



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. 47A - 1:30 p.m., TUESDAY, MAY 21, 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

Tuesday, May 21, 1991

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill 49—The Colleges and Consequential Amendments Act

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer), that Bill 49, The Colleges and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi sur les collèges et modifiant diverses dispositions législatives, be introduced and that the same be received and read a first time.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been advised of the contents of the bill, recommends it to the House.

I have the message from the Lieutenant-Governor to table.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 48—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (2)

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Mitchelson), that Bill 48, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant le Code de la route, be introduced and that the same be now received and read a first time.

Motion agreed to.

* (1335)

Bill 50—The Liquor Control Amendment Act

Hon. Linda McIntosh (Minister charged with the administration of The Liquor Control Act): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer), that Bill 50, The Liquor Control Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la réglementation des alcools, be introduced and that the same be now received and read a first time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 51—The Pharmaceutical Act

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger), that Bill 51, The Pharmaceutical Act; Loi sur les pharmacies, be introduced and that the same be now received and read a first time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 52—The Family Maintenance Amendment Act

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), that Bill 52, The Family Maintenance Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'obligation alimentaire, be introduced and that the same be now received and read a first time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 53—The Natural Products Marketing Amendment Act

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Downey), that Bill 53, The Natural Products Marketing Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la commercialisation des produits naturels, be introduced and that the same be now received and read a first time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 57—The Horse Racing Commission Amendment Act

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): I move, seconded by the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst), that Bill 57, The Horse Racing Commission Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Commission hippique, be introduced and that the same be now received and read a first time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 58—The Development Corporation Amendment Act

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by honourable Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst), that Bill 58, The Development Corporation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Société de développement, be introduced and that the same be now received and read a first time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 55—The Employment Standards Amendment Act (2)

Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), that Bill 55, The Employment Standards Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur les normes d'emploi, be introduced and that the same be now received and read a first time.

Motion agreed to.

* (1340)

Bill 56—The Payment of Wages Amendment Act

Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), that Bill 56, The Payment of Wages Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le paiement des salaires, be introduced and that the same be now received and read a first time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 54—The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1991

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), that Bill 54, The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1991; Loi de 1991 modifiant diverses dispositions législatives en matière de fiscalité, be introduced and that the same be now received and read a first time.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been advised of the contents of this bill, recommends it to the House.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Lieutenant-Governor's message.

Motion agreed to.

Introduction of Guests

Mr. Speaker: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the Speaker's Gallery, where we have with us this afternoon, Mr. Robert Lavalee, the Mayor of Rock Ridge community, accompanied by Councillor Stanley Lavalee and Councillor Amos Marion.

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Gasoline Storage Regulations

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Environment.

We are quite concerned to hear today that the government is contemplating changes in regulations for the storage and handling of gasoline products in the province of Manitoba. We were concerned in the sense that we had not heard about this before, although there have been some consultations going on with apparently selective companies dealing with this issue. The government itself has been dealing with the storage and cleanup of its gasoline products in its own area.

I would ask the Minister of Environment whether he intends on having regulations enforced in the public of Manitoba that will be consistent with the standards that they have used themselves for the Remand Centre, or will they be higher standards in terms of the operators in Manitoba?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, first of all, the discussion on these regulations that are attracting attention in today's media began under the previous administration. Perhaps he missed that during his period in office.

As regarding any potential regulatory changes that we are contemplating, I can assure you the province of Manitoba will be expected to meet or exceed those standards.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, I notice the Minister of Environment did not talk about the Remand Centre and its standards.

Winnipeg Remand Centre Site Gasoline Seepage

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): I would ask the Minister of Government Services, Mr.

Speaker, that the information we are receiving now from his own department indicates that the government is looking at the option of placing in a false floor at the Remand Centre site, that the costs could run as high as \$900,000, that they still will not cover all the toxic contaminations that may not have been taken care of after the excavation took place, before the building went in.

I would ask the Minister of Government Services to inform Manitobans: What are the options that you are looking at? How much will it cost us? Why did the province not have a full excavation of the contaminated soil prior to the building of the Remand Centre, as recommended by many people?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Government Services): Mr. Speaker, let us put it on the record, this did not just happen overnight. This is a cause of about 30 to 40 years.

However, until we receive those proposals—and it is not unique, what is looking at the Remand Centre. It has been done in Toronto with 40-storey buildings. It has been done in Calgary with subdivision. We will take all care and precautions when we are looking at the proposals when they come forward.

* (1345)

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, the minister is right. This is not unique. What is unique is to have an excavation that this government was involved in with the construction of the new Remand Centre and not to take out all the contaminated soil at the time of excavation.

The question to the minister is: How much is this going to cost? Will it require a false floor? The minister has had a number of consultant reports prepared for him. Will he table those consultant reports? Will he tell us and inform Manitobans the extent of the contamination? Will it go up to the Remand Centre? Will it go to the new arena site? What is the extent and scope—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Ducharme: Mr. Speaker, let us not put scare into the people in Winnipeg. If the member from across the way would understand, what you are doing is you are creating a crawl space underneath the existing building, and that will handle those contaminated areas.

We are looking at the proposals that are put aside by consultants that have specialized in Calgary,

specialized in Toronto. When those proposals come forward, I will bring those towards the House.

Rock Ridge, Manitoba Community Subdivision

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, in December of 1989, the Minister of Northern Affairs went to Rock Ridge and promised to expedite the request for a new subdivision to accommodate families wanting to move to Rock Ridge. In February of 1990, prior to the election, the minister approved a proposed plan of subdivision. Then last fall, November of 1990, after the election, the minister turned down the request and said: Give me the names of the people and we will consider it again, those that want to move into the subdivision.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the minister now has the names of some 14 families representing some 62 people wishing to move to Rock Ridge, how can this minister continue to refuse this legitimate request and justify his decision up to this point in time?

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern Affairs): Mr. Speaker, it is very appropriate that the community mayor happens to be here today from Rock Ridge. I am surprised that the member has not asked this question for many, many weeks now and why he would delay until the mayor was here.

Unlike the NDP government who denied the community status, we proceeded to give them community status and a new park, Mr. Speaker, did many things in their community. As we all have to appreciate, there are many communities in the North that have been established for many years and have requests put forward for community improvements and development. On balance, that is what we are trying to do, to make sure that the distribution and the growth of these communities are done fairly, and the department has made the recommendations which I have accepted to this point.

Mr. Plohman: This minister is not in favour of any growth for this community or he would allow the subdivision. That is the only way they can grow.

Mr. Speaker, yes, the mayor and councillors are in the gallery here today, and we welcome them here. They have come over 200 miles to plead their case directly to this minister. He continues to deny it.

I ask this minister: How can he justify a new fire-hall for Spence Lake, just down the road from Meadow Portage that has all of those facilities, a new subdivision and several empty houses at that community, if it is a matter of priorities and scarce dollars?

Mr. Downey: Mr. Speaker, not accepting any of the preamble of the member for Dauphin, without accepting any of it, I can say that, prior to Question Period today and prior to coming to the House, I did have a meeting with my good friend the mayor from Rock Ridge.

An Honourable Member: Finally, after being forced into it.

Mr. Downey: No, Mr. Speaker. It was not a matter of being forced into it. It was by free will of the mayor. He freely came to town and met with me. He did not come under any force.

What I have assured the mayor, Mr. Speaker, is that we do not have any new monies available for the development of a subdivision. However, what I said was, if there are people there who are currently without employment—and they recommended this to me to take a look at job opportunities for people who are currently unemployed—there may be some work that could be carried out in a preliminary fashion. I have agreed to have staff look at that option.

Mr. Plohma: Mr. Speaker, this minister cannot justify expenditures for Pines and for other communities when this community is sitting waiting. It would mean jobs for that community and additional families that would justify other services.

I would ask the minister, Mr. Speaker: In view of the fact that NACC is supporting this request, CMHC says there are a number of requests ready to go in Section 79 Housing, will this minister now admit that his priorities are dictated solely by politics and not on the basis of need and merit? Is that not a fact? This is why the minister refuses to do it.

* (1350)

Mr. Downey: Mr. Speaker, the community of Rock Ridge waited for some six years while he was a minister in government to give them community status so they could grow and expand. What did they do? No, they did not give them anything.

Mr. Speaker, if the member for Dauphin has other communities that he wants me to take the money from, then I would ask him to tell me which communities in the North he wants me to take the

money from. If he had not spent \$27 million on a bridge to nowhere and \$20-some million in Saudi Arabia, there would have been money for all kinds of subdivisions in Rock Ridge.

CFB Shilo Closure

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in 1989, the federal Tory government announced the closing of military bases in Portage la Prairie and in Winnipeg. A number of jobs were tragically lost to the community and an estimated \$137-million blow to the Manitoba economy.

On Saturday in the Toronto Star, two independent sources were quoted as saying that CFB Shilo will be closed or scaled down. CFB Shilo employs 1,600 people with a payroll of some \$65 million.

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. Has the First Minister been informed of any plans to close the base? What information has he received to date?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I have not been informed of any plans to date. I am as interested as the Leader of the opposition is in that. You might say that, in her preamble, she has not indicated that the plans for CFB Winnipeg have been put on hold and those job losses have not taken effect as was initially planned. The plans for Portage la Prairie, with respect to replacement as the sole location for the contracted training of flying personnel, may well result in minimal losses as a result of the efforts of the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Connery) and many members on this side.

She may recall that, when I raised it with the Prime Minister at my meeting with him in August of 1989, she criticized me for raising that issue and not raising other issues. It was as a result of those efforts of this government working with the people of Portage la Prairie that we have minimized the impact and hopefully in the longer term may even have greater economic impact than the things that will now take place at Portage la Prairie.

Mrs. Carstairs: Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disturbed by the Premier's answer, as I think will be every Manitoban, because instead of addressing the issue of CFB Shilo, the Premier has deliberately skirted the whole issue.

Can the Premier tell the House today if he has been in touch with his counterparts in Ottawa to protest any cuts to the Shilo base?

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, I have had officials making inquiries with Ottawa because of that rumour. In fact, when the matter was raised by the member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans), I made direct reference to that in my statement at the Western Premiers' Conference in Nipawin last week, about the fact that we did not want to see continuing offloading and continuing cutbacks in areas that were detrimental to the Manitoba economy.

Mrs. Carstairs: Mr. Speaker, while it is a welcome initiative that he spoke to this at the western Premiers' meeting, none of the western Premiers will be involved in the decision making. The decision will be made in Ottawa.

Can the First Minister tell this House today what direct action he has taken, if any, in contacting the federal Minister of Defence or indeed the Prime Minister to ensure that cuts to Shilo will not take place?

* (1355)

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, firstly, as I said earlier, I have officials making inquiries to ensure that it is not just a false rumour, to see whether or not there is any veracity to the rumour. Depending on the response that I get, I will take whatever action is appropriate.

Homemaker Services Community-Based Programs

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Family Services.

As a result of this government's budget and program priorities, funding for preventive community-based care for vulnerable families has been slashed. It is well documented that these types of services are best provided at the community level, in terms of prevention, responsiveness and cost-effectiveness.

I am tabling a document which compares community-based homemaker services to alternative more institutionalized care. The cost savings for the government for 10 randomly selected cases is well over \$400,000.

My question to the minister is: Since this government's overriding concern is the bottom line, why is the Minister of Family Services considering

not adequately funding these proven cost-effective, community-based programs, which keep families together and often eliminate the need for more costly institutionalized care, such as hospitalization?

Hon. Harold Gillehammer (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, I know the member is aware that we have made, in this government, Family Services a priority in this budget and have increased the funding nearly 7 percent.

We have worked with the agencies that work with children and families across the province and, of course, the six agencies and the treatment centres within Winnipeg. One of the things that has become apparent is that agencies have gone different directions in the way they offer services in their communities. In most cases, the agencies have offered a balance between the foster families and the care at home and the use of the treatment centres. Of course, with the high-needs individuals who are in the treatment centres, they have access to psychologists and psychiatrists to deal with some of the more difficult cases. We would see agencies using a balanced approach of both the resources that families were able to give and also using the treatment centres.

Ms. Barrett: Considering that these 10 cases alone could mean a conservative estimate of a cost increase of \$400,000 to the Department of Health, has the Minister of Family Services consulted with the Health minister regarding the impact of these increased costs and responsibilities for the Minister of Health's (Mr. Orchard) department when these services are offloaded from the Family Services department?

Mr. Gillehammer: Yes, I can assure the honourable member that I consult with the Minister of Health frequently and enjoy his input on many decisions which interact on both our departments.

Family Services of Winnipeg Inc. Homemaker Program Funding

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): Will the Minister of Family Services now assure this House that funding will not be withdrawn from services such as the homemaker program of Family Services of Winnipeg Inc. which provide preventive, cost-effective care and which have increasing and wide-ranging support in the community? Will he ensure that these services are protected?

* (1400)

Hon. Harold Gilleshammer (Minister of Family Services): I can assure the honourable member that my answer today is the same as it was last week and the week before when we talked about Family Services of Winnipeg Inc. The department is working with staff from those agencies to look at their programs. We had promised at that time that we would try and do this very quickly and have answers by the early part of June.

Inner City Foundation Government Commitment

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Urban Affairs.

The Core Area Initiative won international recognition for its innovative programs and its attempts over 10 years to deal with the severe social and economic problems facing Winnipeg's inner city.

The Core Area Initiative has now ended, but, Mr. Speaker, Program 7, one program of the Core Area Initiative, which was innovative, which was long term, the creation of an Inner City Foundation, never got off the ground.

My question to the Minister of Urban Affairs is: Is this government committed still to the creation of an Inner City Foundation? Will it proceed with Program 7 as provided for in the tripartite agreement?

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as the member for Wolseley well knows, the Core Area Initiative is a tripartite partnership. All three partners must agree to any activity related to any change in any program within the Core Area Initiative.

Mr. Speaker, we are presently reviewing potential alternatives for a variety of programs, including the question of an Inner City Foundation. No decision has been taken. It still remains in the program. The Core Area Initiative, contrary to what the honourable member stated, will not be over until March of 1992.

Funding Availability

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, Program 7 provided for a million dollars to be set aside for the longer-term benefits to inner city communities.

Will the minister assure this House that, while he is deliberating, while he and his partners are

deliberating in this watered-down Core Area extension, this \$1 million will still be available for an Inner City Foundation?

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated just a moment ago, it is still available. However, at the present time, a number of alternatives are being looked at by the members of the Core Area Policy Committee. When those alternatives have been ultimately decided upon, we will advise the House.

Core Area Initiative Meeting Discussions

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): Will the minister tell the House what provincial commitments he made to the Core Area meeting of three levels of government over the past weekend?

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the three members of the policy committee met on Friday afternoon, as I indicated to the member for Crescentwood (Mr. Carr) earlier. We have had a number of discussions related to both the Core Area Initiative, The Forks Renewal Corporation and the North Portage Development Corporation. Matters therein are ongoing, and we hope to pursue a number of avenues related to the potential for continuation of programs such as are presently found under the Core Area Initiative.

Foster Care Brochure Circulation

Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable when individuals in this community or any community prey upon people who are most vulnerable and most at risk. I was pleased last week to note the successful prosecution of an individual in this community, who has been charging a fee for adoption services.

I would like to ask the Minister of Family Services if his department has made him aware that same individual is currently soliciting foster parents and ask him what steps they have taken to prevent this?

Hon. Harold Gilleshammer (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, yes, I am aware of the brochure that the honourable member has. I have asked my department to look into that and bring back their best advice.

Government Policy

Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, this brochure, which was circulated some three weeks

ago, suggests that the Conservative government is doing appropriate things on behalf of foster kids and that child welfare professionals have neglected children in their care and advocating several changes in policy relative to foster care in this province.

I would like to ask the minister, is this representative of the policies of his department?

Hon. Harold Gillehammer (Minister of Family Services): I have indicated, Mr. Speaker, to the honourable member, that the pamphlet that he alludes to is one that we have recently received and which is before the department. I think the policies of the department are well enunciated through the ministry and through the department staff. Whenever there are changes, we would be happy to make the public aware of them.

Social Assistance Pharmaceutical Benefits

Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, the public only becomes aware of policy changes when they go to act upon those policies. The minister has, some time ago now, issued a list of drugs to druggists, which are no longer eligible for claiming under income security, specifically drugs that are made available to children, Tylenol, for example, or cough syrup. People on income security are no longer able to claim financial remuneration for those drugs.

I would like to ask the minister why he has taken such a regressive step?

Hon. Harold Gillehammer (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see the member back in good health again and back in the Chamber. I meant to mention that with my first answer.

I would like to remind him that we have added substantially to the budget for social allowances in this province. We have made an increase there of some \$30 million. Our total provincial budget now in social allowances is \$279 million.

We have also made a commitment to work with the groups that represent individuals who access those programs and have made the commitment to monitor some of the changes that have taken place within a department. If there are hardships that come to our attention, we will be pleased to take a look at that.

55-Plus Program Minister's Statements

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Last Friday, the Minister of Family Services stated that there was no increase in the 55-Plus pension program for seniors in years 1981 through to 1985 under the NDP. Firstly, the NDP was not in government until November 30, 1981, and secondly, the 55-Plus program was not established until 1986.

Point of Order

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, this is Question Period. I have not even heard the questions, but there seems to be a dispute over the facts. The member is clearly out of order. I ask him to get to his point.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member for Brandon East, kindly put your question, please.

* * *

Mr. Leonard Evans: I announced this program in the House on May 20, 1986. I want to table a copy of the news release which states that this is a new program whereby we double the benefits of the previous program; two, we instituted annual indexation of benefits; and third, we changed the criteria providing for a massive increase in the number of Manitobans who would qualify.

My question, Mr. Speaker: In light of these facts—and these are the facts—will the minister now correct the record and acknowledge that the 55-Plus program was established in 1986?

Hon. Harold Gillehammer (Minister of Family Services): I have the greatest of respect for the member for Brandon East, but I think that he is factually incorrect at this time. My understanding is the 55-Plus program dates back to 1974, and my comments simply were that, during most of the 1980s that the member references when that party was in power, there was no increase in 1981 through to 1986. I acknowledge that there was a change made in 1986, but there were some five years there where there was no indexing and no changes made in that program. We have indicated this year that we are maintaining that program at last year's levels, similar to what his government did during those years through in the mid-'80s.

Mr. Leonard Evans: A new program was established with indexation, the first time in the

history of this province. Come on, get with it. It is a new program. It was never—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would remind the honourable member for Brandon East, this is not a time for debate. The honourable member for Brandon East, kindly put your question, please.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Will the minister withdraw the statement made last Friday when he was quoted as saying: When they were in government, there was no increase in 55-Plus because the benefits were increased by 4.5 percent in 1987-88, by 4.2 percent in '88-89, reflecting the increase in the cost of living?

We have had increases since then, Mr. Speaker, except this year, with this majority Conservative government—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member has put his question.

* (1410)

Mr. Gilleshammer: I often admire the honourable member's ability to take credit for things that happened in the past, even while he is in opposition, but the renaming of the program or the changes that were made in the program in 1986 do not wash away the fact that there was no change in that program in the five years in which they were in government. There was no indexing and no change.

We have indicated that we have done a similar thing this year where we have kept the program at last year's level. I know that the honourable member, who likes to take credit for these things, will also take responsibility for the fact that there was no change in that program during the years that I referenced.

DeIndexing

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): I hope the minister can read. I would like him to read the news release, because there was a new program established, and he does not want to recognize that.

Mr. Speaker, will the minister now seriously reconsider reinstating the indexation in light of the fact that 55-Plus assists people on very low income, particularly older women, and secondly, that the freeze will impact, not only this year, but indefinitely into the future unless there is a policy change?

Hon. Harold Gilleshammer (Minister of Family Services): I want to assure the honourable member that budget decisions that were made were taken very seriously. Very difficult but necessary exercise was done through the budget Estimates.

You know, I can tell you that, in time of fairly high income by the provincial government, there was no change in that program during the early '80s. I am not sure why there was a change in 1986, but there were a number of years previous to that where there had been no change.

Manitoba Dental Association Legislation Request

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Lels (St. Johns): The news reports today involving this government and the Manitoba Dental Association have certainly caught our attention and, I am sure, the Minister of Health's as well.

I would like to ask the minister: Since it appears that the Manitoba Dental Association requested several months ago from this government some amendments to The Dental Association Act, as a result of the 1990 decision of Laba versus the Manitoba Dental Association of the Manitoba Court of Appeal, which does not allow the Manitoba Dental Association to require its members to upgrade their skills or retrain to meet specific standards, I simply want to ask the Minister of Health if he is prepared to announce today that this government will be introducing the requested amendments from the Manitoba Dental Association in this sitting of the Legislative Assembly?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, thank goodness for the normal research document that arrives in the opposition caucus approximately 8:30 in the morning. Otherwise, there would be no questions.

Let me indicate to my honourable friend that, despite the tenor of the article, the relationship enjoyed by this government with the Manitoba Dental Association has been a very good one, very co-operative one.

Mr. Speaker, what I would like to indicate to my honourable friend is, first, she is correct that the MDA has asked for amendments. Unfortunately, those amendments are not ready to be presented to the House this session. I have indicated to the Manitoba Dental Association that we will, hopefully with the co-operation of honourable friends opposite, introduce that legislation as quickly as possible next session and receive expeditious passage of that legislation.

Ms. Wasylycia-Lels: Mr. Speaker, given that the proposed amendments are certainly in the interests

of the public and protect the public from unfair practices in the dental profession, would this minister be prepared to speed up the process for introducing those amendments in this sitting, especially since we on this side of the House would be prepared to co-operate now and expedite such matters?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, under ordinary circumstances, I would take my honourable friend's word at value, but I have introduced another piece of legislation which we had some attempt to have rapid passage around, and such co-operation disappeared very rapidly for whatever reason.

We will make every effort to introduce the legislation at the next sitting. I would hope that my honourable friend will live by her word and pass that legislation as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, let me indicate to my honourable friend that there are a number of provisions within the current legislation which allow many of the undertakings, which are viewed to be necessary, possible under today's legislation. What is requested, as I understand it, is some tightening up of the disciplinary requirements of that professional act.

Manitoba Law Reform Commission Self-Regulatory Body Review

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Lels (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if this decision to delay the request for amendments from the Manitoba Dental Association is at all related to the decision by this government on November 29, 1990, to ask the Manitoba Law Reform Commission to review policies regarding professional and occupational associations in the province, which we understand will be at least two years in the works.

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, it is unusual that I have three questions from my honourable friend where I do not have to correct her in her preamble, and this is no exception. This government did not delay the amendments—period, paragraph.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Point of Order

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, we in the opposition have learned to become very patient in waiting for the minister to address questions raised by opposition members.

I cannot think of a more direct question that was put by the member. I would ask that you would have that member answer the question and not indulge in the irrelevant comments and debates which we are coming to be accustomed to in listening to those answers from that minister.

Mr. Speaker: On the point of order raised, I would remind all honourable ministers that answers to questions should be as brief as possible, should deal with the matter raised and should not provoke debate.

* * *

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, I will deal with both matters raised by my honourable friend. First, she was incorrect when she said this government delayed the amendments. That is not a factual statement, which I would like to correct. Secondly, I will tell my honourable friend that, with her co-operation, we will have those amendments.

Those amendments are not in any way tied to the issue that has been sent to the Law Reform Commission, which is to design an omnibus professional bill around those organizations which currently do not enjoy legislation granting and conferring professional status. The Manitoba Dental Association is not, Mr. Speaker, included in that review by the Law Reform Commission.

Winnipeg Remand Centre Site Gasoline Seepage

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Environment.

The Environment Act requires the minister to investigate any and all gas leaks in the province, even if they emanate from a government edifice. Can the minister tell the House why gasoline was allowed to leak out of underground tanks for years at the provincial garage at the corner of York and Kennedy Street and why, during all those years, most of which the NDP were the government, the substantial gas leak was not detected? Was it negligence or was it willful blindness, both of which anyone in the private sector would be prosecuted for?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, considering that it is only recently that the regulations have been tightened up and we continue to improve on the regulatory regime for handling of gasoline in this province, we now have

a much better manner of keeping track of where historical leaks have occurred.

This, in fact, was an historical problem, as the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Ducharme) indicated earlier. This leak predates the present construction site by probably a couple of decades.

The fact is that the extent of reconnaissance has been done by the Department of Government Services under the direction of people from the Department of Environment. That amount of research indicates that this is a long-duration seepage that has gotten into the site.

In fact, the removal of the tanks was not the issue. The fact is that the leakage probably predates that by some considerable time. All of that accumulated information is what the Minister of Government Services is bringing together in order to mitigate the impacts of this leak.

Mr. Edwards: Mr. Speaker, for the same minister: The duration of the leak only serves to heighten the problem and how it was allowed to get away for all those years. I assume the minister has done an investigation.

Can the minister tell members whether or not the leaked fuel, which was substantial, seeped north under York Avenue and indeed under the building immediately to the north, the Macdonald Block, as the people in charge of the site at the time suspected that it had?

* (1420)

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, I think that we need to recognize, because of the nature of this leak, that there is a long-term mitigation plan that will have to be put in place. I can assure you I have had some reason, given that there is an historical site that is a long-term base for leakage in my home town, to know that the ultimate mitigation of this takes years and years, through ventilation, through removal of the fumes so that any danger is removed from the building that may be on that site or future buildings.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that is probably a much more effective way of dealing with this than excavating an enormous amount of soil in that area. The problem will be that we are trying to get the gasoline ventilated out of the area, reduce the risk and reduce the possibility of it spreading any further, which will lead to the improvement of the area.

Winnipeg Remand Centre Site Gasoline Seepage

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Finally, for the Minister of Government Services: Has the minister received estimates of the cost for the full cleanup of the spill and/or venting of the fumes? Will he commit to having those cleanup efforts and those plans vetted by the Department of Environment and vetted by the MGEA, the Manitoba Government Employees' Association, whose members will have to populate that building for many years to come, so that we can be sure we do not replace one unhealthy Remand Centre with another unhealthy building?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Government Services): Mr. Speaker, first of all, it was explained by the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) that there was the consideration of having to go 30 feet below York Avenue and shore along York, so it was decided that the management type of membrane to be in this facility, the options to look at that. The consultants who were used have told us that all precautions will be taken. It is not unique, and I express, it is not unique; it has been done in many parts across Canada.

Free Trade Agreement - Mexico Impact on Manitoba

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, I want to, first of all, thank the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Stefanson) for providing me a copy of the Price Waterhouse report on the potential free trade agreement with Canada, U.S. and Mexico.

I want to ask the minister, as a result of the concern that is expressed, particularly by manufacturers in this view, whether the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism has now resigned himself to the fact that we need some specific information on the implications of this agreement for Manitoba, and has he therefore undertaken or is his department undertaking any further statistical studies on the impact of this potential agreement?

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, I think, as I have indicated in this House once before, besides this survey that was conducted back in February, which was an initial survey of the business community, some 80 businesses in the province of Manitoba, that we have, since that point in time, undertaken extensive consultations with all sectors in our

economy, including the manufacturing industry, including labour, including academics and so on. We are also doing our internal research, and we will be coming forward very shortly with a position as a government.

Mr. Speaker: Time for Oral Questions has expired.

Speaker's Ruling

Mr. Speaker: I have a ruling for the House.

On Wednesday, May 15, 1991, I took under advisement a matter of privilege raised by the honourable member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie). I thank the honourable members who provided advice to the Chair at that time.

The allegation in the matter raised by the honourable member for Flin Flon was that the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ernst) had deliberately misled the House in providing information regarding the Rotary Pines seniors housing project. The honourable member did refer, in his contribution to the debate, to the existence of evidence to support his charge but neither described nor explained what that evidence was. Further, he failed to establish a prima facie case of a matter of privilege, because he gave no evidence of any deliberate intent on the part of the Minister of Housing to mislead the House.

Our rules and practices, as well as Beauchesne's, clearly indicate that a member rising on a matter of privilege must do so at the earliest opportunity, which the member may or may not have done. This is not clear. Also, he or she must provide sufficient evidence to support the claim that a breach of privilege has occurred.

Because the honourable member for Flin Flon has failed to do this, I am ruling his motion of privilege out of order.

Nonpolitical Statements

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): 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. That is agreed.

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, I rise with great sadness at having received some terribly disturbing news. It is my understanding that Rajiv Gandhi has just been assassinated in India. I know that he was not only the former Prime Minister but expected to be

returned to office in the election currently being held today.

Certainly, all of us in this House will no doubt decry this senseless, horrible act of violence as obviously a means that someone was attempting to use to settle political differences.

Regardless of our political views, Mr. Speaker, I guess we should all be grateful for the fact that we live in a country in which the freedoms and democratic rights that we enjoy are protected by other than violent means for the most part, and certainly, I guess, we should continue to prize our ability to express ourselves without fear in the environment in which we live.

I would expect that all of us would hope that calm will prevail and that despite this horrible intrusion into the democratic process, that democracy, peace and freedom will continue to prevail in India.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave of the Chamber for a nonpolitical statement.

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

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the Premier (Mr. Filmon) in putting our words of sorrow on the record on the announcement we have just heard that Rajiv Gandhi has been assassinated or has been killed in the political election, that is, taking place this week in India.

Of course, the people of India fought for centuries for democracy, and they conduct the largest democratic vote in the total world, over half a billion people participate and vote in the elections in that country, which in itself is a test to democracy and the principles of democratic rule that we all in this Chamber hold so dear.

The fact that there have been 40 deaths this week already, and the fact that there are further political deaths of candidates, including a candidate for the Prime Minister's job in India tells us, I think, in a strong way that the values of democracy are worth working for every day.

Mr. Speaker, we are saddened and sorrowed by the news today, as we were saddened and sorrowed with the news a couple of years ago with the assassination of the former Prime Minister of India. We are saddened on the other deaths, the volunteers, the candidates in that country of India as they practise their democracy in their country. We would wish all people of India and the free

democratic world the greatest of peace and security of life and limb.

I am sure that we all offer today to the people of India our deepest sorrow and our deepest sympathy on the deaths of Rajiv Gandhi and others who are participating in that democratic process in the great country of India.

Thank you.

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (The Maples): Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to make a nonpolitical statement?

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

An Honourable Member: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: Leave. Agreed.

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer).

I think it is very sad, because if you review the history of the independence of 1947, how the Gandhi family and their grandfather were the pioneers in establishing one of the major democracies and what happened in 1984 with the death of Mrs. Gandhi and those effects are still felt. It is very difficult, it is a very emotional problem. The whole 780 million people are going through turmoil, conflict and violence, and basically, I think, they have failed in many ways to reach a conclusion.

I think we are very lucky in this society that we have all the luxuries. Last week I was in Moscow and I was able to visit 10 towns, Mr. Speaker. I think it was one of the fascinating, one of the most informative sessions I ever had in my life, to see how democracy is important. I think we should all learn from that and hope and wish that peace will come to that nation. I think it is a very difficult task and time will tell.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, before I move the motion to go into Committee of Supply, it is my understanding that we will continue in the Chamber with Education, to be followed by Northern Affairs. Secondly, I will be asking for leave of the House to bring forward the Community Support Program into the Lotteries discussion, followed by the Status of Women, and followed therefore then by the order as laid out.

* (1430)

Mr. Speaker, I wish to therefore obtain the unanimous consent of the House to vary the Estimates sequence established under subrule 65(6.1) as tabled in this House on April 25, 1991, by bringing forward the Estimates of Community Support Program and attaching these to the Lotteries discussion followed by the Status of Women.

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable government House leader have leave to alter the sequence? Is there leave? Agreed.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, I would also ask for leave as to whether or not we can dispense with private members' hour.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the will of the House to waive private members' hour? No. Leave not agreed.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice and Attorney General (Mr. McCrae), 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 Community Support Programs, and Status of Women; and the honourable member for Seine River (Mrs. Dacquay) in the Chair for the Department of Education and Training.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY—COMMUNITY SUPPORT PROGRAMS

Mr. Deputy Chairman (Marcel Laurendeau): Will the Committee of Supply please come to order. This afternoon this section of the Committee of Supply, meeting in Room 255, will be considering the Estimates of the Community Support Programs, Lotteries Funded Programs, on page 24.

Item 1. Lotteries Funded Programs, \$5,012,800; 1.(a)(1) Salaries, \$91,200.

The minister has already given her opening remarks.

Mr. Neil Gaudry (St. Boniface): Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the employees who were moved to Stettler, Alberta, how many of them went?

Hon. Bonnie Mitchellson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship): Mr. Deputy Chairperson, those are Western Canada Lotteries

employees and, in fact, there are five who have agreed to move. They have not moved as yet, but there are five who were working for Western Canada Lotteries who have agreed to move.

Mr. Gaudry: How many work there?

Mrs. Mitchelson: 52.

Mr. Gaudry: Out of the 52, only 5 have agreed to move. What has happened to the other 47?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I am informed that some have already found alternate employment. Others will be here at least until September, because the move is not planned to take place until September. I believe all of the senior management staff have contracts which will carry them through for a year, so they will have a year's pay.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Item 1.(a)(1) Salaries, \$91,200—pass; 1.(a)(2) Other Expenditures, \$30,000.

Mr. Gaudry: What does that \$30,000—decrease by \$17,300 reflect in there?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, that was one-time start-up costs for the Lotteries Distribution System which was set up as a result of the needs assessment.

* (1450)

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Item 1.(a)(2) Other Expenditures, \$30,000—pass.

Item 1.(a)(3) Grants, \$445,700—shall the item pass?

An Honourable Member: No.

Mr. Gaudry: Lotteries Distribution System, \$566,900 compared to \$902,700—oh, I am sorry. I have gone too far. No, that is it.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Are you asking what the reduction was?

Mr. Gaudry: Yes.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, these were one-time Lottery grants. Out of this line came the Prince Edward Award for the Royal Winnipeg Ballet, when the Prince was here. It was a one-time only initiative, and a scholarship fund of \$100,000 was set up under this line. That money has been expended and it will not be repeated.

We put \$100,000 into the Western Canada Summer Games. So that was an initiative last year. Of course, it will not be repeated this year.

There were some start-up costs for housing for three recreation associations: The Manitoba Parks and Recreation Association, The Manitoba Camping Association and the Canadian Hostelling Association. Those were one-time start-up grants which will not be repeated.

The Northern Affairs - Remote Communities, \$66,000 to assist northern communities in raising their share towards Community Places grants. Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the Community Places Program, of course, has been decreased to just \$3 million this year. We are carrying it on for another year and so it is decreased accordingly for northern Manitoba, proportionately.

Mr. Gaudry: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, you mentioned Northern Affairs decreased by \$66,000. Is that just the one community, or is that several communities?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I am sorry. I may have given you some incorrect information. That was the percentage decrease; it was 66 percent. What happened in the past was there was \$300,000 in Northern Affairs to help the Northern Affairs communities raise their portion of Community Places money through the Department of Northern Affairs. Because the program has been decreased by two-thirds, we have gone from \$9 million to \$3 million in the Community Places Program this year. In fact, the decrease in Northern Affairs will be \$200,000. There will still be \$100,000 remaining in Northern Affairs department, so that they can contribute the communities portion to match the Community Places grant. It is just decreased proportionately to the whole program.

Mr. Gaudry: Today in Question Period, in regard to Rock Ridge community, it was mentioned, I believe—Community Places Program. Were they involved in that at all?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, that would not have been the Community Places Program. That would have been application through Northern Affairs, I believe, for community development, but it would not have been a capital grant for Community Places.

Mr. Gaudry: There has been an increase—and I will take both of them together—the Festival du Voyageur and Folk Arts Council. -(interjection)- It is another line, okay.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Item 1.(a)(3) Grants, \$445,700—pass.

Item 1.(b) Festival du Voyageur, \$400,000.

Mr. Gaudry: I believe it is a five-year agreement that you have with the Festival du Voyageur. Is this the first year that it has come into effect, and what will be the increases over the coming years?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, this is the second year of the five-year agreement. Most of the special agreement groups that are funded through this line in the budget will have one year only in the five-year agreement that they will get an extra allocation of funding based, over the five-year period, on what year they are placing a priority.

In fact, the Festival du Voyageur this year is developing the Grand Rendezvous which is a major new initiative planned for February of 1992. They will get in this year's allocation more money, and they will go back down to their normal level.

Over the five-year agreements, every special agreement group has a year that they are targeting that they will need more money, and this is the year for the Festival.

Mr. Gaudry: In the next following year, they will be going back to the \$272,000?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I believe they will be back to \$340,000 next year. There will be an increase. It will not be an increase over and above the \$400,000, but it will be an increase according to their traditional level.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: 1.(b) Festival du Voyageur, \$400,000—pass.

Item 1.(c) Folk Arts Council of Winnipeg, \$400,000.

Mr. Gaudry: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, is this the same arrangement that you have with the Folk Arts Council as the Festival du Voyageur, that next year will be a special increase?

Mrs. Mitchelson: For the Folk Arts Council, this was the year that they got a boost, and that was for costs incurred for the 25th Anniversary of Folklorama.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: 1.(c) Folk Arts Council of Winnipeg, \$400,000—pass; 1.(d) Friends of Winnipeg Pro Soccer, \$80,000—pass.

Item 1.(e) United Way of Winnipeg, \$2,265,900.

Mr. Gaudry: I see there is an increase to the United Way of Winnipeg. Is this on an ongoing basis, this percentage increase to the United Way of Winnipeg?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, it is an ongoing increase on a yearly basis to the United Way. What happens is that we pick up the total operating costs for the United Way through Lotteries so that all the revenue that is generated can go out to community groups.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Item 1.(e) United Way of Winnipeg, \$2,265,900—pass.

Item 1.(f) Valley Agricultural Society, \$195,000.

Mr. Gaudry: Excuse my ignorance here, but Valley Agricultural Society, what does it do?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, they operate as the Manitoba Stampede in Morris.

Mr. Gaudry: The grant that is given, I see it is the same as last year. Is it always the same thing?

Mrs. Mitchelson: That will be for the term of their five-year agreement, \$195,000 per year.

It is my understanding that in the fifth year of their agreement, they will get their one-time only extra commitment.

Mr. Gaudry: So if I understand, all these grants here are on a five-year agreement. Is this a new system that the government has initiated where it is always going to be a five-year negotiated agreement?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Not necessarily will they only be five-year agreements, but what we want to do is re-evaluate all the programs that are being funded on a five-year basis. If, in fact, the need continues for them to be supported, we will negotiate new agreements. If the needs change and there are other commitments that we want to make based on higher priority, then—I guess, what we want to do with the whole process was ensure that we were funding based on needs. If there is a need that continues, we want to evaluate that on a five-year basis and sign agreements.

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I wonder if I might have leave to ask a question of information about the United Way of Winnipeg.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Go ahead.

Ms. Barrett: I understand that it is the covering of the administrative costs of the United Way. Is there a formula or do you—how do you determine what you will pay? Do they just give you the budget and you automatically do it, or is there some control over the amount that you will give them?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I am told that when the agreement was negotiated it was based on historical operating costs. It, I guess, is their operating costs plus their campaign costs. All of that had to be taken into account, and it was based, basically, I guess, on the rate of inflation when the five-year agreement was signed. So it was an agreement that was signed for the five years. Over the period of that five years, it will be a 4 percent increase per year. It was negotiated with them and it was acceptable to them and that was the agreement that was signed.

Ms. Barrett: Just one more question. When was that five-year agreement negotiated?

* (1500)

Mrs. Mitchelson: I believe it was signed in December of 1989, so this is the second year of the agreement.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Item 1.(f) Valley Agricultural Society, \$195,000—pass.

Item 1.(g) Winnipeg Football Club, \$450,000.

Mr. Gaudry: Yes, the increase from \$242,000 to \$450,000 is probably because of the Grey Cup and being the fifth year of their agreement, where they will get—is that—

Mrs. Mitchelson: Yes, that is because of the Grey Cup coming to Winnipeg this year and the need for added revenue.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Item 1.(g) Winnipeg Football Club, \$450,000—pass.

Item 1.(h) Capital Grants - Keystone Centre, \$655,000.

Mr. Gaudry: Yes, there has been no grant prior to this first one year of \$655,000. What is it made up of?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, this is the first year of a two-year commitment by the government for expansion of the Keystone Centre in Brandon, so this will be a two-year commitment only.

Mr. Gaudry: It is not a five-year agreement like the others. Why is that?

Mrs. Mitchelson: This is a Capital Grant. The others are ongoing operating grants and this is Capital—one time only, two-year commitment.

Mr. Gaudry: For their expansion?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Yes.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Item (h) Capital Grants - Keystone Centre \$655,000?

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): I wonder if the minister can give me some type of an idea what the Capital Grants are going to be doing at the Keystone? This is the semiannual grant that is given out to the Keystone Centre out in Brandon.

Mrs. Mitchelson: This is part of our one-third commitment to a \$9-million expansion of the Keystone Centre in Brandon. The federal government has put in \$3 million. We, through the Tourism Agreement, have put in \$655,000 this year; \$655,000 next year; and the remainder of our third portion is from the Tourism Agreement. The City of Brandon has come up with \$3 million. So it is a tripartite agreement, each of us putting in \$3 million for a \$9 million expansion.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Item 1.(h) Capital Grants - Keystone Centre \$655,000—pass.

Resolution 16: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$5,012,800 for the Community Support Programs for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1992—pass.

Shall we briefly recess to allow the minister and the critics the opportunity to prepare for the commencement of the next set of Estimates?

An Honourable Member: Ten minutes?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Ten minutes -(interjection)- Status of Women. Okay. Ten minutes.

The committee took recess at 3:05.

After Recess

The committee resumed at 3:14.

SUPPLY—STATUS OF WOMEN

Mr. Deputy Chairman (Marcel Laurendeau): Order, please. We are now commencing consideration of the Estimates for the Status of Women, on pages 150, 151 of your Estimates book.

Does the minister have an opening statement?

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister responsible for the Status of Women): Yes, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I do, and I have copies for the critics.

I am pleased to present the Estimates for the Status of Women portfolio. This was a year to note past accomplishments. It is the 75th anniversary of the year in which women got the vote in Manitoba. Although some groups, notably aboriginal people, did not get the vote until much later, it is 75 years since gender has been removed as a barrier to

since gender has been removed as a barrier to voting in this province. We have celebrated this event, noting it in the House on January 28 through special publications and through a change in our International Women's Day celebration.

This year the play, *The Fighting Days*, was presented at the Legislative Building and was very well attended. Many of those attending the evening commented on the appropriateness of such a play being performed in such a historic setting. It was truly a night of celebration.

I am delighted that the Manitoba Day celebrations also focused on the contributions of women to Manitoba's development. Events were held at The Forks on May 12, which was coincidentally Mother's Day. We were very fortunate that many of the women's organizations that were involved in the original political equality league were able to participate in this event. One of these groups, the University Women's Club, put on a play in the Walker Theatre that evening and they agreed to have the presentations of the Prix Awards-Heritage as part of the evening's entertainment.

As well as celebrating past accomplishments, the agenda for the Women's Directorate for the upcoming year is an ambitious one. We will concentrate our initiatives in two areas, violence against women and economic security. The issue of violence against women has been an area of concentration for the Directorate for the past four years, and it is unfortunate that it must continue to be so. We know that during time of economic stress there are increased attacks on the vulnerable members of a society. Unfortunately, it is still the case that women are amongst societies most vulnerable.

Changing roles, changing lifestyles and different expectations also lead to extra tension about how men and women relate to one another. These tensions all too often lead to violence. Violence is not an issue that government can solve alone. We have laws to protect the vulnerable, institutions to offer shelter to them and law enforcers to try to ensure that the laws against violence are upheld, but the violence continues. We see violence acted out on television every day. We have a generation of young people who have become quite accustomed to seeing violence as a way of settling disputes.

We as a government have been proactive in dealing with violence against women. We have an extensive well-funded emergency shelter system for victims of abusive relationships. We have funded counselling programs for abusers, sexual assault and rape victims and domestic assault survivors through such programs as Klinik Evolve and Women's Post Treatment Centre. We have made the court system more effective with the introduction of the Domestic Violence Court. In spite of a nearly doubling of the domestic assault charges laid in the past year, we have been able to reduce the time for the disposition of cases from 12 to 18 months down to 3.3 months. The Manitoba Women's Directorate is a part of the implementation committee for this court. This committee is carefully monitoring procedures and making adjustments as required.

We have also been active in trying to establish preventative measures. We believe the doubling of the number of charges laid in domestic assault in the city of Winnipeg last year was in part due to the public awareness campaign, *Abuse is a Crime*, that we ran. This campaign has been taken forward by shelters such as Osborne House through initiatives like the milk carton promotion with all Silverwood's milk cartons printing information on access to emergency shelters.

Manitoba has also been the lead province for the Ministers responsible for the Status of Women in working with all of the provincial Attorneys General to review the issue of women in the criminal justice system. The Attorneys General are prepared to act with the Ministers responsible for the Status of Women to take strong action in this area.

* (1520)

Among the issues we are considering is the relationship between sexual assault and violent pornographic material and how we can better control this type of material. In Manitoba we have already made a start. Through the classification initiative in the Department of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship, we have taken steps to ensure that controls are established in the distribution of violent and pornographic video tapes, a step that we believe is important in this struggle.

It is important, however, to remember that regardless of the regulations that are put in place, no matter how vigilant the law enforcers are, unless society as a whole is prepared to act, we will continue to see these crimes. The answer is everywhere, in the language that is used, in the way

we teach children to play together and in the material that we use for leisure.

Our goal in all of these initiatives is that women must feel safe. The recent assaults on the women of our community have led us to rethink the safety of our cities. The Department of Family Services has seconded a staffperson from the Family Dispute unit to work with the Safe Streets project of the Social Planning Council. Part of this project is to develop models for conducting safety audits of city buildings and leisure areas.

We realize as well that an important part of a holistic approach to the prevention of violence is that material presented to children in schools emphasizes co-operation and nonviolent resolution to disputes. The role of the teacher in the classroom can be critical.

The Women's Directorate is producing a compendium of resources that are available within the education systems across Canada. We expect to publish this directory in the fall. It will assist educators to access material suitable for use in their classrooms. Attitudes must change and we, as a government, will continue to play our role in this increasingly important area.

Economic security for women also continues to be a fundamental focus for the Directorate. We will shortly have announcements based on ongoing work with the Departments of Native and Northern Affairs and Industry, Trade and Tourism that will confirm our commitment to partnership with the women of Manitoba in their pursuit of economic independence.

It was my pleasure earlier this year to tour part of the province with Selma Rudderham from the Women's World Finance project in Cape Breton. This project, an affiliate of the Women's World Bank has stimulated interest in both The Pas and Winnipeg, and my staff will continue to work with the interested groups. As well, as a result of the forums, I am holding a series of meetings with women's groups on specific issues identified as areas of concern. I have invited all participants to write to me personally if they have issues that need further action to resolve.

We are particularly pleased that we have been able to increase the number of co-operative projects in which we participated over the last year. The Directorate was active in the planning and operation of Business Women's Week last year and will

continue to play a supportive role this year. Business Women's Week had over 2,500 participants last year and produced an outstanding series of events.

We have been participants in the planning and design of the upcoming June conference, "Alternatives: Directions in the Nineties to End the Abuse of Women." We are working with immigrant women in their outreach efforts to make their organization better known across the province. We have been active with the aboriginal women in their lobby to have the Aboriginal Healing Lodge, planned by the federal Department of Justice, located in Manitoba. We have conducted training workshops, acted as facilitators and have been resource people on over a hundred occasions to different women's organizations in the past year.

The co-operative approach to Manitoba Day with the participation of many women's groups is another example of the partnership that we have been pursuing with Manitoba women. In the past year, we have significantly increased our contact with the women of Manitoba through the maintenance of two Outreach offices, through a series of round tables, through meetings with community groups, through more co-operative projects, and through a tour taken by the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women to eight communities. Both the round tables and the tour by the chair and the executive director of the Advisory Council were to better explain the distinct roles of the directorate and the council and to establish better communications with Manitoba women outside the Winnipeg perimeter.

In pursuing this better understanding of roles, the chair of the Advisory Council has raised a concern about the name of the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women. It is frequently confused with the Manitoba Action Committee on the Status of Women, an outside lobby group. At the request of the council, an amendment will be submitted this session to change the name to Women's Advisory Council of Manitoba.

We have been pleased that we have been able to positively respond to so many of the Advisory Council's initiatives. Last fall when the council reacted to the tragic murder-suicide which had taken place, the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) quickly appointed Dorothy Pedlar to do a review of policies and procedures dealing with domestic violence. We anticipate the results of this review

within the next two months. The Advisory Council has recommended an interdepartmental approach to dealing with family violence so that information and support can be shared between the Departments of Justice, Health, Education, and Family Services.

I have worked in conjunction with my colleagues to heighten awareness of the issues and all these portfolios. As well, in January of this year, the Advisory Council co-sponsored the Winning Women: Power and Ethics Conference, encouraging women to become involved in the decision-making process.

The Advisory Council submitted their report on single-parent families last month. The plight of the single parent is one that we as a government take very seriously. Since we have been in office, we have completely revamped the access to social assistance for single parents. All single parents now have immediate access to provincial social assistance without any waiting period. This has helped to alleviate the inequities that may have existed in municipalities.

As a government we commit close to \$2 million annually to the Single Parent Job Access Program to respond to the special training and support needs of single parents. We have amended the Social Allowances regulations so that earnings of children who are attending school are no longer deducted from the family's benefits. We recognize that single parents need special supports.

We are carefully examining the recommendations of the Advisory Council in this area. With my colleagues, the Ministers of Labour (Mr. Praznik) and Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer), I met with the Advisory Council to discuss their recommendations. We have asked them to provide more information on some of the recommendations contained in the report. We have, however, also received comments from other groups such as the Women's Resource Centres, who have raised concerns about some of the recommendations. This is important feedback which we are also carefully examining.

I have been pleased with the co-operative working arrangement that has been developed between the Advisory Council and the Women's Directorate. We believe that it is through such co-operation that we can best serve the women of Manitoba.

At meetings with cabinet and with individual ministers, the advice of the Advisory Council has been thoughtful and they have established themselves as a valued advisory body. We all recognize that this was a year when difficult fiscal decisions had to be made. I am pleased to say that we have been able to maintain operational funding to the Status of Women portfolio to ensure the ongoing function of the Advisory Council and the Women's Directorate. The only reduction in this portfolio were nonrecurring expenditures and staff turnover.

The Action Plan that was released this year on March 8 contains over 100 initiatives. They are evidence that we, as a government, continue to treat the issues concerning women seriously; however, there is still much to do. The issues facing women today are complex. The solutions are difficult and will only be able to be realized in the long term. We believe the most successful and productive way to approach these issues is through co-operation and partnership with women of Manitoba regardless of political stripe.

We have this year created opportunities to celebrate the accomplishments of women. We believe that through supporting, celebrating and encouraging women in their roles as leaders, we will help to make Manitoba a better, safer place for all. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: We thank the honourable minister for those remarks.

Does the critic for the official opposition party, the honourable member for Wellington, have an opening statement?

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): Mr. Deputy Chair, I have very few comments to make in way of an opening statement and will make most of my comments as I ask specific questions.

I look forward to being able to talk about these issues. I think the minister, in her opening remarks, has clearly stated that this is an area that crosses many departments. I think it is very important that the dialogue and the communication, not only between the various women's groups in the community, but also within the various government departments, is open and listened to. I will actually not say anything more and deal with the issues as they arise in the line-by-line Estimates.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: We thank the honourable member for those remarks.

We will now start by dealing with Item 1. Status of Women. First, we will invite the staff up and the honourable minister can possibly introduce them.

* (1530)

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I would just like to introduce my staff. Doris Mae Oulton is the ADM of the Women's Directorate; Myroslava Pidhirnyj is Senior Policy Analyst with the Women's Directorate; and Ruth Mitchell is the Executive Director of the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: I thank the honourable minister.

Would the honourable member for the second opposition party present have any opening remarks?

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): No, that is fine.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Thank you.

Item 1. Status of Women 1.(a) Advisory Council on the Status of Women: 1.(a)(1) Salaries \$146,300.

Ms. Barrett: Mr. Deputy Chair, under the Salaries item there is over a \$10,000 decrease in the Professional/Technical area, even though there is still a single Staff Year there. Can the minister explain that decrease?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, one staffperson left and another one was hired. I guess just the classification level—it is still the same classification, but the new staffperson started at a lower level within that classification.

Ms. Barrett: Can I get some background on the new person in that Professional/Technical area?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the person is Betty Nordrum. She is a policy analyst, a nurse by profession, was hired approximately a year ago, has an extensive background in the women's community, a member of the Junior League.

Ms. Barrett: Mr. Deputy Chair, I just note one other question on the expenditure page, and then I would like to ask some questions about the actual activities of the Advisory Council.

In Other Expenditures, there is a \$200 decrease in the actual expenditures. I am wondering if the minister can explain how the Other Expenditures are going to remain virtually the same in light of the goods and services tax, inflation and other cost factors. What will happen to make those numbers remain the same?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, government does not pay the GST. I guess there was an overall reduction across government. It is for postage, so there will be \$200 less spent on postage as there will be reductions in expenditures throughout government on postage.

Ms. Barrett: Mr. Deputy Chair, I realize that the goods and services tax is not paid by government, but there is in the overall budget of the government, I believe, a 6 percent inflation rate. In the throne speech and in the budget discussion, it was agreed that was the figure that the government was basing its own Estimates on, generally.

I am wondering if the minister can explain how the Other Expenditures items in this line are going to remain virtually static.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I guess we all have to look at ways to economize somewhat. I am pleased to say—and I know, for whomever had sat in on my Estimates for the Department of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship, there were reductions in staff, there were reductions in grants. We had to make some choices that were difficult choices.

In this area, we have been able to maintain the status quo. There has not been a reduction other than the postage reduction, and I guess when growth in revenues is at zero percent, I am pleased to say that we were able to keep the money that we kept within the Status of Women portfolio to attempt to maintain.

We are just going to have to look at spending a little more efficiently and effectively. I believe that we will, with the staff that we have in place in both areas, be able to manage and to ensure that the work that has been done will continue to be done.

Ms. Barrett: Mr. Deputy Chair, can the minister explain what comes under Personnel Services in this particular line? There is a definition in the front, but I am not quite sure how it relates to this item.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, those are the per diems for the council members.

Ms. Barrett: On the council meetings, are there the same number of meetings scheduled this year as have been in the past? Are they all again to be located in Winnipeg which, as I understand, they have been in the past?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I am informed that there are no current plans at this point to meet outside the city of Winnipeg. I think we

discussed last year in Estimates that the requirement under legislation is for six meetings per year. In some past years, there were up to as many as nine meetings. There will be seven meetings this year.

Ms. Barrett: Can the minister, just to trig my own memory, tell me how many members of the Advisory Council are from inside the city and how many outside? I do not need a total listing, but just a number.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Eight rural and six urban.

Ms. Barrett: I would like to talk a bit about some of the Expected Results as have been listed on page 12 of the detailed Estimates, the Supplementary Estimates. The first one is the presentation of recommendations to the government regarding women and nontraditional occupations. Can the minister give us an update on what exactly that is, what the recommendations are and what the process has been up to date?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I am informed that it is available in the Advisory Council's office. It is a paper with a—it is a review of different literature that is available, but, in fact, it is not a report.

Ms. Barrett: So there are no recommendations attached to this item?

Mrs. Mitchelson: No.

* (1540)

Ms. Barrett: Is this literature review currently available in the Advisory Council's offices?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Yes, it is available through the office.

Ms. Barrett: The second result is the examination of the existing substance abuse programs for women. Can the minister provide an update on that item?

Mrs. Mitchelson: The review of existing programs has been completed. The analysis at this point has not been completed and will be worked on.

Ms. Barrett: Is there a time frame that we can expect this analysis and report?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I am informed that the earliest would be late fall, very possibly early 1992.

Ms. Barrett: Can the minister share with us what was undertaken in the review part of this examination?

Mrs. Mitchelson: The review was to look at the programs that were being provided and see

whether, in fact, there was any gender-specific approach to program delivery.

Ms. Barrett: I might understand that there were programs in a range of agencies that were not just necessarily women's agencies and to see if there was any need to provide more detailed—

Mrs. Mitchelson: I guess the concern by the Advisory Council was that women be dealt with appropriately in specific ways if there was a need for that type of approach.

Ms. Barrett: Can the minister give me a sample of the kinds of agencies and programs that have been reviewed in this context?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the AFM, River House and the Women's Post Treatment Centre.

Ms. Barrett: Those are the three that have been looked at? There are no others that have been looked at in this context?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, we could get a list of all of the names. They are just not sort of readily available at the top of mine.

Ms. Barrett: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I would appreciate that list if possible, even if it comes after the Estimates process is completed for this department.

What kinds of elements were looked at or what was the process for this review? Was it a series of meetings with the people involved in these organizations or just a look at the material?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I am informed that it was personal interviews plus review of the materials that are being used.

(Mrs. Rosemary Vodrey, Acting Chairman, in the Chair)

Ms. Barrett: Madam Acting Chairperson, were these personal interviews with employees, users of the services, board members?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Madam Acting Chairperson, I am informed that they were with program delivery people and administrators of the program, not those who were using the program.

Ms. Barrett: Who has undertaken this examination?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Madam Acting Chairperson, it was under the supervision of the policy analyst in the Advisory Council on the Status of Women, but it was done through volunteers in government program.

Ms. Barrett: I am not aware of that program. Could you give me a brief description of volunteers in government program?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Madam Acting Chairperson, I am informed that it is—and I know it is—a program of the Department of Family Services. When people come forward with specific skills and indicate an interest in working and providing a service to government, they are hired within a government department to provide that specific research or service.

Ms. Barrett: In effect, they are not volunteering their time; they are paid to do this?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Madam Acting Chairperson, I am not that familiar with the program in Family Services except—no, they volunteer their time in order to gain government experience.

Ms. Barrett: Finally, I am going to be very interested in seeing this because I have some past connection with, in particular, Women's Post Treatment Centre, and I have a sense of what some of their concerns are. Did this review discuss with those people, those service deliverers, their recommendations, their concerns? Were they asked to participate, or was it sort of said, this is what we are doing and you will participate? Was it voluntary?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Madam Acting Chairperson, they were asked whether they would be willing to participate. In fact their recommendations will be taken into consideration.

Ms. Barrett: Finally, will a report be available for members of the Legislature and the agencies that participated in this?

Mrs. Mitchelson: At this point in time, it is the intention of the Advisory Council to provide that.

Ms. Barrett: Madam Acting Chair, could the minister explain the next activity, which is to examine current funding models for women's programs? What are the funding models, and what areas of concern are there that precipitated this activity?

Mrs. Mitchelson: This is just at the very exploratory stage. The chairperson of the Advisory Council has indicated to me—and she is talking to women's groups out there with a sense that there should be a possibility of an umbrella organization that would help on an ongoing basis to fund programs that involve women. She is just now talking to people, to women throughout the

province. As I said, it is in the very formulative stages.

Ms. Barrett: Is this something the chairperson has seen as an area of concern arising out of groups or individuals coming before her saying that we need an umbrella organization or is this something that she has, through her own work, decided is a potential requirement?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I guess based on her experience in the women's community she has a sense that in fact women's organizations should be looking for alternative sources of funding other than government, and this might be a way to accommodate that.

Ms. Barrett: Madam Acting Chair, this umbrella organization would then not be a governmental umbrella organization, it would be a nongovernmental organization.

* (1550)

Mrs. Mitchelson: Yes.

Ms. Barrett: Is there a sense of how this umbrella organization would be set up or established?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Madam Acting Chairperson, I am informed that it is much too early to tell what form it might take. I have just been informed it is not something that—I guess the Advisory Council is playing a lead role in facilitating but in fact would not be an administrator of this.

They are consulting with women's organizations, seeing whether there is a sense within the community that this kind of umbrella organization should be set up. If in fact it should, they might be part of the facilitating of helping it get off the ground.

Ms. Barrett: Do we have a time frame as to when there might be some report on this?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I am informed at this point, no.

Ms. Barrett: The handbook of services available for single parents, can we have an update on that handbook?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Madam Acting Chairperson, I am informed that the information has been compiled. It has not been put into handbook form as yet. The earliest that could be would be this fall, possibly next spring.

Ms. Barrett: When it is available, where would it be distributed?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Madam Acting Chairperson, we have been in consultation, of course, through the Women's Directorate and the Advisory Council,

indicating that if this kind of information is available, it would be nice to have it within the women's network system, through the computered system in the Outreach Offices of the Women's Directorate and in other offices, maybe doctor's offices, Family Services offices and a broad distribution.

Ms. Barrett: What kind of services are being looked at? I see it is for single parents. Is there a particular focus?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Anywhere I guess that single parents would need to go or be able to go for advice and services, whether it be resource centres, whether it be government departments, women's groups and organizations, so a fairly detailed listing of ways to access services or consultation.

Ms. Barrett: I would like to have the minister explain or outline a bit the monitoring procedures on constitutional reform, women in education and family violence. What are these procedures? How are they being undertaken?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Madam Acting Chairperson, as things come up through the media, it is monitored as women call the Advisory Council with issues of concern. As there are new developments, they are monitored on an ongoing basis.

Ms. Barrett: What form does the monitoring take? What comes out of that monitoring, what action?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Madam Acting Chairperson, anything from recommending to a minister of the government some action be taken, whether it be in family violence, it was one of the recommendations of the Advisory Council that the Minister of Justice and Attorney General (Mr. McCrae) responded to with the Pedlar Commission. They write letters on behalf of organizations. They were involved, of course, with the government Meech Lake Constitutional debate. They have circulated a constitutional questionnaire around the province for input from women and women's organizations, that kind of thing.

Ms. Barrett: Madam Acting Chair, which kinds of women's organizations were circulated the questionnaire and is it in the process of being analyzed now?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Madam Acting Chairperson, there are 195 women's organizations that received questionnaires and also Women's Institute, provincial women's council, YWCA, the Resource Centres and many individual women throughout the province.

Ms. Barrett: Would it be possible to get a copy of the questionnaire and what is going to happen with the results of that questionnaire? What is the next step for it?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Madam Acting Chairperson, the Senate House Committee has asked for this type of a process and when the responses are obtained, the Advisory Council will compile those responses and present them to the Senate Committee by June 15.

Ms. Barrett: What concerns regarding family violence are being—what monitoring is being undertaken in that regard?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Madam Acting Chairperson, as I indicated earlier the Advisory Council on the Status of Women came forward to government indicating concerns regarding sentencing, regarding women falling through the cracks in the justice system, at recommending a more co-ordinated approach. As a result of that, of course, the Pedlar Commission was set up. That was one area of genuine concern.

Ms. Barrett: I am wondering if this is the area or if it is the Women's Directorate to talk about Abuse is a Crime?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Madam Acting Chairperson, that would be under the Women's Directorate.

Ms. Barrett: I will wait on that until we get to that point. What is the women in education areas? What areas are being looked at in that regard?

* (1600)

Mrs. Mitchelson: They are part of a coalition on women's education, and they are monitoring, I guess, the number of girls or women within the school system who are maintaining—they have a real concern that math and sciences are as much of a priority for girls in high school as they are for boys. They monitor the dollars and the participation of girls in the physical education system too.

(Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair)

Ms. Barrett: Mr. Deputy Chairman, who is involved in this coalition?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, there was an open invitation by COLE, Canadian Congress on Learning Opportunities for Women, and MACE, Manitoba Adult Continuing Education, for anyone who wanted to be a part of discussing learning opportunities for women. There are many organizations that are involved: the Women's Directorate is involved; the Core Area Initiative is involved; the Advisory Council on the Status of Women; CEIC from the federal government; and

Red River Community College. Many organizations are involved.

Ms. Barrett: Is this an ongoing thing? Are there anticipated any documents or recommendations, or is that kind of thing not coming out of this?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, they are a group that identifies issues and plans strategy on how to deal with those issues. They are a lobby group and probably will become more active as time goes by. They deal with the issues by letter writing or some sort of co-ordinated effort to heighten public awareness.

Ms. Barrett: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I just have a last general question, and I am not sure if it is here or at the end. I am wondering again, as was mentioned actually in the last two sets of Estimates, that there is a real lack on the part of the Advisory Council, and I also believe on the part of the Women's Directorate, in taking initiatives in areas such as child care, pay equity, affirmative action, reproductive health.

As well, I do not see anything in here in the government's plan or the minister's plan to lobby and talk with her federal counterparts and the federal government on these issues, and in particular, the impact that the federal government's financial fiscal policies are having on women in Manitoba and women in poverty in Manitoba.

I am wondering if the minister could explain what appears to be a major lack in focus on the part of the Advisory Council and the entire department?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I do not know whether I should try to answer both the Advisory Council and the Women's Directorate at the same time or not. I know that the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women did take a lead role in the consultations on new reproductive technology and the presentation of that to the federal government.

They obviously did take a leadership role when the Premier (Mr. Filmon) went down. The Premier and the other party Leaders went to Meech Lake. As far as the Women's Directorate goes, we certainly are taking a lead role on women and violence and violence within the justice system. I am the lead minister at the conference in June for the Ministers responsible for the Status of Women on presentation of a very strong position, working very closely with the Attorneys General, who want a paper with recommendations not just to be looked

at and tossed aside, but an action plan for dealing with violence against women.

I think that we as a province are much further ahead of other provinces when it comes to our family violence court. All provinces are looking very closely and monitoring what is happening here in the province of Manitoba.

It has become something for other governments to take a serious look at implementing in their own provinces, so we are taking the lead role in some areas. I guess one of the issues for the court is child abuse. That is one area—and obviously on pornography, we have introduced the video classification system in the province. That will be one of the issues that will be discussed at the meeting, the upcoming meeting in June, too.

Ms. Barrett: I understand the difficulty in trying to separate the two areas. I have a great deal of difficulty in my own head as to which part I should be responding to. I think I will talk about the family violence area when we get to the Women's Directorate. I think that will probably make more sense.

I still see again, not that these issues are not important to women, but that there are, particularly in these difficult economic times—and we probably will agree to disagree on the causes of those difficult economic times—but we all understand that we are involved with them, that some of the actions on the part of both the federal and the provincial governments are having a dreadfully negative impact on the women in the province.

I just wanted to ask the minister if she is talking with her cabinet colleagues and strongly urging them, making them aware of the impact of some of these fiscal decisions which appear to be based on fiscal issues rather than on human issues.

I refer directly, most specifically, I think, to family services and health and education, those areas that are the areas that deal most directly with people and the problems that some of the federal and provincial actions are causing for women in this province in areas such as child care, pay equity and those kinds of things that mean a great deal to women and families in this province. I just, as I said, I am not seeing much in either of these divisions of the ministry of action in some of those areas that have been mentioned for a couple of years now.

* (1610)

Mrs. Mitchelson: Well, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, we do have much dialogue and discussion regarding initiatives for women throughout government, and I think our record does stand very clear in the area of wife abuse and shelters. We have made major increases in funding.

We all recognize and realize that there is more to do, that we have to continue and we have to continue to work and put our money into priority areas. I know that, as a fact, we have increased substantially the funding to wife abuse shelters. We have done a lot in the justice system whereby we have the Family Violence Court now.

In housing subsidies, there are some 490 new units that have come on stream in 1990 and, in fact, 75 percent of those 490 units are filled with single parent women.

You know, there has been much accomplished and we will continue to work. I know that we have had to make priority decisions over the last budget year and try to maintain the services and maintain the subsidies in day care to those families that really need it. We have and we will continue to place priority in those areas.

Ms. Barrett: Mr. Deputy Chair, I realize that this division does not have nearly the resources that are required of it to be able to function as well as, I think, we all would like to see it, and it certainly has not from the moment of its initiation.

I have one final question in this area. In the Estimates in January 1990, which is two Estimates ago, Mrs. Hammond says, we are doing a study on the impact on women of the GST. I am wondering if the minister can provide a follow-up or a progress report on that study.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I am informed that all of that information was compiled and rolled into the whole analysis that was being done by the Department of Finance on impact of the GST.

Ms. Barrett: So we have seen in this last budget that, for example, in the social allowance system where there is a basic increase of 4.5 percent in the basic social allowances, as an example, then that figure would have taken into account the impact of the goods and services tax on social allowance recipients.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I am informed that the whole analysis that was done

would have had an impact on the decision that was made to provide the increase.

Ms. Barrett: So, in effect, there is no available analysis specifically on the impact of the goods and services tax on women. It would have been part of whatever studies were done internally.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, it was all rolled into the total analysis of the impact of the GST.

Ms. Barrett: Just one final comment on that, and then I will conclude this area of questioning. I would suggest that in none of the departments that have an impact on services for women was that analysis accurate or adequate. It should be looked at, yet again, in light of what the federal government itself has said is the impact of the goods and services tax and the Canadian Consumers' Association report, that the impact of the GST on the purchasing power of everyone in this country has been vastly underestimated.

So I would urge the minister to urge her cabinet colleagues to undertake another analysis and with a focus specifically on the impacts of the goods and services tax on people like single-parent families, women in poverty, families with children, that kind of thing.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the member for River Heights has a number of questions that she would like to be asking, but unfortunately she is still in the educational Estimates. I, myself, have a number of questions that I would like to put forward and take this opportunity to do so.

I know that the Advisory Council on the Status of Women has done a lot of good work in the past. No doubt, we look forward to receiving much more work in terms of recommendations and information and so forth from the council.

My first question is dealing strictly with the council itself in asking how often does the council meet?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, seven times a year.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I know the member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett) had asked some questions in terms of the make-up of rural versus city. I would ask the minister in terms of a further breakdown, are there minorities, immigrant women who are on the—

(Mrs. Rosemary Vodrey, Acting Chairman, in the Chair)

Mrs. Mitchelson: Madam Acting Chairperson, there are four aboriginal women and two visible minorities on the council.

Mr. Lamoureux: I wanted to move on down to some of the concerns. I know that there is independent research that is done from the council, and I would ask the minister through the council, what type of independent research they have taken under their own in the last year?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Madam Acting Chairperson, the single-parent families report was one area that was researched, substance abuse, work analysis that has been done is another area. That has been basically the only outside research that has been done.

Mr. Lamoureux: I ask the minister, is there a procedure, is it a report that they file with the minister when they do their research?

* (1620)

Mrs. Mitchelson: Madam Acting Chairperson, we receive an annual report for the Advisory Council on the Status of Women in September of each year indicating the activities that have been undertaken. It is tabled in the House.

Mr. Lamoureux: Can the minister say when the last one would have been tabled and when we could anticipate the next one?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Last year it was tabled around the middle of October for '89-90 and it will be tabled for '90-91—it will be prepared by September of 1991.

Mr. Lamoureux: Madam Acting Chairperson, I know there are certain areas, of course, that the government puts emphasis on. I was wondering if the minister—and she has to forgive me, I have not been here for the full proceedings. Has there been an emphasis on any specific areas that have been designated out to the Advisory Council. Maybe the minister can advise me as to what role does the minister play in terms of asking for or soliciting information?

Mrs. Mitchelson: The Advisory Council undertakes activities on their own based on their decision on what they feel is important to be doing, but the one area that I did ask for advice on was when we talked about implementing a video classification system. I met with the chair of the Advisory Council and asked her to consult with women's organizations. We met from time to time to update her on what was happening with the video

classification system. They took a genuine interest and I think played a very supportive role in getting that initiative up and underway.

Mr. Lamoureux: Does the council meet with different women's organizations throughout the year to find out what concerns are out there?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Yes, they meet with many groups and organizations and discuss issues that are of community concern.

Mr. Lamoureux: I am wondering if the minister might be able to tell me if the other subject areas, in particular regarding immigrant women, are those issues something that come up time after time. Has the council done anything to address some of those more specific problems that they have?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I am informed that one of the members of the council is part of the Immigrant Women's Association, so she reports to the council on activities that are ongoing in the immigrant women's community. They co-sponsor events from time to time with the Immigrant Women's Association.

(Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair)

Mr. Lamoureux: Has the council had any research done in any of the immigrant women's problems that have been aroused either through this representative on the council or through different meetings or requests from the minister's office? I am not only talking about this specific year but in the last number of years?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I am informed only as part of other reports. If it was women in the labour force and that kind of thing, then there would have been a component on immigrant women but nothing specifically. That might be handled through the Women's Directorate.

Mr. Lamoureux: I would imagine that there are a large number of different immigrant groups that do have some specific problems, whether it is at the home or at the work force, that immigrant women have, to a certain degree, more disadvantages and would encourage that the council look into some of these problems and bring forward the independent research, because the independent research proves to be very valuable to all members of the Chamber and one could say to Manitoba as a whole.

I would ask the council through the minister if, in fact, they have any intentions on what their major issues are going to be in the up and coming year?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, part of their ongoing activities are to publish a handbook for services available for single parents, and we talked about that earlier with the critic from the official opposition. They will maintain their monitoring of procedures on constitutional reform, developments of women in education, concerns regarding family violence, women in the justice system and continue to bring forward issues of concern on equality and priorities that, from time to time, are brought to their attention.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the justice system interests me somewhat. This is the first time that I have heard about that. Is there a certain aspect that they would be looking at?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Well, I guess I have indicated, and just earlier today, too, that it was a result of the Advisory Council making a recommendation to government that we look at injustices within the justice system. In fact, as a result of them coming forward, we acted very quickly and appointed Dorothy Pedlar to do a review of the justice system. We should have the results from that study that has been undertaken within the next couple of months.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I want to move on to a couple of the issues that they have dealt with. One, of course, is the single-parent family. A major concern that I have, and I know the minister had mentioned it somewhat briefly, is the whole question of housing. I want to be very specific by looking at battered women. Once a woman has found herself being taken advantage of and ends up in Osborne House, there is a relatively short period of stay in Osborne House. I am wondering if the advisory board has looked into—or the minister's office if the board has not—having some type of an interim shelter, or did the single-parent family study take a look at that component?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Well, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, that would probably best be asked under the Women's Directorate. In fact, there is second-stage housing, and then there is also a priority placement policy within the Department of Housing for victims of domestic abuse to be placed into regional housing. That was where I indicated that there were 490 family units committed or constructed in 1990, and 75 percent of those are occupied by single-parent mothers and their children. There is a priority placement policy in place in the Department

of Housing, but that probably should be discussed under the Women's Directorate.

Mr. Lamoureux: I will hold off till the Women's Directorate, if I am here at that time, to discuss that. The single-parent family research that was done, what was the primary focus of that or the recommendations that came out of that?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I think one recommendation that came forward was sort of a central point of entry into access for government services, and that was one of the key recommendations. There were many other recommendations—let us see—eligibility cutoffs for both shelter assistance for family renters, that is the SAFFR program, substantially reducing the tax-back rates on earned income in the Work Incentive Program, providing child care and travel subsidies for those enrolled in social allowance sponsored training and employment, and implementing a transition period whereby benefits would continue or taper gradually during the first year of employment rather than being automatically cut off.

* (1630)

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I noticed she had mentioned the SAFFR program, a program that I am somewhat familiar with. I know that there has been some concern that that particular program is not being funded or has not been given the resources necessary in order to better enhance individuals who require that. What is the recommendation coming from the council regarding this particular program?

Mrs. Mitchelson: The specific recommendation says eligibility cutoffs for both the shelter assistance for family renters, that is the SAFFR program, and the CRISP program be raised to approximate the low-income cutoffs as determined by Statistics Canada. That is the recommendation.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I am not quite sure if I caught what the minister had meant by that. Are they endorsing the program? In short, are they recommending that it be enhanced?

Mrs. Mitchelson: They are recommending that it be available to more people.

Mr. Lamoureux: How is the minister following up with that recommendation?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Well, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, it would be a recommendation to the Minister of Family Services, because in fact he deals with the program money for these programs. I know a lot of

the recommendations had fairly major cost implications, and they were presented to us around the end of January when I met with the Advisory Council. We were already into the budget process, and the report was released publicly, I guess, after the budget was released.

In fact, any major recommendations with major cost implications are going to have to be evaluated over the next period of time, and any adjustments will probably have to wait until the next budget year. There just is no more money at this point in time to go around, so all of the options will be looked at. There are many that merit extra consideration, and they will have to be looked at. The Minister of Family Services has expressed some interest in a couple of the recommendations and wants a bit more information, but I do know that there are some concerns in the community, too, from Women's Resource Centres that have indicated some concern about the recommendations. I think we have to listen to both the recommendations and the concerns in the community and ensure that whatever we are implementing is done to the benefit of the women who need support.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, on a question of process, I would ask the minister what she feels her role is when you have recommendations that are brought forward from the Advisory Council? Does she have a role to play, or are the recommendations just deferred to the appropriate departments that are responsible for the individual programs and will use SAFFR because they are most familiar with the SAFFR program?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Well, certainly the Minister responsible for the Status of Women has a role to play, and that is ensuring that she works co-operatively with her colleagues in government to ensure that programs that are key and essential to the women in the province of Manitoba are looked at in a very real way throughout departments.

It is the co-ordinating, just as we have been through the Multicultural Secretariat and the Manitoba Intercultural Council and the minister's role as responsible for multiculturalism. It is somewhat similar in women's areas, whereby there are many different government departments and many different programs throughout government that deal specifically with women, women's issues and women's programs. Family programs and all of those, I take a genuine interest in, but I do not, within my budget, have the dollars and the resources

available. Each minister has a whole department to look at, and there have to be priority decisions made. We have focused our priorities over the last few years on the shelter system, on the court system, and those have been a couple of priorities. There is obviously a housing placement priority, too. We have revamped the day care system.

All of those things have taken some time, taken considerable dollars, and as we work along, we realize and recognize there is more to be done. As resources become available, we will have to prioritize those things that have yet to be looked at and put our dollars in those directions.

So it is a matter of the departments having the programming dollars and the ability, and me ensuring, through the Women's Directorate which sits on many interdepartmental committees, that, in fact, the issues affecting women are looked at from the women's perspective from the Women's Directorate, and the advice that I give as the minister responsible, with the expert input from my staff on recommendations, hopefully will be looked at in a positive light.

We try to work together and meet with other ministers in other departments as the need arises to discuss the different programs that are ongoing, and I would love to see every program for every woman in the province of Manitoba looked at and positively responded to by government. We know that the reality is that that cannot happen, so I work together with my colleagues to ensure that priority is placed in the areas that we are looking at, and as more resources become available that we look at the changing needs and reprioritize accordingly.

Mr. Lamoureux: This council has brought forward what I believe is a good recommendation, making it more available to more people. I believe it was the Institute of Urban Studies that commented that the biggest problem with the SAFER and SAFFR programs, which are administered through the Departments of Housing and Family Services, is the fact that people do not know about the programs. If people did know about it, in particular single-parent families, I would imagine that the demand for the program would more than double.

I know the Minister responsible for the Status of Women does meet with her caucus colleagues every week and can put forward persuasive arguments. She talks about the establishment of priorities. I am going to give her an opinion, my biased opinion when it comes to priorities. The

SAFER program, as I say, is a program that is administered through the Department of Housing. We have the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ernst), who has established priorities within that department. I would suggest to the minister that she should be sitting down with the current Minister of Housing and going over some of those priorities.

We could take a look at the Pines development and the cost of the Pines development and if that money was put over into a program such as the shelter allowance for low-income families—

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. Need I remind the honourable member that we are dealing with the Status of Women 1.(a) Advisory Council on the Status of Women?

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, in wanting to keep it relevant, I will tell you how I feel that it is very relevant. The minister talks about priorities. The council has made a recommendation that SAFER should be a program made more available to different organizations, different women, if you will. The minister in her own remarks says that yes, she does have a role to play when it comes to a follow-up to recommendations that are made to her department.

What I am suggesting is, in fact, that she should be consulting more with those ministers where the recommendations are being directed at, whether it is the Department of Family Services, whether it is the Department of Housing and had, in fact, the Minister responsible for the Status of Women said, for example, to the Minister of Housing that the SAFER program is more valuable to single-parent women, that we should be emphasizing and putting more resources in that area. Then we would be able to do more advertising so that more women would be aware of the program, so that we are actually having follow-up on a recommendation that has been put forward from the council. Would the minister not agree?

* (1640)

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, those are very interesting comments to have on record. Now we have the Liberal Party and the Liberal Party policy advocating that seniors housing is not important and it is not one of their priorities. In fact, they are saying, take the money out of seniors, and the Pines is irrelevant, whether it is the Pines complex or whether it is any other seniors housing complex that receives funding in the province of Manitoba, there are many, many women who are

seniors who need housing accommodation. Now the Liberal policy obviously must be that seniors housing is not a priority of the Liberal Party and, in fact, we should take all the money out of seniors housing and put it and redirect it into SAFFR programs, whatever they might be.

There are budget allocations. I think that there has to be priority placed by government in all different areas, and there has to be money spent on seniors housing no matter where it might be in the province because we are an aging population. We have to look at those who need support with young families and we have to look at those at the other end of the scale who need support for their retiring years.

There has to be a balance and, in fact, when there are limited resources to go around, there are choices which have to be made and those choices are not easy, they are difficult choices. It is interesting to note that the Liberals might remove support for seniors housing out of a budget if they had the opportunity and redirect it. Those are decisions that governments from time to time have to make. There are decisions to move or to reallocate when those resources are limited, so I was just interested to hear those comments and hear what the Liberal policy might be if they were government.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I am somewhat intrigued with the answer that the government has given. The SAFER program—there are two, SAFER and SAFFR. SAFFR is a program for families of low income. SAFER is a program for elderly, seniors. They have lost this debate when it comes to the Pines inside the Chamber, and I think her remarks would be best left alone.

To get back on track, because it is so important to follow up on recommendations, whether it is this council or any other council. You have to show and demonstrate good intent. I would ask the minister what recommendations has she followed up on from the Advisory Council?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, our record stands for itself. We have ordered the Pedlar Commission as a result of a recommendation. We have put in place the video classification system as a result of the Advisory Council and us working together. So those are two concrete examples.

Ms. Barrett: Mr. Deputy Chair, I have a couple of questions which were brought to my attention by the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux). They relate to the single-parent families report. First, the minister stated that she received the report in January, I believe, and by that time the budget process was well underway. Can the minister explain why on the covering page of the report it says, prepared by Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women, November 1990? If it was prepared in November of 1990, why did the minister not receive it for two months?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, it was prepared but it was not distributed. I met with the chairperson of the Advisory Council, along with my colleagues the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik) and the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer), I think it was around the 29th or 30th of January, to have the report presented to us.

Ms. Barrett: I am wondering if the minister can explain why, if the report was prepared and it did, as it does, have very clear and substantial cost implications for many of the recommendations, why it was almost two months before the minister received the report.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I am informed that it was the Christmas season. The Advisory Council chair was travelling. It was circumstances that did not allow it to be presented to us until that time.

I might indicate that it did take two years to prepare. We did not stand still while the report was being prepared. There were a few things we were able to change in the interim while the report was being prepared that might affect positively single-parent families.

A couple of those things are the social assistance program to enable recently separated, deserted, sole-support parents to immediately qualify for provincial assistance. That was a change that we made since taking government, something that allowed easier access to single-parent women. In 1989, the social allowances regulations were amended to exempt the earnings of a child in full-time attendance at school from the calculation of social allowance benefits for the family. So those were a couple of positive things we did as a new government that dealt with single-parent families.

We did not stand still. We will continue to work. As resources become available we will have to look

at the priority recommendations that were made, do an analysis and get further information. As I indicated, there were some concerns by some of the community out there that deals with women regarding some of the recommendations. If we had accepted all of those recommendations without listening to those who might be affected, we might in some instances have been moving in the wrong direction.

Ms. Barrett: Mr. Deputy Chair, again I state that I would have hoped that at least the report could have been presented to the ministers. I understand that in November and the Christmas season, et cetera—but I would just go on record as saying it is too bad that the report was completed and not shared so that potentially some changes might have been put into this budget year and enabled single-parent families to have had at least some of their concerns raised in the budget process.

I would like to ask the minister if she is able to share with us some of the concerns that the women's resource groups have raised in regard to these recommendations?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I guess the primary concern of the Women's Resource Centres is the entry point, the office for single entry point to government programs. I think they feel they are providing some of that service right now, and it would be duplication and another bureaucracy rather than in fact real service to women.

Ms. Barrett: I, in reading this report, had the same concern myself, that that would be an unnecessary duplication of services. However, again that to me in and of itself is not—no one expects a report of this depth and breadth to be acted upon immediately or even everything over a very short period of time. I am just saying there were implications for SAFER, for CRISP, 55-Plus, for some of the other programs, where in effect the government in this current budget has gone against the recommendations that were made in this report. I am not suggesting that might not have happened anyway, but it would have I think been far better had this report been available for the deliberations, particularly of the Minister of Family Services, before some of these determinations took place. Frankly, in some of these instances, it has been a retrograde step.

* (1650)

Even if in this next budget year changes are made in some of these areas, it will only be to catch up with some part of what has been taken away. I

expect to spend a great deal of time on this report in the Family Services Estimates, which, I think, is mostly the appropriate place for it. I did want to make the point that I think one of the main roles of the Advisory Council, particularly with a lack of a lot of resources, is to advise and advise as expeditiously as possible.

I would like to just state that I think it is very unfortunate that this report was not made available prior to the final budget process being undertaken. My understanding is that some of those final decisions were very late on, as always is the case in the budget-making process. Had there been another six weeks, the departments affected by some of these recommendations might have made different choices. They might not have, but at least they would have had the information contained in this excellent report to help in their deliberations. Perhaps we could have had a better budget in some of these critical areas, particularly as they relate to women and those groups in our society.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Item 1.(a)(1) Salaries, \$146,300—pass; 1.(a)(2) Other Expenditures, \$116,700—pass.

Item 1.(b) Women's Directorate: 1.(b)(1) Salaries, \$456,500.

Ms. Barrett: Mr. Deputy Chair, I have a lot of potential questions in this area. I would like to talk about the Abuse is a Crime, the media, and how it is not being carried on, and if the minister could explain the decision not to continue with that media.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, throughout government we had a relook at all of the advertising dollars that were being spent. In fact, it was a successful campaign. We had good response. Of course, even the court system has shown a major increase in the number of cases that are being heard.

The shelters, in their own ways, have taken it upon themselves to work, as I indicated in my opening remarks, through the milk carton advertising, and the public awareness is heightened. So it was just a look at the dollars that had been spent. In fact, there are still spin-off effects from that campaign.

Ms. Barrett: Mr. Deputy Chair, do I hear the minister correctly when she is equating a \$200,000 television media campaign, the effectiveness of that, with the milk carton promotion? I mean, the milk carton promotion in her ministerial statement

talks about information on access to emergency shelters, but I just do not see that the two of them are equated or that the milk carton promotion is carrying on all that the Abuse is a Crime promotion initiated. I would hope that there is other stuff happening.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, there is heightened awareness and through the MTS billings there is going to be an awareness pamphlet provided, and the milk cartons. The shelters wanted to do some innovative things on their own. It is not to say that the campaign will never be run again but, in fact, I think that it has had, if you want to call it, a positive impact. I hate to say that, but if the shelters can continue and if we have through the MTS billings an opportunity to heighten awareness in those ways, that is not to say that forever and a day the campaign will not be reused.

Ms. Barrett: I will be bringing this issue up again in the Department of Family Services area. I do think, however, that this would have been an area that, if not that particular campaign, something on that order would have been effective because awareness is heightened. It is not a static thing, and additional families come into crisis and you need to have a long standing very long process, as we all know, in advertising, in order to get anything through.

I have a question about the waiting lists. I have some information that is maybe six months out of date now, but it does talk about the waiting lists for Women's Post Treatment centre, Evolve, Fort Garry Women's Resource Centre and Family Services. I am wondering if the minister—where they are talking about enormous numbers of people who have been turned away, for example, Women's Post Treatment just reopened their wait list after I believe it was almost a year of not taking any new intake in—can respond to that.

I will get to the real question. In these, I guess they are mostly in Family Services Estimates, funding for those organizations has been frozen at last year's level in virtually all cases. I am wondering if the minister made a presentation to her colleague, the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer), suggesting that perhaps in lieu of additional funds going to the outreach in the Abuse is a Crime kind of thing, some money could not have been put together to provide additional funding for these organizations which are obviously, in every indicator, providing much needed services?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I guess in today's times, being able to maintain funding, in some instances, I would have to consider being a priority of government. In fact, when I look at my own department in Culture, Heritage and Citizenship, we received major reductions and that was so we could maintain services in certain areas and enhance them where necessary in Family Services. I know they did have an increase. Probably the detail in the Department of Family Services can be provided by the minister, and he can indicate at that point exactly where priorities were placed and why.

Ms. Barrett: Just one more question. I know that the Other Expenditures was decreased by over \$159,000 in the Women's Directorate, and my understanding is that was from the one-time only Premier's conference. Was there ever any discussion about maintaining that money in the Women's Directorate to do other work?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I would have loved dearly to have kept that money and had another initiative or two this year. The fact of the matter is that, when it came to overall priorities, we will have to look at better times and better financial times for one-time initiatives.

Ms. Barrett: Yes, just a final closing statement, if I may. I am afraid that those better times might be a little slow in coming for some of the women in this province. I think that some of the decisions that have been by this government are unfortunate, to say the least.

I would hope that the next time we come before the Estimates, the minister who is responsible for the Status of Women will have some better figures to look at in regards to all of these areas that deal with women. We are very unhappy with the level of commitment on the part of the government, and I would just like to close with those comments.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Women's Directorate: 1.(b)(1) Salaries, \$456,500—pass; 1(b)(2) Other Expenditures, \$93,800—pass.

RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$813,300 for the Status of Women for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1992—pass.

This concludes the Estimates for the Status of Women. This evening at eight o'clock we will be considering Urban Affairs.

SUPPLY—EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Madam Chairman (Louise Dacquay): The Committee of Supply will now come to order. This section of the Committee of Supply is dealing with the Department of Education and Training. We are on page 43, item 6.

Chairman's Ruling

Madam Chairman: Before we commence this afternoon's proceedings I have a ruling that I took under advisement last session.

On Thursday, May 16, in this section of the Committee of Supply, I took under advisement a point of order raised by the honourable member for the second opposition party respecting the words, "a bit of fluff," allegedly spoken about her by the honourable Minister of Education. I have examined Hansard and find that the honourable minister did not make the alleged reference. His remarks as recorded in Hansard were, "Is the fluff she is putting on the record about the Adult Education program?"

The honourable member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs) therefore did not have a point of order.

However, to assist in maintaining the desired level of decorum I believe I would like to urge all honourable members to choose their words with care and discretion.

Madam Chairman: Would the minister's staff please enter the Chamber?

Item 6. Universities Grants Commission, (a) Salaries, \$229,000.

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Madam Chairperson, I would like to ask the minister if it is correct that the Faculty of Science at all of our universities in fact have a cap on their enrollments, and that the only faculties that do not have such a cap are the Faculties of Arts.

* (1440)

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Until recently, it was my understanding that there were no caps on admissions to the Faculties of Arts and Science. However, this may have changed recently at the universities, and, in fact, I am not aware at this point in time whether that has happened, but certainly I will investigate the matter and get back to the member by memo.

Mrs. Carstairs: Madam Chairperson, I have been informed that there is indeed a cap at the University of Manitoba. I do not know what the status of the other universities is, although I was led to believe also at the University of Winnipeg, but I do not have that directly from administration. I do have the University of Manitoba figure, however.

Can the minister indicate what initiatives will be taken by the Universities Grants Commission to encourage the elimination of such caps in that all of the statistical evidence that we have is that we are going to need more and more science graduates, more and more engineering graduates as we move into the 21st Century? The cap will lead to a deterioration and the availability of those programs to the young students of the province of Manitoba.

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chairperson, yes, I have to concur with the member that the Faculty of Science is an important one to the province and to the future of the province. There has been some emphasis placed on getting more women into the areas of science and mathematics at the universities. Indeed, the university has developed a special program to attract more women into the Faculties of Engineering and Science, but let me say that I am not aware of the cap at this point in time. Indeed, I would not also be aware of the rationale behind the university putting a cap on in the Faculty of Science; however, as I indicated, I would be prepared to look at the situation and report back to the member.

Madam Chairman: Item 6.(a) Salaries, \$229,000—pass; (b) Other Expenditures, \$112,100—pass; (c) Grants \$200,453,700—pass; (d) Access Fund, \$790,000—pass.

Resolution 32: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$201,584,800 for Education and Training, Universities Grants Commission, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1992—pass.

Item 7. Bureau de l'éducation Française, \$4,170,300, (a) Division Administration: (1) Salaries, \$102,100.

Mrs. Carstairs: Madam Chairperson, can the minister tell me, as soon as his staffperson arrives—I will wait.

Can the minister tell the House today how many students are presently enrolled in French Immersion and français programs in the province of Manitoba and whether that is an increase or a decrease over the previous year?

Mr. Derkach: In the français program, there are 5,640 students this year, just a very slight increase from 1989-90. That has basically remained stable from the year before. In the French Immersion, 19,642, up from 19,052, and just by comparison, in 1988-89, 17,780, so a substantial increase in the last two years.

Mrs. Carstairs: With a substantial increase, as indicated by the minister, how is the Bureau de l'éducation française going to manage to provide the essential programming with a cut of 5.26 across the board of this particular department?

Mr. Derkach: Since the French Immersion program was implemented some years ago, there have been curricula written and, indeed, we have a fairly strong set of curricula throughout the program, so there is not going to be a decrease in the services that are being provided. The staff cuts were in the areas where there is a well-established curriculum developed and we will still rely on our school-based professionals or expertise to deliver some of the in-servicing and some of the needs where they may exist. In an overall sense, the system is strong. The system is capable of handling the services that are required with the deletions of the staff that have occurred as a result of budgetary decisions.

* (1500)

Mrs. Carstairs: Madam Chairperson, can the minister tell the House why the immersion policy guidelines have yet to be implemented?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chairperson, there are still a few minor fine tuning points that have to be done with regard to the policy. It will be done in co-ordination with the implementation of the strategies as outlined in Answering the Challenge. We will be in a position as soon as some of these final changes are made to the policy, and then we would be pleased to make it public and known through the school divisions.

Mrs. Carstairs: Madam Chairperson, can the minister tell us today when he expects to have those guidelines in their amended form in place, so that they are the guidelines by which all immersion programs will be directed in the province of Manitoba?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chairperson, a final date has not been established for that. Indeed, we will work towards making those public within the next year so that school divisions throughout the province will, indeed, have some written, if you like, or some established guidelines in place in French

Immersion. I would say a reasonable time would be within the next year.

Mrs. Carstairs: Madam Chairperson, the éducatrices have asked for a very minor change to The Manitoba Teachers' Society Act. Is it the intention of the minister to make that very minor change in the near future?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chairperson, indeed, that is in progress right now. I will be happy to meet with the critics for Education to go through the changes that are going to be coming forward, specifically in the legislation that has been tabled in the House. This is one of the changes that is being proposed.

Mrs. Carstairs: One of the other issues that has been raised with me, by the Francophone éducateurs et éducatrices is with respect to the certification process. Has there been any attempt to speed up the recognition of certification of these Francophone teachers when they come here from outside of the province? I understand the vast majority of them are now coming from outside of the province.

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chairperson, yes, indeed, they raised that issue with me as well. It is one that I was not familiar with until it was brought to my attention. I am not sure at this point what specific action can be taken or must be taken. The department will be looking at it to see that if there is any possibility of speeding that process up, we will do everything we can to ensure that that happens.

Madam Chairman: Item 7.(a) Division Administration: (1) Salaries, \$102,100—pass; 7.(a)(2) Other Expenditures, \$22,200—pass; 7.(a)(3) Task Force on Francophone Schools Governance, \$40,000—pass.

Item 7.(b) Curriculum Development and Implementation: (1) Salaries, \$741,500—pass; (2) Other Expenditures, \$146,100—pass.

Item 7.(c) Educational Support Services: (1) Salaries, \$243,300—pass; (2) Other Expenditures, \$69,800—pass; (3) Assistance, \$1,025,800—pass.

Item 7.(d) Official Languages Programs and Administrative Services: (1) Salaries, \$393,400—pass; (2) Other Expenditures, \$421,200—pass; (3) Assistance, \$471,000—pass.

Item 7.(e)—

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chairperson, in the Estimates book there was an error made, and I would like to draw attention. I have copies for the corrected page in the book.

The error was on page 133 just under the Total Salaries. There was a line that was omitted and that was, Other Costs and Benefits. That was omitted in the first book, and I am just tabling the changes that should have been present at that time.

Madam Chairman: Item 7.(e) Library and Materials Production: (1) Salaries, \$357,600—pass; (2) Other Expenditures, \$136,300—pass.

Resolution 33: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$4,170,300 for Education and Training, Bureau de l'éducation française for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1992—pass.

Item 8. Expenditures Related to Capital, \$35,319,500.

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, before we start this particular resolution, I am wondering if I could table some of the documents that were requested at our previous sitting.

For tabling I am including a letter from Turtle Mountain School Division requesting departmental staff to provide support and information. Also, I am tabling the reconciliation of SY changes for the department, also the changes with regard to transportation funding which was requested, I believe, and the number of Level II and Level III pupils as estimated for September 30, 1991, also the 1991-92 special needs support in dollars and a percentage of that and finally, Madam Chair, a list of the Distance Education and Technology branch projects.

I was also asked two questions on our previous sitting with regard to the number of teacher-librarians in the province at the present time. Madam Chair, I am happy to say there are 221 individuals in teacher-librarian positions in the schools of this province. This figure includes both full-time and part-time positions, as well as some who are responsible for more than the library in one particular school.

* (1500)

With regard to the pupil-teacher ratios for the Level I area, I was asked a question in that regard. I would have to indicate that Level I support in terms of pupil-teacher ratios is difficult to ascertain because it includes such people as resource teachers, special needs teachers, occupational entrance teachers, teachers of the gifted and teacher aides in the whole area of special needs. Therefore, Madam Chair, we do not have, or it would

be very difficult to try and get, any reasonable figure that would include all of the teachers who are working with special needs children. For that reason, I am not able to provide very specifically the pupil-teacher ratio in the Level I category.

Mrs. Carstairs: Can the minister indicate, by list, what schools will be constructed in the fiscal year 1991-92?

Mr. Derkach: That has still not been finalized or announced at this particular point in time, but as soon as that decision is finalized I will consent to sending a copy to the member as quickly as that information is available.

Mrs. Carstairs: Can the minister explain what the approximate \$500,000 for environmental assistance, which received a zero note in last year's budget, is for this year?

Mr. Derkach: Some of the difficulties in some of our schools centre around the ventilation in air handling, or the air quality within a classroom or within a school. We have had to address some of the concerns that have been raised with regard to that specific issue, and for lack of a better term, we have called it improving the environmental situation within a classroom. That is what that particular figure is for.

Mrs. Carstairs: Madam Chairperson, I want to talk about a particular school's problem, but I think it is going to become more and more of a general school problem as we move towards the designation of some of our older schools as historic designations, thereby requiring the building to be renovated as opposed to a new school. It is my understanding that there was a recommendation that the J. B. Somerset building which presently houses Sacre-Coeur School was, in fact, to be demolished and a new school was to be built.

The city has now come along and designated the school an historic site. The school cannot be demolished. There is not a site to put another school because it was supposed to replace the school that was demolished. The other difficulty is that renovation monies are substantially less than the monies that one can put into the capital construction of a new school. Has there been any debate in the department as to how we can change the funding formula for renovations so that, in a circumstance like this, the formula would more reflect the replacement of a new school?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chairperson, this is a challenge, I suppose, that has emerged in the last few years with regard to the designation of some of our oldest schools in the province as heritage sites or as heritage schools or buildings. Because of that, we have had some difficulty in dealing with those school divisions that are faced with such enormous costs for restoring some of these old schools. The policy that the department has been operating under for a number of years now is one whereby the department will fund the renovation of a school up to a point when the renovation costs do not exceed 50 percent of the cost of a new school. That policy has been in place for a number of years, as I have indicated.

Our purpose as a department is to ensure that there is reasonable space and a comfortable environment for students to learn. In other words, our primary responsibility is to ensure that there is a capital facility which is conducive to a learning environment. We are not in the business, as a department, of restoring heritage sites. Indeed, I think we would be criticized heavily by the taxpayers for doing that when there are so many schools and so many needs out there where there is either overcrowding, or perhaps some schools are not adequately equipped with such things as air conditioning or air handling systems. So one has to weigh what the priorities are very carefully.

The policy of the department is in place at the present time, whereby we will replace a school if the costs of renovation exceed 50 percent of new construction. We have had discussion in the department, of course, as a result of that, but nothing at this point in time has been changed, in terms of the approach of the policy that is being taken at this time.

Mrs. Carstairs: Madam Chairperson, I understand that nothing has changed. I think it has to be recognized that this is a unique situation. It is not the wish of the school division in this case. They made the determination to destroy the school and build a new school. What has happened is another layer of government has come in and said, no, we are going to designate this as an historic site and you cannot tear it down. There is not another space available. Can the minister indicate if, under this unique circumstance—and we had one at Laura Secord which was similar to this kind of a situation—some thought will be given to a formula

which is not based on 50 percent of the new construction costs?

For the most part, that is a reasonable formula. Once you have over 50 percent, then common sense would tell you, perhaps, you should build a new school; but common sense is not the factor in this case. Common sense has been put, if you will, on the sidelines because people have said, no, we must protect our historical heritage. That may not make common sense, but it makes sense in terms of our vision of ourselves as a people.

Mr. Derkach: I can assure the member that not only will we take it under advisement and consideration as a department, but we will be speaking with our other departments within government to ensure that there is an understanding in government as to the approach that will be taken with regard to a school site that is designated as a heritage building.

In this particular case, it was the City of Winnipeg that designated the building. Indeed, that becomes somewhat of a problem for us as well. So there are some unresolved situations that are arising because of the aging of the schools in the province, I guess, and one that has to be addressed.

I can indicate, at this time, there has not been a resolution of that, but it is something that we will undertake to examine, and then we will either reaffirm the policy that is in place today, or we will have to change the policy to reflect or to better address the needs in those particular special circumstances where a building has been designated as a heritage site.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Yes, Madam Chairperson. I only have one question. I have asked the minister if he would be able to get for me a copy of what the Public Schools Finance Board has received in terms of the letters and the intent for the construction of new schools or portables for the northwest end of the city?

Mr. Derkach: There has been a request received from Winnipeg School Division No. 1 for a new school at Lucas Avenue. That, as I say, is a request at the present time. It is from nursery to Grade 6, but that is the only request that has been received by the department from Winnipeg School Division No. 1 with regard to an elementary school in that area. There has been no request for a high school in that particular area of the city.

Mr. Lamoureux: Can the minister inform me as to when we can expect some type of sod turning for the new elementary school on Lucas and an estimated date or an idea of when we can expect it to be completed?

* (1510)

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chairperson, as I indicated, the sketch plans for that building have been received by the Public Schools Finance Board. It will become part of the consideration for the 1991-92 Capital Construction program. The school division, I understand, is in the process of carrying on with the plans for the building. As soon as we have decided on our total capital allocation and which projects will proceed, I will be happy to share that information with the member. At this point in time, it will be considered as part of the 1991-92 capital allocation.

Madam Chair, the member also asked for possible dates or windows when we might look at construction. I would say that the earliest that we could look at any tendering process going out would be the late fall of this year.

Mr. Lamoureux: Just to pick up, Madam Chairperson, on the high school. Has the department received any correspondence at all in terms of a request from the school division on the need for an additional high school, or any concerns about overcrowding from the school division of the high school, in particular Sisler High?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, the Public Schools Finance Board have met with Winnipeg School Division No. 1 to look at their needs within that area. It is my understanding that Winnipeg School Division No. 1 is now assessing their high school needs in that area. Once that study or that survey is completed and they have established what their needs are, they will be approaching the Public Schools Finance Board again with regard to their anticipated facilities for construction in the future.

At this point in time, although there has been discussion between the Public Schools Finance Board and the school division, there has been no formal request for a specific high school in that area. I do not think it will come until that assessment is complete.

Mr. Lamoureux: Madam Chairperson, finally, if the minister could get back to me some time in the next couple of weeks through departmental mail, I would appreciate if he could give me an update on the

Garden Grove, Meadows West, Stanley Knowles and Tyndall Park schools in terms of, have there been requests for portables and capacities of those schools—in terms of capacity, capacity also of Sisler High School. Thank you.

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, I would be happy to get back to the member with regard to the status of each of those facilities that he has requested, but I do not have it with me here today.

Madam Chairman: Item 8.(a) Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets: (1) Red River Community College, \$976,500—pass; 8.(a)(2) Assiniboine Community College, \$563,900—pass; 8.(a)(3) Keewatin Community College, \$352,800—pass.

Item 8.(b) Capital Grants: (1) Universities, \$11,900,000—pass; (b)(2) School Divisions, \$21,526,300—pass.

Resolution 34: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$35,319,500 for Education and Training, Expenditures Related to Capital, \$35,319,500 for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1992—pass.

Resolution 27—at this time I would ask that the minister's staff please leave the Chamber.

Mrs. Carstairs: Madam Chairperson, I move, seconded by the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), that item 1.(a) Minister's Salary, in the Estimates of the Department of Education and Training be reduced to \$1.

Madam Chairman: It has been moved by the honourable Leader of the second opposition party, seconded by the honourable member for Inkster, that item 1.(a), page 37, the Estimates of the Department of Education and Training, Minister's Salary, in the Estimates of the Department of Education and Training be reduced to \$1.

Mrs. Carstairs: Madam Chairperson, I just want to put very few comments on the record because I think I have indicated throughout the entire process of the Education Estimates my dissatisfaction with decision making with respect to this particular department.

It is difficult for me to believe, in a society in which everyone is talking about the need for education, the need for a highly trained work force, that Education has been asked to bear such a brunt of cuts by this particular department. It appears to me, and I am sure the minister will argue differently, but it appears to me that at the Treasury Board discussions and

tables, there was not a strong advocate for education in the province of Manitoba. There was not a strong advocate to preserve our community colleges and, indeed, to enhance them. There was not a strong advocate to ensure that school divisions have adequate support for special needs children in their environment. There was not an adequate advocate to prevent the offloading upon the municipalities of this province, some of whom have increased taxes by 15.7 percent.

What we have seen, unfortunately and tragically for the young people of this province, is a Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) who either did not advocate well on their behalf or lost the debate. In either case, I think, the result is the same. The result will be a lack of the same level of standard of which Manitobans have taken such pride in education from kindergarten all the way through universities and graduate schools in the province of Manitoba.

What we need in the '90s and well into the 21st Century is someone who passionately defends the needs of young people, because without that defence the educational opportunities available for them in other provinces are not going to be available to them in the province of Manitoba.

The minister talks about the necessity of cutting, of being in difficult times. No one understands that more than a student who has seen a 56.8 percent increase in his or her tuition fees at our senior university since the Filmon government took office in 1988. No one understands that better than a parent with a special needs child who knows that there is no adequate programming for that particular child. No one understands that better than the young student graduating within the next month, realizing that he or she does not have the placement in the community college upon which they had their hearts set before this budget was introduced.

* (1520)

Although I have never in my time in the Legislature moved the reduction of a minister's salary, nor have I ever in my lifetime voted in favour of the reduction of a minister's salary, I do this one with great regret, because I do not believe the needs of our children are adequately met.

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chairperson, may I also add my comments to this motion because of the fact that one has to take into account when one considers what has happened in the area of education in the last three years, where we have come from and,

indeed, how much we have achieved in the last three years.

Madam Chairperson, I would have to indicate that never before in this department have there been so many initiatives acted upon in that short space of time. Indeed, we are living in a time of restraint, in a time of economic depression, if you like. We are living in a time of fiscal reality that this province has not lived in for a long, long time, I guess since the '30s.

Madam Chairperson, let me indicate very clearly, when we have a province like Manitoba with a million people in it, with some very excellent resources in this province, but we have a debt burden as we have in our province today—not as a result of this administration, indeed as a result of the former administration, and I lay the blame squarely on their shoulders—that \$500 million of interest costs that we have as a province could go a long way to addressing many of the educational needs of this province's population.

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): A broken record.

Mr. Derkach: The member for Dauphin says it is a broken record. It is a reality, it is a fact, it is a truism that, indeed, exists today because of the mismanagement of the affairs of the province by the former administration.

Madam Chairperson, might I also indicate that the member talks about the fact that we have not given enough to education, and that taxpayers have had to reach into their pockets to make up the shortfall. I would like to make it very clear that there is only one taxpayer in this province and therefore that taxpayer has to pay the tax whether it is assessed by the province or the local taxation authority.

We have done our share in terms of ensuring that the priorities were addressed, that the essential programs were maintained and that we have asked other jurisdictions, the school boards, those in universities that are community colleges to ensure that they set their priorities very carefully as well. It is not just good enough for a school division to pass its costs on to the ratepayers, the ratepayers, the parents, the community has to understand what they are paying for, and they have to set their priorities in conjunction with the school boards. In some cases that happened very effectively; in other cases, not so well.

We have also called on those who earn their money from the system to dampen their requests

over the next two years, so that more money can be put into the actual programs rather than into the pockets of those who deliver the services. We have made that call very clear. It was not made just this year; indeed, it was made a year ago.

Madam Chair, I think it is important to note that there were some very important programs embarked on by the department. I would at this time like to thank and acknowledge the efforts of my deputy minister, all of the ADMs, the directors and all the managers in the department who so very diligently carried out their responsibilities in ensuring that there was a new focus, a new direction in the department, and that has been undertaken to a large measure. My highest regard goes to all the staff within my department. Yes, it is regrettable that some were laid off in the budgetary process, but, as has been indicated, that is a reality that we are living through today.

I would only like to highlight a couple of the special programs that we have embarked on. Madam Chairperson, for the first time in the history of this department, we now have a forward looking plan, called the Strategic Plan, that will take us over the next five years. The member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) giggles in his seat, but, indeed, he should laugh at himself because the Strategic Plan is an important document and has been seen as such by many Manitobans across this province.

We could look at the High School Review and the strategies there, an initiative that was not started by this administration, but was completed and carried out by this administration.

We could talk about the special needs guidelines, the first time special needs guidelines were written and drew much attention by many of the educators in this province.

We are moving into a new way of conducting our community colleges in this province, so that it allows them more flexibility, more adaptability to the climate that they operate in, and to offer the services better to the people that they are supposed to offer the services to. Whether they are in the city of Winnipeg, in rural Manitoba or northern Manitoba, our community colleges will better be able to react to the market demands that are out there and the training demands that are there by the various entities that require the training.

The initiative that was announced with regard to Workforce 2000 is another initiative which will allow

for better training—culture, if you like—in this province and will bring in the partners of business and industry into training.

Madam Chairperson, in the throne speech this year, there was more attention paid to education than has been paid at any time. We look at such initiatives as review of the school boundaries throughout the province, something that has not been done for 30 years. It is something that we will initiate and we will carry through.

We looked at such initiatives as the review of university education which, I feel, is extremely important and needs to be done. Those are the kinds of initiatives that I am proud of, that I am proud of on behalf of the department, and that I am proud of for government for carrying out because I think they are extremely important to the improvement of education in the long sense.

We may look at the short term and say, well, we have not done the system any credit because we have not dumped large sums of money. We have indicated very clearly from the beginning that indeed simply throwing large sums of money into the pot is not going to help the matter at all. It is more important to refocus our attention on the real challenges that are before us in the system and address them in a practical and rational way. I think that is what we are doing.

* (1530)

Madam Chairperson, I would never want to hurt the public school system. I have three children in that system, and, indeed, I trust the system to educate my children. I would not do anything to jeopardize or hurt that system in an intentional way.

We undertook another challenge, and that was to ensure that we addressed the whole issue of independent schools in an appropriate way, that it was clear and up-front as to what kind of funding was going there and the accountability measures were put into place. Indeed, that was an initiative that was undertaken that needed to be because the former administration did not have the courage to do that.

Although I regret the fact that the member from River Heights, the Leader of the third party (Mrs. Carstairs) in the House, has moved this particular motion, nevertheless it is something that we will have to live with. But I would have to say that I am extremely proud of what the department has done to this point in time, the initiatives that we have

undertaken. Indeed, I am pleased at the direction the department is moving in, that education in this province is moving in, is a very positive one. If one listens to the comments that are made from outside of this province with regard to the programs in this province, you will know that Manitoba stands at the front in terms of the progressive outlook and the progressive attitude that we have taken in educating the population of this province.

Mr. Plohman: Madam Chairman, I think it is appropriate that I do ask some questions at this point while this motion is before the House. The questions that I do ask are supportive of the motion itself and illustrative of the incompetence and neglect that education has suffered as a result of this minister. As a matter of fact, it is kind of interesting that the minister has adapted a very smooth approach and response to the statement and request for additional funds for education.

On every occasion when he is asked this and when it comes before him, he says that simply throwing money at education is not going to guarantee an improvement. No one is saying that he should throw money at education, but the fact is if there are cuts in financing for education and support, there is definitely going to be cuts in quality in many areas, particularly those areas that are the poorest in the province. So the equality of education across the province is definitely going to suffer, and the minister knows that. He cannot say that not throwing money is an answer to the concerns that many of these school divisions are suffering from at this particular time and are bringing to the minister's attention.

He says in his comments that never have so many changes been acted upon by a minister. The fact is, Madam Chairman, many of the actions have been negative actions by this minister and by this government, so if he is proud of that—and he says he has never been so proud, he is very proud, extremely proud, of what he has done—he obviously has not taken the criticism that has been leveled at him and the actions of his government to heart. He should, because this is one of the purposes of the Estimates process, to gain some insight as to the kinds of areas that should be addressed by his government, and he has neglected them.

I ask the minister, if he is very proud of the work that he has done, and he thinks that he does not have to add additional funds, how he can justify

-(interjection)- oh, but throwing money is not going to be a guarantee. That seems to be his answer, that somehow that is not going to do any good. That is his way of dismissing—we are not saying that if you just throw money at things, which naturally has connotations of just haphazardly tossing it around, that is going to do any good -(interjection)-

Now the minister is saying we have tossed money around in education. Well, let him illustrate—we added Assiniboine Community College in Dauphin. Was that throwing money? Was the nurses program there throwing money? What about Duck Mountain?

I am going to ask the minister if he is going to talk about examples, I have an example right here. There are some school divisions who are extremely poor in terms of the wealth of their property tax base and their ability to raise funds for education at the local level. Duck Mountain is one of those. Lakeshore is another one of those.

If I look at the categorical block, equalization and guaranteed support that the minister tabled in this House, you find that Lakeshore School Division has received a negative funding figure this year of minus .7 percent, no growth, a cut of almost 1 percent to one of the poorest divisions in this province. The Turtle River School Division, also not in a wealthy division, is minus .6 percent. Duck Mountain is minus 1.4 percent, one of the very poorest divisions.

I want to ask the minister how he can justify that kind of funding decrease to one of the poorest school divisions—and Lakeshore, as I indicated, almost 1 percent—in terms of equality? What additional funding did the minister provide to those schools divisions to offset this cut in these grants? He says that it is because of our funding formula. What additional funding did he put in place to, in fact, provide some degree of equalization, some degree of equality in educational opportunities for those kids in Rorketon, in Winnipegosis, in Pine River, in the Duck Mountain School Division and in the Lakeshore School Division? If he did not, how can he justify that kind of a figure for those students?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chairperson, first of all, I would like to correct the member for Dauphin for some of the statements he has made with regard to the fact that they did not throw money indiscriminately at educational programming in this province. I think on several occasions in the House, I have highlighted the fiasco in terms of Limestone training that went on into the apprenticeship

programs and, indeed, the \$41 million and the 18 or so graduates who came out of the program.

An Honourable Member: That is not true.

Mr. Derkach: Yes, that is true, that is fact, and we have that documented, Madam Chairperson, and I could bring that documentation into the House for the member for Thompson. -(interjection)-

Madam Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Derkach: With regard to what we have done for school divisions that have received some decreases, let me make it very clear that we inherited a funding formula that was based on the previous year's expenditures. In other words, the more money a school division spent, the more money that school division received, so if a school division happened to be a wealthy school division and it could afford to implement programs in the first year, then in the second year, the Department of Education and Training would pick the cost of that up.

I am not pointing the finger at anybody. This is the way the formula was designed, it was accepted, but obviously it was not working. So we have embarked on developing a new funding formula for school divisions, but during the interim period of time, we have taken some steps to ensure that there is more equity in the way that the funding is disbursed throughout the school divisions in the province.

What we have done is to implement such strategies as the transportation grant that went to various school divisions this year. I tabled that grant today for the members in the House. There was some \$1.5 million of transportation money that went to those school divisions whose transportation budgets were in excess of 7 percent of their total budget. That went to the most needy school division and that was a result of the fact that school divisions that we visited with in our regional meetings indicated that was the greatest hurt and they needed the money the most.

The formula was decided on an equalization basis so that the most needy would get the money throughout the province. It is not the master solution to the ailments that are out there. Indeed, school divisions that have been low spenders, school divisions that have been poor have not been dealt with fairly through the GSE formula, and that is something that we are looking at very carefully and by late summer of this year, we will have a new

funding formula in place, and hopefully it will address some of the ills that are out there in the whole area of funding to school divisions.

Madam Chairperson, may I say that today the funding approach that is used is much more fair to school divisions throughout the province than it was previously. We have not answered all of the problems that are out there, but indeed it is much more fair than it has ever been in the past, and we intend to do more in that area of creating a more equal playing field amongst school divisions so that educational opportunities can be more equal amongst students in this province.

Mr. Plohman: Madam Chairman, I am pleased to hear the minister at least mouthing those words, certainly not acting those words, about equity in the school system.

My colleague will deal with the Limestone Training centre in some comments that he will make. I look at the formula even for '89-90, Mr. Minister, we see—Madam Chairman, I would like to address a question to the minister.

Madam Chairman: Order, please.

* (1540)

Mr. Plohman: Madam Chairman, I would like to ask the minister a question and if he would indicate whether then this transportation grant additional funding that he tabled today is the only additional funding that Duck Mountain would have received outside of the minus 1.4 percent that it got in its major funding grants. Was there any additional funding for Duck Mountain to in fact ensure that there was some equity, not last year, this year?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chairperson, Duck Mountain School Division came to us last year indicating to us clearly that they had a difficult situation that had arisen over the years because of the unfair, if you like, funding formula that was implemented and was imposed on school divisions throughout the province. Last year we were able to give them, I think it was, \$50,000 to make up some of the hurt that they were experiencing at that time. Since that time we have ensured that no school division will get less money this year than they received last year.

If Duck Mountain is receiving somewhat less money, it may be a result of categorical grants that they receive for programs that they may not be offering, or it could be as a result of reduced transportation monies that will be going because they are not transporting as many students. Those

are the kinds of areas that they would have reductions in, but in terms of their base Duck Mountain School Division will not have received any less money than they did last year.

What the member is talking about is an overall view of the matter when you consider all of those special grants that they were receiving before. I have not been approached by Duck Mountain School Division at this point in time. I have indicated that, if they can prove beyond any doubt that they have a more serious situation in that school division than anywhere else in the province, I would certainly be prepared to meet with the school division and talk to them about their situation.

Mr. Plohman: Madam Chairman, the figures that the minister tabled today, change in transportation funding, do not even apply to Duck Mountain, so there are zero dollars there. They did not get anything out of the information that the minister tabled, so that was a totally irrelevant comment when he answered my comment about additional dollars. There was nothing for Duck Mountain.

As a matter of fact, Dauphin, which does not have a great deal of transportation needs because of the compact school division that it is, did receive \$9,000 more, but Duck Mountain received zero. The total amount for Duck Mountain is minus 1.4 percent.

As I indicated to the minister, he is not acting in an equitable fashion for the poorer school divisions in the province. He has to consider that Duck Mountain raises about the lowest amount per mill of assessment of any school division.

The minister asks, where was I? We, in fact, did give them additional funding to ensure that they overcame some of the deficits that they had, some of the difficulties. The minister did not provide that funding, and over the years there were several special grants given to Duck Mountain School Division to offset the problem.

The minister talks about last year. He did not give them anything this year. He knows they are suffering and they had to dip into a reserve that is going to be gone. The minister wants to make sure all reserves, any fiscal planning is gone by school divisions, make sure they do not have a cent in the bank, keep them totally broke. That is a very poor school division, and I think it is illustrative of the minister's lack of fairness in his approach.

I want to ask the minister on a couple of other areas, in terms of fairness, how can he justify the

removal of Lorne Day's Department of Education position from the Parkland? Can the minister give some explanation as to why he found that position expendable? I refer him to letters he has received that have been sent by the school area association and concerns that have been raised by other organizations about the removal of Lorne Day's position from the Parkland. Can the minister -(interjection)- well, the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger) said I should have asked these questions when his staff was here.

I think the minister is familiar, being from the Parkland. That is why I am asking. If he is not familiar he can take them as notice. I am not going to hold up the passage of the Estimates because he has not been able to provide the information. He can get that at a later date, and that is fine with me if he is not familiar with it. That is perfectly acceptable.

I would ask the minister to deal with the question of Lorne Day's consultant's position in the Parkland area and the justification for removal of that position and the fact that the Parkland will now have to be served by Mr. John Shaw from the Brandon area in order to have the services that were available previously.

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chairperson, if I could deal with the issue of Duck Mountain first of all. As I indicated last year, Duck Mountain came to us and demonstrated that they had a specific need. When they demonstrated that they had a specific need, that need was met. Indeed if that should happen again, if they can demonstrate that they have a need over and above other school divisions, then certainly we would be prepared to look at it, but, as I have indicated to this point in time, we have not met with Duck Mountain School Division. Beyond that, what it does show is that the formula that was in place, the GSE formula that was implemented by the former administration, did not work. It did not work for Winnipeg School Division No. 1. It did not work for Duck Mountain. It worked for very few.

As a matter of fact, when you take a look at all of the fiasco that was created, what we have found is that poorer school divisions were getting continually poorer and the wealthier school divisions were maintaining and even becoming more able to offer expanded programming.

If the member thinks that was a fair approach, then I have to question his value judgment on really what happened in the last 10 years. We have to use

a different approach, and that is what we have embarked on. I said we will be announcing a new funding formula by the end of the summer, one that will be in place and one that will be used for the 1992 school year. That is the best answer I can provide for him at this time in terms of addressing not only the needs of Duck Mountain, but there are many Duck Mountains out there who are in the same position as Duck Mountain is. I acknowledge the fact that their revenue is low because their capability, their assessment is low in that area, and we understand that very clearly.

Madam Chairperson, with regard to the Dauphin situation and the regional co-ordinator there, may I indicate that Mr. Day retired. That position has not been filled. The services are being provided for by the Brandon office. At this point in time the services can be provided adequately by the Brandon office. There will be some decisions that have to be made with regard to servicing the Parkland area in the future, and I acknowledge that.

Let me also indicate to the member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman)—and he knows very clearly that we have placed some very important services in the Dauphin community out of the Department of Education and Training. First of all, we have the New Careers positions that are in Dauphin. There were no positions of that nature in the Dauphin area before, no acknowledgement of the fact that those positions should be required in that area.

Secondly, we have placed some four positions in the Native Ed branch in the Dauphin area. I must indicate that in both cases everything is working exceptionally well. The people who are in the Dauphin area enjoy the community, enjoy their work, find that it is easier to service the area from Dauphin because they are in the proximity of that Parkland area.

We are moving services into that region where there were no services before. This one particular position that the member talks about was as a result of a retirement and that is something that is going to be examined over the next year to see whether or not it can be serviced in another way, perhaps from the Dauphin area or from the Brandon area, perhaps from another location. Indeed, that is something that will be examined over the next period of time.

* (1550)

Mr. Plohman: Mr. Acting—Madam Acting Speaker, Deputy Speaker. Yes, I will get it right.

You will be a Madam Chair anyway and we could call you Madam Chairperson. Maybe that would do it.

I guess the minister's comments about New Careers were certainly welcome to show that there was some degree of service enhancement in the Parkland. However, certainly the removal of the position, even though the person is retired, does not take away from the fact that there is a job loss there and a service loss. In fact, it is when John Shaw is dealing with the Westman area and the feeling was that in the Parkland we were already underserved even with one person, that in fact the removal of that position leaves it woefully inadequate in terms of service. From a decentralization point of view, of course, it is completely contrary to that principle of decentralization in keeping the service now centralized in Brandon for the whole area, which is a common practice.

I wanted to ask the minister a couple of others—and again, if he is not able to provide a direct response, I would appreciate him receiving that response and providing it to me at a later time—dealing with the withdrawal of government support for the hearing screening in our schools.

The minister may have received a letter recently that was sent to his colleague, the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), regarding this removal of hearing screening in our schools and a concern that was expressed by the Dauphin-Ochre school area about the fact that this was being removed.

I wonder if the minister can indicate whether he has taken this matter up with his colleague, the Minister of Health, as to the impact this will have on young children and diagnosis of young children with hearing problems that could save them a tremendous amount of grief and cost later on in life if they were diagnosed early and dealt with accordingly. I see that as a serious matter that the minister, as the Education minister, should be concerned about with his colleague.

In addition to that, the speech and language pathology position has been vacated at the present time and there is the extreme concern that it will not be filled in the Dauphin area. Again, I ask the minister dealing with the speech and language pathology position and the hearing screening—again, both were addressed to the Minister of Health but both of serious concern, I think, for the Minister of Education—whether he can

indicate he has taken any action and what action he intends to take with his colleague to deal with this serious concern.

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chairperson, first of all, I would like to indicate to the member for Dauphin that I met with the Dauphin-Ochre School Board and the superintendent there to talk about the speech pathologist in the Dauphin-Ochre School Division.

As the member knows, previously it was not the Department of Education and Training that provided the speech and hearing pathologist for Dauphin. That was an employee of the Dauphin-Ochre School Division. We were providing grant money as was done under the former administration to the school board. They went out and hired their own people, because they felt that this was a better way to provide service.

What they ran up against was the problem of hiring somebody who was qualified for the position, because no sooner would they hire someone then that individual would find a job elsewhere, for one reason or another. So there was a difficulty, or there still exists a difficulty, in attracting a quality person to the job, someone who is qualified for it, and then retaining that person. What we have agreed with Dauphin-Ochre School Division is to take over that responsibility under the Child Care and Development branch, and I have now authorized the hiring of a speech and hearing professional for the area. That will be undertaken as soon as an appropriate person can be found. I think Dauphin-Ochre School Division is already aware of that situation.

With regard to the other issue, the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) and myself have been in discussion with regard to the services that are provided to children that perhaps are the responsibility of Family Services, Health and, in some cases, even Justice. There is the need for us to look at the duplication of some of those services, address what are the priority needs, and then try to co-ordinate it from the perspective of offering it from the most practical department that it should be offered. If it is supposed to be Health, then let us offer it through there rather than duplicating some of those services.

So there are those discussions going on between the four ministers, and as soon as there is a resolution I would be happy to let the member know.

Mr. Plohman: Madam Chair, I want to impress on the minister the importance of maintaining that service, and I appreciate his response that there is some review taking place. However, we are not talking about duplication now; we are talking about not having the service at all. The prime concern is to have the service available.

I understand this position referred to the Department of Health is the one dealing with clients not in school, primarily. It is a half-time, part-time position with the Department of Health. Perhaps there is some overlap there, but certainly they are saying that this person provided invaluable assistance also to the schools, and so therefore they want that position filled. As the minister said, I hope that his answer referred also to the work that was being done by this part-time speech and language pathologist dealing with clients not in school.

One other question to the minister—and then, in the interests of time, I will allow my colleague to comment and perhaps others on this motion which is before the House—and that deals with distance education. The minister tabled a document today. Distance Education and Technology Branch Expected Results talked about 92 active and ongoing projects. I noticed several at ACC, and I do not know if any of them are delivered out of Dauphin. That is my first question.

Secondly, is there none with the Dauphin-Ochre School Division? I see none as far as I can determine here, and I am rather surprised if that is the case, that there would not be any distance education projects out of Dauphin. I am not able to see them, and there are several out of ACC. Again I ask whether they cover those from the services delivered through Dauphin Parkland Campus.

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, the projects that the member is referring to are those that have been undertaken by various school divisions to develop or to write or to deliver. What has happened is that various school divisions come forward with expertise to be able to develop a distance education program. Dauphin, as many other school divisions are, is receiving distance education programming in their school. They have a satellite dish set up; there are 90 satellite dishes now set up across the province.

I would also indicate that not only is the ACC regional office in Dauphin, but also the first year university program by distance education is being delivered in Dauphin as well. It is one of the five

locations across the province, and for the member's information it is the Dauphin program, the first year university by distance education, is the most successful of the all of the five regions that are being delivered. So, indeed, it shows that that is an area that we need to be delivering more programming through that mechanism, and that will become a focal point for that entire region as we move more into distance education delivery programs.

Mr. Plohman: Madam Chair, certainly we know that this is needed and certainly want to impress on the minister the need to expand those services in the Parkland area and Dauphin certainly as a major centre in the Parkland. I am not surprised that the minister talks about it being one of the most successful because certainly the need has been established there without question. When the expansion of Assiniboine Community College took place, there was a rather extensive needs survey that was undertaken through the Parkland Regional Development Corporation. The minister would fail to expand services in that area probably at his own peril. He has obviously apprised himself of this need and is acting in some regards positively.

I would say to the minister, I have not changed my position one iota regarding the motion that was made because the woefully inadequate funding for the Dauphin School Division, for the Duck Mountain School Division, for the Turtle River School Division, Intermountain School Division—all of those school divisions in the Parkland and throughout this province—indicates to me that this minister is a good year behind, if not more, in his review that he says he is resting his case on insofar as changed spending program that we put in place for the education support program that was in place, a replacement.

The fact is this minister has dawdled with studies too long, and now we see the school divisions suffering at the hands of this minister. That is why they have had to increase their local levies dramatically. As a matter of fact, I understand in looking at some of the documents that the Lakeshore School Division—as I indicated to the minister, one of the poorest divisions in the province—had to increase its local levy by 19 percent.

The minister has offloaded his responsibility—the minister can answer his own question about transportation—(interjection)—no, I do not. I do not acknowledge it; I was just looking for it.

* (1600)

I want to indicate to the minister that there has been an offloading onto the local taxpayers by this minister and by this government at an unprecedented rate. What that has done, in fact, has made the education system less fair, less equitable, because those who are not able to afford to pay to raise the taxes locally are going to continue to fall behind in what they can offer to the children in those areas.

I would urge the minister to take the lesson that he will be learning from the opposition in this House, the chastisement of this minister by way of this motion, in fact, to renew his efforts and to put further effort and energy to ensuring there is equity in the public education system as his first priority and concern in the next year, so that we do not see a further erosion of educational standards in some of those areas which are trying their very best with the excellent staff, with excellent administration, doing their very best with resources being squeezed to the point where they can no longer offer the kind of standard of education that is being offered in the wealthier school divisions.

That is where the minister's responsibility is. He has already been in this position three years, and he no longer has an excuse to blame it on somebody else. It is time now for him to take the responsibility.

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chairperson, when I listen to the comments from the member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman), I guess I regret that he has not been paying attention to the educational system in this province as a member from one of the larger communities in rural Manitoba. I have met with the Dauphin-Ochre School Division several times, but indeed it takes—you have to go up there to meet with the school division to ensure that they know that you are representing them, and sometimes I wonder whether the member for Dauphin perhaps has forgotten the road—(interjection)—

Madam Chairman: Order, please.

An Honourable Member: Oh, I am sorry, Madam Chairman.

Mr. Derkach: The member for Dauphin, I think, has forgotten the way. I know he makes the occasional visit, I think, through the election period into the area for sure, but I have to indicate that we have not abandoned the educational system in rural Manitoba nor in Dauphin.

I have to indicate that when I have met with the Dauphin-Ochre School Division, they have been quite pleased with some of the things that have happened in education. Indeed, there has been very little criticism from that area in terms of the funding. They have benefitted in terms of the funding approach we have used in comparison to what has happened in the past, because they were one of the low spending school divisions, one of the school divisions that watch their budget. Indeed, they were penalized as a result of it. That is not the approach that we want to take. We want to ensure that students are given equitable opportunity in regions of this province as they might have in the city. So, Madam Chairperson—

An Honourable Member: Like Duck Mountain.

Mr. Derkach: Yes, like Duck Mountain where we have afforded them extra funding. When he talks about Lakeshore School Division, I have to say that under the special transportation allowance that was granted to them, I think Lakeshore School Division received something in the neighbourhood of \$100,000 in recognition of their high transportation costs, which had never been done previously either. Because of the way the division is laid out, it is an expensive way to deliver services.

Madam Chairperson, the member also talks about taking education back a year or a year behind. I will argue with the member only because when I inherited this department it was in a state of chaos and indeed nothing had really been done substantial in the department for a number of years. There had been some caretaking, but that is about the extent of where things were at in education.

There was a review undertaken of high school programming, had not been completed; it had gone on for two years without any kind of a resolution. There was no special needs funding in place for, or no special needs approach in terms of providing a policy and providing a framework for how Special Needs education should be conducted in this province.

You can go on and on and name every area of education. When you look at Keewatin Community College in The Pas, that place was virtually shut down. There was very little activity taking place at the community college. I do not know what the thinking was of the New Democrats at that point in time, but they were virtually shutting down the North. We have rejuvenated the college, but at the same time they were running around the North and saying

what great things we are doing for northern Manitoba and in reality they were closing it down.

Madam Chairperson, I only need to point to one example. The member from The Pas, the current member from The Pas (Mr. Lathlin) who sits in the New Democratic benches, when I came in as Minister of Education came to me and pleaded with us to get the agreement signed, or get an agreement, for a Bachelor of Nursing program in The Pas. He had been trying to persuade the former administration since 1984, I believe it was, to try and resolve the matter, with no success. It took us about a year and we had an agreement in place which put in a Bachelor of Nursing program in The Pas. Yes, we changed it. We changed it to a more sensible approach, because the way that it had been proposed under the former administration was going to cost millions of dollars and would have been a chaotic disaster, to put it bluntly. Well, we have a program operating, a Bachelor of Nursing program operating now. Not put in place by the former administration, but by this administration.

I could name program after program after program where this kind of approach was taken by the former administration. Therefore, I am not displeased about what we have done in northern Manitoba and indeed if you talk to some of the people who work in the North, who live in the North, they will tell you that there are opportunities now that have never existed in the past.

Madam Chairperson, -(interjection)- yes, that is right. You have to live up there to understand and appreciate what goes on there. The former administration used to do their management of their northern programs from Winnipeg, from a place down on the corner of Portage and Main, I think it was, an office complex there, and they were conducting all of the management of their training from an office in Winnipeg, but yet the training was supposed to be going on in northern Manitoba. That is how much regard they have for northern Manitoba. That is how important they thought northern Manitoba was to them. You managed everything from Winnipeg and you just paid the transportation costs for the individuals to fly back and forth to Thompson or The Pas whenever it was convenient for them to do that. It was an incredible waste of human resource, an incredible waste of money, and that is the way they were eventually going to close northern Manitoba.

What we are doing now is ensuring that training programs in northern Manitoba are going to be such where people can get meaningful jobs, where people can get skilled in areas where there is work, so that indeed we are not just training for the purpose of training.

I could mention a special program on my tour through northern Manitoba. I ran into an individual who was managing a program and this individual was managing a program that was teaching individuals in northern Manitoba, women, in the area of carpentry. The manager of this firm said she could not understand, but she could not get people interested in the carpentry for women program, but yet the government insisted that this was the way that they wanted to go. They wanted to have this carpentry for women program, and yet no one was entering it. They never thought of changing the program into something that was more meaningful, more effective, and what people in northern Manitoba needed.

Madam Chairperson, I could go into one program after another and we could really illustrate how chaotic and how out of control things were throughout the province in the area of education at that time. When the member for Dauphin (Mr. Plozman) stands in his place and criticizes where the department has gone to since I have come into the portfolio, indeed we have made some exceptional strides in terms of providing quality education, in terms of providing opportunity for Manitobans for quality education in all areas, whether it is in the K to 12 area, or the post-secondary area and indeed in the training area as well.

I think we are doing the right things and also for the right reasons in all of the province in terms of education and training.

*(1610)

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Madam Chairperson, I had not intended to participate in the debate today, but I am prompted to participate by the continued misrepresentations that this minister places on the record about northern education, particularly training in the North.

I think it is incumbent on this minister, Madam Chairperson, if this minister is going to make program changes, to do his homework, because he keeps repeating information on the record that is not correct. I am tired of listening to this minister

continue to mislead the House about what happened in terms of northern education, and where this minister has taken northern education since this government came to office.

This minister talked earlier about there only being a handful of graduates out of Limestone Training. Eighteen he says, 18, says the minister, out of Limestone Training. Am I correct? Is that what the minister is suggesting?

Well, Madam Chairperson, the minister is wrong, absolutely, fundamentally wrong. He is not even close. He is so far off that I really wonder, when a minister can stand in this House and make a comment as erroneous as that, how that minister can have any credibility whatsoever on educational issues.

He does not talk about heavy equipment operators. How many of those graduated? There were 180 completions out of 229 graduates, a completion rate of 78.6 percent. He does not talk about that.

He does not talk about the number of truck drivers that graduated, 86 completions—this is up to 1989—out of 143 trainees, a completion rate of 60.1 percent. He does not talk about the simulated and community-based training that was conducted in many communities throughout the North. There were more than 1,500 completions out of 2,172 trainees, a completion rate of 73.2 percent. Did the minister reference that? Not at all.

Did the minister talk even about the rest of the story on carpentry? The minister talked about carpentry. Well, indeed, there were a number of graduates from the carpentry program. What he did not point to is the fact that you have to go through a combination of training and work experience to become an apprentice. He did not talk about the fact that there were various different levels of training, in fact all levels, Levels I through IV, which were conducted as part of that approach.

He did not talk about the fact that in terms of Level I training, there were 25 courses, 309 trainees, a completion of 212. He does not talk about Level II. There were 12 courses offered, 136 trainees, completion of 94. Level III, five courses, 47 trainees, 30 of whom completed the course. Level IV, two courses, 15 trainees of whom all 15 completed and graduated from the program. Completion rates in terms of forming and upgrading completion was 80.6 percent. Levels I to IV

completion rate was 69.2 percent. Levels I to IV graduation rate to completion was 69.5 percent.

In fact, the Limestone Training Authority had 275 apprentices indentured as of 1989. I really wonder if this minister has any idea what apprenticeship training is all about. What he does not realize obviously, and as shown by his action, his government, which has cut carpentry from KCC altogether, is the fact that people were going through all levels of training—Levels I, II, III, IV.

What he has done through his ignorance of the training system, as espoused by the fact that he has missed by a couple of thousand the number of graduates from that program and has missed by a couple of hundreds the number of people who have graduated from the various levels—what he has done is he has shut off the opportunity for more than 200 northern graduates of Levels I, II and III from having the chance of completing their apprenticeship and being able to be employed at the next dam, the Conawapa dam. That is what this minister has done, and he has the nerve to stand and talk about 15 completion rates—

An Honourable Member: 18.

Mr. Ashton: Eighteen. Well, he throws 15 or 18 when there were hundreds of grads. Now we want to talk about employment. Let us talk about employment of those grads. There are several studies which were conducted into that—the minister likes studies—into Limestone Training, there were follow-ups done on the grads. They have been done, not just by Manitoba but other provinces that have looked to Limestone Training as a model—other provinces and other jurisdictions. How many of the graduates as of—and this is statistics that were available February of 1988. If the minister can obtain more up-to-date information, it would probably assist that minister in understanding what happened.

In terms of total employment as of February 1988 of those who had gone through the program, only 22.6 percent had failed to find employment. That, by the way, is not netting out other responses because some individuals had returned to school, had relocated to other areas but had been referred, had not taken the employment.

If you combine those who were employed at Limestone and you combine those who were employed elsewhere, the total was in excess of 61 percent of graduates of Limestone Training who

received employment in the North. Those figures are available to the minister.

The minister laughs. This is the same minister who has now disenfranchised many northern apprenticeship grads by completely gutting the apprenticeship programs at KCC. You know, this is the minister who a couple of years ago swallowed up Limestone Training with KCC, now has chewed it up and is spitting it out. He talks about shutting down the North. There is less training going on now in the North than at any other time since the Sterling Lyon period. Even in terms of KCC, even after they had absorbed the Limestone programs, they have reduced staff this year. The minister knows that. He ought to be factual and put that on the record. No matter how many, one or two, programs they add, they have reduced three and four programs, and as I said conveniently in terms of the trades programs.

I remember when those programs were brought in. I remember the reaction of Conservative candidates at that time in the North and I am sure the member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) will recall that. I remember the flak that I have received, in particular by one of the candidates for the nomination in 1986 who later ran for the Conservatives. I am not accusing the minister of having the same biased approach but let us be blunt, Madam Chairperson.

The bottom line was the Conservatives were quite happy to go around northern Manitoba and say they were against this because too many Native people were being trained. That is the specific wording. If the minister doubts that, he ought to talk to people who ran the campaign in 1986. I said I did not attribute those words to the Minister, but I have a direct letter written by the then Conservative candidate for the nomination who later ran and confirmed that as a public platform.

That is the sad part about this training. This training benefitted aboriginal people as well as other Northerners but particularly benefitted aboriginal people who had not had the opportunity to receive training in the past. This minister talks about 15 graduates.

He talks about talking to Northerners. Madam Chairperson, I think the greatest effort the minister has made in recent months to go to certainly Thompson, let alone the rest of the North, was to come up during the big investigation that he had of the conduct of the School District of Mystery Lake

on the Eastwood School. Anyone who cares to read that report will find that the minister clearly overreacted in dealing with that situation. In fact now the minister is bringing in legislation to retroactively try and clarify what he thought should have been the policy before as indicated by the Finance minister when he introduced the bill on behalf of the minister last Friday.

Now this minister, I do give him credit for one thing, he did not have the gall to come up to the opening as did the Minister of Northern Affairs. This is the same government that refused to fund the Eastwood School addition in its entirety, that put the school district up there under intense scrutiny for having done what? For having done what? For having stood up for the interests of its local citizens. -(interjection)- Well, the minister should read his own report. If he cares to read his own report, he will see then, once again, that this minister clearly overreacted. If he came up to talk to Northerners before he had allowed the programs to be cut in terms of the apprenticeships, if he had bothered to talk to some of the people in those programs, he would have seen and they would have told him one thing, that what he is doing is putting back northern training by at least a decade.

You know, I find it ironic, Madam Chairperson, that the minister's less than spirited defence of maintaining his salary, which this motion would do is reduce his salary, he talked about having a five-year plan. Well, it is not that difficult to have a five-year plan if you act like this government does. You put education back 10 years, then you know where you are going to go. In five years you might recreate half the items you destroyed. You might re-establish what you have thrown away, but I will talk about forward looking in terms of what is happening.

* (1620)

What is most saddening about this particular minister is, if the minister would just confirm the statistics. If the minister would just admit what actually happened in terms of Limestone Training, even criticize it, even say that is not their choice, even saying that they are not that concerned about Conawapa employment, they will handle it through traditional channels—I would for example point the minister there to difference in graduation rates, and I know KCC has been improving substantially, but the graduation rate in many cases is approximately one-third, not a two-third graduation rate that took

place with Limestone Training—I would have less difficulty, because it is obvious by the actions of this government that that type of training in northern Manitoba is not a priority, trades training, training for Conawapa, training that was done under the auspices of the Limestone Training.

That is obvious because they have eliminated all those programs and they are moving a simple technology program to Winnipeg.

That is what I find most disturbing about the minister's comments, the fact that he keeps insisting on putting information on the record that is misleading, that is a complete misrepresentation of what took place. Like the member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs), I have never moved or supported a motion to decrease a minister's salary, because I often feel that in a way that personalizes government decisions, but when I see the personal stamp that certain ministers, certainly the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) is putting on this government—we will be discussing his Estimates later—or this minister, I have difficulty in not supporting a motion of this kind.

I really hope that the minister, who has in the last few months put back education five, 10 years in many areas of this province—he is talking about studies, what studies, Madam Chairperson? So many studies are going to be autopsies, because if he continues to strangle the school districts of this province, if he continues to strangle the kind of training that we saw so much advancement in, in the 1980s, we are going to end up with the minister conducting studies of a system that is dead. That is an autopsy. You cannot resuscitate the patient after it is dead, has died of starvation. That is what this minister is doing to the education system.

I just want to say, Madam Chairperson, that it is unfortunate, but we will have an opportunity to discuss this later in a resolution on the ACCESS program. It is unfortunate that the minister continues to put that sort of information on the record because, as I said, if he wants to make policy decisions, that is one thing. If he wants to follow through on the long-term bias of many people within his party, certainly in northern Manitoba against that kind of training, if he wants to defend that, the kind of reaction, the flak we got, the immense amount of criticism we got for bringing in training for aboriginal people and Northerners that recognized the specific concerns of aboriginals, northern Manitobans, if he would care to put the honest facts on the record

-(interjection)- the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) if he wishes the information, he will certainly find that we will be educating him as well, in terms of that a bit later. But the bottom line is that this minister is showing a disdain not only for the facts in this particular case, but for Northerners and other Manitobans.

All I ask is that the minister put accurate information on the record, and then if he has a predisposed position, a bias against a certain type of training, if he has that bias, we will live with that as we do with the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) who says that Northerners do not vote right and we see what that results in.

If that is the case, then let that be the case. But let not this minister hide behind rhetoric or inaccurate information. The information on the Limestone Training program is available. If he wants to have his own analysis, personal analysis, that is fine, but let him not distort the facts, let him not distort the figures, and in particular let him not turn a blind eye to the many Northerners who are still in that system, who are in the apprenticeship system, the more than 200 Northerners who are in the apprenticeship system, who now have found, with this government, that their opportunity to complete their education in the North, to complete their apprenticeships has been taken away by this minister.

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation): Not so.

Mr. Ashton: Well, the Minister of Highways says, not so. How does he explain the cuts to carpentry, to plumbing, in northern Manitoba. How does he explain the fact the Civil Technology program, a very excellent program which has a tremendous graduation rate, is being eliminated in northern Manitoba, and the students who have just moved in from outlying communities only in October are being moved to Winnipeg?

The bottom line is that this government has not listened to Northerners, particularly in this area. It has cut back on resources as compared to last year. It has cut back significantly in comparison to other years. We are very concerned about that direction. The bottom line is because of those sorts of reasons, I have difficulty—as I said, even with the 10 years that I have been here where I have never supported a motion of this kind—not supporting it, because how else do we get through as a message to a minister who is not listening?

People in my constituency in the North as a whole—how else can I get that message through? It is a time-honoured tradition. It is a resolution that has been introduced many times before. Given the way in which education has been treated in this past budget, and given the continued failure of the minister to recognize the consequences of his decisions, and, yes, his government's decisions, but as indicated by his own statements, obviously some of his own personal biases; I see from our caucus that we have difficulty in not supporting a resolution of this kind. While we are a minority in this House, and while we may not be able on every resolution to be the winning side—in fact, in some we may, time shall tell—we can express the views of the Manitoba public.

Especially in this case, I express the views of many people in northern Manitoba who are saying that this government has not listened in terms of what Limestone Training was doing and the need for further advancement in terms of Conawapa. It is not listening in other key areas and, indeed, the minister keeps repeating and repeating information that clearly indicates that is the case.

Will the minister at least recognize the reality, the bottom line, that cuts have taken place and, at least in the next year, work to rebuild for some of the areas that have been cut, the apprenticeships with Conawapa coming up, at least develop some sort of training program for Conawapa? Please, for the North, do something for Conawapa.

In other areas as well, in terms of needed programming in northern Manitoba, will he not listen to the concerns of people who at this very moment are calling for the minister to reverse his decision? The Civil Technology students are a classic example. I hope the minister will listen, and I hope that he will take from the voicing of opinion on this resolution, reducing the salary, that we want the minister to be accountable to the people of Manitoba, many of the people of Manitoba who are saying that this government is destroying the education system on a daily and weekly basis in this province. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chairperson, I guess the rhetoric the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) speaks about must come from his own mouth because, indeed, all we have heard for the last 15 minutes is rhetoric and no substance.

Madam Chairperson, the figures that he gives me are not the graduation rates nor are they the

journeypersons who have completed the programs. They are persons at various levels, but they are not the journeypersons who have completed it. Out of the 1,700 who entered the apprenticeship program, 34 graduated with a journeyperson certificate. Out of that total of people who entered -(interjection)-

Madam Chairman: Order.

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chairperson, he does not have the figures, therefore -(interjection)-

Madam Chairman: Order, please.

* (1630)

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chairperson, when we take a look at the investment that was made in terms of training, and we look at the outcome in terms of the people who have been engaged in meaningful jobs throughout the province, I would have to say that in some specific programs there was success, yes, but in many of the programs, there were dismal failures under the NDP administration. Let me just give you a couple of small figures to show you what the graduation costs are per graduate.

If we look at the electrical-electronic program, between April 1, 1985, and March 31, 1991, the total cost for that program was something in the neighbourhood of \$3.5 million. The cost per graduate is something like \$101,000 per graduate. Madam Chairperson, in the Civil Technology program, the two women who graduated from that program have not been able to achieve employment in the areas that they graduated from. In terms of the graduates who are coming out of these programs, are they working on the Limestone project? How many of them? In the Civil Technology program, how many are working on Limestone? How many are working in northern Manitoba? The bulk of them, as a matter of fact, are working in southern Manitoba. That is the truth. I do not know where the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) gets his figures -(interjection)-

An Honourable Member: He got them from Jerry Storie.

Mr. Derkach: He may have got them from the member from Flin Flon (Mr. Storie). In the Civil Technology program, out of a cost of \$4,400,000, the cost per graduate is approximately \$150,000 per graduate. Those are the kinds of investments, and they are important, but we have to ask ourselves the question, can we still continue to give that service at a more efficient cost? -(interjection)-

Now the member for Flin Flon shouts from his chair that is dishonest. Madam Chairperson, I will tell you what is dishonest. The dishonesty lies in the fact that the millions and millions of taxpayer dollars that were thrown away in northern Manitoba yielded very few results. I have to relate, once again, the experience that I had when I toured the North.

All of a sudden, when we went out to the Manfor site, we saw a great deal of heavy equipment lying around the place. The Repap people asked us to get this equipment off their property and to do something about the building that was sitting on their property. I said, who owns this equipment? They said, well, it is your department. I said, what has been happening to this equipment? Oh, we have been using it in Manfor to do things around here, and the rest of it is used in some training. They employ a few people to look after it.

Madam Chairperson, I tell you, I walked through the site and all we had was broken-down equipment that ran no longer, the training had fallen—we had about two or three pieces of equipment that worked and that was all. -(interjection)- Yes, much of the equipment was lying in trees, where trees had already grown around the equipment.

Madam Chairperson, that should give you some indication of how successful the New Democratic program was in northern Manitoba. That is the abuse. Not only were they misleading the people of the North, but they were indicating to them, look at the great things we are doing for northern Manitoba. So they were not doing anything; they did nothing.

We brought this equipment together and we finally auctioned it off to save the embarrassment of having it lie around and have it labelled as government equipment that was being squandered, and how money in the North was really being squandered. Indeed, there are ways to do the training in better ways.

As a matter of fact, many of the instructors and many of the people who worked on many of those projects would come forward and tell you that there was a tremendous amount of waste because the programs were not being delivered in terms of practicality of delivering training programs, but they were being done for political purposes only.

The information that I have from the department with regard to the Limestone Training and Employment Agency and the apprenticeship program, there were 1,720 who received training.

Out of the 1,720, 1,317 failed to complete Level I. -(interjection)- Madam Chairperson, the member for Thompson says, he still does not understand. Thirteen hundred failed to complete Level I and he says he still -(interjection)- Oh, I do not care what your figures say. You better find out the accurate figures and these are them. -(interjection)- That is the problem.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Madam Chairman: Order.

Mr. Derkach: That is the problem, Madam Chairperson. The member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) does not use accurate figures; he uses anything he likes and presents it to the House. He should be ashamed of himself.

Point of Order

Mr. Ashton: Madam Chairperson, our rules make it very clear that members of this House have to ascertain facts before bringing them to this House. Every single fact I brought before this House was ascertained prior to that, and this minister is the one who is misrepresenting and misleading this House.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Madam Chair, I have been a casual observer to the discussion that has gone on over the last hour—

Madam Chairman: On the same point of order?

Mr. Manness: On the same point of order, and I have heard the word "misrepresentation" used many, many times. What we have here obviously is a serious lack of agreement as to the facts and ask you to so order and to indicate to the member he has no point of order.

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

* * *

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chairperson, might I indicate that the figures that I am giving to the member are those that have been gathered by the department? They are as they are presented. There were 1,720 apprenticeship LTA people who received training; 1,317 failed to complete Level I. Out of the 34 journeypersons who graduated, 31 were carpenters, two were welders and one was a millwright. These are the figures as they exist within the department today. These are the figures as they are. -(interjection)- That is right, out of those

journeypersons, and that is Level IV, my dear friend, they are 31 carpenters, two welders and one millwright.

An Honourable Member: How many Level III then?

Mr. Derkach: They are not journeypersons. Madam Chairperson, they say but, but how many here? How many did not complete Level I?—1,317 did not complete Level I. It goes on and on. -(interjection)- The member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) still insists that his numbers are right when they are not. His numbers are dismal; they are wrong. Let me tell you something else, in terms of—the member for Thompson brags about the number of people who were employed on the Limestone site. Let me indicate on a percentage term, in 1987, only 29 percent of the graduates worked at the Limestone site—20 percent of the graduates worked at Limestone. Where were the rest? Twenty-nine percent of the graduates worked at the Limestone site. Where did the rest go? This was an initiative that was put in place specifically to train Northerners for the Limestone project.

Madam Chairperson, just to tell you what kind of planning they had in place, let us look at the NGAP program. They entered into an NGAP program to train engineers for the Limestone site, but, unfortunately, the minister at that time forgot to calculate that by the time the first graduate came out of the program, Limestone would be complete. This is the intent that they had in terms of training people for northern Manitoba.

* (1640)

Madam Chairperson, we have taken a slightly different approach to training people in northern Manitoba. Indeed, we are going to ensure that those who are trained in the North will be able to find employment in the North, and the programs that they train for in the North are going to be those that yield skilled work, that yield jobs and yield a contribution to the way of life in northern Manitoba. That is the kind of training that we are going to enter into. For that reason, this year, out of seven new programs, expanded and new programs in northern Manitoba—and perhaps the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) should pay attention to this—because out of seven new programs that are being introduced in northern Manitoba, six of them are in Thompson. That is new programs going into the Thompson area. Again, as I indicated, we are refocusing our college programs so that, indeed, we

will be training people for meaningful work so that they can remain in the North and so they can work in the North with northern people.

When you look at the training opportunities whether they are in ACCESS programs—and the member says that there is going to be a resolution before the House at five o'clock, a private members' resolution with regard to ACCESS programs—we have lived up to every obligation under the ACCESS program. This government has put \$2.6 million additional money into the ACCESS programs to shore up what responsibilities were those of the federal government and have not been lived up to by the federal government. Madam Chairperson, there have been some very good ACCESS programs. I would have to agree with those, but when you have a limited number of dollars available, then the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) knows very well that you have to choose your priorities and ensure that you put the money to work where it yields the greatest results.

Madam Chairperson, I do not disagree with the merits of the engineering program because, indeed, I am looking forward to that first graduate out of the program. We are anticipating that the first graduate out of the NGAP program will graduate this spring. He will not be the last because there are four who will graduate next year, unless they drop out, and another four the year after.

When you take a look at the NGAP program, we are looking forward to the graduates to ensure that they can contribute to society, to ensure that they can become perhaps role models for many of those who may want to come into programs of that nature. Madam Chairperson, we have to ensure that our federal counterparts are involved in the program because we cannot do it alone.

This province does not have the capacity to be able to deliver those programs that were started under a provincial-federal relationship, under a provincial-federal sharing arrangement. We cannot undertake the federal portion ourselves at this point in time. We have made that point very clear to Mr. Epp and to all of our federal counterparts, to ensure that if they feel those programs are worthy, we insist that they participate in them as well. If they do not participate in them, then we are going to have to limit our funding to those areas that we can.

The BUNTEP program—let us talk about the BUNTEP program for a moment, Madam

Chairperson. Once again, here is an ACCESS program that is very important to northern Manitoba. When I came into the office of Minister of Education and Training, the BUNTEP program was operating well. We have increased some of the locations for the delivery of the program. We have given the BUNTEP program its own identity in Thompson. Indeed, it is a program that we will continue to support.

Once again, here we have a program that was funded jointly by the federal and the provincial government. Indeed, if we are going to carry on with the programs as they were before, we will have to ensure that the federal government does participate.

Madam Chairperson, when the member for Thompson stands in his place and talks about the wonderful programs that they had going and the wonderful results out of those programs, I can tell you that is not so. The programs that they were delivering in northern Manitoba by and large were failures because they did not invest in training that would yield jobs in the North, first of all, and secondly, in meaningful training that would lead these individuals to remain in the North as well.

Madam Chairperson, we have expanded the training in northern Manitoba. We have expanded the training in Thompson. Six of the seven new programs are going to be going into the Thompson area. -(interjection)- If the member would care to read, he will find the Business Administration program is one that is being expanded, not being cut, because that is a program where there is a demand for it. Programs where there is no demand for it, those will have to change and will be replaced by programs where there is a demand for it.

If we look at the Bachelor of Nursing program, why did we go into it—because there is a need for those kinds of jobs in northern Manitoba. We will continue to attract people into that program because the people of the North want those types of programs as well.

So, Madam Chairperson, regardless of what the member for Thompson may want to put on the record in terms of his rhetoric, in terms of his political stand, I have to tell you that we are bent on providing programs for northern Manitoba that are going to provide for those people who take those programs jobs in northern Manitoba, meaningful jobs, ones

that are high-paying jobs that will allow those people to stay and work in the northern part of our province.

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Madam Chairperson, I have listened with a great deal of interest to much of the minister's statement, and it is increasingly apparent that the minister wants to distort the record of the Limestone Training and Employment Agency. If the minister wants what he would consider a more objective review of the success of the Limestone Training and Employment Agency, I would refer him to one of the more right-wing editorialists in the Free Press, Fred Cleverley, who undoubtedly was looking for a way to trash the Limestone Training and Employment Agency, took it upon himself, unlike the minister, to inform himself of the facts, went up to Thompson, did a thorough review of the Limestone Training, the success of the people receiving training and, yes, looked at some of the shortcomings of that program. His conclusion was, as has been the conclusion of virtually every objective observer of that program, that it was successful.

The minister continues to refer in this House to the success as being measured by the number of Level IV graduates, apprenticeship graduates. My colleague from Thompson (Mr. Ashton) has pointed out that the majority of training places were, in fact, not apprenticeship program places, and that you simply cannot measure the number of Level IV apprenticeship program trainees because the program only began in 1985-86. Clearly, by 1988 you could not have that many Level IV apprenticeship graduates.

The question is: Did those people who entered training, Level I, Level II, Level III, meet with success at their levels? The minister may not be aware of the fact that much of the difficulty experienced by the trainees was in acquiring the number of hours that were required to complete the level of training once they got away from the training facilities themselves. They may have done very well in the academic portion, but they were required in some instances to have 200, 300, 400 hours of training on the job. Those are difficult to come by sometimes in northern Manitoba, but the success of this program cannot be disputed by anyone.

For the minister to continue to put on the record this nonsense about having 42 graduates is just a ridiculous misuse of the information he has at his disposal. If the minister wants to check with any reputable northern representative, councillor, from

Thompson to Gillam, to anywhere else, he will find that his information is not being accepted as accurate or true.

In fact, my colleague mentioned the fact that our opponents in northern Manitoba, Conservative opponents, often referred to the success of the Limestone Training and Employment Agency. So, Madam Chairman, let us not confuse that.

Madam Chairman, I want to talk for a minute about the more general problems that have been associated with this minister's tenure in the Department of Education. This minister is a legend in the Department of Education amongst the education community, particularly those who are involved in the public school system. He is a legend because he has refused to listen to every representative group in the public school system since the day he became minister.

* (1650)

Madam Chairman, we could start by talking about the decisions this minister made to ignore a departmental study that was done on literacy programming. The minister, for his own reasons, decided to conduct a \$300,000 additional study when he had on his desk a report that had come to essentially the same conclusions, had been done by the department in consultation with those involved in and interested in literacy, and he chose to ignore it.

Madam Chairman, the list of issues on which this government has acted without the support of teachers, the Manitoba Teachers' Society, the Manitoba Association of School Trustees is, in fact, legendary, because he has not been listening.

I want to talk for a minute about the minister's apparent concern over the fact that training opportunities are being lost because the government is facing restrained financial circumstances.

I have to acknowledge that the minister is not alone in having to accept some of the criticism I am about to level, because I am having a great deal of difficulty supporting the member for River Heights' (Mrs. Carstairs) motion. It is not that I disagree with the member for River Heights, that this minister deserves to have his salary reduced. That is not the problem. What I find a little inconsistent is the role that the Liberal Leader, the member for River Heights, has played in all of this.

She, amongst a few Conservatives, are those who promoted the move of 80 percent funding to private schools, a move which is now costing the Province of Manitoba an additional \$10 million. Not one additional school space was created in the province of Manitoba—not one additional space created—for an additional \$10 million worth of support.

The fact of the matter is, the member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs), the member for Roblin-Russell (Mr. Derkach) talk about their concern over the potential closure of schools in Cartwright, in Baldur, in Dunrea, in numerous other communities across this province. At the same time, they are going around supporting the increase of millions of dollars in private school funding. That is what they are doing. I think it is difficult for those two members to have it both ways. We are either going to support the public school and use our resources to do that, and we are going to protect their interests, or we are going to have chaos in the public school system.

I want to remind the member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs) and the member for Roblin-Russell, the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach), that in 1989 when I rose in the House and asked the minister to inquire into the affairs of the St. Charles Academy, a school which receives some \$327,000 from the province, the minister refused. The Liberal Leader was nowhere to be seen when I asked for an inquiry into the operations of that school, which is spending \$327,000.

My question is: Where was the Minister of Education and where was the member for River Heights when I asked the government to investigate the Laureate Academy, which is also receiving public funds for a private school.

An Honourable Member: You established it.

Mr. Storie: I certainly did not.

Where were the Minister of Education and the member for River Heights when we, the New Democrats, the Manitoba Association of School Trustees and the Manitoba Teachers' Society were calling for a moratorium on private school funding? So the government and the Liberals are prepared to spend \$10 million on private school funding at the same time as they are pleading poverty for the parents of the students at Cartwright School, at Baldur School and at some of the 40 other schools

that are potentially facing closure as we speak, Madam Chairman.

Madam Chairman, where was the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach), where were the Liberals when I introduced amendments to The Public Schools Act in 1989 calling for a thorough review of the implications of moving to 80 percent funding, the implications of that additional cost for public schools throughout this province? How are we going to meet the special needs interest of students in our schools? How are we going to stop small schools from closing without having a serious look at the repercussions of increasing needlessly aid to private schools?

Madam Chairman, the member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns), in fact, may be one of those who supports the introduction of The Public Schools Act back in 1890 and who has been a strong supporter of public schools—I hope that is the case. I find it a little inconsistent that the Liberal Leader in particular introduces this resolution protecting supposedly the interest of public schools when that interest is so newfound, when everything that the Liberal Leader has done since 1988 has worked in opposition, in effect, to the interest of public schools, whether it is dealing with the question of aid to private schools or investigations of the actions in private schools, which have clearly not been consistent with the expectations that we have for the public school system and the expectations we have for those who teach in the public school system.

Madam Chairman, that is only one example. This Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) has been, in my opinion, the most antagonistic Minister of Education to the interests of the trustees of this province and the teachers in this province of any, certainly, in my memory.

The minister has ignored advice from the trustees on virtually every issue he has touched. I only remind the minister of the response he received from trustees across the province when he began to talk about privatizing school busing, when he introduced his project, his special project, to encourage school divisions to privatize busing. I only need to remind him of the response he received from divisions across the province who asked him not to intercede in an area of pupil safety where the province had a remarkable record. In fact, in the province of Manitoba to date, there has never been a fatality related to a school bus accident, never been.

Madam Chairman, there was an accident the other day. -(interjection)- I recognize that there was a young girl killed in a school bus accident, but it had nothing to do with the safety of the buses or no other vehicle was involved—that is one. The point is that the school trustees of the province of Manitoba, those who are charged with the responsibility of providing safe transportation, have opposed that, and the minister was quite aware of it.

The minister knows that the Teachers' Society and many, many involved in education at our universities opposed the unilateral introduction of provincial exams. Madam Chairman, not only is this wrong in principle, not only is it regressive in terms of sending a message to the teachers and their charges, but it is also a mark of this minister that it was introduced in the most confused manner possible.

The minister unilaterally introduced the timetable for the exams and, of course, there was not adequate notification to the teachers, those who would be involved in preparing lessons for their students. The timing of the exam was immediately after the Christmas break so students would not have had adequate time to study for this exam. The most telling fact is, of course, that the vast majority of school divisions chose either not to participate or also refused to recognize the results of that exam.

* (1700)

It is simply another example of this government's, this minister's, I should say, decision to ignore the best advice of those who are involved in the public school system, who are intimately involved with its development and organization for his own purposes, whatever they may be.

Madam Chairman: Order, please. The hour being 5 p.m. and time for private members' hour, I am interrupting the proceedings and we will resume at 8 p.m.

What is the will of the committee?

Some Honourable Members: Leave.

Madam Chairman: Leave that the question be put? Agreed?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Madam Chairman: Agreed and so ordered.

Order, please. The motion before the committee is moved by the honourable Leader of the second opposition party (Mrs. Carstairs), seconded by the honourable member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux),

that item 1.(a), the Minister's Salary, in the Estimates in the Department of Education and Training be reduced to \$1.

* (1720)

A COUNTED VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

Yeas 21, Nays 26.

Madam Chairman: The motion is accordingly defeated.

The hour being past 5 p.m. and time for private members' hour, I am leaving the Chair and this section of the Committee of Supply will resume at 8 p.m. this evening. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

Mr. Speaker: Is it the will of the House to call it six o'clock? Agreed? No.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. Speaker: The hour being 5 p.m., time for private members' hour.

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. Wasylycia-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).

Stand? Is there leave that this matter remain standing? Leave? Agreed.

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 honourable Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld).

Stand? Is there leave that this matter remain standing? Leave? Agreed.

Bill 23—The Manitoba Intercultural Council Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion, 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 member for La Verendrye (Mr. Sveinson).

Stand? Is there leave that this matter remain standing? Leave? Agreed.

Bill 24—The Business Practices Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion, 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 Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld).

Stand? Is there leave that this matter remain standing? Leave? Agreed.

Bill 25—The Environment Amendment Act (2)

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion, 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).

Stand? Is there leave that this matter remain standing? Leave? Agreed.

Bill 26—The Environment Amendment Act (3)

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion, the honourable member for St. James, 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 who has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to conclude my remarks on this bill, Bill 26, which is a relatively simple and short piece of legislation, but which has, I believe, quite substantial impact.

I have drafted this, I might add, so that even the present Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings)

can agree and understand what is in this legislation. It is really very simple. It is a piece of legislation that does what any self-respecting government that wanted to protect the environment would do in this day and age and, indeed, should have done when The Environment Act came in.

I might add that the present government is not to share all the blame for this not being law today. The fact is that the prior administration put into place this legislation and left it woefully inadequate.

This legislation seeks to move forward from the present environment act which divides projects into classes and, quite surprisingly, does not require a public assessment process for any of those classes of environments, a fact which the former administration knew all too well when they exempted the Limestone project from any such environmental process. One might find it hard to believe in this day and age that such a large-scale project with large-scale environment impacts was left absolutely unassessed by this party that claims to have consideration for the environment and stands up in that tone daily in this Legislature, conveniently forgetting their past in this Chamber and in this province.

The people of Manitoba should not forget that the former administration finished tenth out of ten in Canada in its environmental consciousness and had good reason for that. That ranking did not come out of the air. That ranking was well deserved, and if we look at the Manfor activities, we look at the Limestone project, we see why in spades the former administration received that ranking. We understand more fully why they left this, as well as the amendment which I proposed in Bill 25, out of The Environment Act.

We have come to a stage in Canada's environmental legislation where we cannot ignore the public and we cannot exclude the public from consultation and participation in what is their asset in this country, that is, the environment, the physical environment. Mr. Speaker, for many, many years it was left in the hands of industry and business to determine what the environmental consequences would be, how to ameliorate them, if at all. The bottom line is that corporations, as is their wont, and we have to understand what they are and what they do, looked at profits. The balance sheet was what dictated their decisions. If it meant leaving vast quantities of land desecrated by strip mining or by forestry without reforestation techniques, so be it.

Mr. Speaker, I do not particularly blame those in corporate boardrooms who make those decisions. They are responsible to shareholders. They are the ones who look at the bottom line and want to make a profit, but that should not be the end of the story. Government has a responsibility to moderate those decisions and to make more than the profit of today the final word.

The Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) says that is socialist rhetoric.

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): I said, you are a socialist.

* (1730)

Mr. Edwards: Well, he says I am a socialist, then, presumably for the principles which I am espousing. It is precisely that kind of attitude that comes today again from the Minister of Health that typifies the Conservative approach to the environment, which is, take today and forget about tomorrow. They are the ones who on fiscal issues say, we should not mortgage ourselves and future generations, we have to deal with the deficit today. That is what they say on fiscal things.

When it comes to the environment, what do they say? When it comes to the environment, they say the same things they have always been saying, which is an absolutely contrary philosophy, which is, let us take today from the environment and forget about tomorrow and let us desecrate our waters and desecrate our lands. That is the Conservative philosophy.

I must say that at least they do not go the second mile and say things that they do not do. They are up front about it. The Minister of Health is up front today when he says this is somehow socialism to think about the future of the environment in Manitoba.

The NDP, on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, combine both the high rhetoric of an environmentally conscious government and the desecration, in fact, of the environment. It is what some would call hypocrisy. That is what we see consistently from the NDP. If we look at their legacy, it is no more clearly identified than in the issue of environmental matters.

This bill seeks only to put the Class III developments into that public process. Surely that is a minimum commitment to public participation that even the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) can accept.

I rely upon the minister's statements during the Bill 24 debates, and maybe that is naive of me to rely on the statements that he made in December and January. He did say that he believed in the public process, and he believed in the public process for many if not all projects of any size. Well, Class III projects, by definition, in order to be Class III projects must be large-scale projects. Surely these, if any, projects must be included. These are the biggest projects that can be contemplated and dealt with under The Environment Act. Surely these we can guarantee Manitobans some public access.

Mr. Speaker, I note that in the Bill 24 debates in the last session, the minister indicated that he wanted a guaranteed public process when it came to the joint assessments that we are going to be going through with Conawapa, Bipole and the Phase II at Repap. If he believes in that principle, then this bill would seem to be something which is eminently acceptable and eminently reasonable even in the eyes of the present minister.

I personally would advocate for the inclusion of class 2 developments in terms of the public process, as well—perhaps a smaller public process, perhaps not necessarily intervenor funding, but at least a public process. I have tailored this bill for acceptance. I have tailored it on the words of the minister so that he will have no doubt of the statements that he has made when it comes to this bill.

He will be reminded that he made statements which are entirely consistent with this bill and, in fact, given his statements of January of this year during the debate on Bill 24 in the past session, I would assume that he would look at this very briefly and understand this is clearly what he was talking about. This should never have been left out of the original Environment Act and this minister and this government would have no excuse for delaying in putting such legislation into place.

Mr. Speaker, he has said himself he would not contemplate class 3 developments like Limestone or Repap or Conawapa without such a public assessment. Well, time to put his money where his mouth is. Time to come forward with this type of amendment which guarantees the public access to the process, the decision-making process, on issues, on projects that are going to detrimentally affect the physical environment.

I look to this minister in good faith to put the past aside and look to the future. The past for this government on environmental issues is not particularly good. We have the recent experience of Rafferty-Alameda and Bill 24 in which we were all disappointed that the minister did not come through with many of the things which he had indicated, and people were led to believe, would be coming forward in Bill 24. Let us put that aside. I ask this minister to see this bill as the very minimum guarantee for Manitobans of public participation, a guarantee which they do not have at the hands of the prior administration, I will acknowledge. Let us look to this minister to set himself apart from the prior administration and come forward with this type of forethinking and progressive legislation.

Mr. Speaker, with that I look forward to other members' comments and let me say that if there are minor changes, I am willing to look at them. I want to see this pass. It should pass. All parties should look at this. The former administration should look at this and understand that it was recommended to them by the now Leader of the second opposition party, then the member for River Heights. It was recommended; they turned it down. This was something she proposed and they turned it down.

Let us let the past be the past for the NDP. It may be uncomfortable for them to be reminded of the debates leading up to the former Environment Act. I am willing to let the past be the past and let us just put into place what should have been there in the first place.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mrs. McIntosh), that debate be adjourned.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable Minister of Finance, seconded by the honourable Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs that debate be adjourned. Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

An Honourable Member: Call it six o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the will of the House to call it six o'clock?

An Honourable Member: Six o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: The hour being 6 p.m., I am leaving the Chair with the understanding that the House will reconvene at 8 p.m. in Committee of Supply.

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

Tuesday, May 21, 1991

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Introduction of Bills

Bill 49, Colleges and Consequential Amendments Act Derkach	2257
Bill 48, Highway Traffic Amendment Act (2) Driedger	2257
Bill 50, Liquor Control Amendment Act McIntosh	2257
Bill 51, Pharmaceutical Act Orchard	2257
Bill 52, Family Maintenance Amendment Act McCrae	2257
Bill 53, Natural Products Marketing Amendment Act Findlay	2257
Bill 57, Horse Racing Commission Amendment Act Stefanson	2257
Bill 58, Development Corporation Amendment Act Stefanson	2258
Bill 55, Employment Standards Amendment Act (2) Praznik	2258
Bill 56, Payment of Wages Amendment Act Praznik	2258
Bill 54, Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1991 Manness	2258

Oral Questions

Gasoline Storage Doer; Cummings	2258
Winnipeg Remand Centre Site Doer; Ducharme	2258
Rock Ridge, Manitoba Plohman; Downey	2259

CFB Shilo Carstairs; Filmon	2260
Homemaker Services Barrett; Gilleshammer	2261
Family Services of Winnipeg Inc. Barrett; Gilleshammer	2261
Inner City Foundation Friesen; Ernst	2262
Core Area Initiative Friesen; Ernst	2262
Foster Care Alcock; Gilleshammer	2262
Social Assistance Alcock; Gilleshammer	2263
55-Plus Program L. Evans; Gilleshammer	2263
Manitoba Dental Association Wasylycia-Leis; Orchard	2264
Manitoba Law Reform Commission Wasylycia-Leis; Orchard	2265
Winnipeg Remand Centre Site Edwards; Cummings; Ducharme	2265
Free Trade Agreement - Mexico Storie; Stefanson	2267

Speaker's Ruling

Matter of Privilege May 15, 1991 Rocan	2267
---	------

Nonpolitical Statements

Assassination of Rajiv Gandhi Filmon	2267
Doer	2267
Cheema	2268

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Concurrent Committees of Supply

Community Support Programs	2268
Status of Women	2271
Education and Training	2287

Private Members' Business

Debate on Second Readings - Public Bills

Environment Amendment Act (3)

Edwards

2311