

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 25 June, 1985.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Order please.
The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair for the Department of Education, and the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair for the Department of Community Services.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - COMMUNITY SERVICES

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: Committee, please come to order. We are now considering Item 3.(a)(1), Community Social Services, Administration: Salaries; 3.(a)(2) Other Expenditures; 3.(a)(3) Professional Training - the Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: In preparing for these Estimates, I referred to the Estimates of last year, and I know the Minister and I perhaps were referring to different figures. She was referring to the finalized figures, I guess, as they were finally approved. I was merely referring to the Estimates as tendered in the early part of this last Session.

But I note that in the section that we are dealing with there is at least (g) categories and in the present one there are (e) categories, so it's been reduced or compressed by two. I know the Minister seems to have made some opening statements as to exactly what this area deals with on at least one and maybe two of the times she has been asked about these particular Estimates.

I am wondering, just to try and save some time, if the Minister could give me a rough idea as to what happened because, for example, last year there was Vocational Rehabilitation; there was Institutional Mental Retardation; there were External Agencies; there was Community Mental Retardation and then General Purpose Grants. Now some of these titles have been retained but have they been consolidated? Have they been transferred into other departments, other sections, under this act?

Perhaps the Minister could give me just a general overview on why it's now been compressed down to just five subsections.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, the reason has been that in the past the titles have represented the areas where money

was granted outward and it was the functional title, as it were, in developing the approach to services to mental retardation.

We have attempted to develop a co-ordinated approach so that the different needs of people would not be considered in isolation, but in fact we would have a planning process and an allocation of resource that would be co-ordinated.

Basically, the Welcome Home has completed its initial planning phase and is now operational through allocations based on regional plans. We have reorganized the program branch, merging mental retardation and vocational rehabilitation services. We have begun decentralization of operational functions and responsibilities.

We are phasing out some of the Manitoba Developmental Centre farm operation, for example, because the initial purpose for which it existed, in addition to providing the centre with products, was also a work location, but as the population has shifted at the centre, it was no longer serving the vocational purpose and by carrying out a cost benefit analysis, we found that we could supply the farm produce by purchasing in as efficient a way.

We have also begun the phase out of the Developmental Centre School of Psychiatric Nursing for reasons which I am happy to go into at the appropriate time, which we've discussed to some extent in the House.

We have started reviewing desirable legislative directions to ensure safety of the mentally handicapped and begun the development of program data and management information systems. Basically, we have been developing a system which starts with the identification of the people in need, the identification of their various needs and then the building of services based on that rather than starting from the other end with the existing service delivery areas and fitting the needy persons into that system. So it is a major shift in the way in which we have planned and allocated resources.

MR. C. BIRT: I don't mean to oversimplify it, but is the whole section of Community Social Services dealing with the mental aspect of community problems and then the Child and Family Services dealing with other types of community programs, and they're more specifically spelled out?

HON. M. SMITH: The major area of focus has been programs for the mentally retarded under Community Social Services, but there has also been the beginning of making grants to organizations dealing with some of the other special needs groups in the community, such as the hard of hearing, the deaf.

One of the elements that we have had to deal with has been the absence of any comprehensive service delivery or planning process to deal with special needs groups, and our main focus this year has been to work with our largest client group, the mentally retarded, to

develop a continuum of services, a co-operative planning process and a rationalized resource allocation process. But there are emerging groups which will require in the future a similarly co-ordinated service.

MR. C. BIRT: If this is not the area to ask, please direct me to the area and I'll defer the question until later. But picking up a thread of what was in the Minister's comments, I believe that some analysis or research was being done and these are words to change the focus of the delivery of service to the community. Is there such a research or policy development group, and if so, is it contained in Section 3.(a)?

HON. M. SMITH: The basic planning and research functions have been carried out under the section that we discussed yesterday. Within the Community Social Services, there is not a particular unit in that sense, but the planning responsibility, the process, has been very much a top priority for this group. Basically, we are dealing here with services for dependent adults and the development of a regional service delivery system. The fact that not all dependent adults have had a continuum of services or a total planning system is just a reflection of where we're at in Community Social Services and our priority has been put on to the mental retardation area, simply because it's been the area where the largest numbers of dependent adults reside and we felt it was the highest priority for development.

The Child and Family Services, to go back to the question asked earlier is focusing on the needs of children and their families. It is a comprehensive service and it is including the mentally retarded children and their families as well. So if we can think of that as having the primary focus on the child and then the requirements of the family to deal with the child and then think of the Community Social Service grouping as dealing with the particular needs of dependent adults. I think that's the easiest way to separate the functions.

MR. C. BIRT: What is the number of dependent adults in the mental retardation field that the department is dealing with and if there isn't a specific number, perhaps then the Minister could advise as to the size of the constituency that they're attempting to deal with.

HON. M. SMITH: One of the difficulties in this area has been, there's never been a co-ordinated approach to identifying the people in need and we've been engaged in trying to do that so we would know the population that we're dealing with.

The numbers that we're working with at present are that there's about 3500 persons with some degree of mental retardation; of those, less than a third, around the 1100 number, are currently cared for in institutional settings. The others have been either completely cared for by families or have received some kind of community support and in our planning through the Welcome Home program, we have attempted by region, to identify the total number of people with mental retardation in a region, the people at risk of requiring institution if they don't require some better support services in the community, and then the numbers of people currently in institutions who might relate to those regions, so that we would have some mapping, as it were, of the client population.

MR. C. BIRT: The Minister indicated that approximately 3500 people were in this particular area of need of service and was trying to get a better handle on the total population and also trying to match up people to the resources into the community or develop resources in the community for the people and made reference to a mapping, is there some specific time or is there some foreseeable deadline that the Minister would be able to say with certainty that perhaps say in a certain part of the city or in an Interlake region or something like this, we know that there are X people. They have certain specific needs, and we will be able to provide the following on the following basis.

HON. M. SMITH: We have pretty well accomplished that mapping now. In the initial goal of reducing the population at the Manitoba Development Centre, it happens to coincide with a decision to close the North Grove Building within approximately a three-year time frame. We have, in our determination to reduce that population by 220, also identified a similar number in the community who are at risk of being institutionalized unless they receive more services. So that's a target of 440 better cared for in the community.

At the same time, we have been developing support services in the community for the others and certainly for the children, so that more of them could function either with their families or in foster placement or small centres nearer to their family and community. So we're trying to take a long-term view of how better to deal with as many as possible mental retarded persons in their communities.

We recognize that certainly for the foreseeable future, there is still going to be a need for institutional care. We're moving towards a better balance in the system between institutional care and community care. Through careful monitoring, we hope to learn as we go just what the final mix of service requirement will be. We have involved the local staff who work in the regions and all interested parents and community groups that wish to be involved in the process, in the planning and in the implementation of the program.

MR. C. BIRT: I take it, we are just dealing with adults, the figure that we were dealing with of some 3,500 people.

HON. M. SMITH: There is some overlap still in the number of 3,500. That will include some children.

The system in the past didn't separate the services for children and adults. Our thrust in the Child and Family Service area, which we can go into in a little more detail when we reach that, has been to provide support services in the community through infant stimulation, through integration into day care programs, respite care for parents to keep as many children as possible in the community setting. But again, the total development of the child system and the adult system will take some time to become both separated and also articulated so that there is a natural flow from one to the other.

MR. C. BIRT: Perhaps the Minister could just break down into the different types of care that are available for the adults. I can appreciate there is institutional

care, but there seems to be other types of care being referred to by the Minister. So could I have a breakdown as to the types of care that can be provided?

HON. M. SMITH: The institutional care is delivered in places like St. Amant Centre, the Pelican Lake Centre, Manitoba Developmental Centre. Then in the community there are group homes, there are small living units, sometimes supervised apartment living, there is foster care and then there is supported care in the home.

In time we would like to have fully continuous service with ease of movement from one to the other based on the needs of the individual. It's premature for us to say we're at that point now, but that's what we're aiming towards. The principles we will be using, again working with families or with the guardians, is to see people with mental retardation as not primarily having health problems, as having particular health problems; but really seeing mental retardation as a condition of life and seeing individuals as having a right to support services to enable them to live in the least restrictive environment; the one that provides adequate support and development opportunity - adequate supports and protection on one side and opportunity for development, enrichment, a personally satisfying life on the other.

MR. C. BIRT: The Minister referred to at the beginning of my questions on this particular section saying that it primarily dealt with mental retardation but there were other special need groups and she referred I think to the deaf or those with hearing disabilities. But again, you identify the mental retardation group as the most pressing need, the largest group at the moment and that's why you're directing their energies to them; but is it the same idea or same philosophy of delivering service to the other special need groups, as and when they're identified, as to moving them away from sort of a secure institutionalized system and moving them into or integrating them into the community?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, again with building and consultation and recognizing both the need of the individual, their preference to the extent they can express it, and the preference of the family, there would be a similar philosophy. But I think we should acknowledge that government to date has tended to be reactive providing some funding for groups that have initiated care from the community, and rather than taking a planning approach for overseeing that the total mix of services, that would be residential and day program, recreation, transportation and so on, medical care, are provided.

In time I think if the public dollar is going to be effectively spent and some confidence that it's being spent in the most effective and efficient way, especially as emerging groups become more demanding of a fair share of the public dollar, we will either choose to become involved in more co-ordinated planning or be pushed into it. Our preference would be on the initiating side. At the same time government is not in a stage right now where we can rapidly expand our role, so there is a sense of priority, of working carefully through the services to the mentally retarded group which are our largest disability group that we have a direct responsibility for and trying to work through the

principles that we have set out, which we think are most respectful of the rights and needs of the individual, at the same time as providing a fair and an efficient way of spending the public dollar.

MR. C. BIRT: Going specifically to 3.(1), dealing with Salaries, I note that the salaries for March 31st of '85 are \$241,800 and it's projected to be \$252,500.00. What salaries do those refer to?

HON. M. SMITH: This covers the administration of the division. I should add that in addition to working with the mentally retarded group, both the institutional and the Welcome Home, this division is responsible for the regional delivery system of Community Services.

This includes family and child workers, 284 of them, because the child and family systems are not completely divided, I guess, into Child and Family Service or into private groupings that are delivering the service. There are areas of the province, because of the history of the development of services, that were directly initiated by government rather than initiated by volunteer groups and then eventually funded by government; so there's 284 family and child workers, the mental retardation workers, the day care co-ordinators, vocational rehabilitation workers, training people, people responsible for the sheltered workshops for the physically disabled, the mentally ill as well as the mentally retarded, so we have quite a complex package of services.

The figure you've referred to, the salary of \$252,500, covers 7.5 workers, the same as last year. That would be the Assistant Deputy Minister, the Executive Director in charge of Operations, Executive Director in charge of Programs, an Administrative Co-ordinator, two clerical and 1.5 on term.

MR. C. BIRT: One and a half on term. What functions are they? Are they clerical or are they planning, are they administrative?

HON. M. SMITH: Basically clerical relief.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, looking at the Estimates for last year, for the March 31st ending of '85, salaries were projected at that time of \$355,500 and it would appear that what was ultimately spent was \$241,800.00. Why the difference of some \$110,000 between what was estimated in last year's Estimates and the actual figure referred to in this year's Estimates?

HON. M. SMITH: The shift is again in the adjusted vote. We're comparing numbers of 241.8 to 252.5 this year. The change from last year's printed vote to this year's has been a result of the continued restructuring of the division's attempting again to focus the services. Two people have been transferred into the programs area and one into Child and Family Services.

MR. C. BIRT: The two that were transferred into the programs, what type were they, administrative, clerical, directors? Could the Minister please advise?

HON. M. SMITH: Basically program analysts. They were not at the managerial level.

MR. C. BIRT: What does a program analyst do? If you don't have any programs, what can you analyze?

HON. M. SMITH: Because a lot of the work of this department is done by funding groups in the community, program analysts both monitor the program activity and the requirements of the groups in the community and allocate the resource; so what they have to do is check what's being done, relate it to an overall policy so there's equitable distribution of resource, rather than just have an ad hoc sort of budget approval of each group that comes in and said, we need this and so. It's a way of co-ordinating across the board and seeing that a person . . . a group in one area of the province isn't being funded at a much richer or poorer level than a group in another.

MR. C. BIRT: I think the Minister used the correct word. It would appear as if they are co-ordinators really. They're not policy analysts or program analysts.

Mr. Chairman, the person that was transferred to Child and Family Services - I'll pick that up later - but what function did they perform?

HON. M. SMITH: We had a vacant position in this area and the workload demands were greater in the Child and Family so we made an internal reallocation.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, was that a program analyst or co-ordinator as well, or was it some other function that was transferred over?

HON. M. SMITH: In transfer situations, they are reclassified in the new division so that the function that was in this area, it doesn't necessarily have a bearing with the function that's performed in the other division.

MR. C. BIRT: What is the function now in the new Child and Family Services section?

HON. M. SMITH: This person in the Child and Family area has been working and co-ordinating development of services with the Native community . . .

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, in looking at this year's Estimates, the Other Expenditures, Item No. 2 increases from \$22,800 to \$105,800.00. Why the increase and what is it being spent on?

HON. M. SMITH: The funds have been spent on the Welcome Home communications and that's because we're dealing with a very large number of volunteers. Five hundred have been involved in the planning and it's partly sharing the information, making sure that all the groups and individuals involved had access to the information so that they would understand the process they were part of and to build a common understanding of the process.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, the appropriation for last year, in last year's Estimates showed \$82,800 for Other Expenditures and it dropped to \$22,800.00. Why was there the drop between last year and this year's figure?

HON. M. SMITH: Again, because the way these things are handled internally is that if a function has been

moved over, the dollars go with it and it will reappear elsewhere. It's a reconciling process that's done by Treasury and . . .

MR. C. BIRT: To confuse politicians.

HON. M. SMITH: I can appreciate you asking the question, but the data I have to hand doesn't always give that explanation. In a sense, the Treasury ensures that there's not extra money involved, that it's a function that's been moved into another slot. We can obtain that information for you, but I don't always have it at the moment.

Our knowledge at the moment is that it's a professional development amount that's now under Operations. It seemed to be that was where the professional development was being done.

MR. C. BIRT: Professional Training comes next and I'll get into that in a moment, but is the Minister saying, when we refer to Other Expenditures, the \$22,800 referred to in March 31st of '85 was primarily spent on communications?

HON. M. SMITH: No, the base amount would be the ordinary travel and office expenses and so on. The additional amount was in the communications field. Again, it's been essential that we develop this community planning process that it be well understood what the role of the Central Committee is and what the role of the regional committees and because there are numerous issues and problems, it's been important to share information with people along the way so that they could see, instead of just arguing or seeing the world from their particular problem or concern, they could understand the broader system, where the decisions were being made, what the arguments were and what the policy directions were in order to build a community system that would stand us well in the future.

Some of the details - there are ongoing costs of a newsletter, there's reprints of various basic information. There have been some video presentations to explain the system. There are information pamphlets highlighting the program, indicating points of contact if people want more information. There's been an 8 x 10 ft. display for use at information meetings, mall displays, etc. There was a six minute audio-visual developed for use throughout the province to give an overview of the program and generate discussion.

Again I've referred to the newsletter which is ongoing to keep employees, agencies and the interested public informed of progress of the program. There is a manual for group home operators. In the planning process is a pamphlet on vocational rehabilitation, teaching aids for public meetings, travel to regions with materials, video cassettes of the slide show that have been distributed throughout the province, and of course, the volunteer recruitment process.

MR. C. BIRT: In all of this, is there any person designated as a communications officer or the equivalent; or is all of the money, some \$80,000, spent on the materials or types of information that the Minister referred to?

HON. M. SMITH: We have a communications director for the department. She has been responsible for the co-ordination.

MR. C. BIRT: And that would have been referred to on the other Page 1(d), that person's function is there. This is just the materials that are used in this particular program. — (Interjection) — Okay, thank you.

As the Minister had the particular breakdown of the details, I'm wondering if the Minister can put dollar figures to each of those or as nearly as possible.

HON. M. SMITH: I'll take that as notice and have the breakdown tomorrow.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, there was a new item here, Professional Training. Now is this added as something brand-new or has this been transferred in, and if it has been transferred in, where was it transferred from?

HON. M. SMITH: It's been transferred in, at the moment I don't know just where from but I'll have that information. Again, the funds are for training both departmental and Community Service workers staff in our occupational activity centres, workshops, and other agencies such as community residences, the Canadian National Institute for the Blind, the Society for Crippled Children and Adults, etc.

MR. C. BIRT: I want to ask some specific breakdowns, so maybe the Minister might need a moment to get that information.

HON. M. SMITH: We consolidated the staff training funds for the whole division into this item in order to get better control and plan the use more effectively.

MR. C. BIRT: Is the Minister saying that Community Social Services had different aspects of training through its various subdivisions and it's now been pulled together, or this the training centre for the whole department?

HON. M. SMITH: Just for this division.

MR. C. BIRT: Is the Minister indicating by the figures here, there's a drop of some \$15,000 from last year to this year. Has there been a reduced emphasis on training?

HON. M. SMITH: Through consolidation, we feel that we've been able to achieve the same or more at slightly less dollars.

MR. C. BIRT: Perhaps the Minister may not have this at her fingertips, but she gave me a list of the types of training that would be provided and I'm wondering if I could get a breakdown of how that money would be spent, in what particular functions?

HON. M. SMITH: We'll do our best to provide that. I can't guarantee that we'll have it all by tomorrow but we'll do our best to get the . . .

MR. C. BIRT: I appreciate that. I don't want it down to the last penny . . .

HON. M. SMITH: But just a rough . . .

MR. C. BIRT: That's correct.

Mr. Chairman, in this consolidation of professional training for this division, are the staff salaries included or is this money just expended on training programs on the employees?

HON. M. SMITH: No, this would not include the staff salaries.

MR. C. BIRT: Where would the staff salaries be included for training? Would that be under Operations?

HON. M. SMITH: We use a combination of methods. I think last night I referred to the trainers that we have in three different areas, so they will be used in some cases. Sometimes we co-opt people with special expertise. Sometimes there's an outside person brought in. It depends on the topic and what expertise is available locally.

MR. C. BIRT: The Minister indicated that by pulling everything together, there was perhaps an efficiency achieved or some savings achieved. Could the Minister advise me as to how this was achieved or was any part of the training program reduced or eliminated?

HON. M. SMITH: I don't have that level of detail. All I can say is that when you co-ordinate and get different groups to prioritize their needs, you often find this quite an overlap, so that instead of having everybody run a separate workshop, say, on child abuse or behaviour management or something of that sort, communications skills, whatever, that run across the whole area, you're able to draw people from the different work sites to take part in the common workshop.

MR. C. BIRT: That's the precise question I'd like to know the answer to. The consolidation, did it produce the realization that there was duplication and you could eliminate it or was it, in fact, a reduction of training services to the staff?

HON. M. SMITH: I think that it's our belief, our very strong commitment to training and to co-ordinating it, but we realize that as every group was feeling the need for training, it was one of those expenditure items that could easily mushroom and by requiring some system of reporting the needs of planning for the training and workshops and so on, efficiencies could be achieved that we felt again it was a way to make scarce public dollars go further and be more effective. So we haven't experienced it as a reduction in quantity but an improvement in quality and efficiency.

MR. C. BIRT: It's the same question, I don't think the Minister answered it. There's a reduction of \$15,000 in professional training. There was no indication that there was duplication of training programs and therefore there was a saving by elimination of the duplication. It's an allocation of scarce resource dollars. I'd like to

know on what basis they reduced it by \$15,000, in order to guarantee that they had the same level of training as in previous years.

HON. M. SMITH: We actually found that the previous year's budget was underspent by that amount, so it's, in a sense, a fine tuning of our budgeting process. But again any element in a budget, if you leave it completely open-ended, can quickly mushroom and by trying to co-ordinate the planning and the priority setting and so on, we felt that we've put in place a way of both monitoring and developing training in an effective way for the future.

The active process of just responding to requests and not having any way of comparing one demand to another or seeing whether there could be co-ordination just, in our opinion, was not an effective way to proceed. As there did seem to be overlap in the needs, we found that we're able to accomplish the same quantity of service with the slight reduction.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, the training, is it provided to just government employees? The Minister had given me, I think, some categories of people who were being trained or would be trained with these funds. Is it solely spent on civil servants?

HON. M. SMITH: No, we had for example a co-sponsored workshop last year with the Manitoba Association of Rehabilitation and Work and those are community workshops which we fund, but their employees are not direct civil servants.

I should say that between '83-84 and '84-85, the training went from around 27,000 up to 135,000 and the fact that we reduced it to 120,000 this year really just indicates a fine tuning of what we think is the appropriate level of budget that can effectively be used.

MR. C. BIRT: Those are interesting figures, because the Minister said that in previous years the budgets were underspent and we were only fine tuning. How can you triple it or four times it, five times it and fine tune it by 15,000? From 27,000 to 135,000 seems a fairly large dramatic increase and then find that you're not spending sufficient funds on training.

HON. M. SMITH: The budget last year was an indication of the value we put on the training. We in fact did conduct training seminars for staff at all levels, management programs, service expertise, enhancement for field supervisors and workers. There was an advanced training program offered in mental retardation; there were training modules for workshop personnel; there was a training exercise for operators of community residences and there were special programs for mobility of blind persons.

As I said, we moved it up quite dramatically last year. We found that of the total 135,000, at the end of the year we had about 15,000 that was not spent so we felt we could maintain the same level of programming with the 120,000 figure.

MR. C. BIRT: What percentage of the training budget is spent internally on staff and what would be spent externally for the co-sharing of workshops, other things like that?

HON. M. SMITH: Roughly three-quarters of the training would be for internal staff and one-quarter for external. But it's the type of proportion or figure which could vary over time, depending on the identified need. We perceive the services offered by non-departmental personnel as very much part of the system so we would endeavour to build training programs to meet their needs, as well as the departmental; but it's easier to start, of course, with your own direct staff.

MR. C. BIRT: Would that same ratio have held as true for last year's Estimates as for this year's?

HON. M. SMITH: I think again that we would be the first to say that the training needs and the training system are not in a stable state. We're still identifying needs and generating workshops to deal with them, so there could be a heavy swing one way one year, and another the other. We could dig up some of that information just to show the pattern of the last two years, but again I don't think, since we base the training planning on identified need in the total system, we aren't rationing the training with any particular bias one way or the other. The programs are based on the needs out there and, in a sense, the history; you don't necessarily repeat the same program one year that you've done another year.

Sometimes there's a reason for having a super duper, extra large province-wide program and another year you might have smaller groupings, but they're based on needs identified in the community and what's the most effective way to deliver that program; sometimes whether they can be co-tailed on to another conference that's going on.

MR. C. BIRT: The opening remarks made by the Minister dealt with the shifting of the emphasis of handling these particular people from an institution-type setting more into the community setting. The Minister also made, I think, some reference to some 500 volunteers being involved in this Welcome Home Program. What I'm trying to determine is how much money is being spent to help the people in the community, the volunteers, the foster parents, that sort of thing? How much training is going to them - and perhaps more training should be going to them than perhaps your support staff?

HON. M. SMITH: The stage of the Welcome Home that we've been going through this past year has been participatory planning. The 500 volunteers have not so much been the people delivering service as the people interested in planning. As the allocation of resource has now been made on a regional level for both homes and foster care and so on and the training needs of those groups, in a sense, will be the ones that will be identified and dealt with in this year and next year, so it's a bottom-up method of developing training.

Not all the training will be done directly by us. Some will in fact be done through Education, as we've done with day care and other services. If we identify a need and lay out the skill knowledge requirements, we've found Education very responsive and co-operative in providing the service, not only in one setting but they're doing - I guess the day care model is the most exciting.

They are delivering the program in several sites throughout the province so that they're closer to the people who need the training. But that, as I say, will become an increasingly high priority part of the Welcome Home process.

MR. C. BIRT: Does the Minister anticipate transferring or providing funds to either these regional groups or community support programs to allow them to fund their own type of training programs?

HON. M. SMITH: I think we're open on the training side. When we identify a need, we usually go through a process of looking at different ways of meeting the need. There are varieties of on-the-job training, short courses, time off work, incentive pay for people who take training - there's a whole range of ways to accomplish it and we will be looking for the most effective ways. It may be that what works in one region isn't necessarily the best in another, so we're quite open on the method.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, to develop your program of volunteers to work in the community - and I can appreciate with volunteers there could be a turnover rate and you constantly need new people, and new people to be involved if nothing more to expand the base that you're operating from - how do you attract the volunteers? Are there ads placed in the local newspapers or put on television or is it some other method of recruitment?

HON. M. SMITH: We'll use any method we can find - mouth to mouth . . .

MR. C. BIRT: You're doing very well.

HON. M. SMITH: Foot in mouth, word of mouth, pamphlets, local advertising and very much involving local advocacy groups, local groups of parents.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, just for one point going back to that question of Other Expenditures on the advertising, some \$80-odd thousand, the Minister gave a long list of information being produced. Was any of that for any media advertising? I know that the list was going to be provided to me in cost, so I would just ask if there is any of that in there? Maybe that could be included in the list as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)(1)—pass; 3.(a)(2)—pass; 3.(a)(3)—pass.

3.(b)(1) Operations: Salaries; 3.(b)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: Could the Minister tell me if this is the same as last year or is this part of a consolidation program as well, because my numbers may be different.

HON. M. SMITH: Essentially we have the same numbers of people involved, 317 both years. Of those though 14 staff have been seconded to the Winnipeg West agency. You may recall — (Interjection) — No, that's West region. In the St. James area we delivered Child and Family Services direct. With the reorganization they

now become a community-based service and we seconded 14 SYs from, in a sense, our direct delivery group to that agency. I have the breakdown of staff, both by region and by function, which I can make available to you, if you would like.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, then is it fair to say that the 14 are off the Minister's payroll and sort of have gone onto I think West Winnipeg's payroll?

HON. M. SMITH: The agreement that we worked out for the transition is that each SY would stay under the government union contract until a vacancy occurred; and as each vacancy occurs, then it would shift over to the agency. So it was a transitional agreement.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, so as I understand it, in effect, they've been transferred over and it just will take a matter of time before they appear on someone else's payroll and will come off this particular . . .

HON. M. SMITH: But they all come out of our budget.

MR. C. BIRT: Right. The 1984-85 salary estimates - I'm looking now at last year's Estimates, shows Salaries of \$7.9 million; yet the final figure is \$9.2 million and it's almost the same as projected for this year. Why was there an increase of approximately \$1.3 million?

HON. M. SMITH: Basically, we've taken last year's 3.(f) External Agencies and consolidated it into 3.(b) Operations. The adjusted . . .

MR. C. BIRT: Excuse me, I missed the first part.

HON. M. SMITH: Last year there was a 3.(f) External Agencies - well it was grants to External Agencies, okay? Not grants but the staffing that looked after External Agencies. This year it's all consolidated into Operations and the adjusted vote that's done by Treasury, the comparison figures on salaries are \$9,261,800 from last year and this year it's \$9,253,800, so in fact there is just a slight reduction, which would have to do with sort of people coming on at a slightly lower level. So basically it's unchanged.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, what were the three external agencies that the Minister is referring to?

HON. M. SMITH: Basically the function that they perform is, since most of the service is delivered by outside agencies, this group processes their requests for money. It assesses what service they are delivering and relates it to their requests and then recommends a funding level, so that there's some rationale and comparability between the different agencies.

The total social service system has developed in a very ad hoc way, where agencies initiate out in the community; they come to government in time for funding, and they were funded at a lot of different levels.

What we've been attempting to do is move towards a system where we have some basic guidelines, I guess you would say, for what we're funding and at what level, so there's some equity and it's a system that we can build on so that we don't just provide a high level of

service in one place and nothing in another. It's something that has some rationale to it.

MR. C. BIRT: I'm not quite clear on what the Minister is saying. I understand what she's saying and I'll use an analogy. Children's Aid used to receive, I think, monthly cheques or periodic sums of money from the province and then they would administer it. Is the Minister saying that the administrative function that would have been in the old Children's Aid has not been transferred to a staff position with the department and that's happened in three external agencies, and they're now doing it in-house rather than having the money going out to these various agencies?

HON. M. SMITH: There are actually 16 people that would have been involved in the old Children's Aid and the new structure, where they analyze the requests that come in and then recommend the cheques that go out, but there's some, you know, identification of what the money is going out for. We're trying to fine tune that system as we move along, so that we have a clearer notion of what's going for administration, what's going for purchase of what type of service.

MR. C. BIRT: I'm still not clear on it. It may be the hour; it just may be me, but I think the Minister said, in trying to explain the additional \$1.3-odd million, was that three agencies that were externally funded have now been transferred in, and I'm trying to . . .

HON. M. SMITH: No, I think there was a misunderstanding. It was the group, 16 people, who process the budget requests of external agencies that was transferred in from - when I said 3.(f) I was referring to a numbering in last year's Estimates. It wasn't that there were three agencies; it was an appropriation number, and that group has been folded into the operations group. There's a group of 16. There's a director, six co-ordinators, two financial consultants, an accountant, four accounting clerk positions, and three administrative clerical, who perform the analysis monitoring funding recommendation function.

MR. C. BIRT: I think I understand it now, but I'm still having trouble with the figures, because if I look at last year's Estimates, there is a 3.(f) which refers to External Agencies, and their budget at that time was \$608,000.00. That's still only about half of the increase that occurred in the 1984-85 fiscal year. When I asked the Minister at the beginning if this section of operations was identical to last year or had other things been folded into it - and I see now, at least, External Agencies under the old category was folded in. Where is the other \$600,000 or \$800,000 coming from?

HON. M. SMITH: The money to cover an additional 17 staff years has been reallocated to the regions. This grouping covers both our direct service in the regions and in a sense our purchase of service from agencies. These are the field people we have that are dealing with social services, vocational rehab, child and family, mental retardation, and some external social service agencies, so it's a grouping that we think makes more sense, because we're looking at the total service we're

delivering. In some cases, we buy it from agencies; in some cases we deliver it direct. We thought that if we put it all in together we could make more appropriate comparisons.

In the reconciliation made by Treasury, there has been no increase in staff in this area, and as I say the total salary figure has gone down marginally.

MR. C. BIRT: So as I understand it, 16 people were transferred into this particular aspect of the budgetary line, and the other 17 were also transferred in from some place, or are they brand new?

HON. M. SMITH: Another 17 will be reallocated to the regions as the MDC downsizes. Remember we're dealing with the downsizing in that institution that began in the early '70s when it peaked around 1,170. It current has around 770 and within a couple of years will be down around 550, so there's been a gradual reduction in the staff requirement there, although we are improving the ratio of staff-to-inmate at MDC, at the same time as we're building up service in the regions.

MR. C. BIRT: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I'm having trouble trying to figure out who's going where in this reorganizaion. If we look at the 1984-85 allocation, the amount of money allocated for Salaries increased approximately \$1.3 million. Sixteen of those people were from an old 3.(f) allocation. The Minister then referred to another 17 positions for the regions. The Minister is now referring to 17 positions being freed up from the MDC but I believe that's in this year's Capital Budget. It doesn't explain last year's Capital Budget. Are we dealing with the same 17 or are we really dealing with two lots of 17?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, the change in the salary budget is accounted for by three elements. I'm sorry because I'm not working from your last year; I'm working from the treasury adjusted numbers, I don't have them pulled out until I consult. But there were 11 child day care co-ordinators moved in and their salary figures; 16 in the agency relations group; and the 17 from the MDC reallocated to regional delivery of service. They'd be people who would work in behaviour management skills and so on. It's to provide some of the support services in the community for the needs of the mentally retarded.

MR. C. BIRT: Subject to getting the information, Mr. Chairman, of the list of people or positions, I don't have any other questions at this time on this particular section. So we may just wish to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(b)(1)—pass.

MR. C. BIRT: Just a second now. Perhaps a couple of my colleagues have questions on (c). Could we go down to that while I just look at this information? I can come back to it if that is permissible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We want to do it in an orderly way. If there are questions here, let's have it now.

The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Is this the area - I wanted to find out what happens to the people that are mentally

handicapped, who reach 18 and yet they can't be placed anywhere. Are they put in Portage la Prairie?

HON. M. SMITH: In developing the Welcome Home Program, the goal initially was to, we said to get a better balance between the institutional care and the community care. In order to down size the MDC by approximately 220 in three years, we've worked both at moving some people out to the regions where there was a desire to have them and where the appropriate services could be provided.

We have also identified at-risk people in the community and provided them with the support services where they are, or some rearranged residential care, whatever, so they don't go into MDC; and an additional 220 over the three years will be dealt with that way. There would only be a very unusual case who would go to MDC. We are trying to gear up in the community to meet their needs.

One of the slower moving parts of the process has been the provision of day activity centres, but that's now moving along a little more rapidly, so that we are meshing the service. The goal is to have a smooth planned movement along by each person, but we aren't quite there yet. There may be the occasional 18-year-old that requires some special placement. I know we have made some temporary arrangements for one group of 18-year-olds that theoretically should have been ready to move on but weren't quite, or the program wasn't ready for them, but that will be ironed out over time.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman, I understand that any of the children, or I guess students, that are living at home or maybe able to be under foster care - and possibly that isn't the case - living at home would be the example. They get a chance to stay in school till they're 21, but young people that hit the age of 18 and they're not ready to be placed - I hadn't realized that they have come to a position where there is a temporary lodging for them and I understand that these people have got a gap of three years where they're not getting their schooling. Is that correct or has this new program corrected all that?

HON. M. SMITH: Again I'm not sure whether the termination of education at 18 was an education ruling or the fact that Child and Family Service didn't acknowledge responsibility over 18. Last year we actually changed our Child and Family Service Act to allow us, in selected instances, to provide extra help for a transition period up to 21. But the goal with the retarded people I guess would be to have education fold over in a smooth transition to some kind of vocational activity, whether it's training for employment in a normal setting, employment in a sheltered workshop, or just a day activity. The goal is to get all that smoothly moving so there's enough service to meet the need as people come on.

There are some lurches and gaps in the system at present and we're trying our best to deal with some of those emergency situations, because it takes a while to shift from a system that really hasn't worked that way, to one that has the network of service in the community. The goal is to have a smooth transition

from education into some vocational training and placement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(b)(1)—pass; 3.(b)(2)—pass.

3.(c)(1) Manitoba Developmental Centre, Salaries; 3.(c)(2) Other Expenditures; 3.(c)(3) Professional Training - the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. L. HYDE: Mr. Chairman, I wish to make mention, in my opinion - and this is not only my opinion but the opinion of many Manitobans - of the bad judgment this Minister has used in closing down the Psychiatric School of Nursing at the MDC. The Minister of Corrections, in my opinion, has chosen a funny way to make friends, many friends in Portage la Prairie.

The first mistake the Minister made was in choosing not to make mention of the program, the closing down of this program in the Chamber of this Legislature. She rather chose, Mr. Chairman, to go out and speak to the press of her intention to close out the last specialized psychiatric school of nursing in the province.

Mr. Chairman, as was mentioned before, 80 percent of the nursing staff at the MDC, they received their training at the former School for Retardates. I ask the Minister, where will the supply of these specially trained nurses come from after she has chosen to close down the Psychiatric School of Training? Where will these handicapped people get their necessary training and support from the nurses if she intends to close down the school?

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the number of nurses that will be retiring in the not too distant future, in the next few years to come, will simply diminish any over-supply, I should say, of nurses that we have on hand to care for these mentally retarded people.

I question, Mr. Chairman, whether the First Minister of our province and of course this includes the Minister of the Estimates who we are dealing with tonight, if either of them toured that facility that we have in Portage la Prairie, if they have toured that building and seen the handicapped people that need and will always need the care by trained personnel. I doubt, Mr. Chairman, whether these two individuals who I make mention of have ever toured that building and seen first hand the number of crippled children and men and women lying in their beds, will never see outside the walls of that school and this Minister proclaims that we do not need the institution care to the extent that we have today. I say she is wrong and history will prove that she's wrong.

Mr. Chairman, I question if the Minister whose Estimates we are dealing with today, and I include also the Premier of our province, if they've even read one of the many hundreds of letters that have been mailed to their offices protesting the action that this government is taking in the closing down of the School of Psychiatric Nursing in Portage la Prairie.

Mr. Chairman, recently there was a murder committed in Portage la Prairie in our community, the taking of the life of a young woman working as a receptionist in a motel in Portage la Prairie. Mr. Chairman, the man today is under observation in the Psychiatric Department at the Health Sciences Hospital and he is charged with the murder of that young woman. I don't know whether the Minister is aware of the fact or not,

but this man who today is charged as the murderer of this young woman was a patient of the Manitoba School for Retardates and was released at some time.

I'm sorry that I do not have the time when that man was released, but that is the history what is going on and will continue to go on if this Minister and this Government insists that they're going to put . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sorry to interrupt. Is this case before the courts right now?

MR. L. HYDE: No, it isn't. He's just been charged but it is not before the courts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If he's been charged, then it's pending and we should not be discussing something which is sub judice.

MR. L. HYDE: Well, I'll have to back down on that if you insist, Mr. Chairman, but I say the man has been charged but his case is not before the courts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It might prejudice . . .

MR. L. HYDE: I'm concerned about this here issue and I do wish to get permission to continue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: I believe the honourable member should be given every opportunity to participate in debate, but I think that we do have to recognize the sensitivity of discussing any matter that is before or is involved in the judicial process.

Once a charge is laid, then the person who is subject to the charge is under a requirement to appear in court and to answer to the charge; and while he or she may not be physically in court, the matter is deemed I believe to be before the court and therefore sub judice and we as legislators have endeavoured to keep that process inviolate, because should we innocently, in some manner, prejudice the court process, we'd be doing an injustice to the court system and to the individual involved. So out of caution I would urge the honourable member not to pursue it because I don't think it's particularly necessary that he refer to a special case to make his point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Portage.

MR. L. HYDE: Mr. Chairman, I'm not a lawyer; I'm a concerned citizen. The Minister of Labour, Mr. Chairman, being a lawyer as he is, I will take his advice.

I want to stress though that we continue to allow the expansion and the extended numbers of people to enter into our society without the proper - what's the word I'm thinking of or want to use? - the proper knowledge of dealing with our outside society that we will continue to be burdened with the problems such as we have experienced.

However, Mr. Chairman, I'll go on in regard to another program that's been suggested that may be closing down, connected with the institution out there, and I refer to the educational program that is in place in MDC. I wonder if the Minister, when she replies, could

explain to me what is the future, what would be the future of that particular program and how many staff will be effected should this educational program fold up, along with the reported closing out of the dairy operation, Mr. Chairman, which is part of the operation at the Manitoba Developmental Centre. This dairy operation, it has been suggested that the closing out of that program will take effect on October 1st of this year. I wonder just how much this move will save the taxpayers of Manitoba. Can the Minister give the committee here a figure of the savings to the taxpayer by the closing out of this dairy at the MDC and indicate how many employees will be affected by this move?

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the Minister how many additional group homes she intends to establish in the Portage area. With the closing out of the North Grove wing at the MDC in the next two to three years, as has been suggested, can the Minister justify the large expenditures of tax dollars required to upgrade the fire and safety regulations as expected by the Department of Fire Prevention?

I also have been told that even considering the age of that building alone that it is still a sound structure and has many years of service to our province and our community.

Mr. Chairman, as far as I'm concerned, the entire move on the part of the Minister and her government in closing out our School of Nursing in the MDC, the closing out of the dairy operation and the great possibility of closing down the educational program at the MDC is nothing but a political move. It has been stated, not only by me, sir, but by many, many people, and I have correspondence to that effect, many people who are parents of children in that school, saying to me, do something about it, Mr. Hyde. It is nothing but a political move and it stinks. Now that is coming from many, many parents of the patients in that school.

The victims of this move by this government, Mr. Chairman, will be the innocent patients living in our institutions. They will be the victims of the actions of this Minister.

HON. M. SMITH: I'm happy to address those issues because I think a lot of very serious questions were asked and I think there are also a lot of gaps in the information and although I've tried on many occasions to lay them out, I think I will attempt to do it yet again.

The question of the North Grove Building, the fire requirements to upgrade, if we were going to keep that building in operation, were in the neighbourhood of 3 million. There is a much much smaller charge in the neighbourhood of a 500,000 to give temporary fire safety.

So one of the questions before us was whether to commit the larger sum and further delay the development of services in the community, or whether to commit ourselves to downsize the MDC in total, so that North Grove could be closed down and would only require the smaller expenditure in fire upgrading.

We chose the latter path for many reasons, one of which is, in a sense, a tribute to the success of people who've worked at MDC, because over the years, in the same way that putting the retarded people into a large institutional setting, in a grassy setting, in a smaller town, was an advance over the neglect or the

imprisonment, in fact, of mentally retarded people in the past, it was an advance. It was giving them custodial care and health care to the wisdom of the day.

As the health problems were dealt with, people who were committed to work with the retarded and who did a lot of research in learning and understanding the nature of mental disability, in fact, were able, through different teaching techniques, to develop much more personal skills in people, more interpersonal skills, more vocational skills, to the point where the horizon of what mentally disabled persons could expect in their lives went up.

It was also found, as what the policy people call the medical model of care for the retarded, was challenged by a community-based model, where people, again, many of them parents of disabled people who wanted to keep their children either in their own home or close to them in their own community. Because although for Portage the MDC was a very important centre and had a very close relationship with the Portage citizens, for people, for families who had to travel from all other corners of the province, it was indeed an inconvenience and as many of those parents got together and went to see what was done in other parts of the country and other countries with retarded people and learned, as they lived with their own retarded relatives, that much more was possible for the retarded, that many of them - now I don't think anyone is yet saying all, but many more - given good developmental programs when they're young and given adequate support systems in the community, could in fact be cared for at an equal quality, and in many ways, offer them a better quality of life, a better diversity of experience and more opportunity to develop.

Certainly in the last five years of my involvement, there's been a great debate going on among the people who have been very committed and skilled, passionate in the traditional mode, vis-a-vis those who have worked in the community and have seen a different pattern of care. Our response to this debate was to gradually improve the balance. This process had already been going on. The MCD peaked in the early '70s at almost 1,200 people. By the time I was dealing with it, it was down to 770 because that movement out to the community, accommodation of people in the community, had already been going on for some time.

So what we did was just assess whether a further extension of community services was possible. We concluded, along with having to make a decision on the North Grove property, that it could indeed be accommodated. The choice we had to make to provide the money, the resources for the community programs, was not easily accomplished in a year of fiscal difficulty, so we fine-tooth combed our various expenditures to see which things had outlived - not completely their usefulness - but which could, if reorganized, still provide the same service in a more efficient way. We looked at the question of training of psych nurses. There are three institutions in a province of 1 million people that have been training psych nurses. Each has been training 25 students a year for a total of about 75 graduating each year.

Now with the current slight surplus and with the future to looking where the jobs would be for psych nurses, we looked both to what was going on to the west of us in Saskatchewan, where we found all the training

of psych nurses had moved into the community colleges. Then we looked to the east of us and found in Ontario and Quebec, not only had the training moved out of the institution, that specialty had disappeared altogether. Understandably, the psych nurses have been nervous about what their role would be in Manitoba.

We quickly determined that there was a continuing role for them, but in consultation with the Department of Health, found that they expected a slight decrease of the institutionalized requirement in mental health for psych nurses, a gradual increase in geriatric centres in care of the elderly because as we know we're having a great demographic bump, and we expect that area of need and service to go up steadily in the future.

From our part, we were seeing a continuing development of a reduced need of institutional care as we would see an increased demand for service in the community. Now the question of how best to train people in the community came up and we found that some of our community mental health workers have had psych nurse training but a great many haven't. As we looked at the kind of care we'd require in group homes, in foster homes, in supervised apartment living and so on, we realized that some of the skills the psych nurses have are relevant but there are other skills needed as well, so that the training modules required in the future to meet that need would differ somewhat. The question came down to how did we, as a government, see the future training of psych nurses best arranged?

The determination to consolidate the three schools into two, to maintain the same number of trainees, to modify - because each of the centres had developed a somewhat different program although they had a common certification - to moderate the curriculum of all three, so that they would get a balanced theory . . . (inaudible) . . . strengthen the practicum placement, because the premises of the school at MDC will continue to be used at least two-thirds of the year. For all of the 75 students from the other centres getting a lengthened practicum training, that we could take the seven instructors that are currently at MDC, redeploy two each to the other two schools, and offer equivalent employment at MDC to the other three, that we could achieve a small financial saving, at the same time strengthen the training and train people for the jobs that will be there in the future, because we do have a responsibility in developing policy and allocating resource, not only to look at the past and the past patterns, but in fact to plan more effectively for the future.

There's also the question of training people, not just for the one local job that's there, but for mobility, because people do move around. We've undertaken, should there occur any difficulty in recruiting adequate staff at the centre, or to recruit people into this area of work to bring in extra provisions or on-the-job training if required. Because I can see that people might be afraid that the move would under-supply the centre in future. We're aware of that and they're certainly committed to moving in should any extra methods be required.

With regard to touring the centre, or the allegations to those of us who've been planning in this field are somehow without feeling or insight or understanding, I categorically deny that. We've been through the centre,

we've also spent a lot of time working with people who specialized in the field and who opened up to us, I think, some of the possibilities of what can be accomplished in the future.

I know when one has always lived with the mentally retarded people, multiply-handicapped, away in big institutions, off in the country usually, and in this case on a very lovely setting in Portage la Prairie, sometimes one takes for granted that that's the only location possible, but I've also visited the group homes for the mentally retarded around the province and I've seen different physical aids and personal aids, staffing that enables people to function effectively in a more normalized setting, so I don't buy that just feeling pity for people and feeling they must be kept with 100 percent, 24-hour-a-day health care is the only answer for the mentally retarded.

Being mentally retarded brings with it severe health problems that need specialized health attention, but it's also a condition of life. The people who are mentally disabled deserve the very best that we can offer them, not only in the physical care and health care, but also in other opportunities for social life, and for recreation. So that is the thrust of our new development.

In terms of the presentations made by psych nurses, by individual residents of Portage la Prairie, the Instructors, the Chamber of Commerce, by other psych nurses, and I might add by community people, who have had another perspective and who are very delighted that at long last government has taken the initiative in developing community care, I can't admit to having read every one, but I think I have read 89 percent of the material that has come to me. I now know a great deal more about the different perspectives of the different nursing groups, some of the problems they have within their area of expertise, the perspectives of people who want their jobs to stay in Portage. There's such a wide spectrum of sharing that goes on in those letters, and we've done our best to deal with their concerns. Although we can't always agree with the solution they see to the problem, we have looked at the problems that they've identified.

I just don't know how to comment at all, and probably the less said the better. The fact that one mentally-retarded person, who is living out of an institution has been found, if not guilty, at least charged with a serious crime - I'm shocked and I regret something like that, but I can't conclude that 3,500 mentally-retarded people throughout Manitoba must live behind high fences with 24-hour surveillance as though they were all prone to being criminals, simply because one person may have had this particular propensity. I'm all for us trying to protect the public, and I think we must get better at identifying mental illness, and identifying people who are disturbed, providing necessary supports, but I don't think the answer is best dealt with by a theory action. It would tar everyone with the same brush. I think we must understand that the mentally disabled represent as wide a spectrum of variation as all the people assembled here and probably even greater, and we must deal with their individual needs and provide the kind of caring and supporting systems that are the very things that prevent violent personalities from developing.

With regard to the educational program close down, the only rumour or whatever that I can think of that

might have led to that concern is that we intend to remove, as quickly as we can - again, I mean that in a phased way, not in an abrupt tomorrow movement - the under 18's from MDC. We feel that they can be dealt with in smaller settings so that the particular educational program they were receiving will be phased out. However, we have approved in this year's Capital Estimates a very attractive multi-purpose activities building that will go on the grounds at the centre.

At the next session, we have the architectural drawings for you to see, because our goal all along has been to improve the quality of care and the opportunities for people in the centre, for those people who are not able to move to the community, at the same time as we're building the community option.

With regard to the dairy operation, it was justified as part of a mental retardation service program because it offered vocational opportunity. Incidentally, it also supplied dairy products to the centre. It's no longer serving as a vocational setting, partly because of the downsizing of the institution that's already occurred, the people who were able to work safely in that setting are no longer there. The cost benefit of purchasing food from local suppliers seemed to be in favour of closing the operation. There's a fine herd there, a nice piece of property. It will be sold to a local operator who can carry on employing precisely the same number of people as before.

Now, in terms of group homes in Portage la Prairie, I have a listing of the allocation, the first stage of allocation of resource that's followed the Welcome Home Planning Program and I'd just like to go through it very quickly. There are eight regions. A total of \$3,798,480 has been earmarked for 1985-86. The provincial steering committee, working with the local committees, has been responsible to see that there's an equitable distribution of money based on the most critical needs that have been identified by the regional teams. Two factors have influenced us strongly, the absence of existing services in an area and the number of persons in a region at risk of requiring institutional care.

Two regions, Interlake and Winnipeg, have been designated as priority areas for placement of Individuals. Interlake will receive \$540,030 for new services. Approximately half of this will be spent in support of a five-bed residence and a 15-person alternate day program in Selkirk and an eight-bed residence in Gimli. All three projects got under way during 1984.

Six-bed residences and accompanying day programs for Stonewall and Arborg have been recommended at a cost of \$236,087 and they will begin this year. As well, the region has two additional staff positions, plus \$26,000 for respite and \$10,000 for crisis intervention.

Thompson will receive \$49,500.00. That includes spaces for 12 persons in apartments. Also under consideration is the hiring of a service development co-ordinator at a cost of \$34,560.00; \$10,000 for respite care and \$5,000 for crisis intervention.

Winnipeg region will receive \$2,080,696 for new services. There are residential and day programs for 80 persons, 15 for each of the city's six regions, at an annual estimated cost of \$1,818,696.00. Eight new regional staff have been approved. In addition, \$242,000 for respite and \$20,000 for crisis intervention.

Eastman will receive \$221,116 for new services. There will be residential services and appropriate day

programs for six persons in Steinbach and six in St. Malo, totalling \$188,116; \$23,000 for respite and \$10,000 for crisis intervention.

Central region will receive - and this again is the Portage la Prairie area - \$416,889 for new services. Twenty persons, 15 from the centre, will be moved to new residences in Altona, Portage la Prairie, Austin and Somerset where they will also be enrolled in day programs. Total cost, \$393,889,000; \$13,000 for respite and \$10,000 for crisis intervention. One new regional staff position was also approved.

Westman, \$246,073; residential services for 12 in Brandon, half from institutions and half from the community, totalling \$200,073.00. Two new staff persons for the Westman region; respite at \$31,000; crisis intervention at \$15,000.00.

Parklands, \$230,616; residences and appropriate day programs for six in Winnipegosis, six in Grandview, \$210,616.00. Two regional staff positions, respite care at 15 and crisis intervention at \$5,000.00.

Norman will receive \$8,500 for respite and \$5,000 for crisis intervention, plus one additional regional staff position. There may also be two half-time service development positions in Flin Flon and The Pas because we found this region was at an earlier stage in needs identification.

That concludes my . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Madam Minister.
The Member for Portage.

MR. L. HYDE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Before we proceed, I would like to ask the Minister if she can indicate to me and to this committee just how many thousands of dollars does she intend to spend on the North Grove wing, Mr. Chairman? The first figure that I received, and I believe the Minister made mention, I think her figure was 3 million or some figure such as that. I'm not too positive on the figure.

But I was told that the original figure that is required to upgrade the fire safety regulations to bring it to the proper standard was costing in the neighbourhood of \$1,100,000 including the \$600,000 expenditure for the electric doors in that building. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if she could give me the exact figure that she is expecting to spend on that particular building?

HON. M. SMITH: The figure back in '80-'81 was \$2.1 million and as you know we've been dealing with very rapidly escalating prices since then. That's for total fire upgrading. It would not result in a single better program or residence for the mentally retarded. It would just have gone for sprinklers and fire alarms. There would still be dormitory-style of residence, no physical activity, no personalized type of living arrangement.

Now instead of going that route, we are putting - I think the latest estimate we've had from the fire and the Government Services people is around \$600,000 to provide the necessary fire upgrading for the three-year period that people will remain there. The other monies, instead of going strictly into sprinklers and so on, is part of the money that is being reallocated to providing a better quality of service for those people whose families wish them and who can be better supported and given a better quality of life in the community.

Again it's not for all the people at the MDC, but the total population will be reduced by the equivalent of the population in North Grove so that building can, in fact, be closed down.

MR. L. HYDE: To go on, Mr. Chairman, the Minister made mention of the training facilities that were available at Brandon and Selkirk. It is beyond me and beyond the people of Portage la Prairie, as I've mentioned earlier, outside of Portage la Prairie - why, why, Mr. Chairman, did the Minister and her department choose to close down Portage, where we have one institutional process . . .

A MEMBER: Weren't you listening? She told you why.

MR. L. HYDE: Would you keep quiet? Why would this here Minister choose to close down the one institution that we have in Portage when they have two of the similar schools in Brandon and in Selkirk? We had the one school that trained the specially trained nurses for the handicapped people of our province. She chose to close that one down and keep open the Brandon and Selkirk.

HON. M. SMITH: Again, I said before that the consolidation of three into two, the revision of curriculum at the other, so that all 75 would receive fuller theory and longer practicum. All 75, remember, are getting the fuller practicum at the MDC, so that for two-thirds of the year it will be functioning teaching and giving a practicum. It just won't have the official status of a school. Four of the seven instructors will in fact still be employed.

The reason for change is, as I said before, that the MDC used to have almost 1,200 persons and the training program was developed to meet the need at that level. That's now down to - it will be shortly down to half and the training requirements are different. We need people in the community with some of the same training and some different ones.

I can understand how Portage feels that they're losing something, but believe me, when you travel throughout the province and meet with the families and communities of the mentally disabled themselves, they feel they are gaining because they are recovering their family member to live in closer proximity with them or in their own homes, in some instances, with the support services so that they can manage. In the past, so often the only choice they had was to struggle along, 24 hours a day, seven days a week in their own home or to have the person go into a institutional setting.

I have no reflection on that. It was the wisdom of the past, but it's not necessarily the wisdom of today or tomorrow, and we would be remiss not to deal with those issues, both in terms of where we put the money, what kind of services we build, and where we train people.

MR. L. HYDE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister can indicate to me, is it true that the training nurses at Selkirk and Brandon will be partly trained at the MDC? They have to get part of their training there, is that right? How many months of the year, approximately?

HON. M. SMITH: It's being worked out in consultation with the psych nurses' association, the staff, and Manitoba Health Department. The guesstimate we have is that for about two-thirds of the year the facilities of the school will, in fact, be in use as a practicum placement for all 75 of the students.

MR. L. HYDE: One concern that has certainly been brought to my attention in discussing this problem we're going to have in Portage is that the patients that will be placed, under your thinking, in the outside world who will require daily medication - how can we be assured, Mr. Chairman, that these people will get the drugs that they're used to taking? How can we assure that they're going to get that and not create a problem, for the lack of proper treatment will create a problem within our communities?

HON. M. SMITH: That is a key question and it's one that we addressed early on because we recognize that specialized medical care is not the entire part of their lives, but it's a very important one. We have put together a group that is looking at how best to deliver that care in the community. What we will have is staff trained in the homes and the departments and whatever, under supervision; that is, they will be visited periodically by people who review the medication, and give them the prescriptions and the instructions as to how they are to be used, and then they will come and check the people up regularly. It's much the way we work a lot of other systems where the doctor doesn't stay around 24 hours a day to see that everyone takes their medication. They diagnose the patient, decide on the best care, and then trust the next level of people to carry it out.

We do have many elderly, hundreds and thousands of elderly people who have their medication handled. If they're capable of doing it on their own, and that's what happens; if they require supervision in varying senior citizens' homes and so on, it prescribed by the physician, but it's administered by the direct supervisor or care provider.

We do recognize the need to deliver medical care, and we've already been working on how to enable more local doctors, at least more in each region, to acquire some of the special skills for dealing with the mentally handicapped. It's a question of outreach providing the service closer to where the person is, rather than bringing all the people into one place. Even calling them patients conjures up, perhaps, a wrong notion, because it suggests that they're primarily, patients and secondarily, people. We're saying they're primarily people with special needs, and they have complex and severe health problems in some cases, but they can be dealt with in another setting.

MR. L. HYDE: I want to move on just to make mention of the dairy operation, Mr. Chairman. It has been common knowledge in Portage for many years that the dairy operation has not been an economical operation. We know that, Mr. Chairman. That goes back to a number of years ago when the former boys' school, now the Agassiz Centre, operated the beef herd and was intended to supply the meat for both the present Agassiz Centre and the Manitoba Developmental Centre.

I can certainly understand that it did not, and probably was not, an economical operation. I have no grievance at all for the closing down of the dairy operation in itself, but I have concern about, once again, the jobs that we're losing from that move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(c)(1) - the Member for Portage.

MR. L. HYDE: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that the Member for Pembina will want to speak on this subject. He has been a big help to me in my fight towards the sustaining of the school in Portage. I'm sure that the Member for Pembina will at this time wish to address the Minister and her department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

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

Mr. Chairman, can the Minister give us a little bit of information on the decrease in Salaries, the increase in Other Expenditures, and the decrease in Professional Training?

HON. M. SMITH: The reduction in the Salaries is accounted for by the gradual phasing down of staff at MDC as people move out. Again, we don't move the staff until after the downsizing has occurred. The overall staff-to-client ratio is improving slightly.

There'll be a reduction year over year from '84-85 to '85-86, from 688 to 639 in the general area. There are also 17 that have been transferred over to Regional Operations to provide service in an outreach fashion in the regions.

There's an increase on the Expenditure line of 108.1 thousand to cover increased costs of food and clothing.

The Professional Training saving is the amount guesstimated for this year. We are phasing out the program, the two-year training program and we've guaranteed to the students who are currently completing their first year that they will be able to complete their second year in the program before the final movement of staff and closing down of the official part of the school, although again it will still function as a practicum placement for a good part of the year.

MR. D. ORCHARD: In the increase in Other Expenditures, the Minister indicates that that's an allowance for increased food and clothing costs. The Minister is indicating to us that, over a three-year period, the number of residents at MDC will drop by some 220. Can the Minister indicate what expected reduction in number of residents will occur in this fiscal year that we are approving Estimates for?

HON. M. SMITH: We expect it to be approximately 70. The increase in the food and clothing has come about because I've asked the department to be very conscientious about maintaining good standards there. There hasn't been an adjustment for a little while and we felt that this was timely in order to maintain the standards that we think are important.

One of the interesting things you discover when you go out there is that where people used to be all clothed in sort of an institutional style of clothing. Now it's much more individualized because they've discovered

that that's a very important part of maintaining the morale of a disabled person, that they feel more individual when they have more attractive clothing.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Given that the number of residents is approximately 750 at the start of the fiscal year and will be down by some 70 at the end of the fiscal year, given those kinds of numbers you're looking at roughly a 9 percent reduction in number of residents; so averaged over the year, you could say there were 4.5 percent fewer residents to expend Other Expenditures on and we see a 4.4 percent increase, so in reality we're probably looking at about a 9 percent increase. Would that be a fair assumption?

HON. M. SMITH: There hadn't been an increase for some time and, again, I think this is indicative of our determination not to sell the people short who are at the centre. We want to keep improving the quality of care of all sorts. This is reflected in the food and clothing budget. It's also reflected in the commitment to build the activity centre for the vocational and recreational needs of the clients.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister answer, if the assumption that there's approximately a 9 percent increase year-over-year, given the increase in the number of dollars and the decrease in the number of residents, would the assumption be correct that I've made that there's approximately a 9 percent increase in the line of Other Expenditures, year-over-year?

HON. M. SMITH: Assuming that the reduction of people is going on fairly steadily throughout the year, in fact, it will probably peak more towards the end of the year because the monies have been allocated to the regions, but it takes them a while to gear up, to be ready, so probably the averaging would work out a little different than said; but I would say the increase would be 7 percent to 8 percent. The 4.4 percent was the figure we were working with in the increase and it was trying to take into account the flow, the rate of reduction of the residents.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I didn't realize the Minister had finished her answer there.

Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate whether similar increases in Other Expenditures have been allocated in the Estimates for private, not-for-profit organizations that offer similar residences, etc., etc.?

HON. M. SMITH: We have substantially increased the per diems throughout the system. That would be for the private offers of service too. Again because we're interested in building adequate quality in the Community Service, we want to ensure that we're giving adequate funding so that there will, in fact, be the capacity to meet the needs in an effective way.

One of the elements I guess that makes it possible to make a shift like this, is that institutional care does build up to quite a high per diem rate, and when you take that same money and spend it in a more imaginative way, I guess in the community, you are able to achieve quite an improvement in what were the - in a sense the old community system was under-funded

relative to the institution. I guess by down sizing one, we're able to gradually upgrade the other.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, then the Minister is saying that the Welcome Home Program, on an all-costs-considered, is a more economic form of residency to the department than is MDC?

HON. M. SMITH: I'm sorry, I didn't hear that question, but I can give you a little clearer answer to the previous one.

The average rate was about \$21 and it's gone up to \$30.00. Now there's quite a range depending on the level of care and the numbers in residence, as I have a full page of those figures which could be made available if you wanted, but the improvement is of that order.

MR. D. ORCHARD: The question that I asked followed on the Minister's answer that is one to assume, from what the Minister is saying, that the total cost of the department under the Welcome Home Program per individual is lower than what it has been at MDC?

HON. M. SMITH: In fact it's moving up because of our attempt to improve the quality, but had we not started to move to the community or started to expand, the increase in costs in the institution would have gone up, and certainly if you add on top of that, the necessity to upgrade the North Grove Building in the extensive fashion, the impact would have been quite significant. But institutional care is quite costly, without necessarily getting the relative increase in quality.

MR. D. ORCHARD: The Minister, I have to admit, confused me on that answer. Was that answer that it is less expensive under the Welcome Home Program, all costs being considered, than it is in the institutional setting of MDC?

HON. M. SMITH: What we're able to provide is a greater mix of services in the community for the same dollars, but we have actually enriched the allocation of funds, both in the centre and in the community, because of an overall commitment to give a fair share and an adequate share for quality to the individuals.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the Minister hasn't really identified. What I'm asking the Minister is that if it is more economic, as she seems to be indicating, to provide care in a Welcome Home type setting than it is in the institutional setting, then this Minister should be moving post haste, but that doesn't seem to be the case. So is the Minister telling us that it's less expensive?

HON. M. SMITH: The goal in this program is not to save money as quickly as possible. The goal is to be efficient and effective and to produce a program which is better for the individuals. Had we kept going - to care for all the people in the institution and take the at-risk people into the institution, would have meant a total greater than developing the mixed system that we're currently doing.

But the Welcome Home Program is actually going to provide a richer mix of services than was the case

in the institution. At the same time we're trying to improve the institutional services, so there's an overall enhancement of services in both locations.

As I say, the reason for developing the Welcome Home has not been primarily to save money. It's been to provide appropriate and quality care to people, according to the best knowledge of people in the field of mental retardation, who have raised their horizons in terms of what they think the mentally disabled can do and from what types of experiences they can indeed benefit.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I'm not arguing with the Minister on the comparative merits of the various program initiatives, but there are those who are expert in the field that indicate the Welcome Home - the deinstitutionalization program, if you will, whatever name you call it - there are experts in the field who criticize that program from the standpoint that it is one that we cannot afford in the long run; that to staff it adequately, to provide the kind of services that those people will have to live in the community, outside of the institutional setting, that if we adequately provide the staffing and the support personnel for those residences, for the individuals that are moved out of the institutions or never do go into an institution, but simply into a community home setting, that it will be too expensive for us.

The Minister left us an indication earlier on this evening that that wasn't the case, that the Community Residency Program was less expensive. Now if that's the case, I'd like to have the Minister indicate that. It's a very simple thing for her to indicate because it would put to rest an argument against the program of Welcome Home and Community Residences if the Minister can indicate that. I don't want dollars and cents from her; I just want her to indicate whether that impression she left earlier on this evening is indeed a correct one.

HON. M. SMITH: Let me give you a picture of what it was developing in institutional care. Now again you have to be very careful of averages without looking at range because you're dealing with, in institutions, the most needy, the most multiply handicapped; but to give you a rough idea of how the thing shakes down, at St. Amant the average is \$101.48 per day per child, per person; Pelican Lake, \$70.06 per day; the MDC, about \$67 per day.

Now I'll give you a rough sampling of the per diems in the community residences. Remember this is for the residential care, food and so on. It doesn't include a day program and transportation, that kind of extra, but you'll get some idea of the extra money one can then put into those additional services.

I'll just run down quickly the per diems - 50.95, 24.81, 60, 23.63, 26.16, 27.82, 24.47, 26.59. That's the type of per diem that the community residences are functioning on so, had we not developed community residences, we would be into the prices that I described before.

In addition to the residential allocations, when I read out the allocations to regions, you realized that I was throwing in a lot of day care activity and crisis service, that type of extra service, but with the difference between these per diems, there is a great deal that

one can do in a region, plus the enrichment of program with the involvement of parents and community people because these are smaller, more homey type settings. They're more conducive to normal visiting back and forth and involvement of local community people, so that we feel that the total package offers better care for people. For quite a foreseeable time there is going to be some choice involved. No one is forcing any family to place their family member in one place or another so we're going to, for quite awhile, be living with both types of system and with careful evaluation and so on, we'll be able to fine-tune our judgments about who can function in one place and who in another. But it's our belief we need the mixed system.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the figures that the Minister gave for St. Amant, Pelican Lake and MDC, I presume, included staffing costs. Is the comparable figures for the community residences, does that include a cost allocation of support staffing costs as well?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Including the departmental workers that work, not indirectly, on a regular base in the home, but are there as resource people?

HON. M. SMITH: That would be over and above, but the difference between the per diems gives you quite a lot of play there, and because you can use your regional staff to cover a fair area, you're able to do quite a lot that you couldn't do if you didn't down size the institutional.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, just in the rough figures that the Minister has given for the number of staff at MDC and the number of residents at MDC, we have 639 staff at the end of this calendar year, with some reductions. We have approximately 700 residents at the end of this year with, once again, some reductions.

The costs at MDC work out to some, I believe the Minister said \$67 a day with a staffing ratio of something slightly less than one-to-one. Is the Minister indicating that the support staff in the community residency program even approaches the one-to-one?

HON. M. SMITH: It's a different style of staffing. It's more like a live-in parent type of arrangement, although it varies from home to home and then some staff that would be in during the day, but not necessarily in the same numbers at night time, so the ratios don't . . . there'd be a wider range.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(c)(1) - the Member for Portage? Pembina? See what happens when we stay overtime?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, staying overtime doesn't have any effect on me.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister then doesn't have a staffing ratio that she can indicate for the community residences of in-house, live-in staff and support staff, which would give us a comparison of the approximation of staff availability for provision of service, etc., etc., to people who are outside of the institution versus people that are inside the institution.

HON. M. SMITH: Because the planning has been bottom up, built on the needs of the individuals, the staffing requirements in training are the elements that are coming through the system now. There are five need levels that are identified and different staffing requirements based on those.

To date we have had availability of adequately trained staff and we're working on both on-the-job training and there have been, under core areas, some people trained as community mental retardation workers. Because this process is going relatively slowly, we are able to identify the staff training needs and get those on track at a rate that matches the need out there.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Is the Minister saying that there will have to be additional staff hired to provide services to the residents in the Welcome Home Program and in the Community Residents Program? What I'm trying to get to with the Minister is . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, get to the point.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I wish the Minister would get to the point as well, Mr. Chairman. The Minister tells us on the one hand that there's a greater diversity of service, etc., etc., and that it is more economic to provide care in a Community Residents Program, but now she just said that, yes, well we've got these five levels of staffing and there's going to be recruitment and cost, etc. etc. I think what's important to determine is what the future funding costs are going to be of the Welcome Home Program. Whether one is a proponent of the program or an ordinary citizen who wants to be supportive of the program - one thing we all have to know is what we're getting into in terms of future cost.

If the Minister doesn't have a handle on that right now, I think it's something that definitely has to be analyzed so that she can make that kind of judgment. Because, Mr. Chairman, this Minister has made a decision to close a training school which provides a line of worker that has been expert in providing care to the residents at MDC, and can still be very beneficial on a regional employment basis, to provide services to the Welcome Home Program and to the community residents.

So then, Mr. Chairman, unless the Minister knows what the future staff requirements are going to be in her department to support, not only the people that are already in the community, but the extra 220 that she anticipates will be taken from MDC and placed into the community setting, then she can't answer questions as to what staff is required, what the cost is going to be, and what the implications will be two and three years from now on an ongoing basis, what that implication will be to the budget that she will ask for approval of, or future Ministers in her capacity will ask for approval of.

HON. M. SMITH: The planning has been more complete than at any other time with the department. We are identifying and including in services for the people at risk, so that we don't run into this revolving door syndrome. We have 47 residences out there now of varying sizes and levels of care, so we have a reading on the types of staff and the types of training that they

require. We have reallocated 17 staff for this year and the planning for what will be required this year is in hand, and the budget figures are in the Estimates figure.

Again, in terms of the long-term cost to society, we can't predict with certainty how many mentally disabled there are. What we can do is try - and we're trying to diagnose early; to have preventive services where we can through all sorts of health programs; prenatal care; workplace, health and safety, and so on; then through all the things we are doing with the infant stimulation, integration into day care, respite care in the home so youngsters can stay at home; we're providing the best-quality, least-cost care in and putting preventive and developmental programs in, so that the future demands on the public purse will be as moderate as is possible, consistent with them getting the needed services.

I think again that we have a better handle on identifying the needs and planning for the future than has ever been the case before. We're confident that we've allocated sufficient resources for the coming year and that we have a handle on how the system will evolve that is as good a predictor of the future as any other social program.

What we can't of course control is a sudden great increase in the mentally disabled - or hopefully we may achieve some decrease. One of the pressures on the system that we should all be aware of is that as medical skills increase, more multiply disabled youngsters are being kept alive, more premature children. That's a gain on one side, but it does introduce problems on the other. We're convinced the type of program that we're developing is the most humane and least expensive model.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Is the Minister saying that in this year's budget there is sufficient funding to provide an adequate level of care to residents in the Welcome Home Program, in terms of support staff, and in terms of various trained personnel, the five levels of personnel she mentioned earlier, that is being adequately funded in her estimation for this fiscal year?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, then to move on to another topic, in terms of the closing of School of Psychiatric Nursing at MDC, the Minister indicates that four of seven teaching staff will be offered placement at both Brandon and Selkirk. Can the Minister indicate whether, in fact, those four staff people are going to accept a move to Brandon and Selkirk?

HON. M. SMITH: We don't have any information on that as yet. Remember we are phasing out the program there, so there'll be some work for the next year, but the expectation is that four of the seven can be accommodated in the other schools should they accept that offer.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, my colleague, the Member for Portage, pointed out to the Minister that she is picking the wrong school for closing. Brandon and Selkirk both offer on-site, or whatever the particular terminology is, but their schools have the students involved with the mentally ill in Brandon and Selkirk,

but in Portage the school provides the nurses in training with work experience with the developmentally handicapped. That's unique between the three schools. The instructors that are there, the seven of them, are unique in terms of their ability to provide instruction to the nurses in terms of their handling people with the developmental handicaps.

Now the Minister is justifying this closing of the school in Portage by the fact that four of the seven staff will go to the two schools, but yet tonight she says she doesn't know whether that's going to happen. In her own departmental assessment, I pointed out to the Minister that a loss of any of those instructors would be extremely detrimental to the training program that she says is going to be enhanced. I think that the Minister should have a much better understanding as to whether she will, in fact, be able to retain the expertise of those seven instructors after this ill-considered closure, because it's very important to the carrying on of this instruction that's she's going to offer from Brandon and Selkirk utilizing the school at MDC, which she's closing.

Without answering that question as to whether the staff are going to be able to accept and can accept, and will accept placement in Brandon and Selkirk, this Minister can't guarantee that there isn't going to be a tremendous gap in the instructional training available to the registered psychiatric nurses in the Province of Manitoba, a loss of a unique training that is available only at MDC - not at Brandon and not at Selkirk.

So without the Minister having that knowledge, then she's making a hasty decision that's not based on good consideration and valuable knowledge.

HON. M. SMITH: Again I might return - I'm not sure if it was a compliment - but return the comment. The three schools will, in fact, not just carry on as is with Portage disappearing. The Brandon and Selkirk Programs will, in fact, increase their theory on mental retardation, because I remind you that they're developing a psychiatric nurse that is certified as a generalist, able to work whether psychiatric nurses are required. The jobs of the future are going to be decreasingly in mental health and mental retardation, increasingly with geriatrics.

Now psychiatric nurses may not like that and some of them may choose to train to work in the community with the mentally ill and the mentally handicapped. All we're doing is telling them that the jobs for the next 30 or 40 years are going to take that pattern.

The expertise at MDC will be used for all 75 nurses from what were the three institutions, but the new Brandon and Selkirk, they will all spend an extended practicum time at MDC so, in fact, instead of having 25 specialists and 50 who specialize in the other side, we're going to have 75, all of whom have good basic theory and practice in the areas where the jobs will be in the future.

Now there are nurses who will argue that all training should be very much tied to one institution and one specialty. There are others who will argue that nurses should be increasingly trained as generalists and pick up the specialty later on because they don't stop learning once they graduate. I think we've come out with a blend of those approaches.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the Minister again mentioned the training, but she can't really talk about the training available at MDC because she can't assure us that the staff are going to indeed accept this transfer to Brandon and Selkirk.

Mr. Chairman, the point we've made all along is the Minister had, theoretically, a decision to make - why, we don't know - but basically this Minister decided that only two schools of nursing were required and she had a choice of closing one of three schools. This Minister chose a school in Portage la Prairie which offered a unique training, which by the very statement she just made, she said was necessary because now she's going to - claims she's going to increase with the new program, the exposure of all 75 psychiatric nurses to the training available at MDC, thereby admitting that the MDC training is important and essential, but yet this Minister chose to close the school at Portage and not the school at Selkirk or not the school at Brandon.

Mr. Chairman, the Selkirk school is in much worse condition than the Portage school, facility-wise. — (Interjection) — Is there some problem with pursuing a line of questioning tonight? Is there some difficulty that the Minister of Business Development has tonight?

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no problem, I suppose, but reasonable people know when they are tired, mentally and physically.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I suppose, and if the Minister of Business Development is tired mentally, he can go home.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister has indicated the importance of the training at MDC for psychiatric nurses, yet she's closing the school there. I just have to tell her that doesn't make either common sense. . .

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Read Hansard tomorrow; she explained it all.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, we have all these instant experts, but the Minister still hasn't answered the question.

HON. M. SMITH: We're all getting rangy here.

MR. D. ORCHARD: For instance, when we were questioning this Minister on this matter in the House during question period some month and a half ago, the Minister indicated that there was a more substantive saving than was identified in her impact report that the department gave, which indicated there would be a \$24,000 saving. Can the Minister indicate how much larger this saving was, because she did say in Hansard, Page 536, that the saving is substantially different than the \$24,000.00? Could the Minister indicate how large that saving would be and how substantially different it is from \$24,000.00?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I think where we seem to be at cross purposes here is the assumption that the curriculum of the psych nurses at the different schools was completely different or to the extent it was different and there were some different emphases of

practicum and theory, that when they are blended, that they cannot be done in a way that is effective. To train as a psych nurse and get certified as a psych nurse means that you are entitled to work in any place that employs psych nurses. That means you must have good basic theory and practicum in the variety of settings where psych nurses are used.

The fact that a degree of specialization had developed at the different centres could, if left alone over time, have caused a great deal of difficulty because you wouldn't have know whether they were trained as specialists or as generalists. What we're saying is, address the problem, ensure that you've got the balanced theory and the practice. The particular instructors, valuable as they are, and I'm sure that we will retain some, four of the seven, fairly good odds that we will retain a fair number of them, but even should we not, there are other people that are available and a lot of the expertise is passed on in the practicums through the staff that are residents in the institutions and that is not changing. Practicums are on the floor with the staff that is ongoing at MDC; so again, I think the assumptions being made are not accurate.

In terms of cost, the different studies that were looked at separately by the different institutions and then blended reveals to us a \$24,000 on the operating side saving and \$100,000 on the staff cost saving.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, what are you going to do with the three staff that save you \$99,000.00? Are they laid off when the instruction course is over?

HON. M. SMITH: There is ongoing attrition in an institution the size of MDC and they will be redeployed within the institution. They will receive money, but however you do your arithmetic, it's a net saving.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(c)(1) - the Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the Minister cannot as lightly roll in a \$99,000 saving, given the contract that her government has signed with the MGEA which doesn't allow layoffs, and with the fact that she's saying attrition, etc., etc. She has not addressed the concern as to whether the instructional staff will be available, and even tonight she said, well, it doesn't really matter if they are. But if she reads her Impact Report, which was the blending of the three institutional reports, she will find that the people that studied this closure were very concerned about the loss of that staff and I suggest that she should be, as Minister responsible.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicates that there's going to be a reduction in staffing or in residency down to approximately 500 or so over the next three years. Now past record would show that the graduates from the School of Psych Nursing at MDC were primarily the people employed there to look after upwards of the 770 residents, and presumably will still be there for the needs and requirements of the 500 residents after the three-year reduction in the numbers of residents there.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister's own staff expressed a fair amount of concern about the loss of the training at MDC and how it would impact on the quality of staffing at MDC, and expressed a fear - and

if I could find it in here - but basically their concern was that with the loss of that staffing, with the training available at MDC, that the level of care may slip - I can't find it in her report here - but basically may slip to a custodial standard.

Now surely the Minister, who earlier tonight indicated such glowing desires to provide the best possible care to these citizens of our province, doesn't show a great deal of care when she chooses the Portage School for closing, given that kind of a concern and warning by her own staff. Mr. Chairman, that is why we will continue to be extremely critical of this Minister for making the decision to close the Portage School instead of Selkirk or Brandon.

Mr. Chairman, it leads us to no other conclusion than what has been voiced by the Member for Portage and others, that this was a political decision in the closing of the school at Portage; that this Minister and this government dare not close a school of nursing in the Premier's constituency or in the Member for Brandon East's constituency, both of whom are Cabinet Ministers. But when it comes to the school that provides specialized training and specialized availability of residency training, as the MDC does, that school can be closed because it's located in the constituency of my colleague from Portage, in which this Minister does not see any political down side to the closing.

Mr. Chairman, that is the only thing that makes this closing sensible to any outside observer taking all things and all knowledge and all recommendations into consideration, that this Minister made a political decision along with her Cabinet colleagues, despite the nice rhetoric the Minister has given us tonight about using MDC and the facilities to provide an enhanced training with the developmentally handicapped for all the graduates of the psych nurses.

That could have been provided to this Minister, to the schools, to the nurses, with the closing of the Brandon School, which is a poorer facility, probably is going to need a capital expenditure to upgrade now that more students are going to be there; by closing the Selkirk School and leaving the Portage one open and the Brandon one open.

You would do something else, Madam Minister. You would provide a facility outside of the major centres of Selkirk and Brandon, provide a facility in Portage, a smaller community in the province, a decentralization of government, if you will. But the record of this government has been dismal in decentralizing government services. Take the Boissevain Land Titles as one example, and there are many others.

This government does not act responsibly on behalf of the people of Manitoba, and this Minister made a bad decision, politically motivated, which is not going to help the very people that she claims and was expounding such great care and concern for tonight, because she's going to end up with registered psychiatric nurses who will not have the same kind of expert training that they had out of MDC.

She could have achieved that had she closed the school in Selkirk and left the school in Portage in place along with the Brandon school, but politically this Minister did not have the ability to do that because the Premier would not allow that to happen. That's why we say it was nothing but a political decision, because no other recommendation the Minister has indicates

that it was a wise decision to pick on Portage, but she did it anyway.

The people that are going to suffer are going to be this Minister and her colleagues in government, politically, come the next election, but the tragedy is the people who are the least able to defend themselves, those people with developmental handicaps are the ones who are going to suffer in the long run from this ill-considered and political decision.

HON. M. SMITH: Well, you know, I wonder if the honourable members can count, because a school that was operating at a certain level when the size of the institution was double, is not necessarily the best way to organize the training of the staff when the school is at half the size.

I remind the members that the amount allocated to the central region in one year for the new services is \$416,889, plus \$13,000 for respite, and \$10,000 for crisis intervention, another regional staff position; all of which is money and staffing and expertise going into that area. The people in Portage may feel down, but think of how the people in all the other communities are feeling by getting the service shifted over.

Now the change of any school, it's always hard to see anything contract. Everyone likes to grow and expand. It's difficult, but I think the member's doom and gloom view that it can't work, it won't work, no one will shift over, it's all going to go wrong, can be seen as just as extreme as anything that he alleging that I am guilty of.

The consultative process is in place, where we're resolving the issues of curriculum and quality training, numbers trained, the staffing needs later. We have figures that show that the staff resident ratio is going up steadily, improving at the MDC.

Again the assumption that because I can't say that the seven people have made their decision about where they will be relocated means that none of them will disappear from the system, seems to me to defy logic.

If a political decision is something that is a good social policy that has good economic analysis, that is planning for the future, and trying to provide quality service and well trained people in the most efficient, effective way, if that's considered political, fine. That's the nature of the decision.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we either pass this section or move that committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What's the pleasure of the committee?

3.(c)(1) . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: We won't pass it with the Minister leaving those words on the record unchallenged, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. What about the wish to rise, is that acceptable to everybody?

MR. D. ORCHARD: It's up to the Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Rest is a great healer, we need it. Maybe we can renew the vigorous debate next time we meet. We are so dedicated that we are tired and the public policy process may suffer.

Committee rise.

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: The committee will come to order. We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Education. Does the Minister have any responses to make to previous questions?

The Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I believe we're in 5.(g). Is that correct?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(g) Student Aid.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated last September by way of press release that she was speeding up the process of applications for student aid.

First, I'm wondering if the Minister could give me some basic statistics as to how many people have applied for student aid or did apply in the fall period of 1984 or the yearly period for which statistics are computed. Then can she indicate to me what measure was used to allow her to make the assertion that she could, in fact, increase the time required in the processing of applications?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Madam Minister.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, one of the commitments that we made last year was to try and reduce the time for applications. I think there were two areas that we concentrated on. One was giving more integrated support to students and providing them with both financial, personal and academic advice and counselling, and this has helped a lot. We have been able to turn around the time for processing an application from 10 to 12 weeks which it was previously down to 4 to 6 weeks. So there has been a significant improvement.

One of the things I remember showing the Member for Morris in the Estimates last year was the reduction in the application, in the size of the application. It was incredible - reduced it by 40 percent in terms of volume with the amount of information that had to be filled out. So that helped the students a lot and also helped the department in terms of the processing.

The applications are going up each year. They were 20,600 last year, and they are up to 22,000 applications processed this year.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I didn't ask the Minister when we were considering expenditures to community colleges what the enrolment figures were for the year, but my analysis, at least for my summation, after having read the 1984 Annual Report, is that numbers at community colleges are dropping, and furthermore, as we move into the university sections, maybe the Minister will be able to tell me what the experience is at our universities, although I believe those numbers have dropped marginally somewhat too.

Can the Minister explain why then there would be larger numbers of requests for student aid?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, I can get the exact numbers. The enrolments in our colleges are up, they are not

down, overall, and we can give the specific enrolments for the three colleges. The universities have a slight increase overall, but we can give the specific enrolment increases in each of the colleges and universities if the Member for Morris would like.

I think there are a number of very obvious reasons why the numbers are up. First of all, the student enrolments are up in both colleges and universities

A MEMBER: There aren't any jobs in Manitoba.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Does the member opposite want to give my answer for me?

Secondly, obviously, unemployment is a factor. People are having more difficulty finding employment, particularly our young people, and we know that. That means that more of them are not able to handle their program on their own.

There is better information going out. We have much better information going out and very active information going out on the college sites and on the university sites where students are much better informed about what is available. This is having an effect.

I think the question of poverty, expenses are going up and a lot of people that could manage programs and expenses years before are not. Those numbers are increasing.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, I suppose I have to acknowledge the Minister's reasons. I was trying to parallel the increase in applications to the fact that on Page 49 of the Annual Report covering 1984, talking about the Manitoba Community Colleges, at the very bottom of the page this statement is made, "Overall enrolment for the calendar year 1984 totalled 31,369 students. This is down from the 1983 total of 34,477, the second highest enrolment in community college history."

So I didn't make the numbers up; I took them from her own Annual Report. It was on the basis of those figures that I asked the question as to why there would be such a major increase of matching 10 percent in student applications.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I think probably the major reason is that the Annual Report is of December 31st, and our enrolments that we have are program year-ends, and they are not compatible and they don't match. The figures that I have here are that in '84-85 we had - and they are saying it was prepared in October, so they are using the figures that they have in October and it's prepared for December - ours is a rolling figure and the program year-end figure is 34,997 and we're up 35,926; that's the total enrolment in the colleges.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can't move into a major debate about those numbers, because obviously I don't have before me the so-called technique, let alone the raw data as it comes forward by months, though I still find it hard to believe that on the basis of some full year measurement, where numbers drop off 3,000 that, over a period of five months since calendar year-end, that in fact that

number and average could be brought up to that; I find that very difficult to believe. But, nevertheless, this isn't the place to debate it, Mr. Chairman, we're into Student Aid. The Minister did indicate in her answer last year's response that there were 20,000 requests for student aid and that this year there have been 22,000 in number. She has given to me the reasons, from her perspective, as to why that number has increased. I'm wondering whether the percentages, the breakouts, as between secondary and university and colleges, whether those percentages are the same as those she gave to me a year ago, at which time she indicated that 30 percent of student loans were directed toward secondary education, 45 to University and 25 percent colleges?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, there are no loans to the secondary program, the high school program, but the percentages are staying about the same, it's about 30 percent for technical and colleges, including Nursing, and about 70 percent for universities.

MR. C. MANNES: 30 percent secondary and 70 percent universities, so the numbers I'm reading from

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Not secondary, technical and colleges, including nursing, and 70 percent universities.

MR. C. MANNES: So what the Minister is saying, she said 45 percent universities last year, has now risen to 70 percent. Mr. Chairman, I'm quoting from Hansard, Page 1064, I'm quoting the Minister's own numbers from last year and obviously there's been some error. Is that correct?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I think there is some confusion over what we're relating to; is it people or dollars? We don't have the figures here in front of us, we're giving the percentages that there are this year and we're not sure if what you're quoting in Hansard is relating to exactly the same thing.

I might also say, to one of the points the Member for Morris made before, if he would like the information on the enrolment statistics from each colleges and universities showing the exact increase or enrolment changes in each institution, we would be happy to provide that for him tomorrow.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, that's not necessary. I'll, though, for the Minister quote the question I asked. I quote: "The Minister indicated this particular branch received some 20,000 requests for student aid, can the Minister tell me how that breaks down as to request for university students and community college and vocational schools?" The Honourable Maureen Hemphill had this to say: "It's 30 percent secondary, 45 percent university and 25 percent colleges." So that was the basis of the percentages that I used, Mr. Chairman, and I don't know whether at that time the Minister was referring to dollars or to loans. It's not terribly important. I was just curious as to whether there was any significant change in the proportions that was being directed towards each post-secondary institution.

Last year the Minister indicated that there was some \$900,000 in outstanding loans. Can the Minister indicate whether that number has increased in any magnitude?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: \$1.6 million, Mr. Chairman.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, that's a considerable increase in a short span of a year.

The Minister also indicated last year that experience had indicated that 15 percent of the loans are overdue, although half of that amount is usually paid in a late fashion.

Can the Minister, firstly, tell me why the number has increased so significantly; and secondly, can she tell me whether the experience of students paying back their loans has changed at all? Indeed is the same percentage defaulting that has been the case for a number of years, or is that increasing also?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, the information that I've been given suggests that while the number is up \$1.6 million, it's up \$700,000 for Manitoba; that in three areas, Teaching Training, Special Opportunity Loans, and Manitoba Government Loans, these are loans that are returned not through money, but through service. There is a fairly large - although they're all categorized in the same category as being uncollected or the money not being collected - a fair number of them, 191,000 Special Opportunity Loans, 64,000 Manitoba Government Loans, and 258,000 for Teacher Training will not be collected in money. The requirement or the condition is service.

This would be largely teachers and pathologists, teachers of the blind, speech specialists, people in specialty areas.

MR. C. MANNES: Is this a new policy that being instituted, Mr. Chairman? Why not make it a total business-like arrangement? These individuals who are going out and proving their standing with extra educational qualifications are obviously deriving some salaried benefit for doing so, and why wouldn't the government expect them then, to pay back their loans in the normal business fashion?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, it is paid back in a way. It's written off at the same rate that it would be written off where they're paying at \$300 per month of service. This is not a new program, but it's a program where the numbers in it are larger than they have been, and that's having a major effect on the total number of \$1.6 million.

The reason for that is the people who are in high need areas, and highly specialized, a lot of them in the special needs area and I mentioned some of them before: speech therapists, pathologists, teachers of the blind. Those where we have difficulty getting people, we want to train people, than the arrangement has worked out that they will receive the training. They will get the loan, but instead of paying it back, it will be written off at the same rate as it would have been had they been paying back the money.

So it is a business arrangement as far as I can see. It's just that it is handled in a different way, and they have the choice of choosing to pay money or service; and some of them choose service and that suits us.

MR. C. MANNES: One further question on the policy then, Mr. Chairman. If individuals in question either change occupation, or secondly, move to another province, are they committed by the contract by which they took the loan to pay back the loan?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, they are, Mr. Chairman, with interest at the going rate.

MR. C. MANNES: Can the Minister indicate what the total loan portfolio will increase in the next year? We have a 700,000 jump this year. Can she indicate what projections or forecasts there might be in place with respect to 1985 or 1986, whichever is the next year?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the expectation is that this will stay about the same. There will not be a dramatic increase as there was this year. Well, it's stabilizing.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, that makes me then want to ask another question. The Minister is saying that the major reason for the 700,000 was the fact that the government has reached out to specialists within certain areas and asked them to take training, in a manner that they did not in other years. Is that basically the reason?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Two things I think, Mr. Chairman. We're making more special loans to people in the specialty areas, and there are more people in the category of high needs.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, the Minister, on several occasions, has attacked the federal loan program, particularly in support of part-time students whereby interest and principal are required to be paid back under some term program, under some term repayment schedule, almost immediately upon receipt of loan monies.

The Minister has also indicated, or indicated last year, that there was going to be a task force or a conference in July, which would attempt to deal with student aid, in general, and specifically part-time student aid programs.

Can the Minister tell me, after having drawn this particular shortcoming, in her view, to the government on several occasions and having had the opportunity by way of conference to address this concern with the Federal Government, whether there has been any change made at all with respect to federal policy in student aid in support of part-time students?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, there isn't any change to date, although the conference did take place and we have had meetings with the Secretary of State. We are still very hopeful because the program still does have the same tremendous deficiencies in it, to the degree that it's the only time I know that I have ever said a program was so bad that it shouldn't exist, that it is so lacking in ability to meet the needs, and of course the proof here is in the pudding, because in Manitoba we have about 1,500 people who would qualify for this and the number should almost be there because it's a very high need area where they've been looking for support for a long time.

In the first year of operation we had 40 applications, and they had a massive publicity campaign from coast to coast, right across the country, and it increased our applications the following year to 59. So when you look at a target population of 1,500 and recognition that more and more of our people are going into part-time studies and those low numbers, and also the ones that are in part-time studies are the high need students because they're the ones usually that can't afford to take it full-time, so they're single parent or responsible for a family and taking it on a part-time basis.

The numbers of 40 and 59 speak for themselves. There has been no change. All of the provinces, I believe, all of them have now joined us in stating their concern and their request for their removal of interest and the conditions that are keeping people out of the program and we're still hopeful that it's going to be changed.

MR. C. MANNES: Out of the 22,000 loans that have been processed in this present year, can the Minister tell me how many have been refused loan support?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Approximately 10 percent, Mr. Chairman.

MR. C. MANNES: That seems to then be roughly 2,200. Last year the Minister said 3,000 were turned down out of 20,000 who had applied, so obviously the number that are being turned down in this present year is a much smaller percentage than years previous.

The Minister also indicated a year ago in response to a question that the government was doing a more thorough job of up front assessment of the applications as they came forward. Can the Minister draw some conclusion as to why the percentage of people who are being refused, is diminished? Is it the fact that the numbers requesting support are identified more easily as individuals requiring support, or in fact that the criteria or the standards have been relaxed in any degree?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, Mr. Chairman, it isn't because the standards have been relaxed. It's for a variety of reasons. One would be older students. More students with families is another reason. More single parents, more people returning to school from training, so it's for a variety of reasons, but not because of a relaxation of standards.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, is the eligibility of a person over 18 years old, applying for student aid, still tied to the financial situation of the parents?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, it is, Mr. Chairman, for four years out of high school, at which time they are categorized as an independent.

MR. B. RANSOM: I've always wondered just how that really was able to be enforced. I've always understood that someone who had reached 18 was legally on their own at that point, and certainly, as I understand it, parents would have no obligation to be responsible for any person over 18 years old.

Have there ever been any challenges to that constraint that's placed upon student aid?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, when the member says are there any challenges, I suppose there's different ways of challenging. One would be the Appeal Board. We do have an Appeal Board that's set in place that hears the unique cases to see if the criteria was applied or if there are exceptional cases.

So, under that criteria, there certainly would be challenges to this clause and to all of the others that are in, when people think they haven't been applied fairly. They do have to demonstrate independence - I suppose that's one of the basic principles - and there are very few appeals on independence. The appeals are for other reasons, but there are very few related to independence.

Of course, if the parents don't have assets, the parents aren't expected; it depends on what the parents have. When we talked about this earlier, we were saying that we were expecting the family and parents to help more where they could, and that it required students to be able to demonstrate independence, which is four years out of school, or two years of living on their own, two years in the labour force.

MR. B. RANSOM: What I mean, has there ever been a challenge in court on the basis of discrimination? If someone turns 18 and are denied student aid because their parents happen to have wealth, the parents may not be passing it on to the individual and, as I understand it, they have no legal obligation to pass it on to the individual, and so potentially they can be discriminated against because of wealth that their parents have. My question was whether or not it had ever been challenged in court.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, we have not had a challenge in court in Manitoba. There was one in Quebec and the appellant lost the court case. We also must remember the parents are still allowed to claim the students on their income tax if they're going to school, up until the age of 25.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, last night the Minister undertook to provide for me the names of administrators in certain numbers of branches. I'm wondering if she is still collating that material; and secondly, if she would add to that those individuals who are administering the Student Aid Program. I'm not now talking about the staff officers who may be in place and are reviewing and processing the loans; I'm talking about the administration people within that branch. I'm wondering if she would provide that for me.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, we can certainly provide that information. I think that there was a fair amount of information asked if you are talking about deans, and we're in the process of gathering that and providing that information. We're quite happy to provide the information related to the Student Aid Branch.

There was a question on exactly what it was you wanted - excluded managers. Is that what you wanted? Repeat who is it you want lists of and then we'll take it down.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I was asking the names of the administration of the Student Aid Branch, not the people who are assessing or processing loans, but the individuals that are directing the people in place.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: If that is what you want, the answer is easy; it's Rick Kleiman, and he's here and he's the one and only, if we understand what it is you're asking; the only one who isn't processing the applications and who is in a management position.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(g)(1)—pass; 5.(g)(2)—pass.
5.(g)(3) - the Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, the assistance, is that the news loans that have been underwritten by the Province of Manitoba, will be underwritten in 1985-86?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, \$6.4 million is loans, bursaries, grants and loan rebates.

MR. C. MANNES: A final question, what portion of that is loan and what portion is bursary?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, \$6,200,000 is the grants, the bursaries, the loan rebates; and about \$200,000 in new loans.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(g)(3)—pass.
5.(h) Student Aid Appeal Board: (1) Salaries - the Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Can the Minister tell me how many appeals were held during this present year?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, 596 appeals.

MR. C. MANNES: Last year 1,000 appealed, Mr. Chairman. I suppose it's a reflection then to the fact that a greater percentage were able to attain their loan at the first instance. Is my assumption correct, or is there another reason why the appeal numbers have dropped so drastically?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Morris is quite right. The number of appeals is down by 32 percent, and while there will be a variety of reasons, we believe that the largest reason for it is the Integrated Student Services Program that we put in place, the very active and pro-active information system that we have set up, a special program where we're working with high need students, counselling them on both academic, financial and personal matters. I think just basically that they're getting much better information about what is available, so they're not appealing because they were expecting or didn't know what they were going to get.

The number that got the intensive student service counselling is 2,700, which is quite a large number of students to get that kind of direct service, and all of them would be in the high need area. So I think that figure is probably a number of reasons, but it certainly is a tribute to the Integrated Student Services Program that we put in place.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, this question will sort of, I suppose, come under the section that we just passed. Can the Minister tell me whether or not the total allocation of a year ago, \$6,400,000, was it used or was some money allowed to lapse, or indeed was there a requirement that surpassed the official printed estimate?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, Mr. Chairman, we didn't lapse money in this area. We used the whole thing; we used the whole amount. And, of course, one of the reasons is that we had an increase in applications that we were able to absorb within the existing money that we had, and one of the reasons was quicker turnaround time, better processing; I think more efficiency that was built in, where we able to process in the increase of about 7 percent in applications, so we certainly didn't have nor expect to have any money left over.

MR. C. MANNES: In spite of the reduced numbers of individuals who appealed the original decision, can the Minister indicate whether there was a long line-up of people awaiting to have their appeals processed? Mr. Chairman, I asked the Acting Minister of Education one day a question with respect to backlog. An individual called me who was appealing the denial of her loan and was told by somebody within this branch that the fact there was a four- or five-month backlog at one point in time, and that she was maybe caught right at that particular point. I'd ask the Minister whether there's a fluctuation in the appeals and whether or not there are times during the year where there may be a heavy concentration of the 600, for instance, this year and would one of those time periods be early in the calendar year?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, obviously there would be periods in the year when the applications are very very heavy and they are being processed, and as they're being processed as quickly as they can, there would be periods where the appeals were higher during certain months of the year than they were in other years. January — (Interjection) — yes, the beginning of the second term would a high period.

But the information that I have suggests that there wasn't a tremendous backlog in terms of the Appeal Board dealing with the appeals. There may have been some problems with incomplete information and there may have been a number of appeals where the appeal was awaiting completion of the information that was required to deal with the appeal. I'm not saying that there has never been a case where there was not a backlog of some sort, or where some people did not have to wait for their information, but in general it's been moving quickly and there has been no overall backlog.

MR. C. MANNES: 5.(h)(1)—pass; 5.(h)(2)—pass.
5.(j) Northern Development Agreement - Canada-Manitoba - Post-Secondary Career Development - the Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, last year we discussed the BUNTEP Program under this item. Is that the major component of the total expenditure of

\$6 million, or can the Minister give me a breakout in three or four areas, to which most of the \$6 million that is indicated here is directed?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, the major programs are the Community College Access Program; Northern Nursing Education Program; Northern Bachelor of Social Work Program; the BUNTEP Program; Special Pre-Medical Studies and Native Medicine Program, are all contained in this section. Those are the major programs.

MR. C. MANNESS: How is the BUNTEP Program doing at the centres, particularly Grand Rapids and Berens River, Mr. Chairman? I ask the Minister this, and when I say how is it doing, are the numbers of students that originally enrolled to take the program, are they dropping to a point where the department is threatening to wind down the programs? Can the Minister tell me whether numbers - and can she tell me whether numbers in all the other locations are staying at a point at which the government will continue to make a commitment - or not the government - the University of Brandon of course, which I understand is mainly responsible for administrating the program?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, this is a program that the government has and continues to be highly committed to. We certainly wouldn't be closing out a BUNTEP Program where there was still some need or some interest with students. Grand Rapids Program has dropped to eight students, so the numbers are down but it will not close.

What we are doing is moving the programs into different communities, and it is quite possible that when a program has been in one regional area or one community that they will have trained a reasonable number of people to service or go into that community, and then we move into another community.

We have not been able to meet the needs right across the province all at one time, so we have had to make a commitment to do training in certain areas and I think we have seven BUNTEP centres. As some of the needs in some communities are winding down, other communities may be picking up and we may move and put a centre into those communities.

MR. C. MANNESS: The Minister says, "winding down," Mr. Chairman, I have some information with respect to Berens River. The program started with 26; there are 7 left; at least there was at one point in time this past winter. The University of Brandon wanted to close Berens River down, I am told, and take those students who had not completed courses, and I dare say, Mr. Chairman, if it's a four-year course, the program hasn't been in place that long that I think it's to the point where it's graduated that many students that the needs would have been served totally within any of the six or seven locations in which it now centered.

My question is to the Minister: are numbers that have originally enrolled, are they dropping more quickly than otherwise was expected? And are those remaining few that are left in some of these locations in jeopardy, in fact, that the program may be removed before they have completed their course?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that in Berens River, the drop was greater than was expected, but the numbers of students is up again now to the place where it's viable and the program will definitely continue.

MR. C. MANNESS: Can the Minister be somewhat more definitive. What are the student numbers up to now; and secondly, did the students decide just to take a leave of absence or are these new students that have come into the program? And thirdly, to what level can the number be allowed to drop after which, if it continues to drop, the program is in jeopardy?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, the numbers of students presently are up to about 10 and this community and this program has had probably a few more problems than some of the other programs have had. There has been some drop out by some of the students. Some of them have stopped taking the program for personal reasons and it's the community that's having, overall, quite a few problems that is having an effect on the students that are in this program; and people in the program are working very closely with the community in providing both consultation and student support to try and help the students overcome the wide variety of, I would say, personal problems that are affecting their ability to stay in the program. It's a high need community, I suppose would be a good way of describing it.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Chairman, I certainly in no way want to appear critical because I'm not. As a matter of fact, I spent roughly an hour and a half in the classroom at Norway House and found it extremely, I guess, invigorating. I was asked to come in by the professor or the teacher in charge and engaged in quite a conversation with many of the students and had an opportunity to pose a number of questions as to where they saw the course taking them and I left that classroom setting, which was very modest - to put it mildly - with the belief that the program was certainly servicing some very real needs.

I bring the question up, though, to ask the Minister who has the final say? Who has the total say as to what community is to be serviced at this time? Is it the University of Brandon or is it the Department of Education? And as the Minister has indicated, there will be sometime in the near future, some schools leaving communities and moving to other locations. I can understand that, but has that process been laid out? Do the communities know at what point in time there's a very good chance that they'll be losing their school and that it will be moving to another location?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: First of all, in terms of the process, the process is one where the decisions are made, not just by Brandon University or certainly not just by the Department of Education, but it's one where it's a community-based program and that means there's a lot of consultation and negotiation and discussions with the communities to both set up the program and that also would be included if there was any suggestion that the program was going to discontinue.

There is a general understanding that if the program drops below six students, there's a serious problem,

and it will have to be looked at and there is a possibility of the program being wound down. So they have an idea about the figure below which there is a question of whether the program is a viable program, but nothing would happen quickly arbitrarily or, as you can see in the case of Berens River where the numbers did drop, I suppose, dangerously close to the number where they would be looking seriously at pulling it out, the attempt was to work with the community and work with the people that were in the program and give them support so that they could stay in and receive the training. So there was every effort, I think, to keep the programs open and give support to the people who want to take the training.

I might just take a minute to go on record, and I'm glad you went in and saw the program and saw some of the people because they have absolutely marvelous programs. I think an example right across the country - not just through BUNTEP but through BUNTEP and some of our other programs, we've now trained about 500 qualified Native teachers and they're going into Indian Affairs and Band controlled schools and into Frontier School Division acting as role models for young Native people in those school divisions.

It gave an opportunity to many of those people who would never have had an opportunity for post-secondary education before. Their retention rate overall in these access programs, while there may be some problems with some communities like Berens River, their overall retention rate is often higher and better than it is in some of what we call our traditional programs. The retention rate, I think, overall in these programs has increased 76 percent to 79 percent, which is a very high retention rate and higher than regular post-secondary programs.

So overall we have about 300 Native teachers now employed in northern Native schools. That's a tremendous accomplishment, so these programs have certainly proven themselves and we'd be very careful before we made any move to interfere with something that is giving access to people who don't normally have it and giving us very good teachers to go into northern remote and Native communities where they're very badly needed.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Chairman, will the Minister give me the names again of all the people who are drawing salary under this appropriation; and furthermore, I would ask if a Carol Sigurdson works within this department?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have the names and I can read them into the record.

Carol Sigurdson, Audrey Litzenberger, Terry Lamb, Marlene Van Heiden, Janice Scott, Jean Semchych, Bruce Proctor, Brenda Cooke, Denise Meisner, Linda Jackson, Linda Bradburn, Anthony Johnston, Don Unruh and Darcy Phillips.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister may want to deal with this now or maybe in the next section, but I see where Miss Sigurdson was appointed to the Board of Governors, University of Manitoba, Order-in-Council 462. Are there other Department of Education staff people who are acting in a position of board of governors in the university setting?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I can check to confirm this, but I don't believe so. I can't think of another one offhand who would be a Department of Education person.

I might say that the selection was not on that basis where we wanted to have Department of Education people sitting as representatives on the Board of Governors of one of our largest universities. But it's because of the importance, I think, of knowledge and information in a relationship between our access programs, which are post-secondary programs, often paralleling programs that are taking place at the universities, and to have some exchange of knowledge and information between someone who is very familiar with those programs and the university.

MR. C. MANNESS: Could the Minister indicate, to her knowledge, whether this has been done before, where people coming from her own department, people in one major division are appointed to the Board of Governors to give direction obviously to autonomous institutions, but yet still falling under the total purview of the Minister of Education? I guess I'm asking the Minister whether she considers this proper in all respects, and she may be able to use an example where this has been done before. But I ask her whether she gave any consideration to it or not?

Certainly there must be other people in the community who have some understanding of what the Minister calls the access programs. There must be other people in the community who are certainly at arm's length, Mr. Chairman, are at greater length to the University of Manitoba than somebody working within another division of the Department of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I don't know if it's been done before, or if there's a precedent for it, and I don't presently see any problem with it. She's one member of a fairly large board and is not there to represent me or my position, or at my direction at all, but she's there to provide linkage and information to the board, because the University of Manitoba is moving more and more as are other universities are, into looking at branching out and taking on programs that are in the same tradition and principle of the access programs.

Since we have the experience in them, delivering them off campus, out of the institution, and as I said the University of Manitoba is now moving for the first time into delivering its first degree where you never have to set foot on campus. So they are following the experience and the programs that we have had to set up outside of the institutions previously, and more and more of them, I believe, will be delivered by the institutions but not in the traditional way.

So I think that her information and knowledge is useful; that's the reason that she's there. I haven't heard anybody raise any question or have any problem with it, other than the question that's raised here tonight.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Chairman, I have some problem with it, not because of Miss Sigurdson's qualifications, I don't now her at all, Mr. Chairman. It may very well be that she does have an understanding in this area, but certainly all the Minister has to do is allow the person in question to either be seconded to the

administration of that university or to act as a resource person, during which time she can share her expertise.

But this is a different matter, Mr. Chairman. What we have is an individual within the Department of Education who now has a full voting power at the university. I was always under the belief that the board of directors were to be called from various areas of the community, outside of government - even though government appoints many of them, I realize that - to give direction to the university. So, Mr. Chairman, in my assessment of this situation, I see something improper, and I'm wondering why would the Minister stop here? Does she not see some potential conflict of interest arising?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I think the answer I gave before is my answer. I didn't see a problem when we appointed her and I think she's quite able to keep, what he's suggesting are the two roles, separate. It hasn't been a problem to date. Nobody has indicated it is a problem; neither she nor anybody else at the university.

I don't mind the point being raised and I don't mind even taking a good look at it. I hadn't thought it was a problem and I still don't think it is. However if it turned out to be for one reason or another, we would certainly take a look at it. To date I don't believe it is and I don't believe we should be raising a question or a problem that, as far as I know, doesn't exist.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, that's why I raised the question. I don't want it to be a problem. The Minister says that none exists. Well that may very well be the case. I'm just wondering if the Minister is beginning to plow some new ground here. There's a new system of selecting people to the Board of Governors at universities; whereby now people who are totally responsible to the Minister of Education, now are put in positions of influencing university decisions. That's the point, Mr. Chairman.

Miss Sigurdson is totally responsible to the Minister of Education, Mr. Chairman, and that's the point I'm trying to make. If the Minister now is going to use the Crown corporation system, as referred to by the Minister of Culture, well fine, then let the Minister come forward and state her new policy. That's the point, Mr. Chairman. I'm not saying there's a problem. I think there could be potentially a problem in perception. I think it's a bad system to initiate.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I think at this point I have made my points and the Member for Morris has made his. I accept the concern and have heard the concern that he's raising. I have given my answer. I don't think that it is a problem. I don't think it will be. If it turned out to be, we'd certainly look at it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(j)(1)—pass; 5.(j)(2)—pass; 5.(j)(3)—pass; 5.(j)(4)—pass.

5.(k) Canada-Manitoba Winnipeg Core Area Agreement - Employment and Affirmative Action: (1) Salaries - the Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated last year that an additional \$6 million had

been allocated for new programs. I suppose that was over some two or three years. I'm wondering whether there is any additional support that has come into this appropriation.

Item No. (k)(2) indicates a significant increase in Other Expenditures. I wonder if the Minister can tell us why that number has increased; and secondly, whether there are any new initiatives under this program?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there was an additional \$2.1 million put into this program and it brought the level of funding for the agency up to the level that had been agreed to by the three levels of government under the Core Area Agreement.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, can the Minister tell me how long this program will continue to be in effect? Obviously the Core Initiative Program has some deadline, and yet obviously we know that there is discussion being directed toward extending it over another period of time. Can the Minister tell us when the present one will come to an end, and whether or not that would have - obviously it would - direct impact upon this appropriation, but in what year?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, the agreement in this program lapses or comes to an end in March of 1986, the present Core Area Agreement, and of course discussions are under way now with the three levels of government and it has not yet been determined whether it will continue.

MR. C. MANNES: It seems to me that last fall there was - or maybe even this spring - the initial graduation class under this program. Can the Minister tell me the numbers of people that graduated; and secondly, the disciplines or the area of specialization or training that they were able to achieve?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, in 1984-85, we had 54 projects; 650 training positions; 200 now in training; 100 to be trained; and the programs were horticultural technicians; gerontology; family services; chemical dependency; youth worker training; Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce Industrial Training Centre; offset press operators; Native Women's Transition; joint Inner City Project for Adult Literacy; Metis Economic Development Officers; correctional workers; court communicators; community development worker; Counselor Advocate Training; small business programs; Affirmative Action Programs in conjunction with DREE.

MR. C. MANNES: Does this also cover, or is there such a thing as an Immigrant Access Program and Winnipeg Education Program and, if so, do they come under this appropriation?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: The Winnipeg Education Program doesn't come under this, but the Immigrant Access Program does.

MR. C. MANNES: Is this program, the Immigrant Access Program, does it provide grants to immigrants to attend university in the education or social service faculties?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, it does not, Mr. Chairman.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, where does this program, the Immigrant Access Program, where does it place its students then, randomly throughout the community or can they go into all types of locations or settings? Where are they directed?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, they're directed into access services with any number of community agencies, a wide variety of community agencies.

MR. C. MANNES: Would a political office be a place where this program might direct one of their students to act in some capacity in support of a public figure?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, not to our knowledge.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, I would ask the Minister if the person in charge of that program could check out to determine whether a student in the month of March was placed into Mr. Cyril Keeper's office? The Minister may wish to respond at another date.

Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering whether, in fact, there may be some substance to the report that I have that in fact that occurred, and maybe she may indicate whether this would be proper if it did occur.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, we do not place all of the students. We place some of the students and, in some cases, there are particular jobs that are lined up for students while they're in training with, in this case it would be with community agencies. In some cases, the students go out and find their own place.

I will certainly check on the information that the member asks for. It is possible that the placement was done, not by us or by the agency, but by the student themselves. I will check into it.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, in this case, Mr. Chairman, would that student who found their own position, or found a job, would they be supported under this type of program?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I suppose the answer is that they're trained to be an immigrant access worker, and what they would be doing is looking for work where they would be giving help to members of the immigrant community who need help and information in learning how to understand the system we have, and how to get access to programs, information, and supports that are there for them, which is the purpose of the training programs. I suppose that individuals could be looking for a job that suits the skills that they have developed in the community that they serve, but I reiterate again, I don't think that placement would have been done by the department, and I have head shakes to confirm that, but that the student may have gone out themselves and found it.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I'm not trying to cast any shadows on the department; what I'm trying to ascertain is whether or not, conceivably, an individual may be working in a political office and yet drawing

support under this program. That's what's I'm trying to determine, Mr. Chairman, and I ask the Minister to have her staff that are involved in the Immigrant Access Program determine whether or not that may have occurred.

Secondly, if it has occurred, I would ask that, if her department is in charge of the program, that they make that opportunity known and available to, indeed, all other political offices that service immigrant communities.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, the support that is provided for that program is provided when the students are in training and when they are on a site where they would be designated as being in practicum. If they are employed, if they have been trained and their training is completed, there is no support and they would then be getting a salary for doing a job. If he's asking the question, are they in that, we would not probably consider - in fact, I think we would say that we would not consider that an appropriate practicum training site and so we will have to check into the information to see whether the person is in training or is trained and has found himself a job.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, I accept the Minister's response, Mr. Chairman, if she will undertake to find out whether or not the situation did occur. She seems to indicate that by her understanding, as I have drawn her attention to the facts that I have, that she would not be in support of a program that would offer support in that type of situation to a student who would be training in that type of situation.

I'm interested, Mr. Chairman, in the Gerontology Program. Could the Minister tell me specifically how many students are enrolled, how long a course this is, and again, the mandate of this particular program?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, 18 students enrolled for a 15-month program.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I'd ask the Minister, who's in charge of that program?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Bonnie Griffiths.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, who's involved in helping co-ordinate the program? Is there a person by the name of Donna Morrison involved at all in the co-ordination of that program?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: She was the co-ordinator of the program previously and has resigned.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, is Donna Morrison the wife of the Minister's Assistant Deputy Minister, Dr. Terry Morrison?

Mr. Chairman, this was a new program. I ask the Minister how this program came into being? Did the Minister herself develop the program? If so, was it an open competition to bring forward the people who would then be eligible to co-ordinate the program? If so, how many people applied to head it up?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Usually the programs don't come from me, don't come from my office or usually the

Department of Education. Most of them come from the field, from the community. In cases like this, it would be the Age and Opportunity Centre, Clinic, the Mount Carmel Clinic, Health Action Committee all indicated that we needed services for the elderly, and training for services for the elderly. In fact, I would have to say that this has been identified as probably one of the top priorities of, in terms of, I suppose, Health and Education for training needs because we have an increasing elderly population and both Health and Education Departments are trying to identify new ways to provide support and help to them. So the gerontology workers is one of the top priority needs, I would say, as identified by anybody working out in the community with the aging.

We had a number of people who were interviewed. The interviewing and the hiring is done completely by the agency and by the staff, where they hire the people who are most experienced and most qualified to handle those particular programs. When they are getting co-ordinators for a variety of programs, they are usually people who are well experienced and very credible in their field. I would say as long as they meet those criteria, they are open for consideration. There were a number of people interviewed and her qualifications - she was the most qualified and considered by those doing the hiring - and once again I say it was not me or even in consultation or discussion with me, they hired the person that was the most capable and the most able for the job.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, let the record show that I have no quarrel with the program and its intent, so the Minister doesn't have to, in response to my question, make it appear as if I'm criticizing the program, I'm not.

I guess I'm suspicious, first of all, as to who the agency and staff were that selected the individual to head up the department. The Minister says it wasn't herself and yet, Mr. Chairman, as the Minister knows, it's one of those areas that falls totally under, completely under the responsibility of her Assistant Deputy Minister. I find it passing strange that this major program development would be headed by an individual who would be the wife of the Assistant Deputy Minister. I'm wondering if the Minister herself was aware of this. Secondly, can she tell us who the agency and staff were that selected the most qualified person?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: The selection is done usually by the same people when they're looking at directors of new programs. It would have been Dennis Macknak, who was the director of the program, and the assistant director. They would be consulting with the agencies that they're doing the training for. In other words, when we do the training we usually have agreement by - in this case it would be community agencies - that they want to employ, that once these people are trained that there are employment opportunities.

The hiring of that person would have been done in consultation and discussion with the agencies that I mentioned, Age and Opportunity Centre and other agencies like that. In fact, it's my understanding that when they were doing the interviewing and making the selection this person was highly recommended by the agencies that were consulted.

I guess I just feel I have to make the point again that, you know, I'm sometimes surprised at the depths to which the Member for Morris takes his suspicion, because he's suspicious about so many things and worried about so many things. I cannot see any reason why - and we'll put it clearly - the wife of any of the people sitting here in front of me, who are employed in administrative positions in my department, would be precluded from applying in an open competition for a job for which they were highly qualified, and perhaps the most qualified, and being given consideration for that job in an open competition where the decisions that are made are removed from the direct relationship with the other individuals.

No, I didn't know they were hiring her; they don't either talk to me or ask me because I don't get involved in that. The hiring of directors of programs is done by the agency and it's their job to select the best people, and the selection is done by identifying people that are credible in the field, not people that they just pick out of a hat, but people who have the educational background, first of all, is important. But, even more important, would be the work experience and the credibility in the field. If she came through on all of those counts as being the top person, and I'm told she did, then I cannot imagine why she would be precluded from having the opportunity of filling that position. It is sort of a reverse discrimination.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not trying to discriminate against any person. There are two points, firstly, we realize that in today's world more and more people are working for governments, and obviously the opportunities for situations where close relatives, indeed husband and wife, any combination, close people working in the same department, exists. But just for the very same reason, Mr. Chairman, that people in public life are held under some suspicion if, indeed, someone very close to them ends up within their department. For instance, if the Minister's daughter or son ended up being employed within the Department of Education, within some of the areas - not as a teacher - then, Mr. Chairman, there is obviously some suspicion. This case isn't an awful lot different, that's the point I'm trying to make.

The reality, Mr. Chairman, of the situation is that we have a case where an individual was hired who is wife to an Assistant Deputy Minister. I asked the Minister if she was aware of the situation; she claims that she was not. She told me that a director and staff were the people involved in determining who would be hired. I guess I could ask her who that individual ultimately is responsible to, and I'm sure, very quickly she would have to indicate that it's the Assistant Deputy Minister.

That's the point I'm trying to make, Mr. Chairman. I'm not trying to mud-rake Mr. Morrison or, indeed, Mrs. Morrison. The point is, I'm asking the Minister whether she's been apprised of this, because obviously if she isn't going to make it public, then yes, news reports will come out that will spell it out and people like myself will ask questions which are very legitimate. That's my purpose for asking them.

I feel it's my duty to ask the Minister that and I'll accept her response.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I think I've given a fairly full response and I don't feel any differently listening to

the additional points made by the Member for Morris. I did indicate that I wasn't aware, I wasn't notified, there was no discussion with me. They were following the normal process for the hiring of directors of programs. As long as it was done in a manner that was handled through an open competition with consultation with the community and recognition and identification of the best person, then I don't think I have any quarrel with it, in fact, the reverse. If it ended up that you really lost a top-notch person, I think it would be a sad day for the program.

I believe that this was handled in a very open way, through normal competition process, done by the assistants and the director of the agency, and that it was done according to their own, both procedures and criteria, and the person that they hired was the best person for the job. I can accept that.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Chairman, what isn't at question here is whether the person hired was the best for the job or not. I'm not interested in that particular area. What is of concern is in situations like this people usually declare whether there might be a potential conflict of interest. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, those of us who sit in this House had to fill out envelopes here just a while ago to state where there may be potential conflict of interest. The Minister said she had no knowledge of that. Obviously, somebody within her department decided that they did not need to tell the Minister that potentially there might be a conflict of interest, perceived or otherwise. That's the point, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(k)(1)—pass; 5.(k)(2)—pass; 5.(k)(3)—pass; 5.(k)(4)—pass.

5.(m) Co-operative Training Programs: (1) Salaries - the Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Chairman, maybe the Minister can tell me whether this is a new item or whether there is just a new title. Last year, I believe, it was called Interprovincial Training Agreements, it's now called Cooperative Training Programs. Are we talking about the same program, Mr. Chairman?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we are talking about the same program. This section had the Interprovincial Training Agreements under it and it also includes the Manitoba Technical Training Centre; the Adult Training Component of the South Winnipeg Vocational Education Centre and the Interprovincial Training Agreements - they're all under this category. Oh, and one more - our International Education section that I announced last year when we announced the contract with Kenya, that's under this section, too.

MR. C. MANNESS: Is any portion of this, Expenditure? Does the increase in expenditure go to cover the shortfall associated with the South Winnipeg Vocational Centre in its building stages.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: —(Interjection) — No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Chairman, I'll laugh along too because I guess there are so many programs that I

don't really understand totally where they all fit into place. The Minister said some significant portion of the increase was because of the new school there and it's specifically within the program. Can the Minister be more specific as to what portion of it is being directed and the purposes to the South Winnipeg Vocational School?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: It doesn't cover the regular facility or the regular school program. It covers the adult education component that we negotiated with the Federal Government and it includes \$500,000 that is only directed towards operating costs of the adult section of South Winnipeg Vocational and has nothing to do with the other components.

MR. C. MANNESS: I thank the Minister for that answer. I understand that because of the shortfall or overruns that have been allocated - any way you want to consider it, I suppose - at that school there will be some major curtailment in the courses offered in the fall of '85. Can the Minister tell me whether that will have any impact on the programs that are covered under allocation (m)?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, there isn't any effect on the Adult Training Program. In fact, they're oversubscribed. The portion that we're talking about now is the Adult Training Program and they're oversubscribed and we're not expecting at all to have reduced numbers or reduced programs.

MR. C. MANNESS: The Minister last year made reference to interprovincial training agreements, can the Minister indicate within the college setting whether there are any other programs that now come under this agreement? Have there been found any other areas where the community colleges across Western Canada can expedite some economies by locating centrally one college that will handle the students from three or four provinces?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, to date, the programs that we have undertaken are the same that we had previously, for veterinary medicine, optometry, surveying engineering, visually impaired program and the hearing impaired program. I understand that we're presently in the process of looking at a dental therapy program that is just being negotiated now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(m)(1)—pass; 5.(m)(2)—pass.

5.(n) Continuing Education Programs - Post-Secondary Career Development: (1) Salaries - the Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Chairman, I have in front of me the News Release dated April 25th, where the Minister announced a special engineering studies for Native students. Can the Minister give me some greater detail on this new policy of hers, and can she indicate whether the program will be extended to visible minorities within the province?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, this program is not being delivered by me, although it was a joint announcement. It's through the University of Manitoba

and it's under Limestone Training Program, but it is to train Native people, 15, I think in the first year. It's going to be a five-year program where they take four years of engineering in a five-year period and we start with a student enrolment of 15 and then increase it by - we go 30, 45, increase the enrolment by 15 each year for the term of the program.

MR. C. MANNES: The press release indicates that 15 will be admitted every two years beginning this September and a total of 60 students will participate, meaning it's a four-year time by which all students will enter and five years after that, so it's roughly a nine-year program before termination. Can the Minister tell me - well, this press release says students will be actively recruited and selected on the basis of financial need and the likelihood of success in the program.

I can understand the likelihood of success in the program. That makes reference of course to academic qualifications and the ability to be able to cope with the program. I don't understand how students will be selected on the basis of financial need. Is the Minister saying that those individuals who are the most destitute, by some measurement, are the ones that will be admitted, even in situations where students may have a higher academic qualification or standing?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, it certainly would be a combination of those factors, but this program would be categorized as one of our access programs. It's an expansion of our access programs and therefore the purpose of the programs is for both high need students and people who do not normally have access through the traditional institutions, so if they can afford it and if they're in a situation where they can go to the University of Manitoba and get their engineering training, they would not qualify for this program.

This program is to give accessibility to target populations and groups of people who don't normally either have access or who haven't had the traditional educational background which is why they require the additional year and the prepatory year that we usually build into these programs and why they need the financial support that goes along with this program. It's to give access. It's the same thing as our BUNTEP Programs where we've trained 500 Native teachers who never would have been trained, never would have become teachers if all they had was the traditional institutions; the same for our social workers, the same for our nurses, so the engineers is just one more access program. It's an affirmative action program for high need students.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I'm not questioning that there aren't a large number of people in our society, many of them students who have needs and then when we superimpose upon that the Native proportion of our population I have no difficulty with what is being attempted to be done here. I'm just very concerned about one of the selection criteria being the basis of financial need.

Now, what the Minister is saying is that that will be used as a criteria, so I want to know where the break line is. If a Native, for instance, has a bank account, a student has a bank account of \$200 in it or if the

individual, man or woman, has parents who own a car or a truck, clear title, are they disqualified, or has a job, parents who have a job, are they disqualified, in spite of the fact that their academic standing and their qualifications, scholastically, may be superior to somebody else? It doesn't make any sense to me.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, there isn't any hard and fast breaking point that says now you're in and when you dip below this figure you're out, but most of the people who are going into the program will be people who are either unemployed, they may be on welfare, they may live in remote areas where they don't have enough money and can't afford to come down for training and the high costs of training in an urban setting, so there's a variety of reasons. What they would be doing is looking at the high-need students, I think first, and it's a combination. It's only one factor so it has to be remembered that when they're looking at it, they spend a lot of time assessing and screening and counselling people who are thinking of going into their programs.

I think the success rate and the retention rate we have in these programs is a very good indicator that they do a very good job of selection in general in all of our programs, a very good job of selection, and they're not just looking at who is the poorest or who has the least money, they're looking at need because it's an access program and they're looking at interest and ability and all of the things that they measure that give them the information and feeling that these people are interested in the program and can make it. Then the other important element, of course, once they've done that, is the support that goes into these students because if there's one thing we've learned with the access programs is the difference between success and getting through them and not being successful, is often the support that is given to the student that it would be considered extraordinary support in terms of other traditional programs. That is a definite requirement of retention and success of the programs.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, nowhere in the press release does it indicate that it's an access program as such, but I accept the Minister's word. The press release does say though that the Manitoba Jobs Fund will provide \$3.75 million to finance the program for an initial eight-year period.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this indicates that \$3.75 million will be used to educate a total of 60 students, that's roughly \$600,000 a student. Can the Minister tell me - I'm wrong, Mr. Chairman, that's \$60,000 a student - can the Minister tell me whether the Manitoba Jobs Fund will be paying this sum directly to the University of Manitoba or will it be going to the students directly?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, 65 percent of the money goes directly to the students for their support - we have the support program as built into our access programs - and the other thing is, that the money is granted to the University and they provide it to the students but 65 percent of it goes directly to the students; and out of the additional percentage that is left, the costs of educating that student compares to other - I keep calling them traditional programs for the

want of having another description - so the increased costs are the increased cost of all of our access programs where we build in support while they're taking the training.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I'm trying to do some arithmetic in my mind and I may be wrong, but the Minister is saying that roughly two-thirds of the \$60,000 that each student will have in support of that program, which would be \$40,000, that would go directly to the student over four or five years, so that's \$8,000 a year; but tuition and direct university expenses, I take it, have been paid out of that, or is tuition to be met by the student?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Tuition and living costs, Mr. Chairman, some living costs.

MR. C. MANNES: Will it have been covered by the university in their one-third share, or still has to be met by the student with his two-thirds share?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: . . . grant made to the university and then distributed to the student.

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

Resolution No. 51: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$59,397,200 for Education, Post-Secondary, Adult and Continuing Education, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

Item 6. Universities Grants Commission, (a) Salaries - the Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister tell me what the percent increase was in grants to universities and can she tell me whether each of our three universities in Manitoba received the same percentage increase?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, they received roughly the same increase, 2.1 percent.

MR. C. MANNES: I was wondering if the Minister can tell me from her perspective, what she sees happening at the universities. I know the Minister had her staff, indeed many of her colleagues and many of us on this side of the House were in attendance at the University Day of Concerns, the University of Manitoba and the University of Brandon, where the university community was attempting to make the case that funding had been restricted to a point where quality is certainly beginning to fall.

In the case of the University of Manitoba I know we were all given the tour to look at some of the facilities and some of the buildings, most likely those areas of the buildings which needed the greatest repair, and I acknowledge that, Mr. Chairman. But I'm interested in knowing where the Minister sees universities in general in Manitoba going over the next few years. We know that they're tied into a system where there is not much flexibility with respect to tenured professors. We know that the government, in the past at least, this government, has put in place tuition freezes and has

restricted the opportunity to increase revenues from that source. I don't believe the Minister has put a restriction in this year; maybe she has. I have been looking for it and I haven't been able to uncover it.

Furthermore, we have a situation where faculties, General Sciences last year, has imposed an enrolment limit and I want to know whether the Minister believes that the administration at the universities has the tools within its means to begin to grapple with some of these very real problems.

I am fully cognizant of the difficulty the Minister has in going before Cabinet and wrestling out larger amounts of money in support of all areas of education, but nevertheless it seems to me that universities are really not only struggling but are tied, and really are in some respects powerless to help their own situation. It's a little bit different than school divisions where the Minister still holds out some - or at least challenges school divisions that want to increase spending to go to their own ratepayers by way of a taxation vehicle that is open to them. Universities don't have that opportunity.

I would like the Minister to put on the record her views as to where she sees universities heading and proceeding over the next number of years with these restraints in place?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: It's a very broad question; I'll try and summarize my feelings about the universities and the role of universities.

I think the Member for Morris is not just making the question in isolation but is trying to tie it into what he is suggesting are limited resources and lack of sufficient funding, I suppose, going to the institutions. He relates it to attending the Universities Day of Concern and the information that was presented there that they were having a difficult time maintaining programs and maintaining equipment and the institution with the existing money.

So I think I'll try and relate what I'm saying about the universities to the level of funding and support in a number of areas, and I'm sure he'll understand why I do that.

First of all, the Day of Concern was done for two reasons, and it was done certainly to raise public awareness and understanding about the university's role and what it does, because there is a feeling by universities, and by I think all of us that there isn't enough public understanding about universities and what they do. I think the university community feels that the public at large isn't maybe as sympathetic to increased funding for universities as they may be for public schools and other institutions, who they feel a little bit closer to. I know they feel that way because they've discussed that with me and I know that one of the purposes of the Day of Concern was to improve I guess both the knowledge and information and support of the public for funding and improved funding to the universities.

Also, it was held at a very convenient time, and I don't fault them for this, but when the day was held, it was prior to the decision on the level of funding - and I don't want to demean it by calling it a tactic - but it was a very good thing to do at that particular time because they were able to raise the subject and

raise it publicly by focusing and having that Day of Concern.

So one of the purposes - they're all legitimate, I don't even say that any of their purposes were not acceptable - was to get information and a better understanding in the public and the other was pressure on the government to get support and to make their case as clearly as they could and publicly.

This government has done, I think - and I stand on record as saying - more than almost any other government has in terms of their support, not just verbally but financially, for our post-secondary institutions, including our universities. I will go so far as to say even this year when they got 2 percent and they were certainly hoping for more; they got the same amount as the public school system did. But you have to look at the funding that was given overall and we knew that we were heading into limited resources and that it was going to be difficult, and what did we do in the first couple of years we took office, Mr. Chairman? We gave them a 16 percent increase in the first year; a 10.9 percent increase the following year. In the second year, we took their miscellaneous capital, which is the money they use to replace their equipment and to help them maintain facilities, which they had said had been frozen at \$3 million for I don't know how many years, and that their equipment was badly deteriorating, which is a serious issue for a training or an educational institution. We increased it in the first year from \$3 million to \$5 million. I mean, a \$2 million, I think it was a 66 percent increase, in a one-year period, to give them an additional shot in the arm for upgrading their equipment and renovating their facilities.

We have kept tuition low because - if we could and we had the money, I suppose the feelings and the philosophy of this government is we would like to not have any tuition, but the reality is that we're not able to do that. But we have attempted to keep it as low as possible and we've done that in a number of ways. The first way we did it was that one year we paid the tuition. We didn't just freeze tuition; we paid the tuition for the students of Manitoba. It cost us a million dollars out of our pocket and we did that to keep the tuition low. On the other years, we have indicated what we think is an appropriate level, and last year they got 9.5 percent increase, so they have a revenue-raising capacity that covers about 12 percent of their costs, of the cost of the education in an institution, between the three institutions, that a lot of other people don't have.

It's important that the universities are able to do a number of things. One is that they have to maintain the existing programs, I think the broad-based programs, the liberal arts, I think that those are very important programs. They have to maintain equipment and facilities, and at the same time they have to move into new technologies and new programs, because if anybody has to keep pace with changing times and changing knowledge and information, it has to be our universities and our post-secondary - in fact, all of our educational institutions. So we're caught in a time when money is tight and we haven't got as much for any sector, including the education sector that we would like to have, and one of the things that we did that no other province did is that we gave our universities and our colleges access to the skills growth money. That

was \$2.5 million in a year, and each university received a program which was a top priority program for them. And this allowed them not just to maintain programs, but years had gone by where they had no approval for new programs, and I must say, Mr. Chairman, at a time when money was a lot freer and more available than it is and has been for the last few years. The University of Manitoba got a \$1.2 million Microcomputer Program; the University of Brandon got a \$750,000 Distance Education Program; and the University of Winnipeg got a .5 million Child Care Program.

So we made every effort, although our resources were limited, to give our universities access to a block of money that would allow them to move into their top priority new program areas through the Skills Growth Fund. We have put \$30 million into capital. I mean we're not a government that, when money gets tight, we freeze capital construction, like you did.

You know what do we do? We say that we want to keep building to improve the institutions and, over the term that we have been in, we have approved \$30 million in capital construction for the three universities, where each university received the top priority capital facility, ranging from - I don't know - \$8 million or \$9 million up to \$15 million for the various projects, and we can list them; I don't want to go into that detail. I just want to say that we've moved on capital construction that's important to the university, important to the construction and the business industry, and important to jobs. It's one of the reasons why we continue to do this.

Now to try and summarize the point I am making. The universities are important, they have been given, not only their fair share, but if you look at what we've given them overall, I think that we have actually done a better job of funding the universities than they did when they were in office over the same period of time. You didn't have cutbacks in payments; you didn't have the economy at the same level that it is today, so that we've maintained a very good level of funding.

We've done everything we could to improve the quality of the equipment and the facilities; to move in technology; to move in new programs; to build new facilities for them and, at the same time, to keep our Student Aid Program open to all students who are eligible, no ceiling and no cap on student aid, which is important to accessibility for our universities. We've done all this with limited resources, which to me says that we think our post-secondary programs are important; universities are important, they play a special role. Over the life of the three or four year period, we have moved on all fronts to improve their facilities; to improve their equipment; to expand their programs; to maintain low tuition and I think that it's a record in which we can be proud.

So in terms of where they're going, they're going to have to - and I'll just touch on this a bit. We cannot continue to expand in all universities in all areas. One of the things we've been discussing with the universities, when new programs come up, and they often all want to deliver the same program - I mean we had them all wanting to offer nursing programs now or expand nursing programs, because we know the nursing programs are an area that we're going to have to expand into. They are now looking at the immigrant population and looking at developing programs there.

What we have said is that you can't all expand and develop and have the same programs; that we're going to have to look to see which university should and can deliver best which programs, and there's going to have to be more co-operative programming between the universities.

When we're looking at nursing programs, they all have a proposal on our desk. We're telling them that they are going to probably have to agree to develop a co-operative nursing program in order to get approval, because we just don't have the money to have separate programs at each of the universities.

They're all unique. The University of Winnipeg plays a special role in terms of a university in an urban setting, servicing an inner city population; Brandon plays a unique role, it's highly recognized as having one of the best music programs in the country, and that's one of their specialty and highly recognized areas; the University of Manitoba, of course, is in its graduate studies and medicine, so that they're each carving out their own area of expertise and I think it's important that they do that.

Other than saying I'd have liked 4 percent or 5 percent this year, every sector would have liked more, I can't think of a way that overall we could have done a better job of giving direction and support to our universities than we have done in the last four years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, educational funding seems to have declined as a priority of this government, in that when they took over the amount of money being spent on Education, totally, represented 20.3 percent of the Budget; whereas, today, it represents only 18.3 percent of the Budget. So that the amount of money that this government devotes as a proportion of their overall spending to education has declined, and that would certainly indicate that there's a lessening priority on the part of this Minister and the government being given to education.

It would seem also to be perhaps even more so with respect to universities. The Minister gave some figures, she gave 16 percent increase for the first year; a 10.9 percent increase for the second year; and she didn't give a figure for the third year, but I understand it might be 3 percent; and 2.1 percent this year, for an overall increase in funding to universities of 32 percent, at a time that the government's own spending was increasing at a rate of 48 percent, over 48 percent; but yet university funding has only gone up by 32 percent. That certainly doesn't indicate a high priority, although I realize there may be some additional funding outside of that for buildings through the Jobs Fund, things that may or may not fit completely with the priorities of the university; they may fit more with the priorities of the government.

Mr. Chairman, the overall educational funding for the province under this Minister has risen by 34.2 percent, only slightly more than what the universities are getting, at a time that the government's overall spending is going up by 48.8 percent. So maybe the Minister can comment on that as to why the educational funding is getting a lesser priority than it had before; and I would like to know whether she is concerned by the fact that

the established programs funding has risen by 48.3 percent, from 1981-82 until this year; whereas the funding for the Education Department, in total, is up by 34.2 percent, and for the universities, is up by 32 percent. So that the money the Federal Government is transferring to the province for established programs financing has gone up a great deal faster than has the amount of money that the Minister has been able to put into Education.

So I would like to hear some comment from her on those two items, and perhaps she could also comment on whether she does in fact see that some portion that established programs financing money is really intended for post-secondary education, or whether she and the government now see it simply as money that goes into general revenue and it's used for whatever purposes the government sees fit.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I find it interesting that the Member for Turtle Mountain is raising the question of the priority that has been given to education funding by this government, when we are facing what is recognized across the country as a very difficult economic period that all governments are struggling with and all governments are handling in very different ways; and many of the governments and many of the educational departments and Ministers have major cutbacks in program.

The difference between how we're handling it, in terms of trying to provide enough money to maintain our programs, maintain our staffing, maintain our institutions and the way other provinces are handling it, where they've got layoffs of 2,000 teachers, they're closing down institutions, they're eliminating programs, the damage that they're doing is going to be felt for a decade to come, long after the economy has improved and we've taken the opposite position.

I think the point I want to make is that I find it difficult, when you look just at university funding - and he's talking about our first year at 16 percent and 10 percent and, yes, it's right, the year after was 3 percent and the year after was 2.1 percent - one of the reasons we gave the bigger increases in those first couple of years is that because we knew there would be a differential, a range. We could have given less, but we did it because we wanted to put more money into their base and by giving those big increases in those first two years, that money was in their base and the increase was received every year after that, so we know that we helped them over a difficult period by giving up front a larger increase.

But what did you do in your first year? I mean, 2.2 percent, you know, 2.2 percent, and at a time when the economy was much better, when you didn't have cutbacks in transfer of payments, you weren't losing money, the economy in general was better, the inflation rate was better, you gave 2.2 percent.

The following year you gave 5.9 percent; the following year after that you gave 8 percent; and then in the year before the election you loosened up the purse strings. You put a large amount of money into the public education sector, into the Educational Support Program, having given them very small increases previously too and increased to 13.4 in the universities.

When you add it all up over the period of the four years, this government has provided an average of 40

percent more per year in operating grants than the previous administration, so you have to look at what has been given overall. The fact that we've maintained this during this difficult, limited resource period is a clear indication of this government's priority for education and we don't, as a government, and I don't, as an Education Minister, have to apologize, I think, to anybody for the level of funding we've been giving. In fact, the educational institutions themselves and the education community not only thinks, but knows, that this government has provided a better level of funding and compares very favourably across the country and to some other provinces compares extremely favourably.

You have to look at all the money that has been put in and you did make mention of that, but \$30 million in capital isn't a minor factor. It's important to the educational institutions, it's important to our economy, it's important to the construction industry and it's important to jobs. Miscellaneous capital is not included in that; capital is not included in that, the \$30 million, and the Skills Growth is not included in that.

When you look at the public school side, what have we done this year? We have doubled, we have accelerated and more than doubled our Capital Construction Program for schools and if you don't think that affects the quality of education, I suggest you visit some inner city schools that were inadequate for an education program 40 or 50 years ago when the parents were going to school that have not been touched and are still in exactly the same situation as they were 40, 50, 60 years ago. So that's a major amount of money. It's a major, not only an increase, but it's a commitment to the education system, to the quality of education by saying that we want to improve and upgrade the schools across our province to the same reasonable level; and it's so important that we're willing to more than double the money we're putting in a one-year period.

At the same time we recognize that by doing this during a difficult economic period, we are going to improve construction, we are going to improve jobs, we are going to improve business and suppliers' ability to tie into this major construction program.

So when you look at everything we've done, program, capital facilities, miscellaneous capital, the construction costs, lowering tuition, it doesn't matter what arena you look into, this government has done a great job.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Our theme song, "How Great You Are".

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, the Minister didn't address a couple of the questions that I had asked her, she got so carried away, but the fact of the matter is that the government now devotes a smaller percentage of its spending to education than it did when they took over and that's the government's right to establish those kind of priorities. But the Minister of Education is certainly being asked to provide a greater restraint within her area of responsibility than many other areas of the Provincial Government spending, because other areas are rising much faster than her area. Her area has risen by 34.2 percent, while the entire government spending has gone up by 48.8, which is really quite a substantial difference.

There still is the fact that the established programs' financing has gone up by over 48 percent and I still

would like some explanation from the Minister of what's happened there, whether she simply regards money that comes to the province through established programs' financing that is for general revenue.

A MEMBER: We've dealt with that.

MR. B. RANSOM: We have not dealt with it. The Minister of Finance, who doesn't trust the Minister of Education to answer any questions, hovers around all night waiting for me to ask a question so that he can jump in. Well, the Minister has been telling us now when we first raised the issue, that it wasn't the appropriate place to deal with it, that it dealt with post-secondary education and universities. When we got to post-secondary education, she said that wasn't the place to deal with it, we'd deal with in universities. Now we're at universities, and irrespective of what position the Minister of Finance might want to take, I'd like to ask the Minister of Education the question, how she sees the division of money.

I know how the Minister of finance would see it and how he would want to treat it, but I want to know how the Minister of Education would see it, whether she recognizes that money as having any kind of constraints upon it as to how it would be expended or whether she sees it as money that goes into general revenue and it would be of no more significance to education than the money that comes from equalization programs, or the money that comes from sales tax, or personal income tax, or any other revenue that the province might have.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, yes, I do realize it. We kept saying it wasn't an appropriate time, it wasn't an appropriate time; and I suppose at this point I am still willing to give some answers, but in very general terms. I don't think this department is the appropriate time to go into detailed statistics and information about the EPF. But to the general questions, yes, I'm prepared to answer them.

I think we have to look at the whole picture and the government is never in a position where they can only just look at one part of it. When you look at all the federal sources of revenue - all the federal sources of revenue - we're only up \$2.3 million over 1985 when you put everything in together. It doesn't matter which way you look at our expenditures since 1981, Health and Education have substantially exceeded the Federal Government's contributions.

Yes I do believe that Education is entitled to its fair share, and I say that as clearly and loudly as I can, as the Minister of Finance knows — (Interjection) — we say it together. What I expect to be able to argue is that with the money that is available, to do all the things that have to be done - and you must remember too that this government takes a more pro-active stance during a difficult economy where we have things like the Jobs Fund and where we do things that will stimulate the economy and do not take a passive role and just leave the people to get through it as best they can - so we have to look at the overall requirements for the government priority programs.

In that I think government education is important, should be given a priority, and should get its share;

and what I've been trying to say tonight in talking to both public education and universities is, that when you look at the level of funding overall for the three- or four-year period and in all the areas, there are other programs where we're putting money into that we didn't even mention that are coming through the core. It's the 1.3 program that's got \$1.3 million in it.

There are other things, the access programs with about \$9 million where we're one of the only provinces in the country that have these kinds of programs. It doesn't matter which way you look at it, whether it's building programs, maintenance of staff, we come out maintaining and expanding. I mean not only are we maintaining our system, and I said I thought we could do it with 2 percent - I didn't say it wouldn't be tough on us and wouldn't be tough on school divisions - but I said I thought we could maintain our education system and not have layoffs; have existing programs and existing staff maintained, and they were able to do that. We together, school boards and the Department of Education were able to do that.

In our case with colleges, we have put more money into colleges and I think it's up to about 6.8 percent, and that's because in this year we have identified colleges as being a top priority for the expansion and delivery of programs in high-skilled training areas, because of the potential employment and because of the high demands in that area. So we've been willing to put additional money into the top priority areas.

I continue to say that overall I think Education has not only not fared badly, I don't think you'd find the education community at any level, when they talked about the level of support and funding in all levels, would not say, honestly, that the Department of Education and this government has been fair and has done a good job of providing funds to maintain the quality of education in Manitoba.

MR. B. RANSOM: Well, maybe if I study that answer, Mr. Chairman, I might find a response to the question that I asked. There was a great deal of additional information as well. But perhaps it would be more indicative of where the Department of Education stands if the Minister would tell me whether or not she will have some input into the negotiations for the new Fiscal Arrangements Act, which I assume will be coming into place April 1st, 1986. Is her department having some involvement in the negotiations there, and, if so, who is involved?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, certainly I will, Mr. Chairman, and have had discussions of consultation, as does every member of Cabinet. I think this is a very important area for government, and not one that one department, even albeit the Department of Finance, would go off on their own without consultation and full discussion of all of Cabinet. Certainly the Minister of Health and the Minister of Education are very directly involved and would be involved, as is our staff, in the discussions and the negotiations.

MR. B. RANSOM: Will the Minister be involved to a greater extent than her other Cabinet colleagues, given that some of these funds are intended to go towards post-secondary education; whether or not they agree

with the Federal Government on what proportion of the funding is supposed to go to post-secondary education?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: The discussions that I'd be more involved than other Cabinet colleagues, I suppose that is a possibility. We usually make the determination at the Cabinet table about who is going to both lead and be involved in negotiations and discussions. It's quite possible that we may decide that I may be more involved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, the Minister seems to be indicating by her answers that from her point of view there are no problems of significance at the universities; that in fact the quality of education is being maintained, although under some considerable pressure. I think the Minister grants that point.

She did not address my concern or my comment, that is, with respect to whether universities have sufficient flexibility to continue to deal with the greater demands that are being placed upon it, by increasing numbers of students, although the Minister may want to make comment upon the statistics with respect to enrolment numbers.

But the point being, Mr. Chairman, the Minister seems to be different than most other commentators; Jack Dickson, in a special to the Free Press, November 1984, says, "Universities must set right priorities." It seems like everybody is commenting on universities and their futures these days.

An article Roy Romano wrote in the Policy Review, a major article with respect to universities, where he saw their direction in the future and the difficult decisions that the community as a whole would have to make with respect to their future. And Peter Newman writes an article on universities. Of course in this article he's reviewing the Bovey Commission and some of its remarks. John Graham in the Policy Option says, "The mess universities are in."

So, Mr. Chairman, in spite of what publication it is that you pick up today, you can hardly pick up one that doesn't make reference to the difficulties that universities are in. Of course, too often the periodicals or the books, or the - what's the word I'm looking for - statements in question try to bring in everything. They try to address tuition fees, try to address the maintenance of the university autonomy, try to address the fact that there is very little flexibility in the present university systems. I'm generalizing across the nation but, in spite of it all, everybody agrees there are some major problems in universities. The Minister seems not to concur with that, Mr. Chairman.

When I brought up the subject tonight, I asked her to tell me where she saw our universities going. I didn't ask for a regurgitation of how, in her view, her government has done so much to support universities. I asked very honestly for the Minister to lay on the record, first of all, where she sees universities going over the next number of years, taking into account the very specific set of circumstances that universities find themselves.

I'm generalizing, the Minister takes the question as one that is being critical of the **government's support**

to universities. I'd like to broaden the discussion a little bit and see whether she feels that they have any problems at all and, if they do, what she sees as solutions to them?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Certainly, Mr. Chairman, I didn't intend to indicate that the universities don't have any problems, or that any of our educational institutions aren't struggling today or having some problems, both in terms of maintaining programs with limited resources, which is a problem they're all facing, and in terms of making decisions based on the increasing demands and stresses that are coming on the institutions from a wide variety of places with a wide variety of different opinions about what it is they should be doing.

The universities are facing that, perhaps more now than they have before. You could take any given year, is my guess, and you could go back a decade or more, and you could find articles like that, that were written by people, if not by those people, written by other people that make some of the same points about what are their universities doing and what problems are they having. This is an unending debate and discussion. I don't mean by that to suggest that there aren't legitimate points being made and legitimate problems that are there, but this isn't new. We don't have articles being written about the problem of universities and what is their role; all of a sudden it's an ongoing debate that's carried on all the time.

One of the big problems they're having is the - and I don't disagree with a lot of points that were made - I think you quoted somebody who said universities have to set their priorities. That's what we said to them, you have to set your priorities, but not just in isolation of your institution; the priorities have to be set for the province as a whole, and we have to take into consideration where programs will be delivered.

The debate that's going on is a debate that's going on across the country, and I must say, when you raised the question that they don't have enough flexibility, or do they have enough flexibility, that the debate is a much more serious debate in other provinces in terms of willingness, and what I sense to be a growing willingness, because I sit at the table of the Council of Ministers, with Ministers from across the country, a growing willingness to - I don't know what you want to call it - interfere, intervene, start giving some more direct control to the universities and take away whatever flexibility and options and priority setting they have for themselves, because there is some concern about where they're going.

We're not moving in that direction at all, where we're thinking of intervening or taking over, but we are trying to give clearer messages about some of the issues that are facing them.

One of the problems that they're facing is the question of training the broad general education and the liberal arts, as opposed to the increasing demand for all post-secondary institutions to train for jobs. That's something that they're going to have to balance. I don't think, and my comments were they shouldn't move into just delivering programs for the purpose of training a person to do a job, because jobs are going to change so much in the next 10 or 20 years, information is going to change so much that the narrower the training, the more we are closing doors to people.

What I think we have to do - and this is directly to his question, I think I'm finally getting to his point - he asked what I saw the universities in the future doing. I see them not moving into a highly specialized, narrow educational system where they train people and educate them with certain skills for a job. Although they have to do some of that, the education and the things they train them for must do the best they can to prepare them for jobs, but not only jobs. I think that they have to continue with a broad based education that teaches them exactly what we talked about in the public schools, analytical thinking and understanding of the requirement to continue learning and developing all of their life, the ability to gain knowledge and to develop skills outside of the educational institution, so they can make the changes that are going to be required for the jobs that they're going to have down the road that they may not even be able to either predict or imagine. They certainly cannot be given all the information to prepare for them.

My feeling is give them a broad understanding, broad information, broad general understanding in a way that doesn't close any doors to them, and then give them the ability to get the specific skills and information they need for specific jobs.

So that's one of the things they're going to be facing - the question of accessibility. I think that our traditional institutions have to face the reality that our access programs have proven that a lot of people were kept out of post-secondary education, not because of their intellect or their ability, but because doors were closed because of our regulations and our requirements that presumed that they couldn't handle post-secondary education. Those institutions are going to have to adapt to that because we can't keep delivering them outside. I think they're going to have to make changes inside that open doors and that change some of the requirements that in some ways keep out people that are going to be excellent teachers, excellent nurses, excellent social workers, through the training programs they have had outside of the traditional university institutions.

There are problems and there is a lot of change. Just to summarize, I don't think we should go to any extremes. Just because of the pressure and the questions and the debate that is going on, is no time to sort of throw it out and say, now, unemployment is a big problem, jobs are a problem. The job of the universities and the post-secondary institutions is going to be only to train for jobs, to identify jobs and to give people what information they need to do that particular job.

So we have to be careful that we move on the technologies, that we move on the new programs that society is requiring like day care training to meet The Day Care Standards Act, and that we continue to give our students a broad liberal education.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I move committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: The Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Morris, that this House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This House is accordingly adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Wednesday).