

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 24 June, 1985.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

### CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - COMMUNITY SERVICES

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

We are on Item 1.(g)(1) Personnel: Salaries; 1.(g)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just as we concluded at 4:30, I asked the Minister a series of questions relating to the increase over last year's Estimates and we left on the note, I believe, that it was basically the transfer of some five staff out of the Finance Department into this particular department and when all the figures were added together the total line for that section still remained the same.

Now when I look at the section for Financial Services for the '84-'85 fiscal year and compare it to the figures used for this year, it shows a decrease of some \$63,000, yet the increase is approximately \$180,000 on 1.(g). So assuming that it's a straight transfer, as the Minister indicated, and that covers the staff, then what is the other 120-odd thousand? Now I can appreciate there was one other person who was doing some staff training, I believe, who was transferred from the Civil Service Commission along with the \$10,000 expenditure, but I'm basically directing my concern about the possible \$110,000, \$120,000 increase on Salaries in the 1.(g) area.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Actually the five SYs were transferred from Financial Services; two others will be deployed for new services in the branch; and then there was one from the Civil Service.

The total changes, the five plus two; the five from Financial Services and the other two. The Civil Service transfer, we took the function, but not any SYs, and of the two new SYs, one is working as a health and safety officer and another is a training officer. They were transferred from the Seven Oaks staff complement.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Both the health and safety officer and the training officer came from the Seven Oaks Hospital?

**HON. M. SMITH:** No, the Centre for Youth, it's in the Child and Family Service area.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Why were they transferred out of that one division and put into this particular division?

**HON. M. SMITH:** The population in the Seven Oaks Centre was running at a lower ebb for quite a period of time, and we were able to do without the extra staff in that location.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, is it then the intent of the Minister to offer then the services of the health and

safety officer to the Department of Community Services, or is it being applied to a specific area other than the Seven Oaks Centre?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Department-wide.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, is the Minister indicating that there is then going to be a health and safety committee established, or committees established in the department, and this is the person that is going to be responsible for it?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Yes.

**MR. C. BIRT:** To the Minister, was there no health and safety committees or organizations within the department prior to the transferring of this individual into the budget for this year?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Yes, there had been the development of committees, and it was felt appropriate in a department our size to have a co-ordinating person.

**MR. C. BIRT:** I take it this is just for the function of the departmental staff; it doesn't reach out into the various agencies that would be funded, such as the six community child and family centres?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Your assumption is accurate.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Okay, thank you. Mr. Chairman, the transferring of the training officer also came from the Seven Oaks Centre?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Yes, the person had served for a while in the deputy's office in the staff year there, and then moved into the training position.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Is that the Deputy Minister's Office or the Deputy of Seven Oaks?

**HON. M. SMITH:** The Deputy Minister. The person had come from Seven Oaks, had served for a period in the Deputy Minister's Office and then moved into the training position.

**MR. C. BIRT:** To the Minister, what function then will this person be carrying out?

**HON. M. SMITH:** That is the training, the identification of training, helping all the divisions to identify their training needs and to assist them with developing training programs.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, is this the only person involved with training in the department, or are there other people in this component, 1.(g), that are also involved in training?

**HON. M. SMITH:** In addition to the one in this section, there is one in the child welfare area, one in corrections and one at the developmental centre.

**MR. C. BIRT:** I'm sorry the last one was?

**HON. M. SMITH:** The Developmental Centre, Manitoba Developmental Centre at Portage.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, will this training officer's function be for the staff of the department, or is it to develop training for what I might call Crown agencies, or the ones that are at arm's length to the department?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Primarily for the in-house staff.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, our government is attempting to embark on two areas that require additional personnel, one is the Affirmative Action Program and one is the concept of Pay Equity Program and I can appreciate that they're not necessarily the same. Has the department hired anyone to provide these services, either one or both?

**HON. M. SMITH:** We've hired Wendy VanLunen to work on Affirmative Action and there's no special person at this point in time to deal with the Pay Equity issue.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, the Wendy VanLunen, does she fall into this particular area, or does she fall into some other category within the Estimates.

**HON. M. SMITH:** In here, I did refer to Affirmative Action earlier when I said what were some of the program elements.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** It falls in this.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Yes.

**MR. C. BIRT:** So do I understand the Minister rightly, that this Wendy VanLunen is located or is put into this section 1.(g)?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Yes.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Is she the training officer that we've just referred to?

**HON. M. SMITH:** No. If it's helpful, I can read you the staffing in the division.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Is this the section 1.(g)?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Yes.

**MR. C. BIRT:** The names . . .

**HON. M. SMITH:** I don't have the names, I have the positions.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Perhaps I could approach it this way. The Minister's indicated that there were five SYs transferred in; there was one Civil Service position and two SY's, a Health and Safety Officer and a Training Officer. Now is Wendy VanLunen any one of those positions?

**HON. M. SMITH:** No, this person replaced an individual who retired, was in the Employee Relations Department

and as we reorganized some of the functions, this person's chief responsibility is for Affirmative Action.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Is this person a permanent SY or a contract person?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Permanent.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Could the Minister advise the background experience and where Wendy VanLunen comes from; in other words, is she from outside the Civil Service or was it from another job within the Civil Service?

**HON. M. SMITH:** This person was transferred from Government Services.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Could the Minister give the individual's qualifications?

**HON. M. SMITH:** She had been doing Affirmative Action in Government Services. More detailed background information I'd have to take as notice.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, could the Minister advise when this individual was hired and how long that position had been in existence, in other words, the Affirmative Action position and how long it had been vacant - if, in fact, it was vacant for any time.

**HON. M. SMITH:** The director had been taking responsibility for Affirmative Action. This person's been on for six weeks and in the process of hiring her, she has acquired direct responsibility for Affirmative Action and the task of employee relations that the previous incumbent in that SY bid is being done directly by the director, so that there's some shifting of function.

**MR. C. BIRT:** When did the department create the position for Affirmative Action? I appreciate the Minister said that the incumbent has been there for six weeks. Was it just established six weeks ago or had this position been created some time?

**HON. M. SMITH:** The function had been carried out by the director, but the specific position, the specific responsibility has been there for six weeks. The process of developing Affirmative Action, as you've no doubt heard from the Labour Minister, has been consultative and working with the employees to develop the process; and the director of the group was able to carry out those functions. It was now thought that the program was at a stage where someone who could focus more directly on it was appropriate.

**MR. C. BIRT:** The director is who? Is it Director of Personnel?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Yes.

**MR. C. BIRT:** The Minister indicated earlier that the Employee Relations section - and I'm making an assumption here, perhaps I could be corrected if I'm wrong - which is this section, was changed as a result of one of the changes, is Wendy Van Lunen was hired to work on Affirmative Action on a full-time basis. What

other changes occurred as a result of these changes in this particular department and what were the changes?

**HON. M. SMITH:** I think I've described most of them. In this case, I said that the incumbent that has done employee relations retired and that function was taken on by the director. Meanwhile, what the director was doing in affirmative action was that responsibility was allocated to Wendy VanLunen.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Perhaps I didn't make myself clear enough. What I took from the Minister's earlier answer was that certain other changes had been made to the Employee Relations Department of Community Services and this was one of those changes. I want to know what other changes were.

**HON. M. SMITH:** No, I was just speaking about one individual, who was the specialist in Employee Relations. At their retirement, the responsibility shifted to the director.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, the individual that retired, was it their responsibility to be solely in charge of Affirmative Action?

**HON. M. SMITH:** No, the person that retired did not do it. They did Employee Relations and the director did Affirmative Action. Then the Employee Relations specialist retired, the director assumed the employee relations task and delegated the Affirmative Action responsibility to replacement.

**MR. C. BIRT:** The Minister indicated that an Affirmative Action Program had been developed to the point where it was necessary to have someone work with it or at least it had reached a stage so that you needed someone to work on it on a full-time basis. What was the program development, what level of development had occurred so that it was necessary to hire a person on a full-time basis to look after it?

**HON. M. SMITH:** I'm sure that this has been aired through the Department of Labour, where the key responsibility for developing the government-wide program, working initially with MGEA and then with the specific departments to set up a committee of employees to plan how best to approach this. An initial item would be to collect data on what the current situation is in the department, have some notion of vacancy rates and so on and looking at recruitment procedures to see if there's any barriers and so on. Once the approach had been agreed on at the central and then departmental level, then to start implementing the plan required a more of a full-time focus.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, is the Minister saying that the director chaired a committee on Affirmative Action and now that Wendy VanLunen is chairing this committee for Affirmative Action within the department?

**HON. M. SMITH:** There's six people on the committee; three MGEA and three management people. The staffperson acts as the staff support. The Committee

is, in fact, co-chaired by a representative from MGEA and a representative from the management group.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, is the Wendy Van Lunen - if I'm mispronouncing her name, please correct me - is she the staff support person to this committee, or would she be the management co-chairperson of this committee?

**HON. M. SMITH:** The staff support. I should just correct what I said before - they don't co-chair, they actually rotate the chair in the committee.

**MR. C. BIRT:** The answer that the Minister just gave relating to the rotating of the chair, does it rotate then through each one of the six members or is it just one of each and they alternate the chairmanship?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Each of the six.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Could the Minister advise when this committee was established, the date?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Approximately a year, I can get the exact date but I don't have the precise date.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Approximately a year ago, spring or summer of '84, is that approximately it?

**HON. M. SMITH:** We can find out precisely for you for another session.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, I believe that the MGEA signed an agreement with the government sometime in March, I believe, of last year, to deal with the question of Affirmative Action. There was a policy statement set out and it was assigned by both the parties. Was the committee set up as a result of that agreement or was this committee in place prior to that agreement?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Yes, our understanding is that it is the direct result of the agreement on the basis that the approach to Affirmative Action has been particularly recognizing slow turnover rates and so on in government. The necessity to introduce something like this in a way that has the confidence and understanding of the MGEA that the process has been a consultative process from the beginning; in fact, our MGEA reps to it were named during the year, so we've been gearing up, as it were, during the year.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Why wasn't there an Affirmative Action plan or someone dealing with it prior to the spring of last year?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Well, I think the initiative government-wide was set up through the Department of Labour where you can more appropriately put those questions, but the practice of Affirmative Action hiring as long as I've been in the department, has been people have been very aware of it and I think have made some moves in the direction expected. But a fully developed Affirmative Action Program, especially if it's not an imposed program but a co-operative one, I think is

profiting from having good, consultative process at the beginning and then agreed-on method of procedure.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Perhaps the Minister could tell us what initiatives were undertaken since she headed up the department, to do this prior to the formation of the committee?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Well, I don't get involved directly in hiring, except for the senior level but did, in the recruiting that I was responsible for, ensure that there was quite a wide range of interviews and then by verbal encouragement of the management staff to cast their net widely, as it were, and seek to promote Affirmative Action. But again the development of the more formal program had its initiative from the Department of Labour and they've been acting on behalf of the total government.

**MR. C. BIRT:** I don't disagree with the Minister's assessment that the best way to implement this is through a co-operative agreement between the union representing the employees and those in management, because often you have to know the type of problem that you've got so that you can then take appropriate steps to remedy it or to expand on it, as the case might be.

I would like to know though why the Minister didn't initiate some of this co-operative procedure and consultative process all the way down through the department, prior to waiting for an amendment to the MGEA collective agreement because, as the Minister indicates, she had some concern. It seemed to me, that for an important department like this to set a public example, this whole process of consultative co-operation to implement this program should have been taken a lot sooner than waiting for the spring of 1983.

**HON. M. SMITH:** I remind the member that I only took over this portfolio in late November of 1983, and the Management Committee had, in fact, incorporated in their performance evaluation of all division heads, an item on Affirmative Action and the extent to which they were developing an approach. So there had been a department-based initiative, but the more formal aspects of it have developed since the initiative came from Labour.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Then if the time frame that the Minister is referring to is - it took approximately 18 months before anything concrete took place in developing Affirmative Action program within the department.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Quite apart from a formal program, there have been some unusual hirings, if you're comparing the performance of the department, which had the first female Director of a Remand Centre in Canada and so on, so that we were talking about it and encouraging it before we had this more structured approach. Again, as I say, it's something that needs to be understood and accepted to be most effective. I think again that there's been quite a bit of new management in place and certainly in my period in the department, there's been quite a lot of discussion about it and encouragement of Affirmative Action.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, the Affirmative Action has basically four categories and I'm wondering if the Minister can refer to what particular category the department had put into place, at least considered back some time in 1983?

**HON. M. SMITH:** I think all elements have been looked at. I've mentioned an item or two on women. In the Native side, we've been encouraging in various parts of the Child and Family Service, to various methods of hiring and training, recruiting Native people, and also with the disabled.

The turnover rate, of course, has been relatively low, as the member knows, so it's not a quick process under those circumstances. The visible minority group was identified at a slightly later point and we are working on that element as well.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Can the Minister tell me how many employees there are in the department, and I refer to full-time? I'm not interested in the contract employees.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Earlier on, I think I had said there were well over 1,000 direct and the same number indirect. I must correct that. We actually have 2,122.5 direct employees and could be significantly above that in indirect employees through various agencies. — (Interjection) — staff years, yes. Some are not full-time; we do use part-time, but that would not count any contract employees.

**MR. C. BIRT:** How many people retired, quit, whatever, were removed from the payroll for whatever reason in 1982, 1983 and 1984?

**HON. M. SMITH:** I'd be happy to take that as notice and give you the information tomorrow.

**MR. C. BIRT:** The Affirmative Action Committee that has been established, is it dealing with all aspects of Affirmative Action or just one or two of the aspects?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Do you mean by aspects, target groups?

**MR. C. BIRT:** Target groups, yes.

**HON. M. SMITH:** It will be dealing with all.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, has the department developed a plan now for the visible minorities?

**HON. M. SMITH:** It's part of the Affirmative Action plan.

**MR. C. BIRT:** I can appreciate it but it's a component of Affirmative Action and the Minister made reference to this grouping and I'm wondering if the department now has in place a plan for dealing with visible minorities.

**HON. M. SMITH:** We're at the stage of completing our plan that will go to the central committee for review. If it's synchronized, I guess, with what's being done elsewhere then we'll get the go-ahead.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Where is the central committee? Is it in the department or is it someplace else in government?

**HON. M. SMITH:** I think I referred before - it's being co-ordinated in the Department of Labour.

**MR. C. BIRT:** The Minister indicated that the plan is ready or is just about to be referred to this central committee. What is the plan for visible minorities?

**HON. M. SMITH:** First, we're identifying people in the department who would classify themselves as belonging to a visible minority and then as Affirmative Action looks at external factors, the proportion of that minority in the larger community and then the numbers of people trained appropriately for a particular job, so that there are several steps to developing a plan. The goal would be over a fairly extended period of time because there's not rapid growth in the Civil Service, large numbers hired, to gradually approach the number of appropriately trained people that are bearing some relationship to their proportion in the population. There are sort of two factors that have to be looked at.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, I asked specifically about the visible minorities. Is this plan just for them or is there a plan for all four groupings or target groups in the Affirmative Action Program?

**HON. M. SMITH:** I think I said before that all target groups were included and that the plan follows similar approaches. The visible minority is using the self-identification perhaps for obvious reasons. It's not as necessary with the male-female issue or even disabled, although one can't always be quite so sure. There might be a hearing problem or something that one wouldn't be normally aware of.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Would the Minister be prepared to table or share with us the plan that is being recommended to the central committee?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Actually, my deputy was just saying to me that we could certainly table the outline. The detail's not quite completely but we'd be happy to table with the general outline.

**MR. C. BIRT:** The other earlier question that I asked is to deal with the pay equity question. Is it the Minister's intention to have either a specific person or committee within her department to deal with the new legislation of pay equity?

**HON. M. SMITH:** We're not at a point where we can make that determination. The pay equity process will be co-ordinated again from Labour and the process for how departments are going to work with it and whether we'll have committees and/or staff and at what levels will be part of the first year process that will unfold in the upcoming year.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Am I to understand the Minister correctly, that she doesn't know how her department is going to react to the piece of legislation now making it mandatory to establish a plan dealing with pay equity for the forthcoming year?

**HON. M. SMITH:** No, the department will be co-operating with the plan but part of the process is a consultative process on the particular approach to be taken, so we will be proceeding in that fashion. Again, the starting date is September, but as soon as we are through the legislation, we'll be reviewing how we are going to proceed.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Who in the department is designated at the moment to have the responsibility for pay equity?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Because this Budget is April 1st of this year and predates the passage of the pay equity, the classification process will start over in the Civil Service side in the Labour Department. We will co-operate and move as expeditiously as possible but we haven't yet designated the staffperson. I expect it will be someone in this area and initially we'll accommodate it within our staff complement and part of the process, of course, will be to determine how much we can accomplish in co-operation with the Civil Service Commission and the employees.

If we're able to accomplish the phase one of the process without additional staff, we'll do so. If we require extra, that will be part of the cost of the pay equity process. In a sense, until it passes the Legislature, we don't normally commence implementing.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(g)(1)—pass; 1.(g)(2)—pass. There will be no Resolution on . . .

**MR. C. BIRT:** I take it, Mr. Chairman, I had asked for a couple of things to be . . .

**HON. M. SMITH:** That can come tomorrow.

**MR. C. BIRT:** And I can ask questions at that time on those particular ones?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** There shall be no Resolution on Budget item now, No. 1, until after the item 1.(a), relating to the Minister's Salary, which is deferred as the last item in the agenda, has been passed.

Item No. 2.(a)(1) Registration and Licensing Services, Vital Statistics: Salaries; 2.(a)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, the estimated cost for Salaries, 1984-85 was some \$691,700, yet it is shown - I guess, the actual figure for March 31st of '85 - to be some \$618,000.00 Why the large drop?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Madam Minister.

**HON. M. SMITH:** There've been some economies as a result of computerization.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Does that mean that a number of people have been either reassigned or some staff man years have been eliminated? As it deals with Salaries, perhaps the Minister could elaborate on what she means by economizing.

**HON. M. SMITH:** I think if you'll compare this year's adjusted vote with the new expenditure, you'll see that

there's just an increase of \$16,000.00. In fact, there's been a cutback of the number of people, of two, from last year. The adjustment was made in the adjusted vote so really the only increase is just the normal salary increments and increments.

**MR. C. BIRT:** The Estimates though for last year, and the Minister may have to help me here . . .

**HON. M. SMITH:** This is that same process we had this afternoon, that they . . .

**MR. C. BIRT:** What she's referring to, but there's some almost \$80,000.00. Now, is it that two staff positions were eliminated because they weren't filled? Were they transferred out?

I can appreciate the final figure of last year of 618 now goes to 634, and that is just an small incremental. It's really the estimated of last year to the actual.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Because this branch has been developing a more automated system, during the year there were in fact four transfers out and then one term transferred back in as the system settled down and we could more closely approximate the demand.

**MR. C. BIRT:** The transfers out, were they clerical positions, managerial or accommodation of both?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Of the four that were moved out, one was a bookkeeper, an administrative officer person. Two were clerical and one was a computer analyst.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, and the one that was transferred back in?

**HON. M. SMITH:** There's an allowance for a term staff year. At the moment, it's not filled. It's used as an occasional replacement.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Then if I understand it correctly, it was because you didn't use the full complement of salaries that the figure has gone down substantially for the 1984-85 fiscal year. Is that correct?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Yes, that would be the explanation. We're working off the adjusted vote here.

**MR. C. BIRT:** I don't know what figure I'm working out.

**HON. M. SMITH:** We're working off the 618 in '84-85 to the 634 in '85-86.

**MR. C. BIRT:** The Minister said that computerizing the department has led to some savings.

**HON. M. SMITH:** That was misleading. I understand, but as I say, by having identified the four out and the one term back in, and the fact that it all got accounted for in the adjusted vote, I think is as accurate a picture as I can give.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Is the computerization or the streamlining that is going on, is this a phased-in operation? Will

there be further reductions in staff as a result of this program or have we now reached the maximum saving point and maximum efficiency for the department?

**HON. M. SMITH:** At the moment, as far as we can foresee, there will be some savings with the continuing computerization, but some increases because of potential requests for more information having to do with some of the changes that are going on in other bills, both access for research and more people looking up their records.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, could the Minister explain what information has been computerized and what information has not been computerized in the department?

**HON. M. SMITH:** We have this current year automated and last year and gradually picking up the earlier years.

**MR. C. BIRT:** The computerization program, is it purely an internal thing for staff purposes, or is something now that is available in the courts and the Land Titles system where the public can basically access the information providing they key it the right way and then get a printout; now I'm thinking of a birth certificate or a death certificate, those sort of things.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Because of the great public concern, legitimate concern for security of these records, this computer will not be tied in to any other central one. The control will remain with this batch and it's quite tightly restricted.

**MR. C. BIRT:** I take it then, when someone requests some information or a document from this department, that it's the staff that will use the computer and produce the results. The results, then, would be transferred to the customer.

**HON. M. SMITH:** The only exception would be if there were a bona fide researcher that had gone through the usual steps, concerning confidentiality and professional ethics and so on; otherwise it is controlled by the branch staff.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Is it the government's intention, the Minister's made reference to bona fide researcher, has the department developed a policy as to what that person or persons might be? In other words, are there members of the provincial government who would like to get base information on certain statistics or whatever to either develop or change certain policy, or is it to be available to basically people who are outside whether they be research people for industry, the universities, or other levels of government, or perhaps both?

**HON. M. SMITH:** The access to date has been specifically medical, for medical research.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Is that the continued policy in the future, for medical purposes or medical data only?

**HON. M. SMITH:** There's no intent to say only one type of researcher should have access. On the other

hand, there are checks and balances for any researcher that might come and use the files. They must have credentials; they must pay for the service; they must promise a degree of confidentiality and that they're liable I guess if they go beyond that.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, as I understand either the present situation or at least definitely under the proposed changes in the legislation, it'll be up to the director to decide who should have access on a research basis. Has the department and/or director developed a policy or a set of guidelines in which to either grant or refuse someone access to these records?

**HON. M. SMITH:** This has been an area where the demand has been minute so it's been decided on a case-by-case basis; but with the potential for development, we are setting up a committee that will develop the guidelines and ensure that there's some vetting of researchers, some checks and balances, so we can be sure that only genuine requests will be honoured.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, could the Minister elaborate who would be on this committee, is it totally Civil Service or is it people from outside the government as well and what disciplines and/or persons are sitting on it?

**HON. M. SMITH:** The relevant areas of interest would be through the Faculty of Medicine and probably the universities. It would be important to have them represented and someone, say, from Civil Service and the department.

In fact, we only have one request all of last year and that was from someone from the Faculty of Medicine. So it's not likely to move ahead; the demand is not likely to shift rapidly. On the other hand, I think it is a good idea to develop a policy in advance.

**MR. C. BIRT:** It would appear, or it's possible that under the new Child and Family Services Act that a great deal of information may be demanded. I'm thinking now in particular where people are trying to trace their background, theirs or their children's background as the case might be. I believe that authority or the buffer for that is the proposed director under that act. Is it the intention to have the director sit on this committee?

**HON. M. SMITH:** In the Research Committee we would have representatives from the different branches of the departments that were affected. This would basically be statistical research that would be covered. It would be a little different than the items that were being dealt with under Child and Family Service where you're dealing more with personal records. We'd need someone from the Child and Family Service area but not necessarily the director.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Is it the department's intention to place most of the records, and I'm thinking now of the historical data under the old Children's Aid but now the new Child and Family Services, with this department or would it be kept within-house in the, I guess, Child and Family Services Division of the department?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Again, this department only keeps records of births, marriage, deaths. It doesn't keep the adoptions and the types of things that would be under a child and family service area. They will be under the other branch. It does contain the adoption records from pre-1924 which was why there was that extra little clause in the act to cover them.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Could the Minister explain the large increase in Other Expenditures? It's a \$42,000 increase.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Yes, the increase is \$42,500.00. It will cover the implementation of word processing, a new cash register and plastic pouches for wallet-size certificates and some further computer development.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, is this a one-time expenditure or will this be sort of an ongoing cost? I can appreciate the cash register may not be replaced, but would most of this increase stay there on an annual basis so we'll be looking at expenditures in the same neighbourhood or higher for next year?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Only 7,500 would be ongoing of that amount for the plastic pouches.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, could the Minister advise how much money will be raised in fees through this department in the coming year? I think the revenue is estimated at \$1 million. The question is, is it anticipated that there will be no increase in services for this year or is this to reflect increases in service costs?

**HON. M. SMITH:** The branch operates virtually at a self-supporting level. There is some fee increase and some volume increase included in this amount and we should note that there should be better access to the public because this branch is moving from the crowded basement of the Norquay Building to the new Bank of Nova Scotia on Main Street.

**MR. C. BIRT:** I think it's the main floor of the Norquay Building not the basement.

Mr. Chairman, is it the intention that the whole Vital Statistics Department will be located in the Bank of Nova Scotia or is it just a branch that's going there?

**HON. M. SMITH:** The group of 32 persons.

**MR. C. BIRT:** The entire group that are on the Main floor?

**HON. M. SMITH:** The entire Vital Stats group.

**MR. C. BIRT:** The Minister indicated there would be some fee increases. Could she elaborate what these would be?

**HON. M. SMITH:** The fees went up in January of this year, some variation for the different types of licence. Again, I can bring you the details tomorrow. They are all in the 10-20 total range.

**MR. C. BIRT:** The Minister indicated that the branch of Vital Statistics would be moving to the Bank of Nova

Scotia Building. As a result of this move, will the department be paying higher rent from their present location to the new location?

**HON. M. SMITH:** The lease rates are included in the Government Services' budget. I think there is some minimal shift, but the place that they were occupying before, apart from being crowded, had some other furnace problems. There were workplace, health and safety concerns with the current location. You may recall a computer that overheated. It's just the ventilation and the crowding is the problem.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, could the Minister advise whether or not the government owns the Bank of Nova Scotia, or is just leasing it and it's being sublet to this particular department?

**HON. M. SMITH:** As we understand it, it's one of the Heritage buildings, the renovated bank, and Government Services manages those, but some of our properties, as you know, are under Manitoba Properties Incorporated. I understand that it is in that group, but those questions are better placed to the Minister of Government Services.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, is the Minister saying then that rent in any leasehold improvement or things like this are not reflected in her Estimates? Are you not charged some . . .

**HON. M. SMITH:** The practice is for Government Services to show those costs.

**MR. C. BIRT:** My question though is, does not a rental charge get charged to a department, and if that is the case, where would it appear in these Estimates?

**HON. M. SMITH:** No it does not. Government hasn't shifted to a complete functional budgeting or a zero-budget base, so those amounts don't show up program by program.

**MR. C. BIRT:** So I'm perfectly clear on this then, there is no rental payments reflected anywhere in these Estimates dealing with government departments? Some other department pays the rents on this building or any other building?

**HON. M. SMITH:** That's true for government departments. Now there may be a different practice if we were talking about an agency, or a program that's arm's length in some fashion.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(a)(1)—pass; 2.(a)(2)—pass.  
2.(b)(1) Residential Care Licensing, Salaries; 2.(b)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Could the Minister advise what is the number of facilities that are licensed under this and what types of facilities are licensed?

**HON. M. SMITH:** There are a variety. Children's facilities, there are 68 licensed and 207 approved; mental health, 27 licensed, 131 approved; infirm aged,

12 licensed and 28 approved; mixed youths, 4 licensed, 41 approved; and voluntary licensing, 7 licensed and none approved; for a total of 118 licensed and 407 approved; and an overall total of 186 facilities licensed and 407 approved for 593; and that represents also a total of 2,604 beds. Again I could give you the breakdown in beds, if you're interested.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Please, perhaps just a copy of that.

**HON. M. SMITH:** A copy, okay.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, the child facilities, is that one type of facility or does that have a breakdown of different types of facilities?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Licensed via the Children's Aid Society, there's 17, for a total of 99 beds; other, non-private, 18, for a total of 130 beds; private, 15, for a total of 114 beds; and child institutions, 18, for a total of 192. That gives you the overall total of 68 children's facilities and 535 beds.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Licensing standards, is that a particular committee that does this or is it done by regulation? Could the Minister elaborate how these standards are set?

**HON. M. SMITH:** The detail as to standards is in regulation and the licensing is carried out by staff who go around and inspect.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Does the Provincial Government do all of this inspection with its own staff or do other people do it for us? I'm thinking now, perhaps City of Winnipeg inspectors or other agencies do the inspection - or, I'm sorry, inspection for the licensing.

**HON. M. SMITH:** We do the direct licensing. The city has inspectors that look at fire safety and building codes and so on, but we have an overall responsibility to look at all the visible types of elements - the square footage, condition of doors and so on, whether medicine's kept locked, that type of thing.

Anything relating to the type of program operated falls under the program area responsibility, so . . .

**MR. C. BIRT:** It would be later in the Budget?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Yes, and some is in our department and some is in Health.

**MR. C. BIRT:** If I understand the Minister's answer, that all of the regulations that the province has, dealing with these five particular categories that are referred to, all of those are handled by representatives of the Minister's department. Is that correct?

**HON. M. SMITH:** The responsibility for all the licensing rests in this department.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Can the Minister advise how many inspectors there are in staff, if that's not the correct word, whoever it is that deals with the licensing?

**HON. M. SMITH:** There's one director, six inspections and standards co-ordinators and one clerical support.

**MR. C. BIRT:** The 1984-85 Estimates showed salaries of - well, in the year ending of March 31st, 1984, of some \$325,000.00. The estimate for the '84-85 fiscal year is shown at \$319,300.00. These current Estimates show \$275,000.00. This would seem to indicate that the department has reduced its inspection staff salaries by some \$50,000 over a period of two years. Could the Minister explain why? Maybe it's a year - I'm sorry.

**HON. M. SMITH:** It's part of an ongoing development in the department to try to have program responsibility areas, and in the past there's been a lot of, in a sense, expectation that licensing would also look at all the program. What we are trying to do is separate out the sort of observable elements that go into the licensing process and have them under this area of responsibility and then the areas where the program is a major factor, to have that reviewed in another area.

We transferred out one person to the Child and Family Support because we felt that they needed the extra expertise in reviewing the program's side and we were able to conduct the sort of type of licensing that we're responsible for here with the existing staff. So, rather than say it's a reduction in licensing, it's an attempt to differentiate program monitoring from the basic physical standards in all of the home and safety practices.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Is the Minister saying that only one person was transferred out, no others?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Because I don't have the figures that you're using for comparison - I'm not sure I jotted them down right - I have the adjusted vote. The person transferred was quite a highly skilled person with a salary over 40,000 so it would account for the . . .

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, are there any vacant staff positions or is this particular department up to full complement?

**HON. M. SMITH:** No.

**MR. C. BIRT:** No to?

**HON. M. SMITH:** There are no vacancies.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, the person who was transferred to child and family support, is that person involved in the some 2,000-odd beds that the Minister referred to or the figure that was given at the beginning of this particular section, did that relate to just the director, the six inspectors and the one clerking staff? Is it their responsibility?

**HON. M. SMITH:** The eight staff that are in this group are responsible for doing the licensing. The person who was transferred over is helping us with planning the numbers of beds required in the child and family area so that we can more closely match the services provided to the demand levels.

**MR. C. BIRT:** The Minister, I believe, has introduced a new program. I think it's called "Welcome Home."

It's moving people out of institutions or semi-institutions into, I believe, private home settings. Is this going to require an additional inspection load on the department?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Because the load will increase fairly gradually we expect that we can manage with the existing staff complement. Again, remember that the program responsibility will still rest over in the Community Social Services side.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Is it the Minister's intention to have a set of standards for this particular program and are those standards in place?

**HON. M. SMITH:** The standards for this portion of the licensing, the physical facility and so on, are in place so people must already meet those. The program standards are developing and they're growing out of the needs as identified but we can go into in greater detail under the Community Social Services when we do the Welcome Home.

**MR. C. BIRT:** I believe the program is relatively new. Is it difficult getting places for the people who are intended to be put into these situations or is space available and they're having trouble finding the appropriate candidates to put in these various homes?

**HON. M. SMITH:** I think again it would be better to deal with those questions under the Community Social Services when we describe the process that we've gone through to identify people and appropriate settings and then can get some understanding as to what process we are following. Basically, I guess I could just say that the limit on the speed of movement is on the completeness of the planning matched to the needs of the people. They needed to be identified, their particular needs worked out, the local community prioritization and then the money flows, so that the intent is to flow the money at the speed that we can, in fact, put in place good quality and full continuum of services.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I wonder if the Minister could tell me what procedures individuals would go through if they are in the process of, or thinking about, establishing a home to care for mentally handicapped people. I see that the Minister is writing down the name of a person that I've been asking her about for some time. What I'm interested in here is the procedure that they go through as opposed to a specific situation.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Yes, I think it's a good question. The standards that we've been working with here in the residential licensing regulations were, in fact, put in place by the former government. What we have been trying to develop out of that is - because of what was often the case was that someone would come forward with an initiative and they would get licensed, but there was no one responsible for planning that there was enough service in an area for the people in need, or that all the pieces of the required support systems were

there. In other words, you could have a residence for people but there would be no day activity for them or no transportation or medical outreach.

The Welcome Home process is through local teams and a central co-ordinating group attempting to get the continuum of service in place and set some standards. So I guess as we're trying to develop the best program parameters, the process is changing from how it used to be when you just come forward and say, I have a house and can I get licensed, because what we want is the full range of services. It might not be quite so important for the occasional home that might open, but when we're trying to move a population that's been in an institution out to the community and also support a group at risk in the community, we feel that it's very important to have the mix of services there.

The criteria for approval are sort of being established as that process goes along. The member, I think, knows why I reacted quickly to his question because he's been enquiring on behalf of one person who has, in a way, bridged the process, was sort of thinking of moving in to the area before we had the Welcome Home process fully matured and yet, hadn't completed the process. So in a sense, they've got one foot on each side of the process, so their situation has been somewhat more individual, but we've been working with the committees, in fact, to develop the criteria so that the program would be a good quality, but also that there'd be some sort of equitable funding and availability of the complementary services in the area.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, I was trying to respect the Minister's admonition to my colleague earlier that we not talk about funding and programming here, but we talk about licensing and that is what my question dealt with - the licensing aspect of it and what governs the licensing today. What regulations are in place? How would a person know what would govern their application today?

**HON. M. SMITH:** It's the Social Allowances regulations and Social Services Administration Act and there are various local bylaws, of course, that are involved. But the program standards, the reason I jumped over the boundary, is because we've not felt that just having a straight licensing procedure separate from program standards and planning was adequate. We're just at the beginning of trying to develop the blend for all these different target groups. We feel that it's the right way to go; that we shouldn't separate residential care from the other elements, but it'll take us quite a while to get the two procedures fully integrated.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** What regulations are in place today governing licensing? Are they the same regulations that were passed in 1981?

**HON. M. SMITH:** The licensing standards are the same as they were in 1981, but the problem arises in terms of whether the appropriate numbers of people can be placed there and they're governed more by a program policy. So a person may be licensed, but there's no guarantee that they'll have a full house.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Well, what comes first in the process? If someone is approaching the government today - the

Minister says if they're licensed there's no guarantee that they'll have a full house; that, of course, she knows is a problem in one particular situation with one of my constituents. But I want to know now, if someone approached the department today, and wanted to establish a residence, how would they proceed to apply for a license? Might they still then find themselves in a situation where they could have a licensed residence, but no residents, because of another policy or set of guidelines that the department has.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Well, that could happen and we're looking at each one that occurs of that sort in an individual way. I am to meet with the person that the member is referring to that we both know has a particular problem. What I'm trying to convey is that we're separating the licensing of the physical facility from program.

In the past, there has not been, in many of these areas, any program standards at all. It was left rather to an ad hoc reliance on the people who wanted to provide the residential care either looking after some of the other needs or not. We feel that that's not, certainly for the mentally retarded, an adequate way to go. Particularly if we're moving people from an institutional setting into the community or taking people in the community at risk and setting up varieties of residential settings, we have to ensure that the mix of services are available. Such as they would receive a mix in the institution, in the community, they're entitled to at least as good.

The whole motivation for having them in the community is that they have access to a better quality of life. So you must see that in addition to residential care, shelter and food and clothing that they have day activity, recreation, health care and so on, so it's in our desire to move to more co-ordinated planning that we're facing this dilemma. We think that licensing existing by itself is probably not adequate in any program area, but it's going to take quite a while to develop program standards throughout the whole area, and the area that we've taken particular initiatives in is the mental retardation and, of course, the children's programming.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** The Minister said that it still would be possible for an individual to get a facility licensed and then not be able to make full use of that facility. That seems to me to be an unacceptable situation, that a private individual could set out to do that, could apply for a licence, could spend money to upgrade facilities, and then find that they would be denied the opportunity then to make use of those facilities. Surely the Minister should at least be suspending any kind of licensing until she has a complete set of regulations or guidelines in place, so that individuals know what they are doing.

I find in many aspects of government that the public get terribly frustrated in dealing with government, because there will be maybe a number of regulations set out; then they encounter another one that essentially says, ". . . and such other conditions as the Minister may decide," and that leads to all kinds of situations where a person thinks they're complying with regulations and then find another hoop is put there for them to jump through.

So would the Minister not - does she see any obligation on the part of the government if they licensed a facility, and then for some other reason, don't allow that facility to be used?

**HON. M. SMITH:** If we had a fully mature system in which there was never going to be any change, I suppose one could start discussing those arguments. But the situation is that we've had a very ad hoc system where people used to just run places; and in some cases they were superb; in other cases they were borderline and some were pretty awful. The minimum standards that were put in through the licensing ensured minimum safety like fire and just certified that they were healthy and safe.

In terms of the needy people who will stay there, that's a matter of policy in terms of what's the best care and the program standards for those people. Now there's still many groups out there that don't have fully developed standards, but we believe that straight physical standards aren't sufficient, that there must be some program standards. We feel that our obligation is to ensure that type of planning and program support for the people in need.

The question of how you make the transition from one system to another is fair enough and I think again we're trying to look at the people who perhaps started out before there was a program policy in place and see if there can be some flexibility with them. But in the longer run, what we're interested in is program standards that become another protection, if you like, over atop the basic licensing standards. I suppose you could compare it a little bit to whether a restaurant was set up that met fire and health standards, but your inspectors would go and see to that but they wouldn't guarantee customers.

There are people who can go to homes on a private basis, but where there are people that are under the responsibility of the public, other factors come into play. I would be delighted if program standards were in place and clear and fully known right across the system, and I appreciate the need to communicate, and, first of all, develop standards in consultation with groups and then to communicate very clearly to the groups what they are. But in a transition stage, there's going to be some time where it isn't completely clear. We'll try to be fair with people but I think we have to move to develop the program care standards.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, the analogy that the Minister uses, I think is a little inappropriate, when she talks about an inspector not guaranteeing the restaurant being full; neither would he deny the opportunity for customers or clients to be there. How soon will it be until the Minister has in place a licensing system that she considers adequate and will the system be such that an individual will know their complete requirements, their building requirements, as well as their programming requirements; and will an individual be able to know, to be guaranteed that if they meet all of those standards, that they will be licenced and that they will have residence, because I think it's important that people be able to know, before they embark upon a course, that if they meet the requirements that are set out, then they will be licenced and they will have clients.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Again, it's a question of how we plan for the people that we have some special responsibility for. If we are not running the facilities directly, our prime responsibility is split. One the one hand, it's licensing to say a facility is safe; on the other, it is to develop the appropriate programs for the needs of the individuals. Having accurate communication as to the client numbers and their needs and what the standards are, requires a planning process that, first of all, identifies the people and identifies their needs and then develops the services appropriate to them.

We've been operating a system that works the other way round. If there happen to be facilities available, then people get placed there. In a sense, the people whose main responsibility is the quality of program for the needy shouldn't be the same person that's licensing the facility. The bringing together of the two is going to depend on a consultative process in advance and, as I say, when we get to the Welcome Home Program, we'll show you how we're going about doing that. But I think in the mental health and the infirm aged programs, those were at an earlier stage, I guess you would say, of trying to identify the number of needy, the types of facilities and how it all goes together; but what we have is a minimum level of licensing the residences.

I guess some people might hope that if you have a clear licensing system that there's going to be a magic match between the facilities that develop and the needs of the people. I guess we haven't found that to be the case in the past, which is why we're planning from another base.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Is it the Minister's intention to continue to licence private facilities of this nature?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Yes, and any licensed facility can accept private paying persons, either who are paying for themselves or whose family is placing and paying for them; but it's the people who come under the responsibility of the public, where other decisions are made and, again, part of the planning process we're doing with Welcome Home is very much in co-operation with the families of the people in need, wherever they're willing and available.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** And is it the Minister's intention to continue to place such persons in privately run homes?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Sorry, I wonder if you'd repeat the question.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Is it the Minister's intention to continue to place such persons, persons that the government has the responsibility for, in privately run homes?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Yes, it'll certainly be part of our program, but what we said before was we don't guarantee that they will always have a full house.

We are working in this whole area by means of protocols, which have not quite the force of a regulation, but next level of force, which will set out the staff requirements, the sponsorship responsibilities, operators of programs so that people will know clearly

who's responsible for what and what order and why. That's almost complete, but in the retardation field, protocols have been developed through the consultative process. So, in a sense, I guess we could have developed them and laid them on, but we feel that what we will now have is a set of procedures and standards that have public support.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** I'm sorry to pursue this at such length, Mr. Chairman. I thought I'd asked the last question until the Minister made reference to protocols being the next level to regulation. I've always been aware of really only two levels of law making in the province, one being a bill passed by the Legislature and another being a regulation passed under the authority of an act and I have never heard of a protocol. Is that simply another word for departmental policy or departmental practice?

**HON. M. SMITH:** It will explain the procedures that we are using in placing people and the legal requirements are under regulations; but this will give people an understanding of what our policy is so that they can make an informed decision as to what to do about their . . . It's policy.

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

**MR. A. BROWN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I've been listening with a great deal of interest to this conversation and it appears to me that the Minister is not quite sure of the standards that are required for licensing, and therefore that must also hold true when these licensed places are being monitored.

Last year I asked the question of the Minister how often these licensed places were monitored and she replied at that time, once a year, but she was hoping that they'd be able to get around to monitoring the standards to see that the standards were kept twice a year and that this was the objective that she was working toward. Has this objective been accomplished?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Yes, the minimum is once, but in some cases there is twice.

Again, I should clarify that the licensing has dealt with physical standards, safety standards. There were no standards for program at all. We are trying to develop them. It will take some time but we believe they are a very important part of the total delivery of service. We've been uncomfortable with the existence of licensing in a vacuum, as it were, without the program standards accompanying it. It deals only with the residential needs of people and although that is appropriate for more able people and people who are able to pay their way and who perhaps still have a lot of family or community supports, it may be quite inappropriate for a more disabled person.

**MR. A. BROWN:** Mr. Chairman, every year there are numerous complaints that come to light especially around personal care homes which are, of course, under the Department of Health. All of the residential care places really are being watched closely by persons, relatives possibly, of people that are staying there and so on.

With the Welcome Home Program and so on is there not going to be an increased demand for licensing and monitoring? If this is the case, then it appears to me that there is very small increase in the Budget for any increase in demand. I wonder, does the Minister feel with this increase in demand that a sufficient job will be able to be accomplished monitoring all these facilities to make certain that the standards which have been established are kept?

**HON. M. SMITH:** We did review that and I think I answered earlier on that the projections because the Welcome Home projects are coming on at fairly slow rate that we will be able to manage with the same number. However, we'll be able to watch it closely and add on staff if and as needed. Because the licensing system has been in since '81, there is some gradual fine tuning. Some homes produce no problems. The once a year is quite adequate. We're getting better at differentiating which ones need more frequent visits. Of course, there are always a few that require very frequent visits.

Still, we monitor the workloads and the number of problems that occur. Our best guess at the moment is that for the next year we'll be able to manage with the staff that we have. That'll be under close review and if there were any problem develop mid-year, we'd either reallocate from somewhere else or put in an extra person.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, I have a new set of questions and it's about three minutes to 10. Do you want to call it 10 or shall I proceed?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Is that agreeable to everyone?

**HON. M. SMITH:** I'm ready to go on if other people are.

**MR. C. BIRT:** We're not going to finish now.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** What is the pleasure of the Committee? Maybe we can finish this resolution if the question isn't extensive.

**MR. C. BIRT:** The problem is I've got maybe or 10 or 15 minutes on it.

**HON. M. SMITH:** I'm agreeable to stay. Why don't we finish this one?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** We'll go to the resolution then we go, no matter how long it takes us.

The Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, last year the Minister made reference to the number of licensed facilities for adults and for children and also the number of beds, and the Minister through staff, have now given me the numbers. Looking at what was given on the record last year on Thursday, June 7, it shows that there were 17 licensed facilities operated by the Children's Aid Societies, and I presume that's the six of them this year, for 99 beds.

Last year there were 22 for a total of 154. Why has the number dropped so dramatically?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Remember, that's all the Children's Aids throughout the province. There's been a gradual reduction in group facilities for children, particularly for the under-twelves. It's been part of development over the past several years based on an analysis, (1) of the success or lack of same that we were having with the group home approach, and (2) with the demonstration in small projects at first that we were able to achieve better results in foster placement and a variety of other settings. It's been a general shift in program design.

It was found that the three-shift group homes, (1) they were very expensive, but (2) they had a larger number of youngsters and the very thing that these youngsters seemed to need was a closer emotional tie with an adult and the group homes didn't seem to be as successful in developing that and giving the youngster the stability and the strength to wrestle with their problems and stabilize their lives as the other type of program. So there's been quite a major shift in program design.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Is the Minister saying then that there was a reduction of five group homes, for a total of 55 beds, since last year?

**HON. M. SMITH:** The member is using numbers that are not the numbers I have. That's why I'm having a little difficulty comparing.

**MR. C. BIRT:** They're numbers I've been given from your staff and I'm comparing them to the numbers that were used in your answer on June 7th of 1984. I have a whole series of questions, so maybe the Minister might want to recess on this point to see if the figures, in fact, are matching up.

**HON. M. SMITH:** It might be helpful for me, because I have the homes grouped in a particular fashion, and obviously if we were talking about five last year, that must have referred to a smaller grouping of the CAS, they're aggregated here and I can't really respond terribly helpfully until I've got that year-by-year comparison.

**MR. C. BIRT:** I'll give this back to the Minister and perhaps we could follow this line of questioning tomorrow when she has this broken up. It came from your staff.

**HON. M. SMITH:** We have that information here. What we're missing is the . . .

**MR. C. BIRT:** Oh, the comparative.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Yes, the comparative, but we can dig it up because we have it from last year. If you have the numbers from last year that you're working from - the answer's in Hansard, I guess. If you have the detail, it could be referring, say, to receiving homes which are a small group of group homes; there's treatment homes and receiving homes; there's Winnipeg and there's the rest of the province.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, it doesn't make reference. In fact, the phrasing that was used in the note that was handed to me is almost identical to what was in the answer given by the Minister last year and that's what I'm trying to track down.

**HON. M. SMITH:** If the question is basically, have we closed 55 beds out of 154 over the year, that is true.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Now is that just group homes, five group homes?

**HON. M. SMITH:** The equivalent. Again I'll have that breakdown when we get into Child and Family Services. I think it could be more productively discussed under the Child and Family Services.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, the one aspect of the information given to me tonight is that it shows that there were facilities approved or licensed for children, total 68 under three categories; yet last year it would appear that there were 83, for a total of 669 beds and this year there's 535. I'd like to pursue why they were closed.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Yes, the reason I gave, it is the closure of five homes and those are the reductions. Again this has been part of a several year transition to put more resources into supporting children in their families; placing aides and so on, providing counselling right in the family unit or taking children and placing them either with extended family or foster care, because we found it more effective for the children. The great development of group homes was a brave and a bold attempt to provide in that form what the youngster was missing in their own home and it was a practise that was taken in good faith, I think, and achieved some successes. But in the longer term evaluation, and comparing it with what was done in other areas where they had made the shift to use of more foster homes and supports in the family, the results were significantly better in the different mode of delivery and that's been part of the thrust in the shift in the Child and Family Service for the past couple of years.

**MR. C. BIRT:** The information given to me by the Minister's staff indicates that there are 17 licensed children's aid societies, but then there are 33 group homes. Are the 17 licensed CAS facilities, are they group homes or are they something other?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Most of the CAS, almost all, there's I think one or two exceptions, are the receiving homes. They're the ones where the youngster is first received and assessed before a more permanent placement. The other 33 are run by private groups or non-profit groups - a variety - and in a sense, the children's aid societies purchase service from them.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Then are the 17 referred to by the Minister receiving homes? I mean are we dealing with 17 receiving homes?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Again that detail is more readily dealt with when we deal with Child and Family Services

because then we can give the pattern of service delivery. These are the numbers that come under the licensing at the moment, so I understand why you have raised it, but we could probably more productively discuss it when we talk about the services in the other section.

**MR. C. BIRT:** I can appreciate what the Minister is referring to, but we're dealing with the licensing section. Maybe the Minister could give me a greater detail of what these licensings are and what they refer to; and once I can see them, if it's more appropriate to deal with them under the particular program which might be 2.(c) or 2.(e), I could ask them then and tie it into the total program.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Again this is the same split that I was referring to earlier. The licensing is for the physical, visible aspects of the home. Is it dry, warm; has it got fire safety; is there a healthy way of disposing of sewage, and so on; are the doors well fitting, and so on, more the physical aspect of the home? The program side is the responsibility of the Child and Family Service Branch.

**MR. C. BIRT:** The question I'm trying to get at is - and let's use the information that was just given me by the staff - licensed CAS, 17 this year. It would appear that there were 22 last year. What I want to know is, were they closed down because of failing under the licensing aspect? Did the doors not fit or whatever or was it program?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Program.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Then in all of these categories there appears to be a reduction in numbers and I'm comparing the information just given to me with the information given last year and it deals with adult facilities, although there may be a new category here that isn't mentioned last year.

Again, the numbers are down, the beds are down. The question I want in all of these is, is it because of the licensing, the failure to meet standards or is it because of program; and if it's program, then I'll deal with it under program.

**HON. M. SMITH:** I think I answered on the children's, that it's been by a program shift. On the adult, again, I don't know what numbers you're using because I don't have those in front of me. I would have thought that we would see an increase in those. The information we have is that in '84-85, the total number of beds licensed in the adult area was 1,179. This year it's 1,245.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Again, the categories in arriving at the grand number vary and I want to pursue a line of questioning. Is it because they don't meet standards or is it a change in programming? If the Minister can identify, or perhaps, tomorrow, tell me it was standards, then fine, or if it's not, it's program delivery, and then I'll leave it until that particular aspect of the Estimates come up and we can discuss it then.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Our figures show an increase in the number of licensed facilities in the adult, so I'm having

difficulty responding to a line of questioning that talking about reductions. There were reductions in the children's side because of a program decision, program policy. On the adult side, there is an increase.

Again, when I have the comparative detail from year-to-year, I think you'll also find it's because of a program policy. There's needs out there as well, but the group home or various sizes of group home or family home are quite good for adults who need a supportive place to live. Where they didn't prove as successful was in dealing with disturbed or needy youngsters, particularly the under 12's. We still believe that there's a role for the group homes for some of the teenagers, particularly the older ones.

**MR. C. BIRT:** In the information given last year, when it relates to the adult facilities, there are numbers given. Does that include the licensed as well as the approved, or did it just refer to the licensed?

**HON. M. SMITH:** I'm sorry, I don't have the numbers you're referring to. I can give you the totals that I have here.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Well, I could read it.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Okay. Our comparative figures here show increases in both the homes, the licensed and the approved, last year. We can share last year's data with you and perhaps that way, if we're both looking at the same stats, we can then focus in on the relevant questions.

**MR. C. BIRT:** I'd appreciate that. The other question is dealing with all of the children facilities, the total number of facilities and total number of beds are down. The Minister has made reference to changes in policy. Am I correct in saying that the reduction is due to policy changes only and none of them relate to change in licensing standards or some had to be closed because they didn't meet licensing standards?

**HON. M. SMITH:** All programs, because of program policy change.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Subject to that information that the Minister has, because I'm referring to what was quoted on June 7th of last year, and I don't know whether it's including the 'licensed, must approve', or just 'licensed'. I don't have any further questions.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Yes, I assume if you have any further questions, they could be raised under Child and Family Services.

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

Resolution No. 30: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty, a sum not exceeding \$1,150,900 for Community Services, Registration and Licensing Services, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

Committee rise.

## SUPPLY - EDUCATION

**MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER:** Committee come to order.

We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Education, Item 5.(b) Programming Branch. Does the Minister have some statement she would like to make before beginning?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** I just wish to give an answer that the Member for Morris asked to have when we reconvened this evening. It's about cheating on exams, Correspondence Branch.

Supervision of exams is done by, when students are attending schools, they're supervised by their teachers; adults taking correspondence courses but not attending school write either in schools under supervision of a designated person of the community which could be a teacher, clergy, MP, etc., or at the Correspondence Branch under supervision of its staff. If a student is caught cheating then the principal of the school confers with the principal of the Correspondence Branch and they determine together the action to take. As an adult, the supervisor would report this to the principal of the Correspondence Branch who would determine the action to take.

The action generally taken is to mark the paper on which the student cheated as zero. The student may be granted an opportunity to write an alternate paper for that subject again at a subsequent exam period unless the violation was so flagrant or repeated in which the principal of the Correspondence Branch may decide to cancel all further exam privileges or to have the student repeat the entire course.

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

**MR. C. MANNES:** What has been the practice over the last couple of years with respect to finding an individual who has been cheating on these exams? What does the Department of Education do in most cases? How have they handled the matter?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, the information that I had is that they would confer together to see what action would be taken and it could vary. I indicated what I think the general action is and that is that they would get a zero and might have an opportunity to write, not that exam, but another exam at another date. I'm not aware of any fines, but if the Member for Morris is getting at something or knows of a particular case of fines or wants to ask a specific question, it would help if he did it. I don't know of any fines that are being levied in this case.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, I'm not looking for restitution in the form of a fine. I'm just wondering whether there are cases where obvious cheating has taken place and yet the student is allowed to write again promptly thereafter either the same exam or even a new exam. I guess I was just curious as to the policy in place.

When we broke this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, I was asking questions of the Minister with respect to Seniors' Day. Can the Minister indicate whether the Assistant Deputy Minister in charge of the PACE Division, whether that person called the Student Association President,

Sharon Anderson, after the press released with respect to the organizing committee was sent out? Did the Assistant Deputy Minister have occasion to call Miss Sharon Anderson?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** As far as I know, there may have been a call before to see if we could arrange a meeting but not after to my knowledge.

**MR. C. MANNES:** The Minister is indicating that nobody from her department called Miss Anderson with respect to asking the association not to make an issue out of this particular case and, I suppose, to not embarrass the Minister.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Not to my knowledge, Mr. Chairman.

I think that we did make a call to set up a meeting in order to correct what we admitted right away was a misunderstanding and a problem related to communication with the students. That was that when I announced the date for the opening, I believe that the students had been involved in the decisions and in the discussion and since clearly the way it was handled the students were such a large part of the day, it was very important to have their support and agreement and their work. Without it we literally could not have done it as is evidenced by many of the letters that came back from the seniors talking about the activity and the participation of the students.

The purpose was to indicate to them that we were very sorry that something had fallen down through the crack, I suppose, and that they had not been involved prior to setting the date, to immediately set up a date and a meeting with me for the purpose of clearing up the misunderstanding and setting the new date that would be acceptable to all of us and which would allow the full participation of the students.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Is it my understanding that the students at Red River Community College and maybe other two colleges, but certainly at Red River have been sponsoring a seniors' day at that school for some three or four years and they have been underwriting the cost of it, or at least the College has been, maybe the Minister can be a little bit more specific as to who was funding it?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Yes, not the day, Mr. Chairman, the day is very unique and has never happened in Manitoba before this particular day. What has happened before is that the students have for a number of years, perhaps even four or five, put on a dinner for senior citizens at the Lions Manor and that's a dinner that has been, I think, underwritten by the students. I'm getting nods in agreement - at the College so that the students put on the dinner. It's an activity that the students have undertaken each year.

What we have done this year, of course, has gone way beyond that. They carried on with their dinner and that's why they wanted the timing to coincide with the date of their dinner which was February 14. We organized a major open house for all of the senior citizens in the city, had 1,500 come, not only had them visit and see, but actually take courses, actually go

through a preparation or sample some programs and courses that they might come back and take in the future. While it was tied in conjunction with something the students had undertaken previously, the Seniors' Open House Day for senior citizens was a very unique activity this year undertaken by all the colleges.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister in putting out a press statement after the Student Association at Red River Community College had indicated by way of press release their concern, using the Minister's explanation for the breakdown in communication, the Minister in her press release said and I quote, "While I'll make every effort to work this out in a comparative way, I will if necessary cancel the senior citizens day at Red River rather than put our senior citizens in an embarrassing position."

Was the Minister referring to her government's development of a Senior Citizens Day or, in fact, was she going to put an end to what the students at Red River had been doing for many years?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** There was no intention of ever interfering or having anything to do with the students' dinner for the seniors. I was simply saying that we were going to try and work it out with the students but clearly we needed student support and participation to make this a successful day and, to that end, we were willing to prepare to do anything we could to sort out the misunderstanding, to get it back on track and to make it a successful day and we did. We've got articles in the student newspaper that are talking about what an enriching experience it was for everybody, letters and information from the students that say they want to do this next year, this, not being put on the dinner, but have the open house where they open their doors to all the senior citizens.

So the students' reaction after the day was very, very positive, and when we talked about that we would cancel it, it was the entire student open house day that we were talking about, not their dinner.

**MR. C. MANNES:** I would ask the Minister, who funded the costs associated with seniors' day and the cost of treating hospitably 1,500 people?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** The Red River Community College did, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Well, did they have a budget, Mr. Chairman, to do this or did they take these sums of money out of some contingency fund?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Yes, they do have a budget, Mr. Chairman, and the large part of the budget would have come from their budget called "Special Needs Clients," although my guess is that some parts of it would have come under Communication and other areas like that.

There is another example, for instance. The food was all done by the students that are in training at Red River and it's quite usual for them to put on meals and dinners in terms of their training program, to teach them how to be able to deal with large numbers like this. I would say the only difference here would be the size, but it's not an unusual activity and it's built into

the Food Services Program, so it would come from a variety of programs at the college.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, I had the pleasure, just about a month and a half ago to have dinner courtesy of the class, at which time a book called "Economic Perspectives," put out by the college was released and I must say, I was royally dined by students taking the particular course in question.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister now rather than at the more appropriate time under Red River Community College, whether in effect, any funds were shifted out of the traditional open house held by the Red River Community College, such that the fact that the two-day open house period of time had to be cut back to a single day, that single day being Sunday when there is no bus transportation to the Red River Community College.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** No, Mr. Chairman, there were no funds shifted out of that other open house activity that was for the public at large. There was a change in the program this year, but the decision was made long before we made the decision on hosting and having the doors open to the seniors.

We previously had a two-day program. One day was for the community at large and the other day was for the high schools. What we did was continue with the open house for the community, but in terms of the high schools, the decision by the college and the staff was that instead of bringing the students into the college, which they were deciding wasn't as successful as it could be, they were taking a much more activist approach and they were going out to the high schools directly; so it was a changed focus for information. Instead of bringing them in, we had more staff going out actually into the high schools talking to the students, and that was a decision to improve that program; it had nothing to do with the seniors' program and there was no movement of funds related to it.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, I may have a few further questions on this Senior Citizens' Day once we move to Appropriation 5(k).

However, at this time I'll ask the Minister a question with respect to her meeting with the Federal Minister of State, Walter McLean, and that occurred in January of this year.

The Minister makes the point in her press release that it would be an irresponsible waste of taxpayers' money for the Federal Government to support new training institutions at a time when we, in Manitoba, have a highly successful training system. Can the Minister indicate what effect that her meeting with the Minister of State has had? Has it caused additional training programs to be directed towards our institutions that are in place?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Actually, Mr. Chairman, I was a little bit confused, because the meeting I had with the Secretary of State did not deal with the training programs that he's talking about. We don't get funded for training programs under the Secretary of State. We get it under Employment and Immigration.

My meeting with the Secretary of State related to student aid and my concern was related to the part-

time Student Aid Program that they had brought in that we had a lot of concerns about. So he's shaking his head and I'm not sure which number of press release he has but I'm meeting with . . .

**MR. C. MANNES:** It's dated January 30th.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Anyway I'm trying to recollect and you might have to read a portion of that. Largely my meetings with the Secretary of State have related to Student Aid Programs; and if he can read that portion again it might . . .

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicates in her press release that she did discuss with Mr. McLean the Federal Government's Student Aid Program, but before that the emphasis of the press release seems to centre within the area of federal job training programs; and she did discuss that. She said and I quote, "I was able to demonstrate to Mr. McLean that Manitoba was in the best position of all the provinces to deliver federal job training programs."

So my question is, can the Minister indicate whether these programs are now coming to Manitoba because of her meeting with Mr. McLean?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, if I recollect, I think the only other discussion that I would have had with Mr. McLean was related to the transfer of payments in the EPF, the level of funding and discussion about our hope that we maintain the level of funding. And in some cases, I suppose one of the points that I would have been making with him, is that we preferred the delivery of the money that was going to be available for training, to be delivered in this normal way to the institutions and not to be diverted outside for other groups and bodies to deliver. So I think the context was sort of a general discussion with any Minister that we were dealing with at the time over the transfer of payments and EPF.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, obviously this is one of the 200 or so press releases that the Minister did not edit before she released, because the thrust of the press release certainly is threefold; the first one being the fact that the Minister met with Mr. McLean to convince him that Manitoba had an institutional make-up within the area of post-secondary education that should cause federal job training programs to be directed toward this province. My only question to the Minister, seeing that this is now five or six months later, what does she have to report? In fact is the Minister of State or any other Minister in charge of the Federal Job Training Programs, have any of these programs been delivered to Manitoba?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** A hollow guess, Mr. Chairman, I think we do have something to report and actually the point I was making was an important one. The Federal Government's Training Paper put out by the Honourable Flora MacDonald and other papers that have been developed indicate that they were moving in certain areas and under certain criteria. They wanted to do a number of things such as have more training on industry and on-site, have more co-operation

between the private sector and the educational institutions.

One of the things I was communicating to him is that the changes we had made in the last year meant that we were in a much better position, I thought, to meet their top priorities which were also our top priorities because we were moving in all those directions.

I think we have got a recognition of that because we have presently negotiated \$24 million through our regular National Training Agreement and we are in the process of negotiating an additional new \$37 million through the National Training Agreement that we believe, and I think we're going to be, per capita, receiving more than any other province in the country. We believe that it is because our ability in our institutions and the way that we have chosen our criteria and our methods of delivery are suiting their top priorities, so that our proposals are looking very good and the funding is going to go along with it.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Is the Minister of Education giving us a preview of an announcement that may be coming forward shortly?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, we're presently in the stages of negotiations and since the \$37 million is made up of a large number of individual projects, some of which are at varying stages of completion; some have been totally agreed to; some have been agreed to but they're in the final stages of design; but the package is \$37 million. When it is completed so that all the proposals have been completely approved, we will be doing much like we did with last year's announcement, where we came out with the package and set the amount of money and these are the proposals and the programs that we will be undertaking.

I think you will find that they all fit in with top priority skill development areas. They also fit in with the technologies of the future. They also fit in with giving access to disadvantaged people who don't normally have access to these programs, so it's going to be a wide variety of programs that are going to have an effect on our training capacity right across the province.

**MR. C. MANNES:** The Minister indicated in her response and also in her press release, and I quote, "The Council of Ministers has agreed to work with Mr. McLean to make a united case to the Federal Cabinet for greater support for post-secondary education."

Mr. Chairman, I suppose that was after the Minister - it might have been before - had received a copy of a publication prepared for the Secretary of State, prepared by A. W. Johnson, Special Advisor on the financing of post-secondary education, entitled "Giving Greater Point and Purpose to the Federal Financing of Post-Secondary Education and Research in Canada."

Now, the Member for Turtle Mountain will be joining me shortly, Mr. Chairman, and I think the Minister indicated that this would probably be the best time to discuss financing support of post-secondary education. I'd ask the Minister whether or not she might like to share with us the government's analysis, an analysis that would have come forth after the Johnson Report became public?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'll give some general comments, although I'm certainly prepared to

comment further. I think that this would more appropriately come up under universities and that's where we expected it to come up. But, in general, the data had been rejected by all provinces. In other words, the basic information and the statistics that are in there have not only not been accepted by the Province of Manitoba, but have not been accepted by any other province.

What we are saying is that we want to work with the Federal Government to compare our statistics and information and that we're very concerned that they begin to make any decisions on funding or on making any judgments on what provinces are putting what money into post-secondary education, based on the figures that are in that report, because we don't accept them. So I think that, although I realize the Member for Turtle Mountain has come in and perhaps specifically for this purpose, those are my general comments and I'd prefer to get into it under University Funding.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, I did some summations during the dinner break and I don't see where any portion under University Grants Commission is Recoverable from Canada. I know it is but none that's listed within the Estimates, and yet we're now in Post-Secondary Education and almost every one of the items has a section saying Recoverable from Canada.

As a matter of fact I've done the adding of the total \$59 million that we're considering under Resolution No. 51; I add up the shares that are Recoverable from Canada and a full \$29 million of that is Recoverable from Canada. So I ask the Minister why we can't discuss it here, because certainly there's detail associated within every branch, and, more importantly, I think that this is the time to initiate the conversation.

Now I've heard the Minister of Finance from time-to-time begin to dispute of the numbers that have been put forward in the Johnson Report and I've heard the Minister say the same. I believe that if the Minister has any documentation that has been prepared by the government, with respect to the numbers presented by Mr. Johnson, that this would be a proper time to table that information; so that we then can begin to consider this whole question of federal financing of Post-Secondary Education in the Province of Manitoba - consider it with all the detail and with all the information that might exist.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, first of all the recoverable money that the Member for Morris refers to, the \$29 million, hasn't got anything to do with the EPF. It's money that we get for the selling of training to the Federal Government and its direct purchases. So it isn't tied in with the post-secondary with the EPF funding at all. I suppose it's a moot point. It's post-secondary funding.

In general I think the larger amount is related to the universities and we had expected it to be discussed under universities. It could come, I suppose, under any of the - there isn't a line for it so it's hard to say exactly where it fits.

I would, nevertheless, have to continue to say that we are in the process of examining - and have been for a while - examining all the statistics and the

information, making comparisons. There's a lot of problems with it because their bases aren't always the same. We don't break education and health and we dispute a lot of their - both the bases that they're making their statistics on and their statistics. So at this point we wouldn't have much to say as do the other provinces, except what we have communicated to the Federal Government. We don't agree with their statistics; we're very concerned about any decisions being made, both about funding and any judgments being made about what provinces are doing, in terms of spending the money they're getting for post-secondary education and we're preparing our position and a paper to take to the Federal Government. But at this point it is not totally finalized and has not been taken to them and presented to them, either on behalf of the Province of Manitoba or the Council of Ministers, as a whole, who are all taking the same position.

I think what we expect to do is have a meeting with the appropriate Federal Ministers, where we then put on the table our concerns about the Johnson Report. To tell you the truth, it's my understanding that they have some of the same concerns. I do not think that they are accepting the report and all the statistics and information in the report. I think they have their own reservations and they're prepared to meet with and discuss them; so I do not have a proposal or a paper indicating our statistics to present to you at this time, prior to presenting them to the Federal Government.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Perhaps the Minister could tell us, Mr. Chairman, just what sort of division she accepts between Education and Health on the EPF funding?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** We don't separate them, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Well, Mr. Chairman, there is a separation that is done. There was a separation that was accepted by the New Democratic Party while they were in opposition. Have they abandoned that previous position?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, I continue to say that there was an arbitrary separation by the Federal Government. They knew that we did not agree with it and that we do not separate Health and Education funding from the Federal Government.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Does she acknowledge that some of that money is intended then to go towards post-secondary education?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that they're not targeting at the present time. That's what they were proposing to do, but they don't presently, and our reaction was that we didn't want them to.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Can the Minister or any of her staff tell us what the division was at the time that the basis of the EPF or the method in which payment was made, was changed; because there was a time that the post-

secondary education and health expenditures were identified individually, as I understand it, and that they were lumped together and paid no longer on a 50-50 basis; but I believe that it was possible to make some identification on the amount of the money that would be intended to go towards education.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that after they eliminated the 50-50, it went into a block grant to the provinces.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** So then I guess, Mr. Chairman, we can only assume that the NDP accusation that used to be made when they were in opposition, about the previous government diverting funds out of Education, out of universities and using them to build highways, was simply so much empty rhetoric; because if the Minister can't identify any sort of division today, how was her colleague able to identify it previously?

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

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This past year, the Established Program Financing Funds provided approximately 43 cents, 44 cents on the dollar for health and post-secondary education in this province. The other money, the 56, 57 cents on the dollar came from provincial funds.

In 1979-80, for example, those numbers were almost reversed. That is, there was more money coming from the Federal Government for health and post-secondary education than what the Provincial Government was putting in. Per dollar, it was somewhere in the vicinity of 53 cents or 54 cents on the dollar that was going in from the Federal Government. Somewhere around 46 cents or 47 cents on the dollar was coming in from the Provincial Government; so those numbers have been pretty well reversed.

In the last year there may have been some slight decline in the provincial portion from, I believe, 57 cents on the dollar to 56 cents on the dollar in the current year; but very clearly, we're paying overall, on health and post-secondary education, more than 50 cents on the dollar now. In 1979-80, we were paying less than 50 cents on the dollar.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, can the Minister explain how it is that the funding in the Established Programs Funding now has gone up something like 15.6 percent this year, according to the Estimates of Revenue tabled by the Minister of Finance, an increase of some \$57,400,000; while the total spending in the Health and Education Departments have only gone up by a range of \$61 million; so that of the total increase in spending in Health and Education - and I realize that there's not a separation of what's going into post-secondary education, that you could pull that out and I'm sure quite easily it may change the figures a little bit but not a great deal - how does the Minister justify that kind of increase in the Established Programs Funding, when the government's own contributions to the increase are really very small, at the same time as the Minister and other members of the government had gone out to people interested in education and in health care and told them that we can't afford to make these

increases because the Federal Government is cutting back, when it appears that in the areas that are designated to go into specific areas, health and post-secondary education, it seems that there has been a very substantial increase especially compared to previous years.

When I look back at the situation when I was Minister of Finance in 1981 that for that year the increase in equalization was only \$1 million, from '81-82, only rose 1 million over the previous year and the established programs' money went up from 285 to 288, so that there was almost no increase in those years, yet again, I recall the New Democratic Party going out and telling people in the post-secondary education field, the University of Winnipeg, for instance, that if there were cuts carried out in EPF that the post-secondary education institutions would not feel the effects of that, that the government would cover it all.

I find the argument that took place at that time and the actions of the government today, a little inconsistent. I'm just wondering how the Minister justifies this very small increase in the provincial revenues going into these fields at the same time as they seem to be condemning the Federal Government so roundly for not putting more money in it.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Chairman, the member seems to forget from where he went to where and at what time he was doing it. When he was Finance Minister, it was Year 4 of a four-year Tory term and you had that cycle of the Tory tango - three steps backward and one step forward. You had three successive years of cutbacks, cutbacks, cutbacks, and the last year we had the largest increases in spending that we've had since at least 1977.

When he was Finance Minister, it is true, we had the largest percentage increase in provincial expenditures at least since 1977 to this very day. It is true that they did spend more money in 1981-82. I was quoting 1979-80 and in 1981-82 the numbers were better. They were not as strong in terms of the provincial contribution as they were here in 1984-85, for example, and what the member doesn't want to acknowledge is that this year we're receiving \$22 million less in equalization payments than we received last year. He doesn't mention that at all. He doesn't mention the tremendous percentage increases in equalization payments that they had received between 1977-78 and 1981-82 - and they were large. They were much, much larger than what they had been in the last few years. In fact, we were at somewhere around \$400 million when we took office and we're now at 470 million, 450 million - in there approximately. We were up to 470, I believe we're down to 450 and for next year we're going down to 430 unless we have some changes. We were at 470 in 1984-85; down to 450 in '85-86; down to 430 in '86-87 without any further changes.

Percentage-wise in '79-80 in the middle of their term, they were not paying their fair share when it came to health and post-secondary education. They were cutting back. They were paying somewhere around 43 cents on the dollar, 44 cents on the dollar. That was turned around by the NDP. We were paying more on the dollar than the Feds were when we were in office, and we still are.

The Member for Turtle Mountain would like to have us pay even more on the dollar. He seems to feel that somehow we should be coming up with more spending on education, more spending on health, more spending on grasshopper spraying, more spending on drainage ditches, more spending on taking up excess dairy products, more spending on what-have-you - wherever you turn more and more and more spending. Of course we would eliminate the health and education levy and we wouldn't increase any other taxes and we would have a lower deficit.

The magicians who came along with a deficit at their time when they took office and they had this high priority of reducing the deficit in '77. We remember that campaign well. That was their major platform that they ran up and down this province campaigning on and by the time they left office with him as Finance Minister, they had a much higher deficit than they had when they took office.

Now they're telling us that we should spend more money. They're telling us here that we're not spending enough money on post-secondary education. Everywhere we go they're telling us we're not spending enough money but they're telling us we're taxing too much and our deficit is too high. It has become the "party" party. Everybody should have a good time and get your money all over the place . . .

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Listen to this. There's shouting and yelling coming out of your caucus room and you want to talk about the "party" party. People parading up and down the halls with wine bottles. Come on, Schroeder, we know where you're coming from.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Chairman, our staff works very hard, they deliver for the government and for the people of this province. Talk about playing games, Mr. Chairman. Established program financing comes under the Department of Finance. If the member for Turtle Mountain had any courage he would be talking about established financing in Finance, not trying to play games and doing it with Ministers in other departments who don't have the whole range of federal-provincial transfer arrangements before them.

The Education Minister has somewhere in the range of one-third of that money; two-thirds is elsewhere. The equalization, she doesn't have any of it in front of her and yet the Member for Turtle Mountain wants to play around very, very selectively with figures but he won't acknowledge that historically when he was in office they weren't putting 50 cents on the dollar into health and post-secondary education. When we were in office, when we have been in office, and when we will be in office in the future we will do that, we will do at least that. We've made that commitment and we've demonstrated that we have been able to keep up with that commitment. So, let us not hear him telling us about playing games. If he had the courage he would have been talking about this in the Department of Finance Estimates.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, I want to ask some questions of the Minister of Education because she has some responsibility in this area. I realize that the Minister of Finance doesn't want to let her answer questions

but I think she's quite capable of answering questions herself. As a matter of fact, we seem to get more direct responses to the questions that are asked from the Minister of Education by far than we do from the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance always seems to want to launch off into another of his bafflegab tirades to which he has become famous for.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister of Education whether she regards that her department has any call upon increases that come to the Provincial Government by way of increases in established programs financing, funds that come from Ottawa?

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

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, I was about to say when I was going to get up before, that this does more appropriately belong under the Finance Minister's Department, under the line of EPF, and that I think the question should have come up there, and that we did not expect them under the colleges and post-secondary and do not have detailed figures with us. So I put that on record once again to say that we don't have detailed figures to go into tonight and he'll have to accept that I think.

In general, I don't think that we have to apologize. As Education Minister, I think that we have funded the education system very well over the years, and, in fact, in terms of university funding, we've given an 8 percent average over the years and it's a higher average than across the country.

We're the only province, I think, that gave access to the universities and colleges for the Skills Growth Fund which gave them an additional \$2.5 million for new programs in each of our institutions. We increased the Miscellaneous Capital from \$3 million to \$5 million, a 66 percent increase in the first year that we were in office, because we knew the tremendous amount of deterioration of equipment that had taken place over the years in the universities.

We're the only province or one of the few provinces to maintain the Student Aid Program without capping it, without putting a ceiling on it; where we have said that whatever students in the province are entitled under the criteria, they can receive student aid funding. Other provinces put a ceiling on it and said the first 10,000 in the door get money and the last 2,000 don't, because they put a ceiling on the money. We have never done that.

We paid the tuition fee increase for the students one year, put \$1 million where we paid the tuition fee increase so it wouldn't be borne on the backs of the students. I think that where we have been able to, that we've got about \$30 million in capital going into new buildings in the universities. That doesn't even include what's going into the colleges.

So I guess my point is that it's part of a total package, part of a total pie that government has, that they have to make the balancing act and provide adequate funding for education, which is important for health, which is important, and try and do it and maintain a reasonable level of taxes and an acceptable deficit level.

I don't think that we have anything to apologize for in terms of the effort that we have made to maintain educational programs in the Province of Manitoba; not

only maintain them, but even advance in them in major areas like the reforms and the changes in the new programs in our colleges that are unprecedented in terms of what's happening in other countries; and this, at a time when we're training staff; we're bringing in new programs; we're building new buildings; and it's an effort I think that I, as Minister of Education, and the government could be proud of.

We would all have liked a little more money this year. The Minister of Finance knows that there isn't a Minister that wouldn't have said, yes please, if he said would you like another couple of percentages of money. But what we did say is that we would put enough money in to maintain our educational programs and to give expansion where the top priorities were, and we did that in our public school side, in our college side, and in our universities.

I'm proud of the level of funding that we've been able to maintain and the fact that we've been able to keep our education programs and not do the damage that was done in other provinces with the tremendous cutbacks that they have had; provinces that weren't faced with the limited resources and some of the difficulties that we faced here.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, I understand that the Minister doesn't want to talk about the details of university funding, because that's not where we're at, and I'm not asking for details. I'm asking her for her philosophy or how she perceives the established program financing funds that come to the province, and whether or not there is a special call by the Department of Education on those funds, because they are identified as being for post-secondary education and health care; whereas equalization is not. Equalization is simply an amount of money that goes to the province for whatever purposes. So I'm asking her whether or not she sees established programs' funding as being any different than money that comes to the province by way of equalization payments?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, I think I indicated before that the government looks at all of its sources of revenue and looks at the needs overall. It is not identified. It is a block grant and we have a call on it. One of the points that we have been trying to make is that where we are given money, that it's very important that it not just be for federal priorities because they have a federal list and they want us to deliver certain training, but that they accept the provincial priorities and allow us to put in programs that are high priority needs for our province.

So it's not just a matter of the amount of funding. It's also a matter of the distribution and what the money is going to and the province having a say in what programs are going to be brought in.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Is the Minister saying that it's no different than equalization payments? Whatever increase that the province gets through EPF funding would not be treated any differently than money coming by way of equalization?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** I'm having a bit of trouble, because I don't think it's relevant to the program and

I'm questioning the continued line of questioning in this area. It's not relevant to what we're talking about here and not relevant to the program at all.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister can have her choice. She can answer the question now or she can answer it later, whichever she wishes. Earlier when we raised it, she didn't want to answer it. I could understand that. She hadn't been aware of the question; she didn't have the people here who could answer it. She said it was the post-secondary education area plus universities. We're in post-secondary education, that's why we're raising the questions now.

If she would sooner answer those questions under the Universities Grants Commission, I suppose that's fine, as long as she'll give us her assurance that she'll try and answer it because I think it's important that the Minister of Education make her views known.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have no problem with that at all. In fact, perhaps we should have had a little more detailed discussion on when it would appropriately come up. The post-secondary section does not include universities, and because of that we did not expect it to come up here. If we would have had a little clearer discussion, I could have not only said that post-secondary education was the appropriate time, but Universities Grants Commission is the section we would expect it under. That's where I do expect it and we are prepared to discuss it further.

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

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, I had one other request of the Minister within this whole area. The Minister of Finance, and indeed the Minister herself, made reference to some analysis in working document that they've developed in rebuttal to the Johnson Report. I'm asking her again whether she will share that report with the House?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, I think I gave that answer and I said that we're finalizing the report and preparing to share it with the Federal Government. I think until that is done that one would not expect a report that is being prepared for another level of government to be distributed publicly, even in this Chamber, prior to being prepared to share it with the people that you're preparing it for.

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

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Chairman, there is one document that I certainly could forward to the member. I don't have it handy tonight, but it is a four or five-page letter from myself to the Federal Minister of Finance, which deals with the Johnson Report from a financial perspective, not necessarily an education perspective, but it has been concurred in by the four Western Provinces and I'd certainly be glad to send a copy of that to the member.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Fine, Mr. Chairman, we'll accept that, if the Minister wants to send it over some time tomorrow.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister, in April, 1983, indicated that there were going to be some changes at colleges with respect to programs, some courses that year were going to be discontinued. Following on that came the announcement last year, with respect to the new way of - I always forget that name - the ICBL type programming, and then the Minister also indicated that in support of that change she was bringing into place advisory boards that would help deal with the new implementation of competency based training programs.

I would ask the Minister at this time how many courses within the community colleges have been discontinued. Her April, 1983 statement indicated that nine courses were being discontinued for the fall of 1984. This is now a year and a half hence. Can the Minister tell me how many courses have been discontinued?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, we did eliminate nine courses, based on the criteria that we established for elimination of courses. This year we have not eliminated any courses. What we're doing is modifying some of the programs to improve them, and I suppose a good example could be the ABE Program which hasn't been eliminated, but has had a number of improvements to it and moved into competency-based curriculum development, which is a way of taking the information in the program and dividing it into units, that people can then tap in and take either one, two, three or four of the units; so that our focus this year has not been on elimination of programs, but on improvement of existing programs, that we didn't want to eliminate but we knew needed improvement, and on moving toward the modular instruction. I think we've moved on about 20 courses, have been developed, and we're looking at another 17 or so for next year.

**MR. C. MANNES:** The Minister indicates that the nine that were shown in some detail were the number of courses that were removed. Can she now tell me how many new courses have been implemented over the last two years at our community colleges?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think we're in the neighbourhood of about eight new courses scheduled for this coming year, starting in September. I'm just compiling a list, because some of them are being delivered from other colleges.

One is Applied Photography, Food Services Supervisor, Legal Assistant and ABE for Ex-Offenders, and I think this is the one that we're providing through the Federal Government, that they have asked us to do.

In ACC, Tourism Administration, Information Technologist, Applied Agriculture and at KCC, Band and Community Administration, Second Year RN Nursing and Second Year of Business Course.

**MR. C. MANNES:** The Minister says there are now 20 of the existing courses that are in a state of readiness for competency-based training or the modular program, as she calls it.

As I recall, her original press release indicated that there would be an attempt to have nine courses in a state of readiness for the fall of 1985. Will in fact those nine courses be ready for this fall?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** More than the nine.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering if this is the time that I can ask some questions with respect to Skills Growth and the Winnipeg South location, or the Minister can maybe tell me what areas that they should fall under.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** South Winnipeg would come under Capital, Public Schools Finance Board, and Skills Growth here.

**MR. C. MANNES:** There have been many claims and firstly, Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether the Minister wants to discuss, I'm going to be asking some questions with respect to Skills Growth Fund and its involvement in developing the computer resource facility and also the involvement of the Red River Community College with respect to some of the courses that include computer usage.

Could the Minister tell me what has happened with respect to the program at Red River Community College that has caused a number of students who enrolled for computer courses to not have an opportunity, through a large portion of their school year, to work firsthand with computers that were in place, but were non-functional.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, while we had some problems with the computer course and with the equipment, students did have access to it and did have full use of the computers. The computers worked from Day One, but the network couldn't be linked up, so there wasn't a case where they signed up for a program and couldn't work on the computers. They could work on the computers, but the network that we had designed to link up between the institutions, within Red River, couldn't be used. That was the main problem and it wasn't that they weren't working on the computers at all. They did have full use of the computers, but they weren't able to link up with other students in other programs.

**MR. C. MANNES:** My understanding, Mr. Chairman, the Skills Growth Fund had available funding in 1982 and yet not until early 1984 did PACE sign a contract in support of the program. Can the Minister tell me what took so long?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that the contracts were signed in '82-'83, but this is very complicated equipment. You can't get it from everywhere and by the time they identify sources and put it out to tender, it took a fairly lengthy period in time.

At the same time, it also required some facility changes, some revamping and changes of the institution. It also required training of staff, so it was the program that had a number of elements that took a little while to get in place.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Does the Minister find this acceptable? I understand there were students who enrolled in that course, were given a general outline previous that, in fact, they would have full access to

this equipment that was in place. Does the Minister accept the reasons given to her? It appears from a distance that the Federal Government had a fair degree of money that was available and the Minister's Department jumped at it and then all of a sudden couldn't put into place a functional program to take use of it. I ask the Minister whether or not she feels somewhat concerned, particularly for those students who had signed up on a course and then find out that the resource equipment wasn't in place?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I do accept it, not because we would all have preferred that it didn't happen, but the students did have full access as I said before to the computers and the networking was a minor point. It isn't that we would have preferred that it worked. It wasn't even invented until two years ago. So to suggest that the whole quality of computer programming was dependent upon the networking is not so, although I'm sure it would be improved and better if it was working. They had access to a fairly full computer programming. The element that didn't work was this portion of it. The information that we have, in terms of industry, related to students graduating from this program is that they're very supportive of the computer grads and 28 are employed in the field out of 31 from the last class six months ago. Clearly, if you're looking for measurements, I would think that's probably one of the best measurements that we could find is the large number of students employed in the industry.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, how long has the hardware been on site? How long has it been in place at the college and non-functional?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, the equipment has been on site for a while, and it was functioning, but it was functioning below what was required. It didn't have the capacity and wasn't able to do the job. It wasn't that it wasn't it on site not functioning at all. It was performing below the required specifications that have been given to the supplier. We were not able to bring it up to satisfactory performance.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Whose cost will it be to bring it up to a functional state to total capacity? It was my understanding that there was some programming or some basic fundamental, I don't know if it was software or what it was that was required that the department chose to select and now has found out since that there has been some difficulty in instituting what it was to make the hardware functional. Can the Minister tell me how much money has been wasted to change over to either a new program or to upgrade the technology in place to make this hardware fully . . .

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** To date none, Mr. Chairman. There has been no money lost. We are presently negotiating with the supplier. I might say that when we were first looking at the equipment, we really wanted to stay with a Canadian supplier and that was one of the things that we were looking at. We're presently negotiating, and I think that there's a very good chance and we're expecting recovery of the money. So to date,

there has not been any money lost and if the negotiations go the way they seem to be we will be able to work out an agreement with the supplier where they take it back and there's no loss of money to us. That's not final. Final negotiations aren't completed yet.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister says that working towards a conclusion where the Canadian supplier will take back his technology at no cost, can the Minister give me the answer to two questions: firstly, what was the cost of that, and secondly, is the alternative that the department will be following now is to go to an American manufacturer of the technology for it to be supplied?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, we have found another manufacturer. It's a Canadian distributor of an American manufacturer. We have found the appropriate, I think, hardware and we'll go through the regular process in terms of tendering it and the amount of money is \$225,000.00.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Can the Minister tell us when this equipment will be in place? The hardware and the computers have been sitting, I understand, for many, many months at the college. Can she tell us what target of date she has in mind to have this whole problem finally and totally resolved?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, we expect to have it resolved for the fall term.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move again back to the jurisdiction over the community college. I have before me a May 31 edition of the student newspaper. I'll quote from it. "Gary Polonsky, President at Red River Community College says red tape creates a real problem in running the college effectively." This is the quotes that have been attributed to Mr. Polonsky. "Right now it takes 10 signatures to get one staff member from here to Kenora."

Does the Minister have a comment on that particular statement? Can she tell us whether or not PACE is becoming so bureaucratic in nature that much of its efficiency is being lost?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, actually, I believe that's the problem that we did have. To refer specifically from the comment from Mr. Polonsky, the president, he was referring to red tape inside the colleges and he has since eliminated five of the seven internal signatures that were required. So what he found when he got there is that there was a lot of red tape; there was a lot of bureaucracy; and a lot of it was unnecessary and he has eliminated - which is his job to do - he has eliminated a lot of the unnecessary bureaucracy.

In terms of what we have done, we actually recognized I think as soon as we had the report that was done by Dr. Terry Morrison, looking at the functioning and administration and management of all our colleges two years ago, that we did have a lack of controls; there was lack of accountability; there was a lot of bureaucratic bureaucracy and we have moved to eliminate all of those and we've moved in several areas.

We've removed something like 40 percent, reduced our administration at Red River by 40 percent. We've actually eliminated a whole section of administration. We found out we had duplication in administration between the Department of Education side and the college side and that we eliminated that. We found that there was a lack of control and accountability.

So I would say that one of the things that we have done overall is to increase efficiency in a number of ways and one has certainly been to reduce red tape and unnecessary bureaucracy; while, at the same time, we moved to increase controls and accountability in terms of retention rates of students, to improve the capacity of the colleges, take on a larger enrolment with no increased money, to increase the revenues that we are getting from the Federal Government in our capacity to get revenues. So I think that there were a lot of problems. They're probably not all solved but we certainly moved to solve a lot of them.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** Can the Minister tell me whether the autonomy at the community colleges is being increased or decreased because of the changes she has referred to?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, I would say that there is more freedom. I suppose in some ways there's more freedom and in some ways there's a little less. We're looking at accountability, for instance, for things like retention rates that I mentioned before, where there was no central control or direction; where we had said that retention rates must be improved because that's one way of saving money. We've improved our retention rates by 10 percent.

So that's an example where centrally we're taking and giving more directive about what is acceptable and what we're expecting, and in other cases, we're decentralizing and I think we're allowing the heads of our colleges to operate more as educational institutions and less as they were before, as sort of branch sections of the Department of Education. We're moving towards decentralization to the colleges, into the communities with the public too, and looking at the advisory boards that he mentioned before, which will be set up with a broad range of representation from industry, from unions, from community, from public, from students, that will be clearly giving some good advice to the colleges.

One of the things the communities have been telling us for a number of years is that they felt there was an isolation of some of our institutions with the people that they were serving, the students and the adult population. So those moves are improvements in that direction.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** The Minister made reference to her advisory boards. Can she tell me at this time whether they are in place? If they are in place, can she give me a list - not now - but can she provide a list of those people and the various parts of the community that they represent?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Yes, they're almost in place at this point, and certainly in a very short period of time I can give him the full list of the names of the people and the organizations or groups that they represent.

One of the points I wanted to make before about the administration and reducing the bureaucracy is that I think we now in Red River have the leanest administration in Canada with our proportion of 20 administrators to 27,000 students. I understand it's the leanest administration in Canada.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** Mr. Chairman, I'm glad to hear that.

The Minister, in her press release September of 1984 when she was talking about advisory boards, listed a number of groups from which representatives would be selected. I see the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, but nowhere do I see any other reference to the business community, other than that broad group - and I'm talking now about the advisory board that would come into place servicing the Red River Community College.

Does the Minister have any goals in her mind as to how many business people, employers, who obviously must have the greatest to contribute, certainly in the Red River Community College setting? Does the Minister have any goal or objective so as to give business a significant portion of the total number of people who will go into making her advisory board?

In my view, if there's only one business person out of an advisory board of 10 or 12 in number, it seems to me that the Minister is deliberately, for some reason, skewing the representation in a manner that in no way reflects the reality of the economy in the business community.

So I'm interested to know whether she has set limits of the number of people that will serve on this advisory board and if she can tell us, particularly in the case of Red River Community College, what percent or what portion of that number will be represented by business people?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, I indicated that I'd give all the details after, so it's a little bit premature to - although he does have some information about the organizations that will be represented, there are a couple of important points there and he'll have to wait until he sees the whole make-up. There will be members at large and it is possible, I think in Red River, that two out of the 12 or the one-sixth of the people will be representing the business community, because it's possible to choose a business person, not necessarily representing the Chamber of Commerce, but to have business representation through a member at large. Some of it's done through organizations and some of it is done through members at large.

The other important thing that we're doing is that we're involving the business people in the arena that they want to be the most involved in and that is the development of courses. We presently have course advisory committees and we have 85 courses where we have people from the community sitting on the course development and they are dominated, a large proportion of them would be business people. Over 1,000 community people are on these course committees and a large percentage of them are business people. That's one of the things they've been saying, is they want to be involved; that the curriculum is the important thing. I don't believe there's a mention of the courses in that press release.

So they're involved in a number of ways. One will be on the advisory committee and certainly the thing that they've told us that's most important to them is being involved in the development of curriculum.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 5.(b)(1) - the Member for Morris.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, there's something not consistent. I understand, and as the Minister has indicated, there are many, many people within the community at large, a large percentage of them employers or business people who are giving advice with respect to individual courses; and yet when the Minister talks about an advisory board which will, in my view, attempt to develop an approach that will take the community colleges in a direction that is in keeping with the wishes of the community at large, it seems to me that there's a tremendous potential for - I won't use the word "conflict" - but certainly in diverging directions, and I ask the Minister why it is that the advisory board would be represented to such a lesser degree than the course development areas?

If one wants to look, the Minister, in her press release, said that the new board at Red River Community College will have representatives from the following groups: The Manitoba Federation of Labour, the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, and my only comment on the second one is that the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce certainly isn't all totally representative of all the business interests in the community. I'm wondering what the Canadian Manufacturers Association - and I know there's certainly some overlap, but there are many other business organizations - the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, but anyway, I don't think the Minister can say that the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce speaks for all business concerns and all matters.

The third group is the Manitoba Indian Education Association; and the fourth, the Manitoba Metis Federation; the fifth, the Inter-Agency Council of Social Agencies; the sixth, the Manitoba Education Technical Vocational Education Consultant; another is a Regional Technology Vocational High School; and finally, the Department of Employment Services and Economic Security.

Mr. Chairman, I submit, other than the Manitoba Federation of Labour and the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, that the other seven are almost quasi governmental in nature. I ask the Minister why the lack of representation in this advisory council that are going to serve the colleges, in an attempt, as the Minister says, to have them serve better the whole community, and realizing that the function of the community colleges is to train people of all ages for employment in chosen fields; can the Minister tell me again why there's such a low representation of business interests on that advisory committee?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Well, I'll try, Mr. Chairman, but since he obviously didn't like my answer the first time, he may not like it the second time either, but this will continue to be my answer.

First of all, the high domination in the course areas that I suggested is because the courses are related to business and they are in a high proportion where they

are advising in the course development that relates to business.

For instance, the one that he mentioned, the manufacturing organization, is involved in an advisory committee on the course development in that field. So first of all, I continue to say that in the area they have communicated to us, that they are most interested to have direct involvement, and that is the development of courses that affect their area, in our system that we train, that they are very, very highly involved. When you get to a board of 12 people, we're not just training people for business.

We have a wide range of training programs that address, not only a number of fields like the health care field, social service field, special needs field; but we have a lot of different target populations and target groups that we're addressing. It can be students, faculty, labour, seniors and handicapped, and what have we. I don't think two out of twelve - when you look at the broad range of programs and training that we are designing and delivering - that two out of twelve is inappropriate; and that all of those other people have just as much of an interest in programs that are in their area.

So it's the balance that we need, and I submit that with the high proportion of involvement of the business community in the development of courses, and what I think is fair and reasonable representation on the advisory board, I think the balance and the distribution is reasonable.

I think we might remember that there wasn't any representation before. There was no advisory board; there was no representation; there was no involvement; there was no involvement in the development of courses. Let's say we can always improve it, but let's at least give recognition to the major effort that has been made to date, to involve broad members of the community and, specifically, business and industry in college training programs.

We've got co-operative programs where we're training on-site. We're willing to do more of that, where we work hand-in-hand with the employer and train and certify on-site. So I think there's been a move toward working with them and involving them and co-operating and training that far exceeds anything that has ever been done in this province before.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Before we pass out of this area, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister, and I don't have her press release in front of me, but I know when she made the announcement with respect to ICBL program, that she considered it futuristic in the sense that it was the way the future would be going and that she was glad to see where it had a place within our college setting.

I ask the Minister whether she is monitoring its performance in other jurisdictions to see that the theoretical ideals that were granted to the program, in fact, have been borne out in practical application?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, we certainly are looking at other jurisdictions and, in fact, I think I was just told our staff and our faculty have been the ones that have been designing the programs. In fact there's been a tremendous support by faculty to do

the work required, to make the changes in the curriculum; so the changes are being made by people that are actually doing the teaching.

We're looking at other areas, not just in education, that are using this kind of training program and industry, as is sometimes the case, is ahead of educational institutions, that General Motors and IBM have both moved into this kind of training program and now the Federal Government has built into their training program. They say that they want modularization programs, so that clearly I think we're a little bit ahead of the game here, in terms of some other provinces.

One of the advantages we're going to have is that we once again are ahead of the pack and because the Federal Government believes this is a good way to go for all the reasons that we think it is. It avoids a lot of expense, a lot of duplication. It gives recognition to a lot of training and knowledge and experience gained from other programs. It's part of the Federal Government's and the Honourable Flora MacDonald's new criteria for the \$37 million. The fact that we are geared up and we're prepared for this; we know how to handle it; we're training our staff; we're developing our programs, is going to put us once again in the front lines for getting federal money.

I understand and I meant to say this - but I understand that people are starting to visit us, that the word is getting out that we are developing an excellent modularization program because it's being developed in Manitoba. While we're looking at other jurisdictions, we are developing our own. We had 65 visitors in town today and a lot of them are now coming to see the development in the work that we're doing.

**MR. C. MANNES:** How many courses can this new program, how many courses can be taught under its framework? Obviously, the Minister, or I read somewhere where the cost associated with changing to this new program is somewhere around \$150,000 a course. I don't know how accurate that is. Can the Minister tell me specifically how many courses are planned to be instructed in this manner?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, I did give that figure before. It's 17 courses that we have been working on and that we believe will be ready for implementation this September. It will be phased in. When we announced it we said that it's possible to do all of the programs and all of the courses, or almost all of them, but we won't necessarily be doing them. They aren't all appropriate or we may not want to do them all. Certainly, we're moving in those areas where the needs are the greatest to have access to modular instruction. We're doing 17 this year and I think we expect to do another 17 next year. It's important that we phase it in slowly and do it properly and not just think that we can undertake to change all of the programs.

As I said before that we're doing it with existing resources. I don't know where the Member for Morris got \$150,000 from. It's our college instructors that are doing the designing and we haven't required extra dollars for the development of modular courses.

I would just add a bit. We do have criteria for determining which courses are the ones that are the most appropriate and we don't have it with us tonight but we could certainly share it with you.

**MR. C. MANNES:** For once, Mr. Chairman, I'm not interested in the criteria. Although the Minister said where I got the \$150,000 figure; I found it in the article that came from the Projector of February 22, 1985. I believe that the person that's been quoted as using it is Mr. Polonsky, RRCC Director. The article was written by a person called Bayne Gere. It says, "The changeover will cost roughly \$150,000 per program but the college cannot forecast exact costs yet or how much will need to be added to the college budget."

The Minister challenged me as to where I got the figure. That's where I found it. I don't claim it's accurate, Mr. Chairman, however, that's the reason I posed the question.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Basically, I think it's an article that was written by a student and the figures are perhaps either not accurate and perhaps not confirmed, but I don't believe that the figure came from, since we have Mr. Polonsky here in residence and he's shaking his head no, that it's not his figure. I think we can trust that.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, we all make mistakes when we're overeager sometimes. I certainly will take Mr. Polonsky's word as to what was meant and what was said.

The article though says, "Instructors will undergo the biggest change; no more lectures; no more rigid course time schedules. Students will consult the instructor when they need advice. Instruction becomes more like a personal tutor."

It says the paragraph before, "Exams are scheduled according to each student's progress." Is that a fair assessment of the program? If it is, it's one of the better ones I've heard. I'd like to know whether in fact there's a fair degree of accuracy in that summation?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, I think that there might be a move in some of that direction but not an overbalance. I think there will be possibility through this. We know through some individualized instruction where students can carry on and learn at their own pace through this, but there will also be teaching modules and there will also be group instruction and it will be a combination of all of those.

**MR. C. MANNES:** The Minister, when she announced the new program said that a commitment would be made to instructors and community members and students, that they would be involved in this changeover. Can the Minister indicate whether her department or she herself have ever contacted the Students Association at Red River Community College to invite them to be part of this change?

I should tell her that the president of the association over the last year indicates that she was never contacted or consulted. That's why I pose the question.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, the communication and the consultation, because the work is being done by the faculty and by the college themselves and not by my department, there has been major communication and it has been through the administration and the faculty and the students. There

have been a fair number of open meetings where these things have been discussed. They've had four major workshops where the, I think, students and faculty attended the workshops so that the consultation program was one that we agreed to and approved, but the consultation and the work, the work is not being done in my office. It's being done out in the college and the consultation has been taking place through there where we have working committees that are set up and we have student and faculty representation on those committees.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** Where where did it break down, Mr. Chairman? Again, the president has said that she had to request a meeting with the administration before she could get some information. Why would the Minister in a press release say that, in fact, the Student Association was going to be involved in this and then after that association had sat and watched the development of affairs for a period of time had to request a meeting with administration and I daresay had they wanted a meeting with the Minister, would have had to request that also? Where did it break down?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, I understand that there might be another article that it would be useful to quote from and that Sharon has written and I think she has indicated that in the last six months there has been a lot of consultation and a major improvement in the communication and the consultation.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** Mr. Chairman, before we pass this area, I'm going to ask the Minister whether she gave me the names of the individuals who have their salaries appropriated under this particular section. If she has given them to me, the names of the individuals, that's fine. I'm prepared to pass this.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 5.(b)(1)—pass; 5.(b)(2)—pass.  
5.(c) Red River Community College (1) Salaries - the Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, just a couple of short questions. These date back to discussions we had with the Minister of Community Services on the closing of the Portage School of Nursing. Could the Minister indicate whether Red River Community College is undertaking the development of a training course and a program which will graduate a developmental services worker?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** No, Mr. Chairman. I am wondering if the program he's talking about is one that's being delivered through the Inner Core Training and Employment Agency, because I think when this question came up before, we felt there was some confusion. The name was changed and I can't remember exactly why, but there was a name change and there was some confusion about where it was being delivered. But I think that the program he's talking about is under the employment and training agency, not through the college, and it's the Mental Retardation Worker Program. That was the initial name that we had for it. Does that ring a bell?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Then the Minister is indicating that there is no course currently under development for implementation at Red River?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** No there isn't, to my knowledge, Mr. Chairman.

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

**MR. C. MANNESS:** Mr. Chairman, we covered a fair amount of material with respect to the community colleges. However, I ask the Minister whether she had any concern with an article again came out of the Projector, February 8, 1985, where Mr. Polonsky, college director, is quoted as having instructed staff not to speak to any member of the media without his permission. Did this occur, Mr. Chairman?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that that did not take place, and I'm also advised that if we were able to check a letter to the editor that was written — (Interjection) — Oh he thinks that it may be in the paper you're holding, that if you check the letter to the editor there will be information there to the contrary.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** Mr. Chairman, I don't have a paper, I've got a single page.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** I'm informed that Mr. Polonsky, the president, wrote a letter to the editor providing information that indicates that that is not so. Perhaps we could get a copy for you.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** Mr. Chairman, this article that I have in front of me, written by an Andrea Long, indicated that there was a letter written - so I acknowledge that - by the president. However, the writer says the impression gained from the letter is that while the staff is free to speak to the press or other media people, the director doesn't want anyone to run to them and spill a story without first checking with him. Is there in place today in the Red River Community College a policy, written or unwritten, which forces any staff member of that college to come to the director before speaking to anybody or any media person?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Absolutely not, Mr. Chairman. I was going to say no and I'm informed by the president of the college that the answer is absolutely not. In fact there have been so many articles that I have wakened up and looked at in a newspaper that I didn't even know were going to take place, that there were any discussions about programs and things that were going on in the colleges and in our institutions, that clearly shows that that kind of requirement is not there.

There are a lot of very good articles that are written where the information comes from staff or people who are directing or handling the program that talk about and give information about particular programs. In fact, we've had half-page articles or pages of the newspaper on programs in our colleges, where the only condition is - and I think it's one that is normal - if they're talking about something that requires an indication of a policy statement or a change of a policy or anything that would be in the political arena, that would require an answer on that level, then clearly it must come from another source. But when we're talking facts and we're talking information about programs and things that exist, we do not have a policy that restricts them.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, I have found the letter to the editor. It's January 25th and it's signed by Mr. Polonsky, and to be fair, to put on the record, I'll quote part of that to show that I'm not always one-sided. The letter says, "As I mentioned Monday night, I have never met a stronger advocate of total freedom of the press than myself," and I have no way whatsoever of disputing that, although I would ask the Minister whether Mr. Polonsky wrote a memo to all staff members entitled "Projector Article on January 11, 1985 Entitled 'Computer Rip-off?'"

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** He doesn't recall, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, I ask the Page to come here. Would you take this over to the Minister?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** While that's coming I might just make a point that I wanted to make and that is that the president in the last newsletter made a point of commenting about the openness . . .

**MR. C. MANNES:** President of the students?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** President of the student body, yes, on the openness of the college and the freedom to speak.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, I sent a memo to the Minister. It fell into my hands; to whom it was to be directed, I don't know. It was signed or at least initialled by the president of the community college. It says, in effect, that staff should in no way be critical of pace, and that individuals had better speak properly of a major governmental division.

I bring the point up, Mr. Chairman, not to cast any major criticism to the new president, because I've had many other people tell me that the changes in Red River Community College have been, for the most part, very favourable and to the advantage of not only the college but to society at large. But I think when one sees a memo of that nature, that it bears questioning because, secondly, if it isn't questioned, it then puts into doubt the basic freedoms of people who work at that college. I have no way of knowing the accuracy of the memos, but that's the reason I bring it up at this time, not in any way to assassinate the character of an individual who I know is extremely competent, but I think the question bears asking and if the Minister wishes to respond, I invite her to do so.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I do wish to respond and I thank the Member for Morris for putting on the record reaction that he has had about the very positive changes in Red River because I agree they have a very capable president. They are very positive changes and they're putting not only Red River on the map, but our whole training capacity.

I think that you need to look at the overall and I think if he looked at the overall information or messages that he's getting and the feeling, it would be that we've got an excellent system where there's a lot of openness, a tremendous amount of involvement and participation and consultation that never existed before and an openness and an involvement of staff and students that never existed before.

It's my understanding that, in terms of that particular article or memo, that the concern of the president was misinformation, not communication, and that his intention in sending out the article was to plead or ask or even require, which is I think fair ball on behalf of a president of a college in an institution that the information be accurate. So it's my understanding from him that it was related to his concern for what was the communication of misinformation and that his only concern was that the communication be accurate.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, I can't be critical of that. I guess what I am critical though is the inference at least that there is a hierarchy, a higher plateau within the major division that should not be criticized and that of course would be the PACE administration itself and when I begin to see an attempt to cover up - and the Minister says, well, maybe the criticism on the PACE hierarchy was due to misinformation. Well, that may be, Mr. Chairman, but when I see an attempt to reduce the criticism of some higher planning authorities who may or may not have been responsible for hardware sitting idly by over a period of several months, I become concerned; and to me there's no place in a free society for not pointing out the shortcomings of decisions, irregardless - I should say 'regardless' of who it is and what position they hold and that's the reason I brought it forward.

If what the Minister is saying, that the intent of the memo is to squelch bad information or misinformation, well that's possibly a logical answer. If it was just, however, to deflect criticism and safeguard those at a higher level, I cannot accept that.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Just to reiterate, Mr. Chairman, that I do believe that it was the question of misinformation, inaccurate information, and another important point to make I think is the morale of the college, the people at the college, who really believe that it's never been higher and I think that's really an important indicator, in terms of how it's operating and the involvement and participation and the kind of management that there is.

If we just point out too, the way we got our new president in the first place, it was by the most democratic, participatory selection process that has ever been used in the selection of filling such an important position, where we elected faculty and students and they were actually sitting in on the interviews and the search committee, so they have a lot at stake in terms of selecting. It's the first time that ever happened and the decision was unanimous, and I think that while we've been doing a lot, there are going to be some problems. It's a big system and we're making a lot of change but overall the morale of the college, I really believe has never been higher.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, I accept that and I bring this issue to an end by stating, I'm not here to be overly critical and I accept what the Minister has said. I too believe that the individual in place will provide strong leadership to that college for years to come and I share in the Minister's satisfaction that Mr. Polonsky's in place.

Mr. Chairman, and I won't blame this on the new president of the college at all, but I understand that

students of that college and other Manitoba colleges do not fair very well on a Canadian Awareness test. Can the Minister tell why that happened?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, we talked a bit about the survey that was done earlier and is often is the case, when I identify an issue and I do a survey in order to be able to deal with it, the Member for Morris likes to take my survey and my results and sort of throw them back at me . . .

**MR. C. MANNES:** Right.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** . . . and I don't mind that, but I just simply make the point that the study was done by me. The study was done by us, by the college, because we wanted to find out what we suspected and that is that we had a problem with the Canadian Studies, with the content and the amount of the program.

We're finding it in both the public school side and the colleges and we will be moving to Improve program and curriculum in both of those areas; so I think that what we are going to do is undertake a number of initiatives, a few of them which I can mention tonight. It's going to become an elective now for all students. We're going to have noon hour seminars on and off the campus. We have a project that we expect to be funded by the Secretary of State for a bibliography of Canadian based technology materials and we have an agreement by the presidents of all our colleges and universities to explore co-operative programming between the colleges and the universities on Canadian Studies.

The leadership actually that we have begun to take, because we started this initiative six to nine months ago, started looking at it and developing it and trying to identify initiatives that we could bring in that would improve it. A Manitoban, Dave Williamson, has been asked to Chair the National Task Force on Canadian Studies. He's going to be working very closely with us but has been identified as being one of the leaders because this is a question for the nation, not just one that Manitoba is grappling with, although once again we're a little ahead of the others in developing programs and dealing with the issue.

**MR. C. MANNES:** The Minister, in a statement, late June, made reference to a manufacturing technological training centre. Can the Minister expand on this announcement and tell us specifically what does it mean here. I suppose I could read it.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, this is a \$1 million manufacturing centre for high technology and it's funded through the Skills Growth. The equipment to be required for the Technology Centre through the Skills Growth will give the college the capacity to concurrently train the following numbers of people; 10 CN machine and programmer places; 8 CAD graphics design places and 8 robotics programmer and service places. Depending on the courses in which the student users of this equipment are enrolled, they can be preparing themselves for entry into and/or advancement in one of three major occupational areas; architectural and engineering technologists and technicians; systems

analysts; computer programmers and related occupations and electronic and related equipment installing and repairing occupations.

As I said, it's just under \$1 million financed through the Skills Growth in the Federal Government. It will be filled from early morning until late at night and weekends. In other words, we are using this equipment around the clock to train. It's the first of its kind that we have had in Manitoba.

**MR. C. MANNES:** The statement by the Minister made reference again to support through the Skills Growth Fund. It was a question I meant to ask earlier. Could the Minister indicate when this agreement is coming to an end and is the new agreement she's talking about the one to replace it?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, the Skills Growth Fund was a one-time agreement. It was a Skills Growth Fund that had a pot of money. I can't quite remember the total amount in it, but that they allowed the provinces to put in proposals. We were the only province in the country, I think, that gave access to the Skills Growth Fund to our colleges and universities. Each one of our colleges and universities received funding through the Skills Growth Fund.

I'm just reminded that we received the highest per capita share of Skills Growth in the country and this is one of those programs. It's not in place. What they did was give us an amount of money for new programs and new equipment and that equipment and programs went into each of the institutions. What we are negotiating now is a much broader program. The money is larger and the proposals and the range of proposals is going to be much broader. We're still negotiating with them this year, but it is not called Skills Growth.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 5.(c)(1)—pass; 5.(c)(2)—pass; 5.(c)(3)—pass.

5.(d) Assiniboine Community College, (1) Salaries—pass; 5.(d)(2)—pass; 5.(d)(3) - the Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** I'd like to ask the Minister some questions about Assiniboine Community College and the administration there. Can the Minister advise me of the recent changes that have taken place in terms of the administration, some of the objectives that were being pursued and the actual changes in personnel that have taken place, the names of the people who are filling top responsibilities there now?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, yes, the reorganization that the Member for Turtle Mountain mentions is one that is under way right now. It is not quite complete, but when it is, we will be quite happy to give him the names of the positions and the names of the people going into the positions. I would think that some of the reorganization that's taking place in this college is related to the reorganization that's taking place in the other colleges and they were for many of the same reasons.

We have reduced again administrative costs because we found that in all of our colleges we had high administrative costs. We are changing the organization

so that it is more able to meet the priorities that we're establishing. In other words, they're more flexible and more able to deliver programs on short notice, I suppose, that are required sometimes by the Federal Government so that they're set up to be able to handle that.

We're focusing much more on decentralization into the community so that not all of the programs are delivered by the institutions, but a lot of the things that are identified are delivered out in the field. They're taught on site. They may be taught with industry. They're taught in co-operation with labour or management. The reorganization reflects a change in that area. It also reflects the change in terms of student services, because we're moving in all three colleges to integrate our Student Services Program into delivering all student services through the same department instead of having them functioning in a number of departments.

Accessibility, I would think, is another goal and priority that affects the organization that we have developed. I would say that there is very little change. In fact, I'm not sure of any that isn't reflect in terms of the changes in reorganization of all of the colleges to meet the way we're delivering programs, the accessibility, the communication with the public and the community, the ability to be flexible.

All of our positions, I'm reminded, are opened to competitions and have been filled through the established procedures.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Have there not been some changes made in the top positions at the college? The Minister hasn't given me any. Who is heading the college now? I'm not sure whether they're called directors or just what the appropriate term is. What is it now?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, I expect that the position is referring to would be perhaps the filling of a new president, Richard Mackie. We have two new deans; Dr. Neil Russell and Jerry Diswinka, who was on staff, and Rod Danielson is also a third dean. These are positions that are related in all of our colleges now to the delivery of our program.

I might just mention that we did a nationwide search for the presidency and . . .

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, I think maybe the Minister was in the process of saying something there when she ended with the "and". She said that it was a nationwide search and . . .

Is the president in place now and when did he take over his responsibilities? Of the deans, how many deans are there then at the college now? She mentioned three names and she indicated that one had been recruited from within. Does that mean that the others have come from outside? If she could tell me how many deans there are? How many have been replaced in the course of the last year or two, and whether they come from within Manitoba, within the college, or whether they come from somewhere outside of the province?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, I was both getting confirmation of the answers as he was finishing his question, so I may not have all of it.

There are presently three deans and they were all in Manitoba. One of them, Dr. Neil Russell, was in the

PACE section and won an open competition for that position. The other two were internal. So they were all in Manitoba, two internal to the college, and one from the Education PACE Division. The president has been in office about eight months, he's from Seneca College previously.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Who would have been on the selection committee for the president and for the deans?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, in terms of the president, we had a very wide ranging, broad representation committee again doing the selecting. Once again, I just say that I think this is the first time ever that this route has been used for selecting a president. The committee was chaired by Dr. Terry Morrison. There was a member from the Brandon Labour Council; from the Chamber of Commerce; from the Metis Federation; three that were elected from the faculty; two that were elected from the students; a principal of a high school and a couple of broad-based community representatives. I think that's most of the representation.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** How would the couple of broad-based community representatives have been selected?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** The community representatives, the organizations named their representatives; the Brandon Labour Council, the Chamber of Commerce and the broad-based community representatives were named by me.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** We have a complete list then of the names of the people that were involved on this selection committee. Would that have been the same selection committee then that chose the deans, or would that be a different one?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, the selection of the deans was done through a committee made up of Donna Finkleman from the PACE Personnel Branch; and the Civil Service Commission. The president of the college elected faculty representatives and a member from the PACE Division with the selection committee for the deans.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** What's the next level down from the deans and what changes have been made in those positions?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, the next level down is department head and there were some changes in the numbers of department heads. There was reorganization because the range in size varied from 5 to 20, so if the department stayed exactly the same as it was, then the department head that was there stayed in place. If there was a reorganization and it encompassed a larger department or two or three departments were put together, then it was an open competition.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** How many of those changed? How many people were department heads before the organization started? How many department heads

were there? How many department heads are there now? How many people who were filling positions as department heads are still filling positions as department heads today and what has happened to the people who aren't filling positions as department heads today?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, I can give a general answer to the last question. Anybody who was a department head, there's been the guarantee of no layoffs and everybody is guaranteed an instructional position.

In terms of the detailed information that he asked about exactly how many were department heads, exactly how many there are that have been replaced, we would ask his willingness to let us provide that detail to him tomorrow.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** That's fine, Mr. Chairman.

The Minister then indicates by her answer that there were people who were department heads, who are no longer department heads. What they have been given is a guarantee of a job. Are the jobs that are provided, provided at the same level of pay as people were getting as department heads and what sort of status do they have now within a department?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that the pay would be the same as it was except for the administrative stipend. The stipend would have varied depending on the size of the department.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Can the Minister give me an indication of how much that would have been? Can she tell me how these selection committees were established for department heads, whether there were different committees for each person selected or for each position bulletined. Can she tell me whether there have been any grievances arise out of the changes in staffing?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, the dollar differential would have been in the range of \$1,000 to \$1,500 for the administrative stipend. I think I indicated before that where the department stayed exactly the same, the people stayed the same; where it changed significantly, there was an open competition. There were no grievances. In terms of determining the shape of the organization, there was consultation with the faculty on the changes.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** How was the Minister able to accomplish that? Where the department changes, does the position simply disappear? Do they eliminate the position of department head? It seems to me that when you have a position and someone is filling it, that it's just not that easy to simply remove someone from that position. So I'd be interested in knowing how that particular little piece of work is accomplished.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, we do have fewer department heads because we have fewer departments; and I must just refer to one of the things we said before. We were administratively top heavy in all of our colleges

and in terms of better efficiency and saving of unnecessary high administrative costs, which were very high. We've made a number of these changes. We've reduced the departments so there are fewer department heads. The SY stays, the SY position is there and we were working with each individual to determine appropriate redeployment opportunities.

As we have worked and the changes we've made in the colleges, Mr. Chairman, I think it's important to say that we have had more redeployment and more changes and more retraining done co-operatively, between the individual people that are being affected, the unions that are representing them and the Department of Education; and, in fact, we have been singled out, through the MGEA, as being one of the departments in government that is doing an exceptionally good job of identifying retraining opportunities for people.

So where we've made change, we've always taken the individual into consideration and given them opportunities to move into other positions that are not redundant and, in some cases, it requires training opportunities. In some cases, it just requires discussion and agreement with them about finding an area that they're interested in moving into. So we do it wherever this happens. The decision that we come to is a joint decision that is agreed to by the individual, by the union, and by the Department of Education.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, I'm not arguing with the Minister that there wasn't a necessity to eliminate some of the administrative level at the college. All I'm asking her is how that was done. Were these management positions that the government can simply eliminate without any difficulty, essentially with the stroke of a pen, that they can eliminate them and then create as many out of those as they wish to create?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, in terms of the structure, the college is under the Department of Education, and we are able to make those changes. I don't like to say, at the stroke of a pen, because it sounds like it was done arbitrarily and with no rational justification and I know he's recognizing that there may have been very good reason for it. So there were good reasons, there was a rationale, there was involvement of staff people in the colleges in making these decisions and we have tightened up. We have reduced the number of administrative positions. While we have a responsibility to the individuals, we are able to make those changes in the structure.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** I don't believe the Minister answered this - how many department heads are there now and how many of those would be filled with acting people or not filled or still seeking a permanent person to fill them?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, I indicated two things previously. One is that the process isn't quite completed yet; and secondly, that kind of detail, we didn't have right at our fingertips and I asked his willingness to have us provide that . . .

**MR. B. RANSOM:** I'm not sure I asked that question.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** I think you did. Yes, you asked how many had been retrained and how many were

there and how many were in their previous positions, and I said we'd provide that information.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** How many have acting people in them now?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** How many of them have acting people in them now? We're in the process of filling them and we'd have to confirm the exact numbers. We'll do that tomorrow.

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

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister has provided for us the selection committee technique and processes that are in place to fill these positions. Are they uniform across all community colleges?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Yes, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Are they similar to what was in place three or four years ago, or have they changed?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Just to clarify, is it the committees for selecting of presidents that the Member for Morris is talking about?

**MR. C. MANNES:** Not the personnel on the committee, but the process.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** The process. As far as I know, Mr. Chairman, the process is brand new. The open process of having a committee with broad base representation sitting on the committee, doing the interview and making the selection, is the first of its kind to my knowledge.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 5.(d) - the Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** My understanding would be, Mr. Chairman, that the presidents of the community colleges are civil servants, so the Minister presumably accepts the responsibility for the selection of a president.

It is an unusual procedure for the selection. I don't know of any circumstance where, for instance, the people appointed at large have been involved in the selection of a Deputy Minister, for example, within the government. There may be cases. If there are, the Minister might want to mention them.

The other side of the coin would be, how would a president of a community college be removed from that position? What would be the process in place for that? Would that stem from a committee perhaps of people appointed at large and representatives of staff and such?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, I think it might be important to clarify the procedure while it was very unique and the first time it's ever happened and I think it worked out very well, the broad-based representation. They did do the interviewing; they did make recommendations. In other words, while we appointed the recommendation and were in the happy position of having unanimous recommendations coming from

the committee - we might have had a bit of a problem had it not been - they were recommendations to the Minister and to the government, so they had to be made in the normal way. Appointments had to be made by O/C, Order-in-Council, and any removal would have to be done by Order-in-Council. They were not given the power to hire. They were given the right to sit in on the selection doing the interviewing and make recommendations which we then accepted.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** I realize that, technically, the Cabinet retain the responsibility, but how is the performance of a president evaluated?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, evaluations are usually done by those people in administration above the level of the position that you're talking about. In this case, what you might call formal evaluation would be done by the associate deputy minister who is in charge of colleges. In other ways, whenever you have anybody in a top management position, obviously, there's formal evaluation and informal evaluation and information comes in many ways about the abilities of the individuals.

If we could just use, if he doesn't mind, the new President of Red River, Gary Polonsky, I think we've been getting a lot of feedback initially that the changes that he is making and the way he's making them and the involvement and participation of staff are very good for morale, very good for staff and very good for the capacity of the institution, and for students, I might add. There would be two ways and it would be formal evaluation and informal evaluation.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Will this same committee structure be in place to assist in the evaluation of a president that is in place to select a president? It seems to me if you have a process in place for selecting an individual that it would follow, at least, that you would have a similar process in place for evaluation and for the removal of a president if that became necessary.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Only, as I indicated before, Mr. Chairman, in an informal way. That would not be part of the formal evaluation and it could be done through the advisory boards; it could be done through consultation and discussion with the committee. One shouldn't assume that the committee agreed to meet to deal with a very particular process, and that was to do the search and be involved in the search and the hiring of the president. They spent a lot of time doing that. They spent a lot of time reading over the applications that came in, screening them, making decisions and a short list, going through the interviews and, in fact, a series of interviews, not just one set of interviews. They agreed to do that. Agreeing to do that I'm not sure that we can assume that they also agreed to set themselves up as some kind of monitoring body to find out what kind of a job the person that they had selected had done, although they're all in a number of positions where they would be giving feedback in a number of ways.

We cannot get away from the fact, I think, that the responsibility for hiring, even though we've used this consultative process, is still the government's, the

Department of Education's, and the Cabinet's, and firing or removing people would be the same responsibility. In undertaking such a serious move as that, we would be using both the formal evaluation procedures and depending on our professional staff, and informal, although I wouldn't automatically say that that selection committee turns into an evaluation committee of the activities and functioning of a president.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Do informal evaluations appear on an individual's record of performance?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** No, I think that formal performance appears on the record.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** How would one use informal appraisals then?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** I think that where the informal procedure comes into play is in receiving information that comes from other than perhaps the administration that's doing the evaluation. If it was going to be used or it was going to be accepted or useful, it would have to eventually be incorporated into the formal evaluation. In other words, we could not set up a system where we had people out in the community passing on rumours or innuendo that wasn't substantiated or hadn't been checked out, but we all know that we are all judged not just by the person who is above us but by the public at large, by the students, by the faculty and by the community that you serve.

I think that it would all eventually - if it was to be part of the evaluation that determines something as serious as removal of a president - have to be built into the formal evaluation procedure.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Just to pursue this just a little further. I would understand then from the answer that the Minister gave earlier that there are people on staff at the community college who had a hand in selecting the president, in putting the president where he is.

In a normal sort of selection procedure, a person who is selected to a position has no obligation at all to people who are at lower levels and they have no responsibility for those people. They will have been selected either by outside, objective people or they will be selected by a superior, a person higher up the chain of command.

Does the Minister see any difficulty with a situation where someone who now works for a president having been responsible for the president having his job, and since there is this informal method of evaluation in place, does this not create a potentially difficult situation?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, first of all, I wanted to mention that we have system-wide performance measurements for all managers throughout the whole system that are applied to presidents and to others so that there is a basis in terms of measuring. His point about the people, the faculty choosing their boss, I suppose, is the point he's making and perhaps being put in an upper position - I don't know if he's suggesting that - but it's accepted practice in colleges and universities. These faculty people are elected. They're

elected to represent the faculty; the student group are elected to represent the students. I think that we believe that those views are important, that it isn't just the feelings and attitudes and values of the deputy minister or the associate deputy or the Minister of Education that should be looking at the characteristics and the abilities of an individual, but it's very important to have some feedback and input, and that's what it is, feedback and input from students and faculty and other people that are very, very actively concerned about functioning as a university, so the practice is traditional practice throughout the post-secondary educational institutions, I believe.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** It may be, but the Minister is certainly aware that this is a little different situation where you're dealing with civil servants here, as opposed to a situation in a university. I don't think they're entirely the same, although there would certainly be a parallel. But I would think that it could create circumstances that could be difficult for a president and raise the questions of whether that person can really deal completely objectively with an individual who has been on that selection board and now works for them.

I'm not suggesting for a minute that there's any indication of that kind of difficulty existing at the moment. I'm simply pointing it out to the Minister that although it is a new way of doing it, it could have some difficulties associated with it as well.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Just a point I think. Certainly, it's a new process for us and it's one we'll be watching. We haven't had any indication to date that there's a problem, any indication from any of the presidents or any of the faculties and certainly we have seen a number of benefits and the benefits have been strongly felt by the process and the openness of the process and the people involved, so we can clearly see benefits.

We haven't to date found any of those disadvantages, but certainly we'll keep our eyes open and if they are, we'll take them into consideration.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 5.(d)(3)—pass.

5.(e) Keewatin Community College: (1) Salaries—pass; 5.(e)(2) - the Member for Morris.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, before we pass the final item in regard to the community colleges, I wondering if the Minister could provide for the opposition, and I would ask that she do so, a list of the new deans and the new heads that have been put in place or have been selected within the whole community college network over the last three years, if she could do that for us. We don't have to have it today, but I'd like it within the next couple of weeks, if she could provide that for us.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** I'd be quite happy to provide that for the members, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 5.(e)(2)—pass.

5.(f) Personnel Branch: (1) Salaries - the Member for Morris.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, I'd ask the Minister the names of the individuals who are drawing salaries under this appropriation?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, we're just saying that we can probably come up with the director's name without any problem, but the support staff we don't have at our fingertips, so we'll provide that for the Member for Morris tomorrow, if that's all right.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 5.(f)(1)—pass; 5.(f)(2)—pass.  
5.(g) Student Aid: (1) Salaries - the Member for Morris.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, I move Committee rise.

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

## IN SESSION

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Workplace, Health and Environment, that the House do now adjourn.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Tuesday).