



Second Session - Thirty-Fifth Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)**

40 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Denis C. Rocan
Speaker*



VOL. XL No. 40 - 1:30 p.m., THURSDAY, MAY 9, 1991



MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fifth Legislature

LIB - Liberal; ND - New Democrat; PC - Progressive Conservative

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PARTY
ALCOCK, Reg	Osborne	LIB
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	ND
BARRETT, Becky	Wellington	ND
CARR, James	Crescentwood	LIB
CARSTAIRS, Sharon	River Heights	LIB
CERILLI, Marianne	Radisson	ND
CHEEMA, Gulzar	The Maples	LIB
CHOMIAK, Dave	Kildonan	ND
CONNERY, Edward	Portage la Prairie	PC
CUMMINGS, Glen, Hon.	Ste. Rose	PC
DACQUAY, Louise	Seine River	PC
DERKACH, Leonard, Hon.	Roblin-Russell	PC
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	ND
DOER, Gary	Concordia	ND
DOWNEY, James, Hon.	Arthur-Virden	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert, Hon.	Steinbach	PC
DUCHARME, Gerry, Hon.	Riel	PC
EDWARDS, Paul	St. James	LIB
ENNS, Harry, Hon.	Lakeside	PC
ERNST, Jim, Hon.	Charleswood	PC
EVANS, Clif	Interlake	ND
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	ND
FILMON, Gary, Hon.	Tuxedo	PC
FINDLAY, Glen, Hon.	Springfield	PC
FRIESEN, Jean	Wolseley	ND
GAUDRY, Neil	St. Boniface	LIB
GILLESHAMMER, Harold, Hon.	Minnedosa	PC
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	ND
HELWER, Edward R.	Gimli	PC
HICKES, George	Point Douglas	ND
LAMOUREUX, Kevin	Inkster	LIB
LATHLIN, Oscar	The Pas	ND
LAURENDEAU, Marcel	St. Norbert	PC
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	ND
MANNES, Clayton, Hon.	Morris	PC
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	ND
McALPINE, Gerry	Sturgeon Creek	PC
McCRAE, James, Hon.	Brandon West	PC
McINTOSH, Linda, Hon.	Assiniboia	PC
MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.	River East	PC
NEUFELD, Harold, Hon.	Rossmere	PC
ORCHARD, Donald, Hon.	Pembina	PC
PENNER, Jack	Emerson	PC
PLOHMAN, John	Dauphin	ND
PRAZNIK, Darren, Hon.	Lac du Bonnet	PC
REID, Daryl	Transcona	ND
REIMER, Jack	Niakwa	PC
RENDER, Shirley	St. Vital	PC
ROCAN, Denis, Hon.	Gladstone	PC
ROSE, Bob	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Broadway	ND
STEFANSON, Eric, Hon.	Kirkfield Park	PC
STORIE, Jerry	Flin Flon	ND
SVEINSON, Ben	La Verendrye	PC
VODREY, Rosemary	Fort Garry	PC
WASYLYCIA-LEIS, Judy	St. Johns	ND
WOWCHUK, Rosann	Swan River	ND

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, May 9, 1991

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

PRAYERS

Introduction of Guests

Mr. Speaker: Prior to Routine Proceedings, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the Speaker's Gallery, where we have with us today His Excellency Goran Kapetanovic, who is the Ambassador of Yugoslavia.

On behalf of all honourable members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

Also with us this afternoon in the Speaker's Gallery, we have chiefs, councillors and representatives of the following West Region Tribal Council: from the Crane River Band, Gambler Band, Pine Creek Band, Valley River Band, Way Way See Cappo Band, Ebb and Flow Band, Keeseekoowenin Band, Rolling River, Waterhen Band and the President of the West Region Economic Development Corporation.

On behalf of all honourable members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

TABLING OF REPORTS

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship): I have the pleasure of tabling the Supplementary Information for Legislative Review for 1991-92 for the Department of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship, Community Support programs.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern Affairs, responsible for Native Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have a ministerial statement to make, and I have copies for the House.

Mr. Speaker, the statement today is on behalf of myself as minister responsible for Northern and Native Affairs, as well as my colleague the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Mitchelson).

I rise today to speak, Mr. Speaker, about the signing of an agreement earlier today to establish a gaming commission on the reserves that fall under the jurisdiction of the West Regional Tribal Council. Once again, this is an historic agreement. Like The Pas Band, who signed a similar agreement in January of 1990, this agreement will allow the people of the West Region Indian Bands to establish their own Indian gaming commission.

I am pleased we have had such excellent progress on the issue of gaming on Indian reserves. With this agreement, Manitoba is continuing in its leadership role to find answers to challenges that face many provincial governments.

Today's announcement is significant because it represents an agreement with an organization that represents more than one reserve, in fact, representing nine reserves and about 3,600 people.

This agreement has been achieved through a process of practical and constructive negotiation. A provincial negotiating team working under the policy direction of the minister responsible for Lotteries and myself has successfully negotiated this agreement with the chiefs and councils of the West Region Tribal Council. The leadership of these bands is to be commended for demonstrating leadership for their part in the negotiation of an agreement that can serve as a model for future agreements with other Indian bands and tribal councils.

I am proud that the Manitoba government, under the leadership of our Premier (Mr. Filmon), has taken a lead role in the establishment of the concept of gaming commissions on Indian reserves. The issue of gaming on Indian reserves in Canada is frequently a matter of legal conflict between provincial governments and Indian bands that receives considerable attention across the country. It is significant, therefore, that Manitoba was able to achieve this negotiated settlement which can serve as an example for the resolution of this issue. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

* (1335)

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I want to rise

and say that our party supports the agreement that was signed by the government and the bands.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Doer: If people have not had colds before, it has nothing to do with lip syncing, I can assure you.

The very important precedent established by The Pas Band—and we are very proud to have the chief of that band in the New Democratic caucus—the precedent of establishing a co-operative approach to our gaming issues, I think, is not one just to congratulate the governments but also to congratulate the First Nations. There is a strong argument that First Nations, of course, have a tremendous unilateral jurisdiction in this area, and they are not under provincial control and jurisdiction as people, as First Nations that signed treaties with the federal government decades and years ago.

We believe in a comprehensive approach to this issue. We believe that, not only should it be in the area of gaming, but also in issues like justice. We have another proposal on the table today for the Harmony Centre. We are hoping the government will continue on a co-operative, Native self-government approach to corrections, to social services, to gaming, to education, to economic development and, Mr. Speaker, especially in the Constitution, where it is long overdue, that all Canadians recognize the inherent right of Canada's First Nations for self-government and full self-government in our Constitution. We applaud the move today, but it is a very small step on a long journey that we must all travel together.

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (The Maples): I rise today, and I want to applaud the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) and the Premier (Mr. Filmon) for making such a positive step. I think these steps are overdue. We have seen for the last 18 months what has happened during the Meech Lake crisis and the Oka crisis, and finally the people of this country have opened up. It is about time that we should start working and making sure that the Native community of this country is given their rightful place in our society.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is not only the one issue. As the member for Concordia has said, we have to make sure that the other issues which are equally important—and above all the issue of the Constitution where the way the discussions are going, I think it will be again a terrible mistake, I think

it is suicide, not to include the First Nations in that major step.

I want to address one more issue here, which is very important, which the Minister of Health should take as special note, that the health care services for Native people in this country are worse than the Third World countries, and the statistics are very clear. What has been happening as of 1874, various governments have played this game, between the provincial and federal governments, and the issue has been ignored. They are at the bottom of the scale. I think it is about time that we should look towards all the issues and make sure that the issues of self-government—and ultimately make sure that people are given their proper place in our society. Thank you.

* (1340)

TABLING OF REPORTS

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Urban Affairs): I would like to table, Mr. Speaker, the Supplementary Estimates of the Department of Urban Affairs.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Education System Training Programs Funding

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, today the government announced the other shoe in terms of their education programs in the province of Manitoba. They have decimated our public education system since January of this year, since they have had a majority government. What are they doing with the money that they are saving? They are putting it into tax breaks to corporations and other corporate training programs after cutting the public education system.

In the last Estimates, the community college system, post-secondary education system, in this province had a decrease of \$7 million and cutbacks from the Tory government. Today we hear that same money is going to go into corporations in the way of grants and training incentives. In other words, we are taking our public money for training and moving it over to the private sector.

I would ask the Premier: Does he have any documentation at all to justify the cost benefit to Manitobans of privatizing our education system the way this Tory government is, just like Brian Mulroney is in Ottawa?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, the program to which the member is referring is a reduction of payroll tax being paid by corporations who invest that money in educating and training their employees, and retraining their employees, to ensure that they are capable of meeting the challenges of the new opportunities that avail themselves in this decade.

The reality is that, when this member was in a minority government, he supported the systematic reduction of the payroll tax because he recognized that it is a serious disincentive to job creation in this province. In fact, it is a documented destroyer of jobs in this province.

We are having two positive effects out of this initiative. One is that we remove the disincentive to job creation; and, two, we have money in this province invested in educating and training our people. Our human resource capital is the most important investment we can make, and by having corporations making that investment, it saves the taxpayer of Manitoba from having to make that investment. We went both ways, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, the Premier did not answer the question. Does he have any documentation to support his cutback of \$7 million in the public community colleges and redirecting our public money to corporations?

The Premier said that human resource development is key through training and development. We agree with that. God knows, with all the cutbacks that have taken place in our public education system, I think we agree a lot more with his statements than he does in his own actions.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, how can he justify then cutting off all those job opportunities for training in the public community college system, which has a recognized 90 percent success ratio? Where can he show us a 90 percent success ratio for skill training and job opportunities as we had in the community college, which he has decimated?

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, firstly, the member for Concordia is incorrect in his assertion of cutbacks. If he will check the Estimates, he will see that public education in this province got increases, 3.5 percent to the public school system and some 3.5 percent to the universities.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we, by virtue of this policy initiative, have two benefits. One, we succeed in reducing the payroll tax being paid by the

corporations of this province. It is recognized as a destroyer of jobs, that payroll tax. We are removing it systematically as his party supported when they were in a minority situation, I might say.

Finally, the record of those who do training in house, the private sector who train and retrain their own employees, has 100 percent success because those employees all have employment with that corporation as a result of that training carried on by the corporation.

Mr. Doer: Well, as Brian Mulroney and the member for Tuxedo (Mr. Filmon) privatize and Americanize our education system with tax breaks, let the record show that there was a decrease of \$7 million in the budget dealing with post-secondary education and adult and continuing education. Let the record show that this caucus voted against that decrease in the payroll tax requirement for corporations in the October budget.

I would ask the Premier: How could he justify cutting that money out of community colleges, which have had a success rate of not only training people but giving them skills that last through their lifetime? As opposed to corporations, when they close, the people are left with no skills except orientation that is now being subsidized by this government.

How can you justify the public investment for skills over orientation programs in private corporations? That is an erosion of our public school system, the erosion of skill development in our province and an erosion of our competitive situation in the world.

* (1345)

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, we are not making a public investment. Two aspects to this policy: One, payroll tax is removed from corporations, a payroll tax that has been demonstrated and documented to be a destroyer of jobs is removed from corporations; two, corporations are given an incentive to invest in training, upgrading, retraining their own employees for which those employees then have 100 percent success rate in keeping their jobs.

Plines Project Preferential Treatment

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, in March 1990, Flin Flon Rotary had applied for Seniors RentalStart funding. In April 1990, Transcona Legion had submitted a completed application form and owned land. In April 1990, the Elk's Lodge in Neepawa had submitted their

application. In April 1990, Charleswood-Tuxedo Lions were turned down for second-stage funding in spite of having already committed 56 percent of their units.

Will the Minister of Housing explain why preferential treatment was given to developer Bob Akman since his pet project was not submitted as an application until October 1990?

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, I have for days on end responded to the allegations of the member for Burrows. I have documented in the House. If he wants the answers to those questions, he can simply read Hansard. All the answers are there.

Mr. Martindale: The usual nonanswer from this minister.

Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Housing table the 1989 letter from Bob Akman, which allowed Rotary Pines to be given preferential treatment over four other nonprofit groups who had completed application forms?

Mr. Ernst: Mr. Speaker, we have been through this process many, many times. I indicated to the House on previous occasions that the Rotary Pines initiated contact with the Department of Housing on February 23, 1989. You know, the member alleges preferential treatment. These projects come in, go out, go back, go forth. There are discussions happening with a whole host of organizations who wish to have housing projects built for a variety of reasons. The fact of the matter is, it was initiated in February of 1989. I became the Minister of Housing on February 10, 1991.

Minister of Housing Resignation Request

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, since the Minister of Housing is trying to practise Gang of 18 politics at the cabinet table and dishes out favours to his Tory developer friends, will he now resign?

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Pines Project Letter of Intent

Mr. James Carr (Crescentwood): Mr. Speaker, amidst all the controversy and confusion that swirls around the Pines project, Manitobans are left with one dominant image. That is the image of a

government that has given preferential treatment to some Manitobans over others and a government that is playing patronage politics against the provincial interest.

We now understand that the government accepted a Letter of Intent as sufficient documentation to save a spot for the Pines project. Can the Minister of Housing give any other examples of treating Letters of Intent as application for funds? Is this policy written down anywhere to guide departmental officials?

(1350)

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, as I have tried to explain to my honourable friends on a number of occasions—and they are having some difficulty, I think, in understanding how the process works.

The case of awarding of any housing project is not necessarily made on the basis of first come, first serve. When you have the ability financially, fiscally to build four, five or six projects a year and you have applications in excess of a hundred per year—and that application list of a hundred is in a variety of stages of process. Some are available to be built quickly, others are not. Some take time, some do not. Some require zoning. Some require further development design. Some require market analysis—a whole host of things related to those projects.

The question is not a matter necessarily of who comes first but a matter of need, Mr. Speaker, and a matter that is dealt with by the government on a regular basis.

Seniors RentalStart Neepawa Application

Mr. James Carr (Crescentwood): Mr. Speaker, reasons for turning down proposals have only come to light with the knowledge that the Rotary Pines project has been accepted. We have heard over the last number of days that Flin Flon was too rocky, Charleswood did not have enough seniors and Transcona had already received the project, but the minister has not given us any reasons at all why the Neepawa project was rejected. Can he give us reasons today in the House?

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, I have indicated on a number of occasions that I became the Minister of Housing on February 10, 1991. Events that occurred prior to that time, I

am not necessarily intimately familiar with. I have indicated I am looking into that matter.

Pines Project Unit Deposits

Mr. James Carr (Crescentwood): Mr. Speaker, one would hope that the Minister of Housing is aware of decisions that predated his ministry when he is making decisions that are involved in the same number of projects. Yesterday the minister told us that 104 seniors had given down payments for a spot in the Pines building.

Can the minister give the House any proof at all that 104 down payments have been received?

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, when the application for Pre-Development Funding was provided to the Department of Housing, the Department of Housing was satisfied that there were 104 applications for \$250 deposits for units in that project.

Free Trade Agreement Export Enhancement Program

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) has been fond of reciting what he calls to be positive impacts of the trade agreement on Manitoba, on Canada. However, he has also admitted that it has not provided any recourse with regard to the Export Enhancement Program, which is an unfair trade practice by the Americans, to protect Manitoba producers. As a matter of fact, the agreement is harming Canada with regard to the requirement to open the borders and allowing American wheat to come into Canada for domestic markets.

We were pleased that the minister has indicated some concern about the opening of this border, and I would ask the minister, in light of those statements, whether he has in fact taken action with regard to communicating this concern to the federal minister. What action can he outline for the benefit of the producers in Manitoba that he has taken, and what response has he received from the federal minister on that matter?

* (1355)

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): I am pleased to report to the member that back in February we met in Regina. I raised the issue with the federal minister in front of the other provincial ministers. I spoke to him one Sunday afternoon

about three weeks later, again raising those concerns, and he expressed to me his concern about the Export Enhancement Program. Maybe the opening of the border would be an issue that could be used on the table to negotiate reduction of the Export Enhancement Program, and he would try to find some technicalities on which to hold it up.

I wrote the minister on April 19, expressing those same concerns that the import permit requirements should be looked at very carefully, and we should not act until we were sure that we did not have some technicalities to hold it up. They have addressed that, and they have looked for some technicalities and found that there were not any legal technicalities on which to hold it up, and also, because we have increased our exports of many grains to the United States very substantially in the past two years, that we did not want to do anything that might interfere with that flow of grain to that very major market for us.

We export to some 60 countries in the world, and the United States has now moved up to seventh place on the list of important markets for us to export a wide variety of grains. The United States is first, second or third on many of our grains that we are exporting out of this country, and that is an important market. We are concerned about the opening of the border, but we believe, because you have to have end-use certificates or denature, the grain that comes in here, we will protect our producers in terms of being able to have fair and equal competition.

Mr. Plohman: That answer does not deal with the terrible impact that the Export Enhancement Program is having, the American unfair subsidies, on American grain.

I asked a simple question for the minister: What action has he taken since the federal government announced its intention? Just the other day he had said he was concerned. What action has he taken since April 19, not the letter that he sent?

Also, can the minister advise the House as to the date that the Mulroney cabinet is set to amend the Wheat Board regulations to in fact open the border to American wheat coming into Canada?

Mr. Findlay: Mr. Speaker, the recourse on the Export Enhancement Program is the GATT process. The GATT process Uruguay Round has been in place since 1986. I expressed many times in this House my concern of the fact that we did not

get a resolution of the GATT process in December in Brussels in 1990.

I am pleased that the GATT process is now back slightly on track with officials negotiating amongst the various countries. Hopefully, we can move towards resolution of the export subsidy problem not only from the United States' point of view but from the European point of view, to protect our interests.

I spoke to the new federal Minister of Agriculture yesterday, but I cannot give the member their time frame with regard to their Order-in-Council.

Mr. Plohman: Mr. Speaker, clearly the Export Enhancement Program is a violation of the agreement. The minister has admitted that.

GRIP Program Eligibility Review

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): I ask the minister another question regarding the GRIP program, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that more and more farmers are raising concerns about the inequities in GRIP—and that is currently a serious problem. There are many inequities in GRIP, and the latest we have is that farmers who have pulled out of crop insurance recently, after being in crop insurance for many, many years, are getting absolutely no credit for the good record that they built up with crop insurance during the years that they were, in fact, enrolled.

I would ask this minister, in view of that inequity and many others that have to come to light and that I have brought to this House, will he ask for a major review of the impact of the crop insurance records on the eligibility for GRIP coverage? Will he conduct that review in conjunction with consultation with farmers so that they can be assured that fairness will be placed into this program, which is not there now?

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report to the member that the sign up has gone very, very well. Today is the 9th, but I have statistics here to the end of the 6th of May. The sign up has been some 12,000 producers out of 15,000 who come through the door to talk, and that is some 80 percent of the farmers who have come through the door. The number of new crop insurance contracts signed this year is over a thousand at this point in time.

I would also like to remind the member that, some two weeks ago, I made an announcement that we

will have a major review of the crop insurance structure. It will take place this coming summer. Appointments will be made shortly, and all farmers and all producers will have an opportunity to have input to that review committee. They will make major recommendations as to how crop insurance is handled from here on.

Aboriginal Justice System Government Commitment

Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Northern Affairs.

Aboriginal people in Manitoba have heard a lot of empty promises from this government. One of those promises was their commitment to work towards an aboriginal justice system dispensed by aboriginals. I say that this government's promise was an empty one, because one program developed by the Interlake Reserve Tribal Council, which would be a unique opportunity to move towards the system of culturally appropriate justice, has been repeatedly stalled by the provincial government.

Will this minister assure the House that these excuses will not continue and that negotiations will now go ahead in good faith, with the government making every attempt to deal fairly and reasonably with the Native Harmony and Restoration Centre?

* (1400)

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern Affairs, responsible for Native Affairs): Mr. Speaker, with respect, I am sure the member must have got the research done of the government previous to this administration, in reading from some of the record of the NDP government in their term of office, when he talks of hollow promises and lack of delivery.

As far as the details of the particular question, I will take it as notice for my colleague, the Minister of Justice and Attorney General (Mr. McCrae).

Mr. Hickes: Mr. Speaker, to the same minister.

The government has also refused to deal fairly with the issue of the per diems required to provide adequate services at the centre. Not once have any provincial officials formally negotiated with the Interlake Reserve Tribal Council regarding this issue, which is supposedly one of the reasons why the project was rejected by the government in the first place.

Will the minister now assure the House that the per diems will be discussed and that adequate funds will be made available to ensure the success of this program?

Mr. Downey: Mr. Speaker, again on behalf of my colleague the Minister of Justice and Attorney General (Mr. McCrae), I will take that question as notice. I am aware the minister is working very aggressively with the Indian leadership in this particular regard.

Aboriginal Programs Funding

Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is to the Premier.

Will the Premier consider using the \$8 million that he is pumping into the Workforce 2000 project to ensure that adequate resources are available, not only for this project, but also for other vital programs for aboriginal people, such as the ACCESS and the BUNTEP programs?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I believe that, at this point in the session, the demands of the New Democratic Party for spending more money have now exceeded some \$20 million in a variety of requests that they have made for support to municipalities, support to agriculture, support for education, support for health care, support for cultural areas, support for natural resources, additional areas and so on. Every day, as they rise in the House, they are spending tens of millions of dollars more.

The fact of the matter is that this government has done—

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): You just spent \$8 million today on your buddies, \$4.5 million on your buddies last week.

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the member for Concordia to calm down, please. He has had an opportunity to ask questions. He did not do a good job of it, so now he is trying to encourage his other people. I would ask him to calm down.

This government has continued to make—

Mr. Doer: Money for their buddies and \$8 million for their friends.

Mr. Filmon: If the member for Concordia has any further comments to make, I would ask him to stand up and not have his backbenchers ask questions.

He can ask the next question. As soon as I am finished answering this one, he can ask the next question, Mr. Speaker. If he is embarrassed by the way his backbenchers are asking questions, then he can ask the questions.

We have put \$10 million into interim settlements for the Northern Flood Agreement. We have entered into agreements with aboriginal communities for -(interjection)-

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable First Minister has the floor.

Mr. Filmon: We have put money into programs such as the northern Bachelor of Nursing program. We have put money into programs for support of aboriginal programs in education such as BUNTEP and ACCESS and those programs. We have put a program in place of recreation directors for northern Manitoba Native communities. All of these things were never done by the New Democratic Party when they were in government, Mr. Speaker, and they continue -(interjection)-

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, every time we put in programs for Northern and Native Manitobans that were never before put in by the New Democratic Party, they go on to other things because they are too embarrassed to address the things that they did not do when they were in government.

Marlaine Nyznak Home Care Program

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (The Maples): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health. One of my constituents, I have to use her name with her permission today—it is a very sad story. Marion Nyznak, disabled mother of three, has been forced to stay at Seven Oaks Hospital for the last 18 days, not because of her own choice, but because she cannot get enough home care subsidy which is a necessity for her. It is costing \$600 per day for a hospital bed, which could be saved, at least, by home care services at \$80 per day.

Can the Minister of Health tell this House why, when we have such financial difficulty, they are wasting \$500 per day for a simple reason?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, if it was a simple answer to that very complex issue, it would not be before the House as my honourable friend brings it. There are difficulties in terms of working through the service provision of

home care which, between, as I understand, the individual and the home care division, were unresolvable and resulted in this. Home care is willing, is mandated and has the budget to provide those services.

Mr. Cheema: While the home care is manipulating the whole thing, Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Nyznak may lose her three children because her legal counsel is saying, if she cannot go back home, she will lose her life.

Can the minister tell this House today and assure this House that she will get enough home care services so that she can go back to her private life, which has become a public life because of this minister's inaction?

Mr. Orchard: I realize my honourable friend wants to make some political points in the House, but to make the accusation that this is—

Point of Order

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Second Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious issue, and the minister is imputing motives from the member for The Maples (Mr. Cheema). I ask the Minister of Health to make a complete withdrawal.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member for Inkster did not have a point of order.

* * *

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, I made no accusation against the member for The Maples, except my honourable friend said this is my fault because I am personally, as Minister of Health, denying service, and that is rot. That is balderdash. Now, if my honourable friend the member for The Maples wants to resolve this issue for the benefit of the individual who he has identified in the House, he might want to talk to the home care co-ordinators who have attempted to provide this service. He might find out—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, what wild and beautiful rhetoric we have on that side of the House.

Home care is quite willing to provide those services in the home. That is their mandate. They have the funding to do it. They have the ability to deliver the services and will do that. That is the commitment I give to my honourable friend and not

because he raises the issue here in the House but because that is what home care and this government, this ministry is attempting to do for those citizens who need that service in their homes. We are willing and able to provide it.

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Speaker, I, along with the home care services, did meet with Mrs. Nyznak in her house. That was in January, and the issue was discussed. That is why I said I have to use that name, because she gave me the permission.

Mr. Speaker, this minister's department is so insensitive. They are wasting \$600 per day. Last year, the minister said in this House that there is no demand for home care services. They have underspent \$4 million for the last three years. Why can he not simply do the decent thing, supply the home care services and save taxpayers' dollars?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what the ministry, the Department of Continuing Care is willing, able and wants to do, including in this case. It shall be done if they get over the difficulties of that service provision, which are not, because the department will not provide it. We have the budget. We have the personnel, and we have the ability to deliver the service and will.

*(1410)

Racism Investigation Telephone Messages

Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, in March we raised the issue of increased Ku Klux Klan recruitment in Manitoba. Today, our concerns were confirmed with reports of a new, more offensive telephone message by the Klan. I am going to table a copy of the transcript from that answering machine.

A parent told me today that KKK telephone numbers are being circulated amongst school children, and they are being encouraged to call this telephone message. My question today is for the Minister responsible for Manitoba Telephone System. What steps has the minister taken to ensure that Manitoba telephones and answering machines are not being used to promote racial hatred?

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister responsible for the administration of The Manitoba Telephone Act): Mr. Speaker, I will endeavour immediately to find out the nature of the complaint that the person is raising and see what we can do as forthwith.

Racism Investigation Telephone Messages

Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, there was supposed to be an investigation on the KKK activities and their telephone messages. Has the minister sought a legal opinion, or has the government sought a legal opinion? If so, can he tell the House what can be done so the telephone can be shut down by use of the KKK?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Acting Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Justice and Attorney General (Mr. McCrae), I will take that question as notice.

Anti-Racism Programs Education Programs

Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, my final question is for the minister of multiculturalism.

Can the minister indicate whether there are any new programs by this government to assist schools in dealing with these type of racist incidents and racist attitudes in the schools?

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship): I think part of that question could be asked of the Minister of Education and Training (Mr. Derkach). I am sure he would be willing to answer what is happening within the school division in his Estimates this afternoon, which he will be in.

I do want to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that we have, over the last almost year and a half, seconded a person from my department in an initiative that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik) and I have jointly been working on with the Manitoba Federation of Labour to look at ways of trying to combat racism within the workplace. The Manitoba Federation of Labour and the government have these major concerns, and just yesterday I met with the Federation of Labour to get an update on how well they were progressing because we have put staff resources, seconded them over to the Federation of Labour.

I am pleased to say that the work is moving along very well and that we will have modules that will be examined and will be piloted throughout the province over the next short period of time. Those are things that I think are positive moves, that is, labour working together with government to ensure

that we are developing ways in which we can combat racism in partnership.

Home Care Program Gag Orders

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Lels (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I am going to have to digress from the question I was intending to ask and tie into the home care issue, because the Minister of Health has suggested to us that, if we have particular cases dealing with home care, we should be meeting with and consulting with home care co-ordinators. In fact, it has been my experience, the experience of the member for Transcona (Mr. Reid) and others that, when we have attempted to go that route, we have been told that a gag order has been placed on those individuals and that we will have to go through the minister's office.

I would like to ask the Minister of Health if, given his comments today, he is now prepared to go out of this House and lift the gag order on all home care workers and co-ordinators?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend is saying that there is some difficulty with home care cases. I want to tell my honourable friend that I would have appreciated, because she started yelling from her seat when the member for The Maples (Mr. Cheema) was posing the last question, something about January. If she was aware of this individual's case in January, why did she not come to me to seek resolution instead of leaving it for three and a half to four months?

Ms. Wasylycia-Lels: Given the treatment of this government with respect to civil servants and its position on whistle blowers, I, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues will not put people in vulnerable positions of giving their names to the Minister of Health.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member for St. Johns, will put her question now, please.

Ms. Wasylycia-Lels: I would like to know specifically if the minister will issue a directive to officials in his staff in field line positions that they are able to deal directly with MLAs on constituency problems and casework issues so that we can get on with our jobs as MLAs?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend attempts to have it both ways. She says there are these great pressing problems out there, but they

are not important enough to bring to my attention so I can seek remedy. Now who does my honourable friend try to fool with that kind of a statement? Either there is a difficulty which needs resolution—and I want to tell you that every time we have had a problem in home care drawn to our attention, we have investigated, and some of the action has been reinstatement or additional services or status quo or confirmation of the decision, because there has not been full information provided to my honourable friend.

Now she is suggesting that there are these cases out there that, if one would listen to her rhetoric, are just dire circumstances, and she is willing to let them not come forward to me in the normal process so that I can have staff appropriately investigate and deliver the services that she alleges are needed. Shame on her for leaving those people in that kind of circumstance.

Ms. Wasylycia-Lels: The Minister of Health has missed the point. We, as MLAs, are being denied the opportunity to do our job because, when we call into the field, we are being told to go through the minister's office.

Government Departments Gag Orders

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Lels (St. Johns): I would like to ask the Premier, since this is now the second example of gag orders among his ministries, if he will take some action and ensure that all gag orders in all departments are lifted immediately?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, there are not gag orders in any government departments. We are following the policy that was set down by the New Democratic Party. If she wants, we will share with her copies of memos from Mr. Duhamel when he was Deputy Minister of Education under the former honourable Maureen Hemphill who—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, members opposite want to have fun. This is Question Period. I will answer legitimate questions that are sincerely put, but if they want to just have fun and create a circus here, that is their business.

St. James-Assinibola School Division Enrollment Irregularities

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): The Auditor's report released yesterday on the St.

James-Assinibola School Division found substantial irregularities at John Taylor Collegiate and laid blame, in no small part, at the feet of the St. James-Assinibola School Division itself. The report stated, and I can quote briefly: The division administration is responsible for ensuring adequate controls and accountability. In our opinion, these responsibilities were not fulfilled to the extent expected.

Mr. Speaker, why, given this condemnation of the school division administration, has it been entirely left to that same administration to review further enrollment irregularities prior to 1988?

* (1420)

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): It is true that the Auditor's report did make some recommendations and did lay some responsibility in terms of the enrollment figures of the St. James-Assinibola School Division. The irregularities that were found were found within the years that are highlighted in the Auditor's report, and indeed we are satisfied that there was no individual attempt on anyone's part to try and hide enrollment.

I have to indicate that school divisions have been using a system since 1985—I believe that was when the order went out from the Minister of Education at that time to institute a computerized program of enrollment figures for each school division and for each school. That system has been in place. Indeed, it is found now that there need to be some corrections made to that system, and the St. James School Division, along with the Department of Education and Training, is moving towards tightening up the procedures of reporting enrollment. The department, by the beginning of the next school year, will have in place policies and procedures that will be developed appropriately to reflect appropriate enrollment figures in each school across this province.

Mr. Speaker: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

Nonpolitical Statements

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have leave for a nonpolitical statement.

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable First Minister have leave to make a nonpolitical statement?

Some Honourable Members: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: Leave. It is agreed.

Mr. Fillmon: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all members of the Legislature will be interested to learn of the birth last evening at 10:10 p.m. of Jessica Elizabeth Praznik. Jessica is the daughter of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik) and his wife, Shelly, and a sister to Kaitlin. She weighed 7 pounds, 8 ounces.

I am sure that all honourable members will join me in extending best wishes and congratulations to the proud parents and sister Kaitlin.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to have leave for a nonpolitical statement.

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable Leader have leave to make a nonpolitical statement?

Some Honourable Members: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Mr. Doer: I would like to have our caucus join with all members of the Legislature in applauding the father, mother and the new daughter of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik). We wish the mother and Jessica and the minister well with their new family that they have. Thank you.

Mr. James Carr (Deputy Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I please have leave to make a nonpolitical statement?

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable member for Crescentwood have leave to make a nonpolitical statement? Leave.

Mr. Carr: Mr. Speaker, I, too, on behalf of my colleagues, would like to congratulate the Minister of Labour and his wife, Shelly, and Kaitlin on the birth of the new child.

This has particular significance to those of us who were on the constitutional task force, because we cannot ever arrange a meeting because of the pending birth of this child. Now that the Praznik household is in order, perhaps we can get on with the business of saving the country. Congratulations to the Minister of Labour and his family.

Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, if I may indulge the patience of the House for a brief moment just on behalf of—

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable minister have leave to make a nonpolitical statement?

Some Honourable Members: Leave.

Mr. Praznik: Thank you on behalf of my wife, Shelly, and Kaitlin and Jessica. I would like to thank

all of the members of this Assembly for their kind wishes to my family on this very proud day in our household.

There are many times in this Chamber where the partisan nature of politics puts us opposite one another, but it is times like this where we appreciate those very important things which are very near and dear to all of us.

On behalf of my family—which has expanded a little in the last 24 hours—I want to thank everyone here for their best wishes. It is a tremendous day in our lives, and thank you for sharing your thoughts and your best wishes with us.

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, may I have leave for a nonpolitical statement?

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable minister have leave?

Some Honourable Members: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: Leave.

Mr. Enns: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to acknowledge the grandparents of the new Praznik arrival who made all this possible.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), 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 agreed to, and the House resolved itself into a committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the honourable member for St. Norbert (Mr. Laurendeau) in the Chair for the Department of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship; and the honourable member for Seine River (Mrs. Dacquay) in the Chair for the Department of Education and Training.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY—CULTURE, HERITAGE AND CITIZENSHIP

Mr. Deputy Chairman (Marcel Laurendeau): Order, please. Will the Committee of Supply please come to order.

Today, this section of the Committee of Supply will continue considering the remaining Estimates of

the Department of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship.

When this section last met it was considering lines 6.(k) Multicultural Grants Advisory Council \$1,009,200, and the proposed motion of the honourable member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), which reads:

I move, that line 6.(k) be omitted and that line 6. be reduced to \$31,717,100. Shall the motion pass?

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (The Maples): Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I want to speak on this motion because I think it is very important, especially how the members of the government have spoken on this motion and how they have tried to manipulate the whole thing. What they think about the multicultural committee, they think it is a big joke. I think they should look at their faces and read their own comments, what they have been doing. They think that just visiting the multicultural community in the election campaigns will make you the -(interjection)-anytime.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, would you order the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) to keep quiet, because we keep quiet when he talks and we expect the same kind of courtesy?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. The honourable member for The Maples has the floor.

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I think it is very important to understand why this motion was presented. The motion clearly indicates how this government has manipulated the multicultural grants and how they have given them in the hands of a very political, motivated—their own appointed committee, and how they have tried to use the multicultural community for their political gain.

They think that only visiting a multicultural community during election campaigns, having coffee parties, visiting their dances, meeting with five individuals in an age group is making them look good in the multicultural community. It is really sad. That how they can stand in this House and this Chamber and criticize the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) who has brought a very legitimate concern that this government is not doing what they are supposed to do and what they say—exactly.

For them, multiculturalism, as with many politicians in this country, has become a big slogan, and many people abuse that slogan. They think

that people do not understand. It is politically a very popular thing to do in the campaigns. When it has come to the real situation of delivering things, they do not live up to their promises.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I want to ask the minister, they should tell us what have they achieved in the multicultural policy. Have they fought the fight against racism?

They have not even dealt with some of their own federal parts who are speaking not very good of the racist problem in Manitoba, and one example has been one of the members of the federal ring has been quoted saying that there is a possibility that the racism does not exist. I think somebody who thinks that racism does not exist, they are living, not in this country, but somewhere else. So this government has not done anything to fight racism.

Have they done to find the language program—I mean the ESL language program was functioning so well. Now they try to take it from the Education board people, who know what to do, into the Culture and Citizenship program, which will ultimately give this minister more power to control the multicultural community. That is a shame, and they think that nobody knows about that? That we have listened to them and then, when we are bringing the positive things and we are telling them what is wrong, you go off to, you spend your own time. You are spending hours and hours just discussing something which is not there, and then you think that we are going to sit back and take that kind of harassment. I think that is a shame.

What have they done with education in terms of schools, in terms of their education for racism? Have they made the program for during the school education program, which is the human rights program? Have they made it mandated? No, they have not done it. So what have they achieved in the multicultural policy?

What is their record on the boards and commissions of Manitoba? How many people from minorities have they put on the boards? Just to name a few, other than the major positions, can they name more than two or three in a major board position where the decisions are made? Can you name? Have you met anybody on the boards and commissions from the visual minorities? Nil. That is your multicultural policy. If that is a policy—

* (1440)

Mr. Edward Connery (Portage la Prairie): You are a liar, Gulzar. You are a liar.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. I would like to remind the the honourable member for Portage la Prairie that the word "liar" in the past has been ruled nonparliamentary, and I would ask the honourable member to withdraw that statement.

I would like to remind the honourable member for Portage la Prairie that it was nonparliamentary, and I would ask him to retract that statement.

Mr. Connery: Mr. Deputy Chairman, under duress I will withdraw that comment.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Thank you.

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have to thank the member, but it is not coming from my heart. It is not the first time that this member has done, has shown what is really underneath, what his philosophy of multiculturalism is, how he would deal with the cultural groups and how he would deal with the minorities. I think it is very painful for him to—

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. I would like to remind the honourable member that we are dealing with the motion of the honourable member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) which is: I move that line 6.(k) be omitted and that line 6. be reduced to \$31,717,100. I would ask the honourable member to remain relevant.

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I think my comments are relevant in terms of the policy. When a member of the governing party is speaking for the policy and they are part of the cabinet or part of the caucus, that reflects their policy. The policy seems very clear that it is just a lip service, and they do not want to listen to anyone who has ideas, they do not want to reach the communities, they do not want to reach to the grass-root communities to make sure that their values are represented.

They are not going to shut me down here, if I want to say something which is right. I am not going to be shut down by any member. They should make it clear, it is not the election campaign where they can make all these false accusations and get away with this. I am an elected member and I will abide by the rules, but I will also exert my rights in this Chamber.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson, that is clearly the kind of attitude which exists on the government benches, arrogance and manipulating the cultural communities, and above all, they have manipulated

our motion to the extent that it stinks. It is very sad that in 1991, and after knowing what is happening in this country, what has happened with the—

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. I am going to ask the honourable member to please choose his words very carefully. Some of the words that you are bringing up have been ruled nonparliamentary before, and I would really ask you to keep them relevant if we are going to have the proper decorum in the room.

Mr. Cheema: Okay, Mr. Deputy Chairman, if some of the words fall in the category of the grey zone, of not to be used in this Chamber, I will be very careful, but I expect the same thing from the members of the opposite side.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson, what the multicultural community, what the new Canadians, what the visual minorities want, they want simple respect, and that respect will only come if the members of this caucus will respect their values, respect their ideas, give them basic values of life, not lip service for what they have done with the multicultural grants. This is a typical disorganization which has been given power to spend money there for their own political gain. This is a typical example.

For me, in this House, to sit back and listen and then say, well, government is doing a good job, I think it is dishonesty. I am not going to be dishonest to myself, because if I am not going to be honest to myself, how am I going to do good for anyone else, so I think I am forced to speak on this motion, that this government is not living up to the expectation. This government has failed in many ways. This government's own ministers and the episode of 1988 is still very much fresh in the memories of people of Manitoba.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson, it is very sad that when we come to this House, we take an oath that we will represent each and every individual in the best possible way, but if for political gain you are going to try to shut down a community member or part of a Manitoba community or part of the visible minority because—you can shout at me, I am not going to take it. I am not going to take it from any member because I do not do it, and I do not accept it because to bow before arrogance is to give preference to arrogance.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. I will remind the honourable member one more time that he has used an unparliamentary word again, and

that is "arrogance." It was ruled unparliamentary. I would ask the honourable member to withdraw that.

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, basically I wanted to end up saying that I support the motion—

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. I have asked you to withdraw the word "arrogance."

Mr. Cheema: Okay, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, if that word is unparliamentary, I will withdraw it, but basically what I wanted to end up—I wanted to say that the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) has put the motion—the motion's intent is very clear. It is clear how that money could be used through the MIC.

MIC is a body which represents grass roots, represents people who are concerned. They are not part of any special political group, and that power should be given to them. That is what the member for Inkster has said, and somebody to suggest that the Liberal Party—the party which has, in fact, formulated the whole policy of multiculturalism—is going to try to cut the throat of the cultural policy? Is this the way politics is run in this country? Is this the way the politicians run and have, you know, is that the way to decide things and shut somebody down?

Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I am very disappointed, so very disappointed to see that after three years in this House, the attitude of some of the members of the government benches have not changed. I do not think it is going to change, that does not matter to me any more. What does matter is that people out there should know the truth and nothing but the truth.

I support the motion presented by the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux). Thank you.

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship): Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I am somewhat disturbed with the comments that have been put on the record this afternoon. I believe that within the political process and what we experience within the Legislature on a day-to-day basis during Question Period, there are comments that fly back and forth across the House from the government's side to the opposition's side, and members on both sides of the House sometimes are guilty of making comments that might in some way embarrass others on the opposite side of the House.

I do not think that any of us sitting in the Legislature can abdicate responsibility for comments that are made. I believe that in the forum

where we sit as politicians, those comments are made for whatever reason, and they are not made as a result of racist comments in any way. I do not believe that there is any member who sits in the Legislature, who has been elected to represent the constituents that elected them, who in fact would treat any one member of the Legislature any differently than another.

I speak as a Minister responsible for Multiculturalism, and I do know that members of the New Democratic Party and members of the Liberal Party also, in times of anger and times when they feel that somebody has said something that is a little foolish or a little silly, have not made comments that might tend to attempt to embarrass members on the opposite side of the House. I guess it is not a very proud day for me as a Manitoban and as an elected member of the Legislature to believe that any of us would intentionally make comments that would be specifically racist in any way.

I certainly believe that all members of the Legislature are equal members of the Legislature. Some of us are on the government side and have the decision-making power, and the role of the opposition is to be critical of some of those decisions that are made. I honestly believe that every member who sits in this House has a concern and a desire to promote multiculturalism. We all may decide to do it in different ways. We might institute different programs. We might put in place different vehicles that would fund our community, but there is no member on the government side of the House and there is no member in opposition that could come right out and say that they do not support multiculturalism, and there is not funding going and there will not continue to be funding, no matter what government is in power in the Province of Manitoba.

* (1450)

I think that there comes a time when sometimes the comments that are made in this Legislature are comments that would not promote multiculturalism, and when we do not have people in elected office that believe that we are all here for the same purpose—and that is to represent the constituents that elect us, and those constituents come from all different backgrounds, Mr. Deputy Chairman. I believe all of us are here because the majority of those people elected us and we want to do a good job.

I am somewhat disappointed that anything that is said, whether unparliamentary language is used in one context or another, that it is used by many members in many different ways, and that I do not believe the comments that have been made here in the Chamber by the member for Portage (Mr. Connery) or here in the Chamber by the member for The Maples (Mr. Cheema), because unparliamentary language has been used on both sides.

I do not believe that the member for Portage La Prairie was making a racist comment, just as I do not believe that the member for The Maples was making a racist comment.

Point of Order

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, on a point of order. I will reply to any member's questioning in this House, and I will not take any abuse. I will not give, but I will not take any abuse. I want to make it very clear—

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. The honourable member does not have a point of order.

* * *

Mrs. Mitchelson: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, and I just want to comment on some things that were said by the member for The Maples (Mr. Cheema) just a few minutes ago when he talked about this government taking absolutely no action in regard to racism, in regard to English as a Second Language programming, and in regard to multicultural grants being purely politically motivated.

I guess, I would challenge him to come forward and say that the 237 grants that were approved by the Multicultural Grants Advisory Council went to political friends of the Conservative Party. I believe all members of the community were served very well, and I do not believe that there is any one community out there that is solely, purely Conservative or Liberal or New Democrat because every individual within this province, I believe, has the opportunity and does take the opportunity to think for themselves, to believe philosophically the way they believe and vote the way they feel is right.

There is not one community, one multicultural community, out there that does not cross all party lines. I believe that all 237 of these grants that were allocated by the Multicultural Grants Advisory Council were done in the best interest of the

community—every organization that has probably card-carrying members of all three political parties and members who really have the best interest of their community at heart. So I tend to take exception with some of those comments that were made.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson, in regard to racism and what our government has done, I have indicated in the House today and I will repeat again for the member for The Maples (Mr. Cheema), that in fact the Manitoba Federation of Labour recognized that within the union movement, within the work force out there, there was racism. They came forward to government and indicated they wanted to work to eliminate racism in the workplace, and they ask government to join with them in a way of funding.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson, rather than giving them just an allocation of dollars, we decided that it was very important that someone from within government work with the Federation of Labour to help develop those initiatives; those initiatives that could be used throughout government could be used by the unions, could be used in the workplace, and used within the education system to provide ways and means that we could all work together in partnership to try to eliminate racism.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I met with the Federation of Labour yesterday. They have made great strides in conjunction with government to put in place modules that can be adapted to government, to community organizations, to the education system, to the unions and to the work force. I commend the Federation of Labour, and I also commend the staffperson from government who has been working very closely with them.

We will be piloting those modules over the next short period of time, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, so that in fact they can be changed or modified, if they need to be, so that there will be no duplication between what government is doing and we are not spending money over again. We will be working very co-operatively throughout the province of Manitoba to ensure that all of us are sensitive to the issues surrounding racism and all are working together to try to eradicate racism.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I want to talk a little bit about ESL, and I want to indicate that this is Multiculturalism Week in the province of Manitoba, in the education system. I had the opportunity, just at noon today, to be over at Point Douglas School

with those who are taking adult ESL programming at the school. All of the different communities involved had a cultural display set up. All of those who were taking the courses took great pride in presenting to me, as the minister, their culture, their heritage and explaining to me some of the customs, the traditions, the crafts and the activities that go on in their home country.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I do want to say that it was a very proud moment in my life, and I felt very good about the type of funding that we are providing to Winnipeg School Division No. 1 for adult ESL programming. I want to indicate that the students who were taking the programming were very pleasant, were very pleased and thanked me profusely for the money that we have put into ESL training.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I have no hesitation in indicating to those students that there will be money for ESL programming in the province of Manitoba under our government forever. For any of the opposition to indicate that we are not funding ESL, when we have a commitment of over \$1 million in the Winnipeg School Division No. 1 for adult ESL training, I think, is absolutely wrong. They are sending the wrong message out to the community.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I wanted to put those comments on the record, because I was somewhat upset with some of the not-quite-factual information that was being put on the record by the member for The Maples (Mr. Cheema), and I wanted to clear that up.

Mr. Connery: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I regret my comments to the member for The Maples, but when the comments made by the member for The Maples are made, it infuriates me, and it infuriates me that he would insinuate that members of any party in this Legislature would be disrespectful and only give lip service to the multicultural community.

I was Minister of Labour, and I tell you I fought hard for the visible minorities, for all people in Manitoba, the women. I was in Affirmative Action, I worked hard and I was proud of my record, but he says point out one or point out two that you have done. The Civil Service Commission that I appointed—two visible minorities on that Civil Service Commission that I appointed. I never heard the Liberals once condemn us for the make-up of the Civil Service Commission, and we can go and on forever listing the boards, commissions, the

visible minorities, the women from all nationalities, not just visible minorities, that we have put on.

When the member for The Maples (Mr. Cheema) makes those comments on the record, then he better be prepared to take flack, because I will not sit idly by while that member makes those comments about any member, and especially me or members of our party who are sincerely concerned about the multicultural community. Thank you.

* (1500)

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Is the committee ready for the vote?

An Honourable Member: No.

Mr. Ben Svelnson (La Verendrye): Mr. Deputy Chairman, the member for Inkster, and in fact the Liberal Party, has put forward a motion to remove—I have a couple of short questions to the minister.

Could the minister tell us how many hours his council members spend on each allocation round?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I am informed that for preparation time there is a lot of work that goes into preparing to provide the allocations. There are about three rounds of allocations per year; about 30 hours are spent per volunteer in preparing for the allocation round and about 42 hours per volunteer for the actual allocation, so a total of about 70 hours per volunteer.

Mr. Svelnson: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have another question for the honourable minister.

Does the council have any other functions to perform in addition to making allocation recommendations to the minister?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I guess the one answer I would like to give is indicate that they are continually looking at and evaluating the program in terms of the community response and listening to those out in the community for their feedback on how the allocations, how the process is going.

Mr. Svelnson: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I just have one more short, brief question. Has MGAC been able to overcome some of the problems previously experienced by the MIC? For example, you had mentioned the perception of conflict of interest, that type of thing.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I think that, when we look at the perception of conflict of interest, MGAC has not been subject to any criticism in that respect. The council members are not

chosen on the organization that they represent, but they are chosen based on their ability to deal with the entire multicultural community, to look at all different projects based on the merit of the project and make allocations accordingly.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Is committee ready for the vote? Okay. The motion moved by the honourable member from Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) before this section of the Committee of Supply meeting in Room 255 is:

I move that line 6.(k) be omitted and that line 6. be reduced to \$31,717,100.

All those in favour of the proposed motion, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: All those opposed to the proposed motion, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: In my opinion, the Nays have it.

We will now move on to resolution (k) Multicultural Grants Advisory Council, \$1,009,200.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I must say right from the onset that I am very disappointed that the New Democratic Party—I had half expected the Conservative Party—to oppose this motion, but I am very surprised and amazed that the New Democratic Party is now on the record for supporting MGAC. And that is what the issue is all about.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please.

Point of Order

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): The member is blatantly fraudulent in his comments. The member, if he did not understand his motion, we just did the member a favour, and he should really be quiet for a while, having made a mistake that he made just recently to delete a million dollars. We tried to do the member a favour and tried to do the Legislature a favour, because this was getting heated way out of proportion because of a dumb resolution. I think he should just drop it and let us get on to the department's Estimates. Let us start taking the high road and stop these cheap partisan comments.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. I would like to remind the honourable member that the word "fraudulent" has been ruled nonparliamentary, and

I would ask the honourable member to withdraw it. Will the honourable member from Concordia (Mr. Doer) withdraw that statement.

Mr. Doer: I will withdraw the word "fraudulent."

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Thank you.

* * *

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, it is unfortunate that the Leader of the New Democratic Party did not hear my opening remarks prior to introducing the motion. I can understand why he is somewhat sensitive to the issue, but I did want to comment in regard to MIC. Regarding their last fiscal year, they were granted out \$1,296,000. When it was switched over to the MGAC board that was appointed, I wonder if the minister can tell me why it was decreased.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, when the Multicultural Grants Council was created, there was an actual 3 percent increase in funding, Lotteries allocation to the multicultural community, through this line. The fact of the matter is that within the money that was previously flowing through MIC the bingo days were included in that. There is approximately \$300,000 worth of bingo days that are not included in the line under MGAC, but they were included under the Manitoba Intercultural Council.

Mr. Lamoureux: Maybe the minister can tell me if I am correct in making the statement that in MIC's last annual report, '88-89—

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. I would like to remind the honourable member that we are dealing with line (k) Multicultural Grants Advisory Council, and MIC questions should be asked in the MIC section.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, MGAC gives out grants, took over the grant function from MIC, and what I am trying to establish here is, in fact, that there was a decrease to MGAC. Can the minister tell me if the annual report submitted by MIC that had different organizations receiving a total of \$1.296 million—is that correct?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, yes, that is correct, and that was including bingo days which are not included in MGAC's line. Bingo days are allocated to the communities and there is no concrete number. Obviously, the Manitoba Intercultural Council must have, at the time, had reports back from the communities that indicated

how much bingo allocation there was, but that was included—it is not included. When the money was transferred over to the Multicultural Grants Council, the line that was there for direct grants to the community increased by 3 percent.

Mr. Lamoureux: I guess the bottom line is MIC did distribute \$1.296 million, and then it was decreased to—well, the organizations, I do not know if the minister wants me to read. I can read every organization that received the money, and the total—and she is nodding her head—comes to \$1.296 million. That is money that went out to the multicultural community. That is the question. Is that the money that went out to the multicultural communities?

* (1510)

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I think I have this. When the money was transferred over to the Multicultural Grants Council from the Manitoba Intercultural Council, the Manitoba Intercultural Council had some reserve in money. They had money that they had not allocated for some reason, and rather than transferring money over to MGAC through the transition, they allocated all of the money that they had in that year.

Mr. Lamoureux: So, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the minister then is saying that, in fact, they did distribute that \$1.296 million to the multicultural communities. Is that correct?

Mrs. Mitchelson: If I can correct the comment that I made then that bingo days are included. In fact, in that figure that the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) is quoting, yes, that was the money that was allocated, but some of it would have been money that was held from previous years that was not allocated. The Manitoba Intercultural Council wanted to clean up their account before it was transferred over to MGAC.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, there is carry-over every year, and the point of the matter is that last year in MIC they did distribute out that number of dollars. Now following, when MGAC took over, the amount that was distributed to the different organizations—and that is carry-over also—was \$1,009,200. Is that correct?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I cannot give an exact answer. I can give a complete explanation of this when we come back or a little bit later. What I am saying is, because I do not have in front of me what the Lotteries allocation was to the

Manitoba Intercultural Council previously, I do not have that figure in front of me. I will get that information and I will provide it. What I am saying is, the money that was allocated to the Manitoba Intercultural Council was X number of dollars. They may have granted more because they had a carry-over from the previous year or because they had a reserve fund because they did not give out all the grant money that they could have in previous years. What I am saying to you is that the Lotteries dollars that went to the Manitoba Intercultural Council had a 3 percent increase when they were transferred over to the Multicultural Grants Council.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, MIC still has a reserve fund, and they are not making contributions to the multicultural community in the same fashion in which they are. What I am suggesting to you is the fact that the minister, once taking over the distribution of those grants—and it is in black and white in the Annual Report on MIC and it is in her own budget—there is a cutback of close to \$300,000 where the multicultural community received \$300,000 less in contributions from MGAC over MIC. If that is not correct, I would like her to explain in what fashion—why is it not correct?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the reports, as the member indicates, are in black and white. I will indicate that the Manitoba Intercultural Council may have spent more, but they cleaned out their bank account, and any money that had not been spent from years before was allocated by the Manitoba Intercultural Council. The allocation from Lotteries increased by 3 percent to the Multicultural Grants Council, so there was a 3 percent increase in funding.

(Mr. Jack Reimer, Acting Chairman, in the Chair)

If I can put some figures down on paper and show them to the member for Inkster, maybe he can understand then, and I will attempt to do that.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Acting Chairperson, does the minister have at hand the '87-88 MIC Annual Report, and if so, what was the amount that they allocated at that time?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Acting Chairperson, I do not have that. I will get that information and provide it.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Acting Chairperson, I cannot think offhand, I know that in fact it was less than 1.296 for the previous year, but hopefully we will be able to get those figures shortly, because before we

pass this line I would like to discuss it. Maybe if the minister can tell me why, if she does not want to admit to decreasing the funds from MIC to MGAC, then why is it that she chose to freeze it for this year?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Acting Chairperson, all of the umbrella groups—and MGAC is one of the umbrella groups, it is the multicultural umbrella group, the Manitoba Arts Council is another one, the Manitoba Heritage Federation is another one, the Manitoba Community Services Council was another one—they all received a zero percent increase this year in funding, so they were not treated any differently from any other umbrella group. It was a time when—in very difficult financial times we were able to maintain the funding to all of those umbrella groups, but there was no increase to any other umbrella group. MGAC was treated exactly the same as every other group.

Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson): I think the point that both my Liberal colleague and I are trying to make is the way that multicultural granting in this province has been politicized. I guess I just want to say that I support the concept of transferring back, granting authority to a community accountable agency. I do not care what you call it—that is not the issue; but that is the point that we are trying to make.

The question I would like to ask the minister is—I am glad that the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) has a copy of the MIC report from its last year that it was granting grants. I would like to ask the minister: When was the last time that MGAC reported back to the communities with a record of who got the grants and how much they were?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Acting Chairperson, that would be through me as minister. I believe that information has been asked for, and it will be provided.

Ms. Cerilli: It has been asked for by the committee?

Mrs. Mitchelson: No, by the opposition members.

Ms. Cerilli: I would think that it is also of interest to the communities. I would think an organization that is giving out grants to government organizations is publicly accountable and should be putting out an annual report, when they are granting over a million dollars to different communities. That is part of the point that we are trying to make.

I understand that when MIC had the authority for grants they reported back to the communities three times a year. Can the minister or her staff verify that?

Mrs. Mitchelson: It is my understanding that through their Annual Report they would have reported that to the community. I cannot confirm any other report to the community. They are an independent organization, and in fact if they did that I am not aware. I do know that they reported through their Annual Report, and the question that arises is a good question. We will certainly take into consideration, including in our departmental Annual Report the activities of the Multicultural Grants Advisory Council.

Ms. Cerilli: Okay. Another way that it is demonstrated, the way that this whole procedure has been politicized and is seen and that I would say is causing more problems in ethnocultural communities than having both the advisory function and the granting function with MIC, is that the grants are approved by the minister in a way that they were not before.

Can the minister show letters from MGAC that would indicate that they are the ones that are sending out the letters to the community groups, or I can ask the question: Where do the letters come from that approve grants to the community organizations?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Acting Chairperson, MGAC makes recommendations to the minister on what grants should be allocated. There is ministerial approval of those grants. MGAC sends letters out indicating that they have recommended to government that a grant be approved, and ultimately the letter comes from the minister.

* (1520)

Ms. Cerilli: I would appreciate then, when the minister is preparing the package which we have been asking for now almost a week of a report on MGAC grants, that she would include some sample letters. If she likes, she can exclude the names of the organizations, but to have some sample letters. I would also like the research done to show the procedure and letters that were sent out when MIC had the responsibility for that.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Acting Chairperson, MIC, at that time, had the responsibility, and I believe that the member for Radisson could get that information from the Manitoba Intercultural Council. I do not

have copies of the letters that the Manitoba Intercultural Council sent out. They would have those copies, and she could ask them for those.

Ms. Cerilli: Another area where there is some concern with the way that the process has been politicized and changed is the whole area of conflict of interest. When MIC had the granting function, they were very careful that there was some conflict of interest protection by the members who are involved in reviewing the applications. Can the minister explain what the conflict of interest guidelines or cautionary measures are now with MGAC?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Acting Chairperson, they would be the provincial conflict of interest guidelines that all provincial government would be held accountable to.

Ms. Cerilli: I am not in a rush. I would like the minister to explain the process that is used by MGAC.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Acting Chairperson, I can supply a copy of the Provincial Conflict of Interest Guidelines, and those are the same ones that are followed by the Multicultural Grants Council.

Ms. Cerilli: My understanding of the purpose of Estimates is that we would like the information on the record. I would like the minister to put the procedure on the record, please.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Acting Chairperson, I will get a copy of the Provincial Conflict of Interest Guidelines and read them into the record as soon as I can possibly get a copy of that.

Ms. Cerilli: Mr. Acting Chairperson, there were some specific procedures that MIC used to address the whole question of having members with an interest or knowledge or contact with a community group that was applying for a grant, so that there would not be a problem with them having input into the grant application or approval process. Can the minister assure us that these similar guidelines are followed, and can she provide some proof to the committee?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Acting Chairperson, I can absolutely assure that those same procedures are followed, that people do not—if there is a community allocation being made, they absent themselves from the room. I do know that. That was what, I believe, the Manitoba Intercultural Council did. I do not know; I cannot confirm that completely.

I cannot—just as I do not believe the Manitoba Intercultural Council could—provide any proof to the member unless I was actually sitting in the room myself going over those grant applications. I could not provide any proof in this instance either.

Ms. Cerilli: What happens in MGAC now with the applications after they are reviewed?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Acting Chairperson, they are filed.

Ms. Cerilli: I will go on to a third area which I believe is showing the problems with having MGAC function as it does to allocate grants to multicultural communities—that they are missing out, are not able to provide the same kind of community development function that MIC did.

What kind of co-ordination—can the minister give some examples of how MGAC has helped to co-ordinate groups that are applying for funds? If there are two community organizations that, for example, are wanting a grant to hold the same kind of workshop, these communities would be brought together and we would save some money, and also there would be the benefit of having that cross-cultural component to the workshop. I know that MIC, when they were responsible for approving the grants, that was one function that they were able to provide.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Acting Chairperson, I think that cross-cultural awareness and communities working with communities is a great idea. I do not necessarily know whether it has to be done by a funding body, or if, in fact, that should not be the role and the responsibility of government, the secretariat, the Manitoba Intercultural Council and all of the community organizations promoting working together and putting applications forward. I know that each application that comes in is analyzed and assessed, and the allocations are made accordingly.

Ms. Cerilli: To the minister's knowledge, is there any contact between MGAC and MIC on trying to do that kind of co-ordination when grants are being applied for?

Mrs. Mitchelson: My understanding is that in order for information to be obtained on communities applying for grants, that, in fact, the staff at MGAC has been in contact with the Manitoba Intercultural Council to get that kind of information.

Ms. CerlIII: Can the minister explain some examples to show that MGAC has been involved in doing that kind of co-ordination work with MIC?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Acting Chairperson, I would have to go back to the staff at MGAC, get that information and provide it. I do not have it here in front of me.

Ms. CerlIII: That brings me to another question. Can the minister explain why the staff person from MGAC is not here? We have been dealing with this line item for a couple of days now. Is there some rule that I do not know about?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Acting Chairperson, it is not usual for the chairperson of any umbrella organization that distributes funding on behalf of government to appear in the Estimates process. If there are specific questions that are asked—just like the chairperson for the Arts Council or the staff from the Arts Council are not here. If, in fact, information is required, I can ask for that information and bring it back, but it is not usual for that kind of thing to happen.

Ms. CerlIII: How many staff are there with MGAC?

Mrs. Mitchelson: There are two positions for MGAC.

Ms. CerlIII: It would seem to me that it would help the process if we had those staff present. I would think though that the staff from the secretariat might be able to provide this kind of information.

Mrs. Mitchelson: We can certainly get the staff from the secretariat to get that information pulled together and provide it.

Ms. CerlIII: Back with respect to the process that is used at MGAC to allocate the funds, what provisions are in place to ensure that there is fair distribution of resources?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Acting Chairperson, each individual application is analyzed and assessed based on the community support and the type of application that it is. In fact, the decisions are made, as I have indicated before, that allocation is made based on the amount of dollars that there are and trying to distribute it fairly. Not every application is for the same dollar amount, of course. In fact, each one is judged on its merits individually. There is discussion and allocation is made.

If, in fact, a community organization is unhappy with the decision that has been made, they can appeal. They have appealed in the past, and some

of those appeals have resulted in allocation of funding and some have not.

* (1530)

Ms. CerlIII: I would also, with the package of information that the minister is preparing, to include something that would describe the provisions that are in place to ensure that there is a fair distribution of resources.

As well, I wonder if the minister could describe the appeal process that is followed.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Relmer): Order. If I could just remind honourable members that the member for Radisson has the floor. If you would like to carry on a discussion, then you could possibly move to the back of the room.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Every letter that goes out with a grant or a denial of grant indicates that there is an appeal process on that letter. If, in fact, a community organization feels that they want to appeal the decision, they can either appear in person or make a written submission to the council and that appeal will be heard at the next meeting.

Ms. CerlIII: So the appeal goes back to the same group that was looking at the previous application?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Yes.

Ms. CerlIII: What has been the basis? I understand we had some discussion the other day about appeals that had been made to MGAC. I am wondering what were the grounds for the appeals that have been received.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Obviously, the community organization would have felt that for some reason they were not given a grant, and they would have indicated that they would like to be reheard, that they had more information to provide. So that process would be followed.

Mr. Acting Chairperson, I am also informed that there is allocation of bingo days, as I said, to some community organizations. One community organization indicated initially that in fact they felt they could get enough volunteers to run a bingo evening. So they were given some bingo days and then I guess after assessment of that, they indicated that they probably could not find the volunteer support to run a bingo. So they came back to MGAC and asked, in fact, whether instead of bingo days they could have just a straight grant. That was heard and that decision was overturned. They were given a grant.

Ms. CerlIII: Mr. Acting Chairperson, I think if we had the list of grants that have been allocated and a report which I will be pleased to get, but if we had had that before the Estimates process, I think we would have seen that there are some community organizations that have had a drastic reduction in the grants that they have received.

I think that just the fact that we do not have that information—we have been asking for it for days—is an indication of how this multicultural grants process is being controlled, of how it is no longer accountable to the community. There is no accountability to anyone but the minister. I know that there are community groups that are raising issue with that.

I find it surprising that this government, which always claims that they are open government, will not release this report, which used to be released annually to the critics or to the public. When we called for the report, we were referred to the minister's office. This is not an example of open government.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Acting Chairperson, if I can just indicate that the yearly grant allocations are prepared at the close-off of the year end, which is on June 30, so there will be a full report for this year. I can provide last year's report to the member, but until the full year's report is done, I cannot provide that information. So that information will be provided. I will get a copy of last year's grant allocations so that they can be looked at by the member and questions can be raised.

Ms. CerlIII: I guess the point is that MGAC has been functioning for three years now, and that there has not—

Mrs. Mitchelson: No, no.

Ms. CerlIII: —not been—well, more than one year for certain, and there has not been a report back to the community.

(Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair)

I would like to pursue the point that the minister raised with regard to bingo days. I understand that there are two opportunities for community groups to receive fundraising opportunities. One is the bingo days and the other is a straight grant.

Can the minister explain the difference in how decisions are made of which one a group will get?

Mrs. Mitchelson: As I indicated earlier, there is so much grant money to go around and there are so

many bingo days to go around. I think the communities are asked through the application process whether in fact they would accept bingo days or whether they want a straight grant allocation. So they are given that option to indicate. If, in fact, they determine that they feel they can get the volunteer component pulled together to run a bingo, then in fact they might possibly receive a bingo day. If they indicate that they do not want bingo days, they are never forced to take bingo days.

Ms. CerlIII: So I am still not clear. How is the decision made? There is one application process, and it is up to the committee to decide if it is—

Mrs. Mitchelson: It is up to the community, on the application form, to indicate whether they want straight grant allocation or whether in fact they would consider bingo days. If they say no, they do not want bingo days, we do not force them to take bingo days. We look at a direct grant allocation.

Ms. CerlIII: What is the difference in the amount of money that can be allocated between a bingo and a grant?

Mrs. Mitchelson: We can never guarantee what the exact dollar amount will be generated through a bingo day, but we look at an average bingo evening of being about \$2,500. It might be more or it might be less. It depends on the turnout at the bingo event that evening.

Ms. CerlIII: Is there a regulation of how many bingo days an organization gets, or are they given one time and then they have to reapply? How does that work?

Mrs. Mitchelson: There is no set number. I suppose it depends on the size of grant they are asking for, whether they do want to work bingos or not. They may be given anywhere from one to five bingo days to work.

Ms. CerlIII: What is the maximum amount that they can get if it is a grant that they are asking for?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, there is no maximum. It is up to 50 percent of the eligible expenditures.

Ms. CerlIII: It can be 50 percent of any size project or activity?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Yes.

Ms. CerlIII: I guess what I am trying to get a clear idea of is if there is a difference, first of all, between the amount of money granted to an organization if

they are getting straight grants, as opposed to the amount that they are receiving if they are receiving bingos.

I know what it is like to work bingos. I bet that a lot of the community groups are not that thrilled with working bingos. It is a lot of work and often not that pleasant. So I am trying to get an idea of the split then between organizations, as well, if there are certain organizations that seem to be receiving grants more frequently or if there is a mix between one—sometimes they receive a grant and sometimes they receive bingos.

Mrs. Mitchelson: As I indicated before, if the application form that they send in indicates that they will take a grant or bingo days and it does not matter to them, then they are the communities or the organizations that are considered for bingo days. If they indicate they do not want to do bingo days, then we just look at a grant allocation, or you can get both.

Ms. CerlIII: With the information that the minister is going to provide, will it indicate which communities are doing bingos and which are not?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, we can indicate what communities do get bingo days, but we cannot tell you the exact dollar figure that they made. That information would come from Lotteries.

* (1540)

Ms. CerlIII: Is there a penalty for community groups or have there been any problems with community groups that are working bingos with having the number of volunteers required?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I am informed it has happened occasionally, but not that often.

Ms. CerlIII: What happens to the community organizations that do not have the volunteers required for operating their bingo?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, that is done by Lotteries, because Lotteries allocates the number of bingo days—so many are allocated to MGAC, some are allocated to the Arts Council. The Sports Federation has some bingo days, and they allocate them to the community organizations that they serve or represent.

Any community organization, whether it be sports, arts, multicultural, if in fact they do not have the volunteers, the bingo night still runs, but the community organization does not get the funds from that bingo day and the Lotteries Foundation sits down and tries to work with them. That happens

throughout. Those are the rules and regulations of bingo days.

Ms. CerlIII: Is MGAC involved in negotiating on behalf of or mediating or advocating on behalf of the groups with the Lotteries Foundation when there are disputes about bingos?

Mrs. Mitchelson: From time to time, my office gets calls from all different organizations, as I said, whether they be arts or sports or whatever, if in fact they have not had the right number of volunteers. Those are the rules that are set down. As I indicated, nobody has to accept bingo days if, in fact, they indicate on their application that they do not want bingo days. By indicating that they will accept a bingo day, they are making, in essence, a commitment to generating the volunteers within the community.

I know that, in some circumstances, there might be an evening or there might be some unusual circumstances that does prevent that. Part of the responsibility of accepting a bingo day throughout the community is to generate the volunteer enthusiasm to go and work that bingo evening to receive the revenues.

Ms. CerlIII: I guess the point that I would like to make from all of this is that often what happens is it is the smaller community groups, the ones that are possibly less organized, that have difficulty in meeting the rules for the bingo.

The question I had asked earlier is, what are the consequences to these groups if they miss their bingo?

Mrs. Mitchelson: As I have indicated, if they do not have enough volunteers, they do not generate the revenue. They do not get the revenue of that bingo evening. Those are Lotteries Foundation rules.

I have indicated that the first appeal that ever came to MGAC was a community who had said on their application that they would accept bingo days. The committee made the determination that they would allocate them a bingo day. They appealed back to MGAC, because they said, on second thought, we do not believe that we can find the volunteers to run the bingo. So, in fact, MGAC then gave them a direct grant rather than having them have an unsuccessful bingo event and not generate any revenue.

Ms. CerlIII: Is there any effort by MGAC to try and co-ordinate groups that are having problems, needing bingos to—who, if not MGAC? Is that

happening with smaller community organizations that are having problems getting together for the bingos?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: I am going to have to call you to order here a little bit. We are dealing with the Multicultural Grants Advisory Council, and I do believe that the bingo days fall in more under the Lotteries programming.

Mrs. Mitchelson: No, it is in order under—

Mr. Deputy Chairman: I will decide if it is in order.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Yes, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, in fact I have indicated clearly that if a community organization does not feel that they can generate the volunteer component in their community to run a bingo day, they say on their application, we do not want bingo days. We do not force them to take a bingo day. So I think a community is well informed when they indicate they will take a bingo day.

In instances where they have second thoughts and they do not want bingo days, MGAC has listened to their appeal and has indicated to them, well, no, we will give the bingo day to someone else that might want it and feel that they can find the community support, and we will give you a grant instead of a bingo day.

Ms. Cerilli: This will be my last point on this issue, I think, but the point that I am making is that for the smaller organizations, they require the services of MIC which had that co-ordinating function. This points to another reason why it was important to have both the community liaison function of MIC and the granting function together, that a lot of these kind of issues of co-ordinating for bingos or co-ordinating for workshops could be done.

I hope that the minister would take that into consideration. I hope that there will be some thought that often what will happen with the structure that exists is that the community groups that are well organized and larger and established will be the ones that will receive the grants and will be able to follow through with putting in the applications, and that the services of MIC are very valuable to the community.

Maybe to finish off, I will ask if the minister will make a commitment to looking at how the granting functions of her department and the community co-ordination functions of her department can be better co-ordinated.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, we do have a Multicultural Secretariat now in place that will be co-ordinating intergovernmentally. We have an advisory body to government, which is a community advisory body elected by their communities through the Manitoba Intercultural Council.

As a result of their experience in distributing grants to the community, and as a result of them being elected members to represent their community, I am sure that if someone within their community and within the organizations that they serve as the elected member asked them, as the elected representative, where they might go to obtain a grant they would, I am sure—I have every confidence that they would direct them to the Multicultural Grants Advisory Council which could, in fact, deal with their grant request.

We, as a government, have made a decision. I know that we could go on for hours. I know that the Liberal Party and the New Democratic Party do not believe we have made the right decision, but we will agree to disagree on that. We believe that the money through MGAC is being distributed to the communities in a fair way. As I have said in the past and I will say again, it will be the community who ultimately makes that decision, and they will base their decision on what political party they vote for in the future based on all of the things that either the government or the opposition, they believe, can do for them.

We believe that we are moving in the proper direction. I guess it will be up to the community to determine that, but we are going to continue along with the Multicultural Grants Council. I know the opposition will continue to oppose our decision to set up the grants council, and that is what the Estimates process is all about, actually, for you to bring forward your concerns and for us to explain why we have moved in this direction.

I believe I have explained fairly clearly, and I do want to indicate that our decision has been made. We can still debate it. That is the prerogative of both sides, to debate and to discuss the issues. I just believe that the 237 organizations last year that received funding were treated in a very responsible manner by the Multicultural Grants Council and, as I said, we as a government have made a decision. We are going to continue to fund the multicultural community through this mechanism.

Ms. Cerilli: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I hope the minister is not misunderstanding why we are raising these issues. The purpose is to show that the communities, to some extent, are more confused by the way that functions have been separated.

Now the minister is saying that when community organizations want to apply for a grant they also have to go to a third body, which is the Multicultural Secretariat. All of these things were previously co-ordinated under MIC, and I think the community groups were starting to become very familiar with the process. I think, for political reasons, this government has decided to dismantle that process and create their own.

One of the problems we see with that is these groups are no longer arm's length. They are under the direct control of the minister, and I think there are a lot of community groups that see a lot of problems with that.

* (1550)

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, if I just might comment on that, because it must have been for political reasons that the NDP, when they were in government, set up a task force at the cost of \$100,000 to look at how the multicultural groups should be funded.

If, in fact, that administration was extremely happy with the way the Manitoba Intercultural Council was granting that money, then they would not have set up a task force and mandated them to take a look at the Manitoba Intercultural Council and to recommend something to the NDP administration on how that was working. There would be no reason to set up a task force and to spend \$100,000 that could have gone out to community organizations for very worthwhile projects to second-guess what the Manitoba Intercultural Council is doing. I know that the member for Radisson was not a part of that government and that decision-making process at that time, but I cannot help but believe that there might have been political reasons for setting up that task force.

Ms. Cerilli: I promise this will be my last point.

If we are going to talk about unnecessary task forces, I look forward to the minister describing what the multicultural task force that she is proposing in this Estimates book and with the white paper to develop a multicultural strategy, why that is necessary at this time when we have had MIC and their racism report. I think this minister has created

a lot of money into bureaucracy that could have gone into the community far more than the previous government.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, if I could just comment, there is no new task force. What in fact we have committed to the community is to establish a multicultural act. That is exactly what is going to be done through the process of the white paper and a consultation with the community. I would hope that both opposition parties would support the introduction of a multicultural act for the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I have a number of questions. First of all, our overworked research department was quick to get me a copy of the '87-88 Annual Report of MIC, and I wanted to report to the minister in fact what they had distributed out in that year. At that time it was \$1,090,000—

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. I would like to remind the honourable member, we are dealing with the Multicultural Grants Advisory Council. If you want to discuss MIC we will discuss it under MIC at that time.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, what I am referring to are the grants, and the grants that have been going out to the multicultural community. The grants that have gone out to the multicultural community in the last number of years have decreased under this administration.

Now, the minister has said that they have not decreased under this administration. I would like her to be able to tell me what grants MGAC gave out in their first year that would have put them ahead of the '87-88 Annual Report of MIC of \$1,090,000. If she is able to do that—and I do not think she will be able to do that—but if she is able to do that then to explain to me how it is or what associations from MGAC received a total of over \$1.29 million.

Mrs. Mitchelson: I know the member is going back to annual reports when we were not even government. I would hope he would allow me the opportunity to pull together all of the information that I can and present it to him in a manner whereby he can understand that in fact there has been an increase in funding, an increase in the Lotteries allocation to the multicultural community through grants over the last two years.

Mr. Lamoureux: We are talking about two organizations, one, MIC; one, MGAC.

An Honourable Member: You cannot compare them.

Mr. Lamoureux: Yes, you can compare them. You can compare them quite well. In '87-88 they spent \$1,090,000 on the enhancement of multiculturalism in the province of Manitoba. In '88-89 they spent \$1.296 million. Under her Estimates, since it has been changed over to MGAC, they spent \$1,009,000. So her previous arguments of the reserve fund, and if we take a look at the history of MIC, you will see that the grants were increasing under the former administration. This administration cut the grants to the multicultural community, and if the minister—she nods her head no, Mr. Deputy Chairperson. I could read into the record each contribution that MIC made out. You will find that the total, at least—unless the annual report is wrong or I am reading it wrong—comes out to \$1.296 million. I am wondering if she could do the same thing for MGAC which will show it over \$1.296 million.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I will get that information all pulled together. I cannot sit here and compare until I have the financial people do an analysis and bring that forward so that it is clearly understandable to the opposition.

All I know is that allocations from the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation to MIC were less than what Lotteries allocations to MGAC are. Lotteries allocations, dollars from the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation to the Manitoba Intercultural Council, were less than what Lotteries allocations to MGAC are.

We can sit here and we can argue about this back and forth, and the member for Inkster can say there was a cut, and I can say no, there was not. He has figures in front of him that he believes can indicate there was a cut, and what I am saying is I can pull together all of the information going back to the grants that were provided from the Manitoba Intercultural Council that will indicate that, in fact, there has been an increase.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the minister talks about revenue coming in as opposed to actual dollars being spent in the multicultural community, and that is how she is trying to justify what is, in fact, a cut of money from MGAC. I will wait and hopefully I will not have to wait too long—

Mrs. Mitchelson: I cannot get that before five o'clock this afternoon, but I will indicate that even if

we have moved on to another line, I will make the commitment that I will read into the record and provide copies even if we are on another area. I would even give leave at that point in time to come back and discuss it further.

Mr. Lamoureux: With that type of an offer, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I think it is safe for me to say okay, I will wait for it, and we will have the discussion. We will have to defer the discussion of the cuts until she has it before us.

There were 237 organizations that received the funds last year. Can she give me, in terms of percentages, when those grants were approved?

What was the percentage of the grants that were approved in what time period? Does MGAC approve 25 percent of them by such and such date, another 25 percent, or when are the grants approved?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, there are three grant allocation times, or three allocations throughout the year—April, August and December. There would be a greater portion of grants go out earlier in the year. There would be more applications at the beginning of the year and probably a greater percentage of allocations, and I am going to provide that list. So you can see—but I am told probably a greater portion of the money is approved at the April allocation than at the other two.

* (1600)

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, can the minister tell me if the same timetable was applicable to MIC?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I cannot know, and I think that kind of information would be readily available from the Manitoba Intercultural Council. I think they could indicate to you how many grant allocations they had per year and at what point in time they made decisions on those allocations, what percentages.

Mr. Lamoureux: Can the minister tell me what percentage of the letters of approval would have been out for the different multicultural organizations by the August distribution? Was it 50 percent, 60 percent, 95 percent?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I will get that information and provide it.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I wanted to move on to something that is probably a bit

sensitive, but I feel somewhat obligated to ask this line of questions.

There was a time period when the chairperson of MGAC—or let us get a better idea—when did the chairperson of MGAC, the first chairperson, resign?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, there was an Order-in-Council around October 30 of 1990, when the former chair of MGAC was appointed as executive director of the Multiculturalism Secretariat.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I will leave the Multicultural Secretariat's position alone for now and we will go into debate on that when we get to that line. I did want to ask the minister: Does the government have any policy that once appointments that government has made—and I do understand that the chairperson at the time was a candidate for the party—is there any policy on whether or not a candidate or someone who becomes a candidate for the government or for a political party that they have to resign the position?

Mrs. Mitchelson: No, people do not have to resign their positions when they run for political office, and I do not think—I think if you ask the question of the former government, there were probably people that were on different boards that ran for political office. I do not believe they would have resigned. There is not a policy that there has to be a resignation but, in fact, there were no allocation meetings during the period of time, during the election campaign, so there were no decisions that were made at that point in time.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the minister previously had told me that the allocations were made in April and August. They are not made in August?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Those were the deadlines for applications to be in—in April, August and December. The grant applications at that point in time would be analyzed, and the decisions for the grants being approved would be a couple of months later. So if there was an end-of-April deadline for applications being in, then, in fact, they are analyzed and the grant allocations were made probably May-June. Oh, it would have had to be June. The deadline for applications coming in would have been the end of August, and the allocations would be made about two months later. The third round would be December, and the allocations would be made two months later.

Mr. Lamoureux: So then there would not have been letters of approval going out in the month of August or September, because no decisions would have been able to be made?

Mrs. Mitchelson: No.

Mr. Lamoureux: Does the minister, and I will ask her straight out, feel that there is any conflict in having a candidate on a grant-approving board? Does she see any conflict in having that? I know, at the time, the Liberal Party was on the record of asking for the resignation, and I cannot recall—I was not the critic at the time—if there was a response to it, but I am interested in knowing that.

Mrs. Mitchelson: I think if you look at the record of the individual involved—we have an individual that has worked many volunteer hours for the multicultural community over the last number of years, not just started. It was not a decision we made lightly when we wanted someone to head the Multicultural Grants Council. It was a person who knew the community, understood the community, had a good working relationship with many community organizations. In fact, that decision was made because we felt that he was the best person to do the job.

Subsequent to that, of course, he became a candidate for the Conservative Party, and I am very proud and pleased that we have members who belong to our party just as the Liberal Party has members of the multicultural community who belong to their party and do the New Democrats.

I do not think that multiculturalism is an issue that belongs to any one political party. There are people throughout the communities who cross party lines, and I have absolutely no problem. There were no allocations made, and the allocations were not made during an election campaign to try to win or to garner votes.

I will tell you that the communities out there believe and, as I said earlier, all 237 organizations that have received grants through the grants council would have people belonging to their organizations and involved in their organizations that might belong to any one of the political parties. I do not think that all of the 237 organizations that receive funding had only those who were card-carrying members of the Conservative Party as members of their organizations, and I do not believe that they are all political organizations. I believe that they are community organizations that are there to work on

behalf of their communities, and we allocate funds to them to ensure that they can continue on their community activities.

The opposition can make accusations that the decisions that are made are political, but I think that you would be hard pressed to go out to those organizations and ask them, in fact, whether they believe that the decision made to fund them was a political decision. I think you would find that they would believe the decisions that were made were made in the best interests of the community and the community project that they were applying for.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, in many ways I concur with the minister on many of her comments, but I do take exception to a couple. There is no doubt in my mind, no matter what ethnic community—as she has pointed out herself—it crosses all political parties, as well it should. I do not think any political party should stake claim to any different group, because they do not have any right to do such. People are independent no matter what your ethnic background is, and that is the way it should be.

* (1610)

We always have to be aware of public perception. I do not think I have to tell the minister, but the public does not think too highly of politicians, myself included, when it comes to political patronage and things of that nature.

I ask the minister, that given the circumstances surrounding not only this case, because it is not to criticize the individual—I do not question the individuals' backgrounds. What I do question is the perception and how the government of the day, not only this minister but other ministers, have made appointments that are perceived as being patronage appointments.

I can recall, during a private members' hour once, when my Leader introduced an amendment, or I should say a resolution, and it was on political appointments. We were heckled considerably by the New Democrats and the Conservatives saying we would do the same thing. I would like to think that we will not, but there is only going to be one way that we are going to actually find out, and I am introducing that resolution this time around and I plan to keep to it.

My question to the minister is: Does she not believe or does she not feel that what she has done in this particular case on MGAC that that feeds that

negative public perception of not only her, but of all politicians in general because it is perceived, I believe, from the public, when you appoint a party person through no public, for example, consulting with MIC for advertising, that that is going to enhance or strengthen that perception by many of politicians as being bad people?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I believe that the public perception of the initiatives for the community are the concerns that we must have. If, in fact, the community believes the person who is doing the job is a person that has the ability and the capability and the desire to work with the community, as shown by many volunteer hours that have in the past gone into developing a relationship with that community, I think the overall decisions that are made by government are going to be determined and looked at in a manner or way that the community will either accept or reject.

If, in fact, we do some of the right things for the right reasons—whether we be a Conservative government or a Conservative bureaucrat, I suppose—if we make the right decisions for the right reasons, that will be reflected in the announcements that we make and the community will be the ultimate decision maker.

As I have said, the opposition will be critical of all decisions, but I would ask the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) whether in fact—and I know that the Liberal Party has not been in power in the province of Manitoba for a considerable length of time. I know a couple of years ago there might have been some thought that they were government in waiting, but I think the last election has indicated that they are sort of on downhill slide.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I think that we might be able to go back in history, and maybe I could even pull out a few examples, with a little bit of time, on some appointments that might have been perceived to be political, by the former Trudeau Liberal government in Canada. I will pull those examples out, and maybe we could have a little further discussion later on, on whether in fact the member for Inkster agreed at that time that the Liberal federal government did in fact make any political board appointments and what the rationale or reasoning might have been for those decisions.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, patronage is patronage, whatever administration does it, and I am criticizing this administration for

doing it. On that note, I must be firm because she made reference to Trudeau's patronage appointments. Trudeau was in office for—what?—19 years, just over 19 years. In four years, Mr. Mulroney had exceeded the number of patronage appointments that Mr. Trudeau did.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. I would like to remind the honourable member that we are dealing with Multicultural Grants Advisory Council. I have allowed a little bit of leeway here, but I think it is time we bring it back.

Mr. Lamoureux: We are going to refocus a bit more onto MGAC again, the board itself, and this is kind of a follow-up from the line that I have been taking.

Once again, you have created this board, and it is a question of perception. I am wondering if the minister, with hindsight, might want to comment on whether she believes that there could have been a better way of making some of these appointments.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I think that the community perception out there is that in fact we have a board of community volunteers with a broad background and sort of a broad sense of what the community needs. In fact, I believe, and I think I have indicated, that we will agree to disagree on this one. The questions that have been asked all point to whether in fact the government has made the right decision and whether we believe we have made the right decision.

We believe that we are serving the community in a very reasonable, efficient and effective way. To date, I still have not heard from the opposition any specific examples whereby the council has not treated every community organization in a fair manner. I will say that we have made this decision. I believe it was the right decision, and I have indicated quite clearly that we are going to continue with the Multicultural Grants Council to allocate funding to the multicultural community.

I know the Liberals and the NDP do not agree with the process or the mechanism that has been put in place, but we have made the decision. We, as a government, are going to stand behind that decision. We are going to continue along those lines. The community will have to be the ultimate deciding factor on whether in fact we have done the right thing.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, in some regards, she is correct in terms of the Estimates

process and that there is good purpose to it. She has somewhat been able to influence the New Democrats to come a bit closer inside. We saw that in the vote.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I am disappointed, in a sense, that the minister has now really said that she has no intentions on changing the process, because every year, I believe, we do get—there are two-year appointments to MGAC, or one-year?

Mrs. Mitchelson: One, two and three.

Mr. Lamoureux: One, two and three years. Future appointments, I would have liked to have thought, could have been done in a different way. If we cannot get you to give the money back to MIC where it belongs, I would have liked—my second choice I guess, the lesser of the two evils, would be to have her consult with other groups. I guess it is fairly conclusive that she is not going to do that.

Before I end on this particular line—we are going to pass this line hopefully this afternoon, Mr. Deputy Chairperson—I wanted to ask the minister, because she has on numerous occasions brought it up, to cite me some examples of MIC where they have been negligible.

An Honourable Member: MGAC.

Mr. Lamoureux: Or MGAC, okay. I ask the minister then: Can she table the appeals that have been submitted?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I guess I need a little bit of clarification on what is being asked for. You want to know the number of appeals?

* (1620)

Mr. Lamoureux: The minister has said that there have been a number of appeals. Between nine and 10, I believe, was the number she gave me. She asked for me to cite examples of complaints to MGAC, and I am wondering if we can get some of the content of those appeals so that we can see for ourselves if, in fact, there have been negative things or what type of appeals they have been.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I could categorize some things, but I certainly could not give out the information of those organizations that have appealed. That goes completely against, I would hope, what the Liberal Party would believe, that if, in fact, an organization has made application, that the information in that application is confidential information that they are providing, that even under Freedom of Information, if there is a third party

involved that might not approve of that information being made public, then we cannot provide that information.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I would not ask for anything that you could not get through Freedom of Information. What I would ask for is any information that she can give us regarding those appeals.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Line 6.(k), Multicultural Grants Advisory Council.

Ms. CerIII: Because the minister is asking for specific examples, I want to make it clear to her that one of the reasons that perhaps there have not been a lot of complaints from communities, as she claims, is that there is a sense out there that if you complain, perhaps your grant is going to be affected. This is what members of the opposition have heard. In another sense, I would like to have the minister explain, what are the usual reasons that grants are denied?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, just as when the Manitoba Intercultural Council made decisions on denying grants, I guess the Multicultural Grants Council is making decisions. I do not know why MIC declined granting. I could get some information, try to get some examples without giving names of organizations that might have been refused a grant for whatever reasons. I can get that.

Ms. CerIII: I would think that would also be a very interesting thing to put in an annual report from an organization like MGAC. Would the minister consider that?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I would have to contemplate that in light of the kind of information that would have been provided in the Manitoba Intercultural Council's Annual Report and the like, what kinds of information normally go into an annual report.

Ms. CerIII: Did any groups get money for the Ukrainian Centennial?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, with the grants listing, any grant that has been approved for the Ukrainian Centennial, I will provide. I do not have that information here.

Ms. CerIII: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I am getting a bit frustrated with the fact that the minister does not seem to be very well prepared for the Estimates in this line item.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. I would like to remind the honourable member that we are dealing with a number of different issues here, but right now we are dealing with Multicultural Grants Advisory Council.

Ms. CerIII: I am specifically asking questions regarding the function of the Multicultural Grants Council.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, we can provide a list of last year's grant allocations; but this is this year's grants that you are talking about, and the year has only just begun. The first round of grant allocations would be done—the deadline, I guess, was for the end of April for applications to be in, and they would just be in the process of making those allocations now.

So if you are asking for information on whether in fact applications have been received and if there is a sense that applications are going to be approved, I cannot give that kind of information for this year until the decisions are made. Those decisions would not have been made for this year. I can find out for last year and provide that information.

Ms. CerIII: Well, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, we were asked to inquire about some specific examples, but it is obvious that we are not going to get any answers when we have some specific questions. So I will agree now to pass the line item.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Line (k) Multicultural Grants Advisory Council \$1,009,200—pass; (m) Manitoba Heritage Federation \$712,300—

An Honourable Member: Can we take a five-minute break?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Recess five?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Recess five minutes? Five minutes.

* * *

The committee took recess at 4:26 p.m.

After Recess

The committee resumed at 4:34 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. The committee was dealing with resolution (m) Manitoba Heritage Federation \$712,300. Shall the item pass?

Ms. CerIII: I just want to clarify what kinds of programs are funded through this line.

Mrs. Mitchelson: The Manitoba Heritage Federation is an arm's-length organization that funds—we allocate them the money and they fund grants to, I guess, archeology, architecture, archives, genealogy, history, museology, natural environment conservation—grants to the heritage community.

Ms. Cerilli: Does it have any grants to heritage language programs?

Mrs. Mitchelson: No.

Ms. Cerilli: Are there any Lotteries-funded programs that provide grants for heritage language programs?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I guess MGAC or formerly Manitoba Intercultural Council might have provided, in an indirect way, funding for heritage language through organizations that promote heritage language.

Ms. Cerilli: Could the minister provide a list of all the places in government that now are going to provide funding for heritage language?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Yes, we could get that compiled from different government departments and provide that.

Ms. Cerilli: I appreciate that, thanks.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Item (m) Manitoba Heritage Federation, \$712,300—pass; (n) Manitoba Community Services Council \$3,643,000.

Mr. Lamoureux: Yes, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I know in the Supplementary Estimates there is no really set activity objectives. Is there something that the minister can supply us with, just to give us more information about this particular line?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Yes, I can just indicate briefly that the Manitoba Community Services Council is another umbrella organization, of course, that distributes lottery revenue independently of government.

I know the odd time I have received letters from members of the Legislature who support different projects or different community organizations that have applied to the Manitoba Community Services Council and, of course, my indication to them is that we do not make any decisions on how the funds are allocated. They are an independent body that makes the decisions and allocates that fund throughout the province of Manitoba.

I know they give funding to seniors associations, recreation initiatives, libraries, day cares, that kind

of thing. People apply directly to the Community Services Council and, in fact, are allocated grants based on their analysis.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, you will have to excuse me for not knowing more about it, but what I would be interested in receiving is just some background information. I am aware of some of the organizations that have applied for this particular program more so, so that when I am out or when I am asked about the program, I can tell them or give indications in terms of if they would be able to apply to a program of this nature. If she could supply me that type of information and possibly a list of different organizations that have received it, I would appreciate it.

* (1640)

Mrs. Mitchelson: We could obtain a list of the criteria, the guidelines, that the Community Services Council has for grant allocations and an application form. I could get that from the Community Services Council and provide that.

Ms. Cerilli: I am curious to find out if there are grants that go to ethnocultural groups or if there are grants that go to community service related agencies that would be offering programs that would benefit the ethnocultural communities.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Normally, multicultural groups would be sent to MGAC for funding, but in fact there might be many different community service organizations that in some way would impact or work with them and benefit the multicultural community.

Ms. Cerilli: I know that the multicultural community or the ethnocultural organizations are going to be looking for a variety of different places where they can access funds. If this is specifically a fund to fund community service kinds of initiatives, if an ethnocultural organization had an idea or a program that would fall under this criteria, would they be eligible?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, certainly if the guidelines, and I will have to get a copy of those guidelines, if the guidelines—you know, they are an independent organization, arm's length, that funds independently community organizations, so we, as a government, are not responsible. We have absolutely no influence on decisions that are made by any of the umbrella organizations. They act as arm's-length bodies. They do have their guidelines and their criteria, and

I can provide that. I can ask the Community Services Council for that kind of information and provide it to the opposition.

It is just like the Sports Federation is an umbrella organization that funds independently sporting organizations or sports associations throughout the province of Manitoba. Government does not play a direct role in that. The Sports Federation makes their decisions on what they consider a sport, and they have a formula whereby they determine allocations. The Community Services Council does the same thing, so it is another one of those umbrella organizations that funds.

The reason it is here on the Lotteries line is in fact that we have an agreement with them whereby we provide Lotteries revenues to them just like we provide to the Sports Federation or the Arts Council or the Multicultural Grants Council. That is why they are all on this list. These are Lotteries dollars that are allocated to them to service the community that they serve. Applications come forward to them, and they make decisions.

Ms. CerlIII: How is their board developed, elected, appointed?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Their board is elected by the community.

Ms. CerlIII: Then it is considered the same kind of an umbrella organization. Does it have a sole function of just allocating grants, or does this council have other functions?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Just allocates grants. It is just a granting organization with no other role.

Ms. CerlIII: So I guess it begs the question, if this type of an organization is elected by the community, it is receiving Lotteries funding similar to the Multicultural Grants Advisory Council, why then is it elected while the MGAC is appointed?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, that was a decision we made when the granting authority was taken away from the Manitoba Intercultural Council. The Manitoba Community Services Council does not have an advocacy role at all within the community. You know, the Manitoba Intercultural Council does have an advocacy role, and it serves no other function or purpose except to distribute grants. As you said, yes, it is elected by the community, but the decision was made when we put in place the grants council that, in fact, it would be appointed by government and that is the process we followed.

Ms. CerlIII: What kind of community does it serve again—the Community Services Council?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, there is a broad community purpose for it. As I said, it deals with seniors organizations. It deals with recreation, libraries and day cares. I believe the guidelines are fairly broad, just the broad Manitoba community. As I said, I can get a copy of the guidelines and the criteria for applying for funds, and there is an application form.

Ms. CerlIII: What is the main difference, then, from that and the Multicultural Grants Advisory Council?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I guess, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, if I can explain it in a way that might make some sense is—in fact, it was not set up under our administration. It has been there for years.

It was set up, I guess, originally to deal with all of those community activities that might fall through the cracks, that would not be able to apply to the Sports Federation for a grant, or would not be able to apply to the arts council, or would not be able to apply to the Multicultural Grants Council. It is all of those other things that sort of fell through the cracks and were not necessarily sport related, multicultural related, arts related.

So it is all of those things, I suppose, that people do in their leisure time—any community organization that could not get a specific grant from the Sports Federation, could not get a grant from the arts council because they did not fit their criteria, but were well deserving community organizations. I would believe that would have been the purpose.

As I said, it was not set up by our government. It has been there for years under the former NDP administration. I do not know what year it would have been set up. I guess it was set up by the NDP administration back when the Lotteries distribution, when government took over responsibility for Lotteries from the community at that date. I do not know if that was 1983, 1984. It was determined, at that time, that this organization or umbrella organization, should be set up. The guidelines and the criteria were put in place then, and they have not been changed.

Ms. CerlIII: How does the election process work for that kind of a council? It seems like it has a really broad community then or a lot of different groups that would have to be involved.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, there is a review process from within the board, and they look for community volunteers to sit on the board.

Ms. CerlIII: So does it operate like a nonprofit board, where the board goes out and recruits its own new members or how does that process work?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Yes, that is how the process works. They do recruit, and they are tied to some degree to the United Way.

Ms. CerlIII: How about for the other two that are (j) and (m), the Arts Council and the Heritage Federation? How do they compare, in terms of board development or election or appointment, to the Community Service Council?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the Heritage Federation is elected by the community. The Manitoba Arts Council is appointed by government.

Ms. CerlIII: I guess I am failing to understand the reason for having some boards appointed and some elected from the community. Can the minister clarify the reasons for that?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Well, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I guess I cannot clarify why in fact the Arts Council was set up under legislation as an umbrella organization and why the former administration put that into place. It was not done as a result of this government coming into power; it was there under the NDP administration. I do not know what their rationale was for it at the time, but we continue to follow through with that.

Ms. CerlIII: Does the Manitoba Community Services Council have an appeal process for their grants?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, in the past not every umbrella organization had to have an appeal process, but as a result of the Lotteries needs assessment and the new structure that we have put in place, we are negotiating agreements with all of the umbrella organizations, and within that agreement they all are required to have an appeal process.

Ms. CerlIII: Right now the Community Services Council is allocating over \$3 million of grants and there is no appeal process.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Yes, there is an appeal process, and it is right in the agreement that we have negotiated with them.

Ms. CerlIII: I guess that does raise the question of why the Manitoba Arts Council and the Multicultural Grants Advisory Council would have appointed boards and why a Community Services Council would not.

* (1650)

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, as I indicated, it was a system that we inherited as far as the Arts Councils, the Heritage Federation and the Community Services Council goes. Those structures were all put in place under an NDP administration for whatever reasons they determine. I do not know what their reasons were. I could go back and ask maybe, or probably the member for Radisson would have better access to asking her caucus colleagues what the rationale or decision was at that time. I was not part of the decision-making process.

I do know that for the Multicultural Grants Advisory Council we made the decision that we would make the appointments. I have indicated many times, over the last couple of days, that is a process that we put in place, and it is one that we as a government plan to continue.

Ms. CerlIII: Am I understanding the minister correctly when she says that there was just a review done by the Lotteries about the funded programs that would have looked at a question like that?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, before we took over as government, the former NDP administration commissioned a Lotteries needs assessment. That process was in place when we took over as government, and I guess probably the most beneficial thing I could do would be to provide a copy of that Lotteries needs assessment and the recommendations that were made.

As a result of the recommendations that came forward, we continued through with the process, we accepted the recommendations, we acted on some of them and put in place a new Lotteries structure. That was announced in May of 1988 that in fact we would be proceeding with the recommendations that came forward, setting up a different structure whereby there would be agreements signed with all of the umbrella groups, so that there would be some accountability. There was never a form of accountability under the old system when the Lotteries Foundation just gave each umbrella group a certain percentage of the pie and did not ask for any follow-up. What we have done is put in place a

process which is more accountable. I could provide a copy of that report. It was, I know, in 1988, so you may not have a copy of that, but I could provide that.

Ms. Cerilli: This has been interesting, because it becomes apparent that there is some inequity under the Lotteries-funded programs where some communities are allowed to elect their own board and some communities have their granting bodies appointed by cabinet. I would think that is something that government should take a look at. I do not know if there is much difference between heritage organizations and arts organizations and multicultural organizations that would warrant that kind of a difference.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, as I said, part of the process we inherited. I believe the Arts Council is working in a good way. I believe the Community Services Council is doing a good job in the community. I believe the Heritage Federation is, and I also believe that the Multicultural Grants Council are all doing very worthwhile jobs in the community. As I said before, we may agree to disagree. Take the suggestion into account, and I will see if I can find out why, in fact, the Arts Council, under the former administration, had an appointed board as opposed to community-elected. I will try and get that information.

Ms. Cerilli: I would appreciate that. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Item (n) Manitoba Community Services Council, \$3,643,000—pass.

Resolution 26: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$32,726,300 for Culture, Heritage and Citizenship for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1992—pass.

We will now revert back to Citizenship on page 33, Appropriation 4.(a) Immigration and Settlement Services: (2) Other Expenditures, \$111,400—

Ms. Cerilli: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, considering that it is five to five, and I understand that committee would rise at five o'clock, I wonder if there is will in the committee to call it five o'clock?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: What is the will of the committee?

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I am wondering if the minister can tell me in terms of—I know she has different committees that she has established—does she have any ad hoc committees dealing with immigration or settlement

committees that she consults with? Who does she consult with when it comes to immigration?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I am sure the member for Inkster will realize that this is a brand new part of my portfolio, something that has just come over. I am just with the budget process and just taking responsibility as of the new fiscal year at the end of March for Citizenship and Immigration and Settlement, and going right into the Estimates process, I have not personally consulted with anyone to this point. I am just beginning to get my briefing from those staff people who have been transferred over from Citizenship, and trying to put a structure in place whereby we can bring together the Citizenship component, the ESL component of the new responsibilities that I have obtained and the immigrant credentials and all of that into a branch within the department. That kind of thing does not happen overnight. We are working on it. Hopefully, I will have a structure in place whereby we are all working together and accomplishing the best things that we can for the community that we will be serving with this new branch.

If you can understand, it is new. I will attempt to answer all the questions with the staff here to the best of my ability at this point on the programs that are part of my new responsibility. In fact, in next year's Estimates I will certainly be able to be held accountable for all of the things that have taken place over the past year and for the structure that we set up and our ability through that structure to serve the community.

Mr. Lamoureux: I know in the last number of years that there has been more of an emphasis on provincial governments getting involved in immigration matters, something I am not too sure I agree with, with the federal government doing this, but that is irrelevant.

What I am interested in knowing is, does the minister deal with individual immigration cases in her capacity as a minister at all? I know, for example, in my riding I will deal with the odd immigration case through a member of Parliament or something of that nature. Does the minister deal with immigration cases?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I am informed, no, the minister does not. I have certainly not to date in my responsibility, and I am informed by staff that ministers in the past have not dealt directly.

Mr. Lamoureux: I understand and I can appreciate when she says that this is a new portfolio for her. Does she feel that there is a role for her to play when it comes to immigration, individual cases, or would she just as soon leave it with the Government of Canada?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the federal government, through the Immigration Act, has the responsibility for admissions to Canada and specifically for establishing the selection criteria and I suppose implementation and admission.

I believe we, as a province, would like to negotiate with the federal government our own immigration agreement. I know that Quebec has their own agreement. I would like an agreement with Canada that would ensure us our proportional share of immigrants to Manitoba. I would like to see us move on having some say, in some instances, on the types of immigrants that we might get to fill some of the professions that we might have shortages of here in the province of Manitoba.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: The time is now 5 p.m. and time for private members' hour. Committee rise.

SUPPLY—EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Madam Chairman: Order, please. Will the Committee of Supply please come to order.

This section of the Committee of Supply is dealing with the Estimates for the Department of Education and Training. We are on page 38, Item 3. Financial Support. Would the minister's staff please enter the Chamber.

Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan): We were discussing, when we were last in committee, the question of Level I funding, and I am wondering if the minister can table for me—now, I appreciate how the grant is allocated with respect to Level I, but I am sure the minister has statistics which outline the number of Level I students by division throughout the province.

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Madam Chair, we do not have that kind of data available, in terms of the numbers of students who are in Level I at each school division. The Level I grant is one that is based on the total enrollment of a particular school division, and because of the ratio, the grant goes as a block grant, rather than as a specific grant to Level I students. It is then up to the school division and, of course, the professionals within that school division to

determine which students require the assistance and should be considered Level I students.

Some students may require more assistance than others, and for that reason, the school division has the authority and the flexibility to deliver the programs in the best way that they see fit.

Mr. Chomiak: The minister does have access to the divisional ADAPs, and I believe the divisional ADAPs do identify Level I funding, if I am correct. Is that not the case?

Mr. Derkach: The ADAP plans do not talk about specific individuals or the numbers of individuals. Rather, they are the general plan for the program, and there is no specific reference that is made with regard to the numbers of students, especially in the Level I category, but I might, just for clarification purposes, elaborate a little bit on the Level I support. The Level I support includes resource teachers, special needs teachers, occupational entrance teachers, teachers of the gifted, and teacher aides. The support is provided on a ratio which is one to 160 and that includes the teacher aides. The resource teachers are available for all pupils in a school division to assist them with their learning needs and with their disability or their deficiencies in terms of their skills.

The ratio requested is derived by using the full-time equivalent enrollment and the number of resource teachers, special needs teachers, occupational teachers and teachers of the gifted. This is the general approach that we use to the funding of special needs students, especially at the Level I category. In the Level II and Level III, of course, there are specific amounts, and I gave out those particular statistics, I think, at our last sitting.

Mr. Chomiak: Yes, the minister is correct, he gave out those particular statistics. I am also quite familiar with the funding model as it relates to Level I. I stand to be corrected, but I am of the impression that there is an ascertainable means of determining the number of Level I students, division by division, but if the minister indicates that is not the case, I will have to accept that.

I wonder if the minister has a statistical breakdown of the various resource teachers, teachers of the gifted and teacher aides on a division basis, as he indicated in his remarks, that deal with Level I students?

Mr. Derkach: We do not have that information available. That is something that can be obtained

from each school division, but it is not something that we have at our disposal at this time. With regard to the students in the Level I programs, that information, too, can probably be obtained by asking each school division that specific question, but once again that is not information we have at this time.

Mr. Chomlak: Can I ask the minister, does the Department of Education ask each school division that specific question?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, I think the member was asking the question whether we collect, or whether we ask each school division the question, but I am not sure which question he was referring to. If it is the question on the numbers of students that are in Level I, no, we do not ask that question, and we do not get that information. We have always kept data on the Level I teachers because of the old formula that had been applied in the past, and we continued to keep that kind of information. It is not information that I have at my disposal at this time.

* (1440)

Mr. Chomlak: I guess it is clear. It is certainly my opinion and our opinion that the difficulty in terms of funding relates to the Level I funding segment. I guess I find it surprising that we are going through an exercise of finance review and funding model review, and I note that Answering the Challenge makes at least two references towards dealing with special needs funding. I fail to understand why the minister does not have information as it relates to Level I funding, to allow the minister and the minister's advisory committee and any other individuals involved, to make a proper determination of what kind of model should be put in place in order to deal with the difficulty of funding this level.

Mr. Derkach: The advisory committee on education and finance, and certainly the department as a whole, will be obtaining the kind of information for their research purposes that they require. As I indicated, I do not have the information on the numbers of students who might be considered L-I students in each school division, because the approach has changed. The approach has changed to allow resource teachers, to allow special needs teachers, to allow co-ordinators the ability not to specifically focus their attention on the Level I student, but to allow them to assist students who may not necessarily qualify for Level I funding.

It makes it a more general approach, but it addresses the needs of some resource-type

students in a better way. It also addresses the needs of gifted children. I believe that to this point in time school divisions have adopted and accepted that as a reasonable approach to delivering the services to Level I students.

Now when we get into the Level II area and the Level III area where the disabilities are more severe, indeed in those areas we do keep specific counts and, because of the learning deficiencies that are prevalent in those areas, we also address it through specific funding for each individual child, as negotiated or as determined between the school division and the CCDB branch.

Mr. Chomlak: I have real difficulty with the response of the minister on this particular point, because we have identified a problem with respect to funding that specifically occurs in the Level I area. We have identified the fact that many school divisions get far, far below what even the minister, I think, would admit would be optimum funding for special needs.

When we get into Winnipeg No. 1, the minister keeps talking about additional grants and special grants that go to Winnipeg 1, but the point is, it still has to come back to the basics that Winnipeg School Division No. 1 only gets 26 percent of its special needs budget funded by this ministry.

Probably the major portion of that difficulty is Level I funding, and I am wondering how the minister can deal with the problem if he does not have any idea of what the statistical basis is for the problem?

Mr. Derkach: We have a new—it is not a new formula any more. It has been in operation for three years, and the member for Kildonan decides today that he is going to pursue the area of why we should change that model. Well, Madam Chair, I have to tell you that model has been in place now for at least three years, and the school divisions have not expressed any great concern about the fact that this is the wrong approach in terms of delivering services to students. As a matter of fact, in many instances, there has -(interjection)- well, the member says there is not enough money. That is his response to everything. Just throw more money, just throw more money and continue to gouge the taxpayer.

Point of Order

Mr. Chomlak: I believe the minister has made a factual error. That is not this member's response to everything.

Madam Chairman: The honourable member for Kildonan does not have a point of order. It is a dispute over facts.

* * *

Mr. Derkach: He did make that comment from his seat. He said, they do not have enough money. That means throw more money. Well, Madam Chair, our approach is somewhat different. We want to ensure that when we develop a new funding model, the whole area of program effectiveness is going to be addressed, and I indicated in my responses with regard to the new funding model, the whole area of program effectiveness is going to be addressed.

I indicated in my responses with regard to the new funding model, that we have our program people working alongside our finance people. Indeed, the research that they have at their disposal is for the basis of the new formula. I do not have access to that information at this time, because it is the committee that is doing the work.

Madam Chair, I have to indicate also that the move to this type of funding, the Level I funding, was not initiated necessarily by this administration. It was initiated by the former administration. We carried out with it and indeed it has proven to be a more appropriate way to address some of the needs of the students who have those educational problems according to the experts in the school divisions that we deal with.

Madam Chair, if the member continues to want us to change the approach, that may happen, but indeed that is something that is under review with the new funding model that will be announced at the end of the summer.

Mr. Chomiak: Madam Chairperson, I fail to see how the minister can come up with any kind of a model when he does not even know the statistical basis on which it is made. The minister, in his own document, the special education in Manitoba, says and I quote at page 15, the ADAPs are to provide important data for planning future directions so Manitoba Education and Training requires school divisions submit a board-approved annual division special education action plan.

The minister has no idea what is in those action plans and how can he plan a funding model accordingly? It is regardless of who put the funding model in place. The minister is so fixated on scoring political points. The point is, when you have a

school division where only 26 percent of the special needs funding is funded by the provincial government, and other school divisions where 80 percent is funded, that strikes me as inequitable. The minister has failed and has yet to address the reasons or the rationale or attempt to deal with that particular inequity.

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, again the critic is dead wrong, because we do have the ADAP models in place.

Madam Chair, I have to remind him as well, that when his party was in government, they never even sought to develop a guideline for special needs education. There were no ADAP models at that point. There was nothing. It was a chaotic situation.

Today he stands in the House, and he criticizes a model that has been put in place to ensure that we have some specific information on what types of programs are delivered to special needs students. We have one of the finest special needs programs in Canada in this province. We have a guideline that is written finally, one that his administration could not put forth. Yet he stands up here today and says that we cannot run a model, because we do not have the information.

Well, we have far more information than the former administration ever had. We have more accurate information. Indeed, when the funding model has been developed—the funding model is just being developed, and when it is developed and when it is run, then we will use all the criteria to ensure that that model effectively addresses the needs of students and the needs of school divisions out there.

Madam Chair, it is still the responsibility of every school division to develop the programs that they indeed feel are necessary in their areas. If they want to develop their elaborate programs or very minimum programs, that indeed is the jurisdiction of every school division in this province.

Mr. Chomiak: Madam Chairman, can the minister table the document that he has in his hands dealing with the ADAPs, I assume, which are a summary of the ADAPs as provided through the ministry of education?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, this is for internal use, and I would be prepared to use it as a resource to answer any questions he might have, specific

questions on Level II or Level III programming, or indeed Level I programming, as I have been doing.

Mr. Chomlak: Can the minister describe for me the basis on which he makes the statement that the Winnipeg School Division No. 1 has "elaborate special needs program"?

* (1450)

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, it is a well-known fact that Winnipeg No. 1—and if the member would care to look at some of their programs and compare them to other jurisdictions, he would see that Winnipeg No. 1 does have a very good special needs program developed within that division. As I said in my earlier comments in our last sitting, I would not condemn them for the quality of program that they have running in that division.

Indeed, we cannot fund programs that are developed that perhaps are very comprehensive and are very elaborate. There has to be a standard at which we say, this is the programming that we can afford, this is the programming that the province can afford, and we have to forward monies on that basis.

We have recognized the fact that Winnipeg No. 1 has some special problems, and to recognize that we have afforded them an additional grant of \$2 million to allow them to deal with some of those problems. Madam Chair, it is a combination, not simply of having the simplistic approach of saying that they have more than their proportionate number of special needs students, but you have to look at that and you have to look at the quality and the elaborateness of the program that they provide in order to be determining whether or not the level of money they spend on special needs is equivalent to that being spent in other school divisions.

Mr. Chomlak: The minister failed to answer the question, which was: Can he describe what the elaborate program is in the Winnipeg School Division No. 1? He has a summary, I assume, in front of him from the ADAPs. Can he please put into the record what is provided by Winnipeg School Division No. 1?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, when you talk about the ADAP reports, the responses, what we are looking at is not specific numbers of students, not specifics of programs. Indeed, it is a broad plan that is developed by the division on their special needs programming, and if the member has specific questions on programs, we could deal with that

when we get to the section that is appropriate to ask programming questions on.

Mr. Chomlak: My question is simple. The minister has described Winnipeg School Division No. 1 as having an elaborate special needs program. On what basis does he make that statement?

Mr. Derkach: If the member would recall, I said there are some divisions that have more elaborate programs than others, and Winnipeg No. 1's program is more elaborate than some of the other divisional programs.

Madam Chair, if he wants to go through the program, then we should do that when we cover the CCDB area and the program analysis rather than in the finance and administration area, which he should know that we are not talking about at this time.

Mr. Chomlak: Can the minister outline what the special \$2-million grant that he has mentioned six or seven times is, whether it is a one-time grant and whether it will be applied next year?

Mr. Derkach: That \$2 million grant is a grant that is outside of their base support, that is evaluated on an annual basis, their needs are evaluated on an annual basis, and it is determined whether or not they will get it on an annual basis. In other words, there are no guarantees for that grant.

That grant is given for the purpose of establishing programs in the Special Needs area because of the numbers and the complexities of problems that they have to deal with in Winnipeg No. 1. It is recognized by the department that there are special needs for additional funding, but that is done on an annual basis outside of the base grant that is provided to Winnipeg No. 1.

Mr. Chomlak: Can the minister outline for me the criteria by which it is determined to provide that \$2 million?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, the determination of providing that grant is based on the numbers and, perhaps, the needs that Winnipeg No. 1 has in relation to other school divisions. Because of the inner-city characteristics, because of the special needs that school division has, it has been deemed appropriate to afford them some extra funding to cope with those kinds of challenges. Those are the basic criteria. There are no specified criteria to say, well, if you have six students more in this category, we will give you an extra \$10 a student or whatever. It is a block grant or categorical grant, if you like,

which is based on the general needs as compared to other school divisions in the province.

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairman, the minister makes my point perfectly in his response in terms of all of my previous questioning as it relates to Level I and Special Needs.

The fact remains that the funding approach as it presently exists—and I do not care who put it in place—does not satisfy the appropriate needs of Special Needs students. If the minister was not so defensive, we could have gotten to this point a lot further. Consequently, special programs, ad hoc programs, are put in place in order to satisfy that particular need.

My question then is: That need is determined by evaluation of some kind of material. Does the minister pull it out of the air? I would like to have some specifics.

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, first of all let me say that, yes, I have said from the beginning there is a problem with the approach that is used in funding school divisions. I thought the member had listened to that response and had established that clearly in his mind. Yes, there is a problem in the way that we approach funding to school divisions. That is why we are doing the analysis of the whole funding issue to establish a new formula by the end of the summer, as I have indicated on several occasions.

Madam Chair, in terms of addressing the problem of special needs, that is something that is negotiated between the Child Care Development Branch and the school division. Together they look at the programs and establish whether or not the conditions that are prevalent in Winnipeg No. 1 are more severe than they are in other school divisions. On that basis, a recommendation is made as to whether or not a special grant should be afforded to that school division.

I might say, Madam Chair, this is the same grant that has been in place now for five years, and we continue to evaluate it on an annual basis to determine whether the needs are as severe as they were the previous year. If they are, then the grant is forwarded to that division. So the criteria that were in place then are in place today.

Mr. Chomlak: Is the minister of the opinion that the funding in the Special Needs section of the grant is not sufficient for the services required?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, that is such an open-ended and broad question that you could

respond yes to it very easily without elaborating, but I think it is important we indicate that we have to match the level of need that is out there with our capabilities. Indeed we could spend millions and millions of dollars more on special needs students throughout the province, but we have to match that with our ability to pay. That is limited given the financial constraints that we have as a result of a huge debt that this province has that was not encumbered by this administration.

Yes, I would love to spend great sums of money on special needs to ensure that those students have the highest quality of education, but indeed that is not possible given the constraints that we have within this province, and even in the former administration's capabilities. They were not able to forward that kind of funding that was needed out there to meet each and every need.

As a matter of fact, I could quote the then Minister of Education Roland Penner, who said it is impossible for us to satisfy all the educational needs that society expects us to accomplish. He said that, and that is a reality. We cannot satisfy every need that is out there, but indeed we are making an effort to address as many as we possibly can given our fiscal capacity.

* (1500)

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairman, if the minister wants, I will table that very comment of Mr. Penner when he was the Minister of Education, because I have it in my material together with the minister's comments at the very same time when he was in opposition. He may not want to see those particular comments, but I digress. It is a pity that the deficit has gone up ever since this government came to power, but I will not deal with that particular issue. The debt has gone up under this government. It is bigger today than it ever was.

Madam Chairman, the minister has provided us with a breakdown of total special needs support on a division-by-division basis, and I appreciate that, together with statistical changes in that breakdown. Does the minister have that broken down further between Levels II and III and Level I?

Mr. Derkach: I would like to clarify a point within the question that the member raised. He wants to know the support in Level I, Level II, Level III clinician and administration support and co-ordinator support, and I would like to know if he

wants that information in dollars per school division, or percentage change from year to year?

Mr. Chomlak: I can indicate to the minister that I would like all three—dollars, by division, percentage increase.

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, he says that he would like all three. I mentioned two. Could he specify which three he would like?

Mr. Chomlak: I misinterpreted the minister. I will have both.

Mr. Derkach: I will put on the record these figures because I want to ensure that, in fact, they are reflected correctly in Hansard. Winnipeg School Division No. 1, the estimate is for \$5,145,630. The percentage change from '91 to '92 is .5 percent; St. James-Assiniboia is \$1,606,010. The change is minus .3 percent; Assiniboine South School Division is \$1,100,440, 3.2 percent; St. Boniface School Division is \$932,820, minus 1.9 percent; Fort Garry School Division is \$1,100,500, .7 percent; St. Vital School Division is \$1,572,100, 3.6 percent; Norwood School Division is \$254,760. That is flat.

River East School Division is at \$2,106,440, .6 percent; Seven Oaks is \$1,472,440, .4 percent; Lord Selkirk School Division is \$762,280, .3 percent; Transcona-Springfield School Division \$1,304,830, .4 percent; Agassiz School Division is \$437,500 which is zero percent; Seine River School Division is \$775,400, 2 percent; Hanover School Division is \$885,560, 30.8 percent; Boundary School Division \$196,640, .1 percent; Red River School Division is at \$254,840, 4.6 percent; Rhineland School Division is at \$257,000, 19.8 percent; Morris-MacDonald School Division is at \$260,600, .2 percent; White Horse Plain School Division is at \$235,350, .3 percent; Interlake School Division is at \$534,580, and that is flat.

Evergreen School Division is at \$290,700, and that is down .1 percent; Lakeshore School Division is at \$259,200, which is minus .3 percent; Portage la Prairie is at \$586,910, minus .4 percent; Midland School Division is at \$272,500, 1 percent; Garden Valley School Division is at \$445,400 which is .6 percent; Pembina Valley School Division is at \$200,400, and that is minus .2 percent; Mountain School Division is at \$240,875, which is .3 percent; Tiger Hills School Division is at \$254,320, minus .3 percent; Pine Creek School Division is \$258,340, which is flat.

Beautiful Plains is at \$262,130, minus 2 percent; Turtle River School Division is at \$254,400, minus 0.2 percent; Dauphin-Ochre School Division, \$366,710, minus 1.4 percent; Duck Mountain, \$206,320, .3 percent; Swan Valley, \$330,160, .8 percent; Intermountain School Division is at \$258,660, which is at 14.5 percent; Pelly Trail, \$237,225, minus .3 percent; Birdtail River School Division is at \$258,120, which is zero percent; Rolling River School Division is at \$340,550, which is at 3.2 percent; Brandon School Division is at \$1,218,300, which is flat.

Fort La Bosse School Division is at \$288,080, which is .8 percent; Souris Valley School Division is at \$238,850, which is .2 percent; Antler River School Division is at \$234,025, which is minus .8 percent; Turtle Mountain School Division is at \$258,400, which is .1 percent; Kelsey School Division is at \$345,980, which is—

Madam Chairman: Order, please.

Point of Order

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): It is usually customary in committees when there is a great deal of data to be made available to the committee that the minister table the information. We do live in an age of photocopy machines.

* (1510)

It would seem to me it would be appropriate rather than taking a great deal of time reading out all of these statistics, which are pretty hard to follow, for the minister to simply table the document. I think that is a reasonable request. Traditionally, that has happened by all governments.

Madam Chairman: The honourable member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) does not have a point of order.

* * *

Mr. Derkach: Flin Flon School Division, \$262,000, which is flat; Western School Division, \$257,150, which is zero; Frontier School Division at \$476,900, which is 7.7 percent; Churchill is at \$78,480, which is 106.7 percent; Snow Lake, \$93,880, minus 2.5 percent; Lynn Lake is at \$51,050, which is at minus 8.2 percent; Mystery Lake is at \$597,500, which is minus 3.4 percent; Sprague is at \$45,100, which is 56.1 percent; Leaf Rapids, \$137,551, 68.8 percent.

I would also indicate that is the Level I support. I will also indicate that I will have for tabling the

specific details on the other requests that the member made at our next sitting, but I would just like to get it specifically clear what he really wants in those areas. Are these the same figures he wants, the Estimate for 1991-92 and the percentage change between 1990 and 1991-92?

Mr. Chomlak: I would indicate in the affirmative. What I have presently is this total Special Needs support, and what I wanted was a breakdown by the various levels by division, so that is precisely what I want from the minister.

Mr. Derkach: I will have those available for tomorrow, Madam Chair.

Mr. Chomlak: The minister indicated in his comments today and he indicated previously, in fact at the last meeting, that there are certain standards of Special Needs base level—I assume it is Special Needs, but I will use the minister's words. He says certain standards as they relate to special needs, and I am wondering if the minister can outline for me what those minimum standards are?

Mr. Derkach: Once again, Madam Chair, this is a program question, and I would ask the member to defer program questions to the section where we deal with CCDB programming, and I will have appropriate staff in the Chamber at that time.

Mr. Chomlak: The minister indicated in our last session, that is May 7, that the total change on the special levy on an average basis between last fiscal year and this fiscal year is 10.1 percent, and I am reading from Hansard, page 1,767. I am wondering if the minister will confirm if, in fact, that is the correct figure?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, I do believe I read out all of the increases in Special Levy on a divisional basis. Indeed the total Special Levy dollar increase, on a percentage sense, was 10.1 percent.

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairperson, just to ensure that—because I do not have the documents in front of me—we are talking about the correct figure or the same figure. We are talking about the property tax portion levied by school divisions on the property tax by individual divisions, in other words, the property tax level at the school division level, which is commonly known as the Special Levy as opposed to the Education Support Levy.

Mr. Derkach: I will repeat for the third time, Madam Chair. The increase in Special Levy, in percentage terms, was 10.1 percent. It is correct, Special Levy

is that property tax that is levied by the school board at the local level.

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairman, I just wanted to request some information from the minister. I may have it in front of me, if you will just give me 30 seconds.

I am wondering if the minister will give me, in percentage terms, what level private school funding is at this fiscal year as a percentage of funding given to the public school system.

Mr. Derkach: The level of funding that is provided to the independent schools as a percentage of what is provided to the public school system, on a per pupil basis, is 59 percent for the 1991-92 school year. That increased from 54.5 percent in 1990-91.

Mr. Chomlak: Can the minister indicate for me whether there is a graduated plan by which the 80 percent level will be achieved? Can he provide me with the details of that plan, if it is in fact in place?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, the future funding for private schools in terms of percentages as a percentage of public school funding that had been agreed upon between the Department of Education and Training and the Manitoba Federation of Independent Schools are as follows: As I indicated, for 1990-91 it was 54.5 percent; in 1991-92, 59 percent; in 1992-93 we move to 63.5 percent; in 1993-94 we move to 68 percent; in 1994-95, 71 percent; in 1995-96, 74 percent; 1996-97, 77 percent; and 1997-98, we will be at 80 percent. It is an eight-year period of time in which we will move from the current levels that we had in 1990-91 to the 80 percent level, which will be achieved in 1997-98.

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairman, I assume that this will be irrespective of whatever funding model is put in place vis-a-vis public schools following the completion of the finance review scheduled for the summer.

Mr. Derkach: Yes, Madam Chair, that is correct.

Mr. Chomlak: This particular figure will be 80 percent of the per pupil cost of the public school level funding? Can the minister maybe outline for me what the formula will be?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, the formula that is used is the average per pupil cost minus the curricular materials and special needs, since special needs is approached somewhat differently at the independent school level in the Level I area. Therefore, we take away the special needs and the

curricular materials, and I have to point out that we do not fund independent schools for any capital for which we fund the public school system.

* (1520)

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairman, has the minister provided me with that particular figure which illustrates what the average pupil cost is at the public school level, in other words, the figure that is used to determine the 59.5 percent?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, the estimate for the 1991-92 school year for the public school on a per pupil amount is \$3,415, and in the independent school it is \$2,015.

Mr. Chomlak: The method by which it is determined that these monies are in fact spent appropriately is via the audited statements that are provided from the private schools to the department reviewers.

Mr. Derkach: Yes, Madam Chair, that is correct.

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairman, can the minister indicate whether in this portion or indeed any portion of the Estimates there is money set aside for pay equity?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, I think it should be important to note that when we made the announcement jointly with the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik) on moving towards pay equity in school divisions, we did announce that the whole initiative was a voluntary one. There, of course, have been provisions made to access funds to allow for the process to develop, but I have to indicate very clearly that, because it is a voluntary approach to the pay equity concept, it is difficult to determine what kinds of funds are going to be required.

We have allowed for the discussion to evolve with regard to pay equity, and divisions are still discussing at this point in time whether they are going to be in or not in terms of the pay equity situation. Staff from the department are discussing the matter with school divisions presently.

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chair, do I understand it correctly that if certain divisions determine they will be within the pay equity scheme and certain divisions determine they will not, then based on that the Department of Education and Training will make funds available to assist in that process?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, maybe it would be easier if I would simply go through the features of the pay equity initiative.

As of December 13, 1990, the features of the pay equity initiative include a policy framework based on a jointly negotiated process, a pay equity officer and a job evaluation system funded by the Province and centrally available to all divisions and districts.

Provincial funding for pay equity wage adjustments: Manitoba Education and Training will provide 50 percent of a division's wage adjustment costs providing the division's pay equity plan adheres to the policy framework.

The policy framework which was suggested has a time frame of an education period from January to June of 1991, a negotiations and evaluations period from July '91 to June '93 and a wage adjustment period from July '93 to June 2000.

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairman, I am wondering if the minister can indicate for me how many staff are involved in terms of pay equity. Is it one staff year, two staff years, one and a half staff years?

Mr. Derkach: The SYs, Madam Chair, are one SY in the Pay Equity Bureau and that is in the Department of Labour, and one secretarial staff position in the Department of Education and Training.

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairman, I am asking this question at this portion of the appropriations because it strikes me as the appropriate section since the minister's statements lead one to believe that funding is founded, to a certain extent, on personnel costs. Does the minister have the data on the collective agreements in place between the various school divisions?

Mr. Derkach: I do not want to presuppose the specific question the member is asking, but he is asking the dollar amounts that we will be paying for pay equity. That is going to be based on a negotiated settlement at the end of a process which is fairly long and complex and, indeed, we can go through that process.

If the member would like more specific information, I would be pleased to provide it I can, but perhaps he could clarify exactly what it is he wishes.

* (1530)

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairman, the question probably was not worded very well. Can the minister indicate if any agreements are negotiated? How many are negotiated? What is the status of the

negotiations vis-a-vis the tying into the Pay Equity Program?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, only one school division in the province, at the present time, has completed the Pay Equity process and that is Assiniboine South School Division. I might say that they implemented pay equity prior to the announcement that was made with regard to the assistance on pay equity.

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairman, I missed the minister's comments about the time frame under which the department would assist divisions. Could he just reiterate that to me again, please?

Mr. Derkach: The following policy framework or the following timetable is suggested for the entire process. As I indicated, the education period from January to June of 1991, the negotiations and evaluations period from July 1991 to June 1993, and then a wage adjustment period from July 1993 to June 2000.

Mr. Chomlak: Last Estimates process and again this Estimates process, I am going to make another suggestion to the minister to perhaps return in terms of a reporting structure when one deals with the 3. expenditure. It strikes me as strange why the department does not break out the grants to the public schools on one hand and the private schools on the other hand. I am wondering if the minister is prepared to do that perhaps next year?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, it is true that the \$543,710,100 is the funding as it relates to public and independent schools. I will certainly take the member's suggestion under advisement in terms of breaking it out from the independent schools, but, just for his clarification, the support to private schools is at \$17,672,946. I can repeat that, \$17,672,946.

Mr. Chomlak: I thank the minister for those comments, and I am thankful for the fact that he consider it. I do have these figures and the minister did provide them to me, but the total the minister read differs somewhat from the figure that I have at the bottom of this document. The figure that I have at the bottom of this document is \$18,219,185—I am wondering now.

Mr. Derkach: I think we went through this before, it is the difference between the fiscal year and the school year, and that is why we have the difference in figures.

Madam Chairman: Item 3. Financial Support - Schools: 3.(a) School Grants and Other Assistance, \$543,710,100—pass.

Item 3.(b) Miscellaneous Grants.

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairman, I wonder if the minister could just either explain to me or table for me the Miscellaneous Grants portion.

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, I have one copy here that I can table of the Miscellaneous Grants that have been approved for this fiscal year. Perhaps we can get some copies made up.

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairman, I am prepared to move on to 3.(c) pending a receipt of copy of the 3.(b) documents. With respect to the \$17 million paid under 3.(c), can the minister give me a brief description of the General Support Grants and, if possible, a breakdown of the grants themselves?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, this series of grants is the established formula that has been in place for some time now to reimburse public school divisions and districts for the health and post-secondary education tax levy they paid to the province, I believe. I would be pleased to provide this for the member.

Mr. Leonard Evans: I wonder if I could take the opportunity to ask under this section, because we are still talking about public school divisions, whether the Minister of Education has been consulted by the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) with respect to moving the Pine Ridge School program from the Brandon Mental Health Centre to the Brandon School Division?

Mr. Derkach: At the present time, officials from the Department of Health are meeting or are to meet with officials from the Department of Education and Training, and there will be that type of meeting established with the Brandon School Division and those affected parties in Brandon to resolve the issue in providing educational services to the students who are at Pine Ridge presently.

* (1540)

Mr. Leonard Evans: Madam Chairperson, I was very concerned with the Minister of Health's (Mr. Orchard) answers to my questions in the Question Period where he seemed to ignore the protestations or concerns expressed by the Brandon School Division Chairman Mr. Gordon Sefton who very well described the problem, that is, the problem of coping with seriously emotionally-disturbed children or

young people, young people who could be described as really mentally ill. While they had services within the school division to cope with problem students, students who may have some type of behavioural difficulty, emotional problems; they were not prepared to cope with the serious cases. Those serious cases, as I understand it, would have been moved on from the school division to a place such as the Pine Ridge School at BMHC.

Dr. Parker, former chief psychiatrist for the Brandon Mental Health Centre, also in a letter—and I am not sure whether he sent a copy to the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) or not—but this was a letter sent very recently to the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) where he explained that this was really a program at BMHC that enabled the team approach to deal with mentally ill people, that the school, if you will—yes, it was there, yes, there were some courses offered, but that is because it is deemed to be advisable for these young people to be active in receiving some instruction, some training. To consider this to be a normal school setting or even a slightly abnormal school setting that could simply be transferred to the school division was really stretching it.

What bothers me, Madam Chairperson, is that the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) and his staff seem to have made a decision that this school "shall go" and is going to be located in the Brandon School Division, or those children will be located in the Brandon School Division. What the discussions will be about is how to bring this about rather than whether this is a possible move at all. I might add that it is not just the Brandon School Division. It is other school divisions in the Westman area, which, I understand, send people to the Pine Ridge School. It is a decision that just does not affect the Brandon School Division; it affects several school divisions as I understand.

Now the Westman Regional Advisory Council that the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) himself has set up has indicated that they were not consulted before this move. They have now publicly gone on record as opposing it as being a very bad decision, a decision that is bad in terms of the injustice to the young people who are emotionally ill, who are psychiatrically ill. It is bad for them; it is bad for the school itself, the teacher and the other students who have to somehow or other try to cope with individuals in the classroom who may be very difficult to handle.

The reason they are in the Pine Ridge School, quote/unquote school, is because the school divisions were not able to cope with these types of youngsters. I just find that it is incredible that the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) seems to be determined to go on and force the issue by closing down the so-called school, believing that somehow or other the school division is going to cope.

I would predict, Madam Chairperson, that the minister is going to have to back off of this, but I was wondering whether the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) had any views on it. This is not a partisan issue; it is not a left-wing/right wing issue. It is simply a matter of making a decision.

I mean, it is fine to say, look, there are monies that we can save so let us close down a program, because we can save some money and we might do something better elsewhere through the school division. That is fine if that is possible, but, according to the letter that I read from the school board chairperson, this was just an unthinkable proposal; it was going to bring about more direct costs in the school system, but also a lot of indirect costs, costs that could not be measured, costs of disruption and other costs to society.

I daresay that if the Pine Ridge School decision is not reversed I would not be surprised if the school divisions are not able to cope with these children. They will end up, I do not know, simply not going to school, or end up in some group home situation or whatever.

I think it is totally unsatisfactory, so I wondered whether the minister had any thoughts on the matter, whether he felt that the school divisions that we have, not just the Brandon School Division but any school divisions, were able to cope with these difficult cases, not just unusually active children but children who are seriously mentally ill. That is, as I understand it at least, why they are in the Pine Ridge School. That is why the school divisions have passed them on, because even though the school division may have a psychologist or staff who are prepared to cope with difficult cases, these are youngsters who are just beyond the capacity of a school division.

So I just wondered whether the minister had any concerns about this. He may not be that familiar with it, but if he shares the concerns expressed by the school division, whether he could somehow or

other become involved in the discussion with his colleague, the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard).

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chairperson, I am very familiar with the matter, and indeed the member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) is correct when he says that the Brandon School Division is quite concerned about what may happen if those students are moved into the public school system and perhaps inappropriately placed and cause a disruption to the class, indeed, put a class or students at risk.

It is my responsibility, as Minister of Education and Training, to ensure that the safety of students, not only those who are in the classroom but even those who are going to be entering the classroom, is ensured. For that reason, we have entered into dialogue with the Department of Health to explore alternate ways of providing the educational needs of those individuals within those institutions.

The member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) is also quite right in indicating it is not just a matter that is of concern to the Brandon School Division, because some of those individuals are from outside of the urban centre of Brandon. Therefore, not only is the Brandon School Division going to be affected by other school divisions as well, as I indicated, but we are entering into discussions, into important and productive dialogue with the Department of Health so that we can resolve this matter to the best interests of the students who are at Pine Ridge, but also to the best possible interests of the Brandon School Division and other school divisions that might be affected.

It is too early at this point in time to simply say that the resolution of the matter is to move those students into a regular classroom and cope with the matter from there. I think legitimate concerns have been expressed. We need to be cognizant of the importance of the matter and also to the sensitivity of this matter, as well.

When the member says that he is not necessarily looking at this from a partisan, political point of view, I respect that. Indeed, I am confident that he is expressing a genuine concern here. In a genuine sense, I can say that the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) is concerned about this. I am concerned about this as a result of some of the concerns that have been raised by the local community, by the officials, by the psychiatrist, indeed, by the chairman of the board.

* (1550)

We will be conducting a dialogue over the next little while to ensure that we arrive at an appropriate solution. Regardless of whether these students are going to be in an institution or in a school setting, they do require an educational program, and so together with the Department of Health we will decide on who should best deliver that component.

Our mandate is certainly not to deliver the health side of the care or the treatment. Our responsibility is to deliver the educational component and that is specifically our interest. Indeed, it goes beyond that to ensure that safety and students are not put at risk by something that we may do and may cause harm to others.

Mr. Chomlak: Just returning to the 3.(b) section momentarily, I thank the minister for providing me with 3.(b), as it relates to the \$151,000 in grants. The minister provided me with the document.

I am just curious if the minister can outline for me what the internal or what the guidelines are for distribution of these grants. I know that most of them are ongoing for a long period of time. I am wondering what the departmental guidelines are for distribution of these grants.

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, of course miscellaneous grants have been approved over the years based on requests, based on the ability of those associations or organizations to raise their own funds, the dependence of that organization on such funds as government funds and the relationship between the department and that organization. Of course, our goal is always to ensure that there is some educational component prevalent in the organizations that we support.

It is basically looking at each of the organizations that are listed here and determining what level of support they can gain from other sources or what funding levels they can obtain by fundraising events or other fees that they may wish to impose or charge and then trying to match that with some decision on how much we can afford to allocate.

As the member will note, basically all of the organizations have had a decrease in the level of funding, and once again that is a result of the fiscal position of the province and our ability to fund.

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairman, my only question—there are footnotes in this particular document that was provided to me by the minister. I just wonder if I could have access to the footnotes.

I will tell you why in particular. This is, I suppose, a second question.

I note that there is only one organization on this list that did not receive a grant last year, and that is the Association for Bright Children. It went from zero to \$1,000 this year. I note that it is footnoted from last year, and I am curious as to why this year?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, I will table this, but in terms of the Fort Whyte Centre for Environmental Education, which is Footnote No. 1, this organization was paid a total of \$15,000 from two departmental branches—\$11,000 from the Schools Finance Branch and \$4,000 from the Child Care and Development Branch.

Footnote No. 2, the Council of Ministers of Education. This organization's grant is under review.

Footnote No. 3, the Association for Bright Children. The organization in 1990-91 refused their grant of \$1,000.

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairman, that is highly unusual. I am wondering if the minister can indicate, does he know the reason why they refused their grant?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, I guess sometimes we wish we could hear more of that kind of news, but they did indicate that they did not require the grant last year.

Madam Chairman: Item 3.(b) Miscellaneous Grants, \$151,400—pass; 3.(c) General Support Grants, \$17,770,400—pass.

Resolution 29: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$561,631,900 for Education and Training, Financial Support - Schools for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1992—pass.

Item 4. Program Development Support Services, page 39, (a) Division Administration: (1) Salaries.

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairman, I am curious. Is this the section where the co-ordinator of the High School Review is employed, or is it under 4.(b)?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, before I answer that question, perhaps it would be appropriate for me to introduce the staff at the table now. We have a new staff member who has been with us eight months. Of course, the member may know Ed Buller who is the ADM of PDSS and Gail Bagnall who is the Director of Curriculum Development.

With regard to the question that was posed, whether the co-ordinator of the High School Review is in this section or 4.(b), I can indicate that it is in 4.(b).

Mr. Chomlak: I am wondering what priorities this branch has identified as it relates to program development and support in the K-12 education system. The question is not facetious. The question is directed at the minister because there are so many stated objectives in Answering the Challenges, the five-year Strategic Plan and some of the other documents that have been prepared by the minister. I wonder what the priorities of this particular division or branch might be and if the minister could outline it?

Insofar as the activity, one of the two major activities of this division is to identify priorities and develop policies related to program development and support in the K-12 division.

* (1600)

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, with regard to the implementation of the strategies that are outlined in Strategies for Success, might I indicate that the first priority was to set up the steering committee for the implementation of the strategies and also the naming of the Advisory Committee for Native Education—we had indicated that was an important priority—and also the naming of the Advisory Committee for Gifted Education.

The stages that we are at in each of these, with regard to the steering committee, the committee is now in place and, I believe, they held their first meeting on Wednesday. The Native Education committee, the membership has not yet been confirmed; and the Advisory Committee on Gifted Education, we have not confirmed the names for that committee as well.

The second important initiative or strategy to be considered is the Strategy 17—The language arts in Immersion and Français. As the member knows, we adopted the policy that was presented to us in the first document from the committee that had consulted widely with the communities, which was to put in one compulsory credit in French, in français, and one-half a compulsory credit in English. Now that meant that school divisions could enhance that if they so chose. However, we have received some concern from parents and administrators claiming that there is insufficient time for English language arts. We have indicated very clearly that we will

take this next year to consult in the field again, because if there has been a change in attitude or a change in the minds of the people who have their children in those programs, because it is an expanding program, we maybe should consult with them again and then make the appropriate adjustments.

Another important initiative is to resolve the whole issue of the International Baccalaureate and advanced placement credit, or programs for credit. They are currently on pilot status. We have indicated that we would like to remove the programs from status so they can be recognized by the department for credit and also by our post-secondary institutions. That again is going to be an initiative that we will have some consultation on over this next year, and we will be implementing that in some form in the next year.

Another initiative that is to be implemented within the next school year is going to be the Grade 9 credit system. It is to be implemented in September of 1992. This particular initiative has had some discussion in the field, because there are schools that are made up of Grade 9 to Grade 12 components, some are Grade 7 to Grade 9, so there are some questions with regard to what happens to students who are not in a high school setting.

Can they go on a credit system, and if they go on a credit system and then they transfer, will those credits be recognized by the receiving school division? What happens if a student comes from a Grade 9 to 12 setting, then goes into a 7 to 9 setting and has a partial Grade 9? Those are some of the questions that have to be resolved prior to the Grade 9 credit system being implemented completely.

The program Skills for Independent Living is going to be ready in June of 1991 for implementation. We have close to 100 classes who have already asked to be part of the pilot, which can be implemented in September. In-servicing for this course will be held in August.

The provincial exam that we conducted this year or are conducting this year in mathematics we certainly found to be a successful initiative in terms of the way that the process was handled in January, and we are looking for a successful process again in June, and that will continue.

That basically is the list of priorities for implementation within the next year in the High School Review.

Mr. Chomlak: I thank the minister for those comments. I will be probing quite a bit further into the High School Review, but I guess it does not matter whether it is under 4.(a) or 4.(b).

The Annual Report indicates that this branch liaises with the 95 separate schools. I am wondering if the minister can outline for me what those activities consist of.

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, the liaison between the department and independent schools was originally under the field services branch, which was discontinued. In February of 1991, which was just very recently, the whole area shifted to the independent schools office. This office has a component of 1.5 SYs.

The responsibilities carried out by this office will be to ascertain the quality of programs offered by independent schools; to consult with senior departmental staff on policy matters relating to private independent schools and determine the appropriate action and plans; to advise and to consult with the private and independent schools on matters of Manitoba Education and Training policy, funding criteria, legislation and regulations as they may apply to this category of schools; and to serve as an ongoing linkage and channel of communication between independent schools and the department.

I might indicate that is a function that is being carried out, not only with the funded independent schools, but indeed we are trying to establish some linkages with unfunded schools, so that students in this province can have a consistent quality of programming delivered to them regardless of whether they are in a public school, an independent school or even in an unfunded independent school.

* (1610)

Mr. Chomlak: So I take it from the minister's response that a new office of independent schools has been incorporated now within this particular branch of the department.

Mr. Derkach: Yes, Madam Chair, that is correct. I guess it should be pointed out that both the program and finance functions are joined, if you like, through that office.

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairman, I am confused by the minister's response, because I believed in this office of private schools the minister indicated 1.5 staff years. Yet I understood there is at least one staff year that does nothing but monitor the finances

of private schools. So what does the minister mean by his comments that the functions are joined? They are co-ordinated, or are they now under the same roof?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, there is one person who is within the Finance branch whose function it is to monitor the financial aspects of the independent schools, but there are other duties assigned to that individual as well. The office that I speak of has 1.5 SYs, if you like, and they are the program and secretarial support staff.

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairman, so how many SYs are responsible for curriculum monitoring of the private schools?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, there are 1.5 SYs assigned to the program side of monitoring the programs of independent schools.

Mr. Chomlak: So I take it that it is 1.5 assigned to monitoring the program side, the curriculum, and one SY assigned to the financial side in addition to other duties on that one SY.

Mr. Derkach: Yes, Madam Chair, that is correct.

Mr. Chomlak: Can the minister give me the number of students who are known presently by the province to be operating under the home-schooling process?

Mr. Derkach: There are approximately 500 students currently enrolled as home schoolers.

Mr. Chomlak: I take it that does not include the Cartwright people.

Mr. Derkach: That is correct. That does not include the students at Cartwright.

Mr. Chomlak: Can the minister indicate for me what the liaison activities between this branch of the department and the home-schooling people consists of, and how many staff years are assigned to that?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, we have one staff person who has been assigned the duty of monitoring the home-schooling programs. It is his responsibility to keep constant communication with the home schoolers and contact, so we can facilitate in any way we can a better learning environment for students who are being schooled at home.

Mr. Chomlak: The number of children taught at home appears to be growing in the province, and I am wondering if the minister has any indication as to why this trend is growing and any comments he might have on the phenomenon.

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chairperson, I do not know whether the increase in the number of home-schooled students has increased dramatically in the last two or three years, but what has happened is that we have now been able to obtain better data on, as close as we can, the exact numbers, if you like, of students that are being home schooled. Therefore, it shows that there appears to have been some increase in the number of home-schooled students, but that may be a result of the fact that we have got better numbers on which students are being home schooled.

Additionally, I might say that it is not something that is unique to Manitoba. Indeed, it seems to be a societal phenomenon where we are finding that more students are home schooled throughout the country, not just in Manitoba.

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairman, the statistic I was looking at is the 1989-90 Annual Report. It indicates 461 students were home schooled and we are up to 500 some, which is a relatively large increase. Are these students subject, or going to be subject, to the province-wide examination process that the minister put in place?

Mr. Derkach: No, Madam Chair, they are not subject to any of the testing nor the final exam in mathematics because they are out of the school system and are being schooled right at home. So we cannot impose any testing that might happen in the school system, nor can we impose the final examination on them.

Mr. Chomlak: Is that also the case with private schools?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, the funded private schools do write the final exam.

Mr. Chomlak: The minister indicated that the provincial exam process was "successful." I am wondering if the minister will outline for me the reasons that he determined that the exam process was successful.

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, as the member knows, we underwent considerable controversy about the examination and, indeed, the opposition raised a great deal of concern that the exam process would be a failure and that we should abandon the process. We persevered, and as a matter of fact, there was even a lobby amongst teachers not to have the exam marked, that was encouraging teachers to boycott the marking of the exam. Well,

in the end, I would say that the procedures worked very well.

Staff from the department, I would have to say, deserved absolute high marks for the way they conducted themselves in view of the opposition that was before them. They went out to school divisions right through this province where they were requested to come to explain the process. They met at regional meetings. They met at the SAG conference with math teachers to explain the process, to explain the intent of the exam. I would have to say that overall the acceptance of the exam was far higher than we thought, given the controversy that it was creating.

* (1620)

Madam Chairperson, I would also indicate that the exam marking went extremely smoothly, where the exams were marked more rapidly than we thought they could be. The marks were returned to the school divisions in time for students to make their decisions for the second semester.

In terms of the feedback that we have received, I can tell the member that I have received some positive feedback. By far, the positive feedback outweighed the negative feedback, from students themselves, who expressed some satisfaction about the exam and its intent and the fact that they were happy to have written the exam.

Divisions had the choice this year to use the exam to count toward 30 percent of the student's final mark or to have the exam count for zero percent. The majority of the school divisions did count the exam as 30 percent of the student's final grade, and more than 50 percent of the students who wrote the exam counted it for 30 percent of their mark as well.

The other thing was the feedback from teachers who had conducted the examination and who taught the math course. I would say that overall the feedback from math teachers was positive in terms of process and in terms of the content of the exam.

We are looking forward to the exam that is going to be written in early June, and indeed adjustments will be made to reflect the wishes of the teachers out there and the administrators who may wish to write the exam perhaps a little later if we can score the exam in that given length of time. We will certainly give it serious consideration, but we are looking forward to another successful round of the math exam in June.

Mr. Chomlak: The subjectivity by which the minister gave those comments, the basis on which he made those claims is so subjective that I will not even bother engaging in debate on the matter. I believe that the minister's comments will reflect so much subjectivity that I am not even going to debate the matter with him, because it would be pointless.

My question to the minister is: Is it the same exam, the same course that will be set in June and, secondly, which exam and which courses will be examined in the subsequent year?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, I am somewhat surprised at the member's comments. If he does not want the answer why does he ask the question?

He asked the question. I gave him the factual information as we have received it from the field. There was nothing subjective about that. If you ask the personnel in my department, I would have to say that they would tell you the very same thing, that the process was successful, that a majority of math teachers have indicated very clearly that they were satisfied with the content and the process, that more than 50 percent of the students counted the exam as 30 percent of the final grade, that staff from my department worked extremely hard to make sure that the field understood what the exam was about and what the intent of the objective of the exam was, and the exam went over smoothly. There is nothing subjective about that.

Those are all facts that have been ascertained as a result of the first round of the exam. So, Madam Chair, if he does not want the truth, if he does not want the question answered, then I suggest he refrain from asking it. We will continue to supply the information in as factual a manner as we can.

When he asked the question about whether the exam will be the same in June as it was in January, I would have to say the exam will be mathematics. It will not be the identical exam that was written in January, because that exam has been circulated among schools so that they could look at the content and comment on it. But it will be the mathematics exam that will be written in June as well, both in the semestered and non-semestered sections and both in the 300 and 301 areas.

In terms of which exam will be written in 1991-92, there is a steering committee that was established to deal with that topic and to make a recommendation to the minister as to which exam

they would like to see written in 1991-92 and which exam they would like to see written in 1992-93.

That information has not been completely analyzed and, once I have looked at it carefully, a decision will be made as to which exam will be written in 1991-92.

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chair, I guess the minister does not talk to MAST or MTS or any of the other education organizations. My question for the minister is: I would suggest that the process be determined early as to what exam will be written, so we do not have the same kind of administrative difficulties encountered in the writing of the exam and concerns expressed as we had last year. I am wondering if the minister can indicate today when he expects a decision will be made as to which exam will be written in January of next year.

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, with regard to the comment made about the fact that I do not meet with MTS or MAST or any organizations, I would have to indicate that I meet with them regularly. I discuss things with them regularly, but it does not mean that we always agree on issues regularly.

Indeed, he is correct about the opposition of MTS and MAST to the exam, but we are responsible for making those decisions in the end. For that reason, we take full responsibility for the decision that was made.

We will be announcing the exam in the next few short weeks with regard to what that exam will be for 1991-92 and, as soon as we do, I will certainly convey by letter that information to the member.

Mr. Chomlak: The minister indicated that the Skills for Independent Living curriculum will be complete in June of this year. Is that a correct statement? The minister is nodding.

Mr. Derkach: For the Senior I level, Madam Chair, the course for Skills for Independent Living will be completed by June of this year.

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairman, I am not at all familiar with the curriculum development process directly. It just strikes me as perhaps unusual that the curriculum will only be developed in June, and then teachers who will be teaching the course in September will be in-serviced on it in August.

Does the minister feel comfortable that the process is adequate to allow the course to begin in September as per the plan?

Mr. Derkach: Yes, Madam Chair, we made it very clear that school divisions which wish to implement the Skills for Independent Living program at the Senior I level this year would do so on a pilot, or on a voluntary basis, that we would not be forcing school divisions into the program.

As I indicated to the member, there have been over 100 schools which have indicated that they would like to proceed with the implementation of that program and our responsibility is to ensure that staff have the material as quickly as possible. I indicated that the course would be ready in June, and that in-servicing would be held for those divisions that are implementing the program, or those schools that are implementing the program, in August.

* (1630)

As I understand it from staff, four regional two-day workshops have been planned on August 27 and 28, both in English and in French, for all those teachers who are going into that pilot program in the next school year.

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairman, last year, and I am jumping to subappropriation 4.(b). I do not know if it really matters the way we are jumping around or—

An Honourable Member: Will we pass 4.(a)?

Mr. Chomlak: No, I am not. I will have a couple of questions in 4.(a) before I will pass it, then I will revert to 4.(a).

There was a process by which a—Oh, we can pass 4.(a). Pass.

Madam Chairman: Item 4.(a) Division Administration: (1) Salaries, \$226,800—pass; 4.(a)(2) Other Expenditures, \$30,100—pass.

Item 4.(b) Curriculum Services: (1) Salaries, \$2,482,900.

Mr. Chomlak: Last year, in the Estimates process or last Estimates process, under the Results portion of this appropriation, I will quote, “. . . deliver Heritage Language in-services, family life education, one-day AIDS Education training sessions, child abuse prevention programs; deliver on regional or divisional basis, Physical Education, Mathematics, Arts, Science, Language Arts, Business and Vocational Education in-service programs.” I am wondering if these activities are still undertaken by this branch or whether those individual services are no longer offered.

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chairperson, the services are still being delivered and being made available to school divisions on an as-need basis. We are going to be doing some reorganization within this branch to provide services in a different manner, but indeed we intend that the quality of service will still be maintained at a very high level.

Mr. Chomlak: Do I take it then that the AIDS Education training session and the child abuse prevention program are still being offered?

Mr. Derkach: Yes, Madam Chairperson, the in-servicing will still continue on an ongoing basis.

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairman, the minister has hired an individual to co-ordinate the Answering the Challenge: Strategies for Success in Manitoba High Schools. I am wondering under which particular staff year that position falls.

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chairperson, the position is at the Professional/Technical level within this branch. As the member knows, the co-ordinator of this initiative is Dr. Norm Isler, and as I said, his salary is reflected in the professional/technical area.

Mr. Chomlak: The minister will confirm that this is the area where five consultant positions have been changed?

Mr. Derkach: That is correct, Madam Chair.

Mr. Chomlak: I am sorry. Did the minister respond in the affirmative?

Mr. Derkach: Oui.

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairman, can the minister indicate what the five consultant positions were and what has become of those five positions?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chairperson, the five positions are as follows: A consultant in Art; the consultant in the Business Education area; a consultant in the ESL German/Ukrainian area; one consultant in the English language arts, K-8 area; and one consultant in the Regional Services area.

Mr. Chomlak: These people were all let go?

Mr. Derkach: These individuals will still be employed until the end of August, but under the Civil Service guidelines many of these individuals may have bumping privileges so that indeed the individuals who are within these positions may not necessarily be the ones who are going to be terminated.

Mr. Chomlak: If I am to understand it correctly, essentially whether or not it is the particular

individuals involved is not the point, but these five specific positions, that is, a consultant in Art, a consultant in Business Education, a consultant in English as a Second Language, one English language arts, and one other, those positions are eliminated from the Professional/Technical section of Curriculum Services. Correct?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, he is partially correct, but I should point out that we did not eliminate individuals or people, rather there were program reductions that were made and, as a result of program reductions, that meant that indeed some of those individuals are going to be released.

Mr. Chomlak: I guess to summarize, the point is, those are specific staff years that are no longer available to the department to carry out those activities. Is that correct?

Mr. Derkach: Yes, that is correct.

Mr. Chomlak: I am having trouble with numbers. There has been one position added that the minister has indicated, and that is the position of the co-ordinator. Somehow the numbers do not add up. Is there another position that was eliminated, because it goes from 39 to 34, which is down five, and we know we are actually up one position.

Mr. Derkach: Yes, Madam Chair, sorry for the delay. I would have to indicate that the position of the co-ordinator of the implementation of the Strategies for Success was in the base in last year's Estimates, so the reduction for this year is a net of five.

Mr. Chomlak: Can the minister indicate for me the process by which the individual who occupies the co-ordinator role was hired?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chairperson, the position was hired by the regular process of competition.

Mr. Chomlak: Can the minister indicate whether or not a short list was created in terms of the usual competition guidelines?

* (1640)

Mr. Derkach: There is a selection committee that is established for the hiring of positions of this nature, and I would assume that a short list was developed and it would be the short-listed individuals who were interviewed, but I do not have access to that information.

Mr. Chomlak: Can the minister indicate who was on the selection committee for this particular position?

Mr. Derkach: Yes, Madam Chairperson, there were four individuals on the selection committee: a representative from the Civil Service Commission, the director of personnel for the Department of Education and Training, the assistant deputy minister of the Bureau de l'éducation française, and the assistant deputy minister of Program Development and Support Services.

Mr. Chomlak: Can the minister indicate for me how many individuals applied for this position?

Mr. Derkach: I am not certain of the exact number, but there were about 15 persons who had applied for the position.

Mr. Chomlak: The minister has indicated that the normal process, the usual process, was followed in terms of this particular hiring procedure. I am just curious as to just what that normal—can I take it from that response that, in this instance, the job was bulletined and advertised, individuals applied, various interviews were held, short lists were drawn up, and a recommendation was made by the committee to the minister?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chairperson, the process was as follows: There was an external bulletin distributed outside of the Department of Education and Training. After the applications were received and scrutinized, there was a short list prepared. After that short list was prepared, those individuals on the short list were interviewed and, following the interviews, an individual was chosen. That individual was recommended to the deputy minister.

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairman, that individual was recommended to the deputy minister by the special four-member committee?

Mr. Derkach: Yes, Madam Chairperson, by the selection committee.

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairman, who does the co-ordinator report to directly?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chairperson, he reports to the ADM of Program Development and Support Services and to the ADM of the bureau.

Mr. Chomlak: Can the minister outline for me a status report on the strategies for success? As, how is it going? How is the co-ordinating going? In fact, I am going to go into it specifically, but I am wondering if the minister might—

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chairperson, the process, I would have to say, is going extremely well and smoothly at this point in time. First of all, we have

finally appointed the steering committee. The steering committee has met. We have an internal committee within the department that co-ordinates the activities as well. We have the co-ordinator reporting to two ADMs. We also have our director of the Curriculum branch, who sits as an ex officio member on the steering committee and is also a member on the internal committee.

I could also indicate that the co-ordinator of the High School Review process has been out to many of the school divisions in this province, meeting with them, answering many of their questions, and taking back their suggestions.

Now that we have the steering committee in place, I am sure that the process will even become much more smooth and many of the strategies will be much easier to implement into the high school system.

Mr. Chomlak: How does this steering committee and/or the co-ordinator and/or the ADMs plug into the Education Finance review that is taking place?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chairperson, I would have to indicate that I think we have found the proper mix in terms of how we co-ordinate the program area with the finance area.

Unlike the former formula that was developed where they did not consider the program side of it, I would have to say that we have blended the two areas together. The ADM of PDSS is a working member of the advisory committee. Indeed, all of the strategies in the Strategies to Success which have financial implications have been fed through to the committee for consideration, because there will be financial implications to the implementation of those strategies.

* (1650)

So all of these aspects are being taken into account in the deliberations and in the development of the funding model. I am sure that the process is going to be as complete as possible in terms of making sure that each area has some input into the development of the model in the end.

Mr. Chomlak: I think that makes good sense. I think the co-ordination between those various models has long been forthcoming, so I am pleased to hear that there has been that kind of a blending made and that matter will be looked after.

I believe the minister said in his opening remarks that the advisory committee on Native education has been established. Can he indicate that?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chairperson, I indicated earlier on that the committee members on the Native advisory committee have not yet been approved completely. We do not have the complete spectrum of names, if you like.

Mr. Chomlak: I am not certain what the minister means by that. Does he mean that a partial committee has been set up, or that the committee is in the process of being established?

Mr. Derkach: No, Madam Chairperson, we are in the process of establishing the committee, but the process is not yet complete.

Mr. Chomlak: Can the minister indicate roughly when he anticipates the committee will be established and meeting?

Mr. Derkach: I would hope that by the next school year that committee will be in place and will be functioning.

Mr. Chomlak: Can the minister indicate what the progress is on Strategy 25, namely ensuring that Native traditions and lifestyles are incorporated into the core high school curriculum?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chairperson, I would have to say that this is an area where we are going to be wanting some input from the Native advisory committee that is going to be established. I would have to say that currently there has been considerable progress in this area, but perhaps a more appropriate place in terms of discussing the initiatives that have been undertaken would be in 4.(c) when we get to the Native Ed branch.

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairman, is the minister still targeting under Strategy 4 for a co-ordinator for guidance services in each school division?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chairperson, Strategy 4 is part of the Ed Finance model that is going to be developed and, indeed, I cannot speak specifically to it at this point in time because the Ed Finance model is still being developed. Until I see the report and the model, I cannot indicate whether or not this is going to be in the exact form that perhaps the member envisages it. Indeed, they are considering this in the overall Ed Finance formula.

Mr. Chomlak: Regarding Strategy 64, I am wondering at what state the action plan dealing with students at risk and dropouts is?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chairperson, in terms of the strategies that are being worked on for the students at risk or dropouts, Madam Chairperson, I would have to say that in the whole inner-city branch we have several initiatives that are being developed and being worked on to address this entire area.

Also, I would indicate that we were part of the announcement of the stay-in-school initiative that was announced by the federal government and are participating in assisting in that project in terms of helping students or school divisions tap into that program and develop ideas and develop initiatives to encourage students to stay in the school system. I think if we want to get into some of the specific initiatives we can probably deal with that when we get to the inner-city branch, which is 4.(j).

Mr. Chomlak: With respect to appropriations, as they relate to the program that the province is undertaking with the federal government, where would those appropriations be in this process?

Mr. Derkach: That whole area, that whole initiative can be discussed in 4.(j), but I might mention that the provincial government does not contribute or get any funds from the federal government. It is a federal initiative. We co-operate in nonmonetary ways.

Mr. Chomlak: I will deal with that then in 4.(j). Does the minister have at this point any statistical information on the dropout rate for the province of Manitoba?

Mr. Derkach: No. The only information we have was based on the Southam Report, and that is the very reason we need to begin the process of collecting some accurate data. I think we have addressed that when we talked about the information systems that the province has right now, the department has right now, but indeed it is important for us to collect that data. We do not have the accurate data provincially. As I indicated, the only data that we have available to us comes from the Southam Report.

Mr. Chomlak: Have the parent guides been prepared and distributed?

Mr. Derkach: Yes. The parent guides for Strategies for Success are in the draft stage at this time.

Mr. Chomlak: I was referring specifically to strategy No. 67, which indicated the department would prepare guides explaining the details of the

program in areas such as credits, graduation requirements, courses and options, et cetera.

I think that differs in kind from a guide as to Strategies for Success, but I stand to be corrected.

Mr. Derkach: Yes. Those are in the draft stage, but I must also add that they must be translated into several languages as well.

* (1700)

Madam Chairman: Order, please. The hour being 5 p.m. and time for private members' hour, committee rise.

Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Derkach: Just a question, would it be appropriate to ask whether we could waive private members' hour today?

Madam Chairman: The House leader has to—we have to get back into the House to make the request to get leave.

IN SESSION

Mr. Speaker: The hour being 5 p.m., time for Private Members' Business.

Committee Report

Mrs. Louise Dacquay (Chairman of Committees): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the honourable member for Sturgeon Creek (Mr. McAlpine), that the report of the committee be received.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS—PUBLIC BILLS

Bill 22—The Manitoba Energy Authority Repeal Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable member for Crescentwood (Mr. Carr), Bill 22, The Manitoba Energy Authority Repeal Act; Loi abrogeant la Loi sur la Régie de l'énergie du Manitoba, standing in the name of the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld).

Stand? Is there leave that this matter remain standing? Leave? Agreed.

Bill 23—Manitoba Intercultural Council Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), Bill 23, The Manitoba Intercultural Council Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le Conseil interculturel du Manitoba, standing in the name of the honourable Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard).

Stand? Is there leave that this matter remain standing? Leave? Agreed.

Bill 24—The Business Practices Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable member for St. Boniface (Mr. Gaudry), Bill 24, The Business Practices Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les pratiques commerciales, standing in the name of the honourable member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) who has two minutes remaining.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, in my previous speech on this particular bill that my honourable friend the member for St. Boniface (Mr. Gaudry) introduced, I was commenting on the worthiness of how important it was to, in fact, pass this bill because of some of the oversights that the government during the committee had. The concerns that were raised by the member for St. Boniface were very legitimate concerns, and they would have protected the employee at different businesses. It would have protected consumers in terms of advertising.

Unfortunately, at the time, the government chose not to adopt those two amendments that were put forward. That is the primary reason why the member for St. Boniface felt obligated to introduce this bill, and that is why I feel it is an important bill for us to address.

I look forward to hearing comments from the government members, particularly the current minister responsible and the former minister, the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Connery), because I do believe that his best interests were with the consumers and were with the employee. I would be very interested in terms of what their positions are on this bill, and maybe if they can clarify for the Liberal Party why they could not support it at the committee stage and why—well, I should not say why they will not support it here, because I do not know. They might support it here.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member's time has expired. Is the House ready for the question?

Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) that debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 25—The Environment Amendment Act (2)

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable member for St. James (Mr. Edwards), Bill 25, The Environment Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur l'environnement, standing in the name of the honourable Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave that this matter remain standing?

An Honourable Member: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed.

Bill 26—The Environment Amendment Act (3)

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable member for St. James (Mr. Edwards), Bill 26, The Environment Amendment Act (3); Loi no 3 modifiant la Loi sur l'environnement, standing in the name of the honourable member for St. James.

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave that this matter remaining standing? Leave. Agreed.

SECOND READINGS—PUBLIC BILLS

Mr. Speaker: Are we proceeding with Bill 16? No. Proceeding with Bill 17? No. Bill 27? No.

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS—PRIVATE BILLS

Bill 32—The Mount Carmel Clinic Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylcia-Leis), Bill 32, The Mount Carmel Clinic Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Mount Carmel Clinic, standing in the name of the

honourable Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Stand. Is there leave that this matter remain standing? Leave. Agreed.

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

Res. 12—Conservation of Energy

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member for Point Douglas, Resolution 12, Conservation of Energy.

Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas): I move, seconded by the member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans),

WHEREAS electrical utilities in B.C., Ontario and Quebec have established conservation targets at 6 percent for the year 2000; and

WHEREAS Manitoba has established an energy conservation target of 2 percent for the year 2001; and

WHEREAS Manitobans, like other Canadians, must begin to set and meet targets for the conservation of energy; and

WHEREAS the public, through the provincial government, must participate in the setting of any conservation targets established by Manitoba Hydro.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba urge the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld) to direct Manitoba Hydro to immediately set a 6 percent conservation target for electricity, aiming at increasing the target to 10 percent by 2001, thus saving the people of Manitoba the future demand of up to 1000 megawatts of electricity; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Minister of Energy and Mines be encouraged to announce that aggressive conservation targets and strategies be implemented as an important public priority for Manitoba Hydro as an alternative to electrical demands that must be insatiably supplied.

Motion presented.

Mr. Hickes: Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to speak to this resolution because we have seen in the last couple of weeks where there is some effort being made by Manitoba Hydro and the Minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro (Mr. Neufeld) looking at ways of conserving energy.

* (1710)

I believe, and I am sure a lot of Manitobans believe, that we are heading in the right direction by our conservation strategies, and I applaud the government for their step towards conserving energy by the purchase of the Power Smart program.

The Power Smart program, which originated from British Columbia in 1988, has also been purchased by other provinces. With the Power Smart program, they have different means and they have very ambitious targets set in other provinces and if I could just spend a little bit of time on some of the improvements the other provinces, and also British Columbia who initiated this program, will be sharing with us in Manitoba now.

One of the big improvements that we see is street and sentinel lighting and, Mr. Speaker, with the high-pressure sodium lights, you know we are aware that they are more energy efficient and providing the same illumination output while using 47 percent less energy per light, 47 percent.

The only problem I have with that is we create a demand. It is a positive demand but we also must be able to meet the demand that we have created. I know from my experience of living and being raised in northern Manitoba, a lot of the communities will have a very, very difficult time purchasing the street and sentinel lighting that we are talking about here because a lot of outlets that they have in those communities are the Hudson Bay store or local band-operated stores.

I would encourage the minister to pursue avenues for the reserves and small communities to be able to purchase these energy-saving streetlights. That way they would be available to all communities in the North, because we know that Manitoba has harsh winters, and no more so than in northern Manitoba.

My own experience for the weather, I was raised in Churchill, and it is not unreasonable for the weather to get 50, 60 below. You know when the weather drops that drastically your heat costs go sky high.

So when we talk about other measures that the Power Smart program has introduced, we talk about residential and commercial shower heads and, Mr. Speaker, if I may just take a little sentence out of here, it says energy efficient shower heads reduce the flow of hot water by up to one-third, and the result is up to a 30 percent reduction in energy. That is 30

percent, which will save approximately nine megawatts in energy. This is fine for all Manitobans. We know we all have to have showers. I am very well aware of that, and in some bigger households there is quite an accumulation of individuals showering, so you use a lot of water.

Mr. Speaker, I revert again, like when we bring in bills, resolutions or legislate, we have to do it for all Manitobans. That is whom I believe we represent here, all of Manitoba. The reason I mention that is that in a lot of the communities in northern Manitoba there is no sewer and water, and that is one area where we could, by saving energy, maybe we could turn some of that revenue into communities to help them fulfill their goals and having sewer and water that should be available to every Manitoban who wishes.

Another area that I think will save a lot of energy is our industrial manufacturing area. Under the Power Smart program, they have introduced high efficiency motors, and we know, even from my experience working in the mines, and I worked underground for about six and a half years, and I have seen some of these huge, monstrous motors that are operating that bring your cage up and down from your hoist, the hoist that brings your cage up and down from these mine shafts. Just by the sound of the hum of the motor you know that they are using a lot of energy.

In this Power Smart program, it is anticipated that these high efficiency motors will reduce power consumption by 10 megawatts, and that is a great saving.

Another area where we talk about energy conservation is in infrared heat lamps that will benefit the agriculture and the hog producers and, I suppose, ranchers. Right now there are 40,000 heat lamps in use by Manitoba producers, and by switching to infrared heat lamps the program is targeted to save approximately three megawatts in energy demand.

So we have a lot of room and we have only started on the path to conserving energy, but we must go much, much further. I was very pleased to hear where now the target of 2 percent for Manitoba Hydro, that 2 percent is now an invisible target. It has been removed. Now they are saying the percentage, they do not really know what it is. Is it 6 percent, 10 percent, 20 percent, or is it 3 percent? So with these kinds of initiatives, I think it would be

safe to target a 6 percent saving and increase that to 10 percent when we have attained our 6 percent target.

When we are conserving energy and balancing the scales of demand on the demand side and the user side, then we have more power that we could be exporting to other provinces, other countries like the United States and our neighbours, Ontario and Saskatchewan, who were initially thinking of building nuclear power plants. I would strongly discourage that, and I am sure every Manitoban would state the same. We are aware of the disasters of these nuclear plants. We just mentioned in the House the other day about Chernobyl, and if that happened in one of our adjoining provinces, that could have a drastic impact on Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, if we are good neighbours and wise business people, then with the resources that we have from our own hydro projects in northern Manitoba, we could export that to bring the revenues back to Manitoba and, hopefully, set up a fund for individuals who live in northern Manitoba, where the resources come from, to help them face some of the disasters that occur up there.

I was in Thompson when we had that big forest fire. There were people in communities who lost a lot of personal property and personal belongings. They did not have the insurance, and a lot of people did not bother to put claims in. If we had some kind of a fund developed for northern individuals where we took the resources from the North, we should be willing to put a lot of the monetary rewards that we gain from those industries back into northern Manitoba.

I do not think that would be asking for too much, because right now we are using that energy anyway. When we turn to conservation, we save that. If we market it, that is a bonus, so why not reinvest that into the resources where it came from to begin with?

Mr. Speaker, we talk about outdoor timers. They have a \$5 rebate. I think that is only one small step, because timers are fine when you switch off and on. You do save a lot of energy.

* (1720)

There have also been other energy programs that were attractive to individuals, that benefitted a lot of individuals in Manitoba, especially in northern Manitoba where I mentioned the winters are very harsh and it is extremely costly.

When you have homes that are built on permafrost, like in northern Manitoba we have permafrost. If you dig down a couple of feet it is just like hitting solid rock. When you get that kind of a home, you always have a lot of shifting in your homes. It is not unreal to crawl under your house in the summertime and jack it up a couple of inches because your floor has dropped and you jack it up and you squeeze in. That is very common in northern Manitoba.

When you get that kind of a shifting and you get the moisture going into some of these homes, your insulation will get damp and it will rot. There was a program that was in place, I felt anyway, and I am sure our party felt the same—the Home CHEC program—which was to replace windows, doors, insulation. That was a positive program for a lot of individuals in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker. That was a program that helped conserve energy.

When you have that shifting and movement of homes, you get the moisture in, and you know there are very, very few homes in northern Manitoba that are built out of brick and mortar. They are mostly wooden homes. A lot of them in the previous past were built by contractors who would come in and put the houses up as quickly as possible and would leave the community.

So, Mr. Speaker, with the insulation that was put into those homes, there was no real strict guidelines that they had to use the R20, R40. Now we have those kinds of strict measures, but you still have the shifting of those homes. What happens is the moisture gets in and it will rot that insulation like I mentioned earlier. Also with that shifting, you have gaps in your window. With the moisture and the wind coming in, that rots your wood.

So with that Home CHEC program, Mr. Speaker, you were able to get loans through the government at low interest rates. That way, individuals of low income and the seniors were able to upgrade their homes and maintain them in an energy efficient way that was best available at that time.

Now we have other measures. We talk about conservation of energy. One of the big areas that we should be looking at is we have energy-efficient refrigerators that are available on the market today. Mr. Speaker, we should legislate or pass a bill or law where it would require the sales outlets to sell only energy-efficient refrigerators because what has happened and what will happen is the other states

and other provinces that initiate that legislation before us—what will happen is we will be the dumping ground for all those refrigerators and stuff. -(interjection)-

Yes, we will be a dumping ground, because they have to get that market onto somewhere. If they bring it into Manitoba, it will defeat our conservation efforts. So we need to be proactive. With this program it is a start, but we have a long way to go yet. I know that the minister responsible would have to agree that when you create—I mention again, I have to reaffirm this—when you create a demand, you have to make sure that you have the supplies to give to individuals and make sure that the sales outlets are there, so people can go in and purchase what they need to conserve energy.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. James Carr (Crescentwood): Mr. Speaker, I am not going to speak for a long time on this resolution because we introduced a similar one. As a matter of fact, it was the first private members' resolution that we debated in the session.

The NDP resolution is remarkably similar to the one we introduced but remarkably dissimilar to their actions while in government. That point has been made two or three times. I will not spend a great deal of the House's time reasserting that except to welcome the New Democratic Party in a widening circle of politicians, environmentalists and interest groups throughout our province that believe that energy conservation is a valuable target and a valuable goal.

I would like to make a few observations, though. The first is, if these energy conservation targets which are outlined in this resolution were to become a reality, there would be no need for Manitobans to borrow \$6 billion and build the Conawapa generating station in order to export hydro-electricity to Ontario. -(interjection)- The former NDP minister responsible for Hydro, who had a goose egg as his energy conservation target, is chirping from his seat, Mr. Speaker, talking about the lack of relationship between the amount of power we conserve and the amount of power we have to sell. If the former New Democratic minister of Hydro cannot see a relationship between the amount we have available for our own use and the amount we have available to export, then he ought never to have been the minister responsible for Hydro.

I would ask rhetorically to the member for Point Douglas (Mr. Hickes), who has spoken often and with some eloquence about the requirement of economic development in northern Manitoba associated with the building of Conawapa, would he and his party still support borrowing \$6 billion for the Conawapa project if we did not need the energy produced by Conawapa in Manitoba? I leave that question hanging rhetorically in the Chamber and, presumably, we will have an opportunity down the road to debate what the NDP position would be.

An Honourable Member: It might be a very good investment.

Mr. Carr: The Finance critic says it might be a very good investment, and it depends on the return. I would like the -(interjection)- and he is saying that is exactly right. The former minister responsible for Hydro is saying that is exactly right. I would like to see what economic models the NDP has to prove the point—

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Northern States Power seems to be making a profit for the province of Manitoba.

Mr. Carr: Oh, well, the member for Flin Flon wants to talk about the Northern States Power project and the contract that was signed by the New Democratic Party when it was in power. I think he may not want to bring up that subject, because the price of coal has nose-dived since that deal was signed—

Mr. Storie: . . . he has been wrong every time he has opened his mouth

Mr. Carr: Mr. Speaker, the member for Flin Flon does not know when to speak and when he is probably better off staying silent, but that is a decision that he can make.

Manitoba Hydro has taken a giant step forward over the last number of weeks, so much so that we are now very unsure whether or not a 2 percent target for energy conservation is realistic; perhaps it is 3 percent. Maybe we will not need power in the year 2000. Maybe we will not need it in 2001. Maybe we will not need it in 2002. In the year 2005, we get 500 megawatts of power from the deal that was negotiated with Northern States Power.

* (1730)

The question still remains, Mr. Speaker. Are we going to have to borrow \$6 billion on the market, thereby affecting the capacity of the Province of Manitoba to borrow money? If it were for the sake

only of the Ontario sale, I would be very interested in what the minister's answer to that question would be, because it could be that he has his own concerns, and those would be reflected in any conversations he may have with the executives of Manitoba Hydro.

He would want to have two questions answered: Do we need the power and, if we do not need the power, is the deal with Ontario good enough to sustain the project on its own? Until we are satisfied that those two questions have been answered, we may want to think twice or even three times about the propriety of borrowing \$6 billion.

At any rate, Mr. Speaker, our party has been on the record now for some months in promoting the whole concept of energy conservation. We applauded the minister when he announced the Power Smart program. The Power Smart program in British Columbia has really worked wonders in that province.

My colleague the member for Point Douglas (Mr. Hickey) uses energy efficient refrigerators as an example. Before the Power Smart program was introduced in British Columbia in 1988, 12 percent of all new refrigerators were energy efficient. Now, only three years later, 80 percent are energy efficient, and the resulting saving in energy has been enormous.

Why does the B.C. government and B.C. Hydro want to conserve energy? So they will not have to build new generating stations. Why do they not want to build new generating stations? Because not only are they costly in financial terms, but they are also very costly in economic, environmental and social terms.

We do not have to look very far in our own experience as Manitobans to prove that is true. The Minister of Northern and Native Affairs (Mr. Downey) knows that better than most, because he is now negotiating with the Northern Flood Committee.

What did Manitoba Hydro project to be its contingent liability at the time that they built the Grand Rapids station? What did Manitoba Hydro project to be its contingent liability at the time of the diversion in northern Manitoba? Only a tiny proportion, Mr. Speaker, of what the reality has turned out to be.

Manitoba Hydro has historically been very poor at trying to reflect what its costs are going to be, not only economic costs, but social, environmental and

cultural. So energy conservation makes good sense. It is good public policy. It makes good economic sense.

We are glad the New Democratic Party has finally, after all of these years of inaction, adopted a more progressive approach to the subject. We are glad that Manitoba Hydro, under new management and under a new chief executive officer, has seen the wisdom in moving down this road. We support those initiatives and those objectives, and we hope all members of the House will redouble their own efforts to act individually in the conservation of energy so as a society we will be much better off. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a few words on the record concerning Resolution 12, put on the record by the member for Point Douglas (Mr. Hickey). Before I do, however, let me say a few words about the Northern States Power sale that the member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) seems to think is such a good sale.

Mr. Speaker, the Northern States Power sale was sold on the basis of 80 percent of the avoided cost by Northern States Power. I have never heard in my life of somebody selling something to someone on the basis of 80 percent of the avoided cost that they may have if they were to purchase that same product elsewhere. It is like saying, if you go to Safeway, Safeway will sell you the can of soup for 80 percent of what Loblaw's might sell it to you for.

How in the world can someone say, we have got a good deal on the sale of hydro, when they do not know what it is going to cost them to produce it, and they do not know, furthermore, Mr. Speaker, what they are going to get for it when they sell it? How in the world can you enter into a 12-year contract without either knowing your costs or your proceeds from sales? I do not know. If that is a good deal, then I am afraid I have been in the wrong business for a long time.

The member for Crescentwood (Mr. Carr) mentioned that environmental concerns had not been sufficiently addressed. I want to tell him that the Conawapa project is the most environmentally-benign project that we can possibly undertake. Less than one square kilometre of land will be flooded. The water will be retained within the banks of the Nelson River and will not be flooded as has happened in the projects that he mentioned in

his speech. We do believe that when Conawapa is finished, when the environmental process is complete, everyone will agree that it is, indeed, the most environmentally-benign project we could undertake now or at any time.

Much has been said, Mr. Speaker, about conservation. I cannot disagree, I cannot quarrel with the desire for conserving energy as opposed to building new generating stations. The cost of a generating station and the accompanying bipole line is going to cost us some \$6 billion, and that is an awful lot of money for Manitobans to borrow and to repay. I would love to stand here and say, yes, we can conserve a sufficient amount of energy and not build Conawapa.

How can we plan for a future generation on the basis of anticipated, or not even anticipated, but a projected conservation which may not indeed be met? It is one thing to budget for conservation; it is quite another to plan your future generation around that budget. If you are going to plan your future generation around the budget of conservation, you must know you can meet the targets that you are setting for yourself. To set unrealistic targets is to put us into a great deal of difficulty when the year 2001 rolls around and we do not have the energy available to turn the light bulb on when we switch on the light switch.

So, Mr. Speaker, while I applaud the member for Point Douglas (Mr. Hickes) for his efforts to encourage Manitoba Hydro to conserve energy, or encourage Manitoba Hydro to encourage the consumers of hydro to conserve energy, I cannot agree with him that we must set targets of 10 percent or 6 percent and plan our future generation around those targets. We must plan our future generation around targets that we know we can meet.

Much has been said about cost of conservation as opposed to the cost of new generation. I had a discussion with a gentleman who was in Winnipeg not long ago, with whom I appeared on a panel, and he suggested that if we spend some \$2 billion to \$3 billion we could save \$6 billion. I asked him, how do we then get the \$2 billion to \$3 billion? We must raise our rates in order to get the \$2 billion to \$3 billion. He said no, no, you can get that out of your depreciation.

(Mr. Jack Reimer, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

I said it is our depreciation that we use—or the cash that is offset by depreciation that we use to pay

down our debt. He said, oh, you have debt. I said, yes, we have debt; our debt, equity ratio is about 97:3 as opposed to 75:25, which, in my view, would be a proper debt to equity ratio. When he found out we had debt, he did not want to discuss any longer the conservation alternative to new generation.

Manitoba Hydro is very conscious of its responsibility to its customers for energy conservation. In the first instance, let us not forget it is the consumer, and not the utility, who conserves energy. It is you and I, Mr. Acting Speaker, the members of this House and our families, who must turn off our light switches, who must try to conserve. It is you and I and the members of this Chamber who must buy energy-efficiency light bulbs. It is you and I who must purchase energy-efficiency appliances and energy-efficiency motors.

Mr. Acting Speaker, we have one of the lowest cost hydro utilities in terms of the cost to the consumer in the country, indeed, probably the world, and that carries with it the bad news that people do not, and are not, encouraged to conserve. People are not encouraged to turn off their lights. People are not encouraged to buy energy-efficiency refrigerators. People are not encouraged to buy energy-efficiency bulbs. An energy-efficiency bulb will cost in the neighbourhood of \$20 as opposed to what, a dollar and a half for a normal light bulb. This is why people do not buy them.

* (1740)

If our energy costs were as high as they are in some states in the United States, if our energy costs were as high as they are in some countries, we might well be encouraged to save on the purchase of more energy-efficiency appliances and light bulbs. Unfortunately, we will not be encouraged, we being the consumer, to purchase energy-efficiency appliances unless the cost of the energy we use rises and rises dramatically. I can refer you back only to the gasoline crises. When gasoline prices rose dramatically we were encouraged to purchase gas efficient automobiles. We were not encouraged by any government. We were not encouraged by any manufacturer. We were encouraged by our own pocketbooks. Our desire for more gas efficient automobiles encouraged the manufacturers to build more gas efficient automobiles, and so it will be with hydro-electricity.

Mr. Acting Speaker, the member for Crescentwood (Mr. Carr) mentioned the sale to

Ontario. He mentioned the fact that with our increased efficiency, our increased conservation we may well have been able to stumble along until the year 2005, when the Northern States Power sale is completed without building Conawapa.

I am afraid at this point in time we are not certain whether we could do that. Our best projections are, we probably could not. However, even if we could, the sale we have made to Ontario Hydro is at a price sufficiently high to enable us to recover the cost of building Conawapa and its associated bipole line out of that sale so that the Manitoba consumer will not be required to pay additional amounts for his hydro-electricity because of the construction of new generation at Conawapa.

Manitoba Hydro will encourage its customers to purchase more energy efficient light bulbs, appliances, motors. They will do this through advertising. They will do this through showing the customer that by purchasing the more efficient appliances they will save the cost of those appliances in a matter of two or three or four or five or six years. The customer will be told, and the customer will be encouraged to purchase.

To have Manitoba Hydro pay for those appliances or pay a portion of those appliances, give rebates, as has been suggested by some people, would be something that today Manitoba Hydro could not afford. As I have indicated to you earlier, Manitoba Hydro has a 97:3 debt equity ratio which does not permit it to spend any monies that are not for the generation of hydro-electricity unless, of course, the Public Utilities Board permits it to pass through those costs to the people and the customers of Manitoba Hydro.

If the Public Utilities Board permits the passing through of those costs, the cost being the refunding to the customer of some of the cost of an energy-efficient refrigerator or an electric appliance or a light bulb, then of course the customer will pay more for his hydro. The customer will pay substantially more in his electric bill which he may not be prepared to do, but that in itself will cause him to be more conscious of the use of electricity by him and his family.

Mr. Acting Speaker, for the foregoing reasons, I would recommend to this House that Resolution No. 12, brought forward by the member for Point Douglas (Mr. Hickes), not be passed.

Mr. Storle: Mr. Acting Speaker, I am pleased to be able to join the debate at this point.

I am a little disappointed that my colleague from Rossmere, the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld), has decided not to support this resolution, because I think that although there may be some logic in his argument that making decisions about the need for additional energy or hydro-electric generation based on conservation targets may not be the wisest thing in the world, that does not mean that establishing energy conservation targets for Manitoba Hydro is not a worthwhile goal.

I think even Manitoba Hydro at the last standing committee acknowledged that its conservation targets may be very low, and that, in fact, it may be an opportune time to raise those targets and be a little more aggressive when it comes to energy conservation.

Mr. Acting Speaker, the comments that were put on the record by my colleague from Crescentwood (Mr. Carr) were so distorted, so misinformed and uninformed, that I feel somewhat obliged to correct the record.

First of all, the NDP government, the previous government, I have acknowledged on other occasions did not do everything that, in retrospect, I wish it might have done with respect to conservation efforts. It is certainly misleading to say that, either with respect to the Department of Energy and Mines or with respect to other government departments, the previous government did nothing.

In fact, in my first portfolio as the Minister of Housing in 1982, I supported, through the department, an energy-efficient homes program with the federal government, Energy 2000 program, and with local home builders, Mr. Acting Speaker. In fact, I officiated at the opening of the first Energy 2000 home in the province of Manitoba, which was constructed, I believe, by Greentree Homes at that time.

Mr. Acting Speaker, if memory serves me correctly, the total energy bill for heating that particular home for a single year was something like \$125. Our interest as the government, in energy conservation, went back to 1982 when I was Minister of Housing. Over the course of those years, we were involved in an energy conservation program for community buildings. In fact, in Flin Flon the local swimming pool had an energy

upgrade supported by the provincial and federal governments which saved it, on an annual basis, some \$12,000 in energy costs.

The province supported the energy conservation improvements in public schools, in public buildings throughout the province. We had an energy business CHEC program that supported, through the contribution of public dollars, upgrading of businesses, business places, industrial workplaces with respect to energy conservation. We supported energy conservation at the home, at the business, in the community and public building.

* (1750)

I do not know how anybody, including the member for Crescentwood (Mr. Carr), can stand and say the government did nothing. On top of that, the government was involved in an energy audit program.

We introduced what we considered progressive measures to penalize people for driving gas-guzzling cars. We did—considering the context of the importance of conservation and so forth, we did some very progressive things.

Mr. Acting Speaker, if the member for Crescentwood had any legitimate criticism of myself, as one-time Minister of Energy and Mines and Minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro, it is that we did not direct Manitoba Hydro in a very specific way to consider energy conservation, but it would be a mistake to say that we did nothing.

I recall my first meeting with the Manitoba Hydro board, at which time I asked them about their energy conservation programs. We actually, the board and myself, had a long discussion about the apparent contradiction between asking the board of Manitoba Hydro to conserve energy when they, of course, were interested in marketing. We also discussed the possibility of conserving energy in such quantities that we could firm up excess energy because of conservation and export.

That leads me to the remarks by the member for Crescentwood (Mr. Carr) with respect to the construction of new generating stations because I have argued—I have even argued with members of my own party that there is no inconsistency between establishing progressive and maybe even aggressive guidelines for energy conservation and the desire to construct hydro-electric dams, to construct hydro facilities to generate hydro-electricity for marketing in the province of

Manitoba, in other provinces and other jurisdictions, even other countries, particularly the United States.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

The fact is that we are blessed with a certain abundant potential for the development of hydro-electricity, and it always concerns me when ill-informed colleagues like the Member for Crescentwood (Mr. Carr) start talking about the mistakes that were made in the past and the contingent liability that exists with Manitoba Hydro because of some of the damage that was done by hydro projects in the past.

I have said on other occasions, and I will repeat for members who are not as familiar with the history of hydro development in the province of Manitoba, that in fact there was significant damage done on two separate occasions in the province of Manitoba as Manitoba Hydro stored water for hydro-electric projects.

They in effect created huge reserves of water. One of them was in the Grand Rapids forebay, and the member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns) is very familiar with some of the problems attendant with the development of that project. The other, of course, was in the middle 70s or early 70s, when South Indian Lake was flooded as a giant reserve of water to be used on the Nelson River system for the development of hydro projects.

My colleague from Brandon has reminded me on many times, many occasions, that when we came to government in 1969, the original plan was to have a high-level reserve and in fact we, as the government of the day, made a conscious decision to choose a low level, which was some 12 feet, would have represented some 12 feet lower reserve.

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): Instead of damaging just one community, you damaged five.

Mr. Storle: Well, Mr. Speaker, the member for Lakeside of course is quite right that the decision to choose the low-level diversion, as it was called, did create additional problems, but the point I make is that the word "environment" was not part of everybody's consciousness at that time and in fact—and this is a telling, I think, point on the part of members at that time and society in general that there was little consideration to the impact it was going to have on aboriginal people, on the communities.

There was obviously very little understanding of the implications of not only the diversion but the creation of that reserve in the first place.

For example, the reserve-created mercury pollution in Southern Indian Lake and in that water system was completely unexpected and the mercury, of course, came from the leaching of mercury which exists naturally in the soil. It created a problem that is going to be with us for the next probably 200 or 300 years and perhaps longer.

We cannot, at this point, correct those problems.

Mr. Enns: Sixty, and 20 are gone.

Mr. Storle: Well, Mr. Speaker, the member for Lakeside wants to say that the damage is going to last for only 60 years, and the first 20 are gone. Unfortunately, that was the original assumption, and that may still be the member for Lakeside's assumption, but—

Mr. Enns: Enjoy Lake of the Woods, that side of the lake. Enjoy Lac du Bonnet.

Mr. Storle: Mr. Speaker, just before the member for Lakeside gets carried away, I will send the member for Lakeside the latest mercury study done by Environment Canada, which says that the mercury levels are still increasing after 20 years—still increasing after 20 years, not declining, and that in fact the original estimates that that mercury would begin to dissipate seem to be in error.

In fact what they are finding is, what was not anticipated was that because of the nature of the terrain, which is not like Lake of the Woods, but which consists of huge areas of land flooded that is bogged and continues to melt and create additional shoreline which creates additional erosion has created a significant problem, but there is nothing at this point that we can do about that. Those mistakes were made.

The fact of the matter is that creating that water reserve created horrendous problems, environmental problems and problems for the economies of those communities, but that damage has been done.

After the decision was made to go ahead with the diversion of the Churchill River, after the decision was made at what level we were going to create this water reserve, after the decision was made to create the first dam and the first hydro-electric generating station on the Nelson River, the damage was done.

The additional damage, the incremental damage that is done by the subsequent development of hydro-electric generating stations on the Nelson River is, as my colleague from Rossmere (Mr. Neufeld) has suggested, extremely limited. It is a marginal increase in environmental degradation in terms of the quality of the water and in terms of any incidental damage that is done when an additional dam is built. It is important to know that the construction of the second dam on the Nelson River, the additional flooding that was required was contained almost exclusively within the banks of the Nelson River.

When the Limestone Generating Station was constructed, again, other than two small tributaries to the Nelson River which were flooded and did create some incidental incremental damage, the overall impact was marginal. In fact, when the Conawapa Generating Station is constructed, that dam being constructed will increase the water level on the banks of the Nelson River, will affect a couple of tributaries, will affect no community whatsoever, unlike the tremendous damage that was done when the first water reserve was created.

So, you have to understand, I guess, the dynamics, the geography and the typography of that area and understand the history, before you can really comment intelligently on the costs, really, of constructing another generating station.

The contingent liability that my colleague from Crescentwood (Mr. Carr) so much likes to refer to is minimal with respect to the Conawapa project itself. Where the liability may not be so minimal and which we will have to assess as we go along is the prospect of a new transmission line along the east side of Lake Winnipeg, a new transmission line which would transverse areas that are really virgin in terms of economic development. There may be some serious repercussions with respect to that transmission line. Hydro does have an alternative, although they do not seem prepared to consider it at this point.

Mr. Speaker, the need to conserve and the desire on the part of all Manitobans and perhaps all Canadians to conserve energy is a legitimate one. The direction that Manitoba Hydro has clearly been given by members of this Legislature, to be more aggressive in energy conservation, is extremely, I think, well considered and timely. Certainly, the Minister of Energy and Mines is quite right when he says that if we actually save considerable amounts

of power that can be shown to be available for export, we will be winners twice because we will be conserving energy at home and we will be exporting it internationally or to other jurisdictions for profit, Mr. Speaker. I think that is perhaps winning both ways. That is the best of both worlds.

The issue, however, of whether we should be constructing hydro dams and generating electricity

for export and profit to create wealth is a separate question and deserves to be examined separately.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member's time has expired.

The hour being 6 p.m., this House is now adjourned, and stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow (Friday).

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

Thursday, May 9, 1991

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS			
Tabling of Reports		Marianne Nyznak Cheema; Orchard	1840
Departmental Estimates:		Racism Investigation Cerilli; Findlay; Manness	1841
Culture, Heritage and Citizenship, Community Support Programs Mitchelson	1834	Anti-Racism Programs Cerilli; Mitchelson	1842
Urban Affairs Ernst	1835	Home Care Program Wasylycia-Leis; Orchard	1842
Ministerial Statements		Government Departments Wasylycia-Leis; Filmon	1843
Indian Gaming Commission Downey	1834	St. James-Assiniboia School Division Edwards; Derkach	1843
Doer	1834		
Cheema	1835	Nonpolitical Statements	
Oral Questions		Birth of Jessica Praznik Filmon	1843
Education System Doer; Filmon	1835	Doer	1844
Pines Project Martindale; Ernst	1836	Carr	1844
Minister of Housing Martindale	1837	Praznik	1844
Pines Project Carr; Ernst	1837	Enns	1844
Seniors RentalStart Carr; Ernst	1837		
Pines Project Carr; Ernst	1838	ORDERS OF THE DAY	
Free Trade Agreement Plohman; Findlay	1838	Concurrent Committees of Supply	
GRIP Program Plohman; Findlay	1839	Culture, Heritage and Citizenship	1844
Aboriginal Justice System Hickes; Downey	1839	Education and Training	1868
Aboriginal Programs Hickes; Filmon	1840	Debate on Second Readings	
		Bill 24, Business Practices Amendment Act Lamoureux	1887
		Private Members' Business	
		Proposed Resolutions	
		Res. 12, Energy Conservation Targets Hickes	1888
		Carr	1891
		Neufeld	1892
		Storie	1894