

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA**  
**Thursday, 5 June, 1980**

**Time — 8:00 p.m.**

**CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY**

**SUPPLY — MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS**

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor (Virden):** I call the committee to order. We are on Resolution 96, 4.(a) — The Member for Rossmere.

**MR. VIC SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I missed practically of this afternoon's session. I was over in the Education estimates and I just caught the tail end of some remarks with respect to a proposed new bill being in the works as a result of an interim report of the Assessment Review Committee. I am just wondering whether the Minister is prepared to release that interim report.

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

**HON. DOUG GOURLAY (Swan River):** Mr. Chairman, as I indicated this afternoon, that I haven't had a chance to bring this interim report before Cabinet and there is some legislation being drafted with respect to the recommendations. I would hope to have this information available and tabled in the House hopefully by the end of next week at the latest.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** I wonder whether the Minister could tell us when he received that interim report.

**MR. GOURLAY:** I can't just recall the exact date. I would say perhaps around the first of March.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Has he been in communication with the chairman since, that is, in terms of any updating of that report?

**MR. GOURLAY:** I have had two three meetings with the chairman with respect to hearings that are taking place at the present time in northern Manitoba. I'm not sure of the dates that those hearings are completed but I believe it's around next week or so they're finished.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Could the Minister advise as to where the committee will be holding hearings between now and the end of the hearings? Is it strictly just up north?

**MR. GOURLAY:** Yes, they have in Thompson and The Pas, I believe. I just can't recall the dates of those meetings which are in early June and then there is another meeting in Winnipeg to pick up presentations that were missed earlier, for anyone that wanted to submit further presentations.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** And the bill that is currently being prepared, does the Minister expect to table that in the House shortly? Is it within the next few days?

**MR. GOURLAY:** Yes, within the next few days. As I said, I hope that I could have that in before the end of next week.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 4.(a)—pass — the Member for Rossmere.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I must say, I find it to be an incredible position to be in to hear from the Minister that he is preparing legislation based on an interim report of a committee that is still holding hearings, of a committee that is still going to the people of this province and pretending to ask them for their opinions on what is going on with respect to municipal assessment. The taxpayers have been put to a great deal of expense in order to, hopefully, discover something about municipal assessment. Now based on a report issued back in March, after which a number of hearings have been held, the Minister has told us he is preparing legislation which will be in the House by the end of the next week. Yet that committee is out there for what purpose, up in northern Manitoba listening to people after a bill is in the process of being prepared. I find that totally incredible. We have the committee coming back into Winnipeg. It's going to hold another hearing here in Winnipeg to sort of clean up the remains. There were a few briefs that hadn't been heard, so they are going to come here and hear those people.

If I were one of those people coming to the hearing at this point in time, I must say that I would be questioning the purpose of coming. I would certainly be questioning the usefulness of the committee from the end of March, from the time it issued its report, and I would certainly be questioning the government in terms of secrecy between now and the end of next week.

We know that there is a bill in the course of preparation. We know that it is based on a report which was issued at the end of March, and the government is not prepared to provide us with a copy of that report. The government is not prepared to provide the people who go to these hearings in northern Manitoba with a copy of that report. I would suggest that what you are doing is not only tying one hand behind people's backs, you're tying both hands behind their backs and putting a blindfold over their eyes and asking them to come along and talk to the committee. Why doesn't the committee or the government prepare or allow the people to see that report and then when people go to this committee between now and the end of next week, they can make some comments based on the interim recommendations of the committee? I would strongly urge the Minister to do that.

**MR. GOURLAY:** Mr. Chairman, the legislation is based on recommendations that were contained in the recommendations from the interim report. The information supplied at the hearings that are still going on, of course, will be important and will be given every due consideration.

Thursday, 5 June, 1980

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister has stated again he is preparing legislation based on an interim report which was provided to the government at the end of March before which a number of hearings were held by that committee. The government is saying to the people of Manitoba, we will ignore everybody whom we heard after the end of March of 1980. —(Interjection)— I hear from the background that is not the case. I would suggest then that the Minister table the report immediately so that we can discuss it. I would suggest not only for us, but also for those people who will appear before that committee between now and the end of next week that that report should be tabled, and I would suggest that the Minister apologize to those people who have been attending at those hearings between the end of March and now, and who will be attending between now and the end of next week, for secretly preparing a bill based on an interim report which you're not prepared to table and which these people do not have available to them when they go to discuss matters with a commission which appears to have made up its mind on what course of action to take; its made up its mind by the end of March of 1980, and I would suggest to the Minister that the balance of the hearings can be nothing short of a farce.

**MR. GOURLAY:** Mr. Chairman, as I indicated, I would hope to be able to table the interim report by the end of next week at the latest.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 4.(a) — the Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM:** I was speaking on that very point, Mr. Chairman, before we rose for the supper hour and I find it incredible that . . . It's understandable that the government would bring in legislation if the interim report had been tabled but I find it incredible that the Minister is telling us — in fact unbelievable — that the Minister is telling us that the legislation is going to be introduced within the next day or two before the interim report or before the completed report is tabled in the House.

The comments made by my colleague from Rossmere are certainly appropriate because it seems to me that the government hasn't learned. What happened last year when they brought a School Act, a Public School bill in last year, under the same way; there were hearings held and all of a sudden we were faced with a bill, two weeks before the session ended and, subsequently, the government, after criticism from the opposition and the public, withdrew that bill, Mr. Chairman, withdrew the bill under pressure from the opposition and also other groups. Now they're doing exactly the same thing as they did last year and I find that unbelievable, Mr. Chairman. This is what I would call underhanded way of governing the province. This is out and out dictatorship, I would say. Actually it's an insult to the members of this committee; it is an insult to the public of the province of Manitoba and to those people who attended those hearings.

I wanted to speak on some other points on assessment, Mr. Chairman, but if the Minister wants to respond.

**MR. GOURLAY:** Mr. Chairman, I would just like to respond that when the main report is tabled from the Review Commission, it will form the basis of most of the legislation. This is an interim report, with some interim legislation, that will be brought in at this time.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I think the Member for Ste. Rose still has the floor.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, I have other questions to ask but if my colleagues want to talk on this very point I would accede to them and come back to the assessment part of the . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The next member who has the Chairman's eye is the Member for Logan unless he wants to forego his place.

**MR. WILLIAM JENKINS:** Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak on this issue. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I really can't see the purpose of the Minister holding hearings. It is, as my colleague has said, that there is proposed legislation that is being considered on a preliminary report that the Minister evidently has had since March, we're now into June, that's two months ago. Surely there should have been some decision by Cabinet, some consideration of this preliminary report and now we find that here, in the dying days of the session, we're going to be given a bill on municipal assessment. I find it absolutely ludicrous that the government can operate in such a slipshod manner. I mean, you haven't even finished the hearings, the hearings are going on. The Minister has stated the hearings are going to be held in Thompson, The Pas, completion here in the city of Winnipeg and this is a very complex situation, the assessment. The assessment, I imagine, in parts of Manitoba are as much as 10 to 15 years since reassessment in some areas. I don't think the Minister will dispute that too much, there are parts of Manitoba where an assessment hasn't been carried out at least in the last 10 to maybe 15 years.

Now if the Minister is coming in with legislation that's going to make radical changes — (Interjection)— Well, we don't know, we haven't seen the legislation. It's all right for the member to say that . . . It is the same thing as what we were assured last year, just a nice housecleaning bill. We'd clean up The Public Schools Act and The Public Administration Act and regardless of whether the government members here want to admit it or not, it was the opposition that raised the issue first; then it was the people that came here at the public hearings and make you pull your horns in and put the bill out for hearings. I'm just asking the Minister if this is the modus operandi that this government is going to operate, flying trial balloons all the time.

You'll introduce this bill; it'll come to the Law Amendments Committee or the Municipal Affairs Committee and then when you get the flack you'll pull it back and say, we'll hold hearings. Why the heck can't you wait until you get your final report? The assessment is not that urgent that it has to be brought in at this time, especially in view of the fact that you've not even completed the hearings. By the Minister's own admission, he hasn't even cleared the preliminary report with Cabinet and he's telling us, well, I guess next week, Wednesday, which is

Thursday, 5 June, 1980

Cabinet day, they're going to have a meeting on this preliminary report and then they might release the preliminary report next Friday; we'll get the report and we'll get the bill probably at the same time. I say this is pretty sloppy, pretty sloppy. —(Interjection)—

I would say to the Minister, consider seriously withholding any legislation until at least you have completed the hearings. I mean, it is an absolute insult to people who are going to be coming and making presentations on what they are finding — (Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, could you maintain order, please.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I think over the long haul I control it reasonably well, not 100 percent.

**MR. JENKINS:** I understand that the Member for Emerson wishes to make a contribution but he can make his contribution when I'm through, and I'm not going to interrupt him when he is making his presentation, but when I am speaking I would expect that he at least show me the courtesy; if he doesn't want to, well, that's fine, then we can have a slug out match across the table, verbally of course.

But to get back to the point, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, I must say this is simply ludicrous that the government would operate . . . You are the people who are telling us that you're the great people who know how to organize things? My God, as your First Minister said, you couldn't even organize a peanut stand.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Since the last time I spoke on this a few minutes ago, the Minister responded to the Member for Ste. Rose and stated that the legislation would be in accordance with the final report of the committee. I find that to be even more astounding than what we have had up until this point in time. The committee is still holding hearings and people in northern Manitoba, presumably, have spent some time preparing to go before this committee and point out the difficulties involved in assessment, meanwhile the committee had already reported to the Minister and we didn't know about it and certainly the people of northern Manitoba didn't know about it. People here in Winnipeg were preparing reports and didn't know that there was already legislation being prepared, but now we're being told that the Minister knows that the legislation he's preparing is in accordance with the final report of this committee which means one of two things: One, the final report is already prepared and he knows what's in it, prior to the completion of the hearings in northern Manitoba and in Winnipeg, or whatever is being said in northern Manitoba and Winnipeg doesn't matter because they've already made up their minds, and in neither case is that satisfactory. In neither case is that appropriate.

Mr. Chairman, I would certainly hope that the Minister will tell this committee to consider all of the evidence that comes before it and to prepare a final submission based on all of the evidence, both from the people of northern Manitoba and Winnipeg, and from rural Manitoba.

Again, the Minister cannot tell this committee that the legislation is based on the final report of the assessment committee unless it has either already

made up its mind and the rest of the hearings are totally irrelevant or in fact the committee has provided a final report to him, in which case the balance of the hearings don't matter either. Again, I would at least urge the Minister to at least table the interim report in order to clear the air so that the people who go to this committee, the assessment committee, between now and the end of next week, do so knowing what is in the mind of that committee, which has already made an interim report.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, there is one alternative that maybe the Member for Rossmere has missed. He mentioned two. The other third alternative would be that the government is telling the committee what to put into the report. I find that would be astounding, if that was the case, but that's the way it could come out. But I'm going to leave that because they'll have to live with that; the government will have to live with that kind of a situation.

Anyway I wanted to get back to what we were talking about before supper and that was on the assessments . . .

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

**MR. GOURLAY:** Mr. Chairman, I think the Member for Rossmere didn't understand what I said earlier, that the final report, when that will be coming in, I'm not sure when, but the bulk of the legislation dealing with it would be considered at that time.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Rossmere, if Ste. Rose gives up the floor.

The Member for Rossmere.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Chairman, just to respond to what the Minister said, it may well be that what he just finished saying is what he intended to say but I believe that if we look at the record, the record will show that he said that legislation would be based on the final report, the legislation which he is bringing in next week.

**MR. GOURLAY:** I didn't say that at all.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I thought, as I recall it, the member to be wrong on that assumption; earlier, I really mentally thought that and I could be wrong on that. I suppose only Hansard will prove which one is right.

The Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** Mr. Chairman, before adjourning for the dinner hour we were talking about the assessment of farm buildings and now that's being done. I understood the Minister, in response to questions from the committee members, indicated that all farm buildings, when an assessment takes place, the buildings are assessed, not necessarily taxed but they are assessed as to value. That's what I understand the Minister did tell us. The residential buildings and the farm buildings would not be assessed for tax if the farmer was a bona fide full-time farmer. Am I correct in that assumption?

**MR. GOURLAY:** Mr. Chairman, with respect to the assessment of farm residences, I indicated that

Thursday, 5 June, 1980

where a municipality is coming up for re-assessment the rural residences or farm residences are assessed and put in the exempt column. Eventually, we hope to include all farm buildings to be assessed and also the farm people that are making their livelihood from farming, of course it goes in the exempt column. Other rural people living on farmsteads but deriving their income from other sources would be taxable, and I think this is really what you have indicated.

**MR. ADAM:** The Minister, I think, is indicating that at the present time only residential farm buildings are being assessed and not other buildings on the farm, such as garages or any other building except the residence.

**MR. GOURLAY:** That's right.

**MR. ADAM:** Well, I find that kind of odd, too. If we are going to assess buildings we should assess them all and just do it once, instead of having to send people out again to reassess them. —(Interjection)— No, they're just assessing the residential not the other buildings. —(Interjection)— Well, that's not what I understood the Minister to say. I believe the Minister went on to say, perhaps he could correct me if I have misunderstood him, the Minister went on to say a full-time farmer would be exempt but another farmer who had off-farm work, more than probably 50 percent I presume, the buildings would be taxable. Or would that include anyone that works off the farm, just to supplement the farm income to keep it in operation? Because in many cases, Mr. Chairman, that is what is happening. Mr. Chairman, I would have no difficulty naming 25 farmers whose wives are teachers or nurses and working full-time to supplement the farm income. I'd have no trouble finding all kinds of people in that category. So when the members start sneering on the other side, you know, they're not fooling anybody but themselves. All we have to do is look at statistics of what's happening in the farm scene to see how many people are now working out to supplement income and there are more and more hours being spent off farm to supplement incomes. I'm not saying it's a bad thing that we assess farm buildings. I think perhaps we, as farmers, should be maybe looking at that and looking at land as maybe paying a business tax such as other people have to pay, based on volume. Maybe that's the way we should be looking at it; volume of operation, a business tax.

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

**MR. GOURLAY:** Mr. Chairman, I might just interject at this point. The legislation has not been changed since you formed the government. It's still the same legislation now as it was then. The changes that would be coming forth would be recommended and brought forward by the review commission.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, it may be time that we do look at different ways of assessing land because the farmers now, I believe, having to carry a much larger percentage of taxation, especially education tax because of the large areas of land that they have to have to make a living, larger and larger holdings. Perhaps it would be to the advantage of farmers if

we looked at different ways of taxation. I know that they are asking, farmers are asking, and the Municipal Association is asking, for changes in the assessment, the way land is assessed. The Minister hasn't said there is no change in the way land is assessed but could the Minister indicate how land is assessed, farmlands?

**MR. GOURLAY:** Generally, Mr. Chairman, the assessment is based on the productivity of the soil and also the relation to the market value.

**MR. ADAM:** Could the Minister indicate just what percentage of market value, what percentage is used to arrive at the . . . Okay, say the value is 50,000, just to use a figure?

**MR. GOURLAY:** I understand it's based on statistical information based on 20 percent of 1975 values.

**MR. ADAM:** The 1975 value, 20 percent of the market value of the land plus productivity?

**MR. GOURLAY:** Based on 1975 prices.

**MR. ADAM:** Mr. Chairman, when the government wants to buy land, when they want to buy land from an individual, they usually base the market value on agricultural productivity and not on market value.

**MR. GOURLAY:** Yes, I indicated both factors are used in determining the assessment.

**MR. ADAM:** Mr. Chairman, what I am saying now is when the government wants to buy land for its own use, when they want to buy land for highways or whatever it is from a farmer, they buy it on the average value of the land and it's usually on the productivity of the land.

**MR. GOURLAY:** We're mixing oranges and apples here I think.

**MR. ADAM:** I'm just saying that there are two ways of assessing. When they want to collect taxes they use one set of guidelines and when they're buying land they use another set. The Minister, when I asked him about the Special Municipal Loan Fund, he indicated that did not come under his department. Am I correct?

**MR. GOURLAY:** That's right. That's been administered under the Department of Labour and Manpower.

**MR. ADAM:** And yet it's in the report here. Why would it appear in this book? If we can't discuss it, why is it here?

**MR. GOURLAY:** This is where a municipality is borrowing money in excess of the loan and they have to go to the Municipal Board.

**MR. ADAM:** And we're unable to ask the Minister any questions in regard to this program then? He does not have any information to give the committee. Is this correct, Mr. Chairman?

Thursday, 5 June, 1980

**MR. GOURLAY:** That's correct.

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

**MR. ADAM:** No, I'll pass for now. Anybody else?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 4.(a)—pass; 4.(b)—pass. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding 3,050,700 for Municipal Affairs—pass.

Resolution 97, 5.(a) — The Member for Inkster.

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, this is the item where I would like to explore more fully what I consider to be so bizarre a state of affairs as to be unbelievable that even I don't believe it, and I'm hoping, although I am beginning to doubt as to whether the Minister will show that I am wrong or to even add to the bizarreness of what has occurred. I refer to the situation that occurred in the Local Government District of Alexander and I am not going to repeat too much, I just want to briefly state my knowledge of the history is that there was, in the Local Government District of Alexander, five councillors. That as is not uncommon in any political assembly, the five did not agree with each other unanimously on every question. Probably they didn't agree unanimously on very many questions. That there was friction between the Local Government District of Alexander and the local government district administrator by the name of Mr. Andries, and here is where the difficulties start. That Mr. Andries, in league with two councillors, got two resignations from these people on a Friday, the 14th, I believe it was April, although I'm not sure, that at the same day he tried to get a resignation from a third person because if he had a resignation from three out of five there would be no quorum and the Minister would be able to appoint a new council; that he was unsuccessful in getting the appointment of the resignation of a third person; that on the 18th, which I gather was a Tuesday but I'm not sure of the dates, a meeting of the council was held. The local government district administrator was present at the meeting and knew that two councillors had submitted resignations in writing, which were seen by a third councillor.

Despite the fact that he knew that, he did not advise the mayor that these people had resigned, in which case there would have been a quorum. There would have been three if they could get the other councillor there. At least there would be a quorum of councillors who had not resigned and they could have conducted the council business. That the administrator kept this fact from the knowledge of the council and from the knowledge of the Minister, although I'm not sure of that. I want the Minister to tell me that; I hope that is the case. That the local government district administrator then went back to the home of the third councillor whom he hoped to get a resignation from; that he prevailed upon this third councillor to resign and then produced three resignations, thereby having successfully performed what in Latin America would be called a coup d'etat, except there they shoot you. They don't sort of get resignations and have you expelled. But the principles are the same, that there was an insurrection carried on by the head bureaucrat with

the co-operation of some of the opposition politicians, and that he there convinced this third councillor to resign and there was waiting in the wings an officer by the name of Loepky from the Department of Municipal Affairs waiting there on the 18th of that month, who then took those resignations into Winnipeg and produced three resignations; whereupon I am advised that either before suspending the council or after suspending the council, the mayor and the one remaining councillor, plus the third one who had resigned, came and saw the Minister, explained the circumstances under which his resignation was obtained, and said that he wouldn't have resigned had it not been for the actions of this local government district administrator.

The Minister, despite this knowledge apparently, and I'm almost begging to the Minister, say it isn't so because if it is so, it's the most unbelievable set of circumstances that I have heard with regard to bureaucracy, the Minister and the elected representatives at a local level in 14 years that I have been in the Legislature. That the Minister then suspended the council and appointed the person who engineered the coup d'etat to be the administrator; that the local government district administrator then appointed the resigned councillors, who participated in this conspiracy to be members of committees of council, one by the name of Hunter — not the second, but one by the name of Hunter.

Now, all of that would be strange and bizarre enough, except what occurs later compounds the problem. The Minister is advised of these events in the House, does not challenge the accuracy of any of them, not a single one of them, and says that because I have brought to his attention facts that he did not know previously — and I would be interested to know what facts he didn't know previously — he is going to accept the voluntary resignation, although I don't why he should be permitted to voluntarily resign, of Mr. Andries to send in another administrator and call immediate elections. The elections are called and two people win by acclamation, one of whom — to make this story even more bizarre, because comical is not the right word — is the person who resigned. She runs for re-election and another one is named by acclamation — I don't know which one that is; I don't know if that is Mr. Vincent or not — and there is an election pending. That the Minister then reappoints — and I don't care and I'm not sure that it's accurate because the Member for Lac du Bonnet asked whether the council asked for him — but whether they asked for him or not, now we know we have a new political council. We have four people. The reeve doesn't vote unless there's a tie, so there may be now in favour of the conspirator. There may be two who would vote in his favour, although I don't know that they did. But even if there was, does the Minister regard that as something which entitles him to send that administrator back to be the local government district administrator of the council? Because if so, Mr. Chairman — and I'm hoping that the Minister will say it isn't so — that I say that this Minister is incompetent to handle any government department. That if he would reappoint Mr. Andries for one day knowing what we now know and without

any challenge to the facts whatsoever, that if the Minister would make such a reappointment, I question, Mr. Chairman, whether the Minister is competent to handle any government department, because under no circumstances should that man be reappointed to deal with that council.

Now I would like the Minister to tell me what I am in error about, because I must be in error about something. There must be something to this which is not true, although I have tried to check it. I have tried to give the benefit of the doubt in each case to the fact that things were done rightly, that Andries participated in an insurrection; that he used the resignations of three councillors to achieve that; that he was subsequently appointed; that they were subsequently elected and the Minister, knowing what Andries had done, reappointed him on the basis that he would no longer be there after August. I don't care whether he was asked or whether he was not asked.

I also want to know from the Minister . . . Because at no time did I suggest that something illegal took place, illegal in the sense that somebody could go to jail for it or somebody could be fined for it, improper in every sense of the word. What the lawyer told the Minister — because the Minister says he is relying on a legal report, and if he is relying on a legal report, then I think that the members of this committee should see that report. Because I'm interested to know what legal man that we had that would say that there is nothing wrong with this. I want to question the advice that the Minister has received. And I'm not saying illegal, I'm asking whether it is prudent, whether first of all the facts, as they have been enumerated, are incorrect, and if they are incorrect certainly I would want to know what is incorrect about them, because the facts, as I have enumerated them, were all documented in writing by the councillor who was ill and who was approached and convinced to resign. I have given the Minister a letter to that effect. The Minister says that he now says no.

The Member for Lac du Bonnet says that Mr. Vincent has not changed his mind. I think we should have Mr. Vincent in this room and, if it's necessary, Mr. Chairman, to get him into this room as a witness. I think we should have Mr. Andries in this room. I think we should have Mr. Leoppky in this room. I think that this is serious enough that we should have these people as witnesses and, if we can't have them as witnesses — and it may not be the appropriate place to have them as witnesses at a meeting of the Committee of Supply — but we can have them as witnesses in a meeting of the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

I have asked the Minister to refer this matter to such a committee so that he can clean house. But if he doesn't want to clean house, Mr. Chairman, I do and I think that the members of this committee do and the members of the Legislature should want to, regardless of the public.

This is not a political question in terms of whether it is Conservative or New Democrat. It's a question of the due administration of local government districts in this province. If the Minister won't refer it so we can ask Mr. Vincent, did this happen, so we can ask Mr. Andries, so we can ask the Reeve. They are charging that the Minister knew of these things,

that Mr. Vincent came into the Minister's office and told him this is what occurred and, despite that, the Minister made this appointment. If that's the case, Mr. Chairman — and I am hoping that the Minister will say this himself — that then I want to know what is so. And if there's a dispute, Mr. Chairman, then I think that this matter should be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections so we can have the people involved in here, to ask them what occurred.

I'd like to know from the Minister, what am I misreading? Because it is unbelievable and I find it difficult to believe. If you will tell me what part of my understanding is incorrect and if that depends on Mr. Vincent's story, then I want Mr. Vincent here because Mr. Vincent sent the letter which is tabled in the Legislature, which confirms every word that I have just related to the Minister.

**MR. GOURLAY:** Mr. Chairman, to relate back over the history of the case, as I recall it, I just can't remember the exact dates when this situation first came to my attention but it was sometime after March 18th, the day of the meeting when the resignations supposedly had taken place. I was advised by staff that three members of the LGD of Alexander had resigned and therefore there was not a quorum left, so the LGD would not be able to function as a municipal body. So the course of action open to me was that there was not a quorum so the council could not function, the two remaining council members would be suspended until such time as another election would be held to elect a quorum.

That same week . . . I believe it was the next week, the next Monday morning, as I recall, I invited Reeve Thompson to come into my office to discuss the situation. In the meantime, Deputy Reeve Oscar Papineau had called me and I believe we discussed the fact that the Reeve was coming in, that he would come along as well, that was fine. They arrived at my office on Monday morning and they had decided, the Reeve and Deputy Reeve, to bring along Mr. Vincent, one of the resigned council members. We discussed the situation that we were in, in the LGD of Alexander, and I indicated to the Reeve that it would be necessary for me to suspend herself and the Deputy and that, in the meantime, Mr. Andries would act as the resident administrator until the situation could be become resolved.

There was some discussion at that time that the administrator had gone to see Mr. Vincent and advised him that he had received some resignations from two other councillors and discussed the situation with him. My Deputy was in the office at the time and asked Mr. Vincent on three separate occasions if it was true that Mr. Andries had pressured him into resigning and he would not respond to those questions. He did not answer those questions. He did not indicate to me that he had been pressured into resigning.

However, there was indication that Mr. Andries had the resignations in his hand on the Friday evening prior to the council meeting, so we had this checked out and staff had gone to the two councillors that had supposedly resigned. — (Interjection)— This is before the council meeting. They said that they had intended to resign and had given copies of resignations to Mr. Andries to hold in

Thursday, 5 June, 1980

trust, that they had not decided to resign. They were going to give it some consideration.

Then when you brought in some information to the House with respect to copies of minutes that were held at a subsequent meeting, chaired by the administrator, I had not received any such minutes at that time — I believe they did come in subsequently, maybe the next day or a day or so later — but I did not have them when you had raised the question. I was, to say the least, surprised that Mr. Andries would appoint Mrs. Hunter, the resigned council member, to some boards in the district. So, as a result of the publicity that came from the question period of the House that day, Mr. Andries was concerned about allegations about his conduct. He discussed the matter with my Deputy Minister and suggested that he would request a temporary leave of absence until these allegations could be checked out and cleared.

**A MEMBER:** Which allegations?

**MR. GOURLAY:** The allegations that were raised by Mr. Green in the House, as a result of the publicity that came from question periods in the House. I believe it was with respect to his actions, with respect to actions taken at the council meeting, and I think there were some other details that surfaced at that time with respect to his credibility.

I accepted his temporary leave of absence. And the details, you've also submitted a letter I believe, I don't know, within a few days of that same time from Mr. Vincent, indicating that he had advised my Deputy Minister and Mr. Loepky of being pressured into —(Interjection)— and myself. It would indicate from the letter that on two occasions the three of us had been together and he had come and met with us and talked with us. This was not the case. Mr. Loepky was not at the meeting which we had in my office with the Reeve, Deputy Reeve and Mr. Vincent; there was Mr. Forrest, myself and my executive assistant.

I had another staff member, other than Mr. Loepky, who was in the area and interviewed the council members with respect to their resignations. They indicated that they did not present their resignations formally until the meeting of the 18th and that Mr. Loepky was at the council meeting. He had been attending council meetings on a regular basis, as a service rep. from the Municipal Affairs Department, and he arrived and parked his car in front of the office, as I recall, as he indicated to me, at about 10 o'clock or shortly before when the meetings start, and he was present during the entire council meeting. When the meeting ended, Mr. Andries left the council chambers and asked Mr. Loepky if he would mind waiting before he returned to Winnipeg because he would like to see him. Mr. Andries, as I recall, had gone to talk to Mr. Vincent and discussed with him the situation with respect to what had gone on at the council meetings. This was the situation, as I understand it, that Mr. Andries visited Mr. Vincent on many occasions. This wasn't something that just happened prior to or at the time of the resignations; he had visited Mr. Vincent on numerous occasions and visited with him.

Mr. Loepky had no indication that any of the council members had resigned until that council

meeting day of March 18th. He did not bring the formal resignation; he had copies for the Winnipeg file of the resignations that he brought back to Winnipeg with him. Now, subsequently, when the member of staff had interviewed the council members, he did also interview Mr. Vincent after you had tabled his letter in the Legislature and he assured my staff member that in no way did Mr. Andries ever pressure him into resigning.

So this information, in view of the situation, I felt should be passed along to legal counsel within the Department of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Donald. I submitted all the information that I had on the case. He has replied that, in his opinion, Mr. Andries had not violated his duties as an administrator.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, I do not know what legal question Mr. Donald has answered, and I've asked the Minister to submit his report, but I have never charged, nor does any of the material suggest the commission of any offence which a lawyer would look into and I'm surprised that the Minister would ask a lawyer to answer that type of question. The question is not whether Mr. Andries violated the law as an administrator, the question is whether the Minister would have a local government district in place who does that kind of thing. And if you need a lawyer to answer that question then it is a further demonstration of the lack of management in this department. Because if you've got an administrator who says that he could receive resignations in trust, then I suggest to you that the man is absolutely incapable and should be seen by you as undesirable to have as an administrator. Doesn't the Minister know what has happened here?

Now it is confirmed, although it was previously denied, that the resignations were first in his hands on the 14th; that he went to see Vincent on the 14th. Does the Minister want me to draw pictures for him? He went to Vincent with two resignations and said, look, these two people have resigned; we need a third resignation. Therefore, he had what he considered to be conditional resignations.

You find me in the Act, such a thing as a conditional resignation. A resignation takes effect from the time it's in the hands of the clerk. It was in the hands of the clerk. On the 18th he conducted a meeting and did not tell the Reeve that he had resignations of two councillors and he kept them as conditional resignations; he, the person who is to serve the council, has got two resignations which he's going to use for the purpose of getting a third and if doesn't get the third, the two are not applicable.

This is a conspiracy, Mr. Chairman, not a conspiracy which results in people being prosecuted at law. I don't know why you needed Mr. Donald to advise you. This is a conspiracy by the administrator and now everything that has been suggested has been confirmed. There was some doubt, now you have resolved the doubt, that resignations he had in his hands on the 14th. Look at the Act. The Act says a resignation takes effect from the time that it is given to the clerk. But the clerk cannot involve himself in dealing with conditional resignations. He is not to involve himself in the political structure of the

Thursday, 5 June, 1980

council at all; at least that's the way I understand it and if the Minister doesn't understand it that way there is something, in my view, terribly wrong with the administration of the Department of Municipal Affairs.

So we've got a local government district administrator running around saying that he's got conditional resignations in his pocket, in trust, which he can use when he gets a third. Isn't that bad enough? If nothing else was said, if Vincent confirmed that he wants to resign, that he didn't do anything wrong, is it not bad enough that you have an administrator running around getting conditional resignations, which he says he can use when he gets a third? Because I think if that were the only thing that happened, that the Minister has no business . . . The Minister, knowing that, appointed this man to be the administrator of the council and, Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry to say it, made the innocent people the victims. The news of this suspension was not that the local government district administrator had engaged in a conspiracy to subvert a locally elected council but that the two people who stayed on and did not resign had allegations against them as to impropriety, that's what came out.

Mr. Chairman, what comparable mismanagement, not in terms of dealing with funds and other things but dealing with what a local government district is, what the councillors are supposed to be, what support staff are supposed to be, what comparable mismanagement are we aware of? The Minister knew when he appointed Andries that Andries had these resignations three days before a meeting at which the people who had resigned attended and participated in the meeting and the administrator did not tell either the Minister or the Reeve that these people were no longer on council. If they had done so . . . I mean you're all politicians. Don't you know what would have happened; don't you know what has happened here? These two people resigned to get rid of the council, not because they wanted to resign, but they were keeping an ace in the hole; their resignation would have strings on it until they could get a third, because if it didn't have those strings on it they were letting the other three councillors run the council. So if the administrator had told the other politician that there are now only the three of you, you're enemies have departed, those three would have run the council and the local government district administrator had no business keeping a secret the resignations of two councillors and no business saying that he held them in trust. There is no such concept and if their lawyer tells you that there is such a concept I suggest to you that the lawyer is wrong. There is no such concept. Use any word you want, collusion, insurrection, conspiracy, they all apply.

Now Reeve Thompson, Papineau, and Vincent came into the office. Vincent sends the Minister or sends a letter, a public letter, saying that in that office he told the Minister and the people who were there that he thought this was sneaky, that he thought it was petty — I can't remember the exact words, maybe the member has the letter, the member will get the letter — and that if he had it to do again he wouldn't resign, and that he resigned because Mr. Vincent had come to him and convinced

him that he should resign. —(Interjection)— Mr. Andries, right, sorry.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Now just a minute, Mr. Chairman, if it wasn't enough for the Minister to have behaved differently, that he knew that conditional resignations, which are an impossibility, were going to be used to manipulate a third resignation, it wasn't enough that he knew that, that he would suspend these councillors and appoint the chief conspirator to be the runner of the district, then what about what he learned subsequently? He learned subsequently from Mr. Vincent that Mr. Andries had been over at his house with two resignations and asked him to resign.

So let's dismiss the fact that the administrator had two resignations which he was using to manipulate a third. The Minister was aware that Mr. Andries had taken two resignations which were now legitimate, or at least they were still conditional, in my view, until he got the third. Well, he went to get the third. He had two conditional in trust resignations; there's no argument about that. Took them over to Vincent and said, now I need yours. Did Mr. Andries go over to Mr. Vincent's house and show him two resignations and talk about the hockey game that was taking place that night? That's not what Vincent says.

Around 4 p.m. March 14th, Richard Andries, Resident Administrator came to my home with two resignations, Hunter and Fontaine. He attempted to obtain my resignation too. I resisted but when he left an hour and a half later, I was worried. So he was there for an hour and a half asking about his health, with two resignations which he showed him.

On the evening of March 18th, Councillors Hunter and Fontaine came to my home in Robert Andries' car. The three of them are now in cahoots. They claimed nothing had been accomplished at the council meeting that day; the Local Government District of Alexander had no money and everything was going wrong. They asked to take my resignation in with theirs. Under the circumstances, having worried since Friday, knowing I still needed a period for recuperation, I resigned under duress, that's the words in the letter, signed by Vincent. If the Minister is going to say that something else happened, Vincent should be here, before the committee, not this committee.

All of this had been explained to Mr. Abe Loeppky, for Municipal Affairs, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, D. Gourlay, and his Deputy Chief, Forrest. While Hunter and Fontaine were obtaining my resignations, R. A. Andries was in his office and A. Loeppky's car was parked in front. A. Loeppky had been at the meeting that day. Fontaine reluctantly admitted Loeppky was in the office with Mr. Andries and would be taking the resignations to Winnipeg. So he says, Hunter and Fontaine were obtaining his resignation. It may be, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Andries didn't come into the house on the 18th, it's not clear. On the evening of March 18th councillors Hunter and Fontaine came to my home in Robert Andries car with the resignation. He doesn't say that Andries came in that night, and if I have assumed that, and that is wrong, then that is a fact that has to be withdrawn, because he doesn't say that.



I further told the Minister, his Deputy and Loeppky, that I felt the whole performance was childish, ridiculous, and sneaky and that I was prepared to withdraw my resignation. Four people have asked me if I would resign now. Being in better health I have told all four, Loeppky, Minister, CTV, and the Tribune, that I would not now resign. My concern is that Councillors Hunter and Fontaine should have attended a meeting with council four days after they resigned; that the resignations were not brought to the attention of council on March 18th; that the Administrator and Councillors Hunter and Fontaine should have pressured me while I was on leave of absence, so he says, the Administrator, Hunter and Fontaine, should have pressured me while I was on leave of absence from council which I didn't know at the time as I had been too ill to read the minutes. Further, that the Administrator should deny this on public property.

Mr. Chairman, I will admit that there is one fact here that I am not clear now about, whether Andries came into the house on the 18th, because it doesn't say that. But he does say that the Administrator, Hunter and Fontaine, had pressured him into resigning and I got the impression that the Minister agreed that Andries was at his place on the 18th. If he was or was not does not change anything, it does not change a great deal, because he did come to his home on the 14th and stayed there for an hour and a half trying to get him to resign.

Mr. Chairman, this letter has been tabled in the House. The Minister says that Mr. Loeppky told him that Andries didn't pressure him. Well, that's not what he says in this letter which he sent to whom it may concern. If the Minister wants to interrupt me, it's okay.

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

**MR. GOURLAY:** Mr. Chairman, it wasn't Mr. Loeppky who had interviewed Mr. Vincent on the occasion, I mentioned that Mr. Vincent had said he wasn't pressured by Mr. Andries. It was another member of staff. The information I have also was that Mr. Andries did not, as I recall, did not go to Mr. Vincent's house on the 18th. He did ask Mr. Loeppky. He left the Council Chambers, but he had asked Mr. Loeppky if he would not return to Winnipeg after the council meeting; he'd like to see him before he left. But the two resigned council members had gone to Mr. Vincent's house and discussed the situation with respect to the council meeting and had said that they had signed resignations that were not . . . they wanted to attend another council meeting, hopefully that the situation would correct itself and they might be able to resolve difficulties with respect to local government district business. They resigned on the 18th and this information was all given to the lawyer to rule on the validity of the resignations, whether in fact they had resigned on the 14th or whether they had on the 18th, the resignations that came into the office were all dated the 18th. This was subsequently, of course, and we based the resignations on the 18th. The lawyer had indicated that, in his opinion, the resignations were effective March 18th, not the 14th.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, then I think we should get the letter to the lawyer and the answer, because there is absolutely no basis, in my view, for saying that a resignation given to the local government district administrator on the 14th is not effective on the 14th. Maybe the lawyer is not aware that they were given on the 14th to the gentleman, because they are effective if they were given and if the lawyer has answered that to the contrary, then it's contrary to the Act. But in any event, Mr. Chairman, we're not dealing with a question of legality and I do recognize that there is some, at least error, in my own assumption, that he went to the home on the 18th. They came there in Mr. Andries car with the resignations. Andries was there for an hour-and-a-half trying to get him to resign on the 14th, that doesn't change anything. It means he made one trip as part of this conspiracy rather than two and he participated in this conspiracy by not mentioning on the 18th that these two people had already resigned, which they had, and he had the resignations in his pocket, in his hand.

Now, Mr. Chairman, all right, maybe there were mistakes made, but certainly we cannot accept the Minister's statement because it's not the Minister's statement. The Minister is saying that a member of his staff talked to Vincent and in that discussion Vincent repudiated this letter. Well, Mr. Chairman, that is not acceptable. It is third-hand evidence, to refute a letter that is signed by the man himself. And surely the Minister is not going to ask the committee to accept that when there has been tabled a letter by Mr. Vincent himself. —(Interjection)— Yes, has Vincent sent another letter saying this is not correct, or is this not his letter? Was I mislead? Have I been given a false letter? Is this a forgery? I mean, I want to know if I've been duped.

Well the Minister, who is a dupe, says I have been. I want to be proved to have been duped. I want, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vincent to come to this committee and say — and Mr. Downey is now charging that this is a false letter that this is a forgery and I have been duped. That's what he said, that's what he said, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I would ask all speakers to come through the Chair. I heard no remark like would the Honourable Member for Inkster . . .

**MR. GREEN:** If the member wishes to withdraw the remark I accept the withdrawal.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** That's the weakness of this committee, we're too close. The Minister of Agriculture on a point of order.

**HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur):** Mr. Chairman, I didn't make any such accusation and I have no statement to withdraw because I didn't make any.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, I held up this letter and I said I want to know whether I've been duped and the Minister said, yes, you have.

**MR. DOWNEY:** I nodded in the affirmative, that's what I did, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** One speaker at a time. It is hard for the Chairman to control. We're at striking distance of one another and it is the weakness of this committee in this room.

**MR. GREEN:** No, I said he was a dupe. He said I was duped.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Emerson has been trying to get the floor and just to . . . The Minister of Agriculture if he has a point of order we'll listen to it.

The Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, I believe we should get down to the bottom of this.

**A MEMBER:** May I have the chair, Mr. Chairman?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I was going to, just to break the monotony, or the . . .

**MR. GREEN:** Point of privilege. I'll be finished . . . Point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. Nobody else has been referred to as being monotonous. Discrimination, discrimination.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Just to change the pace a little bit, the Member for Emerson has been trying to get the floor and I'll recognize him and I will go back to the Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, you have, I've noticed, I've sat at these meetings waiting while you have had one member dealing with a certain point and I'm going to . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I know, that's the general principle of the Chair, but seeing that we have conflict down there, when you iron that out, we'll come up to this end . . .

**MR. GREEN:** I've ironed it out.

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

**MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think the Member for Inkster is overdramatizing the whole situation of the LGD of Alexander. The situation is not that unique. I think he has a total lack of understanding of rural politics, as rural people possibly have a lack of understanding of the politics that goes on in this House at times. I would like to verify that to some degree.

In my third term as Reeve of the R.M. of Hanover, one year after my election by acclamation, I had certain problems within my council at that time, a split, a three and three split at that time. To my regret, at this time, at that time what I was trying to do was give effect and I resigned and I wrote out in handwriting to the secretary, a letter stating that because I felt I was not being able to pull council together, that I would tender my resignation. Possibly what the Member for Inkster doesn't realize is the reliance of Reeve on the secretary-treasurer or the administrator, whatever the case may be, that you get most of your advice and knowledge from them to some degree because they're qualified in that direction, and as local layman it's not always that

good or, how should I say, you're not qualified to understand the interpretation of many of these things. At that time, the secretary advised me, he said, take it back, think it over. He said, qualify your reasons, this kind of thing. So what happened at the subsequent council meeting after that, Mr. Chairman, I had typed out a letter of resignation, not because I wanted to resign but I wanted to make an effect. I wanted to change things in my council. I felt it was for the betterment because I could not pull them together. For that reason I resigned. I submitted my resignation at the end of that council meeting. The secretary-treasurer of the day at that time held that resignation for a certain period of time and when we talk, and this is why I say the Member for Inkster does not really understand rural politics, I went out to the field 50 miles away and I was baling alfalfa at that time and I had two different groups come and visit me and negotiate with me, not one-and-a-half hours but three hours individually, to reconsider, and the points, and try to negotiate. This is part of rural politics. And he is dramatizing a situation here because of certain rural politics that go on. He makes a big issue out of it. Letter this date, that date. In my particular case there was always two weeks involved until finally the whole thing blew. I was trying to do it for effect, as I am sure the councillors in that council were. We had misunderstandings in our council and I dare say, if the Member for Inkster would visit some of the rural councils, there are a lot of splits, a lot of problems there. Some possibly resign quietly, some do it — (Interjection)— secretary-treasurer is involved always; some do it for effect; some just throw up their hands and walk out. So this is not that unique a situation. For days in the House during question period, tonight here, we've had a tirade about this particular issue in Alexander, which I don't think is that unusual. If you would check with rural councils all over the province, there have been problems all around. There have been accusations between councils. I have had cases, in one of my municipalities, I won't say the name, where there were chairs lifted in defense of each other. So what is the big issue here? Certain members resign for effect, and here we go, and we're having a big tirade about technicalities, hours spent negotiating, what have you. This happens all the time.

Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned, I think we're being a little absurd in this situation and unless the Member for Inkster can appreciate what goes on there, the people out in the country think that we're crazy out here at times, and that's a fact. I'm saying that for effect, but you know, we have to understand the situations. We can't in the House here debate things that we know very little about because some individual has written the Member for Inkster a letter. I think the Minister has been handling this thing quite adequately. He's tried to explain, in all sincerity and honesty, and I think we have to give him credit for that and the more we mention this thing the worse we get it out there, and that's the last thing the rural people need is us people here mixing their pots.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to clarify that. I hope that I would have never had to, in this session or in this Legislature, indicate my resignation as a Reeve for which I have taken my shame and my dishonour to some degree, but I felt under the circumstances

Thursday, 5 June, 1980

what the Member for Inkster is bringing up here, I wanted to bring this up and say that's not an unusual situation. —(Interjection)— Oh no, oh no, I've learned my lesson. This time it will be a fight. I'm not through yet, Mr. Chairman.

I think the Member for Inkster, is a very capable individual and if he would just try and visualize the situation out there instead of making an issue of it out here, I think we'd be able to make progress and pass it on with these things. There are many problems within the LGDs and municipalities and the member knows that. He can go to any council and find out all kinds of problems. I can take you to five in my area right now where there are problems. Some resign to try to make effect, some don't, so what's the big issue? Thank you.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, I really believe that we should indulge the Member for Emerson. He is a man with very little understanding of any type of politics, rural or urban, and I think that we should let him make his monotonous speeches and sort of sympathize with him that he's a man of little understanding and little intellect and a guy who really doesn't impress, he really doesn't appreciate things. —(Interjections)—

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** One speaker at one time.

**MR. GREEN:** You know, we have to bear with people here who have no understanding of politics, rural or otherwise, and who think that things that are happening are usual, that it is a usual thing for a local government administrator to combine together with two councillors in a local rural area against three other councillors in a local rural area and try to undo the council and then that the Minister goes ahead and appoints this local government administrator in place of the council. We have people here who think that is usual, Mr. Chairman, and really we have to be fair with them and sort of listen to them patiently and get their remarks on the basis that you have to have patience with such people even though they don't understand, even though they have no knowledge of the world, even though if they have no knowledge of rural areas or urban areas or any other type of areas. Sometimes a person like that gets into the Legislature and I suppose we have to tolerate that. It's a problem and we have to tolerate it but we'll be able to just pretend, Mr. Chairman, that the thing has never been said.

Now let's get back, Mr. Chairman, to the problem. After all of these things have happened, after all of these things have happened, after the Minister has been made aware of the involvement of the local government district, after he has been sent a letter by a rural person saying that he's been pressured by two other rural people into resigning, saying that the local government district administrator had effected it, saying that the staff of Municipal Affairs had effected it and saying that all we have to do in order to answer that letter is have somebody tell the Minister that he spoke to this man and the man said that he wasn't pressured, I mean, some people think that's all right but we have to understand that these people have no understanding of affairs, that these

situations are not normal but some people think that they are normal. Mr. Chairman, after all of that, when the council comes to life again, who is appointed? The local government district administrator. Conspirator No. 1 is appointed and the Minister says, well, the local council asked me to.

Well, I wouldn't care if they did or they didn't, because I understand rural politics. I say that when there are four, and two are the old ones and one of them is the Reeve, and two are newly elected, that the vote could be 2-1 and the Reeve would not vote, and the two could be on the side of the local government district administrator, who has wrongfully involved himself in this affair. I say that, at that point, the Minister does not reappoint that person. That is my understanding of rural, urban, any kind of politics, and it's unfortunate that we have people who don't understand that here but we tolerate them and we listen to them. We indulge them, Mr. Chairman, because we are kind people here. We don't want to make anybody feel bad.

But that is the situation, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister has reappointed this person and, on the basis of a letter which he refuses to show us from the lawyer, on advice which we don't know what it was, which he has never revealed — the questions to the lawyer — and on the basis that there's nothing wrong with what has happened here. Well, I submit that there is a great deal wrong, that the worst thing about what has happened here is that the two remaining councillors took the brunt of this attack.

The Minister, who understands rural politics a little better than other people at this table, at least knew that he had to apologize to those two people because they are human beings whether they live in rural areas or urban areas, and they become the subject of an attack in the newspapers that they have done something improper and that's why they have been suspended. Well, I understand people, rural people and urban people, and I know that those rural people were very upset with that allegation. Oh, yes, I do, Mr. Chairman. It's the member who doesn't understand people.

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

**MR. DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Member for Inkster indicates that, you know, very boring and lack of knowledge of politics. Well, he's been at various times putting out challenges to other members on this side of the House, that you would run wherever somebody would challenge you. Well, I would challenge you, who know all about politics, to run in my constituency next time around.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, I'll come and speak in your constituency, that's what I said.

**MR. DRIEDGER:** I have the floor.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege. I never challenged any members that I would run in their constituency with the exception of the Member for St. Matthews, but I said that I would come to the constituency of the Member for Pembina and Lakeside and speak there, and I'll come in yours, too.

Thursday, 5 June, 1980

**MR. DRIEDGER:** Well, since you have so much political knowledge and ability, then why don't you come and run in my area?

**MR. GREEN:** You run in Inkster. We need more candidates.

**MR. DRIEDGER:** Do I have the floor, Mr. Chairman?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** No one has the floor for the moment. I think if we'd return to the subject matter, 5.(a), rather than personal attack on fellow members of this Chamber, would be more to gain for the taxpayers, that it should be concerned.

The Member for Emerson.

**MR. DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's interesting enough that the Member for Inkster is waving a letter that is so important where he has all the details on there. The other day he made a 40-minute boring speech in the House relating to one letter in the Tribune or Free Press, I don't know which one, and he said that was one man's opinion; if that was one man's opinion, it should not count at all. Today, he's waving one man's letter here and he says, this opinion should count for everybody right now. By the Member for Inkster bringing up this specific problem from the LGD of Alexander in this House he has created more problems for these people than anybody ever could. That is the sorry part about it.

As far as I am concerned, this matter should be laid to rest and the Member for Inkster should keep his nose out of it. —(Interjection)— No, I will tell you something. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon is saying, we should do away with it all. These people know how to run their affairs. The local politics is something that you . . . well, you probably understand much better than the Member for Inkster does. —(Interjection)— Yes, I'm sure you do. But it's a different ballgame. He looks at the technicalities, like lawyers always do. He talks of, you know, boring comments from myself. Well, can you imagine how I feel about his comments once in a while? He makes 40-minute speeches endlessly about every article that he feels he is qualified on. Well, I'm just a local layman. He says I don't know much about politics. I can accept that fact, but the people in my area elected me to represent them, as he got elected by his people, not even in his own area. Wherever he runs, that's his privilege. But my people have faith in me. If they don't have, the next election they can kick me out. And the same thing happens at the rural level with municipal politics and LGD politics. And here we have a big tirade. The people always have problems, there are always problems, all kinds of problems within the LGDs and rural municipalities because they are dealing with the grassroots. We deal here at the higher level. What we do and what the Member for Inkster has done has created additional problems for people in rural areas where there's problems. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

**MR. RONALD McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I think the problem that we're running into, as a committee, is

the fact that there is no disagreement, that there are problems that occur in all kinds of local government authorities, whether it be the LGD or municipal council or city councils. Now you have factions and you have groups and you have divisions within those councils. Mr. Chairman, there are conspiracies within council; one group of politicians conspire against another group of politicians to get their own way.

Mr. Chairman, what we are dealing with here is not stirring the pot of the people of the LGD of Alexander, but the fact is that an official of the Minister is the one that was leading the conspiracy. If the Minister didn't see that, if his officials don't understand that, then they are very very naive about local politics, very naive, because all the evidence is, everything that has been presented to us, shows that the official, that the local government district administrator was in fact leading the conspiracy, along with two councillors, against the other three councillors, to get their own way. Mr. Chairman, that is what is not acceptable and for the Minister to not understand that's what is happening and to not take appropriate action when that is happening is the problem that this committee faces and the problem that this Minister has.

The situation in Alexander, Mr. Chairperson, would be like if the Clerk of the House here or the Lieutenant-Governor, or the Premier's senior civil servant, got together with us in the opposition to overthrow the government. That would be an analgous situation; because that is what happened in Alexander. The senior civil servant, an employee of the Minister, responsible to council, joined together with the opposition, the minority in council, to overthrow the existing council.

Mr. Chairman, that should be obvious to the Minister and it should be obvious to the officials, and then to make the mistakes, in terms of how to handle that situation that the Minister has made, shows the incompetence in terms of administering the department. And then, Mr. Chairperson, to make matters worse, then the Minister came along and reappointed the administrator to run that particular council, to be the senior administrator for that council. Mr. Chairperson, that would be like the people presently in control of Uganda to say Idi Amin, come on back till August the 1st; we want you to look after things until . . . Mr. Chairperson, so that's the kind of situation we're in and that's the problem we're trying to deal with and not a problem that there is factions, that there is disagreements, that there is internal fights within the LGDs, within all kinds of elected bodies in the province of Manitoba. But the fact is that we have a civil servant taking the lead in that type of activity, in that type of conspiracy.

Mr. Chairman, members of this House who have been around for a while, and I am familiar with the fact that this is one of the problems we had to deal with, I know in rural Manitoba, in northern Manitoba, was to reduce the control, to reduce the power, to reduce the politicking of the civil servants and give the politicking over to the local elected people. That was the fight and that was the battle to make sure that the local people did have that kind of authority, did have the responsibility and were able to be the politicians locally to meet the local needs. There were lots of fights in that, local fights, local

disagreements, all kinds of them but, Mr. Chairperson, what had to be done was to keep the civil servants out of those kind of fights and out of that kind of conspiracy.

Mr. Chairman, I can recall in 1969, when I was first elected, taking the Minister of Municipal Affairs to the Local Government District of Grand Rapids where the community people were complaining of the complete control of everything that happened in their community by the LGD administrator. The administrator tried to line up local people on his side. Some people would come out and say, no, he was doing what they wanted and the other people were saying the administrator was completely running everything on his own, without involving the local people. Mr. Chairperson, the civil servants in that case — I can remember the new Minister of Municipal Affairs getting pressure from the civil servants saying, don't listen to the people, listen to the administrator. Don't listen to the people, listen to the administrator because he knows what's going on. Those are just trouble-causers, just like the Member for Inkster is a trouble-causer, bringing this matter up again. Those other people are just trouble-causers.

What the Minister finally had to do was to transfer the LGD Administrator out of that community to another community; that's how we had to solve the situation. The administrator in the Local Government District of Grand Rapids in 1969 was Richard Andries.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister, whatever he does, after all these problems, to address himself to the direct concerns that we have in terms of the administrators being directly involved in the political activity leading up to conspiracy. I would also ask the Minister, when he does transfer Mr. Andries, not to transfer him back to Grand Rapids.

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

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think a certain historical perspective on this situation is in order because there should be no doubt in anyone's mind that this is something which caught the department unawares. The Deputy Minister and I were at a meeting in the LGD of Alexander several years ago; I am sure he will recall it well. There were several hundreds of people in a packed hall whose basic objective was to get rid of their local government district administrator. And, of course, that is the distinction between this particular situation and the ordinary municipality of which the Member for Emerson speaks. I, like the Member for Emerson, have spent some time in rural Manitoba, some 26 years altogether, including my law practice out in rural Manitoba, and I have seen secretary-treasurers come and secretary-treasurers go in municipalities, because municipalities can fire their secretary-treasurers, there's no difficulty there. What we have here is a provincial civil servant who is sent into a district and asked to run the affairs. And basically until a few years ago, until the NDP were elected, the administrator was the king and it was under the former administration that the local council was given a certain amount of power. One of those powers was not the power to get rid of their local

government district administrator and possibly if that had been given we wouldn't be in this mess right now.

I would suggest again, that the department had full knowledge of the feeling of the local population in the LGD of Alexander with respect to a preference for a move of that administrator. This wasn't a situation where there was no foreknowledge that there were some political intrigues going on. Any resignations, anything going on down there should have been greeted by Mr. Leoppky and everybody else, with the greatest of suspicion because of the background. There had been requests for transfer, in fact, the Minister himself is well aware that, I believe it was a year or two ago, the administrator was not transferred because his department told the LGD that the only way they could transfer him was to pay for his house and there were certain other incidental costs and they decided that it was too costly. That's something that would never have happened in the Rural Municipality of Emerson. That is a unique situation that the people of the LGD of Alexander were faced with, so when we discuss this issue let us not get an LGD confused with a municipality.

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

**MR. SCHROEDER:** We're under Services to Municipalities and I would ask the Minister whether he could provide us with an explanation as to the services provided by the Municipal Department to municipalities.

**MR. GOURLAY:** Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Under this branch they provide counselling services to all municipalities throughout the province.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** What type of counselling services?

**MR. GOURLAY:** With respect to administration. I think it briefly gives some details; principally in the areas of municipal administration and data collection.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** How many people does the Minister have on staff to provide those services?

**MR. GOURLAY:** Thirty-one.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Does this service include suggestions with respect to municipal planning, land use planning?

**MR. GOURLAY:** No.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Lac du Bonnet was on the list. It was vacant so I passed him up. The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. SAMUEL USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I didn't hear the Minister respond to the comments of the Member for Inkster but I wish to add to those comments and I would like to ask the Minister whether or not he intends to continue with the policy of having Richard Andries continue as Administrator of the LGD of Alexander, despite the facts that have

Thursday, 5 June, 1980

been presented to him, both by his officials and, indeed, by members of this committee. That's No. 1.

No. 2, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister whether he has received a second letter from Mr. Vincent today, challenging the Minister's remarks which he made in the House a couple of days ago, as to whether or not he would have taken the positions that he had taken had he not been ill. —(Interjection)— That's right. Now the Minister made that statement in the knowledge that Mr. Vincent is a candidate in the current election campaign in the LGD of Alexander. Mr. Chairman, if that is erroneous information, then what it appears to me as, a situation where somewhere along the way the staff of the department, in informing the Minister, is actually meddling in the electoral process of the LGD because it is now made to appear that Mr. Vincent is not of stable mind or body or whatever it is since, from the Minister's statement, he's changing his mind almost every day.

Now Mr. Vincent had indicated yesterday that he was very upset with the Minister's statement as he saw it, on the TV network or wherever it was in the media, and that he was writing the Minister a letter pointing out to the Minister that is not his position; that everything in this letter he still stands behind. Mr. Chairman, if the Minister has again misinformed the committee, and indeed Manitobans, on this issue, I suggest he owes the candidate, Mr. Vincent, an apology for creating problems for him in the election, for intruding himself into that election by making erroneous statements as to the position of Mr. Vincent on this particular issue.

We would like to know from the Minister whether he intends to continue having Mr. Andries administer the affairs of the LGD. Mr. Chairman, I'm not satisfied with the argument the Minister presents; that he is understaffed or short of staff and he can't do anything about that situation; because he has the option, since he has a number of administrators, of transferring administrators both ways, one out of the LGD and one into the LGD without increasing any staff or without having to wait for the hiring process, to add to staff in order to facilitate the problems in the LGD.

There's a tremendous amount of elasticity within the Department of Municipal Affairs and, Mr. Chairman, it might interest the committee to know, that while the Minister does not have manpower to spare, that his manpower besides Richard Andries, happened to be at the LGD almost every day in the last few weeks, almost every day, other than Richard Andries. So, Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister ought to clean up his act. There is an election under way in the LGD and it ought to be a clean election and the Minister should not be involved in influencing the results of that election. He should not have an administrator there involved as an administrator during the election process, who was responsible for causing the election in the first place, or played a role in it. So, Mr. Chairman, there's an awful lot that we expect from this Minister in terms of corrective measures, to make that election decent, above board and beyond suspicion; because if the present administrator continues to work at that LGD during the course of the election campaign, no matter which way that election goes, no matter who the winner is,

there are going to be arguments as to the role of the department in that election.

**MR. GREEN:** You don't understand rural politics.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I believe the Minister should appreciate the gravity of the situation in the LGD.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, I really think that the Minister has to tell this committee that this gentleman, Mr. Andries, is not going to be involved in that local government district and if I were the Minister, I would not have him involved in any local government district. Mr. Chairman, now I have advice from people who are in rural politics. — (Interjection)— If I didn't know before I have now several members, the Member for The Pas, the Member for Rossmere, the Member for Lac du Bonnet, who have some knowledge of rural politics and I find that the same kind of thing can happen in rural politics as in any other politics, which is what I suspected in the first place. I said that there are difficulties in every political arena, whether it's the Local Government District of Alexander or the city of Winnipeg or any other place, or Emerson as the case may be, and the only point I was making is that the local government district administrator should not be an initiator of the elimination of a council. Is that such an astonishing proposition? Or does the Minister agree with the Member for Emerson that local government district administrators should be upsetting the councils that they are responsible to? If that's the case, if that is the declared position of the Conservative administration, that it is quite open to a local government administrator to engage in a conspiracy with a minority on council, to usurp the council, put it on the record and we will know that and we will tell the people of Emerson that that is the policy of the Conservative party. If it's not the policy of the Conservative party, then get rid of that local government district administrator. Do not permit him to continue. If you don't then we have to question whether the Minister is properly dealing with those people.

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

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Chairman, I agree with the Member for Inkster that the Minister ought to be making a reply to what's been occurring here in the last hour and I would urge the Minister to do so.

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

**MR. GOURLAY:** Mr. Chairman, I'd be pleased to make some comments with respect to the situation, the comments from the Member for Lac du Bonnet. He indicated that the statements that I made in the House would be damaging to the election chances of certain people in the LGD of Alexander. I can only say that the questions and the persistence of the members opposite in bringing this matter before the media on a twice weekly basis for the last three or

four weeks, has probably done more damage to the situation out there than I can comment.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** The truth always hurts.

**MR. GOURLAY:** However, I must say that I have tried to comply with the wishes of the local people. They insisted that there should be an election so there could be a quorum to enable the LGD to administer their own affairs. The by-elections were called and the election for the one remaining seat will be held, I believe it's on the 11th of June. The situation with Richard Andries, the council passed a resolution at their meeting yesterday and it gave three readings to a bylaw appointing Richard Andries as Returning Officer without any discussion or comment.

Now you're raising a fuss and stink here and yet none of the council members there saw fit to argue or discuss this appointment. I can also tell you that I wish to have Richard Andries transferred out of that area as soon as possible and as soon as we can sit down with the LGD council and come up with a satisfactory replacement. I would expect we would have to advertise for a new man because under the collective agreement we have with the other LGDs, we just can't up and transfer an administrator from Grand Rapids or from Snow Lake or from Churchill that quickly and I'm not sure that that's what I want to do in any case. But I would like to have officials from my department discuss the situation with the local government district officials so that there will be some agreement on a replacement for Richard Andries, at the earliest possible date.

I think that it's advisable that under the situation that has existed there, not in the last three or four months, but obviously the Member for The Pas was aware that this man, he caused trouble in Grand Rapids and it was under the previous administration that transferred him to the LGD of Alexander. So I can tell you that we are concerned with the situation, we would like to see things returned to reasonably normal circumstances in the LGD of Alexander and we're prepared to sit down with the LGD Council and get this resolved as quickly as possible.

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

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, I was distracted by the Member for Rock Lake. Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure that the Minister really understands the point that was being made, in fact he couldn't understand the point in light of the comments that he made. The problem is, Mr. Chairman, that we have —(Interjection)— I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, the assistance I am getting from the Member for Portage La Prairie, who wants me to call you 'chairman', Mr. Chairman. If I may continue, Mr. Chairman, I will. Mr. Chairman — Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that the Minister understands the situation, Mr. Chairman, because the issue before us right now is the fact that there was in the local political situation a conspiracy to overthrow the council and get a new council. That conspiracy was led by the LGD administrator.

Mr. Chairman, the fact that the Minister mentioned that that particular administrator was transferred before, Mr. Chairman, I don't think is

very relevant, because it is my understanding from the people within the department and from people at Grand Rapids who had insisted that he be transferred out of Grand Rapids, that the administrator did a good job when he was transferred there, that Mr. Andries did a good job. That he listened to the council, that he followed the council direction and I was not aware of problems in that local government district with the way Mr. Andries was behaving, until recently, until my colleague for Rossmere informed me that some of the old patterns had emerged again. But it appears that the disciplinary action that was taken before had worked and that the administrator had carried on quite satisfactorily.

Mr. Chairperson, I don't think that this committee can let this item pass by, unless the Minister indicates his willingness to take some definite, concrete action. There is an election going on right now. The Minister's statements in the House affect that election. The appointment of Mr. Andries as the returning officer affects the outcome of that election. And, Mr. Chairperson, since the Minister has had one of his departmental officials there almost every day, for the last two weeks anyway, it seems that there is within the department the manpower necessary to replace Mr. Andries at this time, and I think that's the only option open to the Minister and if he could reassure the committee that that's his intention, I'm sure the committee would let the matter go.

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

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Chairman, I had a question for the Minister. Could he advise as to what the moving arrangements are this time. Who will be paying for the house, if anybody?

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

**MR. GOURLAY:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With respect to the moving costs and the house situation, that would be borne by the Municipal Affairs Department.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Could the Minister explain why it is that now it is that department which will be bearing the cost and just about two years it was supposed to be the local taxpayers of the LGD of Alexander who were to bear that cost?

**MR. GOURLAY:** Mr. Chairman, I was not the Minister of the day, I'm not sure why they would want that stipulation at that time.

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

**MR. USKIW:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, there are a number of questions that I have to raise since the Minister is not committed to the only direction which would make some sense and that is to take the parties that have a conflict of interest out of the arena. Can the Minister assure, and how can he assure this committee, that notwithstanding the fact that the LGD administrator was indeed involved, and he admits that he was involved, in pursuit of an action which resulted in the

demise of the council, can he today assure us, in some way, that the same person is not going to, in any way, interfere with the election process under way to fill that council vacancy that now exists. How can he assure us that, Mr. Chairman, is the first question?

The second question I have is that despite the results of the election, in the LGD, and despite the wishes of the LGD Council subsequent to the election, is the Minister committed, irrevocably, with his policy of moving the LGD administrator out of that district?

**MR. GOURLAY:** I'll be prepared to comply with the wishes of the LGD Council.

**MR. USKIW:** Ah, well! Well, Mr. Chairman, that tells us everything now. Mr. Chairman, I'm going to ask for the Minister to resign on this one. Mr. Chairman, we have here a situation where his staff member had done in a whole council, he's put in there to administer the affairs, he's going to be kept there to influence the results of the election, in the hopes that he gets a three to two situation, in order that he will be reinstated as the LGD Administrator for Alexander. That's what the Minister just said. Mr. Chairman, he's saying he's going to go along with the wishes of the council, even though he may accept the fact that the results of this election are influenced by his administrator. Mr. Chairman, this is disgusting.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, the Member for Roblin says we put him there. I can tell you that I did not know the name of Andries until I was told about this event, and is the Member for Roblin saying that because we appointed an administrator, we are responsible for every wrong act that he commits for time immemorial? Because, Mr. Chairman, that's another Progressive Conservative, you know — (Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, you know, it's like the Conservatives who up until 1977 said everything that we did was wrong and starting in 1977 they said everything that we did is right and we were a model government and they are going to follow what we are doing.

**A MEMBER:** No way. No way.

**MR. GREEN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, that's what the Member for Roblin said.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister has just again indicated, either naivete or lack of knowledge of rural politics. He says that they gave three readings to a by-law appointing him as the returning officer. The reason, Mr. Chairman, that I suggested that occurred is that he was the local government district administrator and the returning officer is the local government district administrator. He was the man that was there, they don't hire a new man, he has been the person that the department has assigned to be there, so they have named him the returning officer. Not because they want Andries, and even if they did, the complaint that I am making as a member of this Legislature is that the Minister cannot approbate in any way — that's what the Member for Lac du Bonnet tried to point out — cannot approbate in any way the continuance of a

civil servant in that area who has himself involved himself in the machinations of the politics which the Minister says he's going to follow in determining whether he will be there or not.

The only way that the Minister can resolve this situation is to say, regardless of what the municipal council says, and regardless of what turns out, I, the Minister of Municipal Affairs will not tolerate an administrator who behaves in that way. Now is the Minister saying that he will tolerate these actions, because the actions have themselves influenced the affair. The Member for Emerson says that it's the opposition who are now interfering with local politics in the Local Government District of Alexander. That's true, Mr. Chairman, we are. We say, that it is intolerable to have a local government district council manipulated by the Municipal Affairs civil servant. We say that that's intolerable. We say that that affects local government district politics in the province of Manitoba. And the Member for Lac du Bonnet makes a very strong point if the Minister says that he's going to let this go through and if the council, that they get, hopefully, says that they want Andries, he's going to let that government district administrator — (Interjection)— that's exactly what he said. That's exactly what he said.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Lac du Bonnet asked a specific question — can he assure us that this local government district administrator will be there regardless of the new election; the Minister answered I will try to follow the wishes of the council. That was his answer. And I'm suggesting to you that the local government district administrator has been involved in the politics whereby he seeks his own appointment. That is intolerable, Mr. Chairman, and if the Minister chooses to behave in that way, then the Member for Lac du Bonnet is perfectly right, that the Minister should resign, because we cannot, the members on this side, say that we will have a Department of Municipal Affairs that is administered in that way.

**MR. GOURLAY:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it clear then, obviously I didn't get my message across to the members opposite. I said that I already have complied with the wishes of the council, it's already a known fact that Richard Andries will be transferred, he's in place now and they agreed unanimously to put him there and he will be transferred. I'm complying with the councils' wishes; he'll be in place until we can relocate him and that will be as soon as possible, as soon as we can sit down with the LGD Council and work out a satisfactory replacement for him. I've said that two or three times already, so I don't know how you could be confused with what I'm saying now.

**MR. GREEN:** Well then, Mr. Chairman, I have only one further question. Why is he there now? Knowing what we do know, why is he there now? And if the Minister answers, that is the wish of the council, I say that answer is not satisfactory because the Minister cannot agree to have a local government district administrator there who has behaved this way with respect to the council. Now I don't know what the wishes of the council are, what I do know is what this administrator has done vis-a-vis the council and the



Thursday, 5 June, 1980

Minister had no business reappointing him to that council.

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

**MR. SCHROEDER:** The Minister just finished saying that he would comply with the wishes of council. I would like then to ask him whether, if the new council requests that the motion to transfer Richard Andries be rescinded, he will comply with that request?

**MR. GOURLAY:** Well, that would be something I guess that would be considered if it occurred but as far as I'm concerned Richard Andries will be transferred because that is the wishes of the council right now.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Chairman, in the Minister's answer he stated that that would be considered, that is the Minister would consider a request by the council to rescind its earlier request to transfer Richard Andries. I again ask the Minister, in the event that he receives that type of request, after these elections are finished, will he accede to that request and not transfer Richard Andries?

**MR. GOURLAY:** Mr. Chairman, I read from the members opposite that they would wish that I would disregard the wishes of council in this case. If a resolution came in unanimously agreeing that Richard Andries should remain there, you are saying that I should disregard that advice?

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate it if the Minister did not put words in my mouth. I know that it will be one sweet long time before you would get a resolution unanimous from that current group to keep Richard Andries in the LGD of Alexander. The question I asked was, and it doesn't have to be unanimous, if there was a resolution passed by a majority of the LGD of Alexander council, requesting that the Minister keep Richard Andries in the LGD of Alexander, passed August 1, 1980, will the Minister accede to that request?

**MR. GOURLAY:** I would have to say that it would be very doubtful that Richard Andries would be in LGD of Alexander after August 1st.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Chairman, I will try it again. Within a matter of a few days, I believe it's June 11th, there will be an election in the LGD of Alexander and we will then have five councillors. If that council, at its first meeting after that election, which is well before August 1st, 1980, passes a resolution asking the Minister to keep Richard Andries in the LGD of Alexander, will he accede to that request?

**MR. GOURLAY:** I will consider that when it comes before me. Right now it's hypothetical.

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

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, the statement of the Minister, in my opinion is irresponsible. It is not

worthy of his office. It is not the kind of answer you would expect from a responsible government or responsible department, and if the Minister isn't sure of his position on this issue, I would have expected that the least he would do is say, let me think this one over till tomorrow morning if he's not sure. I would give him till tomorrow morning. But in the absence of that, Mr. Chairman, if he is adamant on this point, then, Mr. Chairman, this Minister should resign. He doesn't know what's happening. He doesn't know what his department is doing. He doesn't know what his staff are doing. He doesn't appreciate the implications of the wrongdoing that has already taken place on the part of his staff members. —(Interjection)— Yes, there is no question about that, Mr. Chairman. There is no question about that. Anyone who wants to look at the history of the LGD of Alexander, I can tell you, a book can be written about it. Let's understand, Mr. Chairman, that the person who is in question here originally fired the person who is the reeve that was suspended by this Minister. It goes away back, Mr. Chairman. The person was fired by Richard Andries. That person ran for office and became his boss as reeve of the council. This administrator is manipulating to undo the choice of the people of the LGD of Alexander. That's what's involved. There has been an election. Either you respect the results of an election, Mr. Chairman, or you don't. Now obviously this Minister does not respect the results of the election of three years ago, or two-and-a-half years ago. If that election is going to be changed, it will be changed in October of this year, Mr. Chairman, but it shouldn't be changed by the manipulations of the Department of Municipal Affairs. That should not occur. And if the Minister doesn't see that, he has no business serving for the people of Manitoba as Minister of the Crown.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 5.(b)—pass. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding 824,400 for Municipal Affairs—pass.

Resolution 98, 6.(a)—pass — The Member for Rossmere.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Could the Minister explain the Municipal Planning Services provided in the last year for the municipalities?

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

**MR. GOURLAY:** I didn't quite hear your question.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Could the Minister give an outline as to the activities of the Municipal Planning Branch in the past year?

**MR. GOURLAY:** Mr. Chairman, this service provides advisory planning services to the various municipalities involved in the province. The function of the branch falls into two general categories; the Planning Advisory Service to local government, and then there's the Planning Advisory Service to the provincial government.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Could the Minister advise as to the number of applications for subdivision received

Thursday, 5 June, 1980

by municipalities or by this branch in the last twelve months?

**MR. GOURLAY:** From April 1, 1979 to March 31st, 1980, there were 1,722. Approved were 1,463; rejected 228.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** How many are pending?

**MR. GOURLAY:** Approximately 1,014.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Could the minister provide us with the position of the government at the current time as to the requirements which are to be met in order that an application for subdivision will be approved? That is, what is your basic policy on land use planning at this time?

**MR. GOURLAY:** They have to conform to locally adopted provincial policies.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** And what happens where you don't have locally adopted provincial policies?

**MR. GOURLAY:** The provincial land use policies apply.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** What are the provincial land use policies? That was my first question.

**MR. GOURLAY:** There is publication available on this.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Is that the policy which was set about two years ago by the then Minister in charge, Mr. Jorgenson?

**MR. GOURLAY:** Yes, that's correct.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** And is the Minister saying that is the policy which is currently followed strictly by his department?

**MR. GOURLAY:** It's the guideline that's used.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Chairman, I'm sure we're all aware that there are a great deal of difficulties involved in assessing subdivision applications out in rural areas. I would like to refer the Minister specifically to an application. I don't have the application number, but I am advised that there was a subdivision approved for a number of lots between Fraserwood and Gimli. There were some 20 lots or so. Is the Minister familiar with that subdivision? Pardon me?

**MR. GOURLAY:** Yes.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** The Minister also, with respect to that subdivision, might recollect receiving a letter from one William Halabura, who is a hog farmer in the vicinity of this particular subdivision?

**MR. GOURLAY:** Yes.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Can the Minister advise as to the class of land which was involved in this subdivision?

**MR. GOURLAY:** That is with respect to 12 lot subdivision?

**MR. SCHROEDER:** That sounds about right. It's within a mile or less, about half a mile of Mr. Halabura's farm.

**MR. GOURLAY:** I don't have the exact classification, but it was grazing property. It wasn't considered prime agricultural land.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Chairman, is it not correct that the current agricultural policy is that all lands of class 1, 2, 3 and 4 are considered agricultural, and if not, what is the policy?

**MR. GOURLAY:** These are some questions that should be directed to the Minister of Agriculture.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** I would hope that the Municipal Planning Branch, within its department, would have some knowledge as to what kind of land should be subdivided and what shouldn't, but I will go back to that letter from Mr. Halabura, which I believe the Minister has a copy of. He's a hog farmer, who has been involved in farming basically all his life. One of the concerns he has is: The current land and subdivision issues make it unsafe to expand for fear of being shut down, yet I produce 230 weanlings monthly and do not desire to disrupt production for it takes three years to develop it. The provincial government has not restricted absorption of large 80-acre parcels of agricultural land for residential use. The hog manure valued at 6 cents per gallon in liquid form should be dumped on agricultural land as a very cheap and effective fertilizer source, but residential encroachment will lead to conflicting use of this source. Now of course, his hog ranch is within about a half a mile of this 12-lot residential subdivision. I am wondering whether the Minister has any comments. And incidentally, the hog ranch is northwest of the subdivision, and I am sure the Minister is familiar with the prevailing winds in this province. Does he have any comments on that?

**MR. GOURLAY:** When applications are received for subdivisions, the various departments that might have some concerns or inputs receive copies of these for their perusal and comments and decisions with respect to the use of this land.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Is the Minister saying that this type of mixing of residential and agricultural operations is one that has no concern to him?

**MR. GOURLAY:** Yes, it is of much concern, and this is why the various departments are circulated with the information so that they can respond with respect to the various concerns that each department might see fit to respond.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** The Minister is also aware, I am sure, of the situation in the Rural Municipality of Rockwood, where several farmers, John and Stan Fox, who are on a hog farm, which has been in existence since 1890, are being threatened with closure. They're being asked to wind down their operation. They've been on there since 1890. That's a long time. One of the problems that we face is are

these encroachments of these residential lots into the heart of the agricultural lands of the province; especially within 40 or 50 miles of the city it's a serious problem. I certainly would hope that the Minister and his department would very seriously consider the impact of these kinds of residential subdivisions on farming operations. It wasn't that many years ago that several other hog operations were closed down, one on Henderson Highway about five miles, not even five miles, several miles south of Lockport, Manitoba, Springfield Hog Farm was shut down. These types of cases, I would submit, are rather upsetting, especially when you consider some of the other costs involved in these basically unplanned rural subdivisions. I would like the Minister's comment on that.

**MR. GOURLAY:** Mr. Chairman, this is why the provincial land use policies were put in place, to try and protect the interests of various types of farming operations and whatever.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Back to that specific subdivision between Fraserwood and Gimli, could the Minister advise as to how many unsold vacant lots there are in that particular area, and if not, it seems to me that one of the requirements of your planning policy is that there should be some demand for these lots. If there is no such information in your department then I ask you, why not?

**MR. GOURLAY:** One of the stipulations is that we request information with respect to demand for such residential rural lots on these subdivisions. There has to be demonstrated demand for this type of subdivision.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Chairman, I find that to be an interesting statement and it's one which, quite frankly, isn't supported by the facts in most of the subdivision applications in this province. I would refer the Minister to a subdivision application which was recently conditionally approved in the LGD of Piney for 15 lots, something like that. Certainly in that particular instance — I don't know, maybe the Minister has some information with respect to salability in that area — but certainly in that instance there was no request made of the developer to provide that information and I'm just wondering whether that is . . . I suggest to the Minister that is not a standard practice of his branch.

**MR. GOURLAY:** I should perhaps clarify that earlier statement, that we do take into consideration the advice and views of the local council in these matters as well with respect to their concerns.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** With all due respect, Mr. Chairman, we either have a land use policy in the province or we don't. And if we have it, then surely the municipal planning branch ought to be following that policy in determining whether it approves or rejects subdivision applications. If it is not going to follow that policy, you might as well get rid of the whole works of them. If you're going to follow it, then do it properly. And if one of your conditions is to determine the salability of those lots, then surely it is up to your department to make sure that that is

information that you have available before you approve the subdivision application.

**MR. GOURLAY:** Yes. With respect to the planning as was mentioned earlier, the various departments are circulated and if they follow the land use and if they have concerns, they'll report them back to the planning branch, if they feel that there's some good reasons why, in their department, they feel that the subdivision should be turned down.

These policies are applied over the province. There's some general applications applied and we depend heavily on the various departments to bring forth their concerns to the planning.

### POINT OF PRIVILEGE

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Inkster on a point of privilege.

**MR. GREEN:** Yes, it's a point of privilege because the Minister indicated that Mr. Vincent did not confirm the statements that he has made. I was just walking out of the building and went to the place where my letters are and I have a letter dated June 4. It appears to be a copy of a letter sent to the Honourable Doug Gourlay, Legislative Buildings, Winnipeg, Manitoba, dated June 4, St. George, Manitoba. In response to your remarks in the Legislature about the transfer of R.A. Andries, I feel you twisted my words. Surely you are aware that there is a by-election coming up in Alexander, Ward 3, in which I am a candidate. Either you are playing games or you are protecting someone. I made a statement of true fact in your office and in the letter tabled in the Legislature and printed in the press. I have no reason to change that statement and I will not change it for anyone. Yours truly, Edgar Vincent. A copy to the media and to all MLAs, so I bring that to the attention of the members.

**MR. GOURLAY:** It's interesting you should receive it before the Minister.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, it could be — I was a Minister and I know that mail sometimes takes a little while to get to a ministerial desk. Mine is a copy, it's not a letter to me and it's indicated to the media and to all the members.

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

**HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel):** Mr. Chairman, on the same point of privilege. I think if I'm not mistaken that was the same matter that was raised in the question period today and the Minister answered at that point.

**A MEMBER:** What's that got to do with it?

**MR. GREEN:** So what? I'm now producing a letter which was sent to me, which I have produced and tabled.

**MR. CRAIK:** No. Mr. Chairman, on the point of privilege, what the Member for Inkster has demonstrated, that he's quite prepared to raise a point of privilege so that the Minister could not have

Thursday, 5 June, 1980

replied it, having gone back to his mail after the question period today and come back in the normal course of events, and answered it tomorrow.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Inkster on the same point of privilege.

**MR. GREEN:** Yes. It is my duty, Mr. Chairman, and I will not hold anything back. I was going out of the building; I picked up two letters; one is from the Overview; the other one has got no return address and I wish to bring it to the attention of the Minister. I'm not suggesting he received it. I'm not suggesting he knows about it. But I want to indicate to him that such a letter has been sent.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister on the same point of privilege.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Chairman, that same information was brought to the attention of the Minister in the question period today.

**MR. GREEN:** I was not in question period today. I was not aware of any letter.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Chairman, nobody else here is responsible for his absence from the question period except himself. I just pointed out that it was raised in the question period today.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, if a letter was read in the House of similar to what I have just read, I will apologize; but I am advised that no such letter was read and that the Minister of Finance is making a specious point. I have done my duty. I am supposed to do it at the first opportunity, which I have done.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Chair would recognize a point of privilege and maybe we better return to the subject matter and the next one on the list was — if Rossmere is finished or not — the Honourable Member for Rossmere.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Could the Minister advise what is the procedure followed by the municipal planning branch where a rejection of theirs is appealed to the municipal board?

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

**MR. GOURLAY:** Where the application is rejected the parties are advised that the case will be presented to the municipal board. The municipal board is advised to hold a hearing at such time as the various departments prepare their information, or case, to be presented at the hearing.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Could the Minister explain why, on occasion, when the . . . well, we'll start at the beginning. A person comes in and makes an application for a subdivision at one of your branch offices. It is reviewed. It is sent out to your various government departments and then it is sent on to the municipality involved with the recommendation of the municipal planning branch. The municipality then, makes a decision. If it's a negative decision, well that's the end of your job. If it's a positive decision,

then it's up to your branch to determine whether it will accede to the wishes of the municipality or whether it will override that approval and nevertheless reject. When you do reject and there is an appeal from your objection, is it not true that at least on occasion in the past year, once the objection is raised to the municipal board your planning branch backs off and in fact accedes to the request for the subdivision approval?

**MR. GOURLAY:** Not unless there was new information brought forward at the time that it would have some bearing on the reversal of the decision.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** I will refer you to a specific case in the Rural Municipality of Brokenhead where precisely that occurred within the last six months or so. In fact, I wrote the letter asking for a hearing by the municipal board on behalf of an individual and very shortly thereafter we were notified that the application for subdivision was now being approved, without a hearing, without going to the municipal board. There was a reversal of decision by your branch and I would like to know the process by which that reversal of decision was made and what, if any, new information was provided?

**MR. GOURLAY:** In that particular situation, there was a reversal of a decision by the Department of Agriculture.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Could the Minister explain whether that reversal of decision was based on a request from the municipal planning branch or from the municipal department?

**MR. GOURLAY:** The situation was reviewed internally by the Department of Agriculture and they reversed their decision on it.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Would the Minister agree with the proposition that in the past year or so, since he has become Minister, there have been some suggestions that at least within the Department of Agriculture that its role has been downgraded, that the individuals involved in making assessments are feeling more and more that their assessment is worthless, and that the municipal planning branch is not prepared to back them up?

**MR. GOURLAY:** Mr. Chairman, I would say that question would be more appropriately put to the Minister of Agriculture. I'm not in a position to assess whether the Department of Agriculture has been downgrading the planning process.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** That's fine, I'll pass if the Leader wants to go.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk):** Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if he can advise the process that is undertaken pertaining to public reserves along rivers at the present time. What is the government policy?

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

**MR. GOURLAY:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, there's an internal review looking at that question right now and they're preparing a report to be brought before the PLUC Committee shortly.

**MR. PAWLEY:** I wonder if the Minister could advise me that until such time as the review is completed, what is the policy or the position of the government?

**MR. GOURLAY:** There's been no change with respect to public reserves along rivers.

**MR. PAWLEY:** What is that . . . ?

**MR. GOURLAY:** It's left to the discretion of the local municipality as to the amount of reserve that they would request; or if there's some special concerns that the province through the planning branch has in that particular given area. The is the current policy on that and has been in effect for some time.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Could the Minister advise in what instances would the province exercise an interest?

**MR. GOURLAY:** In the case where there was a hazard to public health or safety.

**MR. PAWLEY:** I want to ask the Minister if, in a certain case in which a public reserve has been allowed along a river in the past, and a further subdivision is developed along that river, would the policy of the department be to insist upon a continuation of that reserve so that the public reserve could be continued along the river, especially if the reserve originally was established for purposes of a bicycle path or some other form of public activity?

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

**MR. GOURLAY:** That question is being addressed at the present time, but if you could be more specific, we could come back to it.

**MR. PAWLEY:** I would like to refer the Minister to an example he may be quite familiar with, within Swan River, where there is a public reserve which was commenced along Swan River, I believe north and east of the town back in the mid-Seventies, for a bicycle path. Subsequent, and I understand within the last year, a further subdivision has been approved without the requirement for the public reserve, so that in fact the long term object, which was a bicycle path leading through the public reserve right into the town of Swan River can no longer take place because of a change in policy. I wonder if the Minister could advise why that would have taken place.

**MR. GOURLAY:** This would be because of a local council decision in that particular area.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Is the Minister indicating that the Planning Branch or the department would have no input in a situation such as that to insist that the public reserve be continued if it is consistent with some original purposes that were established at the

time that the public reserve was first established along, for instance, that river?

**MR. GOURLAY:** Advice would be provided by the planning service to the local municipality.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Can the Minister advise what the advice of the Planning Branch was in this particular case?

**MR. GOURLAY:** No, but we could provide that information, I'm sure. I'm not personally aware of the situation. It was not brought to my attention; I'm not familiar with it.

**MR. PAWLEY:** I'll leave with the Minister a diagram of the area in question.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 6.(a)—pass — the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I was curious to develop some discussion on the business of marketability of subdivision lots. As I understand, the Minister's response was, that marketability is a criteria that is used before additional ones are approved. I would like to know from the Minister just what he means by marketability.

**MR. GOURLAY:** It's one of the provisions where there has been a lot of subdivisions and vacant lots, and this stipulation is one of the requirements.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, it's a bit of an amusing one to me, in that what we are really setting up then, as I understand it, is a marketing board for developers. That's really what the Minister is saying, that we will restrict the number of lots because we have X number of lots not yet sold from previous approvals. What that is doing is giving not a market approach to the sales of lots in this province, but rather a monopoly approach, and I can't understand a government that believes in the market philosophy intruding into the marketplace in such a way as to deny a prospective homeowner the right to buy in a competitive market. I would like the Minister to explain why, with respect to lots for homes, that his policy and philosophy would be to deny to a potential homeowner the right to buy his choice of land in a competitive market.

**MR. GOURLAY:** Mr. Chairman, this is only one of many stipulations. It's not the only one.

**MR. USKIW:** I understand there are too many, but this is one.

**MR. GOURLAY:** A good example I could give is in the R.M. of Springfield, where there are some in excess of 3,000 vacant lots available, and certainly for a new application to come in, in an area where there was that many vacant lots, I think would have some bearing on the approval or disapproval.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I would to ask the Minister whether, in his view, that if there are fewer lots available, whether that makes them cheaper or more expensive to the potential buyer, because I'm interested in people who want to buy a lot and build

Thursday, 5 June, 1980

a home on it at a most reasonable price. I would ask from the Minister whether in his opinion a restriction on the number of lots tends to increase the price of the lot or tends to decrease it.

**MR. GOURLAY:** Mr. Chairman, using the Springfield example, I'm sure with that many vacant lots, it's not going to affect the price very much.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I truly believe, unless the price of lots comes down in value, then we don't enough lots on the market, and that's why I raised the question, how does the Minister determine a marketability and desirability of the number of lots that are available from time to time, given the fact that we have had high interest rates, we have had a tremendous number of lots approved over the years, and yet the price of those lots are not coming down. So it seems to me that if the marketplace is going to do the job, we have to have more of them available in order to bring the prices to a level where people can afford to buy them.

**MR. GOURLAY:** Mr. Chairman, using the concept that you're putting forth at this time, I guess if we subdivided the whole province, we would have pretty darn cheap lots.

**MR. USKIW:** You might have some cheaper lots, that's right.

**MR. GOURLAY:** That would be very unreasonable and something that we couldn't consider, but we are trying to cut down on the cost of lots by sporadic development all over the place. This is another stipulation, that we probably are making it less expensive by controlling the number of lots, rather than making it cheaper by developing lots all over the place where various services would have to be supplied and so forth.

**MR. USKIW:** I presume then that the Minister has up-to-date information, not only on the number of lots and where they are located, but as to their value. Perhaps he would want to relate to this committee the value of the half-acre lot or the quarter-acre lot as compared to any given time prior to the introduction of his planning authority and restriction on the number of lots. In other words, can he demonstrate that his policy is having a beneficial impact on the price of lots in Manitoba?

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

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Chairman, that figure of 3,000 lots in Springfield is one that we've heard. I see there is a lot of waving here. That figure of 3,000 lots in Springfield, we've heard about that over the years, and I think that the people in the department would agree with me that a lot of those of lots, most of them, were made by description, and they were made prior to the Municipal Planning Act coming into effect. They were made helter skelter; they were made in areas where nobody had any logical hope of selling these lots to anyone who had any sense for residential lots. Now, let us compare those lots to lots, say, in the Anola area where you have some bush, where you have a well-planned subdivision and

you have practically immediate sale. At least you did a couple of years ago, but right now, the market is somewhat soft. But to suggest that because we have 3,000 lots, many of them 10 acres, many of them 15, some of them 20 acres, many of them on country roads which nobody really has proper access to, at least not the people who have to come to work every day in the city; to suggest that is a fair reason not to allow a residential subdivision in areas which are not suitable for agriculture and which are suitable for residential subdivision, is just simply not correct.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Sport and Recreation.

**HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye):** Mr. Chairman, I guess all of us representing rural constituencies close to Metropolitan Winnipeg are wrestling with the Planning Act, and have been wrestling with it ever since it was introduced and even before that. I think one of the things that has to be brought out before the Planning Act was introduced, anybody could do just about anything they wanted to and didn't even need a municipal authority to do that. So if you want to pursue the Member for Lac du Bonnet's analogy, what you would see is, if we hadn't had a Planning Act, we would have had awfully cheap lots, because you could have done anything. When the now Leader of the Opposition introduced that Planning Act, there was much debate on it and it has caused some problems, and I guess we all knew it would. But I would urge the Minister, in talking to my own municipal people and talking to people in rural Manitoba, that his department, as well as the Department of Agriculture and the other government departments, advised municipal councils, don't undertake the authority of the Act to go ahead and make arbitrary rulings and impose what they think is best for the people in rural Manitoba. The municipal councils, many of them, know their area, know it well, know what is good agricultural land, what isn't good agricultural land. I think one of the problems that we have had in the past is the constant hassle of them passing a subdivision and then either Agriculture or somebody saying, no, you can't do it.

Mr. Chairman, I've gone through a number of cases, where I've had to go out with my polaroid camera and take pictures of the rocks personally to prove to the people involved that that was not good agricultural land. So, Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that I believe that we are moving along in a good path. Before the Planning Act, we had some real problems, and in my constituency, people were building without access to roads, without telephones, without hydro. Some people who built in the bush didn't have hydro and telephone and then wanted the service later. This has been curbed now, because the municipalities are taking a responsible approach to the thing. But I don't want to see the government getting involved and telling municipal councillors after they have made the decision and agonized over their decisions, whether or not that particular subdivision should go ahead or not. I would urge the Minister to make sure that common sense prevails in this whole thing and that we don't have some people in either Provincial Planning or Agriculture or someplace telling the municipal councils what they

Thursday, 5 June, 1980

can do. They were elected to represent the local people. Given certain guidelines, they are all becoming more aware of the problems that face us with regard to the shrinking agricultural lands and that. But they do have common sense; they do relate to their people; I believe the authority should rest with them and we shouldn't be going around challenging them at the Municipal Board every time they make a decision.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Chairman, of course, we can't challenge the positive decision of the municipality at the Municipal Board. It would only be a negative decision by the Municipal Planning Branch which would be challenged there. I would agree with the previous speaker with respect to the positive effect of the Planning Act. I can understand the logic of saying we have to take a look at demand before we approve a subdivision application, for the very simple reason that we cannot afford to have one or two lots sold on a subdivision and have a road put in there and have a school bus come in there and have everything else, all the services, and not make use of the entire piece of property. So there is some sense in that. But, again, I would that we should be careful when we talk about 3,000 empty lots, to avoid exaggerating the position in a municipality such as Springfield, because the fact of the matter is that when you start looking at marketable lots, decent lots, there's not that many available.

I would like to move on to the matter of staffing of rural Municipal Planning Branch offices. Have there been any transfers, especially in the eastern district of Manitoba, in the last year?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 6.(a)—pass; — the Member for Rossmere.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** I was hoping that the Minister would answer the question with respect to transfers of personnel in the Municipal Planning Branch in the eastern area of the province. I'm thinking specifically of how many people have been transferred from Steinbach to Beausejour, for instance.

**MR. GOURLAY:** Several people from Beausejour were transferred to Steinbach when the new planning district office was opened in Steinbach November 16, 1979.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** How many people were employed in Beausejour prior to that and how many are employed there now?

**MR. GOURLAY:** There were ten, there are now seven.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Prior to that move, how many were there in Steinbach and how many are there now?

**MR. GOURLAY:** There were none in Steinbach prior to the opening of the office; there are now six.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Then how about Winnipeg? Is this branch growing or is it declining in size?

**MR. GOURLAY:** In Winnipeg we had 83, we now have 80.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** The Minister provided figures for last year's applications and approvals and rejections and pendings. Could he provide comparable figures for the year before that so that we can have something to compare them with? That is, are we going down or are we stabilizing in the rate of applications?

**MR. GOURLAY:** During the year 1976, that's from the calendar year, there were 1,933 applications; in 1977 the same calendar year, there were 2,128; and in the year 1978 there were 2,031; and this past year, 1,722.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** These are individual applications? They're not numbers of lots? Does the Minister have the numbers of actual sub-divided lots?

**MR. GOURLAY:** For an example, in the year 1977 there was an approximate total lots approved of 6,757. We don't have it for any of the other years.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Could the Minister advise as to whether recreational sub-divisions are on the increase or decrease, or where are we with them?

**MR. GOURLAY:** I'm advised that they are all on the decrease at the present time.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Does this branch do the subdivision work for the government for the lots that the Parks Branch auctions off?

**MR. GOURLAY:** No.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Is this branch required to approve those sub-divisions?

**MR. GOURLAY:** No.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** So the Parks Branch can sub-divide any land that it owns or has control over, without approval from this branch.

**MR. GOURLAY:** Excuse me I didn't catch your last question.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** I say, so the Parks Branch can sub-divide any property over which it has control without any objections from this department.

**MR. GOURLAY:** Right.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 6.(a)—pass; 6.(b)—pass. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding 2,011,700 for Municipal Affairs—pass; Resolution 99, 7.(a)—pass; — the Member for Rossmere.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Could the Minister advise as to the function of the provincial planning branch?

**MR. GOURLAY:** The primary responsibility of this branch is to provide secretarial service to the Provincial Land Use Committee.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** I'm sorry, did I understand the Minister correctly to say that it provides secretarial

Thursday, 5 June, 1980

services, there's no professional services involved in this branch?

**MR. GOURLAY:** It provides administrative and professional service and also provides support to the interdepartmental planning board.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** What is the interdepartmental planning board?

**MR. GOURLAY:** The interdepartmental planning board is made up of Deputy Ministers involved in the planning process, those departments that I mentioned earlier that are circulated with respect to concerns in planning.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Does the provincial planning branch have anything to do with appeals to the municipal board from the decisions of the municipal planning branch?

**MR. GOURLAY:** Yes, the interdepartmental planning board would provide the case for the province in an appeal.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Provide . . . I'm sorry there's a lot of noise here.

**MR. GOURLAY:** Would provide the case for the province at an appeal.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** If we're going to visit, it might be as well to go somewhere else. We're trying to clean up and we have about four minutes until we have to suspend until tapes are changed so maybe there is a desire to get something done in four minutes and then have your visit.

The Member for Rossmere.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Chairman, if the provincial planning branch presents the case of the department at the municipal board, what role then does it play, that is does the municipal planning branch provide the information and make the decision that the appeal should be opposed or is it the provincial planning branch that makes that decision?

**MR. GOURLAY:** Where it contravenes the provincial land use policy it prepares the case for the province.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 7.(a)—pass; 7.(b)—pass; Resolve that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding 149,100 for Municipal Affairs—pass; 8.(a)—pass; 8.(b) — the Member for Rossmere.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Can the Minister explain what the Canada-Manitoba Northlands Agreement is all about?

**MR. GOURLAY:** This provides community planning services to northern and remote communities including subdivision design, development planning and administration of Part IX of the Planning Act.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Yes, Mr. Minister, I can read — (Interjection)— Part IX of the Planning Act, could you possibly elaborate on that?

**MR. GOURLAY:** It applies planning advisory services with respect to northern subdivisions. That's to the Department of Northern Affairs.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** To the Department of Northern Affairs. This land I take it is generally owned by the province, is that correct?

**MR. GOURLAY:** For the most part but necessarily always.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I think we're a little bit confused up here. I think I passed a Resolution 149,100 and my book shows that 7 and 8 come under that Resolution. Now I need to be corrected so we'll suspend that . . . 8.(a)—pass; 8.(b)—pass; 8.(c)—pass. Then I will repeat that same to make sure we are in order.

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding 149,100 for Municipal Affairs—pass.

Now we go back to 1.(a)—pass; —(Interjection)— Then we have to ask for suspension till the tapes are changed. —(Interjection)— I need some leadership here from the committee. The committee is suspended if there is anything of importance.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Chairman, there are several areas in this department with which we have some concern. The first again, as we had explained previously, are the proposed changes for The Assessment Act and the interim report of the review committee. I'd like to go over that again. We've been told tonight that somewhere around the end of March, the Minister received an interim report from the assessment committee. It's going up and down this province since then pretending that it has reached no conclusions and the Minister at the same time has been preparing legislation which he tells us will be appearing before the Legislature before the end of next week. That's within six sitting days of now. He's not prepared to release the interim report now and we are at the same time in a situation where the people of the province are appearing before this committee and up until tonight those people have not known that this committee has in fact already made a decision on assessments.

This committee has already reported and this Minister is preparing legislation based on that report, even though people from northern Manitoba are even now preparing presentations, reports, arguments to that committee, even though people in Winnipeg will have an opportunity apparently within the next short while to present evidence, suggestions, arguments to that committee, and the Minister has informed us that this Act is now being prepared and I suggest that any activity by the committee since that interim report was presented is a sham. It should have, if it was going to make an interim report, present it to us and I would suggest that it is improper for a committee to come to any conclusions, interim or whatever, before it has heard all the evidence — that is a fundamental rule for any committee. And for the Minister to be presiding over a situation where he is using that interim report to present legislation to the Legislature and is then not prepared to release that interim report to either the members of the Legislature or to the members of the



public who are prepared to spend their time to give the government their views, I would submit is improper.

There is a second area and that is the whole area of the mishandling of the affairs of the Local Government District of Alexander and I would suggest, well we've been over that a number of times over the last few weeks. I would suggest that the final act of impropriety is that of sending Richard Andries back in there and tonight the Minister has not made it clear to this committee that should that new council, which was elected or is being elected because of the improprieties of a civil servant, should a majority of that council now move a motion to keep the LGD administrator here, the Minister is not saying clearly that he would reject that resolution. On the basis of all of these things, I move, seconded by the Member for Logan that Resolution 93.(a) Minister's Compensation, Salary and Representation Allowance, be reduced to 1.00.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I just have to draw your attention to Section 9, where the Committee of Supply or a section of the Committee of Supply is sitting after 10:00 p.m. on any day, a) the Chairman or Deputy Chairman of the Committee shall not accept any vote that defeats or varies an item in the estimates of the government. So once again I need leadership from the committee. Is it the desire that the committee now rise?

The Minister of Government Services.

**HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside):** Mr. Chairman, before that motion is put, I think, allow me as a member of the committee, to appeal to the reasonableness of the Honourable Member for Rossmere, who really isn't a bad kind of a chap. He has a decent background. I know somewhat of his background, and given the opportunity to reconsider the motion that he just put, even just for a little while, for a few minutes, he may well wish to volunteer to withdraw, because I am sure that he recognizes that the motion is not one that we should be taking seriously or entering into any long debate on.

Mr. Chairman, I just take this moment the honourable member to seriously reconsider his motion to withdraw the suggestion that the Minister of Municipal Affairs' salary be reduced to 1.00.

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

**MR. SCHROEDER:** I thank the Honourable Minister for that opportunity. I can tell the Honourable Minister that during the time that he was speaking I seriously reconsidered it and I regret to inform the committee that I believe that I was right the first time.

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

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I regret that we have been put in a position of having to make such a motion. It was suggested by our side of this committee that the Minister review his position and give us a reply tomorrow on the subject matter of the LGD of Alexander. The Minister declined to accept that offer and therefore we have no

alternative but to vote non-confidence on the Minister, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** May I again read, Where the Committee of Supply or a section of the Committee of Supply is sitting after 10:00 p.m. on any day, the Chairman or Deputy Chairman of the Committee shall not accept any vote that defeats or varies an item in the estimates of the government. So the only choice is to go into the House tomorrow and I ask, is it now the desire of the committee to rise? Committee rise? Committee rise.

## SUPPLY — EDUCATION

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson):** This committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members' attention to page 39 of the Main Estimates, Department of Education, Resolution No. 52, Clause 3. Financial Support — Public Schools, Item (a) School Grants and Other Assistance—pass — the Honourable Minister.

**HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli):** Mr. Chairman, I have some information for the Honourable Member for St. Vital that he has requested. I'll send it over to him now. One was on the teachers' certificates for teachers in the private schools and those under shared-service agreements. I also have the material on private school agreements, the amount of moneys attached to each particular grant. I think I mentioned that I will also be sending him the enrolment study that he requested.

Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for St. Vital requested copies of all the school budgets, from all of the divisions and districts in Manitoba, and I said that we would attempt to supply those if he really wants them. I must advise him that some of these budgets are 200 and some pages long and it will probably involved an awful lot of xeroxing — perhaps some 1,500 worth of xeroxing and a considerable amount of time — plus I would advise him that he will need about three wheelbarrows to handle the material. But if he seriously desiring that particular information I will have my people produce it for him.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (a)—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

**MR. D. JAMES WALDING:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll thank the Minister for the material that he has sent over. I'll try to find a few minutes to study it if I can, meantime I'll put it with the rest of the notes that I had here and see if I can find a few of the other questions that I had wished to raise with the Minister.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, perhaps while the honourable member is getting organized, I could mention to him that we have summary sheets of all budgets setting out each category of grant earned by each school division across the province. If this information, which is in fact a boiling down or a summary of the information found in the individual budgets, would be of similar value to him, certainly it would be a more inexpensive way of supplying him

with the material. However, I will leave that to his particular desire in this case.

I think he had also asked me another question before we recessed for dinner, as to the percentage increase for the coming year over this particular year, and I'm advised that the percentage is 8.5 percent, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. WALDING:** I thank the Minister for that information. That's in accord with my calculations too. I wasn't quite clear — the last document that the Minister referred to as being a sheet mentioning the divisions — I wonder if he could clarify what he is referring to, please.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I was referring to a summary sheet of the budgets of all school divisions in the province as opposed to his original request for individual budgets which are a little more detailed, certainly much more detailed, and amount to absolutely thousands of pages of material; whereas this type of summary sheet contains all of the grants and revenues of school divisions and costs and would be of some value, if the honourable member was interested in that type of material.

**MR. WALDING:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We would be interested in receiving a copy of the summary sheet. We do not wish to put the government to unnecessary expense to provide information that can be used in a more concise manner.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to refer to some of the grants that the Minister has listed for us on a previous occasion. I wonder if I could ask him about the salary grants under the Foundation program which he has listed as being slightly less than last year and indeed slightly less than 1978. We would assume, Mr. Chairman, that what we are looking at here is the effect of a declining enrolment. I'd like to find out from the Minister whether there has been any change in the salary grid, and is the Minister proposing to make any changes in that salary grid?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, in response to the Honourable Member for St. Vital, he is quite right. The salary grant total does reflect to some extent the effect of declining enrolment. However, that particular total does not really show that much difference from last year. Last year it was 80.8 million; this year it is 80.6 million, one of the reasons being, that in spite of the declining enrolments, this particular grant is based on the number of authorized teachers and the salary grant schedule in the regulation, and of course there is a compensating factor here that there are increases in both teacher qualification and years of service.

In answer to his final question, there has been no change in the particular grid.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister mentions that there has been little change in this area from last year. I would remind him that we've had almost 10 ten percent inflation since last year, so even to keep up with the same purchasing power for those school boards who are in receipt of this grant, they would need something in the order of 88 million to have the same purchasing power as the

year before. The Minister explains quite correctly that the number of teacher grants are related to the number of children. This is one effect that declining enrolment has. We might note further down under declining enrolment itself, that although this amount has doubled two-and-a-half times in fact, that what is happening is, the school boards are receiving some 8 million less in purchasing power and are receiving an additional 1.5 million. It's hardly to be wondered at that school boards and secretary-treasurers are scratching their heads and wondering where the money is to come from to pay for these inflated amounts that they are faced with this year.

I would like to ask the Minister, under Transportation, if he could tell us the basis on which transportation grants are paid.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, the transportation grants are paid under a particular regulation that I can cite for him in a minute. They amount to 290 per transported pupil and as soon as I have the particular regulation I can read it out to him or at least give him the reference of that particular regulation.

On page 461, Mr. Chairman, of Section 18, it says, A unitary division shall provide transportation or incur costs for provision made in lieu of transportation and is entitled to receive amounts by way of grants towards the cost of such provision made under this regulation under the following circumstances and conditions. And it goes on to state in some detail those particular conditions. I don't know if the honourable member wants me to go into all of that detail or not.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, since this is an amount paid under the Foundation Program, is it the intention of the Minister that the entire cost of transportation, where it is a properly authorized transportable student, should be covered by the transportation grant. If that is the case, then I will have to raise the question with him as to why there is a per capita grant for transportation, whether that student is transported five miles or 50 miles.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I think the honourable member is aware that as far as transportation is concerned, students within villages, towns and cities have never been eligible for transportation grants under a regulation either of this government or the previous government, with the exception of those particular categories that I mentioned earlier.

As far as his question regarding a per capita grant rather than some other type of grant perhaps, based on mileage, I can only suggest to him that built into this particular sum of money is an averaging of miles in an attempt to come to some reasonable amount that would approach transportation costs in average number of divisions. I can tell him that under the 290 per transported pupil, that we now have in place with this particular set of estimates, there will be some 28 school divisions that have over 80 percent of their transportation costs covered by government grants, as opposed to 17 a year ago, Mr. Chairman.

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

**MR. WALDING:** Two points arise from that, Mr. Chairman. The Minister mentions a number of school divisions that would have 80 percent of the cost covered. Would it not also be true that some divisions had 100 percent of their transportation costs covered, and why should that apply in one division and perhaps not in a neighbouring division?

The second point, again coming back to this old bugaboo of declining enrolment, what is the Minister able to do for those divisions that have to run a bus from point A to point B and find that last year they had 20 students on a bus and this year they've got 15 students on a bus. So this year they get 15 grants to run the bus with and last year they had 20 students to run the bus with. The bus still depreciates every year, it still needs gasoline and it still needs a driver. Would it not make more sense for the province to fund the cost of a bus for a division that needs it? I understand, Mr. Chairman, that this is not a particularly revolutionary idea, that this is in fact what Ontario does. Those school divisions where transportation is needed, the province picks up the cost of the transportation, and this way each school division is treated equally. If one school division has 50,000 miles and 50,000 miles are paid for, if another school division has 10,000 miles and 10,000 miles are paid for, then you do not get this inequity that some school divisions are having 100 percent of its transportation costs covered and some of them a mere fraction of it.

Let me just give the committee a few figures, Mr. Chairman. I have a list here — I haven't counted them, but probably all of the divisions and districts for 1978 — and it shows that Winnipeg's transportation costs were 780,000 and its transportation grants were 175,000, for a difference that the division had to pick up, of well over half a million dollars, 605,000 to be precise. We move to, for example, Transcona-Springfield, its transportation costs were 537,000; its grants 492,000.00. Agassiz No. 13 also had just over half a million dollars worth of transportation costs and it received over half a million dollars worth of grants, for a difference of only 10,000 that the division had to pick up. On the other hand, Seine River No. 14, its transportation costs 572,150 and its transportation grants 572,150.00. No extra amount for the division to pick up.

Similarly with Hanover No. 15, 574,000, and its grants were 74,000.00. Boundary No. 16 was 60,000 short; Rhineland, 33,000 short; Morris-MacDonald, 74,000 short. We get down a little bit further to Garden Valley 26, 176,000 even, were its transportation cost, and its grants, 176,000, exactly the same. One of the smaller ones, Churchill, 54,900 were its transportation costs; 52,800 were its grants, a net difference there of 2,100.00. Mystery Lake School Division, and maybe the Minister has heard something of Mystery Lake's problems just recently. Its transportation cost 21,270; its grants 3,000, Mr. Chairman, 3,000 to cover a 21,000 bill; the difference, 17,910.00. The suggestion there, Mr. Chairman, is that Mystery Lake's difficulties this year were not all of this year's making. They stem back at least one or two years.

The Minister, also on the matter of transportation, told my colleague from Rossmere a couple of days ago that there were to be changes made in the

transportation of students. I've had a couple of people enquire of me in the last couple of days as to whether this is going to apply to city school divisions and I gather from what the Minister says that it will not. However, I am going to ask him if he can maybe repeat those items.

It was also suggested in the newspaper that it will be the responsibility of the sending school division where students for French Immersion classes are concerned to pick up the tab for those transportation costs. Again I am not certain whether those costs will fall entirely on the division or whether it's the intent of the Department of Education to pick up those costs. I wonder if the Minister would review the information that he gave to my colleague from Rossmere the other day so that I can be quite clear of what is intended.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, in responding to the honourable member's last question first, the changes that we anticipate in the regulation would apply to students transported from one division to another in order to receive Francaise or Immersion education, and he is quite correct, the sending division is responsible for supply the transportation as they are now. In fact, in regard to vocational students, and the grant that applies to all transportation in the province, up to 290, Mr. Chairman, will apply.

**MR. WALDING:** If I understand what the Minister is saying is that students who are transported to Immersion courses will come under the category of transportable students according to the regulation. Is the Minister prepared to review this provision or requirement that only rural students will be covered by this particular grant? He is aware that there are many parents within the city of Winnipeg who would like to have their children attend Immersion courses, some of whom now can and some of whom cannot for the reasons pointed out by my colleague for Rossmere.

Is the Minister prepared to review this decision in order that children in Winnipeg could be treated in the same manner as children outside of Winnipeg?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, we certainly are prepared to review and to consider any proposals. The bulk of the concerns that have been expressed to my department to this point have been by parents whose children must travel from their home division to another division to receive, in most cases the concern has been over Immersion instruction. And so we have taken the first step in that regard, I would suggest, in providing transportation grants in that particular situation as we have also for Francaise education. I'm quite prepared to look at the other situation as well, Mr. Chairman. The Immersion course is going through certain growing pains throughout the province, particularly in the urban area, and we will keep it under review.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, does the Minister have any indication of how many students will be involved in this particular change in the regulations? Does he also have an estimate as to how many students in the city of Winnipeg are in a similar position? In other words, how many students are to be benefitted and what is the potential if this were

Thursday, 5 June, 1980

on a province-wide basis instead of simply a rural basis?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I don't have the particular Winnipeg figures, but as far as the change in the regulation is concerned, if the honourable member is asking as to how many students will benefit from that particular change, the estimate that I have is slightly over 600.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, that is a relatively small number. I wonder if the Minister could attempt to provide me with a comparable figure for Winnipeg as to how many students within Winnipeg would be affected if this were expanded?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, a relatively small number. I believe there are slightly over 3,000 students enrolled in Immersion courses at this time in the whole province of Manitoba. This would apply to 600, including of course Francaise students, I would suggest is not really a small number or a small ratio.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister didn't respond to the other point that I brought up in regard to transportation and the unfair or inequitable effect that transportation costs are having on various school divisions. I read out a list here of some of them, I don't intend to read it all, but the point being that some divisions have 100 percent of their transportation costs covered. Winnipeg No. 1 has approximately 25 percent of its costs covered. I seem to recall, Mr. Chairman, that because it was part of a foundation program, it was the intent originally, back some 15 years ago, that the foundation program would cover teachers' salaries, transportation and a number of other rather basic costs. We seem to have got away from that principle of covering 100 percent of the transportation costs and I wonder if the Minister is intending to do anything about this seeming inequity between divisions.

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

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, in our review of the whole educational finance program, that is one of the aspects that we are looking at rather carefully.

**MR. WALDING:** Since the session began, I asked the Minister on two or three occasions about a problem that Winnipeg No. 1 had with its buses, those provided by H & S Transport. The Minister at one stage gave me a date of May of 1979 that his department first became aware that there were buses in violation of the safety regulations. At a different occasion, he gave me a date of August — sometime in August — the 24th, I believe, just going from memory was the date that he heard about it. An obvious conflict. I wonder if the Minister would like to take this opportunity to review what has happened with H & S Transport, the Winnipeg Division No. 1 and the compulsory aspect of the inspection of those buses. Could he perhaps clarify the issue, please?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I don't have that particular data in front of me, but I can clarify one point for the honourable member, and that is that there is no problem at all with those dates that he mentions. I believe the first date in May that he alluded to was the one when I referred to some communication between my department and the Winnipeg School Division in regard to safety inspection certificates. The next date was a second communication in that regard, Mr. Chairman. Those are the two dates that I referred to, and I see no problem or conflict in that regard at all. I merely reiterate to the member those two particular dates of communication.

**MR. WALDING:** Can the Minister inform the committee as to whether there are specific dates in the year when school buses for Winnipeg No. 1 have to be inspected or to pass an inspection or safety program?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, all school buses in the province are required to attain safety inspection certificates every six months.

**MR. WALDING:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm aware of that. I am also aware of the difficulties of inspecting a large number of buses all on the same date. I'm asking the Minister if there are two specific dates when Winnipeg's buses are inspected.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I'll have to check that particular point. I certainly don't pretend to have the particular dates at which each school division semi-annually has its bus certificates brought up-to-date. This can vary from division to division, but I can get him that particular information if he is interested in having it.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, the reason I'm asking the Minister to elaborate on the dates and the procedures, is that there is apparently some dispute, or was some dispute between Winnipeg No. 1 and the department as to when the administration No. 1 was advised that their buses were in violation. Now, can the Minister advise the committee whether he found out that these buses were in violation because of a spot check at some particular time, or was it at the routine semi-annual inspection that these buses were subjected to? The question that arises then is, what happened? When did the Minister write to the department? Now he has given me two dates. Were they both referring to the same occasion, and does that indicate that the Department of Education was aware of this violation prior to May of last year, which is over a year ago?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. Vital, I think, ignores one important point here, that my department had been asked to do a review of student transportation in Winnipeg No. 1. As part of that particular review, they encountered some vehicles that they felt had not been properly checked out in a maintenance sense, in a safety sense, and did not have the proper certificates and they so informed the division as of the date I alluded to earlier.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister can indicate when this requested review from No. 1 took place, approximately.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I will have to check the exact dates, because I wouldn't want to give the member any misleading information. It was carried on over a number of months because, as the honourable member knows, this is not a large unit within our department. I believe under their demonstration there was one person in that particular unit. We have two, plus secretarial help, and we are adding a third person this fall. But we, of course, see bus transportation as the responsibility of the school divisions. It is our purpose to be there to assist in helping develop better safety provisions and so on within the school divisions and to monitor the particular programs that are being carried out by the divisions.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister whether this requested review took the place of a regular semi-annual inspection, or did it occur at the same time or midway between. I'm trying to get some indication of when this situation became aware to someone.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, my department does not go around inspecting buses. This is not their main function. This is the responsibility of the school division to see that their buses are — they inspect it regularly by a qualified mechanic. My department monitors, as I said before, assists, conducts programs of in-service on safety, works with seminars with bus drivers, that type of program. The reason that they became involved in this case was because they had been requested by the division to conduct an overall review of the student transportation situation in this particular school division.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, is the Minister telling us that it was his inspector that found that there were buses being used by H & S that didn't meet the safety standards?

**MR. COSENS:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm saying that it was personnel from department who found that the safety inspection certificates were not in place for these vehicles, and following that, checked some of the buses and indeed did find them wanting in regard all the specifications.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, was it the Minister's inspector, having found that some of these buses didn't come up to the required standard, who then advised the Minister and it was as a result of that report that the Minister sent out his letter in May of 1979 to the school division in Winnipeg No. 1, advising them of this fact.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I did not send out the letter; the letter was sent out by the transportation director of my department.

**MR. WALDING:** Very well, Mr. Chairman, I'll reword the question and ask if that letter that was sent from someone in the Department of Education to

Winnipeg No. 1 came about because of and following that report that the inspector had done?

**MR. COSENS:** No, Mr. Chairman, the letter came about because in the process of conducting the review of the transportation system, our personnel discovered that certain certificates were not in place, safety certificates, and that in fact on spot checking certain vehicles, they found that they were deficient, and as a result of that particular discovery the letter was written notifying Winnipeg No. 1.

**MR. WALDING:** Just one detail there. Was the letter sent to the school board of Winnipeg No. 1 or to someone in the administration who would have that responsibility?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I would have to check on that, but if my memory is correct the letter that went to the Secretary-Treasurer of the school division from the Director of Student Transportation in my department.

**MR. WALDING:** I would like to ask the Minister, again, why a letter was sent out from his department on the October date that he mentioned to me. Was that because nothing had happened or because the safety certificates had not been obtained during that time, at some five months?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I would have to check that letter again as well, the second letter. I think it alluded to some discrepancies that my people felt had not been attended to.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, did the second letter that went out make reference to the regular semi-annual safety inspection that was required by the Minister's regulations, and in mentioning them did it point out that such inspection had not been carried out?

**MR. COSENS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I'll have to check the particular letters. Although I have some semblance of recall, I certainly don't pretend to stand here and be able to remember what was written in each particular letter, but those letters are available and I can check them for the honourable member.

**MR. WALDING:** That's fine, Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't like to try to press the Minister for facts that he wouldn't have immediately before him and I'll wait until he can give us further information of it.

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

**MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a few comments and some questions to ask in regard to this item. Firstly, I've listened with interest to the speech given by the Minister earlier today, the one which you finally interrupted because he was going what you thought was too far afield. I must say that I was really amused at the comment that they produce bills which are now before us because the fact is that they did that last year and look at the mess they

made of those. We have yet to see what these are but to the extent that we have new bills, that's fine.

Mr. Chairman, one of the problems, not one of the problems, one of the advantages that this Minister has is that he has done so little in the face of the demands of education in the last two-and-one-half years that he has had time to devote to these other matters, which are fine; it's good that the proposal to consolidate and revise the legislation with which he has been labouring has been done.

I also was amused to hear his description of the programs they are going into. It seemed to me that every program he described with great self-credit was one built on the foundations laid by Lionel Orlikow.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister on a point of order.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, just on a point of order, a point of clarification. Are we on Item 3.(a) or some other item at this time. I understood we were on 3.(a).

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** To the honourable members, we are on Item 3.(a). I've allowed some latitude in introducing questions and I would hope that the honourable member would be getting around to his questions.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I don't want to go anywhere beyond the proper area, but since I listened to the Minister, I thought he was within the area and therefore I just followed through. But if he's sensitive to that we'll come back to it on another occasion, although I did have to say that the former Deputy Minister of Education is the one that laid the foundation for many of the programs, many of which were cut by this government, and some of which are being continued and for which they ought to be grateful for the fact that the groundwork was laid by Lionel Orlikow.

Mr. Chairman, in more specifics, the Minister took great credit, great credit for that achievement of seeing to it that the government would speed up the payment of grants and the instalment of grants to the school divisions, I gather to the extent of saving some 4 million to school divisions. May I ask him who will be paying that 4 million? There has to be offsetting expenditure in order to compensate for the savings to the school divisions. Could he clarify where that 4 million really will come from?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, it will come from this government.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I should point out to the Honourable Minister that this government, as he says it, gets the money from the people of Manitoba, so it means that it will come from the taxpayers of Manitoba. And what the Minister takes so much pride in is bookkeeping with which he . . . I respect that. I think bookkeeping is right and I think it's right, why should the school divisions be shown as charging an amount which indeed is a debt acquired because of late payments.

You know, I remember when the Minister for Economic Affairs used to stand up over here and say, why you're just fooling everybody, you're taking

it from one pocket and putting it into another, it's the taxpayer, there's one taxpayer. He didn't know what he was talking about when he said it, I'm only quoting him to indicate what he said. I don't agree with that, I figure there are many kinds of taxpayers, mostly taxpayers of low income and taxpayers of high income, and the Minister of Economic Affairs, when he was a member of the opposition, he didn't really see the distinction, but maybe now he does.

In any event then, what the Minister of Education has now clarified is that this great accomplishment of a reduction of 4 million from the school taxes is an additional cost to the provincial taxpayer. And I say that that is right and I say that that is correct and I say that's the easiest thing that the Minister did and could have done. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, that's a good question. But you know, Mr. Chairman, although it's a good question, I think it's a foolish question. I think that in the end the Minister will have to rely on his own accomplishments and on what he does in the future than in the present. I could answer that, I don't choose to because I think it's nonsensical, and I have to say, Mr. Chairman, I too have been guilty of doing that kind of a thing when I was on that side of the House. So although I say it's foolish, I don't just say that the Minister of Education is foolish. I say it's a foolish response.

There's some stories in there about subways running on time in Moscow and therefore they're justified in what they were doing to the people that were being starved, the people that were being discriminated against, and the answer was, well, we're running on time in our subways. It doesn't help very much. The Minister takes as a great credit that we have now shuffled from one taxpayer to another taxpayer the burden of 4 million, and I say that's good. He now also said today, why, not only that, we are starting to negotiate with the municipalities for them to do the same thing. That is completely laughable, Mr. Chairman, — not completely — almost completely laughable, because there it is, indeed the same taxpayer that is being affected is the real property taxpayer. When you take it from the municipalities and push it to the school divisions, the municipalities will be short that money. Now the reason I said it's almost completely laughable, is that there is a distinction between school divisions whose boundaries overlap and are not contiguous with that of the municipal taxpayer. But aside from that shuffle of money, it is really of no consequence to the man or woman who pays the taxes at the municipal level as to whether it goes in the school division or into the municipality except for the fact that school trustees are psychologically very sensitive to the amount of their budgets and increases, and on the other hand municipal people are very conscious psychologically of the fact that they send out the total bill. So you can't really win. In any event, the big accomplishment by this government is that they have speeded up the payments of grants and hope yet to accomplish that from the municipalities.

Mr. Chairman, moving to another subject, the Honourable the Minister was mentioning the Public Schools Finance Board. Could he indicate who is the chairman of the board and how long he or she has had that task?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Public Schools Finance Board is Assistant Deputy Minister Besteck. How long has he been in that particular appointment, Mr. Chairman? I would have to check the exact length of time, a year and a half as a guesstimate; I would have to check the exact number of months.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Could the Honourable Minister inform us whom he replaced and what was the reason for the change?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Besteck replaced Mr. Richmond, who moved to another capacity. He had been with Finance, I believe.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister says that Mr. Richmond moved from the chairmanship of the Public Schools Finance Board to another task, is that what he said?

**MR. COSENS:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, as I remember, Mr. Richmond had been employed half-time with Finance and half-time with the Public Schools Finance Board. He moved from the Public Schools Finance Board to Finance.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Then would the Minister say that he had anything to do with the firing of Jack Richmond?

**MR. COSENS:** No, Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't say that.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I can absolve him of that one, Mr. Chairman. He knows I haven't absolved him of the other one. Mr. Chairman, the Minister said that the question of the Greater Winnipeg Education Levy is under study. How long has it been under study and what progress has been made?

**MR. COSENS:** I think I've answered that question, Mr. Chairman, on a previous occasion during these estimates, but I'm very pleased to tell the honourable member that it has been under study for some two and a half years now. We are making progress, and as was reported in the Budget Address by the Minister of Finance, we are quite hopeful and have every intent of bringing forward a new financing plan for education in this province, before the end of this calendar year.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I'm wondering the extent to which the Winnipeg School Division No. 1 summary and analysis of the impact of this program, to what extent it is correct, both numerically and from the standpoint of equity.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I don't have that particular statement in front of me. I could check it and answer the member at a later date. Certainly there's a considerable impact from a mill rate point of view. If that is what the member is interested in, I can give him the comparisons as to what happens if the residents of Winnipeg No. 1 were paying their taxes without that particular Greater Winnipeg Equalization Levy being in place. I believe this year they would have paid some 9 mills less than they did.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I played a role in the development and the imposition of this Greater Winnipeg Tax Levy, and at that time it seemed to us to be an equitable provision, taking into account the impact on the assessment base of various school divisions by the unification of the tax base for municipalities. May I ask the Honourable Minister if his department study is taking into account the figures, and the development of those figures at that time, to see how they impact now? The reason I ask that is, that I believe that there has been sufficient and substantial change in the tax base and in the assessment of the school divisions within and impinging on the city of Winnipeg, to justify a substantial revision; or if the study so far has not developed to the extent where he could even indicate that that is the case.

**MR. COSENS:** . . . generally are still looking at that particular aspect. I'm really not at liberty to give the member our deliberations to this point. We are considering certain alternatives and certain aspects of solutions to this particular problem. If he would like some of the historical data, I can make an attempt to provide that for him.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I would certainly be interested in historical data, if it is not going to be couched in terms of, this will cost 1,500 to give you. I'd be glad to have what the Minister now has. I wouldn't want him to take away from his precious time, the additional time required to develop figures for me, the studies being conducted for the Minister. I wanted to ask the Minister, who is conducting this study?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I have again answered this question on a previous occasion under questioning on the Greater Winnipeg Equalization Levy from the Member for St. Vital. I don't know if the Member for St. Johns would expect me to answer the same questions over and over again. However, I can tell him I have no reservation about the fact that senior members of our department, who have had experience in financing of education over a considerable number of years.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Is the Minister involved in that study?

**MR. COSENS:** Certainly, at different points in the study, Mr. Chairman. I certainly have been consulted at the final disposition. As we get down to the final alternatives, I would expect to play even a larger role in that regard.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I should certainly hope that when it comes to making policy decisions, the senior members of the staff will have at least the courtesy of having the Minister make the final decision. — (Interjection)— Pardon? It should be. That's why I wondered that he had to say that. So, Mr. Chairman, I am sure that although the Minister wasn't here, he is well aware of the attack made by the present Minister of Finance on the whole property tax credit system, and said that the minute that we can revise the system, change the system of grants to education, we will wipe out the property tax credit.

Thursday, 5 June, 1980

And now the Minister says, two-and-a-half years they've been studying the Greater Winnipeg tax levy, I assume now — education levy I mean — I assume now that the study on the grant structure study and the property tax credit study have also been going on this whole two-and-a-half years. I'm assuming that — he will correct me if I'm wrong — and will he tell me whether it's all one study and can he give me a target date, and whether it's before or after the next election.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I will merely reiterate what has been said during the budget speech with no reference to election at all by saying that the Minister of Finance stated that within this calendar year it is our intent to have the new program in place. I can also tell the honourable member that at different points in our review members of the committee have interfaced with members from Finance, have consulted them, and have utilized their expertise where necessary.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, the White Paper that was attached to the budget, Part Four, which I believe is the last part of it, is a short half-page statement which includes the sentence, that the reform set out in this White Paper represent a fundamental improvement in the efforts of the government to provide adequate shelter and income assistance. And then it says, further improvements or reforms may be suggested during public discussion of this White Paper and the government is open to constructive suggestions. I asked the First Minister a few days ago what nature, what plans were being made to have public discussion in order for the government to hear constructive suggestions and he said he was not familiar with the context of the statement and I quoted to him, but he assumed it had to do with the education study. And I have to tell the Honourable the Minister that as far as I can read this White Paper, it has nothing to do with the education study, so one might think it is not relevant to this item before us, Mr. Chairman. You may be thinking that, but I want to ask the Minister what plans he is making to ensure adequate public discussion of the entire study on grants, on the Foundation Program, on property tax credit, so that the government can benefit from constructive suggestions from the public.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, just in response to the Honourable Member for St. Johns, I can advise him that to this point we have received a considerable number of briefs from interested organizations and individuals who certainly have placed their input before us as regards educational finance. This has been useful. It is something that the committee that is working in this regard has taken under consideration and certainly some of the suggestions will be incorporated into the final solutions to the educational financing program.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, were these briefs and suggestions invited from the general public by the Minister, or some one in government?

**MR. COSENS:** I think, Mr. Chairman, that people involved in the educational community have had a

vital interest in this particular topic for some time and of course have been most anxious to assist any government that would be willing to tackle what is a mammoth job and a very important job. As a result, certain school boards, certain organizations, have taken it upon themselves to do their own particular studies and to make sure that we are availed of the product of those studies. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that they are valuable and their input is appreciated.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister wasn't listening to me when I asked the earlier question, what plans are being made by this government and this Minister to involve public discussion of the work that they are doing so that they will receive constructive suggestions? Now he told me that people interested in education, I presume the financing of education, have of their own accord voluntarily, without invitation, but because of their deep interest, made suggestions. That is not what I would call public discussion. I wonder if the Minister has another term for it?

I remember he had two terms for inspectors and field representatives. Now I want to ask him, does public discussion mean, in his mind, that an interested person will send a brief to him, uninvited, and he will read it and may or may not react to it? Is that what he calls public discussion?

**MR. COSENS:** Public input, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. COSENS:** The Minister is indicating that he does understand the difference between input and discussion because at least he's not admitting, he's not claiming that input is discussion. I'm asking him, and I'm quoting from the White Paper, public discussion of government is open to constructive suggestion. Now if suggestions would come from public discussion, is the Minister or is he not yet ready to say whether he is planning to have public discussions to deal with the studies that are taking place on the question of grants or revision of grants and on the question of the Greater Winnipeg Education Levy?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I would have some difficulty at this time in saying to the member that this particular procedure was going to be followed in that regard or some other procedure. That will be something that I would hope that I could announce in the ensuing months.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I will venture the statement or the prediction or the prognostication that it will never be done. I will venture the guess that the government will do as it sees fit, as it has done with the White Paper, and that any talk about public discussion as is in the White Paper, I believe, is meaningless, and I will have an opportunity to discuss that with the Minister of Finance and I am suggesting that to this Minister of Education. I wouldn't mind if they said, we're making the study, we'll make our decision, we'll go ahead; we've only spent two-and-a-half years on it, it may take another number of months, or years, but he says it will be done before the end of this calendar year and that remains to be seen. I'm looking forward to it. I hope they're doing it.



Thursday, 5 June, 1980

But, Mr. Chairman, I tell you this, that if that report, which will be very important, if that has as much discussion as was made possible by the government's White Paper on taxation, then they will be doing a disservice to the public because, as he says, it is a complicated, difficult study, and I am sure it is. If the public doesn't have any input other than by knocking at the door and leaving a brief at the doorstep, then it will be rather meaningless because we will not have any idea of what went on behind the discussion. There would be no discussion or review papers, as there isn't in this White Paper, and the result will be that the public would not have adequate opportunity to learn and then react and discuss. I'm telling this Minister, if he really means that he wants public discussion, then he's got to make plans to call on it, and he has to be sure to discuss it.

Let me tell the Minister that there has been a lot of flack, and there are members in this House right at this moment who will know that when it came to the legislation involving the unification of the city of Winnipeg, there was a great deal of disagreement, and there still is a great deal of disagreement, but there was certainly a great deal of public discussion before the legislation was brought in. I think that is worthwhile now. The Minister of Economic Development had something to say.

**HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek):** And he did what he liked.

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

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, isn't that peculiar? The contribution by the Minister of Economic Development is and he did what he liked. Mr. Chairman, I never said that public discussion ends up by having a referendum at community hall meetings to make decisions, but public discussion is one where you can hear points of view expressed both for and against the presentation of a policy, and then you make your decisions. So that if the Minister says he did what he liked, in the end, any government that doesn't assume responsibility for its decisions isn't worth being a government. I don't for a moment apologize for the fact that our government acted.

Let me move on, Mr. Chairman, and I might say I'm reaching the end of my list for the moment.

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Good.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Is that the Minister of Economic Affairs who is again making contributions from his seat? He says good. Let me tell him, that as far as I know, I can certainly do without his presence in this committee. I don't who would require his presence in this committee. If he doesn't like it, he could leave, Mr. Chairman, because I can assure him that if there is a vote to reduce the salary of the Minister of Education, he will have an opportunity to come back. So if he is that anxious to speak, that he wants to see the end of what I have to say, then he will have to wait a little longer. But if he doesn't want to make a speech then, by all means, Mr. Chairman, I don't

think it's necessary for us to insist on his presence here.

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Sure.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I quote him now. He doesn't care whether I insist on it. I know he doesn't, but I just want to tell him that his comments are of no help and really don't speed things up, do they? Do they, Mr. Chairman? I wanted to ask about the grants to the private schools. The major change, as I understand it, is to take away from the school boards the responsibility of making a decision about grants to any particular private school, or independent school, I think the Minister called it, within that school division, and to take it right into government for a government to make those decisions. If that is not the only change, I wonder if the Minister would indicate what other changes would take place under this item of grants insofar as the private schools are concerned.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I don't know if the honourable member is referring to the estimates now. I believe he is probably referring to the revised Public Schools Act that we have before us when he makes that particular statement. If he wishes to discuss that particular Act at this time, I suppose that's agreeable, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I'm not discussing the Act; we will be discussing the Act. I'm talking about the intentions of the government as they relate in the expenditure of the grants in this very item. The Minister has stated that a certain amount of money from these grants is money which will go direct to private schools. Mr. Chairman, we told the Minister very clearly this afternoon that we know the Act wasn't passed; we thought he thought it had been passed. Nevertheless, yes, I'm asking him what is the plan for change in the expenditures, in the payment of these moneys, the portion of which would go to private schools? What is his program? What is his plan?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, in the revised Act, and that's what the honourable member is referring to — or bill, if he wishes — the reference that he makes to the payment of grants to private schools is as he states. At this point under the legislation, the school division within which the particular private school exists must sign a contract with that private school for them to then qualify for the grants. Further to the qualification, they must have registered teachers, certificated teachers, and also of course be teaching a program equivalent to the provincial program. The change, as he states, is through the administration of that money. The Manitoba Association of School Trustees have stated on several occasions and through resolution that they do not wish to be involved in that particular process, that they would much rather that the money go directly to the private schools who qualify than be conducted through their particular books, as has happened, Mr. Chairman, for a considerable number of years. So I say to the Member for St. Johns, he is quite correct in his statement.

Thursday, 5 June, 1980

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, as I recall it, and there may have been a change, but I don't remember. The independent or private schools that are currently entitled to grants are listed in a schedule of the Act. Is that still the same way, or is there discretion now that there wasn't before? I don't recall.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I understand that particular schedule was enlarged in 1977 to practically include all private schools in the province. So when the honourable member talks about what private schools are included and what aren't as of 1977, in fact, previous or before we came into government, all private schools have been put on that schedule. There may have been one or two new ones that hadn't been included, but 90-some percent were on that particular schedule.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I thank the Minister for reminding me of that. I do recall there was a very large expansion of that list. Well now, I ask again, what are under the present law, the responsibilities of the school boards in entering into the agreement? Do they certify anything to the Minister? Are they in any way responsible to ensure that anything is done or not done within the schools? Is there any monitoring required on the present school boards?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, there is no monitoring required by the public school board.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Does now, the Department of Education exact the same kind of monitoring over the private schools as it does over the public school system?

**MR. COSENS:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. I am not quite sure what the Member for St. Johns envisages when he says monitoring, but if he means do personnel from my department visit these schools and ascertain the certification of teachers and ascertain the type of programs that are being taught, what curriculum is being followed, the answer is yes.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I know that the government does not propose to become involved in capital expenditures of private schools at this time, is the words added by the member behind me, but other than that, the Department of Education, I believe, assumes responsibility for the educational system in Manitoba. I wanted to know whether the Department of Education gives as much attention to the education being offered within the private school system as it does to the public school system, and maybe I better ask him if it's anything more than these field representatives he talks about?

**MR. COSENS:** From the viewpoint of the monitoring aspect, I would say that the department's involvement with the private schools would probably be equivalent to that of the public system. But in the viewpoint, I suppose, of services provided such as consultative services in curriculum, and so on, I would suggest that they are much less as far as the provision is entailed with the private schools.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, that's exactly what I was expecting to hear. It interests me that the department devotes more attention, gives more attention to the educational program in the public school system than it does in private schools and yet the public schools are run under the responsibility of democratically elected members of the community and the private schools are operated — I don't know whether they're operated for gain or whether they're all non-profit or just what the responsibility is — I'm not aware, I don't know how various private schools are managed. Who does the management? Who has the responsibility? Who determines the curriculum other than the minimum? Who is responsible for taking care of the rights of teachers, the rights of pupils, the rights of the community? How does the Minister relate the responsibilities taken on by a democratically-elected school board as compared with whatever it is that runs the private schools? To what extent does the Minister accept responsibility since his concern about education is now going to involve direct payment of grants to the private schools? Does he see that he has to have a greater knowledge of the way in which those schools are operated?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that at this time the department does have a greater knowledge of the programs that are being carried on in those particular schools and also a greater knowledge of the situation as it regards certification of the teachers in those particular schools. Up until the time when the legislation was changed in our first session in this particular House, that type of information was something that did not exist within the department to my knowledge. Now before a private school can qualify for assistance from the government, we have to be assured and we have to have the information as to the subjects that are being taught in that particular school and we have to have the assurance of the certification of the teachers who are teaching those subjects.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, is the Minister saying that before any grants were given to private schools, they were not required to have teachers who were qualified to teach those subjects which were within the orbit of the Department of Education? Is he saying that? Is he saying that when I went to a private parochial school that the teachers that taught me were not people who were certified with the department as being qualified to teach? Is he saying that?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I'm not aware of the particular private school that the honourable member may have attended, but certainly that was the case in many particular private schools. The people who were providing the instruction were probably very qualified highly educated people but they probably, in some cases, in a great number of cases, did not hold Manitoba teaching certificates.

**MR. ENNS:** You learn something every once and a while, Saul, just keep listening . . .

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I have to tell the Minister of Public Works that the reason I'm here is

Thursday, 5 June, 1980

not only to teach but to learn, and I teach him a good deal. I certainly can learn from others.

Mr. Chairman, I will leave that. I will just make the comment that the system which I don't think is too good up to now, and I don't think it's going to be better, I think it's going to be worse under the proposed change, but not that much worse, I guess, because I don't think much of the system as it is. Nevertheless, school boards, I think, do have a responsibility now because they can refuse to enter into an agreement and in entering into an agreement I do believe — and, Mr. Chairman, I've not been close to this area at all — but it is my impression that when a school board enters into an agreement with a private school today, it assumes responsibility for the educational program within that school along the lines in what I would call the public school subjects. I believe that whether or not they do it, they have that responsibility, and if I'm wrong I wish the Minister would tell me that, but my understanding of that agreement, whatever it is, is one which makes that portion of the school for which grants are given, makes it part of the delivery system of the public school system insofar as the education is being offered to children. If I'm wrong, I'd like the Minister to tell me that I'm wrong.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the honourable member he is wrong in that regard. I think he is confusing the other aspect of shared services, where the private school students attend the public school for instruction of some type in the public school by public school teachers and an agreement is signed between the public school and the private school regarding payment of that instruction. That is a different aspect of the question. If he is speaking of that particular type of agreement, he is quite correct. If he is speaking of the type of agreement that exists today between a private school and a public school where the instruction is given in the private school, then I suggest he's wrong.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, that suits me for the present time, we'll be dealing with it more when we get into the bill, but the answers I acknowledge and appreciate.

Mr. Chairman, the niggardly attitude of the government insofar as the grants to the public school system has been well discussed and received a great deal of attention at the time when the school boards were setting their levies. I don't have to elaborate on that except to say that I hope the Minister will never forget the attacks that were launched on him at that time and I am sure I won't forget them because I attended some of the meetings in a couple of the schools in my own constituency where they were given actual figures of the reduction cuts in program, not of entirety in program, but in staff being made available.

The school board clearly said that, well, some of this is just that reduced number of pupils, which I don't accept, because I know that some of the schools in my constituency are in much greater need of educational programming of a specialized nature than they ever were because of the itinerant nature of many of the pupils and those are problems which I believe the school board is making some effort to

address itself to. But there is no doubt in my mind and from what was said, that it is the inadequacy of the support by the provincial government which made it necessary for the school division to increase pupil-teacher ratio to reduce the additional services which, I don't know, some members may not think are important. But when they cut back on the staff that dealt with music or physical education or library or French — these are the subjects that were cut back on at the Champlain School, for one, — it is because of this government's inadequate supply of funds, unless the Minister will say, well, those are luxuries which the school division could either tax for or not.

As I say, I don't intend to make a big speech about it. We all know the figures, we've heard a good deal about it. We know the general dissatisfaction by the school divisions. We know the impact on the property taxpayer. We know that in the same way as is now happening with hospitals that cannot afford to make a proper adjustment with their employees, and the way the government is starving the health system, so is the government starving education.

What bothers me is the cynicism with which this government has made changes in taxation. I don't go back, well, one can't go back more than two-and-a-half years, when they started making some changes in the general tax system, which was beneficial to the high income much more so than to low income people. Now I ask the Minister to reflect for us his thinking on the property tax credit of which a part is for educational purposes. Incidentally, the Minister, I believe, attributed some 144 million of property tax credit to the contribution by the government to the cost of education. As a preliminary question, could he tell me how much of that money was used to reduce school taxes as compared with the amount that was used to reduce municipal taxes?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I believe the Honourable Member for St. Johns acted as Minister of Finance at one time and during that time his government also used that same figure for a comparative basis and also stated that that total amount went towards the reduction of school costs, or at least school tax costs to taxpayers. If he wants the exact figure, I'm sorry, I can't give it to him. I haven't seen that exact figure. I am told that it is the majority of that figure goes towards the assistance to the taxpayer as far as their school tax is concerned.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, is the Minister saying openly that knowing full well that a portion of the property school taxes does not go to reduce the cost of education to the taxpayer, he nevertheless puts in the full amount and attributes it to the reduction in education taxes, does he knowingly perpetrate the story that all of the property tax credit is a contribution to education knowing full well that it's not true? Is that what he's telling us?

**MR. COSENS:** Not at all, Mr. Chairman. I realize, as I am sure the Honourable Member for St. Johns realized when he was a member of the government of the day, that some portion of that, I understand it's a very small portion of that amount goes to the relief of municipal taxes as opposed to school taxes.

When I use that particular figure, I use it in the same way that his government used it. I use it so that we can have a comparative basis from year to year because I understand this has been the custom in this particular House to claim that particular amount of tax rebate, tax credit, as school tax rebates.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister is not going to draw me into discussing what did happen. —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, let me tell him, I was the Minister of Finance for a long time, so he can throw all the barbs he likes. I want to know, does this Minister knowingly spread the story that all of the property tax credit is a reduction in education property tax, knowingly say that and excuse it on the basis of what he understands the previous government said? Does he knowingly do that? And I believe he said, yes. I'll give him another chance.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I certainly have no hesitation in saying yes, because a small portion of it, I understand, does not apply to the school tax relief, but the greatest proportion does and I understand that customarily in this House, over the last six, seven, eight years, that that has been the practice. I am only following along with the practice as far as the claiming of that particular amount of money, but I certainly do not stand here, Mr. Chairman and say that every dollar of that amount goes for school tax relief. The greatest percentage of it does, however.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I have to tell the Honourable Minister that as one increases the minimum and maximum of the property tax credit, the more one starts biting into the cost of municipal taxation, and I can tell the Minister that I'm pretty sure that the first time it was brought in by our government, it was all education and all of it was used for education and as it increased it developed but, Mr. Chairman, I won't let this Minister off the hook. This Minister is saying, I am following a practice that was in this House. I am asking him — no I don't have to ask him, he's already stated that he knows full well that the statements he has made are incorrect. It's a question of degree. —(Interjection)— Oh.

**MR. COSENS:** I am not saying the statement is incorrect at all. I say we're merely following the practice that was followed by the honourable gentlemen opposite. I can give them the sums that they claimed in each year from 1973 on, and they claimed the total sum as an educational contribution. Some of my colleagues around me are saying, and they also claimed it in two other places as well, but I'm not too concerned about that at this point, Mr. Chairman, but certainly the member is not going to stand there and say, oh, I'm trying to hoodwink someone. I am not hoodwinking anyone at all. I am saying that we are merely following the same practice as they followed in this regard. It is my understanding, although I have never seen the figures, that the majority, the vast majority of this sum of money does go for tax relief. For the honourable member to say, oh, there was a day when it all went for school tax relief, I doubt that just as well, Mr. Chairman. These things are relative

regardless of whether we go back five, six years. At that point taxes may have been lower, both municipal and school taxes and costs were not as high. I am sure that the portion again would be comparable.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister can talk all he likes about what went on and following a practice. I am talking about this year and I am talking about next year and I want to know if this Minister, admitting as he has already done, that a portion of the property tax credit, is of a municipal tax relief nature, is continuing to say that, and he's yes, because it was done that way in the past. He's following a practice. He knows that it is incorrect, and now I want to challenge his integrity, Mr. Chairman, to ascertain just how much there is. He understands; somebody told him; he heard that a large proportion is education and a small proportion is municipal. It may be true, but if he's going to go around talking like that, even though he says it was done in the past doesn't make it right, unless he feels it was right then. Maybe he does, Mr. Chairman. Maybe he says it was correct to do it that way before, therefore it's correct to do it now. If he says that I will understand but that's not what he said, Mr. Chairman. Not once did he say that it is the correct way of doing it. All he said is, I'm doing it the way it was done. I'm really asking him that question, will he find out how much? I suspect the proportion is changing. I may be wrong but let him at least know what he is talking about when he talks, because he is the Minister of Education and he is assuming responsibility for talking about education payments by government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the final point. The Minister for Economic Affairs can rejoice. The final point I want to raise with the Minister is, is this indeed, this property tax credit? Will the Minister assess the change that was brought in by his government of increasing both the top and the bottom of the bracket of property tax credit by 100, that in effect it was a regressive increase? In other words that type of increase helps the high income taxpayer more than the low income taxpayer simply because the increase of 100 is a much greater percentage of the bottom, let's say the wealthy class, the minimum, than it is a percentage of the maximum and to that extent it is more helpful in actual dollars and in proportion to the higher income person than the lower income person. Has he considered that in presenting this to us, and can he justify it?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I would have to refer the honourable member to the Minister of Finance in this regard. It is his department who do the bulk of the studies on this type of tax and so on and they would have those particular figures as to who benefits the most. I know that an awful lot of Manitobans have benefited and benefited greatly by this latest move by this government.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I have to tell him, there a great many Manitobans benefiting greatly out of this item and the shame is that for two years preceding this they were denied the proper and sensible increase in tax benefits so that the Minister should hang his head in shame rather than pride

when he has to admit that for two years they did not do what they did this year and that therefore they really owe the property taxpayers two years back credits for the amounts that they should have been giving them, if they were justified this year.

You see, Mr. Chairman, you can't have it both ways. They stall around; they deny it for two years; they bring it in this year when there is about to be a revolution in the whole school tax structure with all the school boards probably getting ready to march onto the Legislative grounds, and they brought it in this year, under I believe, a form of duress and they denied it in the two preceding years. You can well imagine that had they done it progressively up to 100 this year by saying 25 or 50 and 75 and then 100, they owe a lot of money to the property taxpayers for the last two years, and they should not take pride in what they've done. They should hang their heads in shame. But the reason I asked the Minister the question which I know full well can be better answered by the Minister of Finance, is that this Minister is taking credit for his program, for the property tax credit, so I assumed that the least he ought to do is to be sufficiently familiar with the program to be able to justify it on the educational grants levy, right in Financial Support — Public Schools, that's why I thought it would have here. He is a member of the Treasury Bench, it could not have been done without him, I'm sure. Well maybe it could have. Maybe it could have, I take that back. Maybe it was done without consultation, but surely after it was done he had ample time to find out what is the impact of what he takes credit for, what is the impact on the low income as compared with the high income people, and I again challenge him as I did on finding out the proportion that is school tax and the proportion that is municipal tax, I also challenge him to find out who benefited most from this 100 increase, for which he is taking credit as part of the collective group of Treasury Bench. It would be interesting to see if he accepts my challenge.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, I wanted to review a couple of questions that I put to the Minister the other day. He has handed out some documentation on students and teachers and so on in regard to private and parochial schools, and I also wonder whether he has figures on the numbers of schools themselves. We can see some of the figures of grant payments, we have that, some of the figures on the number of certified and uncertified teachers in the last couple of years, and some information on the number of students in the past year or two, but I asked him essentially for figures of number of students over the past three years, the number of teachers over the past three years, also, if I didn't then, I want to know the number of schools over the past three years, and in addition to that if he had figures of projection. He did release a document to my colleague from St. Vital about public school projections over the next five years in terms of the population of students, but I'm very curious as to whether he has similar projections in regard to private and parochial schools. I would just ask him if

he could make a comment now or if he can provide us with any figures at this time?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I don't have all of the figures that have been requested by the Member for Elmwood with me at this time. He's requesting the number of schools, the number of teachers, the number of students over the last three years, I'll have to get him that information, I don't think he expects me to have that sort of information with me. I can tell him that in 1979, three private schools closed and three private schools opened, that sort of information, but to get down to these particular specifics, nor do I have projections as to the future in regard to private schools. An awful lot of factors can affect that, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, we'll wait for that, but I want to remind the Minister that I asked him that two days ago and it sounded like it was forthcoming at any moment.

An important but brief question is this, and I put this to the Minister the other day, I don't believe he provided us with an answer. Can he clarify for the committee why he is not providing the full amount of the special needs requested by the city of Winnipeg in the sense of School Division No. 1. They contend that they should receive 7 million for special needs and the Minister has said that whereas a million dollars was given a few years ago, he would now increase it to 1.5 million. I would like to know on what basis he does not provide them with 100 percent of their request? Is it because he doesn't have the money? Is it because he doesn't believe their case? Is it because he believes it to the extent of a million and a half over seven or seven and one-half, whatever it is. On what grounds does he not provide them with the full funding? I would like to understand his thinking on the matter.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, surely the Member for Elmwood is not standing in his place and suggesting that government, any government, provides all of the money that everyone requests of that particular government, or perhaps he is suggesting that, Mr. Chairman, and that is rather interesting, because if he is that wasn't the practice that he followed when he was in government, but now he is suggesting if someone asked for 7 million give them 7 million. Of course, he called 7 million a paltry sum a couple of nights ago.

I suggest to the honourable member that on consideration of the situation, on the information that I have at this particular time, the government has seen fit to provide 1.5 million, Mr. Chairman, in addition to the nutrition grant of some 200,000.00. In addition, Mr. Chairman, to all of the other specific grants that go to Winnipeg No. 1 and to some other divisions to provide for assistance with specific needs children, and we will be getting into those at some point during the summer, where we will be discussing the assistance to the Child Guidance Clinic of Winnipeg, that is a sum this year, I believe, over 700,000.00. We can go into the moneys that are provided for the special programs that are offered at the Health Sciences Centre, the educational programs there. We can go into a variety of other programs where the government funds completely

Thursday, 5 June, 1980

the services that are provided for special needs children. In this case, Winnipeg No. 1, because this is the situation that the member is referring to.

If we start adding, Mr. Chairman, all of these sums of money together, it is not that paltry 1.5 million that the member refers to, but it becomes a rather considerable sum of money that accrues to Winnipeg No. 1 to assist them in offering the services that they feel are necessary for the special needs of their division.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, I have to say to the Minister in passing that I ask him not to put words into my mouth, because if he wants to engage in that, I will then invent speeches for him and then I will excoriate him for saying things that he never said. It is called setting up straw men.

I am not satisfied with what the Minister says and, you know, he says to me that he is not going to accept holus-bolus all the requests of all the divisions. I understand that, Mr. Chairman, nobody would do that.

**MR. COSENS:** Now you are putting words in my mouth.

**MR. DOERN:** Okay, well then we are even. The point is this, Mr. Chairman, that I have carefully assessed the requests of the Winnipeg School Division and I think they have a powerful case. They have made that case to the Minister and he slammed the door in their face. I read their brief and I read about all their special requirements, what makes them different from any other division in the city of Winnipeg, in terms of Metropolitan Winnipeg, in terms of any other school division in the province of Manitoba, and they persuade me of the justice or the merit of their case. So I say to the Minister again, does he not accept the fact that they have an immigrant population, a transient population, a native population, that they have particular and peculiar requirements that no other division has, and therefore that they can make a powerful case? I ask the Minister whether it is on the grounds that he doesn't accept their case, that he rejects out of hand what they say and what they argue, or is he saying that he just doesn't have the money, if he had the money or is he had more money he would provide them with more funding? Is he rejecting their case on economic grounds or on educational grounds, or some other political grounds? I want to know the basis of his rejection.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, in the determination of grants for any particular purpose, with any particular school division, my department has some responsibility to assess that situation to the best of our ability and then apportion grants to the best of our ability in relation to the amount of money at our disposal.

In this particular year, we have seen fit, on the basis of the evidence that we had, to increase the one particular grant, the Winnipeg special grant, but as I have mentioned earlier, Mr. Chairman, there are a vast number of other grants that we will move to during the summer and I will be pleased to point out to the Member for Elmwood on each occasion the additional amount that will accrue to Winnipeg No. 1.

But in this case, we have seen fit in the Winnipeg special grant to increase it by .5 million.

It is also our commitment, Mr. Chairman, in the years ahead to keep increasing the amount of money that we are providing for special needs programs and we will follow that particular commitment.

**MR. DOERN:** Then I have to ask the Minister a more specific question. Is he then saying that it was on economic grounds that he decided not to provide a fuller funding, namely, towards 7 million, was it an economic decision on his part?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, there are a great number of factors that come into play, I suppose, in any policy decision, and there are a number of factors that came into play in this particular decision. However, as a result of our consideration of all those factors, we saw our way fit this year to increase that particular grant by .5 million. I am talking just about one particular grant. The nutrition grant was increased this year. When we move to the other sections, the honourable member will find that they have been increased and increased by certainly, I would say, a rather considerable amount. If the honourable member can wait until we get to those sections, that will become very apparent to him.

**MR. DOERN:** I then would ask the Minister on what basis he did not see it as necessary to increase that special grant to Winnipeg for the past two years? He made no increase, he froze that grant, that 1 million for two years. Can he indicate on what basis he decided not to provide increased funding for the past two years?

**MR. COSENS:** No, Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of going into all the details of the strategies and the deliberations that take place in any policy decision. I think if you are a member of the government you take responsibility for those decisions. As I have mentioned to the member I take full responsibility for them and I really am not prepared to go into all of the ramifications of how those decisions are arrived at.

**MR. DOERN:** Then I would ask the Minister whether it was because of the political pressure on the government that he decided to make that move this year?

**MR. COSENS:** No, Mr. Chairman, not a matter of political pressure at all, a matter of consideration of all the factors that must be considered when one is budgeting and after those deliberations, making a decision.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, just one other area I wanted to cover here with the Minister and that is if he could indicate what he is attempting to achieve with his so-called program of testing the writing skills and the maths skills and various other things? I am wondering whether on a point of principle here, on a point of policy, whether he is in fact going to re-introduce province-wide testing, because, Mr. Chairman, this was a debate. Prior to the last election, there was a considerable amount of discussion as to whether or not we would have

Thursday, 5 June, 1980

provincial standards or whether we would have individuality in terms of programs. It would be attempted to be developed in the divisions at the school level and at the teacher level. I want to ask him whether he is going to move in the direction of province-wide standards.

**MR. COSENS:** If I could just interject?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** On a point of order?

**MR. COSENS:** Yes.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister on a point of order.

**MR. COSENS:** Certainly I would be very pleased to address that particular question but we do have a line in the estimates entitled Measurement and Evaluation that deals with that topic specifically under 4.(f) and as long as the member is going to be here in July or August when we get to that item, I'd rather treat it then than this evening.

**MR. DOERN:** It's an interesting coincidence, Mr. Chairman, that 4.(f) is what you get when you're rejected from the army and I think that's what the Minister is going to get when he takes his program before the public in the next provincial election.

Mr. Chairman, there are one or two more questions here. The government has continually held out promises to the people of Manitoba and to the school trustees in particular that they would work towards 80 percent funding in terms of the foundation levy and the foundation program, and yet they seem to have been sliding in reverse. And every time we press this question upon the Minister he says, well, that is a goal. It is obviously a very distant goal, it is obviously a receding goal, because each year that the government is in power they seem to move in the opposite direction. I want to ask him whether he feels it satisfactory when it comes to public school financing that the Winnipeg Division, according to the Teachers Society, depending on what is included in the finance program or the finance package on one account, according to one account they receive only 46.2 percent of the school division's revenue, and if you include the property tax rebate that you only reach a level of 73 percent of funding. I just wonder whether the Minister accepts those figures and whether he intends to, in effect, back up this so-called promise of increased provincial funding, or whether this is just something that he talks about and says, some day in a perfect world we will have this kind of funding, because that is so far all we have been hearing?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I have to correct the honourable member. The figures that he has quoted are not correct. The 73 percent should read 76.6 percent. It is quite possible that whoever the authors were of those particular figures had not taken into account the increased property tax rebate or the increased rebate to senior citizen homeowners, and that type of thing, but the level this year is 76.6 percent.

Further to his question, I would ask him to perhaps wait a few months. If he remembers the statement of

the Minister of Finance during the Budget Speech, he stated that this government would be coming forth with a new educational finance program for the province in this calendar year. I refer him to the actual words of the Minister of Finance and I would suggest that he wait a few more months for that particular answer. Yes, that is our goal, Mr. Chairman, and at 76.6 percent I would suggest we are moving towards it and would draw his attention back to 1976 when the percent for this province that was provided by the government of the day was 73.7 percent — that was 1976, Mr. Chairman, and it did take an increase in the election year by coincidence up to some 75 percent.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, the last area I wanted to ask the Minister about again was what seemed to me a reasonable and moderate request that was turned down by the Public Schools Finance Board, and that is in providing funds for George V School. Now this is a school in my area, it is a school that was threatened with closure because of the fact that it needed structural repairs. It is a viable school; they seem to have a sufficient population. The parents in the area fought to keep the school open. They went to the Public Schools Finance Board time and time again with the Winnipeg School Division and asked for some 200,000 to repair the school, and they were given 25,000.00.

Mr. Chairman, there is something funny here. I wonder if the Minister can indicate how, when what appears to be a reasonable request to keep a school open, if that hadn't been done that school would have been closed, for a 200,000 amount — I don't know how much that school is worth, probably a couple of million dollars — and they went to the province for help and the province did not provide them with a reasonable funding. They gave them 25,000 after I don't know how many meetings, I don't know how many hours the parents put into fighting to keep that neighborhood school open. We are talking about declining enrolment and things like that, that was a sort of general related problem, they have a slightly declining enrollment too, but that wasn't their basic problem. Their basic problem was they had a structure that needed repair.

Mr. Chairman, I am getting interrupted by a member from the Municipal Affairs Committee, whose sidekick from Rock Lake is looking for him in the hall so that they can work out tomorrow's questions, and I would ask him if he could try to find his buddy so that he doesn't get caught off guard.

Mr. Chairman, I don't want to wait up the Minister of Economic Development, he has been sleeping for two and one-half years, so we will wait for him shortly when we get to his department. We are looking forward to that, especially when he went down to Mexico to sell some of those pre-fabricated adobe huts that he is hoping to break into the Mexican market with.

Mr. Chairman, aside from that, I would like to know how did it occur . . .

**HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur):** Mr. Chairman, on a point or order.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture on a point of order.

Thursday, 5 June, 1980

**MR. DOWNEY:** I would think that we are on the estimates of the Department of Education and the comments or the snide remarks made by the Member for Elmwood, as far as I am concerned, are nothing to do with the Department of Education estimates. If he wants to sit in here until this time next year, then he should continue on doing that, but I would think he should be brought back to order to debate the estimates of the Department of Education.

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

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister always answers better when he has a set-up question and I think that is a good example of how he fares better in debate when someone gives him a set-up.

I ask the Minister again if he can explain how it is that at this particular school, and after all the efforts of the parents in the area, over how many months — I guess a whole year — and with finally persuading the Winnipeg School Division, finally getting the support to the Winnipeg School Division, and then going back and forth to the Public Schools Finance Board, they came away with 25,000.00. The rest of the money was, in fact, put up by the Winnipeg School Division; they obviously saw the merit. I am asking him on what basis he can justify this amount of money, which was one-eighth of the request, and if that money hadn't been forthcoming he would have had another school closing in the city of Winnipeg because of inadequate provincial funding and in this particular instance because of capital?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, the Member for Elmwood is on his favourite topic and, of course, it is within his constituency and I suppose that is good politics, because this must be the sixth time that he has brought the topic to my attention. And I must tell him that a proposal comes from the school division to the Public Schools Finance Board regarding additions or new buildings, the Public Schools Finance Board studies that particular request or proposal in relation to the accommodation for students that is required on the basis of the enrolments and the enrolment projections. After careful study by people who do this day in and day out, Mr. Chairman, they make a decision and it is forwarded to the school division in regard to that particular school addition or school building.

This is what happened in the case that the honourable member refers to. The school board then can either accept that particular recommendation, they can ignore it I suppose and go ahead on their own if that is their wish and their desire, or they can appeal it to the Minister.

In the case that he refers to, the school division made the decision that they would go ahead on their own with the particular renovations that they felt needed to be put in place in this case.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, I ask the Minister and I believe there was a meeting with the committee and/or the Winnipeg School Division concerning that school. I believe an appeal was made to the Minister. —(Interjection)— No? Well, I could be mistaken.

All the Minister is telling me is, he is telling me what the mechanism is. He is saying that there is a mechanism and there is a board and I believe I am correct in saying that I drew this particular case to the attention of the Minister. This is not the first time he has heard about this particular case, and I wonder whether he didn't look into this matter. I ask him whether he at any time weighed the merits of the George V case, or whether he left the decision entirely in the hands of the Public Schools Finance Board?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I think the Honourable Member for Elmwood ignores the whole process and so on. I believe he would like a system, and maybe that was the system that existed a few years ago, where if a certain politician wanted a school he went to the Minister and said, I would like a school, and received it, I don't know. But according to the Act the Public Schools Finance Board makes these decisions after very carefully considering all the aspects in the best interests of the children and of the taxpayers of this province. There is appeal to the Minister if the school board feels that the decision is not one that they can live with and that it is not justified. There was no appeal to the Minister in this case.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, I will conclude with a comment, and leave it at that. I say to the Minister that in a way he is getting off the hook here, that he is saying, well, it is up to the Public Schools Finance Board, period, and that politicians shouldn't play a role. —(Interjection)— I should be quiet and not support the schools in my area and he should be quiet and let the Public Schools Finance Board make the decisions. Then this whole Chamber, I suppose, is irrelevant. Maybe we will just have other bodies make decisions as opposed to political representatives.

My point is simply this, Mr. Chairman, and I conclude on this point. There was a request on the part of a school board on behalf of citizens in an area to save a neighbourhood school, an old school with an enrolment of a couple of hundred students, for the sum of some 200,000 — that included a number of things, but essentially it was to structurally repair a school, and to replace that school would cost several millions of dollars, I am sure. I want to say to the Minister, in case he doesn't know, and we'll deal with this later on, we have spent in the past number of years some 6 million to make structural repairs to Red River Community College, 6 million to prevent that complex from having a series of closures because of structural problems. If that was merited because of some very poor design on the part of the architect and possibly some construction flaws on the part of the contractor, if it was felt that there was some merit in providing that money, then I think that the case can be made, if 6 million is to save accommodations for some 3,000 students or whatever the exact figure is at Red River, then it strikes me that one can make a pretty powerful case that for 200,000, a school could have been saved for a couple of hundred students. It seems to me the logic must be the same and the comparison must be similar, because if that decision hadn't been made by the Winnipeg School Division,



that school would be closed. That school would be closed today.

I'm simply saying that I don't accept the judgement of the Public Schools Finance Board in this particular regard. I think they took a narrow position. I think they should have provided all the funding that was requested and I also think that the Minister should have looked into that matter and have possibly overruled the Public Schools Finance Board. He has that authority and he has that responsibility. When he feels that the case merits that kind of action, he has that responsibility to intervene and to make such a judgement. So I tell him that I am disappointed that the entire burden of that cost was picked up by the Winnipeg School Division. I think it was a legitimate charge to the Public Schools Finance Board and I think they failed in that particular area.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (a)—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

**MR. WALDING:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to follow up on some of the comments that my colleagues had made earlier on. I'd like to begin with the matter of aid to private schools and ask the Minister whether there are regulations that a person can look at to see just under what circumstances a private school might be entitled to assistance, and the rate and the timing and details of that sort of thing. Are there such regulations, Mr. Chairman?

**MR. COSENS:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, there are regulations governing those particular circumstances, covering the program that is offered. There must be subjects that are equivalent to the subjects offered in the provincial curriculum and teachers must be certified, for any qualification for assistance.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, assuming, as I believe the Minister did earlier on, that his two bills, PSA and The Administration Act will pass this session, is it the Minister's intention to bring out new regulations to cover the granting of aid directly to private schools?

**MR. COSENS:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think that's a reasonable assumption, that with a new Act, there will have to be new regulations.

**MR. WALDING:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Further to the Minister's earlier remarks about the necessity for teachers in private schools to hold valid Manitoba teaching certificates, I'd like now to refer back to the figures that the Minister gave me earlier on about teachers' certification in private schools, where the Minister indicates that there are a total of 146 teachers who are presently uncertified and presumably teaching in private schools, a figure which is down only one teacher from some 18 months ago of September, 1978. Now, given that the Minister says that as part of the criterion for granting aid to private schools is the necessity for teachers to be certified, how does he explain the fact that there are 146 uncertified teachers, presumably in schools that are presently receiving public funds?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, perhaps I can make this point once again and make it quite clearly, quite

lucidly for the member's benefit. There is no money paid to a private school for any subjects taught by a teacher who is not certified. It is quite possible that there will be moneys accrue to that school for other teachers on staff who are teaching subjects that are equivalent to the provincial curriculum, and other teachers who are certified, but it is quite feasible we could have a school situation with 20 teachers and have 14 that are certified, six that are not. Of that 14, we might have 12 that are teaching subjects that are equivalent to the provincial curriculum. The other remaining two might be teaching religion, or some subject that is not equivalent to that offered by the provincial curriculum.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, when we discussed this matter a year ago, the Minister said at that time that there was a requirement that teachers in private schools should be certified in order to receive public funds. I do not recall the quotation word for word, but the Minister said that steps were being taken to see that certification was granted to certain uncertified teachers. I wonder if he can inform the committee as to what happened in order to grant certification to those certified teachers?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, certification requirements were laid out as to the number of education subjects that a person would have to take, in addition to perhaps an academic degree that they had, before they could qualify for a permanent certificate, and people, to my understanding, are pursuing that in the private schools as, in fact, some pursue subjects in the public schools.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister whether permanent certification was granted to some uncertified private school teachers on a different basis from other teachers in this province, in other words, those going through the usual teacher training procedure and intending to enter the public school system?

**MR. COSENS:** Certification, Mr. Chairman, to my knowledge, is exactly the same for any teacher in the province.

**MR. WALDING:** Is the Minister then telling me that no permanent certification was granted to any private school teacher on any different basis from any other teacher in this province seeking certification?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I would have to rule that question out of order. It's completely repetitive to the previous question, and the answer was given by the Honourable Minister. Would you care to restate your question?

The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, I have found from experience in questioning the Minister that he will give what sounds like a plausible answer and sometimes on reviewing it, it's not quite the full and definitive answer that I would have expected from the particular question. I'm not sure whether I can rephrase it without saying it again, but I'm asking the Minister for his assurance, or is he satisfied, to his

own conscience, that no private school uncertified teacher has been granted permanent certification on any different basis than any other teacher in Manitoba?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, in relation to that, I should tell the honourable member that I can well imagine that if he is looking at the situation where a teacher in training will take perhaps an Arts Degree at the University and then a year of teacher training before going out under an interim certificate that, yes, teachers in the private school would receive certification in a different manner in that they are not expected to go back for a full year after, in some cases, having taught for 28 or 30 years, but they are expected to take education courses, courses in pedagogy, that would be the equivalent of a year in teacher training.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, perhaps you see now why I have rephrased the question as I did, because the Minister quite clearly gave an indication in reply to the first couple of questions there that there was absolutely no difference at all and then when I pressed him directly, yes, he admitted that there were different standards, but they were more or less the same, or equivalent, was — (Interjection)— If the Member for River Heights wishes to enter the debate, he is entirely capable of standing up and attempting to catch your eye, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. FILMON:** If you say anything worth debating, I will.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, I'd like to refer to a matter that the Member for River Heights raised a couple of evenings ago, and that was the Greater Winnipeg education levy. I don't want to repeat what the member said, it was basically true, but one thing that he did not do, and one thing that his colleague from St. Matthews didn't do in speaking to his resolution, was to explain the basis for that Greater Winnipeg education levy and how it is arrived at. I wonder if the Minister would care to explain to the committee just what the basis of that levy is?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, that is a very complicated procedure indeed. Is the member really serious in his request? Does he want me to go into all the details of how that is arrived at and so on? It's an attempt at equalization. They consider all of the divisions that fall within the boundaries of Greater Winnipeg; they take the division with the lowest per pupil cost and then computing from that particular level, arrive at what they consider is an equitable distribution across the city, among all of the school divisions that comprise Greater Winnipeg.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, yes, I did want the Minister to detail the matter and he indicated that, yes, it's very complicated, yet he managed to explain it to the members in about two sentences. It seems a little contradictory, Mr. Chairman.

The reason I wanted the Minister to explain it to the committee is because I suspect that there are many members in this Chamber who do not understand the basis for that Greater Winnipeg

education levy, and in listening to the Minister's explanation of it, I'm not sure that it was entirely accurate. The Minister spoke of the division within the Winnipeg area which has the lowest per pupil cost. I believe those were his words. My understanding is that it has to do with an increase in year-over-year of a particular figure, if he would like to just refresh his memory. Given, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister has been studying this problem for the last two and a half years, as he has told us on several occasions, I would expect him to be very familiar with the details of the problem.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, if the member wishes to pursue this, I would refer him to Section 537.1, subsection 1 of The Public Schools Act.

**MR. WALDING:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I hope that other members of the committee who are also interested in this topic will take note of the particular reference and apprise themselves of the method in computing it.

I would like to ask the Minister what effect provincial equalization has on the Greater Winnipeg education levy?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, they are two separate programs entirely, operating separate from each other. The Greater Winnipeg equalization levy applies only to the city of Winnipeg; the provincial equalization program applies across the province. The provincial equalization program is based on the student enrolment and the balanced assessment of each particular school division and then, of course, the equalization — and it's only a partial equalization, as is the Greater Winnipeg equalization — the provincial equalization is then figured out on a particular formula ranging from 30.00 to those who have the highest assessment per pupil to a maximum, Mr. Chairman, of, I believe, what is it, 300.00? I'll have to check that figure, Mr. Chairman. 318.00, or a figure close to that. We have revised it this year.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister explains that these are two entirely separate programs, and he is right. But he says that one has nothing to do with the other one and I would have to take issue with him on that and suggest to him that equalization itself, provincial equalization, results in a certain amount of dollars going to Seine River, and that is the reason why it is at the low end of the totem pole. It is a program on one hand that is intended by government to equalize things, that results in a greater disparity between the divisions in Winnipeg. I would have expected the Minister to understand that and to be able to explain it to the committee.

I am not sure if he wishes to comment on that or enlarge in any more detail as to how one grant formula affects another.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I must inform the member that he is entirely wrong in his assumption. The provincial equalization has no bearing whatsoever on the per pupil cost that is the basis for the Greater Winnipeg equalization levy, the per pupil cost, in this case of the Seine River, which is the basis, the division with the lowest per pupil cost as

far as the Greater Winnipeg equalization levy is concerned.

If the member is saying, Mr. Chairman, that in fact you have two equalization formulas at work in the province as far as the city of Winnipeg is concerned, he is absolutely correct. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I might add, there are three under the present system. The Foundation Levy in itself is another form of equalization. So we have three equalization strategies in place.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister contends that I am wrong. I am suggesting to him that provincial equalization results in the Seine River School Division, which is the smallest, it affects that division by putting it at the lowest end of the scale and by a certain number of dollars, and I don't recall the number of dollars, and that if equalization were not in effect, then the figure for Seine River would not be down here at the bottom. It would be that much higher and because it was higher, the other school divisions, in proportion, would not be in that same pay-out position, at least the paying divisions, that is, Winnipeg, Fort Garry, and Norwood. It would also result, I believe, in those other suburban school divisions, in receiving less under the Greater Winnipeg Education Levy.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I merely reiterate to the honourable member that the equalization process, whether he is talking about the Foundation Levy, or whether he is talking about the Greater Winnipeg Equalization Levy or, in fact, the Provincial Equalization, has no bearing on the per pupil cost of any particular school division. It certainly has a bearing on the amount of money that they receive in grants from the province and so on, but it has nothing to do with the per pupil cost.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, I won't pursue it with the Minister because I don't have the figures with me, but I'm sure that we won't complete the department this evening and it might give me the opportunity to come back to the Minister again on it. —(Interjection)— I'll inform the Honourable Member for River Heights that I did and if he has a different point of view, again, he is entitled to stand up and make his point.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the Minister for some information on the Foundation Levy and the total assessment that is used by the Public Schools Finance Board in setting the farm, residential, and other mill rates. I wonder if he could give me the value of the total assessment for the province for the latest available year, and possibly a couple of years before that, just as a comparison?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, while we are getting that information for the honourable member, he probably has other questions in this regard; if he would care to place them before the committee, we can be taking those into consideration as well.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, in doing some research on this whole area of assessment and education financing, I have noticed that the levy appears to be listed as balanced assessment, yet the term balanced assessment doesn't apply to municipalities, that there it is called a taxable

assessment. I understand that the mill rate on balanced assessment is adjusted so as to apply to taxable assessment.

I wonder if the Minister could explain to me — he has used the expression before of balanced assessment — can he explain how balanced assessment differs from taxable assessment?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, the balanced assessment is based on the equalized assessment plus personal property for the previous year.

The figures that the honourable member asked for on the total Foundation Balanced Assessment for 1979 — the total for the province was 2.8 billion, and the total for the province in 1980 is 2.9 billion. If the member would like those broken down into the two main categories for 1979, that 2.8 billion is made up of 2 billion under farm and residential, and 853 million under Other — I'm rounding figures here, Mr. Chairman.

For 1980, the 2.9 billion is composed of: Farm and residential, 2.1 billion; and the Other is made up of 886 million.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for that information. I wonder if he could also provide me, at his leisure, with the same figure for the two previous years, 1978 and 1977, if that would be possible?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, certainly I will get that information for the member. I think he realizes that he is asking for information that I ordinarily wouldn't have with me and if he wishes to have that type of information, certainly I'll endeavour to get it for him.

**MR. WALDING:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I had also asked the Minister for an explanation of balanced assessment, and he brought in another term, equalized assessment and I'm not sure that I understand what that is as distinct from taxable assessment. We now have three different terms, all having to do with assessment. I wonder if the Minister could explain the difference between those three.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, those particular figures are provided for us by the Department of Municipal Affairs and it is rather complicated. Perhaps I can produce it in writing for the honourable member. I have to refresh my memory at times on all of the different definitions, so I make no claim, Mr. Chairman, to stand here and be able to explain every aspect of the municipal portion in this regard. I will give the member a definition of these terms and an explanation of how they arrive at these particular definitions.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, I don't blame the Honourable Minister for refreshing his memory. I am told that the topic is somewhat complex and wouldn't really expect him to have a detailed explanation off the top of his head.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I can ask the Minister whether within the Foundation Program this year, there are salary grants for resource teachers for

Thursday, 5 June, 1980

Special Education. If so, what is the value of that grant for this year?

**MR. COSENS:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, those salary grants do exist and I can break those out for the honourable member. Perhaps, in fact, if he can wait until we get to the appropriate section under Child Development Support Services, I can give him the specific number of teachers who are receiving those grants and so on, if that is his particular interest.

**MR. WALDING:** Just for clarification, Mr. Chairman, are those grants under the Salary portion of the Foundation Program? Are they part of the 80.6 million?

**MR. COSENS:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. I am informed that there are 509 in the fall term 1979.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, I didn't ask the Minister for the number; I asked him for the amount, in dollars.

**MR. COSENS:** That isn't immediately available, Mr. Chairman. I can endeavour to get it for him.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (a)—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

**MR. WALDING:** One question that arises from that, I would like to know whether those grants for those 509 teachers are conditional or dedicated to that particular topic, or is the money sent to school divisions under that category, but which they can use for other purposes?

**MR. COSENS:** No, Mr. Chairman, these moneys go towards teachers who are working with children with special needs.

**MR. WALDING:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would certainly hope that they are used for the purpose that they are listed for. The Minister didn't answer my question when I asked is the money conditional upon being used for that purpose?

**MR. COSENS:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, the grants go to teachers who are doing that particular type of work within the system.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, I have heard a number of complaints, mostly from teachers, that funds going to various school divisions for the purpose of Special Education are not necessarily always and entirely used to pay teachers in the area of special needs, special education, and that those dollars, or those needs are competing with other teacher needs. It is further suggested that when the local autonomy is used by local school divisions, that they use that local autonomy to decide what it is that they will cut, and what they are tempted to cut are teaching positions for special education and special needs, and that they will attempt to keep the reading, writing and arithmetic, at the expense of those other dollars.

I wonder if the Minister can confirm that or whether he has any observations or whether he can deny that that is happening? Or conversely, can he assure the committee that it is not happening?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I have had no cases, such as those the member mentions, brought to my attention. If he has specific information in that regard, I would be interested in knowing about it. I suggest to the honourable member that if we are going to respect the autonomy of the elected officials and the school boards of this province, and I do, then that is the other side of the coin, isn't it? There is a possibility that that autonomy might, in some scarce incident, it may on occasion happen that someone will abuse that particular responsibility, but as I say, I have no indication that it is happening. If he has some specific indication I would be very interested in knowing about it.

**MR. WALDING:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't have many more questions on this section. I hope we can move on. One thing I wanted to pick up from the Minister's opening statement, and I'll quote on page 8, over all, considering both provincial and divisional budget contributions, it is estimated that total special education support will reach some 28 million, up 10 percent from the 1979-80 estimates of 25.5 million. In reviewing Hansard from last year, Mr. Chairman, there was a pretty clear indication from the Minister that that figure was not 25 but 15 million, and I believe one of my colleagues had asked the Minister for a break-out of where that 15 million was in the Estimates. It was later shown that not all of that amount was in the departmental estimates for that year. So I'll ask the Minister again now for a break-out of the 28 million. Can he indicate to the committee where that money is coming from and how it is being spent?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I would be quite prepared to break out those particular figures for the honourable member when we get to the relevant section. I would suggest that that would be under Child Development and Support Services 4.(j).

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if by the time we get to 4.(j) that we would not have passed other lines in the estimates where there would be some of this money that is being spent. The Minister mentions Child Development and Support Services, and I notice there is a line under this appropriation, 3.(e). It says some 2.2 million is going to Child Development and Support Services. I wonder if there is not money under 3.(a) that is also going to Special Needs Education, perhaps some under the Salary Grants of the Foundation Program; and perhaps Transportation would have some money in there that would be applicable to Special Needs; whether or not School Nutrition would not come under the heading of Special Needs, or the Winnipeg Special Grant might not be included in that. Now I'm just guessing, Mr. Chairman, because I don't know how the Minister categorizes Special Education. Rather than risk running foul of your wrath, Mr. Chairman, in discussing something that is not before us, I wonder if the Minister could provide that information for us under this appropriation.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I'd be quite prepared to break this down when we get to either 3.(e) Child Development and Support Services or under 4.(j)

Thursday, 5 June, 1980

Child Development and Support Services, where the greater proportion of these funds are.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, I'll comprise at 3.(e). I don't mind doing that. I don't believe I have any further questions on this item, other than to ask the Minister, for what purposes does Manitoba receive from Canada 12.8 million?

**MR. COSENS:** Under the Bilingualism Agreement, Mr. Chairman, we receive a certain sum of money from the federal department of Indian Affairs for Indian students who are attending our schools, and under the citizenship category.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (a)—pass. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

**MR. WALDING:** Could the Minister give us the dollar amounts for each of those, and could he explain the third category, the citizenship? What does that mean and what is that amount for?

**MR. COSENS:** The citizenship category, Mr. Chairman, involves the English- as-a-second language courses that are given to adults in Manitoba, and grants are provided by my department for that particular purpose.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, for the third time, could the Minister give us the dollar amounts under this item?

**MR. COSENS:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, the particular amounts are as follows: For tuition fees for Indian children, 9.9 million; for Bilingualism Agreement, 2.5 million; for the citizenship category, some 216,700 — pardon me, Mr. Chairman, under citizenship 150,000. There is also another category here, Native Para-professionals, with some 216,700, and an item called Sundry of some 50,000. I believe those figures come to some 12,858,900.00.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, did the Minister say that under the citizenship category there that this was ESL for adults? Is it for adults only, and is there nothing that goes towards the public school system for children with ESL needs?

**MR. COSENS:** That's correct, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. WALDING:** Can the Minister detail how that 150,000 is dispersed in ESL classes for adults?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I'll have to check with the relevant regulation in that regard. Under the heading, Grants for Instruction in English as a Second Language, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance on the requisition of the Minister shall pay to each division providing instruction in English as a second language, a grant of 1.15 per hour for each pupil undertaking instruction in English as a second language in a public school located in the city, and a grant of 1.35 per hour for each pupil undertaking such instruction in any other public school, where the pupil is over fourteen years of age and the pupil is not enrolled in a regular day-time program of studies provided by the division and undertaking instruction in English as a second language during the regular

day-time instructional period. And in that case, Mr. Chairman, we recover 50 percent of our expenditures from Canada.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, can the Minister confirm then that there is no federal contribution towards the teaching of English as a second language to children in Manitoba?

**MR. COSENS:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I can confirm that.

**MR. WALDING:** I have no further questions on 3.(a), Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (a)—pass. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if this would be a suitable time for the committee to rise?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Before I pose the question, the next item is Miscellaneous Grants, Item (b), which seems to be quite consistent with Item (a). Would there be further questions? If there are, then I'll pose the motion. Or may I pass Item (b) also? (b)—pass. The motion is that Committee Rise.

**MOTION presented and defeated.**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I will have to carry on. Item (c) Assistance to Schools in Remote Settlements—pass. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, I'm somewhat disappointed at the degree of co-operation that I get from the other side when I take your hint to pass to the next one. The Member for River Heights, heaven forbid he ever be a Minister, says it is mutual. I want to assure the Member for River Heights that I am prepared to co-operate and be as reasonable as possible. It is not my intention to keep him sitting here past midnight or to waste the time of the committee.

We're on (c) Assistance to Schools in Remote Settlements. Can the Minister give us a breakdown of this item?

**MR. COSENS:** There are two situations that remain in Manitoba that fall under this particular heading, Mr. Chairman, the Falcon Beach School and the school at Hillridge, Ebb and Flow, Manitoba. The department takes responsibility for the funding and administration of those two particular schools. At Falcon Beach there are three and a half classrooms, grades N to 8. The students in grades 9 to 12 are transported to Steinbach. There are still one or two students, I understand, that go to Whitemouth in Division No. 13; enrollment of some 48 students, 3 teachers, 1 caretaker, 1 bus contractor, 1 bus driver. At Hillridge we have 8 classrooms, 6 temporary units, Nursery to 6. Grades 7 to 12 are transported to Ste. Rose in Turtle River School Division. 179 students are enrolled at Hillridge, Mr. Chairman, 11 teachers, 2 native para-professional teacher aides, 2 native craft instructors, 1 librarian, 1 secretary, 2 caretakers, 3 bus contractors, 2 attendance officers, 1 student counsellor and 2 lunchroom supervisors on a part-time basis. The school at Falcon Beach, Mr.

Thursday, 5 June, 1980

Chairman, accommodates children of employees of the province, business operators in the vicinity. At Hillridge the student population consists of approximately 70 percent treaty students, and 30 percent non-treaty native students.

This branch also makes some arrangements for other children in remote settlements as well.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (c)—pass; (d)—pass; (e)—pass; Clause 3—pass. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, I believe it was on 3.(d) that the Minister had agreed to give us his breakdown, and with some trepidation, Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest that committee do now rise.

**MOTION presented and defeated.**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** We are on Clause 3. I have passed all the items (a) to (e), but we haven't passed Resolution No. 52. Therefore the question will still be in order to the Honourable Minister.

**MR. COSENS:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I had made some commitment to the honourable member to detail the particular moneys that are being spent in the special needs area, and I can do that under this heading or under 4.(j), whichever he prefers. This particular area covers special grants in a number of areas. In particular, Mr. Chairman, the grants to institutional services, the Child Guidance Clinic, Regional Corps Support Services, and the Gladstone Oral Deaf Program. The institutional services provide full funding for the provision of the educational programs, a number of treatment centres and hospitals, such as the Health Sciences Centre, Children's Centre, the Villa Rosa, St. Amant, Lindenvue Home and St. Boniface Hospital.

This section also covers school division programming for the blind, in other words, funding support for divisions which are programming for blind school-aged children.

As I have mentioned, it covers the funding for the administrative component of the Child Guidance Clinic. It provides regional course support services as well.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. The Honourable Member for St. Vital on a point of order?

**MR. WALDING:** No, Mr. Chairman. If I may interrupt the Minister for a moment, I don't want to waste his time having him read a lot of words into the record. I had asked him if he could give me a breakdown of the 28 million. I was interested in receiving the dollar amounts for which programs.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I think it is rather important that we also realize the amount of moneys that are being spent in these particular programs as well, but the member is interested in the funding on the overall aspect of Special Education, so I can give him these particular figures at this time.

Under Foundation Program Grants, 1980-81, some 509 teachers are authorized here as resource

teachers, TMH, EMH or OEC teachers. The estimated salary total there is some 4,408,000.00.

The authorized clinicians and co-ordinators amount to some 77 people with a total salary component of 810,564.00. These are under Foundation Program Grants. —(Interjection)— 810,564 was the last figure, for the authorized clinicians and co-ordinators. For a total in that category, under Foundation Program Grants, Mr. Chairman, of 5,218,564.00.

The school division contributions — and when I mentioned these figures earlier, Mr. Chairman, I was referring to the total Special Ed. funding in the province, including the actual school division contributions. Their contribution in the area of resource teachers, TMH, EMH and OEC teachers in 1980-81 will be some 9,901,506.00. Their contribution in regard to clinicians and co-ordinators, 3,975,105, for a total in that category of the school division contribution of 13,876,611.00.

The total, then, of those two categories, Mr. Chairman, that encompass the government's proportion and the school division proportion re the employment of resource TMH, EMH and OEC teachers, and clinicians and co-ordinators, amounts to some 19,095,175.00.

The Special Grants to school divisions for services and programs, Mr. Chairman, and these fall under 16.(3)(a), amount to 1 million under the Special Needs category, and we have remarked on that previously. In the case of Institutional Services, and that is the area that is presently under consideration, under 3.(e), 1,025,700.00.

Under the Child Guidance Clinic, Mr. Chairman, 732,200.00. Regional Course Support Services, and I was explaining these a bit earlier — I can come back to that — 429,800.00. The Gladstone Oral/Deaf Program, 102,200.00. A total for those special grants to divisions for services and programs under those two categories of 3,289,900.00.

Under the Department of Education Branch Budgets, Mr. Chairman, under the Manitoba School for the Deaf, 1,474,100; under the 4.(j) Child Development Support Services, a total of 2,071,600.00. So, adding those two figures together, Mr. Chairman, under Department of Education Branch Budgets, Manitoba School for the Deaf and CDSS for (j), a total of 3,545,700.00. There are other educational programs funded directly or indirectly by other government departments, Mr. Chairman, the Community Services and Corrections, and that amount is some 2,020,900.00. For a total, Mr. Chairman, of 27,951,700.00.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Clause 3—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, did the Minister give a breakdown of that last 2 million from Other Departments? Is this mostly the Health and Social Development or are other government departments involved too, and if so, in what manner?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I don't have that breakdown with me but it falls chiefly under Community Services, the greatest portion of that particular amount.

Thursday, 5 June, 1980

**MR. WALDING:** I realize that it's not the Minister's department but can he explain how or what the services are that Community Services would have to do with Special Education?

**MR. COSENS:** I don't have those at my fingertips, Mr. Chairman. I can get the honourable member a list of those particular services and the amounts that are spent in that regard. In fact, I can probably have them for him in a few minutes, if he wishes to pursue some other question.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister mentioned the TMH and EMH and OEC, both under the first group of figures that he gave me, under the Foundation Program, and also under the school division. It was my understanding that TMH and EMH grants were not now conditional. I understood the Minister to say earlier on that grants for special resource teachers were a conditional grant. Can he confirm this?

**MR. COSENS:** I'm not quite clear, Mr. Chairman, on what the member implies by conditional. I have given him the figure on the number of resource teacher grants, TMH grants, EMH grants, OEC teacher grants, that the department will provide in 1980-81. That covers some 506 people in those categories and some 77 people in the clinician and co-ordinator categories and, of course, the sums of money that go with them.

As in the case of classroom teachers, these grants do not pay the complete salary; they pay a portion of the salary. This accounts for the fact that school divisions as well have a contribution in this regard.

**MR. WALDING:** I would ask the Minister what the formula is for arriving at the 506 or 509 teachers. I assume that there is a formula, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. COSENS:** Again, Mr. Chairman, it is based on a student population figure and governed by regulation. I don't have that exact figure right here.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, I just wanted the Minister to confirm that it was on a formula basis and I seem to recollect that a school population of a certain size in a division was entitled to one of these grants and more for larger divisions, and perhaps none for smaller ones. If that is the case, then I want to ask the Minister, is the grant paid to the school division to go towards the salary of one special ed. teacher, or is it sent to them with all of their other grants that they can use for whatever purpose they wish, in the form of a block grant?

**MR. COSENS:** No, Mr. Chairman. I think I mentioned to the honourable member before, these are categorical grants and are to be applied for that particular service.

**MR. WALDING:** I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, my attention was momentarily distracted. I wonder if the Minister would repeat the last answer.

**MR. COSENS:** I'm just reminding the honourable member, Mr. Chairman, that these are categorical grants and must apply to that particular type of teaching, whether it be resource, EMH, TMH, or

OEC. It is based on the qualifications of the teachers, as are other teacher grants.

**MR. WALDING:** I thank the Minister for that information. I do seem to recall from our discussions from last year that those types of grants, EMH and TMH, were no longer categorical grants. Now, my memory might be faulty in that, or perhaps there has been a change in the regulation.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the Minister if he is satisfied that children in different parts of the province are receiving the same level of special education care, or treatment if I can call it that way or whether, as I would suspect, children in the Winnipeg area are in a position to receive these sorts of services on a much more preferred basis than those in the rural area. I wonder if the Minister can confirm that.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, that is a rather difficult question to answer. I think if we were to check the number of clinicians, psychologists, speech therapists and people of that nature within the Perimeter Highway, we would probably find a larger number in proportion to the student population than we would find through the rural areas. However, we have been addressing that in recent years and attempting to provide more people who are qualified as clinicians to the rural areas, through our Child Development and Support unit.

Again, the member suggests that the urban area is more blessed in this regard. I would have to concur that there are in all probability, from a clinician/student ratio, more clinicians to be found in the urban area.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, again, I'm a victim of too much paper around here. I was looking for some figures that I had, and that's why I posed the question to the Minister before. Again, I must go by memory. I have some figures that would indicate that in the Winnipeg area, that the ratio is in the region of 950 or 1,000 to 1, yet when we consider the rural areas and the northern and remote areas, then that proportion goes up to something in the region of 2,000 to 1, which would seem a wide degree of inequity in the sort of services we are providing to children outside of the city as opposed to those within the city. I want to ask the Minister what steps he is taking, or intends to take to balance that proportion.

**MR. COSENS:** As I have mentioned to the honourable member, we have been adding to the Child Development support staff that are placed throughout the rural part of Manitoba and the northern area of Manitoba each particular year and have attempted to augment that staff and place more services in those particular areas. We will continue to do this, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, I must recognize defeat in not being able to find the particular notes that I was looking for and am willing to pass 3.(e) at this time.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Clause 3.—pass; Resolution 52—pass. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty

**Thursday, 5 June, 1980**

---

a sum not exceeding 237,004,600 for Education,  
Financial Support, Public Schools, 237,004,600—  
pass.

Resolution No. 53, Clause 4. Program  
Development and Support Services—pass —  
Committee rise.

Committee rise.