

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 4 May, 1987.

Time — 1:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER, Hon. M. Phillips: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I have a report for the House on the results of the First Ministers' Meeting on the Constitution which took place last Thursday in Meech Lake, Quebec.

Before I left for the meeting, I said I hoped to be able to report progress to the House when I returned. I'm pleased to say that I can report progress, substantial progress.

I feel privileged and proud to have been able to represent Manitoba at what turns out to be an historic meeting. All 11 First Ministers reached agreement in principle, unanimously, on a set of constitutional changes which will make our country stronger and more unified.

When the First Minister announced the results of our meeting, he said it had been "A good day for Canada." He was right; and it was an equally good day for Manitoba.

The constitutional changes which were approved in principle at Meech Lakewent a long way toward meeting the concerns we'd expressed prior to the meeting. Provinces will have greater input in some aspects of federal policy-making and in the make-up of federal institutions. But, overall, the power and authority of the national government has not been compromised.

I will table - and I have already tabled - copies of the unanimous agreement in principle with the text of this statement.

Before the conference, I advised the House that our greatest concern had been the threat of major, new limits on the Federal Government's "spending power" - that is, its ability to introduce new national programs, particularly in areas of provincial jurisdiction - the kinds of programs which, as I said before the meeting, are especially important to smaller provinces such as ours.

Such proposals were tabled at the meeting, but after some discussion, they were set aside.

The spending power change which was agreed upon, though significant, should not prevent a Federal Government from introducing new national programs with strong national standards. That was a major accomplishment, and I believe Manitoba can share in the credit for that outcome.

Under the new provision, provinces will be able to opt out of future national shared cost programs in return for "reasonable compensation," but only if those

provinces undertake their own initiatives or programs in ways that are "compatible with national objectives."

Granted, there appears to be considerable flexibility in those words, but the First Ministers' intent will be clarified in the next few weeks, when the formal, legal draft is prepared.

Our understanding of the agreement is that it will still make possible the kind of federal initiative that led to Medicare - and that it should not stand in the way of early implementation of a national day care program.

There should be no doubt that the Federal Government will continue to exercise considerable leverage by playing a major part in defining what it regards as "reasonable compensation" and what it regards as "compatible with national standards."

The other, large concern for Manitoba before the meeting was a proposal that Quebec, or any province or group of provinces, be granted a special veto over future constitutional changes.

Several other provinces shared that concern - and the agreement, in principle, reflects that fact.

Under the agreement, every province is treated equally. Every province will have an equal say in shaping new key institutions.

That, too, was a major accomplishment - and, again, I believe Manitoba can fairly accept some of the credit for that result as well.

Our one regret here is that the agreement in principle would make the entry of new provinces subject to unanimous agreement by all existing provinces and the Federal Government, rather than by way of the general amending formula of seven provinces with 50 percent of the population. If there were a willingness on the part of the other participants at last week's conference to deal further with that concern in the coming weeks, I would certainly support such an effort.

Another provision in the agreement - the provision that apparently is seen as most important to the Government of Quebec - is formal recognition that "Quebec constitutes within Canada a distinct society." That recognition will complement the constitutional provision recognizing the multicultural nature of the country, which became part of the Constitution five years ago.

The agreement in principle also contains provisions regarding immigration and the Supreme Court - and both offer all provinces better input.

On immigration, the agreement offers provinces the prospect of negotiating federal-provincial agreements on immigration policy. The provision on the Supreme Court commits the Government of Canada to selecting Supreme Court Justices from lists of nominees to be forwarded by the provinces.

Finally, the agreement in principle deals with what has been called the "Second Round" - arrangements to ensure that formal federal-provincial consultations on the Constitution and the economy will occur annually, and cannot be set aside indefinitely, at the discretion of some future Prime Minister.

The first of the new round of Constitutional Conferences will be held before the end of 1988 and

will include, on its agenda, potential changes to the Senate, fisheries policy, and other agreed-upon matters.

That leaves the door open for our government and others to continue to press for strengthened constitutional guarantees for equalization and for regional development.

We also intend to keep pressing to ensure that the issue of aboriginal rights remains a priority in upcoming constitutional discussions.

There is an argument that the agreement in principle will make changes to the Senate harder to achieve. That remains to be seen.

Obviously, it was satisfactory to the Premier of the Province of Alberta, who has been the strongest proponent of a particular kind of change - the so-called "Triple E" proposal.

My reading of the situation is that there is a consensus among First Ministers that the current Senate needs to be changed, and that we should get on with the job of assessing alternatives to prepare our first conference on that subject.

If the attitude around the conference table last Thursday stays the same, I believe, we could well see some changes at that time.

The agreement in principle specifies that until such time as amendments regarding the Senate are accomplished, the Federal Government shall make its appointments to the existing Senate from lists of nominees provided by the relevant Premiers.

I hope that this new, interim procedure - if it remains in effect for any length of time - will raise the overall calibre of appointments. While there have been a few first-rate Senate appointments in recent years, they have been the exception, rather than the rule.

Within the next few days, we expect the Federal Government to set out a work plan for preparing the draft constitutional resolution and to suggest a date for the First Ministers' meeting on this subject. As the Meech Lake communique stated, we expect that meeting to be held "within weeks."

Although preparing the resolution in "Constitutional Language" will involve substantial work - and potentially significant disagreements - I believe the commitments at Meech Lake were firm and will hold.

Once the resolution has been agreed to by First Ministers, it will be put before the Parliament of Canada and the Provincial Legislatures for their consideration.

Here in Manitoba, the deliberations on the resolution will involve the public hearing process which is now a part of our procedures for constitutional amendments.

As I said before the meeting last week, there hasn't yet been an opportunity for detailed public debate on the constitutional changes and their importance to national unity.

Now, the debate is under way, and the direction so far has been constructive.

In part, that is attributable to a growing recognition of the importance to Canada of full partnership of the 6.5 million people of the Province of Quebec.

The debate has also been constructive because of the leadership demonstrated by the Prime Minister of Canada on this issue, and by his colleague, Senator Lowell Murray. I believe the Prime Minister deserves to be commended.

Finally, the debate on this issue has started in a positive way because of the goodwill of all Provincial

Premiers and - let me emphasize once more - their unanimous support for our agreement in principle.

Madam Speaker, last Thursday's agreement marked a historic breakthrough for our country. And, it was achieved without the kind of divisions that have wasted so much time and energy in past years.

Now, we can and should get on with the job of dealing with the urgent economic and social policy issues facing our country: Agriculture; Western Diversification; Tax Reform; Day Care; Aboriginal Rights.

And - as we can do so with added momentum - and more, clear evidence of what can be accomplished when there is genuine cooperation between the Federal and the Provincial Governments.

Last week's agreement proved, again, that basic fairness - to all provinces - is one of the keys to nation-building. It is a lesson that I hope won't be lost on the Federal Government in the months and the years ahead.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I thank the Premier for that statement and report on the accomplishments of the Meech Lake, First Ministers' Conference on the Constitution. I'm sure that the Premier will understand that we were looking forward eagerly to his report when we read the weekend newspapers that said such things, such as, "Pawley to the PM, all is forgiven", and, "Mulroney Gets Top Marks for Quebec Accord". We certainly wanted to see whether or not the air at Meech Lake had had a dramatic effect on the Premier's outlook or whether, indeed, it was the charm of the Prime Minister that led to the new approach, the Irish charm that the Premier has taken pokes at in the past, obviously can be appreciated even by a New Democratic Premier.

Madam Speaker, certainly the Meech Lake Conference is to be welcomed for a number of achievements. First and foremost, the fact that the disparate views and priorities of 10 separate provinces, and the National Government in Ottawa, still allowed a consensus, and indeed an agreement in principle, that was supported by all those First Ministers in attendance, and that has to be a remarkable achievement in today's circumstances with the various views, and certainly the different interests across the country.

We certainly look forward to the details contained in the legal draft as to how all of the agreements in principle will take shape and form, that is to be voted upon here in the form of a constitutional amendment resolution to be put before our House.

We were pleased, as well, Madam Speaker, to know that overall the power and authority of the national government has not been compromised. All of us, believing in the federal system of government which we have, believe that to be an important objective and we're pleased that that has not been compromised, or indeed, has not been affected as a result of these agreement.

We'll look forward, of course, to learning about the mechanics of the operation of the so-called "constitutional veto" that's been given to all provinces,

Monday, 4 May, 1987

and be interested in knowing how that is to work, and to continue to maintain an opportunity to have our democratic form of government that we have under our Constitution at the present time in Canada.

Madam Speaker, we're glad that the Premier has shown some flexibility with respect to reform of the Senate. In leaving our province last Wednesday, he seemed to indicate that abolition was the only card that he was prepared to place on the table. Madam Speaker, we hope that he will continue to show this flexibility in dealing with the principle of Senate Reform that has obviously been agreed to by the other First Ministers.

Madam Speaker, I'm interested to see the Premier's response to his expectation that the province, being able to submit names for future appointments to the Senate until reform is achieved will, in his words, raise the overall calibre of appointments.

So, Madam Speaker, given this government's track record in appointments to boards of Crown corporations that have squandered tens, if not hundreds of millions of dollars over the past four years, I don't think we share his optimism that that is going to raise the overall calibre of appointments to the Senate.

Madam Speaker, I can tell the Premier and his colleagues that we, on this side, are optimistic that the grounds for consensus on a formal legal agreement appear to be solid and appear to give us a great deal of hope for the future. We look forward to the public hearing process, the opportunity to debate and discuss all of the proposals when they become in their final legal form.

We look forward to dealing with many of the major issues that trouble us, both here in Manitoba and across the country; not only economic development and the opportunity for future growth in our province, deficit reduction, the commitment to quality health care that all of us would like to see, but obviously, the changes that we'll see us continue to be an equal partner with all of the other provinces across the country, as we look forward to the future with optimism.

So we thank the Premier for that presentation and we look forward to future opportunities to discuss and debate all the details.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUKE: Yes, Madam Speaker, I'd like to table the Annual Report for the Manitoba Oil and Gas Corporation for the year ended 1986 and, while so doing, I'd like to thank members opposite for their cooperation in reviewing the draft of this report before the Economic Development Committee.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, I wish to table before the House the year-end Financial Statement for Venture Manitoba Tours Limited for the year 1985-86.

Just a word of explanation, Madam Speaker. In previous years this report has been part of the Consolidated Statements of Boards and Commissions and Government Agencies. It is this year being tabled

as a separate item and in that my departmental Estimates are now before review, I thought it would be tabled. It's not part of my department, but it does report to me, so perhaps as the final item on my department's Estimates they would want to have that information.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MADAM SPEAKER: Before moving to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have five visitors who are rotary exchange students under the direction of Mr. Fraser Stuart. The visitors are from the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs; and we have 27 students of Grade 9 from the Murdoch MacKay Collegiate under the direction of Mr. Schroeder. The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

On behalf of all the members, we welcome you to the Legislature this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Constitutional Agreement - hearings throughout province

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

My question to the Premier is, given that there is an intention after the discussions that will further take place and lead to a formal legal document with respect to future constitutional change to bring Quebec into the Constitution, that will involve the passage of a motion in this Legislature in support of that formal resolution; I wonder if the Premier could confirm and indeed assure the people of Manitoba that the public hearing process that will be necessary and will be carried out to hear the views of the people of Manitoba on that constitutional agreement, that that public hearing process will involve meetings being held throughout the province, not just in Winnipeg.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, certainly the desire is to ensure public input. The details of public input, I think, are a matter that should be left to discussion between our respective House Leaders and ensure that we work out a satisfactory means of ensuring the public input that we desire.

Workers Compensation Board - Report of King Commission

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I have a further question. This is to the Minister responsible for the Workers Compensation Board.

I wonder if he can indicate whether or not his office has yet received the report of the King Commission,

Monday, 4 May, 1987

the Legislative Review Commission into the Workers Compensation Board.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for Workers Compensation.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, we have not received a complete report of the King Committee. We expect that we should be receiving a complete report by the end of the week.

MR. G. FILMON: I wonder, Madam Speaker, if the Minister can indicate whether or not he will table that report as soon as it is received by his office.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, we have had questions on this report previously, and I indicated at that time that I would be tabling the report when we have had an opportunity to print it, and to look at the recommendations that are put forward by the King Review Committee.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, by that answer I wonder if the Minister is indicating that it will not be printed when he receives it in its final form.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, the review committee has been working on this for about a year-and-a-half now, and it has taken them a longer period of time to bring the final report than they had expected. The report is not in one piece at this time, and it is just coming to the stage where it will be going to the printers.

MR. G. FILMON: I wonder if the Minister could indicate, Madam Speaker, how long he believes it will be before he can table the complete report in the Legislature.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, we will be tabling it as soon as it is possible. Once the printing is completed we'll be tabling it as soon as possible.

MR. G. FILMON: Yes, Madam Speaker, does the Minister have an estimate of time that that might take?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, it'll be going to the printers and it's difficult to say how long it would take to print it. I would not want to guess how long it would take for the printers to print the final report.

Long-term Disabilities Report, by Craig Cormack - receipt of

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, has the Minister's office received the report of the Long-Term Disabilities Committee prepared by Mr. Craig Cormack?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, we have said on previous occasions that it is an internal report that has been received by the Board of Commissioners, and it is not a final report. We have been told the committee is still working on the report which is meant for the Workers Compensation Board.

MR. G. FILMON: Given that when I asked the question on this particular investigation and report some time

ago, the Minister indicated, and I quote: "If the Leader of the Opposition would like to come, we would like to share any information that we have. If he wants to come and see some of the information we've got I welcome him."

Would that report be one of the pieces of information and reviews that I could see, should I come to his office or to the Workers Compensation Board offices?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: No, Madam Speaker, that committee's report is an internal document, and it is meant for the Workers Compensation Board, and it is not meant for the member.

Long-term Disabilities Report - critical of WCB

MR. G. FILMON: Is the reason why he's not willing to share that report, the fact that it is very critical of the administration of the Workers Compensation Board, and indeed, places a great deal of criticism on their current affairs in the administration of the long-term disabilities?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition will remember all the criticism there was directed in the direction of Workers Compensation when he was part of the government. We are still going through a lot of reform on the Workers Compensation. There has been a lot of reform conducted because there was a lot of changes needed, because there were services not being received by members of the community who were injured and hurt on the job site.

They have made a lot of changes in the area of rehabilitation, but we had said all along that there is still ongoing reform that is needed, there is ongoing reform that is being carried out, and there will be criticism. It's an impossibility to deal with all claimants in a positive way so naturally there will be some criticism directed at Workers' Compensation. That has never been any different, it is still going on at this time.

Tax measures and tax increases - which came into effect today

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister of Finance. Can he indicate what new tax measures and tax increases came into effect today?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Those that were announced in the Budget, Madam Speaker.

MR. C. MANNES: Madam Speaker, I ask the Minister of Finance if he could repeat them for the House and for the people of Manitoba; what products are coming under taxation?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I had thought that the purpose of question period was to seek information that the member does not have. The member is well aware of what measures, from the Budget, took effect today. If he would like further detail I will provide it with a further copy of the Budget Address if he does not recall what was in that budget.

I know that he didn't take much interest in it at the time, and now he is trying to generate some interest.

MR. C. MANNESS: Madam Speaker, the Minister has just provided clear evidence that there were so many tax measures announced on Budget night that he can't remember them all.

Removal of retail tax exemption on insulation - rationale for

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. C. MANNESS: Madam Speaker, my question to the Minister of Finance.

Why has the government decided to remove the retail tax exemption? It used to apply to insulation materials and energy saving devices. What is the rationale for the removal of that exemption?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I would have thought the best time for discussion and debate on matters related to the Budget would have been in the extensive amount of time that was available for discussion and debate on the budget. That's the normal practice, there's a normal period of time set aside for that debate in which all members, and indeed that member participated.

The reason for any of the tax increases related to the need to provide sufficient funds for the government to provide for services, such as, health, education, social services and, at the same time, bring about some reduction in the deficit. I'm pleased to have been able to do that in a way that has provided funds for those services and brought down a reduction in the deficit, unlike governments of the same political stripe as the member opposite in Saskatchewan and Alberta who have done the opposite, Madam Speaker.

MR. C. MANNESS: A final supplementary, Madam Speaker.

Will the government now be increasing loan limits, or reducing interests rates, under the various provisions of the CHEC loan program to offset a 7 percent increase in all insulation materials, such as, weatherstripping, caulking materials, triple-glazed windows, triple-glazed doors? Will the government be increasing some of the grants under that program, to offset the increase in sales tax?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I'll allow that question to be answered in full by the Minister of Energy and Mines, but I can say that the government is pleased to continue support through programs like that to ensure that people have the opportunities to provide for conservation materials in their homes and, at the same time, continue job creation in the Province of Manitoba.

Sugar beet industry - tripartite agreement

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Premier of the province.

Will there be, in the Province of Manitoba, a sugar beet agreement?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture will deal with that question in detail, if required. Needless to say, Madam Speaker, there have been continued discussions involving the Federal Government representatives and the Minister of Agriculture, and myself, in an effort to ensure that the very real concerns that we, as a Provincial Government, have are addressed and are dealt with.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, further to that question, I wish to indicate to my honourable friend that, based on our discussions of last week with the Hon. Jake Epp, two proposals were discussed, and a third option was provided to us by Mr. Epp. Any of those three proposals were agreeable to us and as a result of further discussions and Mr. Epp going back to his colleagues, we were unable to finalize an agreement.

There were further discussions over the weekend and today, Madam Speaker, the concerns still remain the same, and that is, of course, the question of the deficit and our participation in that deficit. It's been agreed that the Federal Government take back our discussions and will be getting back to us on what flexibility, if any, they have in this whole area.

Premier's statement re CF-18 in Free Press

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Premier.

Madam Speaker, in Saturday's Free Press, the Premier made the astounding statement that one should let bygones be bygones, and that he has forgiven the Prime Minister for past offences, including the CF-18 decision. Madam Speaker, the Premier is the only citizen of the province that has forgiven the Federal Government for that decision . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: . . . and, therefore, I would ask him to renounce that statement in the House today.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Let me assure the Member for River Heights that at no time did I indicate that Manitobans, nor the Premier, forgave the Federal Government for

Monday, 4 May, 1987

the decision on the CF-18. I'm not the writer of headlines, Madam Speaker, and I regret very much that . . . Let me assure you that when the Federal Government undertakes initiatives that are wrong we will call them wrong. We will not hesitate to say so, as we did with the CF-18. Madam Speaker, when the Prime Minister deserves to be commended, when the Federal Government deserves to be commended, we will also commend, unlike honourable members across the way that appear to have a single-focused attitude toward all matters, in a very partisan way.

Question period policy - preambles placing blame

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Madam Speaker, with a supplementary to the First Minister.

Putting aside the evangelical fervour of forgiveness on his part, can the Premier confirm that it will be a new policy in question period of this House that . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable First Minister on a point of order.

HON. H. PAWLEY: If the honourable member would have listened to my comments, I would have indicated that the word "forgiveness" was attributable to the headline writer in the Free Press, and not to myself.

MADAM SPEAKER: A dispute over the facts is not a point of order.

The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Madam Speaker, to continue with my question: Will it now be a policy of this government, in question period, that we will no longer have Cabinet Ministers giving preambles to their questions that place all blame for whatever happens in this province on the Federal Government, but will instead answer questions which will make them responsible for the affairs of Manitoba?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, when the party to which the honourable member belongs was in power, we called the shots when they did the wrong thing, whether it was the Crow rate, tobacco; whether it was the deregulation policies of the Member for Winnipeg South Centre; whether it was in respect to equalization, the lack of tax reform. Madam Speaker, we don't have any intention on our part of desisting from calling the shots and being prepared to condemn governments, Federal Governments, whether it be the Liberal stripe or the Conservative stripe when wrong is done. At the same time, Madam Speaker, I'm not going to hesitate to give credit where credit is due when good things are done on the part of the Federal Government.

Senate appointments of Spivak, Roblin and Nurgitz

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: A final question to the Premier, Madam Speaker.

In his statement today to the Legislature there's a rather cheap shot, I think, made at Senate appointments

in this province. Would the First Minister like to define which one of Senators Spivak, Roblin and Nurgitz, who are our recent appointments, he considers first rate and which ones he considers to be less than that?

HON. H. PAWLEY: If the honourable member wishes me to do so I will go across the country and deal with all 108 Senate appointments and advise her which ones I believe were simply pasturing old Liberal politicians off to the Senate because the Liberal Party didn't know what to do with them.

Urgent economic topics - ongoing

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. C. BAKER: My question is to the First Minister.

In his winding up of the statement he made on his trip to Ottawa, he mentioned now we should get on with the job of dealing with the urgent economic social policy issues facing our country, and he mentions agriculture, western diversification, tax reform and day care. I was wondering if he could tell us when these topics will keep on going, especially as in regard to agriculture.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, an announcement will be made very shortly, I believe, by the Prime Minister's office of a visit to the Province of Manitoba, and certainly I intend to ensure that at the top of my agenda, and I'm sure it would be on the top of the Prime Minister's agenda, would be discussion on the question of agriculture, in general in Canada, particularly in the Province of Manitoba in the west, and what can be done in order to more successfully contend with what is a grave crisis in family agriculture brought about because of trade problems gravely affecting the sale of produce.

Provincially-owned school buses - analysis of costs

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. L. DERKACH: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Education.

For some time, or for several years, the former Minister, and this Minister more recently, have indicated to school divisions the cost-effectiveness of using provincially-owned school buses. Last year during the Estimates process, Madam Speaker, I asked the Minister of Education whether he would provide us with the analysis of costs of provincially-owned school buses, including such costs as maintenance costs, garage costs and capital costs of the buses. To date I have not received that information, Madam Speaker, and I'm wondering whether the Minister would like to provide this information before we go into the Estimates process.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I'm certainly prepared to look at whatever undertakings were made that weren't complied with in terms of the Estimates debates that went on last year. I'm not aware of any continuing obligation. I understood the member to ask several questions that were responded to in one way or another; some questions were in fact held over and responses developed for the member during the Estimates process, but if there's some further information that he feels that he would need before the Estimates review, I'm perfectly willing to provide what information I can.

Provincially-owned school buses - analysis of costs - tabling of info.

MR. L. DERKACH: Madam Speaker, if the Minister would care to check Hansard, he would see that he did commit himself to making that information available, and to date that information has not been made available. I'm wondering whether he is prepared to table that.

HON. J. STORIE: Madam Speaker, given his obvious enthusiasm for that information, I'm somewhat surprised he didn't bring this to my attention a little bit earlier that he hadn't received information that he felt was forthcoming. I'm not aware of anything that the department or the Pupil Transportation Division has available for tabling at this point for the member's information, but I've indicated that if he will give me some specifics on what he feels he needs to know, I'm perfectly prepared to provide whatever information the branch has available for him.

St. Vital Mustangs, Community Places Program Grant - request declined

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. J. WALDING: Madam Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation and it concerns the St. Vital Mustangs, a long-established club in St. Vital, well regarded by the people of St. Vital.

The club has been provincial champions on numerous occasions and national champions on several occasions. Recently they raised a sum of money and applied to the Minister for a matching grant under the Community Places Program. My question is, to what extent was the Minister personally involved in declining that request?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture and Heritage Resources.

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

As has been brought to the attention of all members of this House, decisions for the Community Places Program are by a committee of Cabinet, following research and data collected by staff. I think it should be pointed out to all members of the House that there

were over 500 applications, and the demand and the need was certainly far greater than anyone had ever anticipated, indicating the very important nature of this program. We will certainly be encouraging all projects, who were not successful this time, if they are eligible, to apply again.

MR. J. WALDING: A supplementary question, Madam Speaker.

In view of the fact that the application involves a possible fire hazard for changing rooms in a basement location, would the Minister be prepared to review the application?

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: Madam Speaker, I'll certainly look at the information again, but I should repeat that the decision-making is by a Cabinet committee and all decisions are confirmed through Cabinet. Again, there were many, many needs and a great demand for assistance to improve facilities and to meet a variety of pressing community needs.

I regret that we were not able to meet all of that, but we are committed to, over the next several years, with over \$30 million injected into this program, begin to meet some of those pressing concerns of Manitoba.

Morley Kenneth Daniels - appeal of sentence by A/G

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: My question is to the Attorney-General.

It concerns the sentencing of Morley Kenneth Daniels, who tortured and brutally sexually assaulted a woman in front of her children. Crown Attorney Rampersad is reported to have said, society must be protected and that this is one of the worst sexual assault cases. He called Daniels' actions those of a perverted, dangerous man and called for a life sentence.

Will the Attorney-General appeal the sentence of nine years, and show that this government means business about protecting the women against violence?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: This government certainly does mean business in protecting women against violence; this government has led the country with respect to its policy concerning battered wives, not only in terms of the prosecutorial policy but with respect to the services that we have supplied. Let there be no doubt about that.

The member, in asking the question, quotes from our Crown prosecutor. The Crown prosecutor asked for a life sentence. Clearly the Crown prosecutor on the line was doing his duty in line with that policy.

The fact that the judge did not go along with the recommendation of the Crown prosecutor is a matter that we will certainly consider. All such matters are referred to a special committee that we have of senior officials in the department, who regularly review cases of that kind, and make a decision as to whether or not an appeal will follow. I will wait for the recommendation.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I hope that the Attorney-General will give this particular case the highest priority.

Monday, 4 May, 1987

**People in Equal Participation
Incorporated - request for wheelchair
services for members of PEP**

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I have a new question to the First Minister, Madam Speaker.

The People in Equal Participation Incorporated are holding a special event on May 12, Manitoba Day at the Legislature. They have written the Premier for 10 PEP members who are wheelchair-bound - they need some help so that they may also view the House while it's in Session. I wonder what accommodations the First Minister has arranged for wheelchair access for the members of PEP.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, we have been in contact with the community, and we're trying to facilitate them by having them view question period in the Speaker's Chambers. We have made this proposal to them. If they accept it, that's the way they will be viewing question period that day.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Madam Speaker, I ask the First Minister then, in light of the arrangements, but they can watch it on TV at any time, I'm wondering if the First Minister could arrange that on that particular day, we would have the 10 wheelchair-bound people in this Chamber?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I gather this matter was dealt with at the LMC Meeting involving representatives of the different parties. I was not in attendance at that meeting, but it's my understanding this has already been dealt with at the Legislative Management Committee meeting. I would certainly personally want to ascertain the recommendations of the members of that committee.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Madam Speaker, I am now going over the head of that committee, and going directly to the Premier, to ask on behalf of these wheelchair residents of Manitoba, that they be allowed to come and view the Legislature on that particular day which is Manitoba Day. And I ask the First Minister to give special consideration.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, certainly because of the seriousness of the question and our desire, as all the members of this Legislature, to ensure equal access, I will certainly take the matter under advisement and ascertain what the recommendations are from LMC, from Government Services, and ascertain whether there's some other route that can be proceeded with, in order to ensure - if all members would desire - equal access to all residents of Manitoba, to all public buildings, including this Chamber to watch the proceedings.

So, Madam Speaker, I will give the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park my word that I will personally look into it.

AIDS - bisexual activity

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Health.

Given the fact that a medical doctor from Minnesota, at a recent Winnipeg Conference, has pointed out that the heterosexual community is now experiencing an increased risk of AIDS, due to the activity of bisexual males; and given the fact that here in Manitoba we have recently identified male bisexuals with AIDS; can the Minister advise the House what is being done to inform the community at large regarding the danger of AIDS being spread through bisexual activity?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, the honourable member was present when we had quite a discussion during my Estimates, and I suggest that she read Hansard if she wants to be reminded of what was said. This is not something that you can answer just during a period such as this, it is complicated and we spent hours and hours discussing that at the time.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Madam Speaker, I was wanting to know what this government is doing specifically as a result of very recent information.

My second question to the Minister, Madam Speaker, is: Has the Village Clinic provided this Minister with how many of the 100 Manitobans infected with the AIDS virus are No. 1, homosexual; No. 2, bisexual; No. 3, female; No. 4, children?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I doubt if that information, Madam Speaker, would be available. I'll find out. Part of it could be available - I would imagine. I'll find out and I'll report to the House if there's any information that could be transmitted to the committee.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Madam Speaker, my final supplementary to the Minister is: How many of the 100 Manitobans infected with the AIDS virus have given names to trace contacts? And as a result of this contact tracing, how many further cases of infection have been diagnosed? What I'm asking is, how many cases of AIDS have been diagnosed as a result of contact tracing?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, my honourable friend knows this is not available. The contacts, the time, are researched or are discussed with the doctors, not necessarily just the one person, a lot of that is left to the doctor who discusses this with the patient and follows through.

Gowler, Mitch - inquest into death

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Community Services and Corrections.

My question to the Minister is regarding the episode of the drowning of Mitch Gowler, while he was looking after a mentally handicapped person. The drug prescription for this mentally handicapped person had been increased just days before the tragedy to control his violent nature. Why was this mentally handicapped person allowed to leave with only one person to cope with him on a one-to-one basis when it was known that the handicapped person had a real problem?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, I don't know the answer to that specific question. I do know that the mentally handicapped individual was of small stature, roughly 120 pounds, and that the man looking after him was an experienced worker well over six foot and a sizable individual. Again, the particular circumstances of the tragedy are not known, other than by inference, with regard to the general use of drugs and whether they have a direct impact on the behaviour of an individual.

As the member knows, we have asked the College of Physicians and Surgeons to take that particular issue under their consideration and to make recommendations to us. If, Madam Speaker, we find that there is not a clear policy recommendation coming from them, we will undertake a more thorough study and consideration of that matter, but I don't agree with the reasoning that the member opposite gives in this particular case.

MR. A. BROWN: My question is to the same Minister. Will the Minister ask for an inquest into the death of Mitch Gowler so that we may have an independent inquiry looking after this matter?

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, there is a process that's followed whenever there is a death that is not readily explainable. I think in this case the police and the chief medical examiner have been involved, and I think they are the appropriate people to make that determination.

Gowler, Mitch - compensation to family

MR. A. BROWN: Mitch Gowler was receiving remuneration for looking after this handicapped person and other handicapped persons. Will there be any compensation going to his family? In other words, was there any type of insurance coverage?

HON. M. SMITH: I'll take that under advisement.

Community Services - Annual Report

MR. A. BROWN: I have another question for the Minister.

In about one weeks time, we are going to be on the Estimates of Community Services. To date we have not received the annual report. When may we expect this annual report?

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, the Annual Report for Community Services, comparable to the period of time being covered by the other reports tabled, wasn't tabled last year.

Crop seeding - lack of operating credit

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Agriculture.

Madam Speaker, there are fairly large areas in the Province of Manitoba where very little seeding has commenced to this point in time. I'd like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if he has determined how many farmers in the Province of Manitoba are having difficulty in getting their crops seeded because of lack of operating credit?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I will take that specific question as notice and see whether or not there are some statistics that we may have insofar as the availability or non-availability of operating credit. Madam Speaker, the question of operating credit has been one that's been debated in this country and in this province for over five years. In fact, the Province of Manitoba has provided a provincial operating loan guarantee program over the last number of years in excess of \$100 million. However, we realize that we are not able to meet all the credit needs of Manitoba farmers, but I want to take that question as notice to see whether there are large tracts of land going unseeded and what some of the reasons might be.

Operating Loan Guarantee Program - criteria for limiting usefulness

MR. G. FINDLAY: Given that the Guaranteed Operating Loan that the Minister mentioned, only \$53 million of the available \$100 million has been utilized by farmers and it seems to be some of the criteria that are involved in the program is limiting its usefulness, will the Minister look at changing that criteria, Madam Speaker, to make it more available to farmers immediately?

HON. B. URUSKI: In terms of the Operating Loan Guarantee Program, although the current outlay of capital is \$53 million, it has grown, Madam Speaker, from a low of \$25 million in the first year and continues to be there. The use of the program, of course, is made by private lending institutions, and we've attempted to, and are still attempting to, encourage all the institutions to participate in it, but clearly those applications that are coming in through the program would be handled in a normal fashion.

I realize that the \$125,000 limit under the program might not be enough to meet all farmers' needs, and that's why all 10 provincial Ministers of Agriculture, two years ago, attempted to get the Federal Government to complement provincial programs of the Operating Loan Guarantee Program. All 10 Ministers of Agriculture suggested that to the Federal Government. It has not been accepted to date, Madam Speaker.

MR. G. FINDLAY: In addition to that criteria, would he also look at the criteria of the 12.5 percent

government guarantee, and consider increasing that amount of guarantee on those loans?

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, it should be pointed out that the 12.5 percent guarantee is a very generous guarantee in terms of the program, because what it does is allow for the entire loan portfolio - for example, if an institution has \$10 million of loan guarantees under the program and there is, let's say, a loss of \$1 million in that program, the program pays 100 percent of the loss to a total of 12.5 percent of the aggregate loans on the program.

Madam Speaker, it is a very generous program, and in fact has been utilized every year in a greater and greater amount than any other program that has been in place. Admittedly, it will not meet all the credit needs of all farmers, but certainly it has gone a long way in this area.

Supreme Court - three judges from Quebec

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Madam Speaker. A question to the Premier.

Could the Premier advise the House whether, at the meeting of the First Ministers on the Constitution, the First Ministers agreed that three judges on the Supreme Court would come from the Province of Quebec and that Quebec would have a veto with respect to any future changes in that constitutional provision?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, section 42 of the Canada Act requires now unanimous consent of all provinces. Under 41 includes the House of Commons, the Senate, the composition of the Supreme Court.- (Interjection)- I'm going to allow the Attorney-General, who is much more an authority on constitutional law, to respond to that legal question.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney General.

HON. R. PENNER: I'm sorry, Madam Speaker, the Premier and I were talking about two different sections of the Constitution.

The Constitution presently has the unanimous provision in section 41. The Premier was quite right, of course, in saying the intent of the agreement is that those institutions now referred to in section 42, which includes the Supreme Court of Canada with respect to changes after the amendment that is being proposed as being enacted would require unanimity.

With respect to the appointments from Quebec, it has been a constitutional convention that three judges who are learned in the civil law be appointed to the Supreme Court. How the new provision will be worded when the Supreme Court, which is not presently part of the Constitution, is at last imbedded in the Constitution and protected by the unanimity rule, how that will be phrased is not yet clear. Whether it will be a question of three judges from Quebec or three judges learned in the civil law, that's a matter yet to be ascertained.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, a further supplementary question to the First Minister.

Given certainly the need for appointments to the Supreme Court who are learned in the civil law, but given the fact that Quebec presently has a population that represents some 26 percent of the total Canadian population, should that percentage of the total Canadian population drop significantly, say below 20 percent, what flexibility would there be in the constitutional provisions that the First Minister has agreed to that would avoid a veto by the Province of Quebec over any change that would then require the appointment of three judges from Quebec, whereas that province might only have, at that time, somewhat less than 20 percent of the Canadian population?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I think that we can get into a lot of different hypothetical possibilities that could occur, insofar as the Constitution is concerned and change in population. But, Madam Speaker, there is nothing in the Constitution that restricts the number of Supreme Court judges to nine. It's my understanding that more than nine could be appointed in the future, if it was deemed to be reasonable, given changes in the future such as population shift or increase or variation.

MADAM SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY COMMITTEE CHANGE

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that the composition of the Standing Committee on Economic Development be amended as follows: The Hon. V. Schroeder for D. Scott; C. Baker for S. Ashton.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair for the Department of Natural Resources; and the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet in the Chair for the Department of Highways and Transportation.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Baker: Committee, come to order. We're on page 96 and I think we had gone through (c)

Monday, 4 May, 1987

and we're now working on (d), but we agreed that we would go back if we wanted to, okay?

The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to just make a brief comment this afternoon. The Minister put before us, on Thursday, his Yellowhead Route proposed program, projects to be considered, and I didn't react on Thursday, because I had not taken the time to study it as well as I wanted to.

But I want to put it on the record that I appreciate the Minister taking the time to consult with the members whose ridings contain Highway 16, and listening to the input of those members. I think that we have to be appreciative of the fact that \$20 million will be spent in the province on the Yellowhead route.

Those of us who have lived on the Yellowhead and who see it historically as running from Portage la Prairie to the Saskatchewan border, I suppose, felt that we had first call on all of the money from that section westward, but I believe there has been an honest attempt at making the entire highway system, including the section where we have dual laning, into a situation where we use the money to the best advantage.

I'm not going to spend a lot of time arguing on the specific proposed locations, except to say that this will make the Yellowhead route a much-improved highway. I want the record to clearly show that we appreciate the Minister consulting with the members to the western side of the province.

Turning to Bridges and Structures, unfortunately I had to leave the room for a minute during Estimates and I haven't seen the copy. Did the Minister outline what the specific projects of this department are this year?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bridges and Structures, Salaries - we had not yet started on that section.

The Honourable Minister.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, we had.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We had it started? Oh, I didn't believe we had discussed anything on it, sorry.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, we had dealt with the Selkirk Bridge and some discussion there with the Member for Lakeside. I was just going to get to the various bridges that are going to be done under a couple of programs that are related to this section.

Mr. Chairman, we have two major appropriations that deal with bridges. One is the Construction Program where major work is programmed and then we have another allocation of some \$700,000 for miscellaneous repairs and upgrading of bridges throughout the province and replacements and then, of course, there's general maintenance which is small repairs, painting and minor deck repairs and so on.

So in the construction budget this year dealing with bridges, we have a couple of major ones: the Roseau River Bridge on Highway 59 will be done this year; as well as some acquisition projects for approaches on Highway 21 at the Assiniboine River, that are load limited at 33 tonnes; then we have a major project for the approaches at West Bakers Narrows in the North, on

Highway 10, at Flin Flon; then a couple of bridges on 44, on the twinning project that is taking place there. Those are the major bridges in the Construction Program.

Then in the Miscellaneous Bridge Program, which is some \$700,000 - those were mostly, I should say, Mr. Chairman, first on PTH's, those bridges that I just mentioned. We have bridges on PR's throughout the province in this program and it's quite a lengthy list with estimates that range from in the neighbourhood of \$30,000 to \$50,000.00. I could go through all of those bridges in various districts in the province right through from District 1 to District 11 involving replacement bridges. These are all replacement bridges. There are two on 306; one on 217 in the R.M. of Franklin. The first two on 306 were in the R.M. of Springfield. There is one on 218 in the R.M. of Franklin; one in the R.M. of Thompson on 338, Tobacco Creek; there's one on 305, Access 305, the R.M. of Dufferin; 344 in the R.M. of Oakland, there are a couple; 227, three bridges there in the R.M. of Portage la Prairie. There's one on 254 in the R.M. of Rossburn; one on 466 in the R.M. of Rosedale; one on 581 in the R.M. of Ste. Rose.

There's access - in the neighbourhood of 267, the R.M. of Gilbert Plains, there's two bridges; 581 in the R.M. of Ste. Rose, a watershed drain has a new bridge; another one on the watershed drain, access 581, the R.M. of Ste. Rose; on PR 480, the Laurier Drain in Ochre River; and access to 275, the South Ditch in Swan River, R.M.; PR 488 in Swan River as well; and 275 in the R.M. of Swan River; and 516 in the R.M. of Bifrost. Those are the bridges that will be replaced or rebuilt - new bridges; so there's about 23 bridges in the miscellaneous bridge program in addition to the four or five major bridge projects in the construction program that are being undertaken. - (Interjection) -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Blake - the Member for Minnedosa had his hand up.

MR. D. BLAKE: The west bridge in Bakers Narrows, what is proposed there? Are they going to remove that steel structure and put in another causeway, similar to the one on the East Narrows, or are they going to leave that structure in place?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we will be putting in a new bridge right next to the existing structure and remove it after the other one is in place. The approaches will be done this year and then the structure next year, that's the intent - or pre-advertise it in the fall or something.

MR. D. BLAKE: Will the new structure be going on the north side of the existing bridge or the south?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: On the south side.

MR. D. BLAKE: Good, you won't ruin the rock for casting off then, off the north side.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, they're looking very carefully at the areas for casting as well as the burial grounds in the area, the two major considerations.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister might want to refer this question to Engineering, but when

Monday, 4 May, 1987

does the department decide to build a structure rather than using a large culvert? It seems to me that there's a considerable cost saving, the use of large diameter culverts and the long-term maintenance shouldn't be as high, and I give you a specific example of why I asked the question, Mr. Minister. Just south of Riding Mountain on Highway 5, the structure that was put in there last year, I don't know what the price precisely was - one never wants to believe scuttlebutt - but considering the work that was done there, I know it would be considerable. That same creek is handled by culverts of a modest diameter, both above and below that crossing and I would wonder why the department insists on going to these more expensive structures when culverts, I'm told by people involved in the industry, would very often serve the same purpose and would have a lower maintenance cost in the long run? At what point does the department make that decision in terms of size?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, the question has many ramifications. I wasn't certain whether the member was asking about when you'd go from a box culvert to say a bridge or when you would use a corrugated culvert versus a box culvert. I'm informed that the corrugated culverts are used mostly on PR's but the box culverts, the concrete box culverts are used where possible, where the hydraulic requirements don't dictate that a bridge be put in. The concrete box culverts would be put in because of their additional load-bearing capacity that they would have over a corrugated pipe. And they also would last longer and wouldn't be as susceptible to damage and deterioration and therefore wouldn't have to be repaired as frequently.

So the box culverts would be used mostly on PTH's and the corrugated pipes on PR's except where bridges are required because of the hydraulic requirements for peak flows that are dictated and provided to us by Water Resources and there may be other concerns such as fishery concerns, where a culvert might impede the spawning activities of fish and so on that require a more elaborate structure. Those are all the things considered. Generally, the department would try to put in the least cost alternative.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: I guess what I'm trying to determine is, when you talk about peak flows, where does the department get that information from? Is it from its own engineers or did you just say from Natural Resources?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, we do have some capacity or capability within the department to determine requirements, but basically we rely on Water Resources to provide us with information as to the capacities that are required on the basis of their studies in the field on flooding frequencies and so on. For PTH's it's generally a 1-in-50 year flood capacity is provided for; on PR's it's 1-in-33 years.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask some questions in the area of traffic inspections. The Member for Turtle Mountain had some questions. - (Interjection)- Okay.

First of all, does this include all inspection stations; at least the traffic inspections stations, I presume, fall in this area?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that's right. There are 11 permanent highway traffic inspection stations, two of which are staffed on a 24-hour basis at Headingley and West Hawk Lake. There are 26 staff allocated to the 11 permanent inspection stations. There are 15 inspection territories with 18 inspection staff assigned to patrol those 15 territories with portable scales that are set up on short notice so that there's a random check in addition to the permanent stations that are in place.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: With the movement towards deregulation of the trucking industry - and I think there's little doubt that Manitoba is moving in that direction according to the discussions that I've had with truckers - they believe that over 90 percent, and I would ask the Minister if he could confirm this, that over 90 percent of the applications for rights to haul are approved now.

If that is the case, does Traffic Inspections have enough staff to deal with what would be the offsetting means of regulating the trucking industry with increased emphasis on safety rather than on areas where income and right to haul was more restricted?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, just to clarify on the statement from the Member for Ste. Rose regarding approval of requests for authorities, the request for authorities to haul designated commodities, the list of which has been greatly expanded in the last couple of years, is probably, as the member says, 90 percent approval based on ability to provide the service.

The general PSV authorities for carriers in rural Manitoba would be, I believe, far less than that. They still hold a similar kind of hearing that has always been held with regard to the application, approving the public need and convenience, although there is an effort to share the onus of the responsibility to prove the public need will be enhanced versus the intervenor proving that it will be to the detriment of the public need to have a particular authority approved. So there is a little bit of sharing of responsibility there. That's the only way the hearing process has really changed insofar as the authorities being requested.

But insofar as the designated commodities, it's true that there have been a lot of applications coming from persons who were previously not operators of trucking services in the province, and a dramatic increase. Therefore, there is a need to provide, I think, greater enforcement. I don't believe that we're fully meeting the need at this time both from the point of view of weights and equipment and so on, but we're moving in that direction.

We have just introduced the new CVI, Commercial Vehicle Inspection Program, which is for trucks of a certain weight and does not distinguish between what kind of trucking authority they may have. It applies to all of them insofar as inspections are concerned, with truck trailers having to be inspected, I believe, once a year and truck tractors twice a year. So there is that side of it.

Insofar as the weights are concerned, inspections there, we're going to have to do more and we will be doing more through the national safety code as we implement it as agreed to by all provinces. Fortunately, although the details haven't been finalized yet in

Monday, 4 May, 1987

Manitoba at Treasury Board, there has been significant federal funding offered for the first five years of the implementation of the national safety code and that will mean additional staff once that is approved for inspection function. A lot of this will be paid for, as I say, for the first five years from federal dollars, because this initiative regarding deregulation was basically a federal initiative. Although it's primarily dealing with interprovincial trucking, as the member mentioned, there have been a lot of additional people entering into trucking service here in the province for intraprovincial as well, because of the expanded designated commodity list. Therefore, we're going to be assisted in meeting the need there for greater enforcement as well. So it's going to be an evolving process, I think, in terms of meeting the need.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. D. ROCAN: Could the Minister tell us how many people are working at West Hawk Lake? You mentioned there were 11 full time working on these two 24-hour stations?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: No. Mr. Chairman, I said there were 26 staff at the 11 permanent facilities. West Hawk Lake would have eight staff.

MR. D. ROCAN: And Headingley would have another six, I would imagine?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Six at Headingley? Eight at Headingley.

MR. D. ROCAN: That's with two temporary?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure whether they're temporary staff there involved or not. Greg Catteeuw, who is here, would maybe have some information.

Mr. Chairman, I'm just advised that two of the people at Headingley are on term because two of the permanent staff are on long-term disability, and you can only fill those positions with term positions as long as those people are on disability, for one year.

MR. D. ROCAN: Under inspections, I wonder if the Minister could inform us if this working alone plan with the traffic inspections, has it been implemented and is it working yet.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I missed - what is that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Repeat your question, please.

MR. D. ROCAN: The working alone plan that you have with your inspectors at the scales, has it been implemented yet and is it working?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that the working alone plan has been distributed to all of the staff, and they have discussed it and are beginning to utilize that plan at the present time. The member is obviously familiar with some of the people who are

involved in it, and has probably some more specific information on it that he would like to bring forward.

MR. D. ROCAN: No, you know, on your working alone plan for the traffic inspectors, and I just happen to note, one of the ways it's going to be implemented is all area inspection staff are in radio communication with other radio operators. We're talking radio operators, we're talking West Hawk Lake tied in with Headingley or with Souris and Brandon?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, I'm advised it's not so much with each inspection station right across the province, but with the district headquarters in each of those areas. They are all radio equipped.

MR. D. ROCAN: Mr. Chairman, West Hawk Lake and Headingley, that's quite a distance and that can be radio equipped back and forth, or is it through the telephone, that one?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that they would be connected by telephone.

MR. D. ROCAN: And yet, Mr. Chairman, the idea of this working alone plan, is this to protect the employees from getting mugged, or any idea?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: The people who are working at Headingley and West Hawk Lake are obviously working in pairs at night, and in the mobile areas as well in the evening, but wherever there are additional hours. The 24-hour stations are Headingley and West Hawk Lake, and so there are two staff on them during the evening. During the daytime, if there's one staff, of course, they are radio equipped.

MR. D. ROCAN: I also notice that your working alone plan, some of the details are that some of the required equipment is emergency first aid. Are our inspectors now taking the St. John's Ambulance course, or are they prepared to give first aid?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Are the inspectors prepared, equipped and trained to give First Aid? Is that the question?

MR. D. ROCAN: Yes.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I'm advised, Mr. Chairman, that Workplace Health and Safety felt that it wasn't necessary to have them equipped with the St. John's Ambulance training courses or other first aid courses, but they do have first aid kits with them.

MR. D. ROCAN: On this working alone plan again, I take note where on one of the memoranda that went around, it said that they had instructed the committee to canvass the employees for constructive ideas prior to the plan's implementation, and had subsequently been advised that no ideas were forthcoming.

Now my question to the Minister is: Did the committee really go out there and ask for any of these ideas to implement this working alone plan?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I just want to advise the member that this is basically an administrative

function that I was not personally involved with. So I do have to get information from the staff on the details of the implementation of it. If the member is patient on that, I can do that. I do not have familiarity with the details of exactly how this was implemented there. I consider that an administrative matter.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that this is being done under the Workplace Health and Safety Committee recommendations. We have several Workplace Health and Safety Committees throughout the department. There's one committee established for the inspection function. It is made up of two inspectors and one management person. These people form a Workplace Health and Safety Committee for traffic inspection, and have made the recommendations with regard to the working alone policy.

So, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Turtle Mountain should be aware that this is a staff-initiated function as a result of the Workplace Health and Safety Committees that have been put in place.

MR. D. ROCAN: Like, all our traffic inspectors that we have roving either in these little shacks or whatever, are these fellows right now, they're enforcement officers, so would they have a badge? Do they have badges or a certain identification?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, the staff advise me that they do have I.D. cards, identifying themselves as inspectors.

MR. D. ROCAN: But did they ever have badges, like a regular-type badge like a cop would have?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I'm advised that they used to have badges, yes.

MR. D. ROCAN: And the reason that we're removing the badges is for what reason?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, the staff tells me that there was some involvement of alleged - I can't speak for this as being facts, because I'm not familiar with it. So I'm simply advised that there was one inspector who was using his badge for inappropriate purposes, as perhaps impersonating a police officer or something to that effect. I don't know if they would have got their own on that as far as any other equipment, but they're not equipped with any sidearms.

MR. D. ROCAN: We're talking about equipment, and I know these rovers. I've met them many a time. Is there any specific reason why they don't have red lights on the cab of their trucks or alternating headlights or whatever?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Like the conservation officers?

MR. D. ROCAN: Same idea.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, the idea is to keep this function at a relatively low-key level insofar as the public is concerned, and they are not peace officers in any way, shape or form. They're inspectors and, therefore, we haven't gone to the idea of having the

flashing red lights and all of the other paraphernalia that's associated with peace officers. I don't know whether the member is suggesting that there should be a move in that direction. Perhaps he has some thoughts on it, and we would be pleased to look at any suggestions he has, but staff up to this point in time did not believe that was appropriate.

MR. D. ROCAN: We're talking safety and, myself, I have already come roaring down a highway and, all of a sudden, this poor guy jumps out of his little truck with his little red light going in the middle of the dash. All I'm saying is that it would be much simpler for most of these truckers if this fellow had two great big red lights on top of his cab, but that's another matter.

Also, I'd like to talk about this out-of-service criteria, vehicles transporting dangerous goods. Could the Minister tell us a little bit more about the criteria for transporting dangerous goods, some of the placards and documentation?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: All I can say at this point in time - and I think if the member wants me to go and get the regulations dealing with dangerous goods, they're inches and inches thick. It took a long time to develop all of the regulations for dangerous goods. However, I can say that all of our inspection staff have been certified under the courses for The Dangerous Goods Handling and Transportation Act and the regulations made thereunder as they pertain to truck transportation throughout the province. So we do have the certification, and they are familiar with the requirements for driver and vehicle licences, placarding and documentation required for dangerous goods handling and transportation.

So the fact is, the inspection staff is familiar. I am not familiar with the various placards and so on. The detail that is needed there, I think is something that is really beyond my involvement insofar as the development that was done and administrative skill with working groups for a number of years, successive years of staff, federal and provincial at various federal/provincial working committees, levels. So I have not, at the ministerial level, become involved in the precise kinds of symbols that were used and that kind of thing. It's all been done at the working level by technical people.

MR. D. ROCAN: I'm sure the Minister must know or the staff at least know that carriers wishing to transport 16 foot wide house trailers must do so now only with 16-wheel dolly systems. I wonder if the Minister or his staff could tell us how one would go about getting approval or certification of a 16-wheel dolly system.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the staff to provide me with that information. I expect now the member is onto a different area that is not related directly to the dangerous goods question?

MR. D. ROCAN: No, just to do with inspections.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, we have had a number of meetings on this issue in previous years to determine what was the safest way to transport these

extra wide house trailers. Up to that point in time when 16-footers were being requested to be transported on our highways, the widest designation was 15 feet. At that point in time, there were additional requirements for pilot vehicles and signage and lighting and so on. We have made some special requirements put in place for the 16 foot house trailers, and it involves the special 16-wheel dollies, as the member has mentioned. If a person has that, I believe they simply have to contact our permit office and demonstrate that they have that equipment, and they will be given a permit.

MR. D. ROCAN: Still under inspections, like the steering axle overloads now, at present are we starting to implement some new regulations for steering axle overloads?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: We did have, Mr. Chairman, a regulation for steering axle overloads because, in the opinion of the inspection staff, some dangerous situations with severe overloading of the steering axle, and also the damage that that would do to the road, and because of that have put in a provision that steering axles cannot be loaded beyond what the manufacturer has designated as the allowable weights. I could get the figures as to how many thousand pounds that is for steering axle assemblies.

MR. D. ROCAN: Mr. Chairman, like the existing highways special permit that expired on December 31, 1986, has this new one now come into effect or are we still waiting for it?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, we have not passed that at this time. I was investigating the impact on the farm community before putting it through and I'm still waiting for some information on that.

MR. D. ROCAN: Mr. Chairman, still under inspections, triple axle groups, can the Minister tell us or inform us at least - the criteria for triple axle groups - how they would have to be mounted to the frame of a trailer or whatever?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, generally speaking, I'm advised that inspection staff requires a common attachment for triple axle assemblies, but that they do not allow any additional weight for triple axles at this time, over double axles. Basically there's no advantage at this point to that, except that there is a study at the present time, as the member is probably aware, a weights and dimension study that is being done by RTAC, that has been under way for the last number of years and we expect to have that study funded by various levels of government - I should say the provincial governments and the Federal Government over the last three years. It will be making recommendations for standardization of matters such as the issue of triple axles and how they should be regulated across the country. We are awaiting those recommendations.

MR. D. ROCAN: Mr. Chairman, like as restrictions are upon us and they're nearing completion now anyway, but can the Minister tell us, is there any form of concessions during restrictions for any commodities whatsoever?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I guess you could say there's a lot of flexibility and leniency shown in this area, although it is done with the knowledge, to let that get out of hand, can quickly lead to a very rapid deterioration of the highway, so we have to be careful; however, they also realize the importance of the movement of certain commodities during that spring restriction period and therefore are flexible in this area. There are some commodities such as groceries, milk and bread, and other staples that are exempt, farm fuel and fertilizer and seed grain where there are exceptions made.

MR. D. ROCAN: Under Traffic Inspections again, the "log cabin," as we call it, on 2 and 10, are we contemplating building a new one there, or are going to be building it up in Brandon or is there anything in the works right now for a log cabin?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I missed the initial issue.

MR. D. ROCAN: The log cabin which is at the junction of 2 and 10, one of your scales, which is in bad need of remodelling or a whole new scale, is there any talk at all of moving that scale from 2 and 10 up to Brandon, or are we even going to build a new scale?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: There is some consideration by the staff to relocating that particular station and it perhaps could be in the vicinity of Brandon, but there's been no decision made on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Mr. Chairman, moving into the District Offices, are there any changes being contemplated in this area, in terms of combination or centralization of services?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, in terms of changes in the organization - I would take it that the member's referring to maybe the size of the boundaries of those or the shape of the boundaries - there's been no major changes there, a minor change in the area of where District 10 and 11 meet, in the northern area of the province and some consideration for future of the need to break District 10 which covers such a vast area in the north, into say, two districts, because the head office is at The Pas and there's another office at Thompson and the distances are very great. It might make sense to have two separate districts.

Basically there's been some major highways built in the last several years in the North, 10 or 15 years, so things have changed a little bit. So there is that thought that it might be more efficient, but there's been no move to amalgamate districts, if that's what the member might have been asking about. There is a complete review of the staffing needs of the area, of the various districts though and that is being undertaken at the present time.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: What about amalgamation of services that are provided within the districts? It may not fall under this area, but if it doesn't, I'd like to know where it does come in, and that is the maintenance of equipment and services in the areas.

Monday, 4 May, 1987

Is that under the direction of the district supervisor?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Mechanical section is where the equipment is dealt with and that is under another section. 4.(b) would be the one that deals with mechanical.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Okay, we'll ask our questions there.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: They are separate from the district operation.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: The funding to the LGD's, the Minister and I have had some disagreement over the funding that is being provided on a shared basis to the LGD's and you referred to them in your opening statement. There is a 30 percent cutback in terms of some of the funding that the province is providing to LGD's. There are some LGD's, if they were to continue with their budgets unchanged, would either have to go to reserves or reduce expenditures or increase revenue. Most of these LGD's, the revenue option is not a viable one because of the land base that's there in the first place. That's why they are LGD's.

But there is a great deal of concern on the part of many of the reeves of the LGD's out there that perhaps the government has a mind to put them back into a classification of a rural municipality, and I think the Minister would do those LGD's and all of us a service if he could explain the direction that the government is trying to move with these government districts because they are unique.

Many of them are there because they were formerly parts of R.M's and they were in fact breaking the R.M's that they were part of because they could not support the expenditures that were required in order to have them developed, particularly the one that I'm familiar with, which is the LGD of Alonsa. The area was designated an LGD because parts of it were in fact removed from the municipalities because of the fiscal problems associated with it.

I wonder if the Minister could respond, particularly, to the direction that the province is moving, and whether or not the independence should be returned to these LGD's.

When we talk about their reserves, they can't go into debt; so obviously reserves to a lesser degree are desirable for them to have some reserves in case of unforeseen expenditures. Now we've gone through this process before with school divisions where the government changed policies in order to try and force school divisions to spend reserves that they had accumulated over the years.

I'd like the Minister to take a couple of minutes to expand on what direction he wants to move with these LGD's.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, first, I should say that the issue is one that has to be dealt with by the Minister of Municipal Affairs insofar as the future status of LGD's insofar as whether they should be looked at in terms of the municipalities at some time in the future. I really couldn't comment as to whether the Minister and his staff are looking at making recommendations

in that regard in the near future. It is a rather complicated thing which would take, I think, a lot of discussion with those affected and be a rather dramatic change. Therefore, it would be, I think, somewhat difficult. At best, it would probably have to be a transitional type of arrangement that would eventually lead to full status because of the loss in benefits that the LGD's would incur as a result of that change.

I don't know that there is any interest in moving all of these local governments down to the lowest common denominator as opposed to bringing those poorer ones up to a level that they can offer the kinds of services that the residents, the ratepayers in their area deserve, the same as many of the other municipalities that have a better level of service because they are richer in terms of their tax base.

So I think that whole area has to be examined, and I've written to the LGD's with a view to establishing some dialogue in this area. Also, I will be meeting with the Minister of Municipal Affairs further to discuss this further as to where he would like to go and to also provide him some input from our perspective.

But it seems to me, at this point in time, that you could not ignore the fact that there were rather substantial reserves in some of the LGD's that could be used by the LGD to meet needs rather than raising taxes, and substantial reserves, up to \$1 million, I believe, in some of the LGD's, which is much higher on average than the municipalities in the surrounding areas. The municipalities do have some of whatever reserve in many cases but not to that extent.

We have to realize that over \$3 million is going in in kind of an under-the-table subsidy to LGD's through Highways, through road funding, by funding main market roads and 50-50 roads. I don't think that's the best way and most appropriate way to provide equalization funding, if we could call it that, or subsidy to local governments. I think it should be done through a recognition of their relative wealth in a grant form above board as opposed to a hidden subsidy such as road work. I think we should be looking at that as we move along in this regard.

It seems to me that as well the method of providing tax sharing to municipalities and LGD's is not necessarily the fairest and that it's based largely on a per capita basis. That means municipalities with more people get more money whether it takes more money to provide the infrastructure or not. It would seem to me that in some of the LGD's they have widespread geographic areas to cover. They still have to provide a basic infrastructure and, therefore, there should be some method of providing them with some assistance other than a per capita grant. If that could be done, a lot of the funding that goes to them now for roads could be substituted with a more progressive form of a grant system.

That is what I would like to see develop over a period of time, but there is no grandiose plan at this time to see the LGD's revert to municipal status.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Mr. Chairman, I don't think the Minister has shed a great deal of light on where the province would be heading in terms of dealing with these LGD's.

The other aspect that has to be dealt with is that if they are to become more self-sufficient, for those that

have reserves, their reserves would be decimated immediately in providing equipment and facilities. For those who do not have reserves, of course, then the situation would be even more dire.

As a result of that, I hope, if there are to be discussions, that the government, either through Highways or Municipal Affairs, in an effort to be clear and above board, would make sure that the communication with these LGD's is ongoing, and not just to say that there will be communication but in fact get down to some serious discussions about what direction any changes may take because there is a great deal of concern out there.

To quote some of the Reeves, they are saying that if we are to become municipalities, then tell us so that we can plan towards that end and not leave them sitting in a very uncomfortable position not really knowing where they're headed.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I just could mention, Mr. Chairman, in reaction to that, for example, the LGD of Alonsa has an accumulated reserve and surplus of \$707,000, and they received 80 percent of their 50-50 funding this year that they got the previous two years, an average of the previous two years. They were reduced by \$23,000 from \$120,000, on average for the two previous years, to \$97,000 this year. So that was \$23,000.00.

If you were to have to eat up that \$23,000 by your reserve, for example, in this instance, in terms of putting this in perspective, it would take many, many years. As a matter of fact, the interest would probably generate more each year than you would use on this 50-50 road program and you would probably never use up that \$707,000.00.

I'm just using that as an example to show the action we've taken to this point is not so dramatic that it is going to cause them to go into a situation that they cannot reasonably handle. So I put that there for the member; but I do think that there is some legitimacy to the funding that the LGD's get, the help they get, because they are, in many cases, on land that is a relatively poor tax base.

Maybe I didn't shed light into the direction the government would go, but I just want to impress to the Member for Ste. Rose that I think that there should be some kind of offset to these LGD's. If they were to lose the \$3 million in road assistance that they get now, that they would get something else to replace. That would be an above-board funding mechanism grant, not on a per capita basis. That's why I referred to per capita as not being fair.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to spend much more time in this area, but the Minister's figures differ from mine.

The \$97,000 I agree with, but the upper figure I thought was \$150,000 from the year previous, and I don't have the figures in front of me so I stand to be corrected.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: The only reason, Mr. Chairman, that the figures may differ is that there may have been a larger one-time grant, an increase in 1985-86, or 1986-87, I should say, that caused the distortion that would make the LGD or enable the LGD to use figures

that were much larger. That's why we averaged from '85-86 with '86-87, those two years, because there were some anomalies that occurred for special projects or some special requests. We gave an additional amount for one year only, and that really shouldn't be used as the base by the LGD, and yet it was used in some instances for their comparative purposes and made it look like it was a much bigger drop.

The figure that I'm using, that I can provide of 954 is similar to the figure that they got in 1983-84. The total amount that they're getting now is similar to what they got in '83-84 and more than they got in '84-85. But in '85-86, '86-87 we averaged the two and got the total, and then there was \$250,000 taken off that, and we end up with a total funding for 50-50 roads of \$954,000 - about 80 percent of what they had the previous two years, average.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Under District Offices, I had earmarked the transportation expenditure that is listed, \$450,000 last year projected, a \$370,000 drop; a "reduction of staff and related expenses through attrition and reallocation of staff resources."

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, what is the question, Mr. Chairman?

MR. G. CUMMINGS: The question is: A further explanation, first of all, of the size, but we're seeing an \$80,000 drop in expenditures there. The explanatory notes do not explain to me how we were able to achieve that saving. I'm not objecting to the saving, but we have a staff reduction.

That staff reduction is achieved at what level, or is this an average across the board?

Mr. Chairman, if a staff reduction creates an \$80,000 saving in transportation charges, I'd like to know how that shows up in transportation-related savings? Is this taking trucks off the road or what?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, M. Dolin: The Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, we have 12 districts, as the member knows, so we're dealing with about \$7,000 or \$8,000 per district in a reduction which is not dramatic but it is significant, and it's basically as a result of fewer miles travelled. So it's lower transportation costs because of fewer staff.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: That means fewer inspections of roads? Is that what this travel allowance is attributed to?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: This must be people who work on surveys and design work on the highways, engineering aides as opposed to inspectors.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Under Other Jurisdictions - and then following this, the Member for Niakwa will have a question for the Minister - it is stated that the department "provides specialized equipment services not readily available from the private sector on a 100 percent cost recoverable basis."

What kind of specialized equipment are we referring to, or is this simply road equipment? Is it something beyond?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, we're dealing with services to other departments at this point in time: road equipment that is not necessarily available by the private sector; snow removal equipment that may not be available, used in the government parking lots for Government Services, for example; also fuel for vehicles at Highways garages; road construction for Northern Affairs; some bridge construction equipment for Natural Resources; and in the Parks Branch, in Natural Resources, some road construction.

It doesn't mean that all of this equipment is not available in the private sector. It just means that it is available through the department and is called upon, from time to time, by other departments for its use.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I'm not going to prolong the debate. I just have a couple of very small questions. Actually I might not even be in the right place, but I didn't have the chance - it's under Winter Roads. Would I be able to ask any questions on Winter Roads at this point? If you prefer not to, Mr. Minister, I can wait till the Minister's Salary.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I just gave the critic an eye here because we tried to do things in a packaged way, but go ahead.- (Interjection)- Yes, we went over them last week, but we can go over that again, a bit.

MR. A. KOVNATS: It's not going to take long. Mr. Chairman, concerning Winter Roads, how are the contractors picked for the construction of these winter roads?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, what we had done is we had dealt with that particular question and I advised the members that we had allocated these with an arrangement with a number of Native companies in the North, to provide them with an opportunity to gain some experience in contracting and operating equipment, operating a business and company, provide employment in those areas, in the remote communities where there's high unemployment, so that they get the direct economic benefits of this construction activity in their area. So it's not done by an open tender system in this case.

It's an arrangement by way of an agreement that was established a number of years ago and now we have just continued that agreement, year by year, with a small increase some years, sometimes no increase, and we negotiate with them to try and keep it as low as possible. Then they are paid on the number of miles they open by a certain date and how well they maintain it for a duration of a number of weeks to keep that open to a certain width.

So it's a system that seems to be working for those communities. It may not be as cost-effective as it would be had we tendered for all of these. An example would be Norwin Construction on the east side of Lake Winnipeg, which involves a whole number of communities, along the whole stretch of the east side of Lake Winnipeg, and they work together - those communities - with one construction company called Norwin. They split up the work amongst the various

bands and they each do a portion of it, so they all reap some of the benefits.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Mr. Minister, I'm not critical of that, not completely anyway. I think that something has to be done to help up in the North, but what my question was is who picks the Indian Bands that do the work? Is it done by the department or is it done by associations with the different bands that the roads go into? What preferential treatment is given, that's all I'm asking?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, the bands that are served by that particular road would have the opportunity to get involved, and that's an historical thing already. This has happened now for five or ten years, nine years with that group. Say, for example, the one I gave, I guess Norwin Construction for a number of years now, so I wasn't a part of how they were chosen, but the fact is all of those bands in those areas represent the communities that are served by those roads, so it seems to make sense. It stands to reason that they should be given an opportunity.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, S. Ashton: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: We change the chairman here like we change the . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, I'm just trying to keep track as to whether there was any other member that was ahead of you on the list, but I think you're next. The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to pass that section.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: 2.(e)(f) and (g)—pass.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, (b), (c), (d), (e), (f) and (g).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, I believe those other items were passed. If there's any question about that, we'll make sure that the minutes . . .

HON. J. PLOHMAN: No, they weren't passed . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Sorry, the previous Chair checked them, so I assumed they were passed. If I'm in error, I will restate that the entire 2. Operations and Maintenance was just passed unanimously by the committee here.

No. 3. Planning and Design and Land Surveys - the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Mr. Chairman, the Planning and Design, as I read the description of the department, will outline a program of construction and proposals to bring the highway system of the province up to a standard that they would think is at a level that the ministry should be aiming towards. There are two things that I would like to ask the Minister to put on the record.

No. 1, in looking back at the 1985-86 Highways Annual Report, it says that a study is concluded that design standards can be downgraded for 80 percent

of the highway system, thus reducing the cost of construction of these roadways as compared to current practice. This would be accomplished by setting back the timing of paving of very low volume roads, as well as reducing the shoulder widths to be provided on provincial roads eligible for paving, however the standards would still be within nationally acceptable standards.

Has the Minister implemented that recommendation; has the department implemented that recommendation in the design that we are seeing put forward now, i.e., the narrow shoulder paving? Is there a downgrading of the width of the roads that are being constructed? If so, I would suggest that it may be a dangerous path upon which to embark, because it seems to me that long-term planning, particularly on our primary roads network and our major secondary networks, to downgrade the design standards in many cases - unless it can be proven that the saving is worth the long-term pain and I would doubt if that could be proven - that we are setting ourselves on a path whereby we will have a road system that will not in the future be prepared to accept the type of vehicular traffic that we can anticipate.

We consistently see major changes being brought forward in the trucking industry with the size, not only of the loads but the length of the vehicles, and some of these changes are very much in the area of efficiency, but the road system does have to be there to accept those types of vehicles. I would like an explanation from the Minister as to what the department is headed into with this statement?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, this occurred last year and unfortunately we didn't have a discussion of this during the last Estimates when we had all of the information and it was fresh in our minds, it was a brand-new implementation.- (Interjection)- Yes, the member is showing us - and I'm not criticizing him for raising it. I'm just simply saying it occurred the previous fiscal year and therefore it isn't as much available right now, although I could get more details on that. There was a major review that was undertaken of our standards. I guess what we could say is that in the area of maintenance, we've continued the standards that were there, as I referred to them on Thursday last week, and we haven't changed them for about 19 years basically. But in terms of the standards for which highways should be built to, there was a review that was done over a period of about a year-and-a-half or so in the department to look at whether the standards in all cases were realistic insofar as today's needs, keeping in mind scarcity of resources, and to see whether there were any savings that could be achieved by perhaps reducing the shoulder width in some areas, savings that could be achieved from the point of view of maintenance as well as the actual initial construction of those roads.

By doing that, instead of having for example a 10-foot wide shoulder on all low level PR's, they have reduced that to 6 feet or 8 feet in some instances so that there is an actual saving there in terms of the amount of material that has to be moved. It's really an effort to make the dollars go further without sacrificing the standards to the degree that we feel safety would be impacted.

Now perhaps you know, this is all relative and marginal and perhaps there may be some indication in future years that a reduction in standards, to some degree, in shoulder width might lead us to reconsider that at some point, but my advice from the department is that it is not something that they feel would negatively impact on safety.

Mr. Chairman, I did want to mention a couple of other things. In some instances, there was actually an increase in the standards. For example, previous to this review, there was some partial shoulder paving, 3-foot shoulders paved on the Yellowhead, for example, that was not part of the standards that were outlined by the department. This is now an official part of the highway policy for standards for certain kinds of highways, partial shoulder paving, whereas it wasn't before. It was being done but it wasn't part of the standards that were established.

There was some widening of the bridge standards so that they wouldn't come in so narrowly on a number of PR's. People probably have seen that, experienced those narrow bridges, that they would have to be built out to the proper width. Then there was a lessening of the standards requirements for PR's passing through valleys when instead of having to use up valuable farm land, that we could tighten up the curves a bit on some valley construction to reduce the impact on agricultural land and still be acceptable to service the needs of the motorists in that area. So there were a lot of things considered.

As I said, we could get perhaps some estimates on the dollar impact on our highway construction as a result of those changes and some additional examples of where standards were reduced, a typical road, and where they were increased if the members would like to get into that.

As I indicated, that actually took place in the previous fiscal year and it's been the established guideline for the previous year now.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: That was basically my question. The department has accepted that recommendation.

There is a question now, Mr. Chairman, from the Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just while we're on Planning and Design, I would like the Minister just to confirm for the record that the planning and design on Highway 250 from 16 north to 45 has been accepted. It's been designed or planned for some years, but I just want to assure myself that the plan has been accepted.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: While the staff is getting the status out on that particular one, Mr. Chairman, whoever you are, I just want to mention that as a result of this classification study - I just wanted to refer back to that for a minute - the members may notice in the new Highways map a number of highways that have been reclassified to PTH standards as a result of that study that was done. Not only were the standards changed in some instances, but a number of roads were

reclassified and others were added to the PR system in the north particularly. So I believe those routes now more accurately represent the changed traffic patterns in the province and more accurately reflect the classification that they should have as major arterial routes in the province.

I'm just trying to determine, Mr. Chairman, the exact status of the survey and design plan for the section of 250 from Highway 16 to 45. My understanding is that the plan has been already approved and I can get confirmation of that. Because it's already in the acquisition stage, the plan would have been approved already, but it's difficult for me to say and I don't have the specifics with staff as to the latest up-to-date development on that as to whether the plan has been filed. They are well into the acquisition. I would have to get that.

MR. D. BLAKE: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister can just get an update on that so I can forward it to the committee to assure them. They're getting a little nervous - they've been waiting so long and had so many meetings - that they haven't got the thing finished yet. If they acquired the land, that's pretty well . . .

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I imagine they've been meeting a lot with themselves. We haven't had that many meetings. I think we met twice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I take it to understand that you are willing to pass item No. 2., Operations and Maintenance?

Resolution No. 91: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$70,235,800 for Highways and Transportation, Operations and Maintenance, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1988—pass.

We are now on Planning and Design and Land Surveys.

The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Mr. Chairman, does this department recommend the maintenance to certain standards? For example, roads that need upgrading in order to maintain a reasonable standard of road, does this department have any input in that area where it may have come to the department's attention that certain areas of road need to be rebuilt, major reconstructions? Would this department make a recommendation to the Minister on those situations?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think that this question again is tied in with the previous question on the overall classification study that was done, which I understand through the process resulted in an improved communication system within the department overall, the district and the planning and design central.

The planning and design did not do that overall classification study on their own. They did it in conjunction with the districts, who assessed each road in their district to determine what classification would be required to meet the needs, and so they had input into that.

And now, there's an overall plan and their whole system in the districts have been established with the

standards that it will be eventually upgraded to, the road. Some are at the standards that they required, many are under standard. When the reconstruction takes place and the upgrading takes place, the districts know precisely to what standard it will be upgraded, and they design accordingly. Previously, I'm advised that there was no overall plan consistent throughout the province in this area.

So what had happened many times, the district would have to actually consult with planning and design to get their input into whether it should be one standard or another. Now, it's all known ahead of time, and it's a better system.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: Just one question, I'm not too sure if this is the appropriate section here.

I'm wondering about feeder roads from the city feeding into provincial highways and the planning. Is there any negotiation going on with the city about any kind of joint planning for some of these connect-a-roads within the city limits, outside of Department of Highways jurisdiction?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, the member's question is particularly timely at this point insofar as the major studies that are being done on the Perimeter, which involve major sections of the Perimeter at the present time, one in the southwest, well the whole southern area of the Perimeter, and one in the northeast quadrant where the Perimeter hasn't been completed.

So, the city is very much involved in the study team and those in identifying, not only the root and the treatment that intersections should be receiving under an upgraded system there, both on the existing Perimeter with regard to interchanges in those areas, and also in the area where there is no construction as yet, no Perimeter Highway, insofar as how the routes should intersect with the Perimeter. So they are involved very much in those particular areas, and that covers a large part of the Perimeter.

In addition to that, where there is upgrading undertaken on a more ad hoc fashion, there is direct communication between at the director level to the senior person from the Department of Transportation for the City of Winnipeg. So, I think it has been established clearly that there needs to be that kind of interaction and joint planning, and we intend to pursue that. It has not always been evident in the past.

MR. M. DOLIN: Yes, particularly following on that end, the north end of McPhillips and the entry ways into the Perimeter, which is a problem I think I discussed with the Minister a couple of years ago, is where the city is saying it's their jurisdiction where the road is deteriorating, where the entry ways are causing a lot of problems to the people who live alongside that road. Now that there is some kind of joint planning with the city, is there some possibility that a joint committee of the province and the city can get the city to take some action on that north McPhillips area to solve some of the problems of the deterioration?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think what was clear in my statement before is that, where there were

ad hoc approaches taken to a priority that was established by one jurisdiction or the other, there was communication taking place. That should not be presumed that is necessarily a long-term planning process, which is something a little bit different.

We have their input now on the study, so I think that's going to establish a planning process for the areas of the Perimeter that are impacted by those study areas at the present time, but not in the area of McPhillips at this time. That is not one of those areas covered by the Perimeter studies. It seems to me that what we have to do there is to put more pressure on the City of Winnipeg to prioritize some of those outlying areas. It doesn't seem to be their highest priority, I guess, politically, to move on some of those areas. We, I think, should do that through the Urban Affairs Committee mechanism, because we provide significant block funding, some \$50 million or \$60 million - I'm not sure - to the City of Winnipeg, and a lot of it is for capital. We could very well help them establish some of their priorities perhaps in that area.

MR. M. DOLIN: On that, the Minister points out the ad hockery that's gone on and the need for some kind of continuing cooperative planning, and points out some potential mechanisms for getting the city to do this. What struck me, interestingly enough, is two years ago there were substantial repairs being done on the Perimeter Highway in that section by the province, and yet the city was not doing its part in keeping its roads up. I would hope the Minister, whatever process could be used, would get the city to cooperate to make sure it holds up its end in making sure access to the Perimeter Highway is adequate, and that the city does keep up its roads as well as the province is keeping up the roads where they're doing the job.

So I would hope the Minister would do something to encourage the city or pressure the city to stop the ad hockery, and let's have a sort of a permanent joint kind of planning thing to make sure the operations are consistent.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Just a last comment on that, I think it's easier said than done at the political level, and it would involve a pretty heavy-handed approach by the province to establish the priorities. Hopefully, it could be done at a more subtle level.

As I said, there is a communications mechanism at the staff level, but I don't think that we do have enough coordination, frankly. There are areas where we have to do some work on the interchanges on the Perimeter in the future, even Highway 7, a little bit further over, and there's Inkster coming up, and there's responsibility there by the city. And yet, they're not necessarily making them a priority. So I would like to see us put a little more effort in that area.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Mr. Chairman, I like the Minister's comments on where we stand with the request from Miniota Municipality that Highway 355 be extended from Highway 83 into the Birdtail Sioux Reserve.

There have been some discussions take place to date, and the Miniota Municipality doesn't believe that they should have to continue to maintain that road because it's in a state of disrepair now, and it needs upgrading

and obviously gravelling. They would like the province to take over that chunk of road.

I understand there's some discussion going on to determine if it can be done on a joint federal-provincial relationship, and I wondered where that discussion is at and how soon there might be some action taken by the province or the province and the Federal Government jointly to take over responsibility for this road from the R.M. of Miniota.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, as the member knows, in the new program, we do have the sections up to that point. This section leading to the reserve is one that has given us particular problems.

I have written to the Minister responsible for Indian and Northern Affairs on April 24, indicating that we would like him to consider our policy recommendation or suggestion that we have made from the province to apply to have his consideration to have that policy apply. This particular case is an excellent example where we could work in a cooperative way on a road leading to a reserve. I have, as yet of course, having sent this a little over a week ago or 10 days ago, not received any reply. But I'm hopeful that we will get some reply from him, and this will trigger some interest in this area and some action in a relatively short period of time, so that we could get on with this work jointly.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Can I take it from your comments that the province is committed to doing something with this road to take it away from the responsibility of the R.M. of Miniota? Hopefully, it'd be done jointly, but you're committed to following through and seeing that something is done.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: We're committed, Mr. Chairman, in doing our share jointly with the Federal Government but not alone, because we don't think this is a provincial responsibility in its entirety at all. Therefore, it would not be appropriate for us to pick up these costs alone, when indeed the Federal Government has, in our opinion, a very heavy responsibility in this particular situation. So we are committed to moving forward on it.

MR. G. FINDLAY: If they agreed to go jointly with you, how soon would something happen on that piece of road?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Once we got approval in principle from them to participate with us, and on this particular road we would recommend that - Mr. Chairman, our proposed policy for federal-provincial participation for roads leading to Indian reserves would apply if they were to accept it. In this case, on a 50-50 basis, that four-mile section to the reserve boundary for construction purposes would be funded 50-50. If there was any work to be done on the reserve, we were recommending that be 100-percent federal and, insofar as maintenance is concerned, our proposal is that it should be 50-50 for maintenance outside of the reserve, that four miles, and 100 percent on the reserve as well.

That is the proposal and, once that has been accepted, then we would immediately proceed next fiscal year to do the design work and move to the

acquisition of property that's required up to the reserve, so that the construction could begin. So it's going to take a couple of years to get the work done actually, once there's agreement.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Are there any such other sections of road in the province in a similar category, where the R.M.'s are paying for the upkeep of a road going into a reserve?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I can't think of any right offhand where they would be doing it, but there are many different situations, very unique situations in the province. That is why we're trying to develop a policy that would apply consistently because, up to this point, it's been an ad hoc approach where every situation was dealt with on its own and no consistency whatsoever. I don't have a list of similar ones. I really can't say whether there are any other situations where an R.M. is providing the maintenance for a road that exclusively serves a reserve.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Just a final comment, I would stress on the Minister the urgency of getting the resolution to decide on how the cost-sharing shall be, because the road is in poor shape. If it's going to take two years, it's going to be quite costly to keep the road in reasonable shape until that time comes.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I've just got a couple of comments I guess, first, in regard to the North End of Winnipeg and the state of the access roads into the North End, as the Member for Kildonan had mentioned earlier. His emphasis was on McPhillips. McPhillips south of the Perimeter into the city certainly is not in very good shape. In my own constituency, we have the northern part of the Oak Point Highway, running from Inkster Boulevard north to the Perimeter, and also between Keewatin Street and the Oak Point Highway. You have four lanes on either side of it, but you don't have that linkage there.

I fully respect that it is the city's jurisdiction, but it was interesting last year that the city, just as the city was coming up to the elections, all of a sudden found some funds to put in a full four-lane interchange at Keewatin and Inkster. But they had not, from the best of my understanding at least, had any kind of planning for increasing or for building more access along that roadway. Those roadways, I'll say, are very high usage.

You have next to them the largest trucking firm in the province - I believe it's Reimer's - is on Inkster Boulevard, and uses both McPhillips and Oak Point Highway. On Keewatin, the CPR's truck yards are there, along with Kingsway Transport; on Oak Point Highway, Paul's Hauling and his affiliates. You also have a number of the major service garages and facilities for the trucking industry of Manitoba along there as well.

I would certainly give any encouragement I can to the Minister in his negotiations with the city, to encourage them, and to maybe put some funds up front along side of them in speeding up that work. The roads presently there cannot withstand the weight of

the traffic that is using them. If we're going to - (Interjection)- well, the Member for Minnedosa says, you should see the country roads. Well, the country roads don't have anywhere near the volume of traffic that these do. These areas - (Interjection)- yes, I appreciate the weight of the trucks is similar, but the volume of the trucks and the rate of the trucks is far, far greater there.

So I don't know what can be done to push the city, but I would certainly appreciate the Minister in pushing that. I'm not saying that all of them have to go to a four-lane standard. Some of them can be an upgraded two-lane standard. It would probably be sufficient. Certainly, the ones that are interconnecting, it makes sense if there are four lanes on either side of it that the interconnecting piece in-between be four lanes as well, and also the relatively short stretches of road that we're talking about here. We're not talking about miles upon miles of new four-lane highways which I, as the Minister well knows, am not very supportive of. But the Minister has already responded to the Member for Kildonan that he would like to or will try and address that with the city and I appreciate those efforts. If he has anything further he'd like to add to that before my next question, which I'm sure he suspects or he knows what it is already as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, because we have put ourselves on a restricted diet in terms of hours for the various Estimates, and because Highways, in my opinion, has been a little bit short-changed to begin with, I hope the members of the government might consider keeping their questions to a minimum and keep them on their own nickel or we may be here very late tonight, because it was our intent to try and wrap this up.

MR. D. SCOTT: On that same point, if that was a point of order . . .

A MEMBER: Certainly that was a point of order.

MR. D. SCOTT: . . . we have a responsibility to represent our constituents and raise problems before committee, the same as the members opposite.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: You can walk in his office every day.

MR. D. SCOTT: Well, the Minister keeps his office open for the members opposite to come in and discuss any difficulties they have as well.

MR. D. BLAKE: Do you want to keep the Minister here until two o'clock in the morning?

MR. D. SCOTT: So just because a member is on the government side, does not mean that the member cannot participate in committees. We've gone through this discussion several times in the past.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that we can keep on going for an extra half hour this evening to make up for the member's questions.

Mr. Minister, do you want to respond to the Member for Inkster?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that we will be attempting to make greater use of the Urban Affairs Committee mechanism on this. The Oak Point Highway to No. 7 there is almost completely the jurisdiction of the city, as the member knows, and therefore, will have to be addressed by the city through persuasion by our government.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that, and being that they are major interconnections to the provincial highway system, I'm sure the Minister will use what influence he has with the city to try and make them change. Maybe we need more frequent city elections, because when a city election comes along, all of a sudden we get some interchanges built.

The last question I just thought I'd like to raise, and I guess since we're dealing with planning, this is the most appropriate place to raise it in and this is something I've raised with the Minister in the past.

I want to repeat it for the sake of the record, as much as anything, to be able to have more clearly an understanding of what we are doing as a province in road building.

What I'm speaking of in particular is the standards to which we're building our roads, and one of the members opposite made a statement a couple of minutes ago that perhaps the standards that the Department of Highway sets are somewhat high for our needs. But, in particular, when I was vacationing in -(Interjection)- Well, did the report not say that there was some room to lower the standards and still be at a national standard?

MR. G. CUMMINGS: It said they could be lowered to 80 percent of the present standards, yes, it did say that.

MR. D. SCOTT: Okay, the report states that. Now one of the things that I inquired of when I was looking at what we are doing in highways here, particularly in relation to four-laning, and having travelled a fair amount in Ontario, I wondered if their standards were similar to ours; and in checking with one of their planning staff, I found that they do not consider four-laning the highway until they are between 12,000 and 15,000 cars per day; and our standards are much, much higher than that, in that I believe we are looking at four-laning some roads as little as 3,000 cars a day.

I'm wondering, given the financial richness of Ontario, who feel they cannot afford it until 12,000 vehicles a day, whether we should be considering to use some of the funds - diverting funds from four-laning towards general upgrading and maintenance of the two-lane system throughout the province, which it would appear compared to other jurisdictions, in Ontario, in particular, which is a much higher volume of vehicle traffic compared to what we have here in Manitoba, that it might be appropriate.-(Interjection)- Yes, the member asked me if I'm opposed to the Highway 75 four-laning, I think it's ridiculous to go ahead and four-lane Highway 75 further than we already have.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: What we have done up to this point in time, Mr. Chairman, is used a standard of about

3,000 vehicles per day to consider a highway for four-laning it. That's the point when it becomes critical in terms of safety, from the experience and the data and accident statistics, and so on, that the department has.

Insofar as other jurisdictions, it's different situations that may exist; usually in Ontario it's major new routes that they're constructing and they decide, at the very outset, that they're going to build them to four-lane limited access expressways and that's how they build them. But they do have some projections as to how much traffic they will serve. I don't have a lot of data on what those projections are, but it's not usually existing routes, such as we are dealing with here in Manitoba.

That's my advice, at any event, and we have to, with limited resources, look very carefully at those standards. I agree, there's a limited number that we can do with only provincial funding. We get into the whole area of federal funding and the need for additional dollars to meet the needs of our major interprovincial and international routes. So at the present time, we have to be very careful in how and when we undertake major new projects that require twinning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, through you, to the Minister, I want to discuss with the Minister again the question that continues to concern us in the Stonewall area, and that has to do with the Planning and Design Department division of the Department of Highway's determination to route a major trunk highway into the Town of Stonewall onto residential streets, etc.

I find it as difficult today as I did several years ago, when this issue started, why this determination to do this to Stonewall? Why has Stonewall been designated as a community that routes a major highway into town, when, in all other communities, by-passes are used to avoid the downtown section of a community? I refer to areas such as Neepawa, in Brandon I understand the department is considering and planning and designing a by-pass for the by-pass, because of the buildup along the by-pass.

But in Stonewall, we are still faced with a situation which, by far the majority of the residents, some 724 who have signed petitions in the past, 93 percent who have attended public meetings; public meetings which the Minister did not attend.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, and committee members, that some of the 724 people are with us at this committee meeting because of their continuing interest in this question. I simply ask the Minister, why the determination to designate Provincial Trunk Highway 67 onto the residential street of Stonewall called Fourth Street, and then onto the north, the access road - the current access road that we now have from No. 7 Highway to Stonewall, known popularly as the north route?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, we did discuss this at length in Estimates I think on two occasions in the past. It may be repetitious and certainly I am not, at this point, as familiar with all of the details as I would have been on occasions that we've discussed this in the past.

Certainly, we're not changing anything. The route is there at the present time. It serves the community in such a way at the present time and we're not proposing to change that one iota. What we're simply doing is upgrading it so that it will be a safe highway into Stonewall. That does not in any way prejudice or prejudge the need for another route, the south route, to Stonewall. That can be done at some time in the future. It's a matter of dollars and cents in terms of what we can afford. The fact is even if there was a south route built at the present time, the north route would require upgrading. It's just not in a shape to handle the volumes of traffic that it does now or would under the circumstances of another alternative, this south route, the three-mile south.

So the projections are clear that this route would still be a very busy highway and it needs to be upgraded. There is very poor vertical and horizontal alignment. We have worked with the landowners to determine a way to take the least property possible on the south side so that the residences would be affected as little as possible and now have decided that it's time to get on with that upgrading. Once that is done, then decisions can be made and our thoughts can turn towards another by-pass route, but that does not affect the work that has to be done here.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I have to take issue with the Minister.

You are changing things. I can send him up photographs of what is Fourth Street in Stonewall, which most of the residents have to back right onto what is now being designated as a provincial trunk highway from their driveways, hardly an acceptable method of accessing a provincial trunk highway.

I know how difficult it is, and I'm sure you know, Mr. Chairman, how difficult it is as a rural member to get an additional access onto a trunk highway, a PTH, from some of your farm fields or from some of your constituents who may wish to have an additional access road to it.

Here we are, and it is the change, this is Fourth Street, Stonewall. Now the Department of Highways has put a Highway No. 67 sign over on top of that Fourth Street sign. That is changing the designation. I don't mind, Mr. Chairman, if that designation is going to be temporary, I'll accept the Minister's suggestion, but I want to hear from Planning and Design that it is an acceptable routing of a provincial trunk highway onto a residential street in Stonewall.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, first of all, I, as Minister at this time, am not changing anything insofar as the designation. I don't know when the sign was put up, frankly, but that has always been the route for many years through Stonewall, those vehicles that would not be destined for Stonewall itself and they would want to by-pass to go along Fourth and then south down the route to Winnipeg or whether it be 67 east to Highway No. 6.

Clearly, nothing is changing by this construction of Highway 67 to Stonewall from Highway 7. We're not changing anything and the member is misrepresenting what is happening here if he says that we are. That route is now serving that area. We're simply proposing

to make it safer and we'll do that within the limitations that we have in that area.

The member also should remember that the Town of Stonewall supports us in these efforts. Successive councils have indicated to me in resolutions and letters that they support this work.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister wishes to engage in the question of who is supporting what position, then he ought not to forget to mention that the R.M. of Rockwood, the R.M. of Woodlands, and by far the majority of the residents, 742 have signed and sent in petitions as compared to 42 who have supported the programs of the Minister, and 93 percent at other public meetings, of well-attended public meetings, indicating their displeasure with the present routing.

Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that provincial trunk highway ended where it had butted into Fourth Street. There was a natural extension of the south route which original highway plans clearly indicate ought to have in time, in due course, when traffic demanded it, been extended as the natural extension of 67, keeping out of two right-angle degree corners, staying off of residential streets in Stonewall and joining No. 7 Highway a mile south.

That is the record, Mr. Chairman, and the designation of the residential Fourth Street of Stonewall as being 67 has come during the lifetime of this government. The redesignation of the access route, known as the north route and having a 67 sign, has been redesignated in the lifetime of this government. The redesignation of what we call the Bog Road, I believe it was - I forget the numbered road, the road that runs straight east from Stonewall to Lower Fort Garry, the fort - that was a numbered provincial road, not No. 67.

Those changes have all occurred during the lifetime of this government, and the Minister ought not to indicate that I am in any way misrepresenting the situation. These changes have occurred, perhaps not to the Minister's memory, but they occurred during the period of time that I am speaking of.

Those were provincial roads, those were access roads, those were Stonewall residential streets not otherwise numbered. The provincial trunk highway ended where it ends now, where it butts into Fourth Street at Stonewall. Any extension of that trunk highway ought to proceed along the southerly route.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't wish to be unkind to the Minister. I appreciate the Minister wants to do a temporary routing of 67. I appreciate the Minister's position in wishing to correct the access routes Stonewall now enjoys. We call the Three Mile Road the north route. There are difficulties to that road. That road is substandard, needs upgrading, but it becomes important as to what you're designating that route as to the standard of designation. Are we designing the three miles to provincial trunk highway standards, but then forgetting about the gap that Fourth Street leaves in the system?

The Minister can get support, and certainly get my support, for redesign or improvement of the north route, take out some of the difficulties of that route, give us a bit of shoulder, take out some of the unacceptable topographical lines that make that highway not as safe

as it should be; but I object to it being necessarily built to a provincial trunk highway which then leads us, understandably, to believe that the department has made a decision with respect to the future extension of No. 67.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I would have to get the exact information on the cross-sections to determine whether this is being built to any higher standard than it would if it had a different designation as an access road as opposed to the current designation, because there's already been a lot of adjustment made to the standards insofar as the amount of right of way that's required on the south side so as not to impact on the residents along the way. I understand, if my memory serves me correctly, that it's merely a 15 ft. section on the south side, along those residences that is being required, which is very minimal no matter what standard we're talking about here insofar as upgrading 67 at its current location.

I just want to point out to the member that 67 has been that route as far as I can remember. I used to work in Stonewall many years ago, 1970, about 17 years ago, at Comstock there and I drove on there all the time, 67 to Highway 6 was there as it is now and that route was the same as it is now except in better condition. I don't know what's changed, maybe the 236, PR 236 which is with Fourth Avenue is suddenly now being dual-numbered to be 67 as well as 236 to join up to the two sections. I don't know when that happened, I don't think it was in the last couple of years, it was several years ago. I thought it was always like that and I don't think anything, as far as the pattern of traffic in that area, has changed in the last 17 or 20 years insofar as the use of those roads.

So really we're not changing anything and I think we're on then to the state of what standards, to the question of what standards should be applied to this route and I, in previous discussions with staff, was satisfied that they were taking the minimal amount of property required to do the job there and I will satisfy myself that that is the case in future discussions with them, to determine that they are indeed taking as little as possible under any circumstances, with the upgrading of that road.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make it very clear that the question of land requirements, although that's always troublesome to people affected, is not the case. The residents are, I won't try to speak on behalf of all of them, are certainly prepared to acknowledge that that piece of road needs some upgrading and are prepared to contribute, if need be, some land to make that possible. They, I might say, are somewhat upset by the approach the Department of Highways that it is now taking with respect to land requirements, that is sending out expropriation notices before sending out an offer to purchase. That seems to be a new policy that this Minister and this government has introduced which understandably upsets residents who haven't even been given an opportunity to refuse a deal, but to be served by expropriation papers first, and then have someone start talking terms with them.

But, let me come back to the central issue that is of concern to my residents in that part of the

constituency and that is the future designation of a major trunk highway. If the Minister is telling me, if the Minister is putting on the record that that isn't changing, that a decision with respect to the eventual extension of no. 67, whether it's on the south route or on the route that it's now using, is that still open to question, that would be information that I would like to have on the record.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: What I've said and I still stand by is that the reconstruction of the north route has no bearing on future decision with regard to whether a south route is required or not. That is a decision that is still open and has to be taken at some point in the future by whoever is government at that particular time, and Minister at that particular time.

I just want to make one point about the expropriation. We've had a new policy in place now for about three or four years,'83 I believe, with regard to expropriation and it was in response to the problem that was created when land values were rising rapidly and those people who would not settle through negotiations would be the ones that would benefit the most because the expropriation date is established at the time of filing for expropriation and if you wait a number of years, when multiple acquisition situations, then that person that didn't settle voluntarily, often benefited more than those who did and received more for his property. So that's why this new process was put in place, it was nothing unique for Highway 67. It had been applied throughout the province consistently.

However, we have reviewed this and decided, and particularly now when there isn't the rapidly increasing land values and not only that, that could change quickly, it does leave a rather uncomfortable result in many cases where landowners feel that there is heavy hand of government being applied to them, that we are going to, with new projects coming in this year, apply a new process, a new policy, that will allow for some period of time for mutual negotiations and arriving at a settlement and then after that time that is established every six months or four months, after that four month period, then expropriation would be filed. So we would have time for some mutual agreement but we have had a policy for three or four years in place in this province that we have now reviewed. So that addresses the member's concern with regard to the expropriation.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to note that the Minister and the government has seen fit to modify its heavy-handed approach because it would have allowed me to have put on the record to note that, of course, that is the difference between a Conservative Government that asks and an NDP Government that takes. But I didn't want to discuss the question of land expropriation at this particular time.

Just so that I understand the Minister, he is saying that nothing he and the department is doing is prejudicing any future decisions with respect to the routing of Provincial Trunk Highway No. 67, that future decisions with respect to that routing, as desirable as it may be in the opinion of many of the residents along the south route, is still possible. If that's the case, Mr. Chairman, I suppose that's all I can expect at this point from the committee. I might simply say that, quite

frankly, I would prefer to have the monies the department is expending on paving 236 between Stonewall and Balmoral which all my constituents want. The department and the Minister could make themselves more friends in that part of the country by doing something like that, rather than going against, flowing against the wishes of so many residents in that area, when highway dollars are already scarce.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I thank the member for his comments. The fact that the member is saying that he doesn't want Highway 67 in its present location upgraded, that it's not a priority, I'll have to consider that because we really felt that this was time to get the work done but I think we will be moving on that, in any event, after I discuss it with the staff. The fact is that it has been known for some time that that route is not satisfactory at the present time and so that's why we wanted to move it. Certainly not with any desire to inconvenience people and to disrupt their lives but this happens right across the province in various places when we have to upgrade roads.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have in front of me the new projects for '87-88 and I'm wondering what the planning is going on here with Highway 41. On page 6 the item there, Highway 41 grade and gravel south of PR 545, west of the Assiniboine River and I'm not clear as to what could be going on there. I think, to my mind, it should be north of PR 545, that chunk of gravel on the slope of the valley there. I would think that's what's being relocated but maybe there's something going on there I'm not aware of. Can you tell me?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, I believe, I have a different list in front of me but it's the same material, it's different information. The Deputy says that he believes that that is correct south of PR 545, west of the Assiniboine River in a new location.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Mr. Chairman, is the new location to replace that chunk of gravel road on the side of the valley now, or is it to replace a chunk of existing paved road?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: The member is saying that he doesn't understand the description here? It's from south of PR 545, where 545 joins 41, just south of there, up to the Assiniboine River.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Going north, okay.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Going north.

MR. G. FINDLAY: It's that chunk of road that's gravel.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: A longstanding problem that is finally being addressed by a caring government.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Not that there hasn't been some need brought to your attention.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Gee, did you call me on that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

A point was raised here awhile ago by some of the government backbenchers about communications with the city in the McPhillips area and some of the additional studies and proposed construction that is being brought forward north of the Perimeter. How much does Planning and Design contract out in terms of their work?

We had studies done in the Selkirk area and there was a study done on the Perimeter. We touched on this earlier, and you said, well, this was the area that probably should be addressed. Do we not have people in the department, is the department overworked, that they have to contract out? I have no particular qualms about contracting out, but what criteria does the department use for - and there seems to be a fair amount of this work being done, and I'd like to know what percentage is being done and whether this is because the department simply does not have the men and the facilities to handle the studies.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, the fact is, for major studies it's been found to be more cost effective to utilize private consultants. We do want to ensure that we continue to have a healthy consulting engineering community in the Province of Manitoba and do want to balance between contracting out and in-house work. So major studies for future planning, recognizing the expertise we have in the province, have in most cases been farmed out to the private consultants, because that gives time, enables our staff in-house to do all of the other smaller jobs that are required to keep up with the regular upgrading of our facilities.

There's a lot of design work that has to be done by the in-house people in any event. So that rather than tying them up on these major projects, where it would take, in many cases, a lot longer to do, and would mean that other work would have to sit, we are able to engage these private consultants. It's really a peak point in time where you don't want to staff to that peak, so you engage outside help to do it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour now being 5:00 p.m., I'm interrupting the committee for Private Members' Hour. Committee will reconvene at 8:00 p.m.

SUPPLY - NATURAL RESOURCES

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

We have been considering item No. 2, Regional Services, 2.(a)(1) Administration: Salaries; 2.(a)(2) Other Expenditures; 2.(a)(3) Problem Wildlife Control.

The Honourable Minister.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I believe, when we left off the last day, there was an indication from the members opposite that they were wanting to pursue a few questions in the area of Fire Suppression, and we'd be quite prepared to deal with those matters now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for La Verendrye.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

If I may just go back and question the Minister in regard to the Eastern Region, I believe I was not quite finished with some of the questions that I had in that respect, and if he would allow me to, I'd like to proceed.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: We've had a fairly free-ranging discussion. I know the Member for La Verendrye has a particular interest in some of the Parks questions, and that will be coming up, by agreement, immediately after this section. But if it relates to Regional Services for that region, by all means.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: I wish the Minister would allow me to question him on some of these issues in regard to the Western Region, because I do not expect to be here the full afternoon and I'm not sure what time you're going to be in regard to that item, so if I may ask you some of these questions.

In regard to the greens fee costs, would you be able to tell me what the greens fee charges were last year at Hecla and are this year, and also at Falcon last year and this year?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, that will be covered in more detail under the Parks section, but I can indicate that in fact we have had some increase in greens fees. I believe last year the greens fees for Falcon and Hecla were approximately \$9, my recollection is, and they will be going up to \$12. So there will be an increase in greens fees. That is a reflection, I think, of what is happening elsewhere. We do not make that decision in isolation of what is happening in other areas, and there have been increases there.

So I would just say, on that specific one, when you're looking at greens fees for a particular time - and that I believe was what would be considered prime time. Then there are categories of people, some of them for seniors, there are reduced rates and there are reduced rates at different times. But if you were to look at prime-time greens fees on Falcon Lake and Hecla, it would be going from \$9 to \$12.00. It could be more. That's fairly accurate I think, but we could be more precise when we get to the section on Parks.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Would the Minister be able to indicate whether these greens fees are the same in both parks for different groups and different times of the year?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I don't think that I can answer that absolutely. In some of the material that we had intended to release later today with respect to the Parks - and I indicate it is part of a press release this morning dealing with Gull Harbour - there is a new working relationship being developed between the Gull Harbour Resort and the golf course. It is the intent to have them at the same level, but I can't say at this moment that they are.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Would the Minister be able to indicate what the future plans are for the Falcon Lake Ski Hill and Club?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, that is an area that I'm sure we'll want to revert to but, as the member

has indicated, he would want a bit of a response at this time.

I want to share with him and all members that the Falcon Lake Ski Hill has been a concern. The Member for La Verendrye has brought that to my attention in previous years. The level of usage of that particular facility is such that we are incurring losses in its operations.

We have been discussing, with the local ski club and other community groups, ways in which its continued use could be assured. We had looked at some cooperative arrangements and we had looked, in fact, at a contract arrangement, or management contract, for the course, but that was not taken up. There was an individual who was exploring it and then decided, because of concerns, one specifically being the cost of insurance, that they chose not to pursue that, so we are operating it.

There is an active group in the area that is looking at ways of acquiring some improved equipment, rather than having the tow rope, that they would have a lift. So they are looking, I believe, at some equipment from Ontario. If that were to develop and if we can work cooperatively with those in the area who have an interest in keeping that as a viable winter operation, we are quite prepared to work with them.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: I find it sort of disturbing to have the Minister indicate that it is not a viable operation when that's the only part, basically, that's had an increase in the number of vehicles that have entered the park in total. All the rest are down. And this is one where he's isolating just the ski hill separately from the rest of the so-called facilities that are available at Falcon Lake in total.

I did ask a year ago, during Estimates, for a revenue and cost sheet on the Falcon Lake area, and actually what I did receive possibly a month ago is something that basically is in this book. It's actually no more than repetitious figures of what's in the annual book, and it does not isolate the Falcon Lake.

I'd like to pose that question again to the Minister, whether he is prepared to table for me the cost figures of Falcon Lake only, because I realize that golf course is one that is bringing in, in that respect, a lot more revenue than the Hecla Golf Course. When it comes to these Estimates Books, there is almost twice the amount of expenditure at Hecla in comparison to Falcon Lake, and I think the priorities should be restructured so that, in cases of this nature, we would be fostering the tourist industry that is available instead of basically deterring them from going to a park of this nature.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate clearly to the member that it is my desire to provide as full a listing of information as possible, but I indicated to the member that the section in which we could provide the very kind of specific information that he wants is the section that follows immediately, and we will have the staff in attendance who could provide that information.

So I want to say that we have provided information. The member has acknowledged receipt of the information. He feels that some of that perhaps is not sufficiently detailed. If he wants more specific detailed

information, I would like to suggest that we wait until we are dealing with Parks.

But clearly, that information in respect to the park has to take into account the use at different times of the year and, in terms of getting the most effective use of our resources, I think we have to recognize that there are limitations on the kinds of services that we can provide. If we have to rededicate some of those resources from winter use to provide adequate summer use - and I would venture to say that services at Falcon Lake are very, very good services. Our concern for Falcon Lake Ski Hill is whether we can continue to operate under the existing arrangement, given the level of use that exists. It is only that concern that we have.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: I have a few more questions in regard to the Parks though, but then I will wait till later on possibly, and address those questions at that time to the Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I think we're prepared to move all the Estimates up until the Fire Suppression aspect of it. We can deal with Fire Suppression now if you want, or whichever way the Minister would prefer to do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)(1) to 2.(j)(2), inclusive, were each read and passed.

2.(k)(1) Northern Development Agreement - Provincial - Fire Program Development and Evaluation: Salaries; 2.(k)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could clarify under items (k), (m), (n), (p), (r), (s), (t). These are all related to fire suppression, firefighting, fire detection, etc.

My first question is: Why is it set up in such a complex category? Why couldn't we have it simplified in terms of firefighting and fire detection? We have a whole list of categories here, and it's very hard to establish exactly what's going on.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, really what we are attempting to do by way of those categories - and perhaps the staff can advise me of the history of these - but I think we should have those kinds of categories in an attempt to better understand where our expenditures are being made and for what purposes they are being made.

We have costs that are related to the placing of equipment from region to region in advance of a fire, but just ensuring that there is adequate capacity to deal with fires. There are programs dealing with training. There are components, as the member has indicated, that deal specifically with detection, and I think those costs, we should have some idea of separate from suppression costs, and there are costs related to the different agreements, the Northern Development Agreements that we have in place. It is only that we want to have an accurate as possible assessment, as good managers, to be able to make decisions for future years, to allocate these costs and be able to say where are we incurring our costs.

If in fact we have to make some decisions with respect to allocations of dollars, we have a basis on which to make that decision. If in fact we had one global figure for detection, then I think it is under that arrangement that we would be criticized more rightly of trying to bury the costs as opposed to having several categories. Clearly, this is not an attempt to bury any costs. It's an attempt to provide very good and sound information on which to make decisions.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Under the firefighting programs, all of them, it indicates "Northern Development Agreement" and then "Provincial."

Is there any federal money involved in any of these Estimates here?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, the development agreements provide for sharing of costs on some items.

Some items within those agreements are 100 percent federal funding and some items are 100 percent provincial funding. So these items that we have here are 100 percent provincial funding but later, as we go through the departmental Estimates, we will see that the federal contributions will be recognized.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to clarify that statement because is he saying that there is additional funding besides what is shown in these categories that have been expended for firefighting, or is this the total amount that is being expended and then cost-shared federally under a different category?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: No, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to indicate in any way that there are costs that are not accounted for. I'm just simply saying that within this category, these particular categories, now when we come to some other parts of the departmental budget, I think you will see some reflection of federal participation there.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, so I understand it correctly, these figures that we see here are the actual figures that are expended in the total program for fire suppression, firefighting, and then the adjustment is made later on in terms of the federal-provincial cost-sharing later on in the Estimates here. Right?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I just want to indicate that, when we are speaking of Federal Government participation, there are different vehicles for that, the Northern Development Agreement being one. The Northern Development Agreement does not just deal with Natural Resources, it deals with different departments.

Within the Northern Development Agreement, under that specific component, there is no federal participation in Natural Resources but, when we go through the ERDA agreements, there will be federal participation, but not under the Northern Development Agreement as it relates to Natural Resources. Then within other departments - and I'm not familiar with those - but I would expect that there would be programs within some other departments which might be 100 percent funded by the Federal Government, but not in the Department

Monday, 4 May, 1987

of Natural Resources under the Northern Development Agreement.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I have one more general question on this, and then I'd like to get into some specifics.

Can the Minister indicate whether there's any Manitoba Jobs Fund money in these Estimates here, under firefighting?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, there's not any of that funding in this section dealing with fire suppression but I point out that, when we are dealing with reforestation, there will be evidence of that.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Could the Minister indicate the amount of loss in dollars through forest fires for '86-87?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could seek clarification. Did the member ask for the value of the lost production, lost timber due to fires? Is that the question?

MR. A. DRIEDGER: That's the question.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Okay. It'll take just a moment.

Mr. Chairman, we have that information available, but it's not in the documents that we have here. So what I would suggest is if we could have it brought to us either later today or when we're sitting next.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: That's acceptable.

I wonder if the Minister can indicate, based on last year's figures, are those the actual expenditures? What monies were actually expended last year? Is that based on what the budgetary figures were shown, or was there an increase or decrease last year?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, those figures, depending on which page he is looking from, but clearly what will happen is that we budget for fire suppression cost and then, depending on the experience of a given year, you could be either above or below what you budgeted.

I can just point out that in 1983-84, for example, which was a difficult year as far as fires, the budgeted figure was 6 million, very nearly 7 million, 6.9, and the expenditures ended up at 12.9; 1984-85 similar at 5.9 budgeted and then an actual expenditure of 10.2.

Our experience is, this year, we are much ahead at this point in terms of other years and averages. So there is a concern on our part this year that, if conditions continue, we could be hard pressed. In terms of last year, for '86-87, the allocation was 8.8 and the actual expenditures, 8.59. So we were slightly underbudget last year.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate what happens to money that is not expended? Does it lapse? Is it transferable? Can it be moved around within the department?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, we do have some latitude within the branch of Regional Services. We can

reallocate some of the funds, but I'm advised for the previous year that there was a very small sum of money that was lapsed.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Can the Minister indicate the amount of staff who are employed under the total programs that we are looking at under suppression, detection, prevention, firefighting itself, for the staff, full-time staff as well as the part-time staff or stand-by staff, the amount of people who are involved in this kind of a program?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Within the detailed Estimates here, some of the staff years are there, but I think the member is probably interested in the part-time employees who would not appear in these figures. I'm told that last year we had about 330, and this year the figure would be about 310.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Could the Minister indicate where these stand-by or part-time employees, under which category their salaries would be reflected?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, there is a reduction in subappropriation 2.(p), and then the other area which would be affected would be subappropriations, 2.(s) and 2.(t). So the (s) dealing with the Fire Tac Programs, there's a slight reduction in the Helitac Program as well. So they would be spread through those three subappropriations.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I wonder if the Minister could explain, if there's an increase in part-time help this year, why there is a reduction in the salaries aspect of it under some of these categories. Specifically under (p)(1), which is the Salaries, I assume where you indicated part-time firefighters were under, there's a reduction in there. And under (s), there's a reduction in there. And also under (t), if this is where their salaries are reflected, how can we have more people on stand-by, part-time help and then have a reduction in these areas?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: I'm sorry if I've misled the member, but I was saying that is where the reductions were taking place. We were not having more, but it is in those areas that we would in fact have staff reductions.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to get too technical here, but the Minister indicated that there were 10 more. There were 300 last year, and this year we're looking at 310 part-time help. I wonder if he could clarify, and then he's talking of reductions.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, just a clarification, I said that there were 330 reduced to 310, so that it was a reduction, in fact. It wasn't from 300 to 310, but from 330 to 310.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Okay, fine, I misunderstood the Minister, I thought it was 300.

Can the Minister clarify why there would be a reduction in this program at a time when we're looking at a possibly very, very serious situation developing across the province? How does he arbitrarily come up

with figures that are less, without having any indication of what the situation is going to be like?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Well clearly, Mr. Chairman, this budget was not struck when the fire season was upon us. These budgets are developed, work goes into casting these budgets, going back to November and December of the past year. And you work sort of on the anticipation of average conditions. Clearly, if we were in a position to anticipate weather conditions, climatic conditions six months in advance, there would be a different basis for budgeting. But we can only budget on the basis of average conditions. So knowing what we did at that time and having certain resources at our disposal, we made decisions with respect to staffing and the allocation of staffing.

Clearly as was indicated from the information that I shared earlier, when you go back to 1983-1984, as an example, where conditions are such that we have to allocate more funds, those decisions will be made. And we have done it in previous years but, as well, I want to share with the members that, in terms of allocating scarce resources that we have to prioritize our activity, firstly, in terms of safety for communities and the individuals who occupy those communities, so that is where our first allocation will be. In dealing with the fires in different areas, we will make our decisions based on the value of the forests and the greatest commitment of resources will be to those areas where there is the highest value, and that would take into account not only commercial value but recreational and heritage values as well.

So having made those decisions, clearly there are some of the remote regions where there was little commercial value, little recreational value and, where there was no risk to human life or risk to community, our commitment of resources would be decreased and some of those decisions were made.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Under fire protection, I understand that both manpower is used for surveillance, as well as airplane surveillance. Can the Minister give me an indication what percentage is done by airplane surveillance? For example, I suppose in the northern area it's mostly by airplane. How much is done in that category and how much money is spent through air surveillance, and under which category would that come?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: In subappropriation 2.(m) in the Detection Program under transportation, that figure there of \$228,000 would reflect the budget for air surveillance.-(Interjection)-\$228,000, that's correct, just for the surveillance portion of the program.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: That's for aerial . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, D. Scott: The Honourable Minister.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: That's right, aerial surveillance. But my staff advise me that, as effective as air surveillance is and we do utilize it, there is still a very major role, in fact, the majority of the detections, it's estimated that 60 percent of them are made from observations other than from the air.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Can the Minister indicate how many of these contracts - are the contracts entered into with private organizations? What portion is done through private contracts, and what's done through government airplane or the government air corps, or whatever you want to call it?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, in the past we have used contracts with private individuals for surveillance purposes, but it should be pointed out that our adaptation of new technology for detection of lightning strikes - and that being really the main concern - that is improving to the point where we then would not have contracts but when circumstances were such that, based on the use of the detection equipment, we had a concern and a specific reason, we would engage someone to do flights in that area when there was a specific concern. But there are no standing longer-term contracts for flying the surveillance flights.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Is that a change, Mr. Minister, from previous years, in terms of that you used to have contracts with private operators who were doing surveillance? Is the Minister now saying that this is not being undertaken now, that a different approach is used in terms of fire detection?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: The change, Mr. Chairman, is not that we would no longer be contracting out work with the private owners of aircraft. The change is that, rather than having people on stand-by contracts, we would hire these individuals as the need arose. So it's more of an opportunistic approach rather than - we're relying more heavily on the electronic equipment for detection of strikes by lightning, and combining that with this effort that we will approach it on that basis, that we will hire as the need arises rather than having people on a longer-term contract.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister feel that the fire detection system that he is promoting right now is as efficient as the one that has been in the past, or is this a deletion of services to some degree in terms of fire detection?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, in terms of dealing with lightning strikes - and we recognize that fires are caused by different sources. In fact, as I reported in the House last week, the fires that we had to that particular day, none of these were from lightning strikes. These were caused by the activity of people out in the field. So clearly, that detection equipment will not be of value there. But when we get into the summer season, the majority of the fires that are caused will be in fact caused by lightning strikes, and electronic surveillance is very, very effective in terms of monitoring that. But depending on conditions and given the need, we would back that up with aerial surveillance and other forms of surveillance. So clearly to that specific question, yes, the equipment is very, very effective.

I've just been given some information here which would indicate that, in the long run, about 40 percent of the fires are caused by lightning and 60 percent by the activities in the field. I think what is important to note, that this equipment can in fact give you a jump

on it because, given a particular pattern that might appear from the monitoring equipment, you could anticipate - we wouldn't wait until you necessarily saw smoke but, given certain very dry conditions as we have now, if the equipment showed that there was a series of strikes in a particular region, rather than waiting for smoke, we could in fact go out and monitor it. So with a combination of this equipment and using the flights that we have traditionally and surveillance from towers, we are much more effective in detection of fires.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is then indicating that he is confident that the kind of detection system that we have in place right now is as adequate as it was last year, in spite of the fact that we have a reduction in that category in expenditures?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Yes, that's correct.

Certainly, I would not want this to be taken to mean that we were making less of an effort in this area. I think we are confident that the equipment that we have at our disposal, by adapting that new technology with some of the traditional approaches, we can be more effective than we were previously. But what I want to indicate is that, given the nature of fires, this should not then be taken as a guarantee that we will have fewer fires, because the level of fires relates primarily to conditions that you have out in the field. What we are looking at here is our capacity to detect and then respond to those fires.

So clearly, what we have to look at then are the conditions. We note that we have had, to date, fires at a level far in excess of what we've had in previous years or the average years up to this point. This is not a reflection of the equipment that we are using or the approach we take. In fact, as I said, where perhaps on the weekend there may have been some that started by lightning but, prior to that, there were none that were started by lightning.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate whether there has been a reduction in fire ranger positions for the coming year over last year?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I have here the information dealing with the levels of staffing, region by region. In fact, in that specific category of fire rangers, there has been a reduction of 10 in this year over the previous year. Our current level is 119.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is telling me that, at the present time, there are 119, and last year there were 129. Could he explain the rationale for a reduction of 10 fire rangers?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, again I want to point out that these are the figures that are in the budget, based on the information that we knew at the time, and you base your decisions on average conditions. I think it would be irresponsible of us to strike our budgets on above-average conditions or below-average conditions. We can only go on what we will assume is an average year.

Given those decisions and other decisions about the prioritization of our activity that some of the more remote

regions where there were forests of little value or no commercial value - there was no risk - we would concentrate our resources in those areas where there was higher value. Being able to adapt the new technology that we spoke of, we felt that we could manage this with a staff reduction of 10.

Now given certain developments and given the conditions that we face, that should not then mean that we will not bring in additional staff to deal with the conditions that exist in the field now. So clearly, I want to indicate that to the member opposite. What we are discussing now is the budget which was struck some months ago during the winter months but, as we deal with conditions in the field, we will have to adjust.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could indicate what the qualifications are of fire rangers because, if we can drop 10 in a year, what do they do then when they are dropped for this year? Do you turn around and can you arbitrarily hire fire rangers, or do they have to have certain qualifications? If they have to have certain qualifications, when we have a reduction of almost 10 percent in the staff of fire rangers, what happens to these people? Do they stand by until situations warrant it for them to be hired, or what is the process? Do they not need any special qualifications?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, in dealing with these positions, there are not qualifications in the sense of having to undergo specific training at a particular location or at a particular institution. We are looking for people who have experience and knowledge of the woods, being able to work in those areas, people who have knowledge and experience in working with equipment. Then we will provide some training for these individuals in order to prepare them to deal with the specific circumstances in which they find themselves.

There was some redeployment, I understand, of those who were previously employed in that capacity, but not all of them were able to be redeployed.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, are these fire rangers the ones who also do the investigations of causes for fire, or is there a different qualification for people who do investigations, whether it's a lightning strike or man-caused fire?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, the investigations into causes of fires are handled by the Natural Resources officers. That would not then preclude the possibility of a fire ranger assisting with the investigation. But those investigations would be directed by the Natural Resources officers.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate how many man-caused fires took place last year?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, for the 1985 season, I have this information that I can share. We have the numbers and the causes.

There are approximately 10 categories wherein fires were caused. We have the information on the five-year averages, and also the percentage in each category

by cause. So I would seek advice from the critic as to which information he's wanting. If he's wanting to have absolute numbers, I can read those into the record; if he is wanting percentages, I can - (Interjection) - This is in the annual report on page 52. The annual report from the department on page 52 would have that specific information.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, yes, I had that there. I noticed that there was no figure in there for 1986, and I was just wondering if there was a reason why '86 has been deleted in the report, because certainly that should be available as well.

The other question I have along with that is, of these man-caused fires - I think we can call them that - were these all investigated as to the actual cause of it?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: I have the information for 1986 that I'll read into the record, and it will be included in the next year. The man-caused fires for 1986 were at 142, and those caused by lightning were 75.

But what we have to recall is that we had conditions in the field last year which were not at all conducive - and we're pleased to see that - to fires, so it was one of the lowest years on record.

I'm looking over the chart here over the last 10 years and, in terms of fires caused by people in the field, last year's was a record low and so was the one on lightning, so it was a record low year when I look over the last 10 years. Going back to 1976, as an example, there were 755 fires caused by activities of people in the field and 373 by lightning; in 1980, 556 by activity in the field and 526 by lightning.

The other question that the member had was in terms of investigation. We recognize fully that where there are fires that are caused by the activity of people in the field, that some of those are not set deliberately, they're accidental. They could be accidental fires but, where we have reason to think that it was a deliberate act of destruction, we will investigate it; but if it is clearly a fire, for example, where somebody was burning some stubble or whatever and the fire got away, there really isn't much point in undertaking an investigation in those circumstances where it is very visibly an accident.

The same thing happens, I'm aware of a number of cases along the right-of-way, along the railroad as an example, where a fire would be caused and then spread. It's not a deliberate act, it's an accident. But where there is reason to think that there was a deliberate act on somebody's part to ruin, to damage our forests in some way, we would investigate it.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate how many people were charged and how many were convicted under this section?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Again, Mr. Chairman, we have the figures here only for '85, but we will get the figures for '86, but I want to indicate that in 1985, there were 29 offences; 15 of those were warnings, and 14 were guilty. But again, that follows, if you look at the information over previous years, that will I'm sure track with the conditions out in the field. But for '85, those were the figures.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could indicate who does these investigations so that charges can be laid? Is it the RCMP that assists in the investigation when charges are laid, or is it the C.O.'s that do it? If it is the C.O.'s, what are the qualifications of our C.O.'s when they lay these charges?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, these investigations are undertaken by the Natural Resources officers. They do have specific training in investigation, and there are people within the group who are more qualified than others, more experienced than others, and they will draw on those individuals as is necessary. We could call on the RCMP to assist in the investigation, if necessary. I can't say to you specifically that I'm aware of where that has happened, because we do have very highly qualified people in the force to deal with that.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I've been sort of trying to get a little bit more information on the record because I have to express some concern. I think, as the Minister indicated, last year was one of the better years in terms of having forest fires both by lightning and by other causes. Based on the figures he gave me initially about the increases from '83-'84 where it was budgeted \$6.9 million and an expenditure of almost double that; the same thing in '84, it was almost double that again and, you know, gradually the budget has been going up.

I'm wondering if the Minister is using the case of last year, which was a good year for fires, to try and prune down his spendings again, because we see reductions in the Estimates, understandably if it's a bad year and hopefully situations will turn around. But what we see here is that; based on last year's figures - and obviously the Minister has had some pressure to try and cut some costs somewhere along the line - what better example than to use last year's lack of fires, which was an exceptional year, he agrees, and starts cutting down on his expenditures, and it's very obvious that's what's happened. I just want to raise that concern with the Minister. I think, lest he feels that he's fooling anybody by using this approach, we're going to be watching very carefully what happens. The fact is, I can almost guarantee this Minister that, based on the exceptional year we had last year and the very dry circumstances now, unless it changes, he'll be running for Special Warrant before the summer is half over. His expenditures are going to be dramatically much higher possibly, unfortunately, than we've had for many a year.

So I think that, when we talk of reductions in here and the Minister is patting himself on the back in terms of getting his Estimates in at a certain level, I want to indicate to the Minister, don't get too self-congratulatory at this stage of the game, because I think you might be in for a surprise. I fully realize that it is not that easy to predict, because you have to use a basic set of figures somewhere along the line.

I just want to make very sure that the services available are not going to be cut back because of this government's decision to try and treat Natural Resources as a second category somewhere along the line, that this is an area where they can constantly keep cutting back on. The Minister himself, in his opening remarks, indicated he and his department are the

guardians of the resources. We want to make very sure that the Minister does not forget this and starts getting lax in terms of his expenditures, that he is prepared to be a good guardian, especially of our forestry which is of a major concern. Certainly he is not the one who is going to be instigating the forest fires, I realize that, but I want him to have a very realistic attitude and approach to this thing, and not to play around with figures too much and not cut back on services. That is why I was trying to establish the fact that services would not be decreased. That's why I asked whether the Minister felt comfortable that, in terms of detection, they still could do a proper job with that.

The same thing with firefighting itself, when I see reductions of 10 fire rangers, I get nervous right away because I hope it is not the intent to move in that direction in terms of cutbacks. As long as at least the staff is available that we can bring these people into play when it is necessary, hopefully, it won't be.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: I think, as I listen to my critic, I suppose he is doing the political equivalent of what we call presuppression, because I didn't hear that I was congratulating myself on this matter. But I think that is part of his responsibility, or maybe there's sort of a preventative maintenance work in anticipation of - he was just giving me fair warning, early detection system, perhaps we should call it.

Clearly, we are concerned, we are faced with a very real concern that the member opposite has often brought to the attention of government the overall level of expenditures has to be managed in some way. We agree with that, and the Department of Natural Resources cannot isolate itself from that process; we do have funds allocated to this. I should point out to the member that the level that is allocated for this year is at the second-highest level on record, so it is not as though the amount allocated here is out of line with the historical trend. It is the second-highest level on record.

What we have said - and the member has reinforced that statement - is that we are the stewards of the forest in this case, we are the stewards of the different resources in our charge. And clearly, if there is an unusual threat, a threat beyond that to which we had geared, we have the capacity to respond.

If you review the expenditures of previous years, it's clear that can't happen. So we can proceed on the basis of what we anticipate but, if we geared up each year to the worst possible conditions that we would anticipate, I think then the member would be in a legitimate position to argue that we were allocating on an extreme basis, and that would not be prudent management.

We are allocating on the basis of conditions that we can anticipate upon historical averages, that we have demonstrated in previous years and, in fact, we have demonstrated this year to date that we can gear up, we can respond to conditions in the field. And we will certainly not see those valuable resources of ours jeopardized.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, in my concluding comments or questions here, can the Minister clarify that, under the Federal-Provincial Agreement in terms

of the Northern Development Agreement - I think, under that, my impression was it was under that category where the cost-sharing takes place. If there's an escalation above the budgetary figures shown here, for example, as the examples that the Minister gave in '83-84 and '84-85, I believe where it almost doubled, does the Federal participation then double as well in terms of the pickup on that? Or are they just only participating on the basis of the figures we have here?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, perhaps before I answer that, I neglected to earlier introduce a staff member who was not with us previously. Seated next to Mr. Boyle, who's the Director of Regional Services, Peter Lockett, who's the Director of Financial Services.

But in responding to the specific question posed by the Member for Emerson, I want to reinforce again that, though this is part of the Northern Development Agreement, it is 100 percent provincial funding. So if we do have to increase our expenditures, it would be by way of Supplementary Supply, and it will be a charge to the province to fix it up. In this category, there is not a federal participation so, if we had to exceed the level that we have budgeted for, it would not be drawn from the Federal Government. This portion, the Northern Development Agreement as it relates to the Department of Natural Resources, Fire Suppression, is 100 percent provincial funding, so it would be Supplementary Supply.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I want to apologize to the Minister. I don't know whether I caught this quite right. My first impression initially was that some of the figures stated here are cost-shared federally under a different program, but then there's cost-sharing on it. Anything above the figures here, if there's Supplementary Supply needed for additional monies for fire suppression or firefighting, that is not cost-shared? I'm not quite clear on that.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: There are different federal-provincial agreements for cost-sharing. The Northern Development Agreement, as it ties in with the Department of Natural Resources here by way of the agreement, the agreement says that this portion of those services will be paid 100 percent by the province.

There may be some other components of the Northern Development Agreement related to other departments where the Federal Government will participate but, in this case, it's 100 percent by the province. But when we get into the ERDA agreements relating to forestry - and that's a separate agreement - the Federal Government participates in that program, and we will be dealing with that in the Forestry section.

But clearly in this case, it would be Supplementary Supply that would be required, so I would ask the Member for Emerson to keep that in mind and, if conditions persist as they are and if we, through the Minister of Finance, come for Supplementary Supply later in the year, that he would not be too harsh on us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(k)(1) to 2.(t), inclusive, were each read and passed.

Resolution No. 119: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$20,341,700 for

Natural Resources, Regional Services, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1988—pass.

Item No. 3.(a)(1) Engineering and Construction, Administration: Salaries; 3.(a)(2) Other Expenditures; 3.(a)(3) Less: Recoverable from Other Appropriations.
The Honourable Minister.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I apologize. There is agreement between myself and the critic, due to the absence of the Director of Water Resources who's attending a meeting in Ottawa, that we will skip this section and proceed with Parks, and then Engineering and Construction and Water Resources, which tend to be dealt with closely, and then we'll go into Parks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If this is agreeable to the committee, we will proceed on item No. 4, Water Resources.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, one other point on the section that we just completed I would want to share with the member opposite, we have a summary sheet here of some of the excellent initiatives that have been undertaken within the department in terms of training for staff, upgrading of equipment, some of which we discussed, communications with schools and training our fire guardians. I would be pleased to share a copy of that with the member opposite, so that he could in turn share it with others to increase his level of confidence and the confidence that other people have that in fact our fire management program is indeed very effective.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Water Resources, item no. 4.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Order please. Mr. Chairman, I think possibly you misunderstood the Minister of Natural Resources. We had agreed that, because the Director of Water Resources was not available, we would skip item 3 and item 4 and go directly to item 5, and I want to just indicate that we had agreed to do that with the understanding that possibly on Thursday we could then go back to cover those two areas, regardless of how far we've come on the other sections. Would that be agreeable?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If that is agreeable to members of the committee, so be it.

Item No. 5., Parks, 5.(a)(1) Administration: Salaries; 5.(a)(2) Other Expenditures.
The Honourable Minister.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, perhaps before we hear the first question from the critic, we just want to introduce the staff members who have entered. At my immediate right is Claudia Engel, who is the acting director of Parks, having recently assumed those responsibilities when Rich Goulden became the acting assistant deputy; and we have as well Derek Doyle, who is one of the assistant deputies in the department.

Perhaps just one point of clarification that I would be prepared to share for the member, I just noted at this time, better understanding the federal/provincial agreements, I have some information which indicates that some of the agreements are 100 percent provincial funded. There are those that are 100 percent federal

funded, and those are matching dollars. So there is an equivalent amount spent, and then there is a third category which is a cost-share. There is participation by both levels of government in those agreements, so I would be prepared to share that with the member at another time.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister was referring to the fire suppression costs. Am I correct in that? -(Interjection)- Fine, I would appreciate getting that information.

Mr. Chairman, as we go into Parks, I am wondering if the Minister could make a bit of a general indication as to the direction that his department is looking for in Parks, what is expected, what changes can the people of Manitoba expect this year in terms of regulations, liquor control programs, things of this nature. I wonder if he could maybe come up with some kind of an opening comment as to where he is taking the people of Manitoba in terms of the parks of Manitobaf

HON. L. HARAPIAK: I'm really very pleased to be able to give the member some indication of the direction that we are continuing to move with Parks, because I think Parks presents one of the most exciting opportunities that we have within the department to provide for the day-to-day enjoyment of people in various parts of the province to enjoy that rich heritage that we have.

In addition, it provides the opportunity to take into account the needs of future generations, wherein we provide parks facilities, we designate parks, and to protect tracts of land; and I should say, not only through the parks programs, but others that we will be dealing with, that is, the ecological reserves, to ensure that through the activity on the land in the different forms, very legitimate activities, whether they be agriculture, harvesting of the forests, mining activities, development of hydro-electric power, that there still be those opportunities for recreational pursuits of Manitobans and visitors to the province.

We did distribute last year - and I'm just having brought back to the House today - a particular illustration of the different categories of parks that we have in the province, ranging from wilderness parks to recreational parks, with different levels of activity within each one of those categories. What I will be making available to the member opposite as well is a more detailed plan which follows up that particular brochure to provide more extensive detail on each of the categories of parks and parks development.

There is a twofold consideration, I guess. We do have the parks that are in place already, a certain level of service there and we want to maintain those. But in addition, we are looking to provide more parks opportunities, not only to meet the increased demand from Manitobans but to be able to attract some of the visitors from other provinces and indeed from other countries to come to Manitoba and spend some time here enjoying our great outdoors. So the funds that we have at our disposal have to be directed to those two initiatives: No. 1, the maintenance and enhancement of existing facilities; and No. 2, to bring other facilities on stream.

When you look at the province, I think that there are really two categories that we have to address. There

are those who want cottaging experience; there are those who want seasonal experience; there are those who will want just a day-use experience. Clearly, the bulk of the population of the province is concentrated here in the City of Winnipeg, and we will have to provide parks experiences which are accessible to the population here. But in addition, what we want are parks situated so that people in various parts of the province will have access to that, whether it be on the southeast part of the province, represented by the Member for Emerson, the northwest part of the province represented by myself in the Parkland area, or if we get into the northern regions. We want people in all parts of the province to have access to those parks experiences, again keeping in mind that there will be different kinds of experiences demanded by different individuals. Some people in a park want very much what you would say is an urban experience in a park setting, with all of the amenities. At the other end, you will find those who want very much a wilderness experience that they would have in an isolated area, such as Atikaki in the wilderness park. So we will be providing those facilities, maintaining the existing facilities, and designating new parks.

I'm particularly pleased with the kind of support that we received from the Parks' staff. They are a very enthusiastic staff complement who dedicate themselves to the task at hand and try to ensure as much as possible a pleasant experience, not only for Manitobans visiting the parks but those who are visiting our parks from outside of the province. We view the people who attend our parks as, in many ways, being ambassadors for the Province of Manitoba, and the feedback that we get from the users of our parks is that they have been well-received. We look forward to continuing that kind of service for the users of our parks.

The member will recall that we had distributed this brochure last year and it's, "A Heritage for Today and Tomorrow." This document outlines those parks that are already in existence and those parks that we see as coming on stream. So clearly, we want to again put this on the record which will illustrate the areas where we have considerations for parks.

If the member is interested in more detail, we do have this document which is a system plan for Manitoba's provincial parks. This is the technical report that supports that particular effort. So I'm pleased in that we have not only good experiences for those who are in the parks and visiting there today, but we do have a good plan for the parks. It is not simply a fly-by-night approach, a response to an emergency approach, but it is a well-thought-out and documented plan which takes into account the needs for those current-day users of parks, as I said, and those of future generations.

I want to share with the member as well - and we have a copy. It was a press release issued today with respect to the Grindstone and Hecla Management Plan. There was a consultative process that we had undertaken over a number of years which saw the development of a management plan. That management plan has been approved, and I've issued a press release today to that effect, indicating that it has been approved.

We are looking forward to a further development of that park, which is to be rededicated as a heritage park. We have undertaken a zoning of the different

land uses on the island and on the adjacent mainland at Grindstone to indicate what kinds of activities will be accommodated in the different zones, and that will provide for an orderly development. It will leave people understanding clearly what kinds of plans we have for the parks.

This, I should point out, is not just our plan. It is a plan that was developed through consultation with the public. The document was taken out, and there was ample consultation with the public. It was taken back, modified and brought forward in its final form. So though the Department of Natural Resources and I, as the Minister, are pleased and proud to bring forward this final draft of the management plan, it is really something that we share with the public of Manitoba, because they were part of the design of that.

So my final comment, Mr. Chairman, on the Hecla-Grindstone Management Plan, we are particularly pleased that the Icelandic Village is very much a part of the future plans of this park. We want very much to see the village as a living village, if you will, that will reflect the heritage of the very proud dedicated people of that area, and that it will provide for those with a cultural link to the area the opportunity for them to participate in bringing that village to life. There have been meetings between the departmental staff and the Icelandic community of the area. There was a gathering last summer, which was very successful. Plans are already under way for a gathering this summer, and we think that it is going to be very, very exciting in terms of the future of the park.

One other area that I would mention on the Hecla-Grindstone Management Plan, the one area that has been controversial is that of hunting in the park. The park plan provides that the prime use of the moose population will be for viewing but that, in order to manage the numbers, we will be permitting seasonal specialized hunts from time to time. Now, in terms of the implementation of that program, we will proceed with this year, the publication in terms of the hunt for the upcoming season will be the same as it was for the previous year. The handbook is in the process of being printed. But in seasons hereafter, it will be very much an assessment on a year-by-year basis and whether or not a hunt of moose is allowed - and I point out again that it would be on a very specialized basis - would only be to manage the numbers where, if the number of moose started to exceed the capacity of the habitat of the area to sustain the population, we would look at a specialized hunt.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I would conclude my comments and look forward to further discussion with the member opposite.

The other point, I'm not sure if the member opposite has got a copy of this. I gave him an earlier press release, if we can share this particular copy of the press release with the member opposite as well.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, I've got a copy of the press release that he had this morning on the Hecla project there. That is part of the Hecla Island-Grindstone Project, but the Minister indicated that there's a management plan for the Grindstone area?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: It's the same.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: That's the same thing?

Would it be possible, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, whether a copy could be made available of the management plan - I don't know how extensive it is - but so that we can have a look at it and have it for public viewing.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Certainly, Mr. Chairman, we would be glad to make that available, because it is really a product of that public consultation process that took place. I will make a copy of the plan available to the member opposite.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Portage.

MR. E. CONNERY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I will be concentrating a little bit on Hecla, because that's an area I have some interest in, but I have a few other questions of more of a general nature.

Attendance at the parks for 1986, they should be available now. Can you tell us what happened in 1986?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that the statistics for previous years' use have not been compiled. It will be about a month before that is in hand but, if there were specific sites, perhaps we could provide some information. But there will be a document produced to report overall on those.

You're talking about the year ending March 31, 1987. That's the year in question, so those figures are not yet compiled.

MR. E. CONNERY: Does the department not have an idea what took place, because there are monthly readings, and so these would be coming through? They haven't compiled the final result, but they must have some indication.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised by my staff who figure on the basis of what they have at this time, not having the overall figures but recalling the information that they were dealing with, would indicate that it has been fairly constant.

I do have here the information in our annual report in terms of attendance, for example. Vehicle attendance at our parks was at about - I'm interpreting a graph here, so it would be about 1,250 vehicles in '76. Pardon me, I'm reading in thousands here, so there'd be 1.25 million, reaching a high in 1984 at about 1.5 million, and then declining slightly in 1985 by approximately 10 percent, I would say.

If the member was wanting to refer to, if he has the annual report, on page 41, there's that tracking information, but we do not have it for the last fiscal year. But the trend line seems to be down slightly. I think one of the considerations at that point may be attributed to the cost of transportation within the province.

MR. E. CONNERY: I didn't realize I would get the exact figures from the Minister, just had it recovered? Was it staying on-line? But the indication is that there's a slight decline continuing. Thank you.

Is there any federal money in this department and any Jobs Fund money?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, we just want to make clear here when we're talking about the parks, and then there's the related item in this particular case of Gull Harbour. So there was Jobs Fund money, and I indicated in tabling the report today that we could deal with that perhaps at the conclusion of the departmental Estimates. There's not Jobs Fund money in the parks, but there was some Jobs Fund money that went into Venture Manitoba tours.

MR. E. CONNERY: What about federal money? Is there any cost-sharing or federal monies that are in here that don't show up?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: I wonder if the member could clarify? Is he talking specifically about the current year or perhaps about the previous year? That would help us because, in the previous year, there was some in the Destination but, if he's talking about the current year, I would seek clarification here.

MR. E. CONNERY: We're dealing with the current year, the year under review, 1985-86.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Just again to clarify that, we seem to be dealing with two things. The year under review in the annual report is the previous year. The Estimates process is the current year, so you are talking about the one . . .

MR. E. CONNERY: The annual report.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Okay, that would be the previous year. Okay, that clarifies it.

Mr. Chairman, I have information here under the capital investment at Hecla specifically, through Destination Manitoba, which would be from federal funding. This was over a five-year period ending in March 31, 1987, so it spans a period of years. There was an expenditure of \$500,000 at Hecla, and I can indicate here how that was expended.

The village stabilization was \$170,000; the Cantoba (phonetic) Club, \$70,000; \$56,000 went to project management and \$204,000 spent on the marina. Now that is over the term of the agreement; it was a five-year agreement. Now I can't give you specifically, as I stand here, the year in which that was spent, but that covers a period of time ending March 31, 1987.

MR. E. CONNERY: The Minister is saying this agreement ended in March of '87 this year, the five-year agreement?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: That is correct.

MR. E. CONNERY: Then that didn't show up that I recall - I'd have to do some more research back in old tourism books, but I don't recall seeing that listed in the books previously. I am concerned, this year we see under Capital Grants, under the Tourism, under Destination Manitoba, which I didn't notice before to any great degree, we did see a little bit. But now under Natural Resources this year of \$260,000, Venture Manitoba Tours which, of course, is not Natural Resources, but the Oak Hammock Marsh, we see

funding now going from Tourism to the government parks, which I was kind of under the impression last year that this wasn't the situation, that it wasn't going from one government department to another government department. That worries me that it should be going to communities. It should be going to non-profit organizations and to profit organizations.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that the program does have different categories for participation, and one of the categories provides for the participation of municipal governments, as an example, a non-profit organization, and there was a category for participation for the Provincial Government.

So I guess what I would want clearly understood is that this was not in some way an attempt to hive off money that was intended for some other sector. It is clearly within the terms of the agreement, and it was an agreement between the Federal and Provincial Government, that there was provision for this kind of an allocation, so it was clearly aboveboard. I would leave it at that.

MR. E. CONNERY: I hate to disagree with the Minister. I think there is a siphoning off and, if it was permissible, I'd have to go back and read the agreement. I've read it a couple of times. I just don't recall offhand that the Provincial Governments were to be part of it. I don't discredit or say the Minister is not telling us the truth but, if that is permissible, we now see an accelerating of that money going to government departments. I have no quarrel with it going to municipal governments, to cities, to that sort of thing, but I think Natural Resources should be funded within its own budget and not be taking tourism money that should be going to other groups.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I guess, if the member is looking at the figures, you know, when he suggests the flow is being accelerated and he's looking at the investment at Hecla, I can't give him a year-by-year indication of where that flowed, but it was an agreement for that amount and the agreement is terminated. But I would not agree with the member that the flow of money to the province is being accelerated. I don't preclude the possibility of some other agreements. In fact, I would hope that we could get agreement with the Federal Government, and I don't see this frankly as being a problem.

If we look for support from the Federal Government for different projects and if we can, for example, get them to participate in some of our agreements on water development as we have been from time to time, I think that is good. In fact, I'm sure when we get into the section dealing with water, some of the people from the southwest part of the province will want some indication of whether or not we've been able to secure Federal Government participation on some of these very important projects. Clearly, I think there is an advantage to the province and to the people of the province.

My point, Mr. Chairman, is that, if there is an advantage that can be had from this arrangement, it is not to the Government of Manitoba which is apart from the people of Manitoba. These benefits flow and

whatever facilities we put in place are for the enjoyment of the people of Manitoba. So clearly, I would want to indicate, if we can secure that participation and it is for the advantage of Manitobans, I would continue to seek it.

MR. E. CONNERY: I disagree with the philosophy of the Minister, because I think enterprises that are run by private enterprises are going to be run an awful lot better than those that are run by the government. I don't care of any party stripe that you are, no government runs business well. I think Hecla Island is a great example of business that is poorly run by the government. Now you talk about waterworks, nobody else wants to dig a drain for nothing. Naturally, we want federal money in doing the Overhill Drain that hopefully some day we might see. Then we would welcome federal money, but I don't think federal money should be going into some of these resort areas.

The works at the International Peace Garden, is that strictly provincial? I thought that was a federal-provincial.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I guess I just want to put on the record that I agree there is a very important role for the private sector to play. I, for one, would never suggest that what we have to do is seek to have everything delivered by government. I've never said that, and I don't think the Member for Portage la Prairie would indicate anywhere that he has heard me say that. I think what we are doing is looking at delivering services for the people of Manitoba. I think there is an important role for the public sector to play in terms of providing parks opportunities, but there are ample examples where we are doing this not in isolation of cooperating groups and of the private sector. So clearly, we want to have a good working relationship.

I just point out that we have entered, for example - I think the Member for Gladstone would be aware of the Friends of Sprucewoods - into an agreement with the people of the area where they would undertake activities. We, in February of this year, entered into a similar agreement, and I had the pleasure of being at the Brereton-Mantario Rally where we signed an agreement with the Friends of the Whiteshell, a cooperative effort between the province and the people at the community level. We provide funding for people at the community level to organize and support the activities of the Parks Branch. We are in fact looking forward to perhaps a similar kind of arrangement with the Icelandic community in Hecla. So clearly it is not a matter - I think the Member for Portage la Prairie is suggesting that it has to be totally one or the other. I think there is room for cooperation; I think we have demonstrated by way of this particular branch of my department that there is a lot of good will out there between the department and the community. There is a cooperative effort, so we, from the department's point of view, certainly don't want to create the impression that in order to have a parks experience that people would be totally reliant on us.

I can point to other branches' activities within the Department of Natural Resources wherein individuals have undertaken to develop resort facilities, and we have cooperated with them. We have worked with them

to identify space for these, allocation of the resource for these activities to enhance tourism, which I know the Member for Portage la Prairie has a keen interest in. We have worked in that way, and we will continue to work in that way.

The point I would make with the Member for Portage la Prairie, when you're looking at Hecla, that we separate, in terms of looking at Hecla, operations of the Gull Harbour Resort and Conference Centre from Hecla. He had made a fairly strong comment about Hecla being an example, not a good example, but I think that the Hecla Island Park and Grindstone are just excellent resort facilities. We do have concerns, as I indicated in tabling the report, and we will be discussing later if concerns about the Gull Harbour Resort, would we feel that it is being turned around; it is coming.

But I would ask the member, if he is making those points, to make clear whether or not the comments relate to the operation of the Gull Harbour Resort and Conference Centre, which I think is a separate issue from the question of the island in terms of their operations though, in terms of the experience that the people have there, the two are very much related and can be and will be very much supportive of each other.

In terms of the Peace Garden, there is a sharing of four government agencies, I believe: the State Government from North Dakota, the Federal Government from the U.S., the Province of Manitoba, and the Government of Canada. The Federal Government grant to this operation for the past 10 years has been \$35,000 annually. Our grant is increased. We were at \$50,000 last year, and we will be up to \$63,700 for the current year. So again, we are increasing our support; perhaps some others would see fit to increase their support.

We recognize fully that North Dakota, for example, has made a very significant contribution to this and they carry a good portion of the load, and we certainly recognize that they are major contributors to the well-being of the Peace Garden. But this too is an example of the capacity of governments not only within a country to work together, but to work together between countries, so cooperation does work.

MR. E. CONNERY: I'm all supportive of that cooperation and I'm not opposed to you getting involved with Friends, as long as they're not all your friends. Some of them are our friends. I think it's that kind of cooperation I can accept, and I think a good indication of it is the St. Amant ward which is run by a board, and the Manitoba Developmental Centre for the mentally handicapped in Portage that's run by the government. St. Amant is well run and the Portage one is poorly run. So that's the kind of cooperation that I'd like to see you continue on.

You say you went from \$50,000 to \$63,000 at the Peace Garden, the Manitoba Government portion, but the \$50,000 of course is last year. We're looking at two different years, aren't we? Was that \$50,000 then last year - that would be a capital cost - was that over and above the normal provincial money put in?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: I think the member is asking about the Peace Garden specifically. That was for a grant

towards operations of the facility, and he is correct. The \$50,000 was from the previous year and the \$67,300 - pardon me - I think just increased it significantly, so I'll backtrack. It's \$63,700 rather than \$67,300, so that is our commitment to it for this year.

MR. E. CONNERY: Then what was your commitment to it last year, when you did this annual report? Now it says Capital Grants in the Business Development and Tourism Book. It says Capital Grants, and it says International Peace Garden. Can you explain to me what was done with the \$50,000, and what was your provincial grant to the Peace Garden that corresponds with this year, in '86?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Again, Mr. Chairman, it may be necessary to check with the other department in that we didn't contribute anything to capital projects last year but, in the previous years, I think we made a contribution to a water treatment plant. So I'm not just sure, in terms of the figures that he is referring to, what the year-end of that particular department report is and when that would have flowed, so if he can tell us what document he is referring to.

MR. E. CONNERY: It's the Business and Development Annual Report for 1985-86, and it's under the Destination Manitoba (e) Capital Grants, International Peace Garden Incorporated, \$50,000.00.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: I don't want to be answering, Mr. Chairman, for another department but I think, if he's looking at that, that is an accounting for a year previous to the year of which we are speaking. So I would suggest that he could rest comfortably, that it is all in order and accounted for. But when those departmental Estimates are up, he could follow it through. But we are talking about different time frames here and I think that is where the problem arises. He is talking, I believe, about two years previous.

MR. E. CONNERY: It says on here Annual Report, 1985-86 and, if you're in charge of the International Peace Garden, and Tourism gave you \$50,000, then surely, Mr. Minister, you should know what you did with it. I can't believe it.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: I know that it takes a considerable amount to make the Member for Portage la Prairie a believer, but I will try. I don't profess to have authority at the International Peace Garden. It is not operated by the Department of Natural Resources; we make a contribution. There is an independent board that operates that particular facility, so it is not a park in the sense that we are responsible for it. We make a contribution and the particular board runs it. So I just want the Member for Portage la Prairie to be aware of that. Is he a believer? Perhaps, he believes now.

MR. E. CONNERY: I wonder if the Minister would then maybe get the details for us so we could see what the money was spent on. Obviously, it was designed to go to capital, so there must have been a program for it. So if the Minister would take that under advisement, I would be satisfied with that.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, what I would suggest is that we will secure a copy of the Annual Report for the International Peace Garden, which we will make available to the member and then perhaps that, along with the information that he would wish to pursue with Business Development and Tourism, would provide him with the answer, because I think it is really not within my jurisdiction to answer the question to which he is seeking information from.

In terms of the operational grant, this department made a grant to the Peace Garden. We've made note of that. He is wanting to pursue a contribution towards some capital works, which was made by Business Development and Tourism to a body which is not accountable to my ministry. So I would suggest that we would make a copy of the annual report available and, when Business Development and Tourism is up, it would be pursued in that vein.

MR. E. CONNERY: I'll give the Minister a compliment. If he doesn't know what the money was used for, surely the Minister of Business Development won't.

Have the fee changes for all of the camps and everything else been published, what all the different fees are going to be this year? I don't recall seeing it. I asked the critic, and he doesn't know if they've all been published yet. Have they been and, if they have, can we have a copy of the new fee structure for all the various parks and whatever goes on, camping, the whole thing?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Yes, I've advised that the press release has gone out indicating what the fee structure will be; I have it here in front of me. If there's a particular category, then I'd be glad to answer that. We can make that information available; it is part of the press release. It's not as though it isn't public information, because we have issued press releases with respect to fee structures.

MR. E. CONNERY: Are there any categories, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, that haven't increased?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Yes, there are.

MR. E. CONNERY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'd like now to get a little bit more specific on Hecla, which the Minister is very thrilled with, and I've been to that facility and I think it is a lovely facility. I think it's a beautiful area, but I will tell the Minister that it is poorly run in the sense of the resort. But since we're not dealing with the resort, we won't get into that.

I'd like to ask the Minister why he is now transferring, I believe, the golf course to the Venture Capital Tours, or the Hecla Resort. What is the purpose of doing that? And if you transfer, and reading the news release that you have out here, it's a little - you say that they can plan their package. Now is that going to mean that people who are staying at the resort will have a priority to getting on the golf course versus the campers or the day people. What is going to happen there?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I want to go back to the question that the member raised with respect to fees. He asked if there were categories in which

there was no change, and I said that was so, and that is correct. I'm not sure if he's interested in knowing which categories those are.- (Interjection)- That's correct; it is a rather short listing. It is the category for seniors where we had no charge previously and we're still not charging, so that's not an increase.- (Interjection)- Yes, I have to say in all frankness that is the only one. There are categories where there is a dollar increase. There are other categories, depending on whether you're looking at seasonal use. There are larger increases, but the categories where there was previously no charge for seniors for camping permits, there's still no charge, and the lots for seniors on Monday to Friday there is no charge. There was no charge previously, and there is still not a charge.

There was a change and again, just to be sure that we do not mislead anyone, there was previously no charge for the fully serviced lots for the seniors, but there will be a charge in the current year for the fully serviced lots.

I was going to proceed with some of the information that he asked in terms of the operation at Gull Harbour, if he's interested. If he wanted to come back to this, I would still like to respond to the point that he raised about the working arrangement between the golf course. What we want to point out there is that we feel not as effective a utilization of the golf course and the resort facility as there might have been, in that people when they were calling could phone the resort and find out whether they could book accommodations but, if they were interested in golfing, they would then have to make some further calls to find out when the space was available on the golf course. Then, if that didn't match, they would have to work back again. So clearly, all we are trying to do is say that the resort is a major attraction and the golf course is a world-class golf course. It's a beautiful facility and we should maximize its use. If we can increase the usage of the area, increase people's enjoyment of the area by providing a better service in that way, I think it's something that we should proceed with.

There is an arrangement between the Venture Manitoba Tours and the Pro Shop, if you like, so that up to that point of the Pro Shop, for people coming in and wanting to make arrangements, they can communicate effectively with one. Beyond the gates of the Pro Shop, the responsibility for the golf course is still with the Department of Natural Resources for the maintenance of that. There will be a payment to the Department of Natural Resources which will be equivalent to their fee structure of the previous year. So that money will still go to the Department of Natural Resources. It's not an attempt to take that money and have it go through Venture Manitoba Tours without having the flow through the Parks Branch for maintenance of the facility. So I think it's a good relationship.

MR. E. CONNERY: Did I read in your news release that this would enhance the financial viability of the facility? If it's just going to be a means of facilitating people booking at both places, then there is really no revenue, and yet I thought I recognized in the news release that there was going to be some financial gain to the facility.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Yes, it was within the news release, that's correct. I think there will be a benefit to both in that, if people in making their arrangements find that the packages can be put together that are more attractive in terms of making arrangements, those arrangements can be made more easily, clearly I think then we will have a higher level of usage, both of the golf course and the facility, and that clearly is in a business what you want to do is have the maximum use of the facility.

I think through this kind of an arrangement that we can cross-sell in a sense. Those people who are using the golf course, we can make the arrangements for them to use the hotel, if they wish. We can promote the use of the food services that are available at the hotel and true, as well, with those who are at the hotel, we may have the opportunity to promote the use of the golf course, both major attractions for the area, so I think it can be a benefit to both. It can be more convenient for those who are making arrangements, and I am confident that it will increase the level of usage of both facilities and it will enhance the viability of both of them.

MR. E. CONNERY: The Minister will assure us then that, when the booking for the golf course is through the Venture Capital Tours or the resort, they won't be holding back spots for people who they anticipate will be booking at the hotel, that it'll be first-come, first-serve, so that all people have the same, because I can see a real danger that management is going to hold back places for people who would be booking.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Clearly, Mr. Chairman, that's what our intent would be, but I think we would want to point out that, as with other facilities, sometimes, for example, if there is a large group of people coming through and they want to know, can you accommodate whatever number of golfers for those occasions we might want to - in order to have a particular group of tourists come through - say, yes, we will book those times for you in order to get you on the course.

I can think of examples that people have brought to my attention where a group may come in and we say we've got a certain number of people and we want to have a shotgun start so that means, in order to get all of those people on, you may in fact then have to restrict the usage for a particular day at a particular period in time. So for those special circumstances, I think it is a good approach to take in order to accommodate a particular group to put some conditions on. But generally speaking, no, that would not be the case.

MR. E. CONNERY: The Member for Charleswood has just reminded me that it's illegal to fire a shotgun in a provincial park.

Does the department and the Minister have a long-range plan for Hecla? I've read somewhere - and it's probably in that news release - that it was going to be on a break-even or make money at some point. Could you show us a plan of how this is going to take place?

We look at the usage of Hecla Park, and we're looking at 30 percent usage or cost recovery, I should say. When we look at the amount of money going into Hecla

Park, we're seeing 30 percent recovery. We see the amounts going up year by year to where - I don't know, what is the figure for this year? I don't see it in the Estimates. Do you have the figure for Hecla this year of capital input into the park, and do you have a game plan? Can you just enlighten us as to how we believe that in four or five years it's going to be a paying venture?

HON. L. HARPIAK: Again, Mr. Chairman, what I would ask the Member for Portage to do is to - I think what he is really referring to is the Gull Harbour Resort rather than the game plan for Hecla.- (Interjection)- Okay, so that when we were talking about it being a break-even operation, I made that statement with respect to Gull Harbour, and I would be quite prepared to discuss the recovery plan, which I have a great deal of confidence in, when we come to that final line in my departmental Estimates. That may be where it is most appropriate to deal with it. We should point out, as I had present with me today making my press statement, the chairman of the board for the Venture Manitoba Tours, Mickey Levine. Mickey Levine, I think, is well known throughout the City of Winnipeg, been very successful in the hospitality industry, and he has been part of that board for a short while and he, along with others, are making a very, very solid contribution to it.

I should point out that the year for which I've reported today is that period in time covered by - we had a management contract. The Gull Harbour Resort was under a management contract with a private-sector firm. That was not working out well, and we had to terminate that particular agreement. So the period of time covers this report, and it flows partway into the next reporting period. But even on the basis of the new arrangement, where it's under the direction of the board as I indicated in my press statement, we have seen that start to come around. We've got a significant challenge ahead of us but I'm confident, with the experience that we have in the person of Mr. Levine and other board members, that we can in fact reach that goal in three to five years.

Going specifically to the question that was raised on Hecla, on page 37, there is an indication of the level of capital expenditures for Parks. Later, I would suggest when we're dealing with capital projects for the department, that we will then deal with the figures for 1986-87.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Charleswood.

MR. J. ERNST: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First I'd like to say that last year, if we could switch the focus for a minute from Hecla Island to the Whiteshell Provincial Park, last year there was a long, detailed, involved and, by and large, successful negotiation over changes in park operations and particularly as they relate to development of leased cottage lots.

I wish to compliment the Minister and his staff for that negotiation and for the success that it had. However, there was one kind of cloud overtop of that whole negotiating process and it has caused a great deal of concern as far as Whiteshell cottagers are concerned. The Minister received some of that at the

meeting he attended, the Annual Meeting of the Whiteshell District Association last March, and that concern actually has grown, if anything else, rather than lessened.

That deals, Mr. Chairman, over the question of sewage treatment, on-lot sewage treatment or on-lot sewage containment, if you will. The concern is, by and large, from the cottagers who I've come in contact with and from the Whiteshell Association that I have contact with, that their concern is that the proposed method of handling on-site sewage by the department is going to cause more problems than it's going to solve. They have a very great concern that, because of the necessity for holding tanks and the inherent costs associated with pumping out those holding tanks, there will be abuses of that, resulting in more pollution perhaps than presently exists.

Mr. Chairman, this book is called "Cottage Country." It's "An Environmental Manual for the Cottager, produced by the Ministry of the Environment in the Province of Ontario." It is a rather detailed 52-page booklet dealing with all sorts of problems as they relate to environmental concerns respecting cottagers. They summarize, Mr. Chairman, the systems for treating on-site treatment of sewage in six categories, listing them one to six. No. 5, the second-last category, is called a holding tank. If I may, Mr. Chairman, read from this booklet produced by the Ministry of the Environment in Ontario, it says, "Class 5 System, a holding tank - only used where other disposal solutions are impractical or in temporary situations. It is rarely approved with new construction."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I'd be prepared to provide a copy of this booklet to the Minister if he wishes. "By and large, the use of the holding tank is in instances where, because of inadequate soil in the lot or limited size, a satisfactory subsurface sewage disposal system is not possible." Mr. Chairman, I have to ask the Minister why the Province of Ontario would classify their system for holding tanks as a No. 5 system, and I quote from their book again, "rarely approved with new construction," why his department now professes that this is the answer to all of their problems.

Ontario, as a matter of fact, went out of holding tank systems several years ago because of the problems inherent in them and because of the kind of pollution that resulted from having those kinds of systems. Does the Minister's department have some new answer now, that they know more than the Ministry of the Environment in Ontario who have had experience with this kind of system already and who now have said in this booklet produced for all cottagers in the Province of Ontario that this system is used only where other disposal solutions are impractical? Perhaps, the Minister could comment on that.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: I must say at the outset that I enjoyed immensely the opportunity to discuss this issue directly with the cottagers at their annual meeting. The Member for Charleswood was present, and I think he will recall some of the discussions that took place. I would want to read into the record that I have a great deal of respect for the cottagers of the area and their concern for the environment. They said clearly that they wanted the quality of the parks experience there

to be protected. They did not dispute, they did not argue with the figures that were available in terms of the deterioration of water quality from the disposition of sewage and sillage. They said, we want to ensure that this is an area that we can enjoy and our children can enjoy.

There is a very significant pressure on the area. That is one of the most heavily utilized areas in terms of cottaging in the Province of Manitoba. So there are very significant pressures and we know that, where people utilize an area, there has to be some means of disposing of the waste from those who will be in the area. The use of the area, as it had been, - there were clear indications that the level of water quality was deteriorating, clearly an indication on the part of the users that we had to protect that water quality. The decision was made to convert, in an orderly manner, to the use of holding tanks.

Now from my recollections of the meeting that took place, there were some who had the very concern that the Member for Charleswood raises, but some who suggested that in fact what will happen is that cottagers will take and puncture the holding tanks. Let me say that I disagree with the notion that cottagers would have so little respect for the area that they want to enjoy that they would fracture the holding tanks in some way to dispose of the sewage through the fracture and contaminate the area. I don't see cottagers as being people of that sort. I see them as being very responsible people who genuinely want to retain the quality of the area.

I recall more the concern being that there would be an orderly transition and the matter of having an approved system and, if in fact that was an approved system, if the cottage changed hands that, rather than the holding tank being required at that point, perhaps there could be a review to see if in fact it was still an approved system. We agreed that was something that had to be worked out and could be worked out, and that is in the process of being addressed. But I do not recall that people were saying that there should not be some orderly method of disposing of the sewage and sillage.

It's interesting to hear that though the Member for Charleswood says that the sewage, the holding tanks are not acceptable. There is reference to that in that document from which he quotes, to some suitable means of disposing of the sewage and sillage.

I'm not sure of what he has, but clearly the regulations at this point provide for some acceptable alternative, where somebody can come to us and say, this is an acceptable alternative to the disposition of it, there's provision for that. But let me go further, to point out that at this very point in time we are involved in discussion in another part of the province, at Clearwater Lake, where again, at Clearwater Lake near The Pas, there was not sufficient capacity in the lagoon to deal with the effluent from the users of the area.

We were in the process of constructing a lagoon, and we had designed a discharge into a marsh area, which would have eventually drained into Clearwater Lake. There was an outcry from the people of the area in that they felt that this would have a negative effect on the lake. But we said, what our problem was that there was seepage from the existing lagoon at what is known as Pioneer Bay into Clearwater Lake already, so

that very facility that was in existence did not have sufficient capacity, so water's effluent was seeping into the lake and having a negative effect on the lake.

There was a hearing of the Clean Environment Commission, and the Clean Environment Commission ruled that the design of the system that we had could not allow for the discharge from the lagoon. On two occasions during the year, it could not allow for that discharge into the watershed of the Clearwater Lake, not into discharge into the lake directly but into the watershed of the lake.

So here we have the people in The Pas telling us, and very seriously concerned on their part, which I respect. They want to protect the area; they want to have it available for future generations. The Clean Environment Commission ruled - and we will respect that ruling - that there will be no direct discharge into the watershed of the lake. And I hear the Member for Charleswood, I think, suggesting that, in the Whiteshell where we have more intensive use, we should not be looking to design systems wherein we would remove the effluent from the area so that it did not seep into the lakes which the people are enjoying. So I'm having some difficulty with that, and perhaps he could clarify it.

Clearly, what we want and they want - and I think, with the cottagers, we are simply trying to provide that which the cottagers want - is to ensure the quality of the parks experience in the years ahead.

MR. J. ERNST: Well, Mr. Chairman, that was a very interesting story and I thank the Minister for that, but he really didn't answer the question.

The question was: What does his department know? Have they found a new idea, as opposed to the department in Ontario that says it doesn't work? Answer the question, please. What do you know that's different?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to suggest that what Ontario has decided for Ontario is wrong. Members opposite have often said to us, when we've made reference to what happens in other provinces, you're not in Ontario, you're not in Saskatchewan, you're in Manitoba. So I would say to the Member for Charleswood, we are in Manitoba, and we've made a decision on the basis of what we think is right for Manitoba. If the government in Ontario and the cottagers from Ontario feel, in their circumstances, that is the appropriate measure to take, I am not going to say that they are wrong. I can only proceed on the basis of what we think is right in Manitoba.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, for the record and for all to hear, if in matters of this sort I were to be criticized, I would rather be criticized for being cautious and careful rather than taking an approach wherein we would jeopardize the resource and perhaps, in some instances, have it lost forever. I would rather be criticized and, as I pointed out, I understand clearly that I will be criticized by some.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, it was only this past week that I saw a copy of the Dauphin Herald, and there was a picture of an elderly man and there was a very appropriate quotation. The quotation said, "I cannot give you the guaranteed formula for success, but I can tell you that the guarantee for failure is to try to please

everyone." And I will not try to please everyone, Mr. Chairman.

MR. J. ERNST: Let the record first of all show, Mr. Chairman, that I don't think any cottager is interested in having his lake polluted. I don't think there's any cottager that isn't interested in preserving the integrity of those lakes and their experience throughout the province but, in the situation of the Whiteshell, the terrain, the Precambrian Shield is different than most other areas in the province, and that is identical to what the experience is on the other side of the Ontario border. It's the same type of terrain. The situations there are unique and different.

Here we have a situation where, in Ontario, the Ontario Government has tried the system that you're proposing and it failed. Mr. Chairman, it failed, for whatever reason. The fact of the matter is the people aren't any different. In fact, most of the people are Manitobans on the other side of the border in those cottage situations in the Clearwater Bay area and the other lakes in Northwestern Ontario in that particular situation.

So, Mr. Chairman, here we have a system proposed now by the department which has failed in another jurisdiction in identical circumstances. Now, Mr. Chairman, I can't understand why the government - unless there has been new technology, unless there has been some better way; otherwise I think the Minister should get his head out of the holding tank and understand that . . .

A MEMBER: That's a low blow, James.

MR. J. ERNST: I appreciate it's a sensitive area, but the fact of the matter is, unless there is some kind of new technology or new way or something that would mitigate the Ontario experience, why in heaven's name would you want to now go with a system that has in fact elsewhere under identical circumstances failed?

It's not the question of not wanting any system. The question is: Is this system the correct system? I think that's the major concern and, given that it's failed in another jurisdiction, perhaps it isn't and perhaps another way of dealing with this matter that would be more ecologically sound would be the best way of dealing with it.

I would hope the Minister can respond to that.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I guess what I want to point out to the member opposite, if what he is suggesting is that this is the only approach that can be taken, we've never said that. We said, of what we have available to us in terms of the current technology, this is the approach that we are taking, this is what we are suggesting.

But we've said clearly on many occasions and I will say here that, if somebody has another solution, come forward with it. I would suggest to the Member for Charleswood, if he has an alternative to this, let him put it on the record. We are not opposed to new ideas; we would encourage new ideas. Clearly, when some new approach is developed to deal with this issue, we would be prepared to deal with it. So we're not closed; we're not locked in forever and ever to the system. It's the best that we've got now.

I guess in terms of the experience from Ontario, the Member for Charleswood has not really indicated in any detail why did that fail in Ontario? Did it fail, as some would suggest, because though the holding tanks were there in fact some people fractured the holding tanks, or that there was not sufficient monitoring to see that people were complying with the proper operation of these, to see in fact that people were not simply using the holding tanks for collection purposes and then pumping it out onto the landscape?

Clearly, if that is what is going to happen, that is not a fault of the system; it is not a fault of that particular approach of utilizing holding tanks. There is a problem then with those who would abuse the system and that, for the most part, has to be in remote cottaging experiences in particular and, in fact, elsewhere a matter of self-discipline.

Surely people should not say that we will put in the holding tanks but we're not going to comply with it. We're going to wait for the Department of Natural Resources, through the Parks Branch or the Environment people to come out and say we are not complying. It's their area. Why would they not want to comply? Who are they hurting if they don't comply?

I would challenge the Member for Charleswood. In terms of the system, the alternatives it would suggest is a holding tank for the sillage or the white water. I don't hear anybody saying from that area that what we should be doing is having the sewage go into the privies. They don't want that. So I think clearly the system will work but, if there are new ideas that can be brought forward, we are quite prepared to take those new ideas and we will approve new ideas. If they bring them forward, if they say this system will work, we are prepared to approve them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour is now 5:00 p.m. I am interrupting the proceedings of the Committee of Supply for Private Members' Hour. The committee will return at 8:00 p.m.

Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

The Committee of Supply adopted certain resolutions, reported same and asked leave to sit again.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for . . . , that the Report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

NO. 11 - EMIGRATION OF SOVIET JEWS

MADAM SPEAKER: Private Members' Business. On the proposed Resolution No. 11, the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: I move, seconded by the Member for Niakwa, that

WHEREAS hundreds of thousands of Soviet Jews and other Soviet citizens have applied and been refused exit visas; and

WHEREAS the Soviet Union has publicly announced its support for human rights; and

WHEREAS Soviet Jews should be allowed their basic human rights to be Jews and to emigrate from the Soviet Union if they so desire.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Assembly wishes it recorded and made public that it supports the basic right of Soviet Jewry and other Soviet citizens to be allowed to emigrate; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Assembly urge the Government of the Soviet Union to continue its human rights efforts and give evidence of its sincerity by allowing fair and early consideration of emigration applications of Soviet Jews and other citizens of the Soviet Union; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Clerk of this Assembly be directed to forward a copy of this Resolution to the Soviet Ambassador to Canada and to the Federal Secretary of State for External Affairs.

MOTION presented.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I think it is somewhat serendipitous, fortuitous and perhaps an omen of some kind that today happens to be the 39th anniversary of the founding of the modern State of Israel. When this resolution comes forward, I think it is an appropriate time for it to come forward. Whether it was just luck or whether there is somehow some kind of indication that there will be some successes in this area, Madam Speaker, I don't know.

I would like to express my appreciation to the honourable members opposite for their desire to support the speaker on this motion. I would also like to express my appreciation, particularly to the Winnipeg Jewish Students Network, who provided a great deal of information and who with Jewish students around the world have provided a major thrust in providing the leadership to keep the plight of Soviet Jews before the international public, Madam Speaker.

I would like to point out some of the situation that Soviet Jews presently face. I will not go into a detailed history because time prohibits about the history of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union programs, discrimination in the Pale, etc., Madam Speaker. But I will point out some of the difficulties faced by Jews at present.

At the age of 16, each Soviet citizen is issued an internal passport. The passport issued to Jews bears the stamp "Yivrei," meaning Jew, all across in big red letters. No other minority in the Soviet Union has a similar sort of identification. This results in an open and an official discrimination and constant harassment. The admission to universities is restricted; jobs are limited; housing is hard to obtain. It is evident that, in spite of official claims that anti-Semitism is against the law in the Soviet Union, it tragically appears to be a law honoured in the breach.

The other problem is, those who wish to live openly as Jews as opposed to those who give up their Judaism to integrate into Soviet society because of the pressures they face, those people have no official education, no synagogues, no legalized Jewish activism and, because anti-Semitism is linked with anti-Zionism, they are subjected to political and cultural scrutiny and harassment. Those Jews who wish to assimilate face these very same hardships, since their passports identify them as Jews.

Statistics, I understand, are somewhat variant, but at some times they were estimated to be approximately - in 1959, the Soviet census, I believe, said there were about 2.3 million Jews in the Soviet Union. That figure in 1980 had dropped to 1.8 million. This was certainly, as the resolution makes very clear, not because of emigration; it was because of integration and many people being forced, in one manner or another, to either give up their faith, their culture, or to go underground, and therefore no longer be recorded as Jews.

It seems obvious to anyone who would look at this situation - and this is not a situation particularly one of the left or the right. It is a situation faced by a minority group in an oligarchical society, Madam Speaker. This is a basic truth of any kind of anti-democratic society and anti-democratic rulership that wishes to control minority groups within its society. It's interesting in history, hundreds of years ago, when the pogroms took place against the Jews, at that time the essence and focus of the pogroms was to kill a third, convert a third and drive a third out of what was then Russia.

Madam Speaker, what is interesting now is they're no longer killing a third. They are certainly trying to convert more than a third to their anti-Jewish non-sectarian system and take away the culture and the religion of the people in that cultural minority in that country, but also they are refusing the right to emigrate, which strikes me as being somewhat interesting and somewhat ironic. When you don't want a group in your society and you want to eradicate them from your society, one would think you would allow them to leave. That is not the case.

The Jews would want to leave the Soviet Union for a number of reasons. They believe their spiritual and historic homeland is in Israel, whose 39th anniversary is today I mention, Madam Speaker, of the modern Israel. The fact is, as I have pointed out, Madam Speaker, they had been denied equal rights guaranteed to other nationalities by Soviet law. Their centres of cultural have been closed; their publishing houses and printing presses have been closed. Both their languages, Hebrew and Yiddish, have been suppressed; the teaching of these languages is suppressed. It is impossible to get books on Jewish history, Jewish prayer books. There are only three, I understand, functioning rabbis in the country the last time I heard and according to this. And also they have been either integrated or oppressed in Soviet society.

There are, if we go by the figures, Madam Speaker, that now exist, 1.8 million Jews in the Soviet Union who are identified as Jews. Of these, it is my understanding that 390,000 have applied for exit visas from the Soviet Union. To give you some figures, last year, there were 914 exit visas approved - 914 out of 390,000.

Let me explain, Madam Speaker, my understanding of what a visa application requires in the Soviet Union.

Jews who openly declare their desire to leave the Soviet Union must apply to the Ovir, the Visa Office, for an exit visa, and once refused they become what is called refuseniks. This creates a very special status. They usually lose their jobs; their children are expelled from schools; they may lose their housing, and generally face continuing harassment by the KGB.

Once a job is lost, a person is a "parasite of the state" and if a new job is not found within three weeks, he may be arrested for "parasitism," Madam Speaker. Once a person applies for an exit visa, he is no longer welcome in any state job and so this very well engineered vicious circle forces many professionals to become street sweepers and night watchmen.

Many organizations have fought for the right of Soviet Jews. The Soviet Government, by the way, as is Canada, is a signatory to the Helsinki Accords which allows, Madam Speaker, for family reunification. Out of these 390,000 applications, Madam Speaker, it is my understanding approximately 11,000 of these people have relatives abroad and are not being allowed to exit from the Soviet Union in spite of the Soviet signing and protestations on human rights that they believe in family reunification of Jews and in all societies where family members - and I think the problem here is a definition of who is a family member abroad.

What has happened recently, Madam Speaker, which I think should be reported and should be stated, is there is a term called *glasnost*, which means openness, which is being tossed around in the Soviet Union basically since the Gorbachev era, which means that the Soviet Government, under the statements of party secretary Gorbachev, is developing a new policy of openness. There are some people who believe this and some people who do not believe this.

One of those who does seem to believe it, and there are two interesting and highly publicized individuals - one is a dissident - a dissident being a Soviet patriot who wants to democratize the Soviet Union, not necessarily a Jew but a person who wants to stay in the Soviet Union and make it a more democratic country - is Andrei Sakharov who does believe there is some motion, and believes that we in the Western World and dissidents within the Soviet Union should be pressing and supporting Gorbachev in that *glasnost* policy he believes in.

Another one is an interesting person, Josef Begun. Josef Begun was a 54-year old mathematician who emerged after serving three-and-a-half years of a 12-year sentence, his alleged crime being to distribute anti-Soviet literature. He has since been allowed to emigrate from the Soviet Union. He was interviewed recently by Maclean's Magazine, Madam Speaker, and asked about *glasnost*. He said: "We did not know how it would touch our lives." Maclean's asked: "Do you believe Gorbachev is sincere when he says he wants a more open society?" Begun replied, "Yes. It is a great event in the history of this country and maybe also in the world. Wherever you have a closed society and oppression in one country, it generates hostility and tension from other countries."

So when a country like the U.S. becomes more open, more free, it creates more trust in the world, and basically what he says is that this will happen in the Soviet Union if that kind of activity is encouraged. However, in the Winnipeg Free Press, there was an

article entitled, "Exit rules for Jews to ease." It says: "Soviet officials have promised that 11,000 Jews and their families will be allowed to emigrate to Israel within the year, Jewish leaders said yesterday."

According to the Jewish Post, however, "According to reports from Moscow, April 2, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman, Gennadi Gerasimov said, 'We cannot guarantee an exact number of applications that can be presented and receive favorable outcomes.'"

Madam Speaker, we as signatories of the Canadian Government, and we as parliamentarians in the Manitoba Legislature, have a responsibility to pressure the Soviet Government to make true its statements of openness in its society.

One of the difficulties that we have - and there is a quote Stephen Granovsky uses in the Jewish Post - and Stephen Granovsky is a person who I am very thankful for providing information to me and one of the young people who has continued this battle to free the Soviet Jews and to allow them to emigrate to their homeland. The quote he uses which I think is worthwhile considering here for all members is: "There may be times when we are powerless to prevent injustice, but there must never be a time when we fail to protest." This is a quote from the Elie Wiesel, and I think this is absolutely true, Madam Speaker.

We are but a small voice in this Legislature. Individuals in this society, the students, the Jews, the non-Jews, are all small voices pleading for fairness, for democracy, for individual rights within what has been a closed society. We are also supporting any movement on the part of that society to open itself to democratization, to internationalism, to allowing people to be free.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased that this resolution has come forward. I am pleased that members of this House will be considering this resolution. I would like to close with a hope from one woman named Tanya Lebedeva, a demonstrator who has been trying for seven-and-a-half years to get permission to go to Israel.

She states: "We are a lot of people who are in a desperate state. We need support, moral support, any kind of support." Tanya Lebedeva and the 11,000 Jews who have relatives abroad and who can come under the Helsinki Agreement, and the 380,000 who do not but should be accorded the same rights, Madam Speaker, I urge this House to go on record in supporting Tanya and those 11,000 and the other 380,000.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution proposed by the Member for Kildonan on the emigration of Soviet Jews. I have the complete support of all members on this side of the House.

Madam Speaker, I am not only going to be speaking in support of the resolution for Soviet Jews, but I wish to speak in support of the freedom of human rights for all peoples in the world who are oppressed.

Madam Speaker, if the rules and regulations that go on in the Soviet Union today were in place in 1906, I would not be standing in front of this Assembly and speaking today. My mother, my father, both emigrated

from Russia, and I had the good fortune of them emigrating to Canada. They met when they were here in Canada, not when they were in Russia, although they came from an area in the Crimea that they were both from approximately the same area. There were many people there of Russian and Ukrainian background in the Crimea. I guess that's the influence of my enjoying the Ukrainian foods. The holopchis and the perogies comes from that time that my mother and father had emigrated here, and that was the food that I was most aware of at that time.

Madam Speaker, I am proud of my background. I am a Canadian citizen and I really don't have any close association or relationships with people in Russia today, but my heart goes out to them. The Jewish people who are trying to emigrate from Russia, my heart goes out to them, Madam Speaker, inasmuch as I look at Moses and he says, "Let my people go." I don't want to get too sentimental about it. It breaks down to what is fair.

I hear all members of the House saying, you know, if it's fair, let's do it. If we can encourage the people who control the Soviet Union to allow these people to emigrate not just to Canada - it's not to bring them just to Canada - but the people of Israel are begging and have asked that they be allowed to emigrate to Israel.

The Member for Kildonan mentioned that it was the 39th anniversary of the founding of the State of Israel. What a wonderful day to be speaking on this resolution.

We are going to be making remarks, and I know the remarks are going to come from the heart, but the resolution was well worded and I must compliment the Member for Kildonan. It's one of the first times that we've had so much in common. It's not a political situation at this point, Madam Speaker. Politics don't come into it. What comes into it is the good of the people of the world who are suffering under human rights. I've been through it before, and again I'm not going to cry of the discrimination that I've gone through. I've lived through it and I guess it's made me into a better person. I will not condone discrimination. I will not be associated with discrimination and I will not be accused of discrimination, Madam Speaker, but that's another story. I will get back to that at another time.

Madam Speaker, we've got a group of people who are trying to emigrate from Russia, mostly to the State of Israel, and I can't understand for the life of me why they aren't allowed to emigrate. The Russians don't want them, Israel wants them, but maybe there are some future hockey stars there that the Russians don't want to leave. I just can't understand it. You don't want something, let them go. But under the guise of whatever reason, they just don't let them emigrate.

In order to emigrate from Russia, Madam Speaker, a Jew has to present an invitation from a family member in Israel in order to qualify under the guise of family reunification. You've got to go through all kinds of subterfuge just to be able to leave for the State of Israel. The Canadian Jewish Congress estimates that 30,000 to 40,000 have been officially refused to leave the Soviet Union. Why? Are all these 30,000 or 40,000 spies? Is this what the Soviet Union is afraid of? I just can't believe it.

The reasons that they give that they can't emigrate: having access to state security; having a connection with the military; having a relative who has access to

sensitive material. It's not in the best interest of the state for family reasons; for instance, lack of permission by former spouses or employer, all what might consider to be legitimate reasons, but I just don't believe it.

Madam Speaker, Russia makes it almost impossible to leave. I guess we take a guess at the amount of Jews in Russia, 2.5 million to 3 million Jews that are now living in Russia. I'm not saying that all of them would want to leave. I guess there's got to be some people who accept their lot there in Russia. I asked my mother and father why they left Russia. They were looking for religious freedom; they were looking for freedom not to be in the military; they were looking for the freedom to speak their own language freely.

There were many things about Russia that they did like - the orchards, the temperature, things of that nature, Madam Speaker, but they made up their mind to leave, and they left.

What happens when you apply for an exit permit today? First of all, you lose your job. Secondly, if you're not working, you're sent to jail and you're charged with parasitism. You're constantly harassed and searched and bothered by the KGB. I just can't understand it and believe it, why?

I think the USSR has to show some sincerity. They react to pressure, Madam Speaker, they do react to pressure and we have to put that pressure on, as non-involved people, like people who represent the people of the Province of Manitoba, to speak out, to allow Soviet Jews to emigrate. There is no doubt that the Soviet Union is sensitive to pressure.

I'm not about to threaten them about not having relations with them concerning the selling of Canadian wheat, things of that nature, Madam Speaker, because we do all have to live together. But I think that Mr. Gorbachev better be aware that we're not going to stand by and sit by idly and allow any group of people to be harassed, oppressed and discriminated against.

Madam Speaker, I can only conclude - and my words will not be included in the resolution, the resolution was well-thought-out and well-prepared. But my resolution - or for the members of this Legislature and whoever might want to read it in Hansard in years to come - of my special feelings, not just as I say, for Soviet Jews, but for all oppressed people throughout the world.

But thank God for a place like Canada, where I can stand up here in the Legislature, duly elected by the people who I represent, and say this is right and this is not right. I represent people who understand my background, who accept me for my background, but also accept me for my 60 years of being a Canadian citizen, almost 60 years, Madam Speaker, and my father and my mother choosing to become Canadian citizens. I would like that opportunity for everyone in the world who wishes to come to Canada or the State of Israel, as this particular instance, to be allowed to do so.

Let's send a message to Russia to let them know that we're not going to stand by and let them oppress people. We want Russia to let these people go. Let them go to the land of their choice; let them go to a country that will accept them with open arms, where they can be productive and contribute to the society in which we live.

Madam Speaker, I see my light is flashing and I do want this resolution to get to the Russian Ambassador

here in Canada. I would like this resolution to be told to the Ambassador from Israel who happens to be in Winnipeg today, and I think the Honourable Member for Kildonan will pass it on. I know there will be another member of my side speaking in favour of the resolution, and I want to thank all the members for being considerate to me, not only for my background, but for my feeling towards oppressed people of this world.

I thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I would like, in speaking on this resolution, to indicate my strong support to the sentiments that were expressed by both the previous speaker and the mover of the resolution. I think what we're dealing with is the broad question of human rights, the human rights I think of all of us, in particular the plight of a people; the people who have been much persecuted throughout history, Madam Speaker, and who today are seeking to obtain what is probably the most basic of human rights, the right to practise their religion freely and also the right that many of them have chosen, to emigrate to the land of their choice.

I want to indicate that I was personally privileged to be able to attend the caravan rally that was held on the steps of the Legislature last year, along with the Member for Kildonan who introduced this resolution and a number of members of the Legislature, including the Member for Niakawa. And I was quite impressed by the activity that the Jewish community of Winnipeg had put on to mark the caravan and, more importantly, mark the serious questions that we have to deal with in terms of the terrible human rights abuses that we're seeing in the Soviet Union, the terrible human rights abuses that Soviet Jews have faced, not just historically, Madam Speaker, but in recent years as well. But I think one must include the historical perspective, as did the Member for Kildonan, to give true light on the situation.

Madam Speaker, Jews in the Soviet Union have been subject to terrible abuses, terrible persecution over the years. For many years there were, as the Member for Kildonan pointed out, officially approved pogroms. In fact there were 224 against Jews in the reign of one czar, Czar Alexander III, during which many Jewish people in Russia were either persecuted or murdered, Madam Speaker.

This has continued into modern-day history, despite a period of a number of decades after 1917, when there was a relaxation of some of the persecution that had taken place against Jews in the Soviet Union. Under Stalin, there were once again many terrible human rights abuses. Of course, Jews suffered during the Second World War as did many others in the Soviet Union, but they suffered in particular, Madam Speaker. In fact, more than two million Jews in the Soviet Union perished during that period.

After the Second World War, what I think was particularly ironic was the fact that, despite the strong effort the Jews in the Soviet Union had put into fighting the Hitler invasion, they were once again persecuted. In fact, they found themselves subject to increased persecution, a new reign of terror.

Some of the figures on synagogues probably tell the whole story, Madam Speaker. For example, the number of synagogues dwindled from 450 to 60. As the Member for Kildonan pointed out, one finds in the Soviet Union today only three practising rabbis. That was a result of direct persecution against the Jewish religion in the Soviet Union. There was also persecution against individual Jewish activists, including a number of trials in the early 1950's, when a number of Jews were, I feel, unjustly convicted of crimes against the state in the Soviet Union and were executed.

Of course, in recent years, there's been something of a reawakening in the Soviet Union amongst Jewish people. In fact, since 1967 there has been, in particular, the call for an opening of emigration so that those who choose may have the right to emigrate from the Soviet Union to a land where they can practise their religion, practise their way of life, achieve their true freedom as individuals.

For a period, there was some progress, Madam Speaker. In fact, since 1970, 250,000 Jews were able to leave the Soviet Union. However, in recent years that number has dwindled substantially. In fact, in 1986, only 914 Jews were able to emigrate from the Soviet Union.

To put that in perspective, there were an estimated 50,000 so-called refuseniks, 50,000 people with relatives outside of the country who, according to the Helsinki Accord, should be accorded the right to emigrate, who have not been able to do so. As the Member for Kildonan pointed out, an estimated 380,000 have taken at least the first step in applying for the right to emigrate from the Soviet Union.

Madam Speaker, let there be no doubt about the human rights implications of what we're talking about. I mentioned the Helsinki Accord, and that is particularly relevant, I think, to the situation in the Soviet Union at the present time. I'd also like to refer to the universal Bill of Human Rights, which was adopted by the United Nations in 1948, which clearly indicated that everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this declaration without distinction of any kind, such as language, religion, political or other opinion and national origin.

Madam Speaker, those rights include Article 12, that no one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence; Article 13, that everyone has the right to leave any country including his own and to return to his country; and Article 18, which states that everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion, and that this right includes freedom to change his religion and belief and freedom, either alone or in community with others, and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance; and Article 27, which states that everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts, and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits.

I cite those particular articles, because I think it's clear in the case of the Soviet Union that those have been violated, not just in terms of the Jewish people, Madam Speaker, but in terms of many people in the Soviet Union, but it has particularly been the case in terms of Soviet Jews and particularly in the case of the practice of their religion and the right to emigrate.

And as I stated as well, Madam Speaker, those rights were clearly stated again in the Helsinki Agreement which was agreed to by the Soviet Union, and I quote: "That participating states will respect human rights and fundamental freedoms including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

It also included, Madam Speaker, a clear statement that the States would deal, and I quote: "In a positive and humanitarian spirit with the applications of persons who wish to be reunited with members of their family, with special attention being given to request of an urgent character, such as requests submitted by persons who are ill or old."

So, Madam Speaker, the universal Bill of Human Rights and the Helsinki Accord clearly state the right of individuals to the most basic of human rights and clearly state the right of emigration.

What has been happening in the Soviet Union clearly contravenes that. There should be no doubt about that, Madam Speaker. It's been clearly documented by such organizations as Amnesty International, in terms of some of the treatment that those who have been described as refuseniks, as dissidents, have received, some of the arbitrary imprisonments they've received, some of the treatment they've received in detention camps, that has been clear. So too is the fact, as I mentioned earlier, that despite the fact that 50,000 Soviet Jews have a clear claim to the right to emigration under the Helsinki Accord, that has not been observed. And despite close to 380,000 Soviet Jews have the right to emigration as outlined in the universal Bill of Human Rights, that has clearly been abrogated.

In that context, Madam Speaker, I think one has to look at the recent developments in the Soviet Union with fulsome optimism but also some caution as well. Those developments I'm referring to are the declared policies of democratization and glasnost. I say that they are a cause for optimism in some sense, Madam Speaker, because I feel that any move towards democratization and the recognitions of human rights in the Soviet Union is something that we should all welcome.

But I state that it should be taken with caution because of the fact that there have been some very mixed signals arising out of the policy of glasnost while, for example, some dissidents including many Jewish dissidents have been released from detention camps in the Soviet Union, in fact, approximately 140, I believe. There have been mixed signals on the emigration question. For example, on Tuesday, March the 31, Soviet officials - of this year, pardon me, Madam Speaker - were reported to have promised that 11,000 Jews and their families would be allowed to emigrate this year; 11,000 to emigrate, Madam Speaker.

Then in a report from the Jewish Post on April 15, 1987, only two weeks later, and I quote, Madam Speaker: "There were reports from Moscow that dampen the optimism which arose here early in the week that large numbers of Soviet Jews would soon be allowed to leave for Israel, and that the Soviet Union is moving towards a thaw in its relations with the Jewish state. In fact, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman was quoted as saying that there were no arrangements for larger numbers of exit permits to be granted."

Recall, Madam Speaker, I think at this time that I mentioned before that only 914 Soviet Jews were

allowed to emigrate last year, only 914. So, as I said, despite some of the positive developments with glasnost, I think there were serious concerns that I think that we all have to have as to the extent to which that declared policy of openness and respect for human rights will be observed and particularly in the case of Soviet Jews.

I think that is why it's absolutely imperative that we discuss this whole question through such vehicles as this resolution, and I think that's where we should start, by passing this resolution. But I think that we should go further, Madam Speaker, as have the Jewish Students' Association, and they were very involved, I should add, in organizing the caravan last year and the vigil for Soviet Jews this year. I think we have to go further and support them in their efforts, support such organizations as Amnesty International. Through such mechanisms, Madam Speaker, yes, of writing on individual claimants, participating in vigils or rallies to deal with the overall question of human rights and the rights, in particular of Soviet Jews, but I think, we have to, in doing so, recognize how important that is. I think we have to recognize clear progress has been made in recent years in terms of the respect for human rights and the release of dissidents in the Soviet Union by direct pressure from western countries. I don't feel that a number of the dissidents who have been released in recent years would have been released if it wasn't for that continued pressure.

The Member for Kildonan, for example, referred to Joseph Begun and his release, which I think was clearly the result of that pressure, and other dissidents, of Andrei Sakharov of particular note, who have been released in recent years. I think that's something that we have to do outside of the formality of this resolution. I think we all have to take some stand on this particular question, do what we can and encourage our constituents and people in Manitoba generally.

I think we have to do it in recognition of the clear fact that what we're talking about is the particular plight of a people, of Jewish people in the Soviet Union. It's a plight that is shared by others in that country because certainly in terms of human rights, abuses in that country, no one can restrict its application. Many others of different political, national or religious beliefs have also been persecuted. But let there be no doubt that Jews in the Soviet Union have been subject to particular persecution. In fact, as the Member for Kildonan pointed out, they're subject to particular problems related to identity documents which only they have faced. As I have indicated, historically, Madam Speaker, they have been subject to persecution for many years.

So let us deal with the particular concern here, the particular plight, and see what we can do, but do it in a spirit that, as the resolution points out, respects the human rights of all, both in the Soviet Union and, as the Member for Niakwa pointed out, in other countries throughout the world.

I think that we in Canada, where we do have a great respect for human rights, I think we have an obligation, not just to work to maintain that in our own country, but to work for its respect as has been outlined in so many international documents and as is outlined, I think, in just the most basic of human views and courtesy, Madam Speaker, that we make sure that we work for its application in every country throughout the world.

So in that spirit, Madam Speaker, I want to indicate my full support for this resolution, and my hope that all members of this Legislature will support it.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I'm privileged to take part in the debate on this resolution and to indicate my support for the resolution.

Madam Speaker, I say privileged because, as in the case of my colleague, the Member for Niakwa, I am a first-generation Canadian. My people came from the Crimea, much the same area that the Member for Niakwa referred to. They came regrettably under somewhat different circumstances, illegally, and in stealth and by bribery as did so many of those people who sought to leave the USSR after the revolution of 1917.

Madam Speaker, in speaking to this resolution and indicating my support for it, I speak with a certain amount of sadness that this kind of resolution should be necessary in 1987.

And, Madam Speaker, I say with even greater sadness, because I have a great love for what in many respects I still call my mother country, Russia. I sing Russian folk songs, would you believe it, Madam Speaker, actually quite well. I enjoy the history. I hope to travel through Russia as different members of my family have. I have first cousins and two remaining living aunts living in Russia. So I speak with some personal knowledge of the question at hand.

I would have to contradict the last speaker to say that, while this resolution is specifically directed as it quite properly ought to be in terms of the question at hand, that of releasing Soviet Jewry who have indicated their desire to leave, and that all too often the Government of Russia has shown by every measure that they don't particularly want them, as my colleague has already pointed out, but let me assure members of the Chamber that applies to all residents of the Soviet Union of all nationalities and of all religious backgrounds.

There is no other state in the world that employs such a large-standing military police force as the Soviet Union, known as the KGB, to do what? To do what? But to watch its own people.

You see, I'm saddened, Madam Speaker, that we display a level of hypocrisy, a double standard, when it applies to the USSR. We talked about them, and this is the only exception I have in their resolution, when it says that we urge the Government of the Soviet Union to continue its human rights efforts. Madam Speaker, they have never started. They have never started.

Oh, they have done certain things when it was politically expedient for them to do so. There have been waves, there have been moderations, there have been individual releases under pressure and, undoubtedly, we are under one of those circumstances right now. That's why this resolution is particularly timely, because I believe the present administration, the present leader, Mr. Gorbachev, may well be influenced by even small voices, as somebody else said in this Chamber, that emanate from the Manitoba Legislature.

But together, with other small voices, they become a chorus and they become a well of public opinion. Astute political leaders without any regard to human rights, regrettably, will sometimes make a decision that can affect the lives of thousands of people, indeed hopefully, if the purport of this resolution is successful, hundreds of thousands of people, to release them from what, Madam Speaker? Simply to allow what we take so for granted in this great country of ours, the freedom of movement - simply the freedom of movement, Madam Speaker.

Now, Madam Speaker, I take this opportunity not to get into a large ideological battle with my friends opposite, but has it not - and perhaps it has - escaped the attention of the mover of this resolution? He particularly should be aware of it - and as all members should be aware of it - this resolution comes before us at a time when President Ronald Reagan in the United States and his administration is passing emigration laws that will invite, bring in, allow millions - they don't know how many, four or five - of people who came to that country illegally to come out of the closet, not to be taken advantage of anymore, not to be exploited by unfair hirers of people and so forth, to take full advantage of this system of the country and become Americans.

Now, Madam Speaker, I often hear echoes from the other side about the Americans versus the Soviet Union. I just want to take this occasion to point this out. The difference is the Americans are good; the Americans are open; the Americans are free. Well, is somebody laughing? -(Interjection)- Is somebody laughing?

We don't have to pass these kinds of resolutions directing or asking for anybody to leave America. Anybody that wants to leave America can leave America, but we have to pass these kinds of resolutions about the USSR. Is that -(Interjection)- Well, Madam Speaker, somebody asked me about Latin Americans. The Latin Americans come to America. Among those millions are those people who have fled Nicaragua, who have fled dictatorships, military of one kind or another. People from Chile come to the United States first before they come here. Why do they come to America? Madam Speaker, they come there and they are being granted full - even though they got there illegally. We're talking about two things.

Here we are talking about people who are being prosecuted, Soviet Jewry who are losing their jobs if they stand up and be identified as a Jew; people who are losing their jobs if they stand up and express freedom of religion to practise their religion. They are being called refuseniks, which means they are parasites of the state; they are put in jail, persecution follows them. And that, Madam Speaker, I assume is what has moved the mover of this resolution to move this resolution.

So please, Madam Speaker, allow not my few remarks to be interrupted by the kind of insensitive left-wing

mental-loony thinking on this subject matter that does not allow me to make legitimate comparisons.- (Interjection)- Well, now, Madam Speaker, you notice how testy they all of a sudden all become, because I'm simply saying that we don't have to pass this kind of a resolution dealing with American Jewry.

Any American Jew who wants to go to Israel goes. Any Soviet Jew who wants to go to Israel has to have the support of this Legislature and Legislatures around the world, and the people around the world, to release them from bondage. That is the simple point that I am making, and that's what the Member for Thompson ought to understand.

So, Madam Speaker, I want to support this resolution. I want to have the hope, share the belief that measures of this kind will help. I can, and I truly believe that they do help, because the situation in all jurisdictions does change and it is changing in the Soviet Union. I simply say that a great deal has to change in the Soviet Union before we can, for one moment, believe that it is genuine and not being done for what has been done so often, for crass political expediency.

There is - and I could get into a dissertation about that - good reason why the present new leadership of the Soviet Union wants to relax international tensions, wants to spend less money on the arms race, because consumer pressure, public pressure in that country is there as well as in all other countries, and he would like to - it's difficult to call people like that reformers, but he's being referred to it, people like Krushchev. But there are those who say that he tried to bring about an increased higher standard of living to the Soviet Union general population, as I believe Mr. Gorbachev is right now.

For that and many other reasons, he is prepared to talk much more seriously with whom? With a president that the communist world as a whole abhorred, our own western leftists have called - I can recall hearing a speech about doomsday, the clock being moved up the day that Ronald Reagan was elected. But it's amazing, Madam Speaker, to what extent rapprochement and the easing of international tension is happening under the presidency of the current President of the United States and with the welcome new face that the Soviet Union has brought to its leadership.

With those few words, I wish to indicate my support to the resolution.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: Is it the will of the House to call it six o'clock?

The hour being 6:00 p.m., I'm now leaving the Chair with the understanding that the House will reconvene in Committee of Supply at 8:00 p.m.