll provide him the details in response to his question. Having promised that I do not at this point in time care to speculate on what it may or may not include, not having the precise details in front of me.

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 47(a)--pass; 47(b)--pass; Resolution 47 Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$625,900 for Education--pass. Financial Support - Public Schools. (a) School grants and other assistance - \$154,205,200. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, this brings me to the subject that I broached this afternoon before I was caught up short on a point of order, and I go back to the point that I was trying to make at that time to sort of pave the way for the kinds of things that we want to examine under this particular resolution. That is that this government and this Minister certainly have argued and maintained that they have worked toward the objective of providing a greater degree of equality of education opportunity in the Province of Manitoba, and that includes presumably, the Greater Winnipeg area, and our contention is on the basis of the record and the basis of the costs of the program and the basis of the disproportionate share of the costs borne by different sections of the community, that they have in fact moved further and further away from equality of education opportunity rather than closer and closer to it.

It appears to me on the basis of the costs and the financial structure for supporting the costs of elementary and secondary school financing in Manitoba in the past seven to eight years, that there is less opportunity for students in outlying and rural areas and for inner city areas and school divisions, less opportunity for them to enjoy a high standard of education opportunity and equality with students in more affluent divisions than was the case seven to eight years ago. And the reason is that costs of education have risen so sharply so dramatically, and the burden of carrying those costs has been shifted to an area of the community namely the real property taxpayer who cannot meet the increasing and escalating burden any further. I think that the financing support formula for the public school system in this province needs a thorough overhaul, Mr. Chairman, and I know that my colleagues agree with me on that and I know that many Manitobans feel the same way.

Certainly there are many professional educators or persons in the professional area of education on school divisions and in teaching positions and those responsible for providing the budgetary input into the program who are enormously disturbed over the difficulties and the dangers that are developing in this whole area of education costs and how the burden is to be borne and shared.

The province's percentage shares, Sir, of support of elementary and secondary school financing in Manitoba and particularly in the Greater Winnipeg area has, no matter how you want to analyze it, declined steadily during the past five years and it has declined sharply since 1967. And no matter what kinds of counter arguments that you bring to bear having to do with the education property tax rebate and having to do with special grants, no matter what kinds of arguments of that sort that you bring to bear, any objective and fair analysis of the statistics, of the figures, measured in terms of real dollars in 1975 and 1976, measured in terms of percentages of input, whether by the Provincial Government or whether by the property taxpayer, the conclusion, Sir, is clear and unarguable, that the province's percentage share has gone down, the real property taxpayer's share has gone up in a steady curve during the past five years and in what I've described as a sharp curve taking the eight year period 1969 through 1976 as a whole. I think that it is obvious to anybody taking a fair-minded approach to the question, that the burden on property taxpayers has become extremely onerous. But that is not the serious thing in itself. Whether a burden is onerous is one thing, whether a burden is bearable is another. I think that the situation has reached the point where it is highly questionable today, whether, if the trend continues in this way for very much longer, there is a sufficient resource in the hands of the property taxpayer in this city and in this province to carry that burden and to meet the costs necessary to provide the education services that are currently being provided. The result is going to be that there will have to be cut-backs and reductions in service and our students and our future will necessarily suffer. But more than that, the result is going to be that there will be a greater and greater disparity of education opportunity between those students who are fortunate enough to grow up and go to school in relatively affluent school divisions and those who grow up and go to school in the less affluent ones.

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd)

I think that there are legitimate questions that should be asked on behalf of the Winnipeg taxpayer. There's certainly legitimate questions that should be asked on behalf of all Manitoba taxpayers of all real property taxpayers in the province and I've alluded to them and to the burden that that taxpayer is being asked to carry and to the question of whether he can carry the burden in the size to which it's growing. But there are also additional specific legitimate questions the Winnipeg taxpayer, I think, can ask, Sir. The Winnipeg taxpayer gets hit harder than anybody else and the Winnipeg taxpayer gets less equitable treatment than property owners in the rest of the province when it comes to the distribution and apportionment of services funded by and supported by the province.

The Minister is fully familiar with briefs and presentations that have been made to him and his department from school trustees, school divisions. I have not seen any answers, certainly not answers that explain anything or satisfy anything to some of the questions that have been raised by, for example, the trustees of Winnipeg School Division I, in terms of the services which should be funded in the City of Winnipeg by the Provincial Government and which are not funded. And the question I ask at this point is why is there discrimination against the Winnipeg taxpayer in particular areas of education support? I know the school trustees of Winnipeg Division No. I have raised the question with the Minister and with the government having to do, for example, with transportation grants which are available to school divisions in the rest of the province which provide for, I believe it's \$190 per student for those requiring transportation and which are applied to handicapped children in Winnipeg but which come nowhere near to meeting the cost of transportation of handicapped children.

The Winnipeg School Division in its brief paid particular attention to this question of transportation and pointed out that the \$190 which is adequate for regular school busing has to compare, when it's applied to special transportation needs of handicapped pupils in Winnipeg to present costs cited by the division as between \$300 to \$400 per pupil per year for trainable mentally handicapped pupils and \$1,000 to \$1,600 per pupil per year for physically handicapped pupils. Those are the pupils that are being supported ostensibly in Winnipeg by the Transportation Grant Program of the Provincial Government and they're being supported at the same rate that normal, regular transportation support is offered to normal physically and mentally normal students in divisions outside the city. And that \$190 per pupil per year grant which covers transportation costs to a relatively adequate degree in the other divisions, is supposed to compensate for the costs of anywhere from \$300 to \$1,600 for the pupils of a handicapped nature in Winnipeg.

There are areas in Winnipeg where there should be normal transportation grants supplied along the lines of those supplied in divisions outside of Winnipeg, and once again, I'm not bringing any material to the Minister's attention that has not been brought to him before, but hopefully it will produce a response and an explanation and a justification from him in this instance, or else it will produce some action that will eliminate these discrepancies and compensate Winnipeg fairly for the kinds of costs that are imposed on the city taxpayer.

The example in the latter instance that I was referring to has to do with the north-west area of the city which was formerly part of the Rosser municipality where 640 pupils approximately are transported by school buses twice daily to and from Lansdowne and Lord Nelson Elementary Schools and Sisler High School; and where 100 children from the downtown area who formerly went to the old Alexandra School, which no longer exists, are transported by school bus four times daily to Fort Rouge, Clifton and Mulvey schools. --(Interjection)-- Well in view of the Winnipeg School Division and I must submit that in my own view it would seem to me, Sir, that these students qualify the same as students in rural divisions, and that their division, namely the Winnipeg School Division No. 1, surely qualifies the same as rural divisions for normal grant funding, normal Provincial Government support to the tune of \$190 per pupil per year for the provision of that kind of transportation, but it's in Winnipeg and they don't get those grants. That's one example of what I would call discrimination against Winnipeg and the Winnipeg taxpayers. There are a number of others.

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) There are the problems of the educational programs in the inner city and I alluded to that this afternoon. The Winnipeg School Division No. 1 has formally and very emphatically asked this government for special financial support from the province for inner city educational programs, because by the nature of that part of the community there are a wide number of citizens and students who require special services and there is not the kind of financial base, the kind of tax base right in that part of the city, the kind of affluence and access to financial resources to pay for the kinds of programs that are necessary. As a consequence, the burden, if I may use that term, of supplying education and educational opportunity to that part of Winnipeg must be borne by the real property taxpayers throughout the Greater Winnipeg area generally. This is in large part what the Greater Winnipeg education levy was designed to provide. But the result is that the Winnipeg real property taxpayer is paying more and more of a load, more and more of a cost that should be contributed to in substantially larger part by the province itself, because the whole relationship between the province's degree of support and the property taxpayers' degree of support has become completely inequitable to the point where the property taxpayer is having to pay a percentage of those costs that far far outstrips and outweighs the 20 percent concept that was contained in the original thinking on this subject and that is suggested by most authorities as the desirable share.

The school division to which I refer has raised a number of arguments of this kind before the Minister and his colleagues in the Cabinet having to do with discrimination and discrepancies and inequities that seem to apply, for some reason, against Winnipeg and Winnipeg real property taxpayers and that have produced a situation where the real property taxpayer in Winnipeg is being asked to carry an unfair share of the burden.

I would like to ask the Minister for his views and his department's assessment of the current funding difficulties and problems, and I would like to know from him whether he and his department are considering revisions in the grant structure that will once again raise the level of provincial participation to a degree that is fair in terms of not only the students, but in terms of the real property taxpayer himself.

Sir, the specific problem for 1976 really has to do with how this province and how the taxpayers in this province are going to meet the immediate increase in school costs that are facing them. School board budgets are expected overall to reach, or have reached an increase this year in 1976 of some 12 percent over last year and that works out to a need for an additional \$35 million dollars approximately to pay for the public and for the elementary and secondary school program in the province. Now, if the province were to maintain the same kind of degree of support that they put into the program in 1975, which was roughly 69.7 percent, the government would have to increase its grants by approximately \$24.5 million dollars. That would still leave an additional 10.5 million to be raised by special levy in 1976. And that's over and above the 20 percent foundation levy, that's over and above the special levy that's already imposed on the real property taxpayer, and it's over and above, for Greater Winnipeg taxpayers, the Greater Winnipeg education levy, an additional 10.5 million that would have to be raised by special levy. But it's likely to be substantially more than that because it would only be held to the 10.5 million if the province were to increase its grants by about \$24.5 million and at this point in time we have no assurance that we're going to get, as taxpayers in this province paying for our education system, that we're going to get that kind of an increased assistance from this government.

So, Sir, I think the situation in terms of funding and in terms of structure of the financial support program is critical. It's deplorable, as one of my colleagues says, but it's more than that, it's critical. I don't see how the program can be met in 1976 and in the years immediately to come unless there is a complete overhaul of the grant structure and there is a complete rationalization of this province's approach to the basics, and the basic requirements and the basic things that have to be funded first and foremost in terms of education before excessive expenditures are assigned in less important areas. Because the financial support from the province has been diminishing for the past seven to eight year period to which I've referred, Sir, the support from the Winnipeg property taxpayer has been demanded in increasing ratio. Considering the fact that we started out

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) on this program a few years ago, proposing that the province pay 80 percent of education costs and that the individual taxpayers through their real property taxes pick up the other 20 percent, there's been a pretty dismal and a pretty disturbing reversal of position, Sir.

Even figuring the effect and the hope for best results of the property tax rebate into the picture, if we look at the equation for the last three years we find that total government contribution to education in 1973 was 73.1 percent, which means that the real property tax burden at that point had gone up to approximately 27 percent. In 1974 the government contribution was 71.1 percent, and as mentioned a few moments ago, in 1975 it was down to 69.7 percent, under the 70 percent level. This is putting the fairest interpretation possible on the effect and the impact of the property tax rebate. There are many who would argue that the statistics to which I'm referring give much more credit to the property tax rebate for reducing the burden of the property taxpayer than is rightfully due. But putting the fairest possible, the happiest possible interpretation on it from the government's point of view, we're still in a position in 1975, or we were still in a position in 1975 where the government's share was down under the 70 percent level and the property taxpayers' share was up over the 30 percent level, and that is a set of mathematical figures in relationship that really bear out the trend on a curve. The fact of the matter is that it's a continuing curve and disarmingly, apparently, a continuing and worsening situation. As I said, without that necessary \$24.5 million in increased grants from the Provincial Government this year, if we don't get that, the picture is going to be worse statistically in 1976 than that to which I've referred for 1975.

So where does the government go, and where does the taxpayer go, and where does the duty go for rectification of this position? I said this afternoon, and I repeat that with this trend, the students, the youngsters who are suffering the most, who are getting hit the worst, are the youngsters in the less advantaged, the less affluent school divisions, particularly in the Greater Winnipeg area because the kinds of funds and funding that their schools have available to work with are being continually strained and pinched to the limit so that they don't get some of the additional services and some of the additional advantages that up to this point in time taxpayers in suburban divisions, more affluent divisions around Winnipeg have been prepared to provide. So in the end the people who need the best available opportunities in education to compensate for socio-economic disadvantage are getting the worst possible opportunities because of the financial breaks. That is the reason, Sir, why I raise the challenge as to the direction and the results of this government with respect to the one goal, the one objective that I would have thought that they would sincerely have had in mind and an objective that I'm sure all of us in this House could subscribe to. That is the goal of providing a greater equality of education opportunities.

I suggest, Sir, that when the Provincial Government's share of the costs of education in Winnipeg between 1967 and 1975 - and here I'm talking about Winnipeg, not the province as a whole - between 1967 and 1975, has gone down from 36.1 percent to 25.5 percent, and when the share to be supported by Winnipeg real property taxpayers, through school division educational tax levies has gone up in that period, 1967-1975, from 62 percent to 79 percent, that we're moving further and further away from equality of education opportunity. These are the figures that were compiled by the Winnipeg School Division No. 1, the Minister is not unfamiliar with them. In 1967 the total expenditures for the Winnipeg School Division No. 1 were \$27.4 million, provincial support from consolidated revenues at that point was \$9.8 million for 36.1 percent share. The Winnipeg School Division education tax levies at that point were \$16.9 million for a 62 percent share. Today, eight years later, 1975 the School Division's total expenditures were \$55.4 million, the support from consolidated revenues was \$14.2 million, which is 25.5 percent, the support from the Winnipeg real property taxpayer was \$44 million, or 79.4 percent.

Now that has got to be a situation that not only disturbs those of us in the opposition and hopefully some of those in the Minister's department, but has got to be disturbing to the students and their parents in those school divisions in Winnipeg that don't have the advantages that some of the more affluent suburban divisions and other divisions

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) in the province do have. I'm talking here specifically about the Greater Winnipeg area, the province's share of support taken across the province as a whole is a little higher than is the case in the Winnipeg area, the taxpayers' burden is a little lower. I referred to those figures earlier. But we're looking at approximately 69 percent for the province, approximately 31 percent for the real property taxpayer. But for the City, as I've said, we're looking at 25.5 percent from the province and a figure that is estimated in the 75 percent range for the property taxpayer in Winnipeg.

So I put it to the Minister that the basic challenge that we see in this particular area, under this appropriation, is that the Public School System in this province is not being supported properly from a financial point of view at the present time. That the grant structure needs serious overhaul and updating, that the real property taxpayer, particularly in Greater Winnipeg, needs critical relief from the situation that is increasingly heavy and onerous and getting worse every year for him, and that the student himself, particularly the student in the less advantaged parts of the Greater Winnipeg area is the person who is being short-changed and who's finding that his or her opportunity for education equality is diminishing rather than increasing.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I'll make every effort possible to answer the questions put to me by the Honourable Member for Fort Gary, although I think that during the past while that he was speaking he was really concentrating on one issue, and that is what in his opinion is the burden of education costs upon the real property owner in the City of Winnipeg. He started off by making the allegation, the charge, that over the years we've been moving farther away from equality rather than toward it. Now the honourable member could go back to '66, to '67, when the foundation grant formula was introduced into this province and he would have found that at that time there was no commitment on the part of government to pay 75, or 80 percent, or whatever percentage of a total education cost, but rather of approved education costs, and the Minister of the day made it very plain at that time that if any school division wants to expand, enrich its education program beyond the level that the province was prepared to support, then the school division would have to do it on its own. In other words, Mr. Chairman, the richer would be able to have more, and the less affluent less.

Now, let's just review our record of support for the past six or seven years, let's go back to 1970. In 1970, Mr. Chairman, the total expenditures on education in the Province of Manitoba, that's the total by all school divisions, was \$160 million. The government input at that time was \$82.3 million, for a total of 51.4 percent of the total cost.

In 1971, the costs increased to \$178.8 million. The province in keeping with its commitment to gradually assume a larger portion of education costs and thus bring about a greater measure of relief to the real property owner, in 1971, out of the \$178.8 million, the province picked up \$99 million or 55.3 percent of the total education expenditure.

In 1972, with the introduction of our Property Tax Credit Program, out of total school expenditures of \$198.7 million, the total government input was \$104 million plus \$37.2 million by way of property tax credit, for a total of \$142.4 million, or 71.7 percent. --(Interjection)-- I'll come to that. I'll come to that. Let the Honourable Member for St. James just bear with me for a minute or two and I will answer his question. In fact I'm quite prepared to answer his question at a later point in time just from hearing it as given to me from his seat, he doesn't even have to get up and make a speech. But if he wishes to he can make a speech on that, too. I wouldn't deny him that privilege, every member is entitled to the same rights in this House.

In 1973, the total school expenditures then were \$221.8 million, and the provincial total support was 79.3 percent - \$175.9 million. And then, Mr. Chairman, from that point on, it remained well above the 70 percent mark, well above the 70 percent mark. And school trustees today would argue that the province should pay 80 percent, 75 percent of the education costs, in that range. And we're about as close to it as we could possibly be.

In 1974, out of a total of \$250.3 million spent on education, the government input was \$191.2 million, for 76.4 percent. And for the past couple of years, it was well

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) over the 74 percent mark. Out of a total of 292.5 in '75 the provincial support was \$217.3 million and the estimate this year in relation to a total expenditure of \$337.6 million, the provincial level of support will be \$250.2 million, again for about 74.1 percent. Then look at it in another sense. Over that six-year period, the total expenditures have slightly more than doubled, due to a number of factors; one, enrichment and expansion of education programs, more schools were built, more teachers were hired, programs were expanded, new programs were instituted in our school system, coupled with inflationary pressures, yes. So the expenditures have doubled, a bit more than doubled, from \$160.1 million in 1970 to \$337.6. Had they doubled it would be 320, so it's slightly more than double.

The provincial level of support has tripled, Mr. Chairman, from \$82 million in 1970 to \$250.3 million. So who is not keeping up with the increasing demands of school divisions, with the increasing pressures of inflation, who's not keeping up with whatever other factors may bring about any increase in the cost of education. More than tripled, from 82.3 to \$250.2 million - three times 82.3 is about \$247 million.

Now I'll come to the Honourable Member for St. James, and I think that this is apropos to the comments that were made by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry when he said that it was the Minister for Urban Affairs who claimed those taxes. I'll agree, I'll agree that in municipalities there may be some spillover, some spillover from the school tax bill on to the municipal tax bill. But, Mr. Chairman, it's the same taxpayer, it's providing tax relief to the same taxpayer. And as the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, as he was saying that his prime concern was the lot of the taxpayer in Winnipeg, in the City of Winnipeg, in the Winnipeg School Division and others, he would likely find that in the vast majority of cases there's very little, if any, spillover from the school tax portion of the bill into the municipal tax bill.

Now, to proceed with equity insofar as bearing the costs of education by the taxpayer. It's true, Mr. Chairman, I suppose one could approach owners of homes that may have a market value of \$75,000 or \$100,000 or more, whatever their assessed value would be, that they are probably paying a few hundred or well over \$1,000 in school tax. Perhaps well over \$1,000 even minus the Property Tax Rebate.

Now maybe that's the type of owner that the Member for Fort Garry is primarily concerned about. But I'm more concerned, Mr. Chairman, about the person living on a fixed income. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, I'm more concerned about the senior citizen. Yes, I am concerned about the senior citizen. Mr. Chairman, I could take the Honourable Member for St. James into my constituency and take him into home after home and he will find very few people, if any, paying any school tax today, paying any school tax today. Because, Mr. Chairman, that person who qualifies for the maximum benefits of our tax credit scheme receives . . . -- (Interjection) --

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. James state his point of order.

MR. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Mr. Chairman, my point of order is that the Minister is indicating that I made a comment that I am questioning his concern about the senior citizens or elderly people, and I would like to point out to the Minister that I did not make that comment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! That is not a point of order. The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, at the present time, at the present time with the tax credit scheme that's in effect for this year one has to have real property of an assessed value. I'm not talking about market value, the market value would be much much higher than that, but of an assessed value, somewhere in the order of seven - I haven't taken a pencil and paper to work this out, but I would estimate somewhere in excess of \$7,000, in excess of \$7,000 before he would pay any school tax at all, the person living on a fixed income who qualifies for the maximum benefits - in excess of \$7,000.

Mr. Chairman, just to explain to you what a home assessed at \$7,000 is, my home is assessed at \$7,000. And I want to tell you, Mr. Chairman, that I am paying less by way of school tax today - and I'd be the first to admit that perhaps I and others

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) . . . like me and like some others in this House should be paying more perhaps - but I'm paying less today than I paid in 1959 when I bought my home. In 1959, Mr. Chairman, the school tax, the school tax on my home was \$179. In 1975, it was \$302, minus \$175. Now surely I don't have to do that simple arithmetic exercise for the honourable members of the opposition to indicate to them that it works out to \$127. And that's the tax that I pay, that's the tax that others in my neighbourhood pay on homes of a similar kind; on today's income, not the 1959 income. On today's income, '59 income, not '69, on '59 - it's 17 years ago that I bought my home.

Now, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry goes on to talk about the inequities in Winnipeg, and he complains that the property owner within the Winnipeg School Division is saddled with an undue burden because of the Foundation Grant Formula, because of the City of Winnipeg equalization, I suppose, which he hadn't mentioned, which he should have mentioned, I don't know why he didn't mention it. I'm sure that's the reason why he didn't mention it because the suburbs are the beneficiaries of the Winnipeg equalization. But, Mr. Chairman, in an attempt to provide some balance, you know, two things were done. And as far as the honourable member's concern about that person owning a home in downtown Winnipeg is concerned, now it's true that he may be contributing toward some portion of the education costs in the suburban divisions or to those that do not have the broad tax base that Winnipeg has, but by the same token, by the same token that resident in what used to be the suburban areas of Winnipeg is now contributing toward the police force that the City of Winnipeg requires, is contributing towards the Fire Department that the City of Winnipeg requires - (Interjection) - Yes, he is contributing toward - (Interjection) - And you know, Mr. Chairman, the Village of Brooklands doesn't need fire-fighting equipment to put out a fire in a building of a size of the Richardson Building or the North Star Inn or whatever else that the City of Winnipeg requires. So that's where balance comes about, Mr. Chairman.

Insofar as transportation grants for the handicapped are concerned, this, Mr. Chairman, is only one facet of a much larger problem, of a much larger issue; this is one facet of the overall general development of a program for children with special needs. And this, I had indicated earlier to the extent that it was possible for me under that particular item in the Estimates, and there will be opportunity to expand on it still further a Special Needs Program is in the process of being worked out. It is true, that I suppose as far as a school division such as the Winnipeg School Division, and perhaps others within Winnipeg, are probably either in a position or in a much better position to institute or expand an education program to meet the special needs of children than other school divisions are. But looking at the special needs from a province-wide basis, we do have many school divisions which, at this point in time, are not prepared to put into effect a special needs program, for a variety of reasons and for reasons other than just dollars and cents. The acquisition of equipment, the acquisition of staff, working out inter-divisional, co-operative arrangements and deciding on what types of programs they're going to deliver. Because when you're dealing with some of our sparsely populated rural divisions which may have only two or three children suffering from one type of ailment and another school division may have two or three, and perhaps a third one, then it's impractical and impossible for each school division to establish a complete range of special needs programs for all the special needs that could possibly exist. In many cases, it would be more practical to institute and develop such programs on a co-operative basis, and it is that type of planning that is presently going on.

And we do recognize the fact, Mr. Chairman, that with the institution of a special needs program, with the proclamation of legislation that was passed during the last session that particular section of the Act dealing with special needs, that we will have to take a real close and hard look at the transportation costs, because we do realize that transportation costs of children with handicaps or whatever kind, are much higher than the normal transportation costs. That the maximum grant that we pay at the present time, \$190 per year per eligible student, and I underline the term per eligible student, Mr. Chairman, because even rural school divisions do not qualify, it's not simply a matter of multiplying their enrolment by \$190, and thus to arrive at the amount of the grant that

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) . . . they receive. It's only those children who are included in the calculation who live in excess of one mile from the school that they attend, who are included in that number. But when the special needs program is developed then we will have to take a look at the transportation costs of such children wherever they may be.

Now, the honourable member also raised the question of what assistance is there offered to the Winnipeg School Division in light of the fact that being an urban community of the size that it is that it does have problems that are unique onto it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I did make reference to this point earlier in the debate of my Estimates but now that we're dealing with Grants, very well I'll take the time to elaborate upon this particular point.

A week and a half ago, as a matter of fact, it was on April 23rd to be exact, we announced that we will make a special grant of \$700,000 to the Winnipeg School Division, in recognition of the extra costs of unique special programs required to be provided by the division. And in making this grant, I want to make it perfectly clear that this is not for new programs - and no doubt the Winnipeg School Division may have many new programs and many new worthwhile programs that it may want to implement - but this grant was intended to deal with those programs presently in operation, and it's intended that the provision of this special grant will permit a reduction of one mill in a division's 1976 special levy. Therefore the following programs, English as a second language, classes given for more than 300 children and serving about 550 in the school year by 16 full-time teachers, 300 in a given point in time but because of a turnover of children some children may require special assistance in a class of immigrant children, but they may spend less than a year within that class and then they may be in a position to move into the regular stream, so over a period of a year the Winnipeg School Division will probably see about 550 children through classes of this kind, by 16 full-time teachers.

And also to assist in the payment of the costs of the operation of summer classes teaching English as a second language, again serving about 150 immigrant students and 20 native pupils, ethnic teacher aides, at Pinkham, John M. King and Victoria Albert Schools, where in these three schools 55 percent, 27 percent and 39 percent respectively of the pupils are immigrants. Native teacher aides, 12 full time and two half time serving an estimated 2,500 pupils of native origin in one nursery school, one high school and nine elementary schools. Five native classes, serving 160 native students, and all of these, Mr. Chairman, I may add are designed to assist the native person, well firstly to assist the child of immigrant parents to assume his place within our school system and profit from it and also to assist the native child moving into Winnipeg, a large urban community, perhaps from a remote northern community into an entirely different environment, different way of life, to adapt to it and profit from his stay here. Immigrant children and adult education, 45 basic English classes serving 275 adults given through the Winnipeg Adult Education Centre at schools, plants and ethnic community centres.

So these are the types of programs, Mr. Chairman, that the additional \$700,000 grant which was announced, and to which we have committed ourselves to recently, are designed to pay for within the City of Winnipeg, within the Winnipeg School Division, designed, and I repeat again, designed to meet the special needs facing a division such as Winnipeg.

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'm glad to have the Minister's assurance that there is special funding coming to provide some opportunities for the students in the inner city area, and I'm also glad to have his assurance that transportation grants within the Winnipeg School Division for handicapped children are being re-examined and hopefully will be upgraded. But I must confess, Sir, that we obviously work from a different set of figures, and from a different appreciation of the education property tax rebate, because the Minister tells us that the \$175 property tax rebate which is, for example he qualifies and he has suggested there are many Manitobans who do, that all of that goes to education --(Interjection)-- well many of them qualify for more than \$175. I'm talking about the \$175 minimum to which he refers - he's telling me that all that \$175 or 300, whatever it is, whichever end of the scale you want to take goes to education, that it goes to support the education program and that it goes to school boards in the Province and that, Sir, is arrant nonsense, none of that money is paid directly to school divisions, and there are about five different ways, and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources knows full well, --(Interjection)-- well, I say about five, my colleague says three, of analyzing the breakdown of the equation on school costs in this province. There are at least three different ways of arriving at the effect and impact in terms of reducing the taxpayers' bill of the property tax rebate where education taxes are concerned, and it depends on which end of the scale you work from, it depends on which end of the scale you work from. You know, certainly if this government and this Minister are going to sit here and tell me that every nickel of that Education Property Tax Rebate goes to education, well then they can produce a set of statistics that make it look as though there have been enormous increases in the province's share of the program, the cost of the program, and consequent reductions in the property taxpayer's share.

But, Sir, as I said before, that money does not go directly to school divisions and it's arguable whether any substantial percentage of it, whether any percentage of it can be allocated in the mathematics to education costs as such, I mean this government is attributing all the property tax rebate to education. The fact of the matter, Sir, is that the property tax rebate program amounted to \$75-1/2 million in 1975, the government paid a total of \$31-1/2 in 1975 to municipalities - that's exactly what they paid in 1975, a total of \$31-1/2 million in 1975. Now if you take a look at the 1975 Education Support Program mathematics the cost of education in 1975 in the province were \$292 million; the government's share from the foundation program, Sir, was \$121 million, and the property owner's share of the foundation program, the foundation levy provided another \$30 million, so that gives us \$151 million. Other grants contributed \$18.3 million. Let's say the Property Tax Rebate, the \$31-1/2 million that the municipalities were paid by the government on the Property Tax Rebate in 1975 is calculated in there as part of the government share, that produces an equation that leaves \$90.8 million to be raised by special levy. The totals work out this way, Sir, that the government share is \$170.9 million, and the share from property is \$121.1 million, so that means that government support for education in 1975 was 58.5 percent, and that means that the property taxpayers' share was 41.5 percent, is that right? 41.5 percent, yes, and I suggest that those figures are substantially different from what the Minister is trying to tell us about 72 and 73 and 75 percent of the share coming from the government, and I suggest that these figures and those mathematics are just as valid as any the government is using because that property tax rebate does not go to the school divisions, and it does not go in total or even - it probably does not even go in 50 percent extent to support the cost of education, so I revert to the original contention, the original charge that I made, that the government's share has gone down and the property taxpayers' share has gone up, and that's across the province, I'm not concerning myself here particularly with Winnipeg whatsoever. --(Interjection)-- Well all right, I was mentioning Winnipeg before because in Winnipeg the discrepancy is even greater, and I was mentioning Winnipeg before because I felt that there was discrimination against Winnipeg taxpayers.

The Minister has answered some of my questions in that area with respect to transportation grants and special programs for disadvantaged neighbourhoods, but look at

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) the Manitoba picture overall, the total provincial picture and you come to a position of 58-1/2 percent support from the province, 41-1/2 percent from the real property taxpayer, and it was supposed to be 80 and 20, that's the way the program started, was it not gentlemen? It was supposed to be 80 percent from the government, and 20 percent through a foundation levy that was supported by the real property taxpayer, well now the government support is 58-1/2 percent and the property taxpayer is 41-1/2 percent, and I say to you that by any definition that is a decreasing contribution by the government in terms of today, you know, in terms of dollars, in terms of the program as it stands and as it costs today, and an increasing burden on the real property taxpayer, the Manitoba real property taxpayer throughout the Province.

Now what is this government going to do to reverse that trend before the real property taxpayer is paying for half the program or more than half the program, and before he reaches a point where he can't pay for the program and as a consequence the services can't be provided.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Member for Fort Garry has hit the nail right on the head. What he is worried about is relieving the burden of the school trustees, of the school divisions, and what we are concerned with is relieving the burden on the municipal taxpayer, and that is the difference, Mr. Chairman. Well I can make my proof of that position because the honourable member has continued to say that the property tax rebate is not going to the school division, it is not going to the school division, and he is worried about the school division, and we are worried about the person who pays taxes to the school division, and if it went to the school division I suggest to you that that would be the worst form of tax relief for the taxpayer and best out for the school trustee, and that has been the position that's been taken by the Member for St. James, and by the Member for Fort Garry for the last year; they have been worried about saving the status of municipal councillor and the municipal school trustee. I suggest to you that they want to save them at the expense of the municipal taxpayer, because what have they suggested, Mr. Chairman, we have seen this in action, we saw this in action, in 1969 prior to the municipal election, to the provincial election, immediately prior within two weeks before the election was called, the First Minister of the province, then Walter Weir announced there would be an increase in the unconditional per capita grants rebate to municipalities, it was going from \$3.00 to \$8.00 and who was that done for? Was that done for the Municipal taxpayer? No. As a matter of fact they had in the same year, or two years earlier in the same, in effect legislative period, between '66 and '69 eliminated what was then the property tax rebate of \$50.00 to each municipal councillor, which we said was a good program but which should have been put on the municipal tax bill and should not have been sent out in \$50.00 cheques, and we then when we instituted the program put on the municipal tax bill. The only portion that does not go on the bill is that portion which is based on capacity to pay, which an individual has to apply for, and even then we don't send them a Provincial Government cheque, he gets a cheque from the Federal Government and we are not concerned that it appears to him that he is getting a cheque from the Federal Government rather than the Provincial Government, which was the entire concern of the previous Progressive Conservative administration with regard to the rebates, that Mr. Roblin said, we want him to see our name on the cheque, and that was the basis upon which they gave a rebate.

Now Mr. Chairman, what the honourable members have been saying continuously is that we should relieve the municipal councillor, we should relieve the municipal school trustee, and we should do so at the expense of the municipal taxpayer. Well, Mr. Chairman, we are not asking relief for our political position, we are not willing to sacrifice the position of the taxpayer to the municipal councillors, they will have to handle their own positions as will the municipal trustees. What would be the effect of taking the same amount of money that we are now giving in rebates and giving it to the school divisions and the school trustees: First of all, immediately that the money was available it would be spent, and I say that it is axiomatic, Mr. Chairman, that any

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. GREEN cont'd) jurisdiction which has that kind of money coming, particularly which they do not have to tax for, they will spend, it is almost a necessity to do so. When we were on Metro Council if there was provincial money on a 50 percent cost-sharing program, if we didn't spend it we lost the money. In the Provincial Government the Weir Administration was driven into Medicare, something that they didn't want to do, because there was 50 percent federal dollars lying on the table, which if they didn't take they would lose. So first of all, it would be spent, Mr. Chairman. Secondly, if there was a measure of a relief it would go flat across the board, and I got the figures last year, if the T. Eaton Company now pays in the area of \$250,000 to \$300,000 in taxes and there was ten percent tax relief, they would be relieved to the extent of \$25,000 to \$30,000. I gather that they now get \$175 if they have a title on which - no they don't even get it, non-residence they do not get it - that \$25,000 relief would be taken from the other taxpayers of Greater Winnipeg who now are entitled to get the full measure of relief through the rebate program that we have instituted by the government. And what happens to the back-spill? And you know the Member for Fort Garry says, and the Member for St. James says, well you've taken that off the municipal taxes how can you now take it off the school taxes, well, Mr. Chairman, it's interesting that they are now becoming particular, and whenever they talked about municipal taxes and show how they have been skyrocketed, in giving the figures they have always included the school taxes, why are they now so particular about reducing them? Because what the government said, Mr. Chairman, what the program of the New Democratic Party was, was that we would attempt to relieve the individual taxpayer, the homeowner, the person who is paying for the home by rent or otherwise, from the cost of those programs which are for people, specifically Health, Welfare and Education Programs. But the only way you can do that effectively, Mr. Chairman - and we certainly studied it - is to give the homeowner that portion of his taxes which goes to that and to the extent that there is now, and this year there will be a \$200 minimum on the rebate program, there is, Mr. Chairman, in most cases - and I cannot say that it is universally so, but in most cases, and particularly for those people who live in modest homes, a complete return to them of those municipal taxes that are used for health, welfare and education. Now, Mr. Speaker, I didn't get the chance to do it on the Throne Speech Debate, but I have four homes in the Inkster constituency and these are actual bills. These are not fictitious and I'm willing to give the names and the bills to my honourable friends if they insist that they want them. I've received the information through my office, I gather it is correct and I'm going to give it to the honourable members.

One is a home on Polson Avenue. I know this home myself, I have been in it, it is a home which I think now would sell between \$25,000 and \$30,000. I don't think that I'd be exaggerating the value of that home that it is a very nice home, it is more than a modest home, I would say it's an upper middle class home. As a matter of fact, the 1975 taxes on the home are \$744.01. That's the 1975 taxes. It's a newer, higher standard home. The taxes in 1969 were \$470.08. Today's taxes are \$744.01, taking off the rebate, they are \$569.01, which means that, Mr. Speaker, between 1969 and 1975 the realty taxes including school and residence have increased by roughly \$100. That's only, Mr. Speaker, if this person is an income earner. If this person who lives in this home is of lower income, if he is not employed, if he is a person who depends for his living on fixed pension, if he does not earn enough to make income tax, then Mr. Speaker, he is entitled to an additional \$125 rebate, in which case his taxes would be \$441.01. So that between 1969 and 1975 there is an absolute decrease in taxes between what a low income earner would have to pay on that home between 1969 and 1975. We couldn't do that under the program suggested by the Honourable Member for St. James, or the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

The next one is a - excuse me, Mr. Chairman, I gave a home on Polson Avenue which I said that I had been in, it's the home on Lansdowne Avenue that I have been in, which is the next one and I'm sorry if I've mixed up the two.

His taxes are \$662.06 in 1975. They were \$435.61 in 1969. Taking off the rebate they are \$487.06, meaning Mr. Speaker, that there has been a \$50 tax increase

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. GREEN cont'd) between 1969 and 1975. In what other city in Canada would the taxes have increased only by the sum of \$50 between 1969 and 1975, a period of six years? If the person in that home is of the low income group, which entitles him to the full rebate his taxes would be \$362.06, which means that for these people that you're talking about, the pensioner, the person who is living on fixed income, who wants to stay in his house, that the taxes would have reduced from \$434 in 1969 to \$362 in 1975. An absolute reduction of \$62 in the five years when everything else has gone up, when all the taxes everywhere have gone up. An absolute reduction, Mr. Speaker, of \$80 in five years.

The next house, this is a home on Magnus Avenue. This is a more modest home, a 1975 tax bill of \$528.93. A 1969 tax bill of \$324.66 if they are receiving only the rebate to which everybody is entitled, taxes of \$353.93 in 1975, an increase, Mr. Speaker, of roughly \$30 over a period of five years. And if that person is a pensioner, if that person is the poor pension fixed income taxpayer who is trying to save their home that you people are always talking about and gets the rebate of an additional \$125 --(Interjection)-- \$300? I haven't even included the cost of living tax rebate. Her taxes would be \$228.93, a decrease of roughly \$96 over five years.

These are actual bills. These are people living in my constituency. These are people whom you say we should give the money to the trustees and let them worry about reducing the mill rate in the City of Winnipeg. Well I tell you that every attempt that has been made to reduce spending by giving money to the trustees has failed. It has failed to the extent, Mr. Speaker, that in the Province of Ontario they were trying a system of giving money to school trustees or to municipalities in inverse ratio to their spending. In other words, if they spent less, they got more as an incentive, or at least they were trying to devise such a system. They never got to it, I don't think so anyway. But they were trying to devise a system to give the municipalities the money not on the basis of their increased expenditures, but if they could reduce spending they get a bonus, because every attempt to reduce municipal spending by giving municipalities money failed, and it's got to fail. So the only way to do it is to protect the municipal taxpayer, not the municipal council, and let the municipal councillors fight for their political lives as the Member for Fort Garry has to fight for his life and as I've got to fight for my life. It's the taxpayers that have to be protected, not the councillors. For the councillors I could care less. They're doing their job. I care for them, I am as much solicitous of their political position as they are of my political position, and the Member for Crescentwood and the Member for Wolseley knows just how much they care about the political position of this government.

A MEMBER: Fight fair.

MR. GREEN: Fight fair. Mr. Chairman, --(Interjection)-- a house on Pritchard Avenue, this is a much more modest home, a much more modest home on Pritchard Avenue, but I tell you that there are hundreds of such homes; west of McPhillips, Pritchard Avenue, Selkirk Avenue, Magnus Avenue, Manitoba Avenue, hundreds of such homes. Tax bill in 1975, \$384.11; tax bill in 1969, \$260.39; with the rebate alone, last year's taxes were \$209.11, with the rebate alone. An actual reduction of roughly \$50 in a period of five years for the low income, modest home owner taxpayer. We could do that giving the money to the school trustees, to the School Division? This person is not paying more school taxes. You, with all your eloquence, you can't go into that home on Pritchard Avenue and tell that woman that we should give the money to the school division. There's no way you'll convince her. And I can give you, not thirty minutes of time, but sixty minutes of time, ninety minutes of time, you're not going to convince her that we should give that money to the school division.

A MEMBER: Thirty-five days give her.

MR. GREEN: In five years. Now, Mr. Chairman, I will concede that in these figures I have not obtained, I am certain that they would not make a great deal of difference whether there has been reductions for local improvement taxes or whether they were paying for roads, most of these houses are in areas where the work has been done for years.

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. GREEN cont'd)

Now, an absolute reduction in taxes between 1969 and 1975, in a home on Pritchard Avenue, in Inkster constituency, in the City of Winnipeg, and you are telling me that we should give the money to the municipality in addition to what we have given to the municipality, in addition to the fact that we have increased the unconditional grant from a measly \$3.00 per capita in 1968 to \$16, at least I'm using the low figures.

In 1976, 500 percent increase in the unconditional grant. In addition to that this person is paying a tax of \$209.11 in 1975 as against \$260 in '69. But Mr. Speaker, I haven't dealt with the best of it. If this person is in the low income groups, if they are an old age pensioner, if they are living in a modest home and are worried about their home being sold for taxes, if they receive no income, if they are entitled to the highest rebate, they get an additional \$125 off the \$209 and end up with a real property tax of \$84.11 in 1975 as against \$260.39 in 1969. And if they are then in addition to that, entitled to the cost of living tax credit, they could apply that cost of living tax credit to the real property tax, which I guess I shouldn't do because the Member for Sturgeon Creek is sure to get after me, and in this case I guess I really would have no defence, but they would be paying no real property taxes at all. They will apply that to something else. They'll apply it to their increased cost of milk, increased cost of bread, which is what it's for. And we will leave them with paying taxes of \$84.11 in 1975 after five years of inflation, and increased costs in each of these areas, and come out with a tax in 1969 of \$260 as against a tax in 1969 or \$260.39.

Now you know I've been telling my constituents that, you know they tell us in the Legislature that we shouldn't give this money to you. We should give it to the municipalities or we should give it to the school divisions and then when the school division gets that money the bill that they send to you will be less. And that's what the other parties are telling us. And they ask me, yeah, well that's why we elected you and not the other parties. So please do not you do what they are telling you to do. And if I have to listen to the Member for Fort Garry or if I have to listen to these four householders who live in my constituency, you know, there's no choice who I have to take to listen to. --(Interjection)-- No, no that's right, and I suggest that the honourable member --(Interjection)-- I suggest to the honourable member that he start listening to the people who live in the modest homes in Fort Garry rather than to the school division people who come to him and say, "We got to get together and get these New Democrats." I suggest that they start listening, because he's not going to get anything from those school divisions and he's not going to get anything from those municipal councillors. The honourable member thinks that that is the best way of handling things, to try to sort of gang up with the pressures that are exerted upon us by various municipal bodies who come in and raise hell with us; if he thinks that that's where the action is, then I say be my guest, stay with them as long as you want.

I do not believe that the people of Winnipeg want us to change this system. I believe that the people of Winnipeg say that this is the way in which they get the best benefits out of a system of taxation which is designed to try to see to it that the homeowner is not paying an onerous share of those costs of education which should probably be paid by the community at large. And Mr. Speaker, what I have said here relates to rural constituencies as well.

It relates to the rural constituencies, the taxes on a modest homeowner in a town in rural Manitoba. It does not relate where there is many acres of farmland, where the farmland is a business, and this is part of their cost of doing business for which they get a credit when they file their returns, and in a good year it helps them, and in a bad year, of course, it doesn't. I'm not stressing that. But the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that what we have been told is that one of the anomalies that has occurred in small towns in rural Manitoba is that they pay no taxes at all - that they pay no taxes at all - because the tax rebate system has resulted in that portion of their taxes and there may be a large portion to education and a smaller portion to ordinary municipal service, but what has occurred is that the tax rebate system has dealt with it.

So, Mr. Speaker, if we're talking about tax bills in general, if we're talking about everybody's home, I can't say that everybody gets the same benefit out of the tax

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. GREEN cont'd) rebate program; but the person on low income, the person with no money who is not in the category where he pays income tax, the person who is occupying a modest home, that person has got a much better deal as a result of the tax credit plan than if the money was being given directly to school divisions. And I think that that person is very happy on that account, and is much less concerned with the anxieties of his school trustee and his council. It's not as if I say that these people should not complain. They have a right to complain and I think that it is traditional that wherever there is a municipal provincial government, the municipality will be saying that it's not getting enough money from the senior government. And as long as we don't get excited and don't get intimidated by the remarks of the Member for Fort Garry or the remarks of the Member for St. James, and stay with what we know to be a sensible relief to the real property taxpayer, then I don't think that we have any problem with our own consciences as to what we are doing for the municipal education taxpayer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Mines and Resources says that obviously I think the best way of handling things is to line up with the pressure groups that are trying to put pressure on and intimidate the Provincial Government with respect to this kind of funding. I don't need any gratuitous political advice from the Minister of Mines and Resources, or from the Member for Churchill. I'm not lining up with anybody. Where does the Minister get this stuff about we're worried about the school division, we're worried about the municipal officers? Where does he get that nonsense? That's nonsense. That's rubbish. Who do you think the school division is? --(Interjection)-- Who do you think the municipality is? In the first place, what we're worried about is the people that pay those tax bills that they get that are worked out by the school division, go through the board of reference, and go to the Provincial Government and to the municipality, that's who we're concerned about. And the Minister can read all the figures he wants to me but I can tell him that there are figures that are equally impressive and equally meaningful that counteract his argument very emphatically.

In 1973 the special levy to pay for education, the special levy we're talking about, this is after the foundation levy --(Interjection)-- Yes, this is after the foundation levy. The special levy to pay for education in this province was \$72.4 million. In 1974, a year later, it was up by 33.78 percent to \$96.9 million. In 1975, a year later it was up by another 16.8 percent to \$113.3 million and it'll be up again next year by as much or a greater amount because of the additional cost and because there hasn't been a corresponding increase in support from the Provincial Government.

Now in the end, I mean the Minister can talk to me all he wants about being worried about the municipal council, worried about the - he poses as the great champion of the taxpayer, well who does he think we're talking about when we're talking about this special levy? We're talking about the taxpayer. And maybe his tenant on Polson Avenue is in a better position at this moment but I can tell him that there are hundreds and thousands of real property taxpayers in this province who are not in a better position and when their tax bills come out in the next few days they'll find that they're in a substantially worse position than they've been in yet.

What the Minister has done, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I am not referring to my tenant. I took an actual homeowner on Polson Avenue. It's got nothing to do with me. I took a total bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Then I say the member's constituent, it was one of his constituents. I thought he was referring to a tenant. A constituent. Anyway that doesn't alter the fact that the Minister and I are both talking about the same thing, we're talking about the load carried by the taxpayers. He seems to think that he's right and the program advanced by his government is right, I say the figures bear out that the special levy which has to be borne by the real property taxpayer is getting heavier and heavier and worse and worse.

And I say further, Mr. Chairman, that the remarks of the Minister add up to a

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) direct and total rejection and repudiation of municipalities. That's what they do. What the Minister did in effect was turn his back on the municipalities and say to hell with you, you get your own way out of it. We're the Provincial Government, you fight your own way out of this, we don't care about the municipalities, we don't care about the school divisions. You know, all we're going to do is try to sell the argument to the individual homeowner on Polson Avenue that we, the great New Democratic Party, the party of the people is defending the little taxpayer, we don't care about the other level of government even though it's our responsibility. Well I'm telling you this that the school divisions turn around, they get the money through the municipalities from the same person that you're getting it from, and that's the person that I'm concerned about to just as great a degree as you. So I reject out of hand your allegation that I am trying to defend the school divisions and I'm not interested in the taxpayer. The reason I'm on my feet is that I am interested in the taxpayer and I am interested in the degree to which the equality of education opportunity in the province has diminished in the last few years because the costs have gone up so greatly.

So let me ask the Minister this: Is he saying to us that the school divisions then should opt out of the various programs that they have developed for their particular schools and their particular students? Is he saying that it could start here? If that's where he wants it to start that's fine, but then let's say it, but if he thinks the school divisions should cut back on everything, then that's a perfectly valid message. Stand up and tell the school divisions to cut back on everything. But as long as the kind of education opportunity that this government professes to be interested in providing is being provided, or an attempt is being made to provide it, and as long as costs keep escalating, that special levy keeps going up, and in the end it's the same person that the Minister and I are talking about, and I say that their system is working an increasingly burdensome difficulty on that individual taxpayer.

If the Minister wants to stand up and tell me that he thinks that school divisions across the province should cut back on all their programs, and slash their budgets by 25 percent, then let him say it.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK Q.C. (St. Johns): Mr. Chairman, I was listening to the Honourable Minister of Mines and to the Member for Fort Garry, and indeed I don't think they were talking about the same person, and that is the impression I have received.

I heard the Member for Inkster, I'm sorry the Honourable Minister, talk about the people of a low income group, talk about the resident homeowner in those areas where he knows the homes are modest, and he described the fact, and it is a fact and those figures can be looked up, I'm sure, I believe they're uncontested, that for people in that group there has actually been a cash reduction. Well that's so. But the Member for Fort Garry when he gave us the list of the total amount of increases in special levies was talking about a different taxpayer. I don't know his figures, I haven't checked them, but let's assume that they are correct and let's see how the burden of that taxation is distributed, and the difference between his form of distribution and our form of distribution tells the very story that the Honourable Minister of Mines was describing to us. And that is that the people of modest income, the people in modest homes, the people to whom inflation has been a heavy burden, because most of them are on fixed incomes, that they are the persons to whom we directed this kind of assistance.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is obvious, one has only to look at total figures, bulk figures to see that somebody did indeed pay a differential. But that somebody happens to be me, and maybe other members in this Chamber, and other people who are not in the low modest income group - and I suggest, that every member in this Chamber is not in the low income group - and maybe our taxes have gone up, but the vast difference between giving increased grants, foundation or whatever else we would give, the way the Conservatives would have us do it, would be to effect a total tax bill on property tax, which means that industry, which means that commercial operations would have a substantial reduction in taxation along with, on a pro rated basis, with those people on modest income.

And Mr. Chairman, it is our objective on this side of the House to ease the

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) burden on those people of low incomes. It is not our objective to rearrange taxation so that the people and the industries and the businesses in the high income bracket should be relieved of paying for the cost of providing municipal services or education or any other costs. That is so well known it doesn't have to be restated. So let's recognize the difference. These figures that we have heard, given by both of the last two speakers, are probably correct, and they only point out the re-distribution in which this party, the New Democratic Party is interested, and I think they point out that the Conservative Party is not concerned about that kind of re-distribution, they are concerned about a general reduction of property taxation. And in order to accomplish what they say, they obviously mean that they want to reduce the taxes across-the-board. Mr. Chairman, is that a new thing for them? Were they not talking about exactly the same kind of an across-the-board reduction in income tax? And I'm not talking about income tax, Mr. Chairman, because we are dealing with the burden on the real property taxpayer, but the method in which they wish to operate is exactly the same in all forms of taxation: Across-the-board cuts, be it so that all people have their taxation reduced in that way. That's the difference, Mr. Chairman. Why don't we recognize that? Why do we have to scream at each other or suggest that there is anything unfair in the way we are presenting it. The truth is that the figures given by the Honourable Minister of Mines affect low income people, the suggestions made by the Conservative Party are across-the-board.

Now we all know very well, we can't deny the fact that if Eaton's pays a higher property tax bill, that gradually works down to the consumer. We know that, and the consumer consists of all of us. And in the end, and this has been shown time and again, in the end the people in the low income bracket are assisted by the kind of specialized designated assistance we are giving to them.

We don't find the money in any magic way. The money comes out of the revenues of the province. The money therefore comes on the ability-to-pay principle, which is accepted by every political party I know of and by every government in the western world, is based in the main on progressive income taxation in varying degree.

Ontario may want to have a 7 percent sales tax, Newfoundland may want to have 10 percent sales tax, we want to have a higher income tax. So I say, we are more progressive. But generally speaking, those who have the ability to pay more do pay more, and that is the way we all operate. It's a question of degree. The Conservatives of Manitoba are not ready to go the extent that we have. The Conservatives of Ontario have come quite a way. It's a question of time.

I assure you, Mr. Chairman, that if the Conservative Government would be in power tomorrow, they would not change, and the Leader of the Opposition has stated they would not change these kinds of benefits that we have enacted. They may have voted against them but they won't change them.

I'm not sure that the Conservative Party has said that they would eliminate the property tax rebate. And if they said that I want them to say it loud and clear so that people of Manitoba will know it. And I challenge them now. The Leader of the Opposition is here, I don't know if he has a quorum in his caucus but he has highly respected members of his group present today, let them today say - would they eliminate the property tax credit? Let them say it and let them say it today, and I'm going to sit down soon to give them a chance to say it, because the Leader of the Opposition has challenged my statement that they would not remove this tax. I don't believe they will but let me hear them say that they will.

But I don't want to be distracted from pointing out that we have not said to school boards that they should cut programs. That's never been said by us. As a matter of fact we are a party that runs on the level of the school board as well, and there are New Democratic members in the school boards in Manitoba and they have talked about the programs that they want to develop. And let us not forget that the people in the school division that the Honourable Minister spoke of are members of the School Division No. 1 which has always prided itself for many years of having a very extensive program of education. Now it needs it because there are many problems in the centre core particularly. But we have never told them to cut it. As a matter of fact,

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd). . . . we do say that when they do have a budget, they should be accountable to the people who elect them to that position. Therefore we say that if there are benefits that we want to pass on, on a selective basis to the taxpayers, we do that and they are still accountable. But in doing that, all they can do is set a mill rate. It's up to the municipality to decide how to tax. And so far the municipality of the City of Winnipeg has chosen to continue to pass the heaviest burden of taxation on real property tax. We have given them opportunities to switch. They have not taken advantage of it. That I say I can fault them as a citizen and as a property taxpayer, but I don't fault them in their right to make their decision as to how to do it. And if they choose not to go into the growth taxes that we have made available to them, all right, let them know they're available and let not members opposite ignore the fact that having the opportunity, they are not taking advantage of it.

I want to come back again, Mr. Chairman, and conclude by again asking the Leader of the Opposition not to leave the Manitoba people in the dark because I admit right now that until 10 or 15 minutes ago I believe that Progressive Conservative Party would not eliminate the Property Tax Credit Plan. After I was interrupted by the Leader of the Opposition, I am in doubt. And now, Mr. Chairman, I challenge the Progressive Conservative Party to get up and not leave us in doubt for any longer. Tell us now. You must know how you stand. Would you eliminate the Property Tax Credit Plan? Would you not?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Member for St. Johns for this opportunity he's provided me with here. And maybe we should just deal with his topic of some urgency to him at the moment so that we can eliminate all doubts from his mind.

I want to first of all point out to him that a Property Tax Credit Plan was brought in by the Conservative Government, I think prior to my time, in 1965-66, Mr. Chairman, which at the time was an across-the-board \$50.00 credit plan, as the Member for St. Johns pointed out, which at that time was a lot of money in relation to what \$50.00 does now in terms of property taxes. And Mr. Chairman, after working with that program for a period of I think two or three years, it was in application, regardless of the fact that the present government will say, well that program was different than ours because you had to go through a different technique in order to get it back to you at that level. Mr. Chairman, you still have to go through a very cumbersome technique to get it back, that is, you have to apply through your income tax return in order to get it back. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Chairman, you still have to go through the calculation of your income tax return to determine whether or not you will get any more than the \$175 or the \$200, Mr. Chairman, in order to get it back. So the main difference is that part of the total moneys allocated here will come back to you automatically on your tax bill as a credit, but the remainder you have to go through the calculation, and go through the costs, Mr. Chairman, of first of all taking it from the people out of the left hand pocket and then coming back to them several months later and having them apply to get that back again out of the right hand pocket, in the meantime setting up a bureaucracy that is an unnecessary bureaucracy. --(Interjection)-- Well, they don't get it all back, Mr. Chairman, my colleagues are right here. You don't get it all back, you get it back less what it cost the government to administer the program.

But we seem to be overlooking the basics of the operation of our municipalities and school divisions in the first place, Mr. Chairman. Well, if you want me to not leave that I'll tell you we had the political courage to eliminate it once already, what makes you think we wouldn't have the political courage to do it again? That's more than I'll say for you, that's more than I'll say for you, Mr. Chairman --(Interjection)-- No it's a very cheap vote buying technique, and this government knows it better than anybody else, it buys votes like you wouldn't believe. You can probably collect many votes, if you want to narrow it down to that issue, but let's not forget the very simple basic fact, the municipalities and the school boards are created by the Provincial Government, they aren't created and recommended to a British North American Act, with delegated responsibilities that says, they shall collect all the property taxes for schools and all the operation of . . .

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) school divisions. Property tax came in to build services, municipal services, property taxes went on to operate municipalities, property taxes went on to finance school boards, but all at the pleasure of the Provincial Government, that was the creation of municipalities and school boards.

If you want to go way back into the Genesis of this, they are your people that you create, not you as a government, they are created by your Provincial Government period, any provincial government, and when you let them down by setting them up as strawmen, no, Mr. Chairman, as the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is doing tonight, we have no concerns about school boards, we have no concerns about municipal councils, you know, this is the cheapest way that there is in politics, set them up and knock them down, but just don't forget the fact you created them, they're your babies, the school boards and the municipalities are your babies, and if you want to take that high and mighty position you go fight your own battles, we'll fight ours, just don't forget the fact that you can wipe them out or create them or do anything you like with the stroke of an act of this Legislature. They have no positions, no power greater than any other citizen in this province, so don't use them as your whipping boy, those people out there are out there working, and I disagree with you completely; I disagree with you when you say that if you gave the money to the municipalities and the school boards it would somehow get spent, not as effectively as you paying that person down there as an individual, and that's effectively what you're saying, in effect, that's what you're saying, if you were to give the money to the municipalities and the school boards, it would be spent in a manner what you could consider as being squanderous, that is effectively what you're saying, and I disagree entirely. I spent some time on school boards, other people in here have spent time on school boards, both sides of the House, they've spent time on municipal councils, a lot of people have come to this Chamber by virtue of the fact that they've had some experience at those two particular categories of public responsibility in government.

And I can tell you, and you know very well that municipal councils, and school boards basically are made up of pretty responsible people. What's happening is they're being used in a whipsaw position by the government. They say you set the taxes, you levy the taxes, and if your taxes are such that we want to rectify them we're going to go back to this cumbersome basis and we're not going to pay it back on a pro rata basis, what we're going to do is we're going to start at a level that costs us the least. We're going to start at a level that costs us the least and that's going to be first of all, we're going to start at a level where the money that we spend in paying it back gets us the most votes. That's what this program does in the Province of Manitoba and you have capitalized on it like nobody else has capitalized on it.

And I'm going to tell you, I'm going to repeat that the previous government brought this program in first of all and probably one of the first programs in Canada that was used as a rebate program. It's been realized that it was an inefficient ass-backwards way of financing education and it set up the foundation program, it set up the foundation program to make grants from a responsible government to responsible school boards in a fashion that provided a responsible level of education in the school divisions and that foundation program allowed us to get away from this backwards way of attempting to finance education through this rebate system; and what happened after was that this government let the foundation program go into such extension disrepair that it was no longer possible for them to maintain a level of equitable property taxation because they weren't getting the proper funds in the proper manner to the school divisions that needed it through a proper foundation program in order to keep the property taxes down, so they came in through the back door and established a property tax rebate.

Now where are you, you're in so deep, you've dug such a hole with this program that it's going to be extremely difficult for you to get out of it. You've got yourself into such a position that it is going to be extremely difficult to get out of it, because despite the fact that this year you're going to increase the program from \$67 million to \$77 million, which is only a \$10 million increase, the property taxes have increased far in excess of that, far in excess of that, the remainder, the residual that still goes on

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) property will be twice that amount, at least twice that amount and more. So what's happening is that you're buying back some of your liability from one end of the assessment group on property, you're buying back your liability, but you're digging your hole deeper and deeper and deeper and the reliance on the property tax is getting greater and greater and greater on average. The statistics show, and I stated the figures in the Budget, that on a per dollar assessment basis, and I compared the cities, that Winnipeg on a per dollar basis, including the rebate, is still the highest taxed city on a per dollar basis of homeowner value west of the Maritime Provinces. Now, Mr. Chairman, you can give me the statistics about a house on Polson Avenue, or wherever it may be, but the fact is that on average it's increasing at a rate that digs you deeper and deeper and deeper into this reliance on this program.

Now, I come back to the fact, is the province responsible for those creatures, their creations, the municipal councils and the school boards, and from what I hear tonight those fellows better start looking out for themselves, because they've been put to seed, and they're going to be used by this government as the whipping boys in this battle to try and abdicate responsibility for setting of the real property taxes on the properties of the homeowners and the farmers of Manitoba. Well they're preoccupied whether we'll wash it out or not. Let me tell you right now, it would be our prime objective to get rid of this sort of an inefficient program. Now if you say, will we wash it out? I say how many years do you give us, because right now you're up to \$77 million, and how fast can you absorb \$77 million into a grant structure? If the Foundation Program can be repaired in one year to the point where we can again establish an equitable school finance program, I assume we would do it one year, but I tell you one thing, it will come back to a Provincial Government recognizing its responsibility, which is to adequately finance, which we did, adequately finance its school boards and its municipalities that you don't have to go through this process, this very inefficient and backwards process, and don't give us the argument that, don't give us the argument that since it's done in Ontario it's a good thing - we hear that from you all the time. Don't give us that argument, just remember the fact that we probably, the former Conservative Government, which was even before the time I was in this Legislature, started this program and tried it out for two or three years and abandoned it. And abandoned it because it had the political courage, it had the political courage to abandon it. And it was, it was taken out of operation, and more credit to them, but I can't see this government doing it. They've got themselves into such a hole, I expect that they won't get out of it. Besides they have too much fun with it. They like to play class warfare with it. They have a lot of fun playing class warfare. They can take a certain income group with a certain assessment and persuade them that they really are in fact protecting them against those bad guys over there that have a high assessment. So rather than accepting their responsibility, rather than accepting their responsibility, rather than accepting the responsibility of truly financing their school boards and their municipalities in a fashion in which they should, they prefer to take the bucks, by-pass them and play class warfare with them and that's exactly what they're doing.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to make one more reference here in the debate that's taking place. You know the thing that is most interesting of all is not that the government uses this only to justify school tax rates and somehow reduce to some extent property taxes through this by direct rebate, they also use it, as has been indicated, to show it as reducing municipal rates. And that shows up too. It doesn't show in here as a school tax rebate, this is the Education Estimates, it shows as a Property Tax Credit, and it doesn't apply just to school taxes, it applies to municipal taxes as well. When the school tax is used up it applies to property tax as well, so it's applied to a second application, it's not just schools.

But thirdly, in the third way it's used - and this is in the literature not sent out by the government but sent out by the Premier himself to the constituencies of Manitoba - he shows this as a method of reducing income tax. That's the third application of this money. Now just remember when you make this third application, just remember that it has come into the government's hands by taxing property too extensively in the

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) first place. It comes in, part of it comes in, it comes to the government and then the bureaucracy sends out a cheque back to the individual. And it is justified on the basis on the one hand it's reducing school tax, which we're doing to-night; it will appear again when we're in Municipal Affairs because then it will be justified on the basis that it is reducing the taxes on the municipal rates; but thirdly, there'll be a brochure going out to every person who doesn't have an NDP member at least, but maybe it goes to all the 57 constituencies, showing them a table as to how Manitoba's income tax really isn't as bad as it looks, it's not 42½ percent of the federal rates, it is in fact 42½ percent of the federal rates. --(Interjection)-- It's going to come back to them as a reduction in income tax.

And then the fourth big swing is, it will be printed in the Globe and Mail. You see what a versatile procedure this is, Mr. Chairman, and all we have to do is set up the municipal councils and the school boards and sock it to 'em for part of those big taxes, because it allows these people to use it three times and when you really reach the pinnacle of achievement you get the Globe and Mail to publish it.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that we might even be a little less opposed to this - we're opposed to this system on the basis that it's just an inefficient way of financing something that you're responsible for - to take the money away and pay it back, plus a little advertising, plus a little bureaucracy, but what really gets the average citizen is when he gets that thing in the mail from the First Minister that says really our income tax isn't as bad as you think it is because you can subtract off the amount of the rebate from your income tax. Well, you can't have it three ways, Mr. Chairman. You can try, you've heard it said you can't have it both ways, well this government is trying to have it three ways. And it's not going to wash. You can keep talking all you like and we can fight in this Legislature all you like, but you know what, the people of Manitoba are going to decide and they really basically feel that your rebate system is a lot of nonsense. If you go back to the people and say to them in one simple statement, citizens of Manitoba, we're going to finance our school boards and we're going to finance our municipal councils in such a fashion that they can pass the savings on to you, that we're going to reduce your taxes and we're going to assume that responsibility, like any honest government should, because they were created by us in the first place, they're going to listen to you. But if you think they're going to buy all this nonsense, all this advertising that's going on, and all this bureaucracy that's going to handle this thing; if you don't think that they can't see through that, then in most cases you're wrong, because they can see through it. And I think you'd be far better off, I know you'd be far better off if you'd just simply face the facts of life and finance them properly. --(Interjection)-- Well okay, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Mines and Resources makes a big case of the party in his constituency or the four parties in his constituency have their taxes reduced. Let me ask you about the number of elderly people that never do apply, that never do get their money back. How many people - you've even extended this program to the point where people that are in your personal care homes, personal care homes, have to apply, file an income tax return in order to get this money back. Well, Mr. Chairman, why don't you finance your personal care homes to an equitable level where that sort of nonsense is not necessary? Mr. Chairman, personal care homes were instituted long before this government came to power. --(Interjection)-- Oh well, Mr. Chairman, let me explain to the good people opposite here. How many people in your personal care homes are actually applying for this thing?

A MEMBER: Many.

MR. CRAIK: I agree, many are, but many are not. They're not. So, you know, I'd like to know, because I know personally of many cases where people have not even been aware of this program. They go to a personal care home, they basically pay for their personal care because it's a program that is partially funded by the government; they pay their per diem rate, which is approximately equivalent to their basic Canada Pension and they pay it, and that's it. Comes the end of the year, many of them are in their 70s or 80s, and so on, individuals who are not even aware of this ridiculous, stupid method of financing property taxation. But still this government says, "It's not a property tax." You call it a property tax rebate, but you have it applied to personal care homes

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) where the people don't any more have an equity in that personal care home, or can be considered a renter any more than they can be from living in a hotel in Winnipeg. I mean this is the depth of ridiculousness that this whole program goes to. --(Interjection)-- Well I can tell you that you do a survey of the accountants in the Province of Manitoba, and they're maybe not even the best source, but ask them how many of the people, senior citizens, living in personal care homes --(Interjection)-- Better still, have you asked the administrators of the personal care homes? Have you done a survey of them, have you asked them how many people in your personal care homes are actually applying for this thing?

But you see how silly it gets? Property tax started out being a tax on property to pay for services to that property. It went on to administration for the purposes of maintaining that property in the municipalities. It went on to pay for schools. And all governments in all parts of the world realize that paying for schools on the basis of property tax is inequitable, it's not sensible, but it's done because they needed more sources of money at the local level and they did it. But now they're getting to the point where your property tax credit is also applying to people who are living in personal care homes that are built, and sponsored and subsidized and paid for by government through this cumbersome, stupid technique of asking an 80-year old person to file an income tax return that they haven't filed in all their life, is just the ultimate in stupidity. And you people believe in this stuff. You go on with this crazy technique when all you have to do is take the Foundation Program in Education, finance it properly, whether you're in Winnipeg or you're in Duck Mountain division, finance it properly to account for the discrepancies in the assessment values for students and go to them. They're not going to blow your money on you, they're going to spend it equitably, but you can't do that. You've got to go through this contorted technique of taking the money away from them, paying it back on this technique that ends up not only trying to do something for property tax but ends up subsidizing people in personal care homes and many of them get it, and many of them do not get it because they're not capable, not aware, and just don't file their income tax return in order to get it. So that's how, you know, nonsensical the whole system is. So let me tell you, the faster and sooner we could get out of this technique by putting up a proper financing program for schools and municipalities the sooner we'll do it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister for Urban Affairs): I just want to ask the member a question. Is he aware that in order for pensioners to qualify for the GIS they have to fill out an annual form, otherwise they will not get the GIS, and they are getting it? So therefore they're filling out forms.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: . . . Minister how many are actually applying for GIS because many aren't.

MR. MILLER: Those in personal care homes, I'd say over 90 percent, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition had made mention of the fact that via our tax rebate scheme that we take money out of the left pocket and place it in the right pocket, and the Honourable Member for Morris asks from his seat, and vice versa. But, there's one point that both of them forget, that they're not the pockets from the same pair of pants, and there's the big difference.

The honourable member speaks of class warfare. When I ran in 1966, the first time that I was elected to this Legislature, and I was told about the class warfare then, about the high cost of medical services, discriminating against the people in my constituency about the high cost of automobile insurance, about the high cost of drugs, and about the high taxes, and they were complaining about class warfare. They were complaining about the class warfare that the previous government was waging for years and years and years. Now, they're accusing us of class warfare, of vote buying.

Well, Mr. Chairman, we've been through an election subsequent to the one when

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) we were elected government and what my constituents tell me is - yes, the majority of my constituents, the vast majority of them, a very large majority of them express their thanks for finally recognizing the needs of the person with fixed income, on low income, and doing something to assist his lot, and not the type of vote buying scheme that was outlined in that June 1968 memo. You know, the solid opposition ridings, the sold government, marginal government, etc., and then the point rating of the various programs that multiply one times the other and that's to indicate the priority that the government is to assign to the various programs that they wish to announce on the eve of an election.

Now, the Honourable Member for Riel also spoke about the tax burden on the wage earner. Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that the Globe and Mail is a socialist newspaper. I've never heard it said so. On Friday, April 23, 1976, to give a comparison how the provinces compare, how the provinces compare on the sum total of federal tax, provincial tax, health premium, property tax, tax credits or rebates, and you know what, Mr. Chairman, a person, a head of a four member family earning \$8,226 in Ontario will face a total of \$1,078 unavoidable taxes. He has to pay his federal tax, he has to pay the provincial tax, he has to pay \$384 health premium, \$384.00. At that income level he would qualify for \$215 tax credit or rebate, whatever they call it in that province, for a total net tax of \$1,078. Now, in Ontario and so it goes, Quebec total of \$1,056; New Brunswick \$958; Nova Scotia, \$948; British Columbia, \$939; P.E.I., \$936; Alberta, \$785; Saskatchewan, \$754; Newfoundland, \$720; Manitoba, for a total of \$682 - \$682 as compared with that Tory government in Ontario that's supposed to have the answer to all the problems - \$1,078 unavoidable tax, and this is making no reference to other taxes. This is making no reference to other taxes, this is making no reference to our Pharmacare Program, this is making no reference to a difference in gasoline tax, sales tax, just these unavoidable taxes, and a deficit budget of over a billion dollars in the Province of Ontario. So that, Mr. Chairman, is class warfare.

The Honourable Member for Riel goes on to say that we have no concern, that we're letting the school divisions down, that we have no concern for them. Now, Mr. Chairman, never have we in any way put a lid on, or any restraints on school board expenditures. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I want to give you a few figures by way of comparison. In the Province of British Columbia, and this is on the basis of this year's Estimates for 1976, in the Province of British Columbia, you know, where now they've rid themselves of those terrible socialists and they have their Social Credit Government in, and that Social Credit Government is going to cure all the ills, well, Mr. Chairman, in British Columbia the total provincial contribution including tax credits, the total provincial contribution that it pays of the total school board expenditures is 53.4 percent, 53.4 percent. The Province of Alberta - that wealthy Province of Alberta with that Conservative Government - a total of 69.7 percent. Saskatchewan, a poorer province than Alberta or B.C. for that matter, 73.7 percent is the provincial contribution. And ours is 74.1 percent for this current year.

And, Mr. Chairman, no matter which way you look at it, if you make a comparison, make a comparison of total school expenditures . . . Let's take a look at total school expenditures on a per capita basis, relate it to the population - I'm sure that there is a relationship, Mr. Chairman, because the larger the population the more children you have going to school, the higher the expenditures. The population of British Columbia, I don't know offhand, in the order of three million or thereabouts, between two and a half and three million - very well, bordering on three million, for a total expenditure, a total school board expenditure of \$785 million, running somewhere in the order of \$250-\$275 million per million population, per million population. --(Interjection)-- All right, the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, he wants to be convinced. I'll be glad to; I'll talk directly to him, and I will not ignore you, Mr. Chairman, no. \$275 million per million population. The population of Alberta is running well over two million at the present time, for a total school board expenditure of \$673 million or somewhere in the order of \$300 plus million per million population. --(Interjection)-- Saskatchewan? I just finished telling you. Oh, the one living in Alberta, that \$8,200 a year man would be paying \$785 of

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) unavoidable taxes, \$103 more than in Manitoba where he pays 682. And in Saskatchewan, in Saskatchewan, Mr. Chairman, with a population bordering on a million, their total school expenditures run at \$284 million - that's their Estimates for the current fiscal year. In Manitoba with a population of a million, plus a few thousand, the total school board expenditures are estimated for this current year at \$337.6 million per million population. So where's all this pressure that the opposition is accusing the government of imposing upon school boards to cut back on expenditures, Mr. Chairman?

Then let's look at the total provincial contribution - and we make that on a per capita basis. That population bordering on three million in the Province of B. C., their provincial government estimates that it will pay in total by way of grants and tax credits, \$419.5 million, for the three million population, \$130-\$140 million per million population. Alberta, \$469 million for their two million population, \$225 million - well of course, you know, everyone will say, and I would be the first to agree, Alberta is a more affluent province, of course it should be in a position to offer a greater measure of support to education than we could. Saskatchewan, \$209 million total provincial contribution including the tax credit or rebate, for their - and their population is roughly equal to that of ours, a few thousand, ten, fifteen, twenty thousand perhaps less than, but it's roughly the same. I'm sure if one were to calculate this to the last dollar, it would come out only to a difference of a few cents per capita because the difference of population is so slight, in the Province of Manitoba for our million, \$250 million total support by way of tax credit plus direct grants to schools. And even, Mr. Chairman, if one wanted to. . . if one were to go through all the books of all the school divisions, all the municipalities and identify each and every dollar which way it went, I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, that you would find that at the very least, 75 to 80 percent of the tax rebate money can be attributed directly to the reduction of school tax. And certainly in an area such as Winnipeg and its school divisions and many others - and many many others.

So, Mr. Chairman, no matter which way you slice it, no matter which way you slice it, what we've done is we've managed to do two things: No. 1, we've allowed the education program to expand, the school divisions to enrich it to meet the local needs of a community, and we managed to accomplish that in a manner that would be most equitable to those who would have to pick up the tab, and that is the man on the street, the taxpayer. And it's true, of course, we're the first to admit that we haven't reduced taxes for everyone. In fact those earning, what? \$25,000, \$30,000-plus taxable income - yes they will be paying a higher total tax, and many others will be paying a higher total tax, and the person earning a higher income doesn't qualify for the maximum rebate either. Of course, we realize that. But it is that scheme that brings about a greater measure of equity than the flat \$50.00 cheque that the Roblin administration sent out for a few years.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let's look at what we did this year. Let's look at what we did this year in addition to easing the tax burden on the taxpayer, the total expenditures, the total school board expenditures increased from 1975 to 1976 by a total of \$45 million. There was an increase in provincial grants to school divisions amounting to \$20 million; an increase in tax credit amounting to \$12 million, for a total of \$32 million. One doesn't have to involve himself in any complex and detailed mathematics to subtract 32 from 45 to arrive at the figure of \$13 million being the net increase in the special levy to the taxpayers in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out this to you, and I make a special point of it, that this year in particular when perhaps all the people of Manitoba are feeling the inflationary pressures more so than ever before we did take the deliberate steps to do what I've just outlined, which resulted in a net increase of only \$13 million in the special levy as compared with an increase of a special levy last year of \$16 million. This year we did better, and the year before there was a net increase of \$24 million. So, Mr. Chairman, when the opposition members get up and rant and rave about inflation, what are we doing about inflation, what are we doing about inflation to help the poor little guy? Here's an example of what we're doing about inflation. Here's an example of what we're doing about inflation to assist the one least able to pay.

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister again continues to amaze me as we go through these Estimates. I was pleased to have the former Finance Minister enter into the debate and the Minister of Mines give us the benefit of his wisdom, because I have some figures here that I hope those two members and the Minister will explain as we talk about this special levy. And the one that I'll deal with is Duck Mountain School Division and I'll use as a classic example one of these low income areas where there are no \$30,000 homes, there are no \$40,000 homes; I'll use the LGD of Park as a base to prove my argument, which includes the villages of San Clara, Boggy Creek which I'm sure members are quite familiar with.

A MEMBER: That's not in Duck Mountain though.

MR. MCKENZIE: Intermountain. This is Intermountain I'm dealing with this time. If I said Duck Mountain, I apologize, I was wrong.

Mr. Chairman, we'll look at the special levy that the LGD of Park was asked to raise in the year 1973, which is a matter of \$12,353.

That was '73, this new program that the Minister and the government was telling us about, this tax release that was given to those people out there, was already working. In 1974 that special levy was increased to those people to \$16,963, a startling increase of 37.3 percent, the Local Government District of Park. Let's move on then. In '75 the special levy to the taxpayers of the Local Government District of Park went up to \$27,197, a startling increase of 60.3 percent, 60.3 percent. Now let's move on to the next year. In 1975 it went up to \$31,020, another 14.1. Now just add those three years, 37.3 plus 60.3, that's 97.6 plus 14.1, that was the taxpayers in the Local Government District of Park. --(Interjection)-- Special levy, special levy. --(Interjection)-- Right, that's the special levy that was levied against those taxpayers that live in the Local Government District of Park.

Mr. Chairman, the school division had to go and ask the Public Finance Board for permission to raise this kind of money. And if in fact as the Minister said as a moment ago, that he has never put a lid on the school divisions, then why are these budgets screened by the Public Finance Board? I would suggest to the Honourable Minister that there is a lid put on the expenditures of the school divisions at the level of the Public Finance Board.

So, Mr. Chairman, I will just go on and fill out the end of this commentary by the Board on this basic problem, not only this but the towns and the municipalities, and I'll read the last clause. This is what the Board says: "It is inevitable to observe that education costs are on the incline, with enrollment on the decline. Such a movement if not rectified, without a doubt will cause the system to collapse and will take the effort of all of us to prevent this from happening." Now what more statement would the Minister like to have on the record tonight as we're dealing with his Estimates, to get some semblance of order across. The system is not working, the Foundation Program is not providing the students with an equal opportunity for education and I'll read that again for the Minister in case that he wants to hear it. "It is inevitable to observe that education costs are on the incline, with enrollment on the decline. Such a movement if not rectified, without a doubt will cause the system to collapse and will take the effort of us all to prevent this from happening."

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to the Honourable Member for Roblin, to the question that he put to me, and also suggest to him that it would assist us in the course of this debate if in addition to the special levy figures which he quoted for that portion of Intermountain School Division, if he would also total up the net amounts paid by the taxpayers in that same area for that same period of time, and indicate the number of taxpayers who paid no school tax.

Mr. Chairman, the honourable member seems to imply that the Public Schools Finance Board in some fashion puts a lid on school board expenditures. The Public Schools Finance Board reviews budgets simply for the purpose of calculating the level of provincial support that it offers, that it will offer in a year, and that is a far cry from putting a lid on the school board expenditures.

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd)

The honourable member quoted from the San Clara newspaper, or from somewhere, a complaint from the Board about increasing costs and declining enrollment. Now I am certain that the Honourable Member for Roblin will remember when I announced the increases in school grants because that was one feature that should have been of particular interest to him and I know he would have wanted to take that message back to his constituents; when I announced that in school divisions within which there will be a decline in enrollment in excess of one percent of the previous year's enrollment, then there's a special grant paid of \$350 per student loss in enrollment in excess of that one percent. In other words, if the enrollment of Intermountain School Division should be in the order of 2,500 and if the enrollment were to decrease by 75, one percent of 2,500 is 25, leaving you 50, so 50 times 350 will determine the amount of the special grant that the school division will receive for that year, recognizing the fact that it isn't always possible for a school division to reorganize its staffing structure and whatever; it can't be flexible to that extent, can't be responsive that rapidly, so there might be a period of time when they would be faced with having an additional teacher overgrant or whatever else. At any rate, the state of affairs may be such that their expenditures may be disproportionately higher, so therefore to ease that load we are paying that grant to all school divisions in the province which may suffer a declining enrollment in this fiscal year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 48(a). The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I listened with interest when the Honourable Minister of Mines started his debate on reply . . .

A MEMBER: He's not here.

MR. MINAKER: Which is unfortunate - the Minister is not here . . . reply to my honourable colleague from Fort Garry and made innuendoes that the Honourable Member from Fort Garry and myself were only thinking about the school boards, not the taxpayers. But this is normal for the Honourable Minister of Mines to make an assumption and then debate his point around that assumption, whether it's correct or not. And I'd like to draw to the attention of the government side that what the honourable colleague from Fort Garry and myself have been talking about for many years in this House - for myself only for three years - is the fact that school divisions have different tax levies in the City of Winnipeg. Maybe the members on the other side aren't aware of this, that unlike the municipal tax for the City of Winnipeg which is one base for a resident homeowner, it is not true for the taxpayer when it comes to education taxes and it varies quite a bit from community committee to community committee, and this is why we make reference to the school divisions. This is very important, in my opinion, and maybe the honourable members in the back row on the other side aren't aware of this, that there is a variation on a home in the City of Winnipeg as much as \$144 a year in education tax. And not a big home, a home of \$6,000 assessment, and it doesn't matter whether you're 65 or 35, if you live in that home, depending on whether you live in Seine River or whether you live in the City of Winnipeg, you could pay \$144 more a year for education tax. So I suggest to the Honourable Minister of Education that maybe we make accusations that he is trying to create a class warfare - he's not only trying to create a class warfare, he's trying to create a territorial warfare. It doesn't matter whether you're 65 or whether you're super rich or what, this year, if you happen to live in Seine River School Division you pay \$280 tax for education; if you live in the City of Winnipeg you pay \$441 on the same assessed house value of \$7,000. Now if that's not territorial consideration I don't know what is. So that is the school taxes on a \$7,000 assessed home. So this is the point of issue that we're trying to raise, that it doesn't matter whether you're 65, 75 or 35, if you own a home and happen to live in the Seine River School district you pay \$280, and if you live in the City of Winnipeg with the same assessed home, you pay \$441, a difference of \$161. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the proposal that the Minister of Mines put forward to us was garbage, and that's what it was, nothing but garbage, and he knows it.

I was very interested in the Honourable Minister of Education, his comments in reply to the Honourable Leader with regards to - but it doesn't go in the same pockets,

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. MINAKER cont'd) and that's right. He says, Mr. Chairman, in reply, that it goes in the left hand pocket and it goes back in the right.

MR. HANUSCHAK: But not in the same pair of pants.

MR. MINAKER: But not in the same pair of pants, right. Mr. Chairman, I agree 100 percent with the Minister of Education, because if we look at the report of the Provincial Auditor of this year, what does this government think about these taxes that it's putting in its pants? Well, it decides under individual income tax that, well we'll take \$444 million off of the individual in Manitoba and we'll put it in this pocket. Gee, that's a lot of money, maybe we might leave it there right now, we won't give it all back right now. And looked at the corporation income tax and decided to take another \$30.3 million; looked at the retail sales tax and took another \$26.4 million than it did the year before and it got given to it another \$25.4 million more than it had the year before from the Federal Government; and it decided to take another \$9.2 million more from the mining people; and then it took another \$5.7 million from the revenue from the Liquor Commission than it had the year before; and then all of a sudden it decides, gee, we got something like \$152.3 million left over here in our pocket, right there - oh I guess it would be right there in the left hand pocket, that's the side they prefer. And then they said: What will we give back this year, you know, what will we give back and who will we give it back to, yes, who will we give it back to? So it decided, well, maybe we'll give something like, oh 2.4 percent more we'll give back to the education people, that's \$6.8 million. Then it thought, well, maybe we'll give another 19 percent of that back in overall rebates, a total of \$28 1/2 million, we'll give that back to the people, but we'll keep that other, we'll keep the rest of that \$144 million or that \$147 million in that pocket. And that's what we're talking about, Mr. Chairman, is this government is locked into this idea that if it gets money from the people it's got to keep it and spend it; don't give it back to them or don't take it in the first place, it's got to take it because that's the way they think.

The Honourable Minister of Education talks about, we want to look at the school program, we want it to expand and we also want to make it equitable. Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell the Honourable Minister in the area that I represent, in the last three years, that the special levy in the last two years has gone up 80 percent. And what did the Honourable Minister and his government decide to give back? Seven percent of it. And this year he makes a great to-do of giving back something like - I don't know whether I have the correct figures here - something like \$32 million out of the overall increase of - maybe the Honourable Minister can even advise me on that particular figure - that they're giving it back. Yet, is it ever interesting that all of a sudden the education tax, the overall spending in St. James is still going up 12 percent this year. And what happens if we look at that taxpayer in Winnipeg, not in St. James, let's look at Winnipeg because they get, believe it or not, the worst deal. They're the people who are at the present time under this split system of figuring out how education is spread through the City of Winnipeg, get the worst deal. And what happens to that home? And I don't think a \$6,000 assessed home, Mr. Chairman, is a big home. I think that's an average home in Winnipeg or in St. James or in Fort Garry. That's, you know, I would say the average individual that's on that lower income. And what happened to him this year in the City of Winnipeg with the tax increase? Well I'll tell you, Mr. Chairman, in 1975 he had a 51 mill assessment against his property for education tax; this year he's got 63. So what does it work out to? This year he's taxed \$378 for his education, last year his tax \$307, so it's an increase of \$71.00. And what does the Honourable Minister say? Even if he takes the complete tax credit system of \$50.00 for the lowest income person who qualifies, the person is still looking at another \$21.00 he's got to find, not even counting the municipal tax that will increase.

So this Minister has very clearly said, Mr. Chairman, that he gets all of the tax credit for property tax credit - he said it here tonight, very clearly. So when we deal with the Municipal Affairs Department, make sure that he doesn't take the credit for that tax rebate because this Minister, Mr. Chairman, has taken it, he's taken it all. And he tries to claim that he's looking after the education system where, in the area that I represent, in two years they had to look for 80 percent increase, cover it and this

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. MINAKER cont'd) government picked up seven percent of that tab. And this year they're trying to be big people and try and claim that they're picking up all of it. And I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that is incorrect because they have an 11.8 percent increase in our area and I would like to find out where this is all going. And when I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this government is taking it into its pocket, I'll agree with the Minister that it's not all going into the same pockets. It's going into the government's pocket, they're keeping the majority of it; they're deciding how they're going to spend it, on Saunders, on Flyer and the rest of them. This is how they're spending it, they're not giving it back in priorities.

There's no doubt about it, when you look at the Budget this year on the overall expenditures that we're looking at, when you compare it through the years, the percentage of the overall expenditures by this government for education has gone down, and they cannot deny it. The First Minister didn't even reply to that comment, he made an offhand remark with regards to some of the comments I made during the Budget Speech. But I would suggest that when you look at the amounts of money that's going to education today, some \$309 million under the overall Budget, and you compare the same amount of money in the overall Budget that went to education back in 1969, that it's down some 30 percent, that's what it is. So we know where the priorities of this government are. It's not in education to assist the property owners, it's in some other avenue, some other area of responsibility that they've chosen. And they have decided that the property owner will pay for that education system, yet this Minister stands up, Mr. Chairman, and tries to claim that they are taking a greater share than they did before. Yet in the very area that I represent and quote - I'll quote right from the comments from the school board that represents St. James-Assiniboia, and they said exactly: "Estimates for 1976 are based on a 40 percent provincial contribution." Forty percent, although the province paid 48 percent of 1975 expenditures. Yet this Minister stands up, Mr. Chairman, and tries to claim that they're talking about 70 or 76 percent. In the area that I represent they're contributing something like 40 percent towards the education. And, Mr. Chairman, if it's 40 percent in St. James-Assiniboia, if I can believe the homeowners' tax schedule and I think it's fairly correct, for a \$7,000 assessed home, when we compare that in St. James-Assiniboia, the school mill rate is 55 mills which represents 40 percent contribution by the province of \$385; in Winnipeg it's 63 mills, they have to pay \$441 on the same house. So they're obviously worse off. And if we look at Assiniboia, they're \$371, \$399 for St. Boniface, Fort Garry \$413, so no wonder my honourable colleague from Fort Garry is complaining, because he's even paying more than St. James is, and the City of Winnipeg is the worst off. So it's very difficult, Mr. Chairman, to believe this Minister's comments when he makes statements that the government is picking up a greater portion of the tax burden on education this year when, in fact, the figures that the people are paying in dollars and cents on their tax bills does not verify these statements.

MR. HANUSCHAK: The honourable member conveniently forgot to mention two or three additional figures, referring to that home assessed at \$6,000 with a school tax levy of 55 mills last year and 63 mills this year, at --(Interjection)-- No, his first figure was six, six or 7,000, well \$6,000 - I believe he said \$6,000 --(Interjection)-- Yes So I heard him correctly the first time, \$6,000, 55 mills is \$330; \$330 minus \$175 is \$155; 63 of 6,000 is \$378 minus \$200; minus \$200, that's \$178. The special levy charged against that person's property has increased by something bordering on 15 percent and with the increased assistance by way of the increase in property tax rebate, the net increase in the cost to that taxpayer is also in the order of 15 percent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 48(a)--pass. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: A couple of questions at this juncture, Mr. Chairman. I still find a wide gulf of credibility, I guess, existing between the two sides with respect to the proper mathematics with respect to what the correct figures are. Certainly everything that we have and everything that's been made available to us, and I would assume to the government, would indicate that the province's share is substantially down as my colleague from St. James and my leader and I have said, and the Member for Roblin and others,

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) and that the provincial program is depending more and more on the property owner and the real property taxpayer. The Minister's figures seem to indicate a very wide discrepancy in terms of information and I don't suppose we're going to be able to resolve that difference. We have not been satisfactorily answered though with respect to our claim that the trend has been, as we've suggested, for reducing input, reducing support in the province and increasing burdensome demands on the real property owner.

But let me ask the Minister a couple of questions if I may at this juncture, Mr. Chairman. It's my understanding that the Minister's Advisory Committee on Education Finance recommended major changes to the grant structure last year, and that the Minister was in agreement with many of those proposals and that he stated at the time that Cabinet would give them very serious consideration. I would ask the Minister what kind of consideration has he given the grant structure and the request for major changes to it and the proposals and recommendations that came from his Advisory Committee on Education Finance. Let me also ask him what the maximum of additional grants is that school divisions can expect in 1976. It's my understanding that that figure is somewhere around \$10.3 million, the maximum additional grant total that school divisions can expect in 1976 from the province, \$10.3 million. If that's the case, well then there seems to be a credibility gap between what the province is doing and what school divisions were assured or felt they were assured the province was going to do. Because I believe that they were under the impression, rightly or wrongly, but they believe rightly, from the Minister, that there would be substantial increase in provincial government support and that the government recognized that in order to maintain the present level of service, to maintain the present level of service and to maintain the present level of provincial government support, there would have to be an increase of grants in the neighbourhood of \$25 million, so that certainly was the impression that school divisions had, that there would be that kind of upgrading or would be that kind of increase in the neighbourhood of \$25 million, and it appears at the present time that that figure will be something like 10 or \$10 1/2 million. Who is going to make up the difference? How is the cost going to be borne? Are programs going to be cut back or is the special levy just going to be increased again, and also my other question about the kind of recommendations that were forthcoming from the Minister's Advisory Committee on Education Finance for a reorganization of the grant structure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I thought I had . . . in fact not I thought, in fact I did answer the honourable member, or I commented on the very point that the Honourable Member for Fort Garry raised now, in speaking a few moments ago, when I did point out . . . and one has to look at the sum total of the main Estimates and the supplementary and one would find the following - and I will go through this again: The increase in total expenditures of the school divisions for this current year is \$45 million; the increase in provincial grants, a total of \$20 million. Look at the sum total of both figures. Increase in tax credit, \$12 million for a total of \$32 million; 32 from 45 leaves a net increase of \$13 million. Now, Mr. Chairman, this does relate to some of the recommendations which came forth from the Advisory Committee. One of their main concerns was reducing the inequities amongst school divisions, between "the have and the have not" school divisions.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to draw a couple of points to your attention which bears this out, that this is exactly what we've done. I've made reference to the small schools grants, those schools having a population in excess of 10 percent of the total enrollment enrolled in schools with a population of fewer than 175 pupils qualify for an additional grant of \$10.00 per pupil, and the declining enrollment grant which I had commented on earlier where those school divisions wherein there may be declining enrollment exceeding one percent of the previous year's enrollment. And in addition to that, and I think that this probably is more significant than anything, I want to draw your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the per pupil grant, the foundation per pupil grant which in 1973 was \$50.00 per pupil and this year it's doubled to \$100 per pupil and this year it's doubled to \$100.00

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) per pupil; plus the equalization grant which was inversely proportional to the balanced assessment per pupil which in 1973 ranged from a low of \$3.00 per pupil to a high of \$21.00. This year it's from a low of \$20.00 to a maximum of \$125.00 per pupil. In other words, in 1973, looking at the total of the two, the per pupil grants, that's the foundation plus the equalization, ranged from \$53.00 to \$71.00, and today it ranges from a total of \$120 to \$225.00. Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the Honourable Member for Fort Garry that the matter of education finance is not something that is dealt with in one year and tucked away, put away for years to come, this is a matter that's under continuous review from year to year, and I'm sure that come next year, whatever further changes will have to be made that will be within the ability of this government to pay, that those changes will be made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 48(a). The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: One further question, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to ask the Minister whether the authorized teacher grant formula is under review and is going to be re-examined. I understand the pupil-teacher ratio is declining in the province, and if that's the case and it appears to be - I think it's down in the last five years from 21.1 to one to 18.3 to one - if that's the case, why should not the authorized teacher grant formula be overhauled and recalculated to accommodate the change in ratio?

MR. HANUSCHAK: That, Mr. Chairman, at this point in time is under review.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 48(a). The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I've been listening with interest to the variety of figures that have been quoted from this side of the House and from the other side as to the proportion that is paid from general revenues of the province, the total cost of education and those that are paid by the taxpayers in the form of special levies, and I suppose that argument will go on and perhaps it bears out our problem about the level of achievement in the basics. There's certainly some difference in our arithmetic here, and perhaps the Manitoba Association of School Trustees are entirely in error, and perhaps the school superintendents that have been quoted from time to time. But certainly the impression seems to be pretty broadly through the land that the percentage of support from general revenues of the province for education is declining and has been declining since the Foundation Program was put together back in 1968. And I'd like to review the brave words contained in this document that I have had in my desk for eight years. It says that the cost of education and welfare should be paid out of government revenues, and the people who see their special levies going up and up and up wonder how this strong assertion will ever be achieved.

And it's also interesting to note the assertions that are made from time to time by various people. The First Minister . . . this is 1970, December 16th: "The province plans to assume 85 percent of school costs." This is Altona: "Premier Ed Schreyer told the farmers here Tuesday that it would be too gigantic and destructive to remove in one step the cost of education from municipal property tax, but he does say that the government hopes to shift 85 percent of the expenses to the broader provincial tax base during the long-range program." Well we started pretty close to 80 percent, I think the First Minister will agree, and now we have gone down to - what figure shall I quote? I was going to say 55 percent plus or minus ten, depending on you play the game with the credits and so on. So it's perhaps hardly moving in the direction which the First Minister so bravely called for back in December of 1970.

He also made some remarks about the fact that we'd just about reached the peak in costs of education and that we just couldn't afford any more costs in that direction and that something had to be done, and that we were looking at different cheaper types of construction for schools and so on. Well, the costs of education in spite of those warnings have gone up almost double since that time, and the percentage contributed by the province to take away and reduce the burden of the real property taxpayer has gradually declined. And if we continue to debate in specific terms just what percentage that decline is, I think we will probably never reach any firm decisions, at least certainly not in this forum and during this period of the debate of the Minister in 1976.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to go to some more specific questions for the

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

(MR. MCGILL cont'd) Minister in connection with this major sum of \$154,205,000—odd that is shown in his Estimates today as the - how is it described? It's school grants and other assistance for 1976-77. I'm wondering, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister can tell me, is the special grant for the Frontier School Division included in this sum, and if so, how much is it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Sir, it is included in this item, it's in the order of \$5.584 million.

MR. MCGILL: That's included in this total sum of \$154 million. How does that compare with last year's grant to Frontier School Division?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Last year it was \$3.866 million.

MR. MCGILL: Well over a million dollars of increase. I wonder if the Minister could explain the reason for that percentage increase in the case of the Frontier School Division.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I could take the question as notice and provide the honourable member a breakdown of the expenditures. I believe the honourable member did indicate that he has a number of questions to ask of me, so if he wishes to proceed with his remaining questions.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, this is a rather sizeable increase in terms of percentage. I thought the Minister might have some general response to that. I wasn't asking for a specific detail on every item but when there's an approximately 40 percent increase in the grant for Frontier schools the Minister must surely have something in mind that would justify this increase.

While the Minister is looking that up I wonder if he could tell me what other sums are included in that \$154 million besides the Frontier School Division. What other sums are included in the \$154 million besides the sum for Frontier School Division and the Foundation Grants? We know of the Foundation Grants and we now find that there's a \$5.5 million for Frontier School Division as well.

MR. HANUSCHAK: The \$5.5 million for Frontier School Division is an estimate. It's not a final estimate at this point in time; we do not have the final figure at this moment. I would hope that the final figure would be somewhat less than that. In fact I think it's realistic to think in terms of something, oh splitting the difference between last year's \$3.8 million and the requested \$5.5 million. So it would be somewhere closer to 4.5, 4.6 and also a transfer of funds due to a change in formula.

The breakdown of the \$154 million: Salary, \$76.8 million; Maintenance Administration Supply, \$21.4 million; Transportation, \$11.4 million; Capital Bus, \$3 million; Debt Servicing, \$22.9; Other Capital, \$6 million; Print and Non-print, \$3.5 million; Vocational per Pupil, \$2.1 million; the per pupil grants, \$21.2 million; Small Schools, half a million; Declining Enrollment, \$1.2 million; Finance Board Salaries and Expenses, \$50,000; Interest Charges, \$600,000; for a total of \$170.8 million.

Out of that the Foundation Levy covers \$34.1 million leaving a provincial share of \$136.6 million plus other grants of \$23.6 million made up of the Equalization Grants, \$10.1 million; Special Revenue, \$145,000; Frontier, \$5.5 million - and I should mention that in that increase the cost of the School Milk Program is included in Frontier School Division budget which in itself accounts for \$240,000, \$242.5 thousand which was not part of the Frontier School Division budget last year; Local Control, \$150,000; School Health, \$50,000. So whatever increase there is in the Frontier School Division budget the \$390,000 - \$440,000 should be borne in mind, that were added in there. Tuition Fees Indian Students, \$2.1 million; Tuition Fees not Indian Students, \$390,000; Special Grants, \$552,000; Northern Cost of Living, \$624,000; School Nutrition, \$180,000; French Bilingualism, \$2,045,000; St. Boniface College, \$100,000; Shared Services, \$312.9 thousand; Other \$38.5 thousand; Special Needs, \$484,000; Native Para-professionals, \$335,000; Evening Schools, \$146; Core, \$100,000 for a total of \$23.6 million.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brandon West. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether this wouldn't be a good time to adjourn for the evening and perhaps the Minister, if it's necessary for him to elaborate on his remarks, he could do so tomorrow. So I would move that Committee rise.

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

MR. CHAIRMAN(Mr. Walding): There being a quorum, the Committee will come to order. I would refer honourable members to Page 35 in their Estimates Book. Resolution 70(c)(1) - the Honourable Minister.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, I want to just give another statistic which I believe was asked for Friday which I did not give this afternoon when I was dealing with the number of fatalities and other accidents, whether they occurred daytime or night. For whatever it's worth I think it's a good statistic and this is for 1974 again. This is dealing with the age groups. Kind of different, driver, how many we have and so on.

Now if you take the age group 16 to 19, there were in 1974, 53,120 drivers in Manitoba in that age group, 53 thousand. Out of that 53 thousand in this age group between 16 and 19, 11,449 were involved in some type of accident, reportable accidents, right. We don't have any statistics here - we probably have but I haven't been asked by you how many were fatal and so on but that's beside the point. --(Interjection)-- 11,449 which constitutes about 21.7 percent.

Then if you take the group between 20 and 24, that age group, there are roughly 71,000 drivers of this particular age group in the Province of Manitoba. There were 12,480 of this group were involved in some form of accident for a percentage of 17.5 percent. Then if you take the age group between 25 and 34 there were roughly 117,700 drivers in Manitoba and 13,480 were involved in one type of accident or another, or a percentage of 11.5 percent. I believe that someone asked for this information, I'm not sure of who it was. Nevertheless I think these are good statistics to have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anything in particular on the older drivers. What about 34 and over?

MR. BURTNIAK: No I don't have anything from 34 up, Mr. Chairman. There may be something available but I haven't heard. --(Interjection -- In the previous statistic that I gave you, drivers involved in accidents period, but not related to the total drivers of that particular age group. That's a little different. We have them broken down in various age groups but not exactly the way we have it in here. It's a little different story. No doubt there were a number of fatalities here too but we don't have that. Did I go too fast on that? I'm sure someone asked for information, I forgot to give it out this afternoon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Chairman, thank you. This afternoon I was dealing with sort of broad brush approach to some of my concerns pertaining to safety and safety education. These alarming figures are an indication that we're somehow or other missing the point or not getting our message across because of course with the new fad in the sixties and seventies of drugs combined with alcohol it's a wonder we don't have more fatalities.

I was dealing with the role of the medical profession, and the Minister, after we broke, indicated that there was some regulation or some moral indication that the medical profession was to supply certain information to the Motor Vehicle Branch and as a newcomer I would be very much appreciative if - unfortunately I didn't read that section of his report - if I could be enlightened in that area.

As I mentioned I was concerned with people with heart trouble and fainting and many things. When you read about why somebody crossed a centre strip of a highway, it's because he had fainted or he had a heart seizure or something along those lines and it seems that if we do cherish life that some of these things should be taken care of.

I also had, in response to - I don't know why they pick on me - a lot of requests in the area of safety checks. I had a number of so-called knowledgeable people indicate to me that under certain conditions radial tires weren't safe. I'm sorry to see that in both meetings the Minister of Consumer Affairs isn't here because I think that many things that are discussed under the Highways Minister have a consumer related situation to them. I would like to know if the Minister has ever entertained a study to this effect, that under certain conditions radial tires present a certain safety hazard.

The other is that many people have challenged me to find out from the Minister under the area of truck safety checks. They say some of the worst vehicles and unsafe vehicles are in the used truck trade. It would be interesting some time to find out the percentage of trucks compared to cars and the accidents that they are involved in. In

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. WILSON cont'd)other words what I'm possibly saying is you would think that truck drivers would be superior people to handle a particular vehicle yet it seems that whenever there's a fatality, it's usually a truck involved somewhere along the line.

Under the 40,000 inspections it occurred to me - and it's something I raised in the House especially under a resolution we talked about - is I feel that looking in the paper and the news media, in the paper, that there's a lot of public auctions. I would think that these cars that are being sold should be subject to some sort of safety check. I had the privilege of attending a sale on Saturday which was advertised as Manitoba Government vehicles. I will say this: of the small percentage of the cars sold that were Manitoba vehicles, they were safety checked. One could almost feel a sense of relief when they knew it was a government car that it had been safety checked, that they were buying a car that they could drive out of there and it would indeed prove roadworthy. I still have not been able to find out who bought the two new tires for the back of all of these government cars but we'll look into that some other time.

It proved a point, that the other vehicles being sold were part of a growing trend amongst auto body shops and what I call derelict car hospitals in which so many of these old tanks that have been laid to rest in fields are fished off and taken out to McArthur's Towing and taken to different body shops and they're put into a situation where they're sold for \$500 or \$600 and really it's unfortunate that there is such a thing as poor young people in the world that through lack of finances and through lack of being available, or have a credit rating, have to resort to driving these things. Combined with the youth and condition of the vehicle, it probably lends itself to that 21 percent that the Minister talked about. You know you combine the attitude, the inexperience on the roads, together with their economic situation where they have to buy these cars from the derelict car hospitals it does present a problem and I think that we almost need a safety squad to go around and sort of expose these body shops that are involved in this. There's even been areas that a lot of them may or may not be involved in, the interesting practice of tampering with serial numbers but that's something that the law establishment will find out. Basically in summing up I'm talking about truck safety checks; I'm talking about my concern about a study of radial tires and again cars that are sold at public auction. In my opinion if they couldn't pass a safety check they should be sold to General Shredder or sold to the auto parts people. As I say, the government makes all the money during the lifetime of the automobile. They make all the revenue from it. It seems they should assist in putting it to rest. I would like to say also that I think the 30-day limit on your tax is a little too short because that means in many cases a person who buys a car - because it doesn't have a warrantee on it finds out that he's bought a lemon so then he has to go out and buy another one. Each time he's getting rapped five percent. In other words I think a working man should under certain conditions be allowed to have - the 30 days in my opinion is too short. In other words apparently the refund is only allowed up to 30 days and I wonder what the reason was for that short period of time. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 70 (c)(1) - the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Yes. I believe I had my name on before the supper hour. The other day, I believe it was on Thursday, the Minister gave us figures of- I just can't remember exactly but I thought it was 38,795 total accidents in the province of which 30,000 were from the urban area of Winnipeg. The figures that have just been now given to us in the three age groups, the accidents there is 37,409. And we're up to age 34 now. Is the difference, the age group from 34 up to whichever age, the ages of the people who are now holding licenses, make up the difference of a thousand accidents?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, the member I believe is mixing up two different figures. I think in one case we're talking about the total number of drivers and then on the other hand we're talking about number of accidents so naturally there are more drivers than there are accidents. I believe that that is where the, where the . . .

MR. ADAM: On Thursday we were given the figures of 38,795 for the whole of the province, of which 30,000 was for the city. This is just astounding, that there would be such a difference in accidents in the city as opposed to the rural areas. Now we're

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. ADAM cont'd)given the figures today of three age groups that have been involved in 37,409 accidents and 38,795 is the total for last year. I'm just wondering if the age groups above 34 make up the difference 38,975 and 37,409.

MR. BURTNIAK: The total number of drivers is roughly 63,800 as compared to 37,000 some-odd accidents. That may be not the exact figures but it's in the ball park. I'm not saying that these are actually exact to the very last degree but they're pretty accurate anyway.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, how many drivers are there in the province?

MR. BURTNIAK: Five hundred and thirty-eight thousand total drivers. In total. There are 2, 3, 4 drivers in each family so there's over 500,000 drivers. Five hundred and thirty-eight thousand drivers in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Minister could tell us how many vehicle registrations we have? I wonder if the Minister could tell us how many vehicles are registered within the Province of Manitoba.

MR. BURTNIAK: Approximately 530,000.

MR. BANMAN: So what we're saying is that for every driver there is just about one car registered. Under the safety program there's been some talk with regards to driver training programs and the like. Has the department made an assessment on the high school driver training program? There's also been some talk about people having to take a driver training course before they would receive a driver's license. I know in the rural areas in particular most of the people that are under the age of 16 or at the age of 16 get a chance to drive some kind of vehicle, whether it be on the farm or in their small town and do get a little bit more practice I appreciate than the people in Winnipeg do. Is there any move by the department to make any of these driving programs or driver training programs for people who are going to be getting their license for the first time, compulsory, at the present time.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, the member says "at the present time." We're always looking for new ways of improving things and as far as that goes it's really a matter of policy. The government will have to decide on that issue. I can't elaborate on that at this time because it's really a policy matter. But I wouldn't discount that particular fact at some time in the near future.

MR. BANMAN: Would I read the Minister right then that certain studies are being undertaken at the present time and the government is assessing the accident rates and different problems incurred by drivers of a relatively younger age that have just received their license and that the government is now engaged in an assessment of that particular problem?

MR. BURTNIAK: Yes, when you're dealing with things like the various programs that involve the safety of our vehicles and the highways and so on, the Motor Vehicles Branch, the Department of Highways has for the longest period of time I would think, tried to assess the problem and has tried to come up with a solution hopefully. The subject that the Member for La Verendrye mentions, I would say that it has been constantly reviewed to see if anything can be done to improve the situation.

MR. BANMAN: I'm going to move along to another subject matter which I think has been brought up before. I'm just wondering what the Minister's view is with regards to this matter. At present, as the Minister realizes, automobiles being sold by vendors, namely licensed automobile dealers with the Province of Manitoba, are the only ones that are required to have safety checks. I appreciate that the Minister is undertaking by the computer setup to go ahead and spot check different vehicles which I think is a good move, but is there any other move by the department to try and bring the almost 50 percent of the used cars that are being sold right now under a certain type of safety check. I know the problem is - and I've spoken with the Minister of Labour about it - is he feels that we haven't got enough licensed mechanics in the province to go ahead and check these vehicles.

I think maybe what could possibly be done is work a system like the present safety certificates that are being worked right now. In other words an authorized representative of that particular vendor, whether it be the manager or an authorized person

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. BANMAN cont'd)from that corporation, has to sign that safety certificate at present. Isn't there some system whereby we could get the repair shops, get them to sign a safety certificate before this vehicle comes on the road? You can sell a hundred dollar car, as the Minister appreciates, you can sell a hundred dollar car and it never has to go through a safety check if it goes through private hands. Yet it has to have a safety certificate from the dealers. I'm wondering if there is any move afoot there and I appreciate the problems that the Minister is having because of the licensed mechanic thing. We haven't got enough tradesmen in the province and that is a problem. I think maybe we could set up a system whereby authorized people that are bonded could possibly be signing these particular safety certificates. For a standard fee maybe somebody could do it. I know in Ontario if you sell a car to Ontario it's got to go through a safety check first and it's got to be signed by an authorized person. Maybe we could tighten up a little bit on that account.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, as I said before I guess it can't be helped, it's unfortunate, we are repeating so many things because the members are in two different committees. We dealt with this early this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, but I don't mind repeating it again. The safety check program, at least in my opinion, is one of the programs that I'm very much in favor of because if there's any one thing that we can do to prevent accidents from happening because of mechanical conditions of a vehicle, the safety check program is that type of vehicle.

I might point out, as I pointed out earlier this afternoon, that we are expanding that program. We are going to be bringing in some legislation at this session as a matter of fact. When I introduce The Highway Traffic Act, Bill No. 2, I believe it is, it will be in the amendments of that particular bill. The problem was, as the honourable member knows, we are talking about licensed mechanics. Well here really in my view, the government's view it's really not necessary to have licensed mechanics say check these vehicles because we are not dealing with motors and the likes. We're talking about mechanical functions of the vehicle. As long as a person has had some experience, some length of time in that kind of work then he should be qualified to make the safety check. This is the kind of legislation we are going to be bringing in very, very shortly. I just repeat for the honourable member's benefit.

One other thing I think I should mention, the previous question from the Member for Wolseley. He was concerned about reports by doctors and the likes. I would refer my honourable friend to The Highway Traffic Act, Section 151, Subsection 1; Reports by Doctors and Optometrists. I don't know, Mr. Chairman, whether I would have to read this, I think the honourable member can check for himself what is in the bill.

Then of course the other point that the honourable member makes in regards to radial tires - as far as I understand, I have no knowledge of any defective radial tires. Now there may be but that of course wouldn't come to this department as such. What I am aware of is the fact that you cannot, or you should not mix radial with other tires, particularly in the front wheels because you're going to have the shimmying effect that could contribute or cause an accident if you drive any length of time. As long as you have the same kind of tires I don't think there's any problem. I'm not aware of any defective make of radial tires, I believe the honourable member was saying, something to that effect. Maybe that should be brought up to the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs rather than the Department of Highways. As I say that part of it is the only thing I am familiar with and I think that it's important that the people should be told somehow not to say, on the front wheels, put one radial and some other tire, because that is dangerous.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the Minister for his comments I look forward to that legislation he mentioned that he will be introducing. I think that's the right way of going about it. It makes somebody responsible, even though it might not be a licensed mechanic, but that somebody is responsible for whatever he signs, I think is a good step forward.

I'd also like to encourage the safety program because I know from personal experience most of the people that go through there, the fellows that are doing the safety checks are catching pretty well everything from headlights being out to brakes worn and

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. BANMAN cont'd)that type of thing. I think that it has done a certain amount to try and stop some of the accidents on our highways and byways. Of course the biggest problem that we have is the nut behind the wheel and I don't know how we're going to go about checking them out but every effort, I guess, should be made and I suppose the Minister is trying to make sure that people that get onto our highways are people that are competent and the people that should be having the right certificates and the right qualifications to be driving. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Chairman, my purpose in asking for the floor was to comment on the statement the Minister made a few moments ago - and I have not been in this committee as often as I would like to have been, I've been attending the other committee. I heard the Minister make a remark in response to a question that was posed to him by the Member for La Verendrye that it was a matter of policy and therefore he did not feel that he was compelled to answer that question on this occasion. I want to remind the Minister that kind of answer may be very well in the House on the Question Period but it is not suitable in this committee. The Minister is obliged to answer questions respecting policy in this committee but not in the House answering questions on the Orders of the Day. There is an entirely different set of rules applying to the questions that are asked in the Orders of the Day as opposed to questions that are asked in this committee and the Minister at least should have the courtesy to respond to questions that are asked to him in a way that gives information to this committee, that the committee asked for. That's the reason for the committee sitting in the first place.

I hope he does not get the idea that he can get out of answering questions simply by saying it's a matter of policy because he can translate anything into a matter of policy if he wants to and answer nothing and if that's going to be the way that he answers questions in this committee then the purpose of the committee is being thwarted. I suggest to him that when questions are asked it is his responsibility to answer those questions to the best of his knowledge. If he doesn't know the answers, then fine, let's admit that he doesn't know the answers. But if he knows the answers then try not to get out of answering those questions by saying that it's a matter of policy because that won't wash in this committee, I can tell you that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BURTNIAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I accept that lecture but I don't think that at any time any questions were left unanswered. I think that the Honourable Member for La Verendrye is satisfied because I didn't say it's a matter of policy, Mr. Chairman, I could say that it's a matter of policy, however, I went further and said to the honourable member and to the members of the committee that we are introducing legislation to deal with that problem. I don't know what the Honourable Member for Morris is all excited about because I don't think that I shirked my duties in giving the answers. I think I've tried to do the best I could.

MR. JORGENSON: . . . simply trying to point out to the Minister that there is a difference between asking questions in Orders of the Day and asking questions in this committee. The answers that he may be able to get away with in the House will not enable him to get away with in this Committee.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, I don't think that there was any attempt made by me to get away from answering any questions. I think there was only one or two questions that would take some detail, some research to do and I've mentioned it to the committee and we're preparing those questions for the members of the Committee probably tomorrow or day after, as soon as possible. I don't think that anybody has shirked - or at least I haven't shirked my duties in giving the answers to the committee. I understand the functions of this committee as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 70(c)(1)--pass - the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): I have one more question under this item, under safety, and maybe the Minister has answered, I was in late, about driver testing, Is it now covered throughout the whole province? How many mobile units do we have serving the smaller communities, smaller towns? Can the Minister tell us how many units there are serving smaller towns and smaller areas and drivers coming off the

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. PATRICK cont'd)suspension list, are they now properly tested in areas - say it's not in urban centres - what kind of testing units have we got? How many units is there, can the Minister indicate?

MR. BURTNAK: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whether we have covered every - well as a matter of fact I shouldn't even say that, I'm pretty sure we haven't covered every corner of the province quite sufficiently. We have tried to make this sort of program available to at least most Manitobans. We do have ten units in the province and six permanent offices, up to this point in time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 70(c)(1)--pass; (c)(2)--pass - the Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: I wonder if the Minister could break down the \$1,049,400 as to just where that money has gone.

MR. BURTNAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. That roughly comprises of items such as for example, the Driver's Handbook. I don't know whether the honourable members have had an opportunity to receive the latest copy. This is the first new copy I think we've had, in about eight years. As a matter of fact I had a copy with me this afternoon, I neglected to bring it this evening. But they're available now. There is a short supply of them; we have to reprint some more, but it's sort of the kind of book that I think keeps up with the times. It gives a lot of important information to the drivers. That's one of the things. Then the vehicle inspection thing and of course depreciation on the equipment as well as the cost of the units that I just mentioned, the ten units, the mileage, the gas, the whole bit. That comprises that figure.

MR. EINARSON: What's the maximum distance - for instance if a person loses his driver's license because of maybe three speeding charges in say 3 months, what's the maximum distance that person would have to go to undergo the driver's training course and I'm given to understand he has to attend it for four weeks. First of all I would like to ask the explanation of why that driver training course is necessary for someone who maybe has driven a car for four years and what is the maximum distance that one would have to go for that course?

MR. BURTNAK: I believe the Honourable Member for Rock Lake is referring to the Defensive Driving Courses.

MR. EINARSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it's part of safety.

MR. BURTNAK: The Defensive Driving Course. Twenty or thirty miles I guess. That's about the most I would think. At the furthest I would think no more than 30.

MR. EINARSON: . . . attention of the Minister that I know in one area they have to travel as far as sixty miles for a Driver Defensive Training Course. I thought that this was a bit unreasonable, Mr. Chairman, and I wondered whether that could be brought a little closer to home. For instance if a person is sixty miles southeast of Brandon, a number of them had to go there and they thought this was a bit unfair. I was wondering what is the thought behind having to attend four weeks in a row? In other words they travel 60 miles, that's 120 miles return trip, and they do this once a week for 4 weeks before they can get their license back.

MR. BURTNAK: In the first place, Mr. Chairman, I am glad the honourable member brought to our attention that there is that discrepancy, shall we say, that people have to travel that far. We've taken it down and we'll certainly look into it, as to if that is the case, why it is, and so on. I would think, Mr. Chairman, the idea is to make sure that the driver is re-educated properly. Probably once is not enough. They feel that the four lessons, that the course comprise of at least four lessons so I guess that is why they have to go four different weeks in the month.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to leave the impression that I am opposed to them taking the four lessons. The point I want to make is that I feel that if they have to travel 60 miles, 120 miles return, four weeks in a row it is a little bit much and if they could bring that just a little closer to home, that's the point I'm making. I've no objection to having them take that driver course.

MR. BURTNAK: We'll look into that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

MR. WILSON: I appreciate the Minister, Mr. Chairman, answering a couple of my questions but I was asked to ask this question. Has any organization supplied your department with a study pertaining to under what conditions radial tires may not be safe? In other words you mentioned today that some of the young people have them on two wheels, but not on four, this type of thing, that they might not be safe at certain speeds. I'm wondering if your educational department might consider making a public disclosure sometime under what conditions these radial tires may be unsafe. My parting comment since we're passing the Safety item is that I would hope some time the Minister would get together with the Hotel Association and put up a big sign: most fatal accidents are caused by people leaving this premise after it's closed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 70(c)(2)--pass; (c)--pass. Resolution 70(d) Highway Traffic and Motor Transport Board, Taxicab Board and Licence Suspension Appeal Board - the Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Chairman, is this where Motor Carrier Board would come in? I would like to ask the question then, if indeed I owned a transfer company and wanted to get an increase or a surcharge, I suppose the first route would be go to the appeal board. Would that be right, Mr. Chairman, or what is the procedure?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, surcharge on what? You're talking about freight?

MR. MCGREGOR: Yes.

MR. BURTNIAK: Then the first place you'd go is to the Transport Board, that's right, not the appeal board but the Transport Board.

MR. MCGREGOR: So they set up the hearing then. --(Interjection)-- What is requirements regarding advertising? In other words how will my customers know that this is coming?

MR. BURTNIAK: The Board, once they receive application, they do give notice to the general public on the situation.

MR. MCGREGOR: Like the Manitoba Gazette.

MR. BURTNIAK: That's right.

MR. MCGREGOR: No other publications?

MR. BURTNIAK: I'm not sure whether there is also advertising, there may very well be but I am not sure of that.

MR. MCGREGOR: My problem is a local one, you might know, Mr. Chairman. A particular local trucker out of Virden came in and sold the idea to the Board, they called a hearing unknown, absolutely unknown to any of the customers. He stood up at the hearing and said all his customers approved of it. I have a clipping here I would like the Minister to look at. What route, say in this area, the people of Virden, the customers of Virden - this was granted and none of them knew it until it came out boom, this is the surcharge. Just to show you what it did, 50 pounds will cost \$7.89 with this company and before it was \$5.85. Or 51 pounds to 100 pounds category it will cost now \$8.11 when before it would cost \$6.05. There seems to be nothing that the customers there can do about it. There is competition of the CP trucks at this moment but they have applied to discontinue that service so then he really got this in without a debate, without any discussion. Is there no appeal for the customers at that stage once it's been granted?

MR. BURTNIAK: I don't really think that there is. I would have to take this particular case, Mr. Chairman, and pursue it with the Motor Transport Board to see all the details, exactly what transpired. Usually the franchise trucker is by regulation, by law compelled to file rates with the Board and to make application for rate increases and the like. Then of course the notice goes out. What you are referring to here, I am not aware of that particular case because it's dealt with by the board and I have not really heard anything about it. I would certainly like the member to give me the pertinent factors and facts about it and we'll certainly look into it to see what went wrong if anything did go wrong.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Chairman, I would certainly like the Minister to take this

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. MCGREGOR cont'd)into consideration because I've been there when other moves have been made through the Motor Carrier Board and you always got advertised that the Greyhound was pulling a run off or those sort of things. This came in unknown to me, realizing that only a few get the Manitoba Gazette, and damn few that get it ever read it. So it's just a fact that it's a poor way to advertise. I don't look at it, maybe I should. I missed it.

MR. BURTNIAK: I felt that it's not the advertising takes place only in the Manitoba Gazette, I believe that there is local advertising as well but I may be wrong on the latter. I thank the honourable member for the information given to me and we'll look into it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Chairman, what I was going to talk about was more about the License Suspension Appeal Board and it is okay to refer to that now. I find in some cases when a person has had an offense and he's been up before the court, he's given 45 days isn't it in which to come before the License Appeal Board. Then they go and at that time when they appear before the License Appeal Board they find out that they have to take some written tests or some sign up in a driver's test or something like this. At that time they find that out. During the next while they can't drive their vehicle. At that time they can't drive their vehicle.

MR. BURTNIAK: During the 45 days they can drive their vehicle and then when they make their application to the License Suspension Appeal Board, they've got 45 days and during that period of time they are able to drive their vehicle until their case comes up. What is your question?

MR. HENDERSON: Well the problem is after their case comes up they go down and they bring some letters stating that they need their license - we're talking about somebody needing a working licence, a working permit or whatever you call it. In one particular case I know now the person was told that he had to pass some tests before he could get a working permit. If he'd been told that earlier he would have been prepared to have written those tests earlier.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, that perhaps could have been the case. It happens - probably quite seldom but nevertheless it happens where the Board will request the individual to take a driver's test before they will consider as to whether or not - if they feel that they should be perhaps given a temporary licence let's say, that they would rather like to see him go through a driver's test before they will issue him that particular temporary licence.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Chairman, in this particular case the person was allowed to keep on driving for the first 45 days and then when he comes up before the Appeal Board he's told that he has to write this test before he can get a licence at all. At that time he's cut off from his driving even though he's a worker. This is what I'm talking about.

MR. BURTNIAK: Well it all depends. If he was late in applying to the Appeal Board, that could happen. It all depends. It may be the fault of the board - you can't really blame the Board because they're not going to sit somewhere else out of town for example, although we have some members from various parts of the province, but they're not going to sit in on one application for an appeal. It may take them a little while until they have more than one to hear. But I don't know the circumstances. Nevertheless also the onus is on the applicant to make sure that he applies as early as possible in order to be heard within the 45 days. It's hard to say just what the circumstances actually were in that particular case.

MR. HENDERSON: . . . some appeals coming up. They're always set back on their appeal anyway. They can't come before the Appeal Board very quickly because there is now such a line-up of people going before the Appeal Board. Is this not so?

MR. BURTNIAK: That's probably right. But it really shouldn't go beyond four weeks.

MR. HENDERSON: In this particular instance I was given to understand that the fellow did apply to go before the Appeal Board and his date was set but his date was set

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd)back a considerable time and then when he came before the Appeal Board they said, well now you've got to write some tests before you can get your licence. During this time he has no licence to drive.

MR. BURTNIAK: Yes, I understand. We can't really pass any judgment or evaluate the situation exactly because we don't know what really transpired in that case. Maybe they felt because of that particular offence or whatever they requested this individual to take a driver's test after the 45 days had expired because of the hearings or whatever. Now if that is the case I don't really think we can fault the Appeal Board or anybody for asking him to take a driver's test. Perhaps they didn't have a chance to review the thing until just within the last couple of days or so and then decided that in this particular instance that this individual should perhaps take a driver's test before they could issue him with a conditional licence or permit. It depends on the circumstances. There are so many variables here it's hard to judge a particular case on its merits as we know it here.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I understand it's very difficult for you and it's difficult for us too because we usually only get a part of the facts too. The way I've been told in this case, the person was told to come before the Appeal Board and he thought well that will be okay and he came before the Appeal Board. He came with letters stating he needed a working permit and things like this and then he was told - he had received a letter that had said something like, if you have been instructed to take something on AA or on Driver Training, bring something with you that indicates that you are enlisted in this course now. But he wasn't instructed in this. So he came before the Appeal Board and then they said to him well, you'd better write this exam before you get your licence. So during this time now he has no driver's licence.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Under the Taxicab Board, I wondered if the Minister might indicate how many members are on this board and what type of meeting remuneration they receive if any. I haven't really seen that great an improvement. I remember the former Minister, Mr. Borowski, wanted a wide-open sort of free enterprise taxi system based on the fact he couldn't see why some of these 1972 Fords were selling for \$17,000 when in fact the people were really buying the privilege of a licence rather than the physical car itself. I wondered, because it is a closed shop, why the public isn't being given the service of what I would call a newer or better cared vehicles. By that I mean who dictates the policy as to whether a person can have a fleet of old tanks or whether he should be renewing his fleet every couple of years. It seems that because it is a sort of monopolistic position that if you're one who, in the case of handicapped people, you try to find a taxi where you'll get a certain cab driver who will help you in and out of the taxi but by and large most of the part time taxi drivers are not opening doors or using the boy scout image that many of the older drivers have. I was wondering what the Minister might comment as to how that system works. Who dictates the policy as to whether the fleet is new or old, whether the taxis are clean or dirty? What role does the Taxicab Board play in this? Surely if the Taxicab Board has set our cab fares amongst the highest in Canada we should expect a premium fleet. I wonder if the Minister might comment on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, I don't know really if the taxi fleet in the City of Winnipeg is all that bad as described by the honourable member. There are no doubt cases where there may be one or two that probably try to get away with it but that has always been the case, even in the past, probably more so than it is now. As far as the policy and so on that all comes out from the Taxicab Board. They have, I believe, two or three inspectors that go out and unbeknownst to the cabbies, they can stop them at any time, anywhere. If they see that there's something that they should check or they should notice something that should be brought to their attention, they do that and they have been doing that. Even telling them to clean up their cars. Sometimes they get pretty muddy and dusty and they've been told that. As I said before this is pretty hard to really control 100 percent, to make sure that the cars are always spick-and-span and everything else, inside and outside and all other things; that they don't drive around with dented fenders

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. BURTNIAK cont'd)for months on end and all these things or maybe their lights are out of focus and all that. These things are brought to the attention by the inspectors but no doubt there are some that do get away from the inspectors.

The composition of the board, there are five on the board. Three are appointed by the Provincial Government, there is an appointee by the Winnipeg Police and one by the City Council. So those are the five members that constitute the Taxicab Board.

MR. WILSON: How many licensed taxis are there in Winnipeg at present? I could leave that with you.

MR. BURTNIAK: I don't have the figure exactly, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WILSON: I'll leave that with you then. I'm interested in how many taxicabs are licensed both permanent and part-time and what is the minimum requirement that they have to be on the road per week? In other words could a person have a licence and not run that taxi for a month if he so desired? Is there any requirement on him once he gets the licence to run the cab? Is it possible for somebody to get hold of a taxi licence on a speculative nature, that due to supply and demand he may be able to sell his privilege for a larger capital gain later on, like one does in the stock market? Or is he required to run his taxi so many hours a month?

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, I do believe there are certain requirements but I doubt very much if the application is made to purchase a vehicle or two or whatever the case may be, that the individual spends X number of dollars and not run those cars for a business. I can't see that happening. To my knowledge at least in the recent years I don't think that has happened.

As far as the number of taxis, I do know that they do request additional taxis for a holiday season such as Christmas, New Year's and things like that. The number of permanent taxis - it's about 450 I believe that are permanent. As I say, for the holiday season there are provisions whereby part time taxis can operate I guess 75 or maybe 100, it depends on the requirements.

MR. WILSON: Could the Minister indicate when the last time the number of taxis increased and how many years ago was that? Did it go from 400 to 450? What I'm trying to get at is when was the last increase in the number?

MR. BURTNIAK: I'm asking the Registrar here. He doesn't remember offhand just exactly when that - but I'm informed that that's been a long time ago since there has been an increase from what figure to now - we don't know. Right now we can't give you the answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, on this matter of taxicabs I was just wondering where the responsibility is insofar as the government is concerned. I know they have established their rates and I can think of one instance - now maybe you might think it's unfair to use one example - but the attitude, and I think this is prevalent in this area as in many other areas, whereby I know of a lady who hired a taxi to go down to see the hairdresser and this lady was about 86 years of age. She had a cane and when she was brought back she was let out of the taxi and she'd asked the taxi driver to give her help to get to her house. He didn't even bother opening the door. She got out and she stumbled and fell in her doorway and it was her brother that came about three hours later who found that she had fallen and broken her shoulder. I'm wondering if the government has any involvement to the point where they play a role insofar as the kind of service we're getting from people who are operating taxis in the City of Winnipeg.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, when it comes to those kind of things I don't think the honourable members would want the government to get into these kind of things anyway. Through the board we request the fleet owners and drivers to be as courteous as they possibly can be, to take all things into consideration, into account. However I realize that there are cases where you may come across the situation whereby the individual driving that particular cab may not be all that courteous and very inconsiderate. These things happen. They happen all over, not just in the City of Winnipeg but all over the province from time to time. It's unfortunate. How you can actually prevent that from happening, I don't know. Perhaps the driver or the owner of that particular taxicab, if he's not the driver himself, if he has a hired driver, perhaps he could, I suppose, relieve that

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. BURTNIAK cont'd) particular individual of his duties. But that onus then becomes on the owner of that particular fleet. If it happens to be the owner himself then I would say that he will not stay in business very long if he treats customers in that manner.

MR. EINARSON: How long has this Taxi Board been in operation? Could the Minister indicate?

MR. BURTNIAK: In the forties, late forties.

MR. EINARSON: I had one other question, Mr. Chairman, but I dealt with the Registrar and I think that suffices then. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd just like to ask the Minister several questions with regard to the problems that CP Transport is facing in Saskatchewan right now. My first question would be: if someone holds an intraprovincial as well as an extraprovincial licence in the Province of Manitoba, does the government or the Motor Transport Board have the authority to cancel the extraprovincial licence? In other words, for some misdemeanor can we cancel a person's running rights in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. BURTNIAK: I would think it's a legal question. Nevertheless when the member refers to the CP situation in Saskatchewan, I did take that question as notice in the House the other day and I have the information now in my office. I don't have it with me. I didn't think that this would come up tonight. Apparently, from just looking at the information that we received, the party in this particular situation, there was assurance given by CP Freighters that they would not impede the services in the Province of Manitoba because of the action that was going to be taken in Saskatchewan. I believe it's in the hands of the courts apparently so we're awaiting the decision of the courts as to what is eventually going to happen in Saskatchewan. I want to repeat that they assured us in Manitoba that the various communities that they service will not be affected. They would supply or provide service of some kind to these communities.

MR. BANMAN: In essence what the Minister is saying, that he has been speaking to representatives or officials from Canadian Pacific and that outlying points in the province where it does haul to, will not be affected by whatever happens in Saskatchewan.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, to the best of my knowledge they assured us that they would provide some sort of service to points in Manitoba. However as I said this is now in the courts so it's pending the court's decision. We'll see what happens.

MR. BANMAN: Another problem which has probably been brought to the attention of the Minister and that's to do with the Highway Traffic Board. With the sort of decentralization or de-urbanization trend that is happening right now we're experiencing certain strip developments which I know the Minister's Department is trying to curtail along provincial trunk highways. This is causing a lot of problems and I know the Highway Traffic Board is dealing with several within my riding where the people have already built a house with the understanding or maybe the belief that they would receive access off the highway. What happens then is that their application is turned down. It's causing a lot of problems in rural Manitoba and especially I think within close jurisdiction of the City of Winnipeg where there are not access roads as such. I'm wondering if the Minister's Department has made representation at all to maybe the people in municipal planning, that possibly some of these municipalities, before they can issue a permit to a particular person for building a house, if they would have to specify that they do have an application or that they do have access to this thing.

I know the other problem is that many of the municipalities have a very loose system of handing out building permits. I think there's one or two even in my riding which don't have any building permits at all. In other words anybody can build anywhere. This is causing real problems because somebody is going ahead and spending \$40,000 and \$50,000 on a house not thinking at the time that they won't be able to get access and I have a case right now where it's either go across a large drainage ditch or get access to a highway and this person has already built that particular home. So it is causing a large amount of concern to a lot of people that are building houses in rural Manitoba and I would like to draw the problem to the Minister's attention. I'm sure some other people have done the same thing. But there should be some solution arrived at so that these people

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. BANMAN cont'd)after building a large house or something like that, find out that they don't have access to their property and then sit there high and dry driving through the ditch and when the spring waters come they can't get access.

Now on the other hand I would like to say that I endorse the policy where we're not going to allow this type of strip development that's taking place. Because you can have a built up highway which is a fairly busy travelled highway and you can have a driveway every 200 or 300 feet, and I think that's kind of crazy. But maybe with the co-operation of the planning people and I know the new Planning Act, if that's implemented a little better it might help. I hope that the Minister's Department is putting some input into this particular problem and that people will not be forced into bad economic buying because of the problems faced with this.

MR. BURTNAIK: Well, Mr. Chairman, we're very much aware of the particular situation that the Honourable Member for La Verendrye referred to. It has been a problem and it has existed for many years for many of the reasons that the member has already mentioned. We're working with the municipal planning people and under the new Planning Act and we hope that we can overcome some of these problems.

However, there's another problem that I don't know whether the Honourable Member for La Verendrye is familiar with, although maybe it's not one and the same. It's a little different matter but nevertheless we had a very serious problem and I figure at least it was very unjust and unfair when in the late fifties the government of the day decided to implement so-called control circles. Now the putting in of these control circles perhaps was not unfair but it was unfair to those people who were caught within those control circles and in many cases it was unbeknownst to the particular owners and they were paying taxes on the property and so on and then when they wanted to expand their property they were told, of course, that they could not do so.

So we've tried to change that situation because we feel that is really unfair to those people. However it's a different matter, it's not the same thing that the member was talking about but we've run into these kinds of problems in both cases. In many cases though I must say that you can't exonerate the actual people who sometimes have ignored the municipal jurisdictions and what-have-you and just ignored them completely and went and built when they were told that they could not build that close or can't build there period. But they just completely ignored that directive and went ahead and constructed these buildings. So you have a combination of many different situations.

MR. BANMAN: I thank the Minister for that answer. I draw that particular problem to his attention again because I seem to be getting several of those a month because of the de-urbanization that's taking place and the general growth pattern that we're experiencing in the Ste. Anne, Niverville and Steinbach area. There seems to be a lot of people from Winnipeg moving out there and buying five and ten acres and then going through this type of thing. The Board I think has taken these particular matters into consideration as far as I'm concerned and at present, have been able to straighten these matters out and I just hope that there's a certain amount of indulgence on behalf of those. When there is a legitimate case, when the municipality goes to bat for a certain individual that the Board will take this into consideration because rural municipalities such as the rural Municipality of La Broquerie has no building permits and people are sort of out in the dark when it comes to this particular problem. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to get back to the taxicabs and ask the Minister how stringent are the tests that the drivers have to go through before they can qualify to be a taxi driver?

MR. BURTNAIK: Just this last year we've gone into the class licence system which was non-existent. Before all they required was the chauffeur's licence at the time, but they went through a pretty stringent test. In the new legislation which is before us and which we have approved and which has been in existence for about a year now, which is the class system they will go through the test which is prescribed by the Class 4 licence which they will have to have, medical, I guess, and all these other things, re-written test and what-have-you. This is spelled out in the Class 4 licence which they have to have

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. BURTONIAK cont'd) to be able to drive a cab. There will not be any more chauffeur's licenses as such.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, if for instance a driver had an alcoholic problem, could this be determined in a test or . . .

MR. BURTONIAK: Mr. Chairman, every driver or every owner that wants to drive a cab or a driver hired by the owner of a taxicab must first also submit a medical report. If that report shows that he has this particular kind of problem then, of course, he may not be able to get a licence because of that particular problem.

MR. ADAM: If he didn't indicate that he had a drinking problem he could still probably get the licence, eh? Is that . . .

MR. BURTONIAK: Well, yes sure.

MR. ADAM: I had a kind of a very uncomfortable experience just about a month or two ago where I hailed a cab at the Holiday Inn. It was a Sunday evening and I wanted to get down to the Misericordia Hospital and I realized after I got in the cab that I had a drunken driver on my hands. He started down York Street and fortunately there wasn't much traffic and he was going from side to side, from sidewalk to sidewalk. He didn't turn on his meter until we got down by the Bay parking and we crossed --(Interjection)-- Well, you might laugh gentlemen but it was a very very difficult situation. We got across Memorial Boulevard and across Osborne and made a left turn onto Colony and as soon as we got around the corner he just put her to the floor. I knew that he was going to plough into that island at the other end of the street where you go back on St. Mary's Road or - it was on St. Mary's that we were going west. I thought I had a team of horses in my hand and I yelled "whoa", you know, but he didn't stop. He ploughed into this island and I was dazed and I knew he wouldn't be hurt, he was smashed. But anyway the island disappeared. It's a big steel pipe and I got out and the first thought that came to me was to find a phone and Sunday, everything was closed. I started to walk back in a sort of a dazed condition. I asked the fellow if he'd been hurt, he got out, he was staggering around and to this day we still don't know what happened. I never got his licence, the car was gone and the island was replaced and we still don't know what happened, but that guy shouldn't be driving. --(Interjection)-- I never paid him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Minister.

MR. BURTONIAK: Mr. Chairman, no doubt, you know, I'm sure the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose had a rather frightening experience in this particular situation. However, I think that the proper procedure that the member should have taken at the time was, when he was able to get out of the vehicle - although probably the driver would not give his name, but the taxis I believe are numbered - there is a number on the cab, there is licence, so on. You should have reported it as quickly as possible and I don't think it's still too late to report an incident of this kind. I think I sure would, as quickly as possible, report it to the . . . --(Interjection)--

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I reported to the Autopac people right away. Fortunately I wasn't hurt, but it was a very harrowing experience and I did everything I could, I reported him to the police and I wanted him nailed, and there was just no way, because I walked out of there in a daze. I never even got his licence number, all I know is he said 210 when he reported in to headquarters and they denied that they had an accident, headquarters denied they had an accident.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I want to raise another question about Licence Suspension Appeal Board and I'm sure that safe motoring depends upon the strength of the chain which is safe cars, safe highways and safe drivers; and I know the Minister indicated that we had a large number of suspensions this year, much higher than last year. My question to the Minister is how many appeals, or were there more appeals this year and were there more appeals granted or refused that we're trying to determine. Are we proceeding in the right direction that we're trying to make the highways more safe and the streets more safe, anyone that appeals gets his licence right back or what happens?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, there was an increase in 1974-75 in the number of appeals - no in 1974 - 15.5 percent increase of appeals. --(Interjection)-- 15.5 percent, yes. The year 1974-75 there was a 15.5 percent increase in the number of appeals.

MR. PATRICK: Has the Minister got the total number, Mr. Chairman?

MR. BURTNIAK: The total number of appeals? Yes. The total was 2,992 and the previous year was 2,594.

MR. PATRICK: How many appeals were granted? Was there a higher percentage this year than last year?

MR. BURTNIAK: Some 70-odd percent of the appeals were granted I'm informed. Some 70-odd, I'm not sure whether it's 72, 75 or whatever, but something over 70 percent, yes.

MR. PATRICK: . . . work from it only or how . . . ?

MR. BURTNIAK: Yes, probably. There was a combination of everything I would think, but mostly that would be the situation. If they show a cause whereby they are going to lose employment or they can't make a living or have no income coming if they don't drive, if their livelihood depends on driving - let's put it that way - then that plays very heavy with the board. --(Interjection)-- Oh, yes, yes, that's right.

MR. PATRICK: The other question, Mr. Chairman, is have we got more suspensions now, we still use the same demerit system, the demerit points, or are we tougher on suspensions now than we were say three or four years ago, or are we more lax, can the Minister indicate?

MR. BURTNIAK: There has been some increase in the number of suspensions and I would think perhaps, you know, there's a lot of things that have to be taken into consideration, but for whatever reasons they probably are dealing with these people just a little bit tougher perhaps than they did in the past, and for good reasons.

MR. PATRICK: . . . the nature of suspensions be, would there be most, like the 2,992 that appealed, would most of those be for impaired driving or . . . ?

MR. BURTNIAK: I don't have the breakdown, Mr. Chairman, at my fingertips here, but I feel that these would be mostly for impaired driving, or .08 or whatever. --(Interjection)-- Something to do with liquor, drinking and driving, because as I reported earlier from Thursday, I think Thursday evening, where the greatest percentage of our accidents that occur are because of the drinking driver.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is exactly the thing that I was hoping to get at under the Licence Suspension Appeal Board. Before I go into that I wonder if the Minister could indicate what the \$25,200 increase is? I notice you have \$212,300 under "Other Expenditures" and I wondered before I go into the last part if I could have some indication as to what type of expenditures would those be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the honourable member's information we're still on (d)(1), dealing with Salaries. The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: All right then, okay, then I'll go into the aspect of - I'm very concerned that most of these 3,000 suspensions are liquor related and it would seem to me that even with the reinstatement it should be one of - even when his time period is up - is the onus should be on him to demonstrate that the use of the car in the evening obviously is something because he cannot control his drinking. He is then a danger to himself and to everybody else on the street. One of the comments that was made to me while I was talking to people was that there seems to be a new thrust in this area of what they call the "lawyer versus the layman". In other words the general consensus on the street is that the Licence Suspension Appeal Board has sort of - you're able to have a better chance of being reinstated if you are represented by a member of the legal profession - and I wondered what makes that board that way, that an ordinary layman doesn't have the same type of presentation possibly is what I'm trying to say - how flexible are the Board in their rules? You say that if a person can show cause that he needs his car who checks this out; what onus is there on the person who is making the appeal if the information he supplies to the committee is false; and is it true that many of these people are

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. WILSON cont'd) taking Legal Aid lawyers with them, because it would seem to me that Legal Aid was not designed to represent people in this area?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, the point made by the member, you know, is really not correct because there's no indication where the appeals are granted whether the ordinary layman, as he put it, appealed on his own behalf or with a lawyer. However, that does not preclude anyone from taking a lawyer to act on his behalf in front of the Appeal Board if that is the wish of the individual. But many cases - about 50 percent or more of the appeals were people coming in on their own without any assistance from the lawyers. So I don't really think that what the honourable member is saying is quite accurate, correct.

MR. WILSON: Well, I would think if you have a system which suspends people on obviously a poor driving record, that 70 percent of them should be successful in their appeal is rather alarming, and I would be very pleased if most of them that this 70 percent would fall under were certainly conditional and well supervised because, otherwise the percentage is extremely alarming and I couldn't agree more with the Member from Assiniboia when he says, "You've got those three combinations going and the last one, the safe driver certainly is not a safe driver if he has an alcoholic problem or anything pertaining to the liquor aspect." Again I don't know what the onus is under Section 151(1) for Optometrists and the Medical Profession, but I'm certainly going to look into it and I would hope that area would be looked at because I think that it's the safe driver, the person behind the wheel that's causing all these problems and the costs just cannot be measured. And one other parting comment, I wondered if the department kept any records of - does the taxicab board keep records of the revenue generated from all the taxis in the province? --(Interjection)-- They don't? There's no record of that. The reason why is I was looking at some of the estimates of the different departments, it seemed to me that the two levels of government, the Provincial Government and the Federal Government were keeping these cab companies in business. But however, I'll leave that.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, just to respond to the comments made by the honourable member that the high percentage did receive consideration by the Licence Suspension Appeal Board and were given a temporary licence, or a special permit or something like that. Of course he must keep in mind that in many cases these people that appeared perhaps, well not perhaps but definitely in this case, where they were the first time offenders and their conviction was not perhaps all that serious, and for the first offender the Board took this into consideration, and it is also found that where people who have committed an offence and then lost their licence or about to lose their licence and appealed to the Board they became better drivers. Perhaps in many cases for the longest period of time they did not make that same offence. So, you know, these are important things and of course, just because there were a higher percentage of licences granted, in most cases they were first time offenders, which you know I don't think the Board would want to deal too severely with them; and then of course as I said before if it so happened these people are dependent on driving for a livelihood; and that being the first offence then actually the Board would be a little more lenient with them than with someone who perhaps was a second or a third time offender.

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, again I got on another subject here, and I've also been distracted. On the Highway Traffic and Motor Transport I was wondering - I think this is in order here - in regards to approaches and you were answering the Member for La Verendrye about the larger problems. But this is a simple matter where a farmer is on one side of the road, he has to cross a provincial road, and he requested an approach to get to the farm right across the road, this would save him driving a half a mile down the road to go all the way around. They told him there was no approach within that mile and they refused to give him an approach at the half-way intersection. I was wondering is this against the policy of the Department of Highways or . . . ?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BURTONIAK: No. Here again we are dealing with local problems, local situations, but the policy is hopefully not to install more than one approach per mile, you know, and I realize that sometimes it creates some hardship for somebody that may be within that mile. So we try to combine maybe two approaches within the one for the use of both which doesn't always work out. But, you know, this is what we are hoping to do and at the same time I think, to go back just for a minute if I may, Mr. Chairman, we're talking about land acquisition and the likes, I think wherever the density of traffic is quite high the route to go, by this government or any government as far as that goes, is to try and buy enough property whereby certain areas - maybe not to the entire highway - but certain sections in the more populated sections, along the road where service roads could be built; and I think that is really the answer. I know for a fact that certain provinces in Canada where they do not permit certain approaches, say in a larger town where they say you have to move out three, four, five miles out of town before you can construct a business, but they are providing for the facility whereby the approach or a service road can be constructed or is constructed so that people don't have to come in off the highway on these approaches because not only is it an inconvenience to them, but it's dangerous. It's dangerous for them and it's dangerous for the motoring public. The more private approaches you have along the road the more dangerous it is, and I think a perfect example is Highway No. 9, it's just terrible, it's become another street it's not a highway anymore, it's just another street.

MR. EINARSON: I know exactly what the Minister is talking about and you can have too many accesses in the way of roads and approaches and it becomes dangerous. I'm not talking about this particular situation, this is a matter of probably Public Relations which I am registering with this department, whereby this is a farmer who co-operated with the Department of Highways when they were building up the PR road in question. He went out of his way to assist the Department of Highways in taking care of rocks and what-have-you and then when he asked for a simple request of putting one approach about the half mile across the road, at which there was no approaches in the whole mile, the department turned him down. It was requested of all those authorities and I wonder whether your policy is such that you don't even allow one approach in the whole mile.

MR. BURTONIAK: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry to hear that because that is not the case. If this happened, as the Honourable Member for Rock Lake says, that probably was just some lack of PR in that case or something went wrong, if there are no other approaches within that mile. There had to be some discussion, some agreement could have been made, I'm sure. Who is at fault here, I am not familiar with the case, but I'd be glad to take that information from the honourable member privately and we can look into it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon): I would just like to ask a couple of short questions, Mr. Chairman. They're starting a project in the Flin Flon area from Flin Flon to Baker's Narrows. I understand it's in five phases and you're working on the second phase now. Is that work up to schedule? Are they behind or ahead or even with the project?

MR. BURTONIAK: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether we should be dealing with this. I believe the Honourable Member for Flin Flon is back on construction.

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

MR. BARROW: Will I be given the opportunity, Mr. Chairman? --(Interjection)-- I see. Sorry about that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member can deal with it under the Minister's salary, if he wishes. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: A few questions with respect to the Driver's Licence Suspension Appeal Board. The Minister I think has indicated that there are about 3,000 did he say - suspensions a month under the Driver's Licence Suspension Appeal Board.

MR. BURTNIAK: About 3,000 appeals come in, in a year.

MR. JORGENSEN: Could the Minister say just on the average how many drivers are suspended per month throughout the year. I know there's some going off and some coming on. What would be the average?

MR. BURTNIAK: The closest statistic I can give the Honourable Member for Morris, off the top of my head mind you, would be about 24,000 per year. So you can more or less average it by so many per month. Just off the top of my head. Now I don't know if this is . . . --(Interjection)--

MR. JORGENSEN: What I was asking is - maybe I'd better direct the question in a different way. How many drivers would be suspended per month? Out of a total of would you say half a million, how many per month would not have their drivers' licences available to them? That's throughout the period of a year.

MR. BURTNIAK: The Registrar gives me the figure of about 2,000 now. I am not sure - maybe the honourable member could repeat the question again.

MR. JORGENSEN: The department puts out a booklet which lists the suspensions for each month. That's accumulative, yes. That's right. What I'm asking is just about how many would be on that booklet each month? It's around 22,000 is it not?

MR. BURTNIAK: 22,000 or 24,000.

MR. JORGENSEN: Twenty-four thousand drivers that do not have available to them their drivers' licences, out of a total of 530,000 or 500,000 drivers listed in this province. That would be the percentage of drivers for that particular month they're not allowed to drive. Now I know some will be getting their licence back, others will be coming on but on the average it runs around 20,000 to 24,000 drivers. Is that right?

One assumes that every time a driver has a licence suspended, along with that suspension is a fine. It would be difficult to imagine that a driver would have a driver's licence suspended without having to pay some kind of a penalty of a fine. Indeed he will pay a penalty if he exceeds the number of demerit points that are authorized under the law. How much money is accumulated in the period of a year from fines collected under driver's licence suspensions?

MR. BURTNIAK: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, that question should be posed to the Attorney-General when his department's Estimates are before the committee, before the House. Because perhaps - I'm not sure but I would think that the Attorney-General would have that kind of information.

MR. JORGENSEN: Is that not information published in the Statement of Revenue? It seems to me that there's a figure from \$3 million to \$4 million that is listed as revenue to this particular branch of the Department of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: I believe that the revenues for this particular purpose or derived from the fines and the likes, I believe, are listed in the Attorney-General's Department. I am not aware of any amounts that we have in our Estimates. I'm not sure.

MR. JORGENSEN: The fines that are collected from drivers who have been in violation of The Highway Traffic Act, those fines, those moneys are collected by the Attorney-General's department, the Minister says.

MR. BURTNIAK: Any fines that accrue to the province are reported to the Attorney-General . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: All of the moneys that are collected in fines, in violation of The Highway Traffic Act are collected by the Attorney-General's Department.

MR. BURTNIAK: That is correct.

MR. JORGENSEN: Then where do they go from there? Is that money turned over to the . . .

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

MR. BURTNIAK: That money then is turned to the General Revenue of the province.

MR. JORGENSEN: It goes to Consolidated Revenue or does it go to the Public Insurance Corporation.

MR. BURTNIAK: It goes to Consolidated Revenue.

MR. JORGENSEN: Is it not transferred from there to the Public Insurance Corporation?

MR. BURTNIAK: I wouldn't think so, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder if those sort of questions wouldn't be better asked under Public Accounts? The member would probably get an accurate answer to his question.

MR. JORGENSEN: Since it deals with the Driver's Licence Suspension Appeal Board and the violation of conditions of The Highway Traffic Act, but I won't pursue it. I've posed the questions; I have not received an answer, at least a satisfactory answer, and if the Minister says that I should seek my information elsewhere that's fine.

I wonder now if the Minister could answer one other question. Are there any life-time suspensions in the Province of Manitoba? Are there any people who have been barred for life from driving an automobile?

MR. BURTNIAK: Yes there have.

MR. JORGENSEN: And how many would that be?

MR. BURTNIAK: I've been informed less than a thousand, somewhat under one thousand persons that have a life-time suspension in the Province of Manitoba from driving.

MR. JORGENSEN: Is that number increasing?

MR. BURTNIAK: Slowly, but unfortunately it's on the increase, yes.

MR. JORGENSEN: I know it would be increasing. If there are life-time suspensions it's not going to decrease. But my question is - maybe I should word it another way - is the acceleration or the rate of increase of suspensions greater than it was say ten years ago, five years ago, or whatever? Or is it about the same?

MR. BURTNIAK: If I do answer, Mr. Chairman, I would hope the Honourable Member for Morris would understand that I would actually be guessing at this particular moment. I would think it would probably be the same but here again I wouldn't want anybody to take this as gospel because I'm really guessing on it.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well in any case the Minister, whether or not he is guessing, I would gather from his answer that the rate of increase is not so great that it would have been noticeable. Otherwise the Minister would have obviously noted it. So I can assume then that the rate of increase of life-time suspensions is no greater than it was a number of years ago.

MR. BURTNIAK: Yes. Here again I repeat I would guess at that.

MR. JORGENSEN: The reason for those life-time suspensions, is it usually alcohol?

MR. BURTNIAK: Yes, I would say that about 90 percent of the cases are attributed to alcohol.

MR. JORGENSEN: Thanks very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of MPIC.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member from Morris raised the question with respect to fines. I just wish to indicate that the fine per se as per a ruling of the court, none of those funds go to the Corporation but there may be an additional premium assessed as a result of the demerit points, assessed on a driver's licence, resulting from the conviction. Those funds would go to the Corporation. But the actual fine itself would go to Consolidated Revenue, not to the Corporation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: There's another question. Do all of those fines go to Consolidated Revenue or is some of them allocated in the municipality in which the offence took place, in which the charge was levied?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BURTNIAK: There's some sort of an arrangement. There's some sort of

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. BURTNIAK cont'd) a split there as far as I know. To what percentage or whatever it is I don't know.

MR. JORGENSON: Is it not a fact that if, for example, a driver was caught speeding say in the Municipality of Strathclair or whatever, if he was charged in that particular area that the fine would go to that particular municipality?

MR. BURTNIAK: I would think that it would depend as to who pays for the police services in that particular municipality. It would have some bearing in that respect I would think.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of MPIC.

MR. URUSKI: I believe that generally speaking if it would be the RCMP on provincial highways or roads, generally it would be handled through the Law Courts or through the Attorney-General's Department. I would imagine that if it's in a community where it's patrolled by town police, that the point that he makes may very well be valid but I'm sorry I'm not knowledgeable enough to be able to be specific on it. It may very well be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Chairman, my subject's a little bit on something different but it was mentioned here earlier by the Minister, what they call "control circles". I feel sure that probably a lot of members don't know just what they mean by control circles. I don't know how long it is since that term has been used myself. I have one case now that I know of where these control circles at an intersection where they're 350 feet, that's in the radius too I believe, that it affects the value of property.

In one case I know of, between having to build 100 feet back from the highway, there was a residence there already, between that and getting an approach on the control circle, it just wasn't possible for anybody to get rid of their property. I have found out now that it is possible to get rid of this property, that the highway will buy it and pay the people for it. But this is something I know has gone on for ten years and this person, it was never told to her and I just found it out myself in this last while and I'm working on it. But this is something that I think the department, when they are buying up land for highways and that, should tell people so as they're completely aware of it. Because I know in this case, between the approach and this not being able to get a building permit and the control circle, that this person has had this property for ten years without anybody in it and been paying taxes.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, we do have a fund established for this purpose and wherever necessary we will buy the property. But we've gone further than that whereby not only will we notify the person that is actually involved or is within that circle, but we also notify the neighbors as well. So that all know exactly what's going on so that they don't get caught in the same kind of a situation as some of these people that were caught in when the so-called control circles were put in or established without the people that were right in these circles knowing anything about it until some other time. Of course there are times where maybe the owners knew, were able to find someone who was willing to buy the property, sold the property to them without telling them the dilemma that they would be finding themselves in if they wanted to expand. But we have been buying some of this kind of property where people wanted to expand and couldn't. Therefore we buy them out and they can go elsewhere.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I'm glad to hear that you're doing this now. But in this case that I'm talking about, this same person has owned it all through this period of time and they've told two different highways people, two different highways because it's at an intersection and they never knew that the government would buy the whole portion. They've had it for about ten years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Chairman. I want to inquire of the Minister: what is the policy on the Drivers' Licence Suspension and Appeal with respect to older citizens? --(Interjection)-- Yes, senior citizens. I don't know of what age it is but I'm sure every member of the Committee from time to time has had an angry phone call or a communication from someone who has had a driver's licence

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) for 30 or 40 or 50 years and they maintain stoutly that they're quite capable of driving but they've lost their licence. I know that the departmental people are very diplomatic in telling them the reason but is there a hard and fast rule? Is it tied to age or is it tied to an examination? If when a driver reaches a certain age does he automatically lose his licence or is it a loose procedure where he must qualify every year and if, in the opinion of the examiner, he's fit and able he can drive till 80 or 90? What is the policy here?

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, no. The rule of thumb is that whether a person is a senior citizen of whatever age, 65 or 75, the Board does not really deal any differently with them than they do with anyone else. Except of course, if - you know I might point out too that in some of these individual cases I have had individual people come to me with a problem like that. They sometimes tell you why or they're very concerned because they are going to lose their driving privileges and then upon checking they don't tell you everything that the Motor Vehicle Branch has record of. So you have to check out first before you can make a decision. Nevertheless as I say they're not treated any differently except of course if there is some physical defect or handicap they may have. They may look at it from a different point of view and of course it will depend on the age of the person. They may say, "Well maybe you shouldn't be driving anymore." But in most cases, barring these physical defects or whatever, they're not treated any differently than anybody else.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: That really hasn't answered my question. I'm trying to find out how does the department decide? Do they wait for a doctor's report or do they decide on age alone? I'm not saying they wait for an accident to happen but is it a yearly test?

MR. BURTNIAK: In some cases they may ask for a doctor's opinion on the matter or they may decide, in their own wisdom, to give this individual a test. There are all kinds of tests that he can take. Either a written test or an oral test. A person may not be able to read and write but he probably has been driving for a long time and was able to read enough to know the speed limits and the different signs, curve and what-have-you. So they go through that kind of test and there's nothing preventing them from taking that test. Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry I don't know what the honourable member is trying to get.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I haven't got the answer I'm seeking. When at an age in life does a person receive any sort of special attention if he has a driver's licence? Is he allowed to go on in a normal manner as a man of 40 years of age or when he reaches 65 or 70 is he treated in a different manner? All I want to know is what is the policy of the department? When they start to deal with a person because of age they may feel they have to relieve him of his driver's licence. How do they arrive at the decision and what are the factors? For example, if a person is 70 years old, never had an accident, never been in any serious difficulties and is in good health, is he treated as a person of the age of say 40 or does he receive special attention because of his age?

MR. BURTNIAK: If a person is 70 or whatever and the individual has been driving - naturally he'd be driving for a good many years - accident free, no reported convictions of any kind then of course he would continue to drive. Now whether this is right or wrong - maybe the government should have some sort of policy whereby a person at a certain age - and I would say it should be a fairly elderly age - but really at the present time we don't really have any kind of stringent policy to say that if a person is say 70 years of age that he cannot drive regardless of what his health is like or whatever. If he's in good health and has had no convictions, has had no accidents, he will continue driving.

By the way, Mr. Chairman, if it's reported by a member of his family or by someone else who say, well you know Mr. Jones has been driving for so long but I think that we should check up on him to see because he has a certain problem, then of course we'll do that. But otherwise he will just continue to drive like anyone else.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MCGREGOR: The life suspensions. How many of those are lifted in a year

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. MCGREGOR cont'd) out of that thousand? If indeed they do get their driving rights back, does that mark stay on their licence all the rest of their life that they were a lifer or something or is there a five-year period that if they're in good behaviour does that get stricken off if they were never . . .? --(Interjection)-- No it isn't so. There is a case of lifting life suspensions I believe under certain conditions. I have been associated with some of those. What is the percentage and if indeed they're on good behaviour, does that mark stay with their licence and when is it erased?

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, I don't have that information but there are certain cases, very few I would say, where the life suspension is lifted for whatever. It's got to be a good reason. But it can go through the Appeal Board or to the County Court. He may be granted a temporary licence for certain occasions. But those are not too many; they are few and far between. But there are occasions and this is the procedure that they would follow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 70(d)(1)--pass; (d)(2) - the Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Are these just the same usual expenses that you've had in every other department? They increase just the same?

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, there's not a tremendous increase but there's somewhat of an increase. There are a greater number of hearings by the Appeal Board and the likes that have taken place in the last year, travelling and so forth. That's what constitutes the somewhat of an increase. I don't think it was an enormous increase, it's a normal increase because of inflation, let's put it that way, and a greater number of hearings.

MR. HENDERSON: There's always a small part of this computer expense included in this too, in every case.

MR. BURTNIAK: Yes, there would be some small fraction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 70(d)(2)--pass. Resolution 70 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$8,771,700 for Highways--pass.

I would refer honourable members now back to Page 33. Resolution 64(a) - The Minister's Compensation. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to thank the Minister and these people with him for the answers they have given us but I still feel much like I felt in the beginning, that with inflation going on like it has and with the way the Provincial Budget has increased that you, as the Minister, haven't been able to get your share of the pie, as we could say. Your budget has only increased just around five percent, the way I work it out, and government spending has increased in the neighbourhood of 16 percent and possibly more.

We, in the Conservative Party, are usually complaining about you spending money but in this particular case we'd like to see more money put to this department because we feel that money spent in either building roads or repairing roads is money that's really invested and helps a farmer to save his car or his truck or whatever else travels on it and it also makes life much more enjoyable.

I feel that there's a considerable revenue coming out of the Highways Department because the tax on gas and everything now is really enormous. I think myself that I'd like to see more spent on it and I'd like to go back to the Provincial Roads that they're maintaining. I know that if you came to the Minister's Office as I did one time with a group from the Development Corporation that they'll probably sit down and show you that they've put on more gravel and they've maybe graded more miles now than they ever did before. But there's so much more traffic than there ever was and there's so many more trucks that these roads really do need a lot more maintaining. Even though you're doing more the people don't seem to think that the condition of the road is better. I said earlier that there's many cases where they're leaving the Provincial Roads and they're travelling on the Municipal Roads so they definitely are feeling that you aren't maintaining those roads as good, by comparison, as they were before.

Outside of that I think that your department is doing all that it can in the way of driver safety and regulations that will make everybody else safer travelling on the highway

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd) It's to be hoped that something will happen that will have a cutdown on people who are having their licence suspended because it's a terrific amount and it's a terrific expense to them but it seems to be the lifestyle. I guess you probably are doing the best you can for them when you suspend their licence for a while and make them go through the Appeal Board. We've got to realize that if we don't want accidents on the road we've got to keep some of these people off. It's our responsibility even though we know that they're coming to us all the time because we know that this is also causing a lot of the cost in Autopac.

All I would say is that another year I would like to see you fight harder for a larger share of the Budget and I just wish that your other Ministers had heard some of the remarks that were said by other people in our party and the Liberal Party and I think that they would be maybe more inclined to give you a larger share of the Budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, there's quite a road project in the Flin Flon area as you know, Mr. Minister. It's in five phases. The first phase is almost completed. I understand the second phase is going to be a time consuming thing because they do cross two bodies of water. What I was interested in was one and two are well on their way, I understand from the schedule the third, fourth and fifth should be shorter and easier than the first two, I think. The people are very appreciative of this road, don't misunderstand me, but I do get a little flack on the time element. There are some questions. Could you give me any information on that?

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, very briefly, this project, like any other project anywhere in Manitoba, will depend largely of course on many factors and the major one is weather conditions. As far as I know things will proceed on schedule as much as possible. However climatic conditions sometimes play a very very important part of the overall program or a particular program. Hopefully it will be on schedule and then again the other phases, whether they'll be shorter or just as long as the first ones, I am not aware of that but if that is the case, fine. There again I say hopefully that project will be completed at the proper time or at the given time. But if something develops, bad weather or whatever reason, strikes and what-have-you there could be a delay. But this is something that's unforeseen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Virден.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Chairman, I along with others do appreciate the co-operation and the answers, Mr. Chairman, that have come through you.

The one problem that I do see in my area over the last weekend and being in Virден and riding with the Mayor of Virден, he was quite concerned of a provincial street that is in very bad shape in comparison to some of the other town streets. The taxpayers do look and we fix this but the Provincial Government really isn't doing much on 9th Avenue. It's ten or twelve blocks and the fact that Zenith Paving is out in that general area later this summer they wonder if there isn't some consideration for a small amount like ten or eleven blocks and that's also the curbing.

On the other chunk it was a bit of a disappointment. I must say I did get a little bit of expenditure this year which I was accused of when I was critic, of getting it all, which I got nothing. But however I can defend myself better this year. It was 259, that stretch between 21 and 24. It's hardtop on both sides and that's a gravel road in between. To make it more specific from Harding to Wheatland and I know the right-of-ways were acquisitioned for last year or during this year and I must say they're expressing a lot of disappointment that there's nothing being done this year. I tried to defend you, Mr. Chairman and your Minister, in saying this is a year everybody's asked us to hold the line. But if I defend you this year and I don't get nothing next year I guarantee I'm not going to defend you any longer.

That was the one thing - and I must say, Mr. Chairman, I have been blessed with extremely good divisional and district men not only in this administration but before in the other administration. I can certainly name them, I know them and I know it's especially trying this spring when I have so many roads going through the Assiniboine Valley that are washed out.

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. MCGREGOR cont'd)

I have an example: I got a late call at midnight last Wednesday. I phoned Mr. Reed in Virden and he promised Friday if he could get hold of the equipment he'd be there. He was there Friday and that's the kind of co-operation that I appreciate and likewise to the sub office at Rivers, it's just as co-operative. I, as a member, can just say that I really really appreciate the kind of co-operation I get from Brandon Divisional, Rivers District and sub district - pardon me, the Virden District and the sub district at Rivers and the people that are there. I guess we take credit - maybe we hired them but they're genuine public servants and I don't look at them in any way what their politics are. I just say I hope I get more next year, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I think the Member for Pembina expressed what is a general concern and the Member for Virden as well. But we were talking about our concern about the overall maintenance program for the Manitoba highways and I wonder if the Minister, in terms of his priorities - he has only so much money to spend on roads and maintenance and he has to determine where the greatest need is - does he rely essentially on the recommendations of his divisions, his area engineers in establishing which roads need the attention the most?

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, yes. Each district we have, and we have twelve of them in the Province of Manitoba, in this regard they do come up with their priorities within their own district as far as maintenance is concerned. I believe you're talking about maintenance?

MR. MCGILL: Yes.

MR. BURTNIAK: As far as maintenance is concerned they do follow the rules and regulations as laid down as I said before, no particular hifalutin policy except common sense. They try to apply that to the best of their ability. So I think that is all we can ask of our staff and I think that they have done a real commendable job.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, there's one specific item here, Provincial Road 457. There's 10.4 miles of bituminous overlay and shoulder gravel. Was that a recommendation from your engineers in the Brandon area?

MR. BURTNIAK: Yes, I would think so because in all cases when we get our road programs together for the year, each district supplies their priorities to the central office. It's a tremendous program and then, of course, we have to weed it out based on our allocation of funds. All these requests are made by the district engineer and his staff in each established district.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister when was that road originally blacktopped?

MR. BURTNIAK: I really couldn't answer that question right now, exactly what year. I'd have to dig out the information.

MR. MCGILL: Within the last two or three years?

MR. BURTNIAK: It may be, may very well be.

MR. MCGILL: And now they're doing an overlay on that. I'm just asking because I've been over the road a few times and I'm a little surprised that they would be going back to it at this stage. We're talking about 457, 10.4 miles - on Page 23. From PR 340 to 1A. What I'm thinking about is we have half of PR 250 that I mentioned the other day which is still gravel; half of it has been blacktopped for the first time with a cold application; now we're busy going over and recapping a road which is blacktopped and the part that is still gravel on 250 remains. I'm attempting to establish the kinds of priorities that you're working on here and I would just like the Minister to assure me that his engineering staff in Brandon felt that the surface of PR 457 was in such a state of disrepair that it required a priority application over any other roads in their area.

MR. BURTNIAK: The only assurance I can give my honourable friend is that, as I said before, these are the requests that come in, priorities set out by the district engineers within their own district. I cannot see why some job or some work would not be recommended if it wasn't necessary. I am not familiar with all the technical details that go on. I am sorry I can't go into that without advance notice but certainly in this

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. BURTNIAK cont'd) case, like in any other case, it had to be a recommendation by the department or the branch of our department in that particular district, for whatever reason.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of MPIC.

MR. URUSKI: I'm sorry, I've got it now. I just wanted clarification on which road is - 457 did you say?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I indicated my displeasures earlier in the Estimates insofar as our whole road program was concerned. The Minister knows and I think I speak on behalf of many municipal councils in the rural parts of the province. But somehow the Minister doesn't seem to agree with some of my comments I made. I just want to register those comments that I think are valid and still legitimate.

The one thing that I wanted to, if I am permitted to ask the Minister, in Brandon division how many of the new machines were allocated to that division for the purpose of removing snow and where were those machines placed? Is that in order to ask the . . .

MR. BURTNIAK: I suppose it's in order to ask as a question but I don't have that information in front of me, Mr. Chairman, so I really can't answer that specifically. I can get the information for the honourable member as far as that goes if the honourable member . . . I haven't got it right in front of me.

MR. EINARSON: I'd like to make one further comment then, Mr. Chairman. While my colleagues and I are trying to be as constructive as possible in bringing to the attention the fact that there isn't sufficient funds to operate this department - and I have had it said by people who were employed, operating the snow-removing equipment in this province - have been very unhappy where machines that have been working have had to be sent to the shops for repair and because they are so old and the kind of workmanship that is given these machines in the shops - and I know one particular operator was telling me that you have to turn the wheel of a machine 80 degrees before it responded - I would say, Mr. Chairman, that's a very serious matter insofar as the Department of Highways is concerned to ask anybody in the employ of the Department of Highways to operate a snow-removal machine. I bring this to the attention of the Minister because I think that we do need more funds to be spent on equipment for not only maintaining our roads but also for snow removal in the winter months. I'm given to understand that there was two machines, new machines, purchased in Brandon division and I believe they were both placed on the, pretty well a similarity - I'm not sure whether the Member for Morris got one of them put in his area and another one was placed not far away. My point is this: if this is true, and I'd like the Minister to check it out, that I think in all fairness that if he's going to put one machine in the northwest part of the province we could have one, at least, in the south part of the province. These are just some comments that I've been getting from different people and I think that I'm only to say in closing to the Minister that I think that he certainly must be given more consideration by his colleagues that further funds are necessary for his department in order that he can have an opportunity to function properly.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to preclude anyone out but I wonder if the honourable member would repeat his - oh, I'm sorry - you were asking about the placement of these two pieces of equipment in Brandon. That was your question?

MR. EINARSON: Yes, the two pieces of equipment. I think, Mr. Chairman, they said I said "Morris". I'm sorry, I meant for the constituency of Virden.

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

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to take this opportunity on the Minister's salary to thank him for the roads that will be coming into our area. I want to assure him that roads are a big issue as he knows in the rural areas. It's highly important because people have a long way to travel to get to market and to the towns to deliver their produce. I'm sure that under the circumstances the Minister is doing his best. I want to take this opportunity to commend the members of the district offices, the engineer and his staff in our area. We have Minnedosa and Portage but the majority of our constituency is the District of Dauphin and last fall, as you are aware, we had a very heavy

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. ADAM cont'd) rainfall in the fall, in September and right on to the fall and again this spring and also in the spring of 1974. I just want to advise the Minister that as far as I'm concerned the staff, the local foremen in the different areas have done a magnificent job and they certainly deserve our commendation for what they have done.

In closing I just want to say that we'll be right after the Minister for more roads all over our province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, one hates to, you know, go through a repetitious resume of the highway program but since we're operating with two committees it's not always possible to be where you want to be at the time you need to be there.

I wanted to ask the Minister about one particular item on his road program and that is contained in the items that are to be considered on Page 19 of his report. I notice an item that says Highway Nos. 240 and 305. Now the Minister knows my interest in those two particular roads. The item says that there's to be a location study. I was wondering if that location study would mean that it is now the intention of the department or if they've decided that from the Hood Bridge south that they're going to build a road over to Highway 240 and then complete Highway 240 down to St. Claude then south to, well, as far as the highway would go, which would be Darlingford. It is the route that I think the people of that area have been attempting to convince the Minister would be the proper route for him to follow and I wonder now if the department have made that decision. I can't see any other reason for this item in here including the two highways, 240 and 305, other than to assume that the department now have concluded that it is the most practical route to follow.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry I don't have my program with me right at the moment but if that is the indication - I'm not sure what is on the program. Is that from the previous year's program?

MR. JORGENSEN: No, that's the one to come.

MR. BURTNIAK: Oh yes, this year's program.

MR. JORGENSEN: Not the one to be completed this year, it's the project scheduled for 1976-77. It seems to me that a location study which would include Highways 240 and 305 would mean that you intend to join the two in completing that route south from Highway 4 which is already completed to the Hood Bridge. I wondered if the Minister's intention was to move east to Highway 240 and then south from there rather than follow directly along 305.

MR. BURTNIAK: Well the location study just is exactly what it says, a location study.

MR. JORGENSEN: But you're looking at the joining of those two roads.

MR. BURTNIAK; That's right.

MR. JORGENSEN: That's fine. One other question I would like to ask the Minister and that's in connection with the work that is to be completed in the Town of Morris on Highway 75. They are this year planning to complete long overdue work on Highway 75 within the Town of Morris itself. The Minister knows about the negotiations that have been going on with respect to the government completing their portion and their responsibility insofar as Highway 75 is concerned.

There were also some other negotiations being carried on with respect to the financing and I don't want to detail them here but the Minister I believe, knows what I'm talking about. I wonder if he would be prepared to give me an answer to that particular question. I was discussing the matter with the Mayor of the Town of Morris over the weekend and he was very curious to know whether or not the Minister had made a decision with respect to that particular matter. The Minister will recall that he told me some time ago that he felt it would be wise to wait until the highway program had been announced before he made a decision on that matter or made an announcement on that matter. I wonder now if he would be prepared to do that.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, I believe that I'm familiar with the problem that the Honourable Member for Morris is referring to and I did indicate to him several weeks ago that a decision will have to be made for the information of the local council on

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. BURTNIAK cont'd) that. I realize that it wasn't something that I could give any indication at that time. We've perused this problem and this kind of situation and we realize that it wasn't very easy to make a decision and we hope that we will be able to proceed with what the member had requested unless something should happen that's unforeseen at the present time. But barring any such catastrophe I would hope that we would be able to proceed with the request.

MR. JORGENSON: . . . and with that reassurance I will discontinue any further questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Chairman, we've come onto a different subject here on which there could be easily a difference of opinion. When I spoke earlier I spoke about groups that got up petitions and stopped the department from getting ahead with their work because they got up petitions and many times the right decision wasn't gone ahead with because of petitions. You people remember what I said - at least it's on the record. I think that No. 240 and 305 is one of these in question. That road would have been built years ago if the people in that area hadn't squabbled around with petitions. I'm satisfied that when they had this engineering crew make the survey and decide to go ahead with the road that the people would quit with their petitions and let the road be built.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I won't dwell too long on the Minister's salary either. Unfortunately I missed a great part of the debate trying to sit in on the two committees.

I actually am pleased with some of the work in my constituency but like most of the other members I haven't had enough done. I'm happy with the work that's been done on 270, but disappointed that the Minister is not showing more work being done on 250, especially the part that runs through my constituency. It's worse down in the Member for Virden's constituency I know, but the heavy tourist traffic is always up in the north part of the constituency in the Sandy Lake area and I get a great number of complaints from that particular spot.

I just want to have it on the record, Mr. Chairman, one of the complaints that I hear most often in the rural areas has been covered by many of my colleagues, the fact that there just doesn't seem to be enough maintenance funds to provide the municipalities or to provide enough work on maintaining the rural roads. I'm sure the Minister has had that brought up on more than one occasion and there's no point in belabouring it but I think there has to be some effort put forth by the department to extract more funds from his Cabinet colleagues and ease off on some of the Other Expenditures and make sure that these roads are maintained in a proper level before they deteriorate to the point of requiring major rebuilding expenditures.

If the Minister has covered it in his earlier remarks I'll pick it up in Hansard, but I was interested in this section of No. 10 Highway being rebuilt in the Flin Flon area between Baker's Narrows and Flin Flon, the straightening work. I'm aware of much that has been done but I wondered what condition it's in. If he covered that I'll pick it up in Hansard but if no one has questioned him on that I wonder if he could give me some idea of how that work is progressing and will that new section be opened for the tourist traffic this summer?

MR. BURTNIAK: I believe that particular topic was covered earlier.

MR. BLAKE: If it was I'll get it in Hansard.

MR. BURTNIAK: The member for Flin Flon asked that question and I briefly replied. I don't think there is much point in repeating.

MR. BLAKE: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 64(a)--pass. Resolution 64 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$842,100 for Highways--pass.

That completes the consideration of the Department of Highways. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, your Committee of Supply has considered certain resolutions, requests me to report progress and begs leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

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

MR. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Fort Garry that the Report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hour of adjournment having arrived the House is now adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:30 p.m. tomorrow afternoon.