



Fifth Session - Thirty-Fifth Legislature

of the

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS**

(Hansard)

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



Vol. XLIII No. 24 - 1:30 p.m., Tuesday, May 10, 1994

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fifth Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, May 10, 1994

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Committee of Supply

Mrs. Louise Dacquay (Chairperson of Committees): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered certain resolutions, directs me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the honourable member for La Verendrye (Mr. Sveinsson), that the report of the committee be received.

Motion agreed to.

Introduction of Guests

Mr. Speaker: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have with us this afternoon from the Joseph Wolinsky school thirty-four Grade 11 students under the direction of Mrs. Linda Connor. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable member for St. Johns (Mr. Mackintosh).

Also, from Sisler High School, we have 16 English language students under the direction of Mrs. Carol Grier. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux).

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Health Care System Funding

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

On April 8, we asked the government a number of questions about reduction in staff at the St. Boniface and Health Sciences Centre and what the impact would be on patient care. The government started off by saying we were exaggerating and then, when they were confronted with the fact that it was one of their own management documents, they indicated it may not take place for a couple of years.

Mr. Speaker, the government recently received a brief dealing with the impact of government decisions on health care facilities in Manitoba. In that brief they say to the government, over 400 health care workers have been laid off in the last 12 months. It goes on to say further that hundreds more remain uncertain in view of the approximate \$100-million reduction for the urban hospitals by April 1, 1996—as about 80 percent of the staff is from wage costs.

I would like to ask the government and Premier: What is the real hidden Conservative health care agenda? How many more people are going to be laid off and what will be the impact on patient care in the province of Manitoba?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the agenda has been laid out as a result of consulting over 13,000 Manitobans about health care. The agenda was laid out in the spring of 1992 to which there was universal and unanimous agreement about the plan and the policy laid out in the document, Quality Health for Manitobans: The Action Plan.

From time to time in the implementation of that plan and policy, there will be honourable members opposite and perhaps others who will raise concerns along the way. The policy is the subject of unanimous agreement. If the honourable members opposite do not agree, then let them say so. The capacity of our hospital system is underutilized because of the supports we have built into the community.

This year marks the sixth year of budgeting by this government, and we have seen an increase in the Home Care budget of some 93 percent over those six years. We have seen the construction and the replacement of beds in the long-term sector equalling or surpassing the number of beds closed in hospitals.

So honourable members opposite raise as many issues as they can along the way for their own purposes, but, Mr. Speaker, the object is quality care for Manitobans. That is what is promised in the policy and that is what is being delivered.

* (1335)

Mr. Doer: The minister never answered the question, of course, about the additional \$100-million reduction to the urban hospitals and the impact on staffing and patient care.

Mr. Speaker, we are opposed to a doubling or tripling on the reduction of support in our hospitals, and the layoffs and line-ups that are going to flow from that. Our hospitals are already under too much pressure.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Premier: Why is management in the health care facilities of this province saying that this government does not know the impact of their own decisions when they say that the arbitrary government decisions that are being placed on management are without any apparent understanding of the service implications and that consequently affects operations negatively? Why is the government operating in a way that is totally inconsistent with patient care and service provision in the health care facilities in this province?

Mr. McCrae: I think perhaps what the Leader of the Opposition is doing is responding to some people's comments about the proposed implementation of Bill 22 in certain sectors of the health sector in Manitoba.

The honourable member fails to recognize that I, a couple of weeks ago, sat down with representatives of the Manitoba Health Organization and their members which represent the acute care sector, the long-term care sector and the community health centre sector of Manitoba and made it very clear to them that I understood

fully that the application of Bill 22 could work differently in different settings, that there is more capacity to adhere to the principles of Bill 22 in an institution where the capacity is not fully used up, where that ability diminishes in a personal care home, for example, where usually they are filled right up. So that understanding on my part was imparted to the people there. We look forward to their proposals.

Health Sciences Centre and Grace Hospital were able to use Bill 22 last year. I understand St. Boniface Hospital is saying that they think they may be able to use Bill 22 this year. Regardless, I want to see the proposals before I will lend my support to them.

The honourable member and the colleague behind him, as usual, stand in the way of every move towards building a better health care system for Manitobans.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, the minister is confirming now that their move is to cut another hundred million dollars out of the health care system of Manitoba in terms of the urban hospitals, as management themselves quoted to the minister in terms of the brief that they have presented.

I would like to know, and I think the people of Manitoba would like to know, what is the impact of a hundred-million-dollar reduction by the year 1996 on the urban hospitals? What will be the impact of that on patient care in the province of Manitoba? Can the Minister of Health please inform Manitobans on that issue?

* (1340)

Mr. McCrae: I made it very clear at the meeting to which I referred, Mr. Speaker, that whatever proposals come forward, I will not tolerate proposals that would have a negative impact on patient care in our acute care centres. After all, hospitals of today and the future are going to be places where very acutely ill people are going to be cared for.

I say to the honourable member—and anybody who was at the MHO meeting will bear me out that I used the words: I will not tolerate proposals, I will not accept proposals that have anything to do with a negative impact on patient care.

With honourable members opposite, everything about the plan is just right except when you try to implement one piece of it, and that is, they do not enjoy the support of the people in the health care sector in Manitoba when they want to stand in the way of that shift. Honourable members opposite would prefer to see our hospitals filled to the rafters with people who do not need to be there. That is what they have made clear over and over again in Estimates debate and here in Question Period and outside this House, that they would have hospitals filled to the rafters with people who do not need to be there.

Health Care System Funding

Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health.

The minister ought not to accuse us of destroying the hospital system. It is they who are proposing a hundred-million-dollar additional cut to the hospital system.

Mr. Speaker, after three years of slashing and cutting and Connie Curran, this government continues to cut first and ask questions later. How can this government explain, how can the minister explain how they can be even remotely in touch with reality in the health care system when they propose to slash a further hundred million dollars out of the urban hospitals? That is their proposal, not ours.

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Health): I think the honourable member is a little bit confused about this, because if he is interested in seeing slashing and cutting, he need only visit his neighbouring provinces to the east and west. I do not have to remind him what kind of administrations are in those provinces.

If you look at the labour implication in Ontario of the removal of 5,000 acute beds in that province, when you look at the closure of 52 hospitals—not beds, hospitals—in the province of Saskatchewan, I can show to the honourable member—if he would care to sit down with me, which he refuses to do after repeated invitations—that the approach in Manitoba is not the slash-and-burn approach being used in other

provinces, but a phased approach to quality care for Manitobans.

Mr. Chomiak: My supplementary to the same minister: Can this minister explain how government can be so out of touch with reality that they ask nursing homes to impose cuts that are quoted in their own management document that are required currently to operate below Manitoba health staffing guidelines because of funding restrictions?

How can they ask for further cuts to facilities that are below Manitoba's own standards, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. McCrae: I would ask the honourable member not to clutter the record with inaccuracies. I have made it very clear everywhere I have been, 45 communities in Manitoba and many, many institutions of various kinds, that I will not tolerate staffing levels that put patients in Manitoba in any danger and also anything that would impact negatively on the care of patients.

The honourable member ought to bear that in mind. All he has to do is check with all of those people with whom I have engaged in discussion over the past eight months. That is the bottom line that will not be breached.

When it comes to slashing and burning without regard for care in the community, where was the honourable member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans), where was the honourable member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) in 1987 when, with no planning for the future, no alternate care, they closed permanently for the first time 42 beds at Brandon General Hospital.

I remember it well, Mr. Speaker. I live in Brandon. That was the approach, the beginning of their health care reform. Shortly after our taking office in 1988, we resolved that was not going to be our approach to health care reform. We would use the phased approach. In doing so we have consulted, either in devising the plan or in implementing it, somewhat over 13,000 Manitobans in the process.

Mr. Chomiak: Mr. Speaker, they cut first and ask questions later.

My final supplementary to the minister is: How can Manitobans feel secure about this government in charge of nursing homes that tells nursing homes that are already below staff levels they have to further reduce staff levels when in fact the minister's own department in 1991-92 bragged in the annual report that they had set in place staff guidelines that were supposed to be adhered to?

How can they now say those staff guidelines that are below levels have to be reduced further, according to their own documents?

* (1345)

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is incorrect. We are not asking people to reduce levels of staff that provide care to patients. We are not asking for that, and we would not accept that kind of a response if it fell below safe staffing guidelines for hospital or personal care operations.

The honourable member is absolutely wrong when he talks about our insisting on the reduction of staff levels. The honourable member also used the expression "cut first and ask questions later." If he reviews the documents and reviews the minutes of my meeting with the MHO, he will find that I have not cut first and asked questions later. I have asked care facilities in Manitoba to look for ways to reduce their spending so that we can make these places efficient.

We know from the experience at Health Sciences Centre and St. Boniface that there are layers of inefficiency. We know that. Honourable members opposite want to defend that continued inefficiency and waste of taxpayers' dollars. Meanwhile, we have pressures in other areas that do need attention.

SHI Limited Government Loan

Mr. Paul Edwards (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, by Order-in-Council of April 20, a couple of weeks ago, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism signed off on a loan to a company called SHI Limited for \$2.5 million. SHI Limited is not listed in 411 in Winnipeg or 12 other centres in Manitoba. It is not registered with the Canadian or the Manitoba Corporations

Branch. It is not a member of the Winnipeg or Manitoba Chamber of Commerce. We are led to believe that it is registered in Saskatchewan but does not have any activities or assets in Saskatchewan.

Who is SHI, and why are they getting \$2.5 million of taxpayers' money?

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, just to start off with, it is obvious the Leader of the Liberal Party does not give a damn about jobs in Manitoba and the creation of jobs. In fact, he is antijob creation.

SHI has not received a \$2.5-million loan from the Province of Manitoba. There has been a proposal put forward. If they meet 16 conditions, Mr. Speaker, then in fact we would enter into a proposal that SHI have before the company, but in fact it would create almost 600 jobs for the people of Manitoba, particularly in the Selkirk area, which is supported by the people of Selkirk.

Mr. Edwards: Mr. Speaker, the question remains unanswered, who are SHI, and I want to ask the minister, in lieu of this loan, and albeit the conditions he mentions are not made public, where that fits with the recommendation of three months ago from the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, which have repeated their statement to government, and I quote: Grants and grant-like subsidies to businesses and associations should be eliminated. The use of grants is of dubious economic benefit. These forms of subsidies make unfair and unproductive use of scarce taxpayers' dollars.

Why is the government of Manitoba, why are the taxpayers of this province guaranteeing a \$2.5-million loan to a company, Mr. Speaker? Why are we guaranteeing that money to this company? Who is this company? Why can they not borrow their money on their own?

Mr. Downey: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Liberal Party may not be interested in creating jobs in this province. This government is.

The company which the member refers to constructs or manufactures or makes heavy manufacturing or heavy mining-type equipment—

is the type of work they carry out. We were lobbied by the Selkirk Chamber of Commerce, by the City of Selkirk, all the residents in the area— [interjection] And by the New Democratic Party? No, I do not think so, Mr. Speaker.

We were lobbied by those organizations interested in that major manufacturing plant going to Selkirk. One of the main conditions that has to be met by SHI is to raise some \$24 million in capital before we would proceed with the \$2.5-million loan. That is one of the main conditions that is in the agreement.

* (1350)

SHI Limited Government Loan

Mr. Paul Edwards (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in the last three weeks through grants, loans and forgivable loans, this government has committed \$4.7 million. That is in the last three weeks through I, T and T funds, including this grant.

Why, Mr. Speaker, is this government attempting to buy its way into the next election?— \$4.7 million in three weeks which directly contradicts all of the advice from the business community which says, stop giving direct grants to business. Why is the government continuing to do that?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I hate to try and help the member for St. James out of his confused state, but this is the individual who has been saying over the last number of weeks, the invisible hand of government, that government has not been wanting to get involved in creating jobs. Now, when government gets involved in a program that creates over 230 new jobs at Palliser Furniture, that may well create, if these people can raise the capital, 600 jobs at SHI in Selkirk, he says, why should government get involved in this?

He cannot have it both ways. He has to remember that people out there will be able to read what he said just two weeks ago and how he is completely contradicting himself today. It is the most foolish thing I have ever seen in this House.

Point of Order

Mr. Edwards: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if the First Minister thinks that a company that had \$192 million in revenues last year needs a loan, I do not.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member does not have a point of order. It is clearly a dispute over the facts.

Community Health Clinics Funding

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, my questions are for the Minister of Health.

Manitoba health organizations have clearly stated that if the government proceeds with its arbitrary directive to apply Bill 22 to community health clinics, there will be a corresponding reduction in services to the community, and in some areas and some clinics this is going to mean closures of up to at least five days.

These clinics deal with patients in crisis. Somebody in the medical system is going to have to deal with these patients, and it will be at the high end of the emergency services rather than at the cost-effective end of the community clinics.

I want to ask the minister today, is he prepared to guarantee that community clinic services, including home-based care and outreach, will remain fully accessible to Manitobans?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I said earlier. I made it very clear to the community clinics that I would not accept any proposal which resulted in what the honourable member has suggested.

Ms. Friesen: Would the minister explain how the government in its reform plan can talk of expanding delivery at community health centres and yet in this, its first signal of its new reform policy to the clinics, it is a cut of 2 percent? Will he tell us where the consistency is in government health policy?

Mr. McCrae: The honourable member should spend some time in Estimates with her colleague from Kildonan and the honourable member for Crescentwood (Ms. Gray), because we have been

discussing community clinics and potential expansion of services in those areas.

Ms. Friesen: Will the minister then end the uncertainty today in Question Period that he is creating about the future of community clinics and tell us specifically how he plans to maintain and expand the cost-effective and specialized services that they offer under this 2 percent cut?

Mr. McCrae: I am going to continue, Mr. Speaker, to work with community clinics and those involved in the delivery of health care to Manitobans to make sure that it is done well, that we improve services along the way and that we improve efficiency.

* (1355)

Municipal Board Review of Gimli Project

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, a number of days ago we raised with the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach) the question of his particular interference in a million dollar development in the community of Gimli. Since that time the debate in the community of Gimli has escalated and the concern and the anger over the political interference of the Minister of Rural Development continues.

My question is to the Premier.

Given the fact that these two interveners are both Conservative supporters and given the fact that this Minister responsible for Rural Development is now asking that this particular appeal be sent to the Municipal Board and the fact that Mr. Duguid sits on the Municipal Board, will the First Minister now override his Minister of Rural Development, cancel the hearing scheduled by the Municipal Board and allow this project to proceed so that it can create employment, create investment in the community of Gimli?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I find all of this somewhat humorous given that Mr. Chudd, who is the proponent of the development, is not only a supporter of ours but drives me in the Gimli parade every year. If we had done something contrary to the normal procedures in order to favour Mr. Chudd, this very member would have been standing up in the House

criticizing us and complaining because we were favouring a supporter of ours, and he would probably have gone to all great lengths to make the linkage between Mr. Chudd's support for the party and driving me in the parade and all these kinds of things. It is absolutely nonsense.

The minister has the responsibility to carry out all of the procedures that are required of him under The Municipal Act. One of them is that when interveners appeal, those appeals should be heard by an objective third party such as the Municipal Board.

On the other issue that he speaks of, not only will Mr. Duguid not have anything to do with this appeal in terms of the board itself, but he has offered to resign from the board in order to keep complete impartiality of the situation.

The fact is, this is being handled by the book by the minister, and the member opposite ought not to try and make some cute political tricks out of it. The fact is that there are procedures, and the procedures are being followed to the letter.

Point of Order

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I know the Premier likes to use this particular phrase, but "cheap political way" is very clearly unparliamentary in Beausheue. I would ask that perhaps the Premier withdraw that comment and stick to answering the very serious question that was raised by the member for Flin Flon.

Mr. Speaker: On the point of order raised, the honourable member is correct. This word has been used, bantered about here in the last little while and nobody has actually made objection to it, but in 1988-89, in Beausheue's 848, I did ask then an honourable member to withdraw the words "cheap political shots."

The honourable First Minister, please, if you would, sir, withdraw the words that are unparliamentary.

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, I unconditionally withdraw that comment, and I am sorry if I offended the member for Flin Flon.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to thank the honourable First Minister.

* (1400)

* * *

Mr. Storie: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Premier for those remarks and I remain unoffended. One becomes accustomed to those kinds of remarks from the Premier from time to time.

The fact of the matter is that what this issue underlies for the people of Gimli is the fact that the First Minister and none of his ministers seem to have any standards. This is a conflict. The intervener is a member of the Municipal Board.

My simple question to the First Minister is: Will he override the Minister of Rural Development's (Mr. Derkach) decisions, cancel the hearing so this investment and these jobs can continue in Gimli?

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, because the question is repetitive I hesitate to be repetitive with the answer, but I will have to proceed because the member opposite obviously did not understand or did not listen when I said that not only as a member of the Municipal Board will he not sit on the issue or have anything to do with the issue, but Mr. Duguid has offered to resign.

Secondarily, the point with this issue is exactly the same point as with other issues like appeals to ministers over environmental matters. There is a process, there is a procedure that the minister must follow. When an intervener appeals, as he has the right to do, then that appeal must go through proper procedure. The matter has been referred to the Municipal Board so that member and others could not claim there was political interference. The matter will be heard by the Municipal Board, and provided that there is nothing that has been done that is out of context with the requirements of the law, then the investment will continue to proceed, Mr. Speaker.

I do not think the member opposite is really understanding the issue when he suggests that we cut off the appeals, that we do not allow due process to take place and that we just simply bulldoze it through in favour of somebody who has

made the proposal. I just cannot believe that the member is suggesting that.

Mr. Storie: The objection was political to begin with.

Mr. Speaker, everyone in the community, from the R.M. to the mayor of Gimli to the planning board, has approved this project. The only two objecters are two supporters of this particular government—

Mr. Speaker: And the question is?

Mr. Storie: My question is: Given the fact that the minister has the discretionary power to dismiss this appeal as frivolous and vexatious, will he now do the right thing and dismiss this appeal and allow the jobs to begin in Gimli?

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely foolish on the part of the member opposite to say that we should waive due process, that we should cut off avenues of appeal and that we should make a political decision on the matter. It is absolutely foolish.

We are going to allow the Municipal Board, because how is it up to the minister to decide whether this is a political appeal? How is it up to the minister to decide that? That is why you have a Municipal Board in place to make those judgments, and we will trust the judgment of the Municipal Board.

Air Contaminants Emission Guidelines

Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, one of the fundamental flaws with the Conservatives' agenda on health reform is it does not make the connection between environment and health, and this connection will prevent illness by stopping pollution at source. I have with me a list of the 16 ambient air contaminants for which there are guidelines and objectives in Manitoba, and I am going to table a copy of this. These are not standards that are regulated and enforced with penalties. They are merely objectives.

I would like to ask the Minister of Environment: Are there new air emission objectives? What are these new air emission objectives for Manitoba? When were they set and—

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

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, I believe the member is probably leading towards the question of how do we make decisions in situations where assessments have to be made, and they are always made on the basis of a health risk assessment.

Ms. Cerilli: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to ask the minister, when was the last contaminant guideline established for Manitoba for ambient air emissions? Has the Clean Environment ever set a guideline, and when was that done?

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, the Clean Environment Commission, whenever they are faced with these types of situations, look to risk analysis to make a recommendation on what is appropriate in specific situations.

Palliser Furniture Emission Guidelines

Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary for the minister is: The members opposite have mentioned Palliser Furniture in Transcona. This is an industry that emits formaldehyde dust.

I would like to ask the minister, can he explain how the air emission guideline was set for this industry and what that guideline is and how it is enforced?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, the last time, last summer, when we had questions from the opposition about this particular operation I think that they were operating under the impression that there may have been some emissions from this plant in forms of sawdust that were found on the property of some of the neighbours.

As it turned out, upon investigation we found out that sawdust came from a house that was being built in the area, not from the plant.

This plant had a number of situations in the early portions of its operations that needed to be corrected and dealt with. To the best of my knowledge, they are operating well within their guidelines right now.

Education System Reform Students' Forum

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education following the Estimates of yesterday when the minister confirmed that in fact they will be bringing down a blueprint on educational reform in the month of June.

Part of putting together that blueprint was to include the parents, to include MAST, the partners, as the minister often refers to them, being school trustees, teachers and so forth. One of the most important stakeholders that this government is missing is in fact the students themselves.

I asked the Minister of Education yesterday why he does not include them, and he talked in terms of, well, we need some sort of a process in order to take into account their opinions.

My question to the minister is: Why will this minister not have a forum for students to be able to have input into the blueprint?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Education and Training): The member is partially right in reliving last night's conversation. As I indicated to the member, I am, on several occasions and every opportunity possible, dialoguing with students, trying to gain greater insight as to how we should reform the education system. Those views are being taken into account to the extent that they are unified and they basically point in the same direction. It is happening.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, one could challenge the comments that the minister is just putting on the record. How can this government provide a blueprint on education reform while not making a commitment to allow all students in the province, much like they have provided for school trustees, superintendents and teachers and the parents? How can this government go ahead with a blueprint and present one without consulting the students of the province of Manitoba?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, I clearly said that we are consulting, and I am consulting. What is at dispute here is the member wants to have a forum indeed where theoretically upwards of 20,000 students are asked to be in attendance. I say to him

that the process that we are engaged upon will certainly allow for those students in the community who are interested in commenting. They will have an opportunity to provide greater reaction to a document ultimately made public.

Mr. Lamoureux: There are 40,000 parents and 20,000 students in terms of invitations that went out. It is something that is very feasible. I want to go to the Premier (Mr. Filmon) because the Premier is ultimately responsible for the education system in this province.

How can he allow his Minister of Education to bring forward a blueprint without providing the opportunity of students throughout the province to be able to have direct input on the blueprint knowing full well that the Minister of Education is being very selective with the students he is currently meeting?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, I am growing tired of the member for Inkster and this kind of questioning. The member should realize that I am a member of a cabinet. This is government policy. So for him to try and pretend for a moment that this is not government policy, I would say to him, is showing his lack of understanding of how Executive Council works.

I can assure the member, again, as I did last night, that I am dialoguing with students. I can assure him further that once we table the blueprint, students will be asked to contribute with respect to —[interjection] Mr. Speaker, you see, the members are suggesting it will be, as such, government policy. Well, we are dialoguing upon that, so I am indicating to the members that we take seriously his suggestion. Indeed, it was our action, long before that, that we continue to dialogue with students and all of the stakeholders, and we will continue to do that through this process.

* (1410)

**Louisiana-Pacific Co.
Treaty Land Entitlements**

Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, in the last few weeks, I have raised many times with this government, both in the Chamber and in discussion with government members, the

concern that bands in my constituency have that they have not been contacted to discuss their land claims or their traditional land-use territories that are going to be impacted by the Louisiana-Pacific deal, but today—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Ms. Wowchuk: Mr. Speaker, since these people have indicated very clearly that they are not opposed to economic development, they only want a fair share of the pie, will the Minister of Native Affairs agree today to meet with these bands to discuss their concerns and their traditional land-use areas and their treaty land entitlements to see how they fit in with the Louisiana-Pacific proposal?

Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister responsible for Native Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the only people, or the only individual, who is raising these issues at this stage is the member for Swan River. Quite frankly, none of the bands she refers to has requested a meeting. I say to her, if they request a meeting with myself or the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Driedger), I am sure we would be more than willing prepared to meet, but I have to tell the honourable member that contact has not been made.

There is a protocol in place for dealing with treaty land entitlement issues, and that process is underway to make sure that there is a flow of information. It is only the member for Swan River who is not aware of that process.

Ms. Wowchuk: Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from one band in my constituency, and I have written to the minister on behalf of the bands asking them to come up.

I want to ask the minister, why, when there is a dispute in southern Manitoba that affects jobs, he asks the two sides to stop acting so childish. When is he going to stop acting so childish and deal with this issue?

Mr. Praznik: Mr. Speaker, all I can say to the members opposite is, whatever my strategy it worked and those people are back to work, and that is what counts at the end of the day. We got an agreement on sugar, and that is probably more than

members opposite would have gotten in those circumstances.

I just want to say to the member, if the communities involved want to meet with myself or any representatives of the government, we would be more than pleased to meet. The only person who is making the request is the member for Swan River, and, quite frankly, those communities have not made a contact for a meeting.

Ms. Wowchuk: Mr. Speaker, I have indicated very clearly that I have written on behalf of the bands and the bands have said that they want him to come.

Why is the minister not prepared to move on this issue so that we do not lose jobs in the Swan River area? Why will he not address the concerns of these bands which are very serious concerns?

Mr. Praznik: Mr. Speaker, first of all, Louisiana-Pacific has been made aware by our treaty land entitlement negotiator of those obligations. Secondly, I understand that Louisiana-Pacific has been meeting with some of those bands to address those concerns.

Thirdly, I would say to the member for Swan River, who would like to treat the First Nations of our province in a very paternalistic or maternalistic way, if you truly stand for self-government and people taking control of their own lives, I think the least we could expect is if those communities wish to meet with ministers of the government they would surely make that request. I personally believe the member for Swan River is trying to create an excuse for her own problems in her constituency.

Health Care System Funding

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, we are extremely concerned about the documents that have come into our hands that show the government intends, with its secret agenda, to cut another hundred million dollars or more out of health facilities in this province. We are extremely concerned about the impact on hospitals in rural Manitoba considering that these hospitals and nursing homes have had major cuts over the last few years. In Dauphin, \$1 million alone over the

last few years has been taken from the operating budget.

I want to ask this minister how many more millions he wants out of the hospitals in rural Manitoba.

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Health): It would be very refreshing for me if honourable members opposite—refreshing for all Manitobans if they had concern for impact on fellow Manitobans, on patients, on people who need health care services. That would be refreshing to see.

Honourable members opposite have demonstrated only their concern for their friends who are the union leaders of this province. That is whom they speak for when they come here. I speak for the people of Manitoba, and my concern, my daily motivation is to ensure that we move from the health care system that the honourable member pretends to want to preserve to the system that will be sustainable for many, many years to come.

You do not do it by going to a place like Brandon in 1987 and shutting down 42 beds permanently without any plans for the future.

Point of Order

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I realize that the minister is in the middle of Health Estimates and maybe getting somewhat tired of the lengthy process, but questions should be answered, according to Beaudesne, very clearly, very briefly and dealing with the matter raised.

We are not talking about the 1980s. We are not talking about other provinces. We are talking about the province of Manitoba. Rural hospitals are being cut, and we would appreciate an answer.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member does not have a point of order. I believe the honourable Minister of Health was answering the question.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

House Business

Hon. Jim Ernst (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, we will today continue with the consideration of Estimates, Health in the Chamber, and Education in the committee room.

I move, seconded by the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into a committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the honourable member for St. Norbert (Mr. Laurendeau) in the Chair for the Department of Education and Training; and the honourable member for Seine River (Mrs. Dacquay) in the Chair for the Department of Health.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY (Concurrent Sections)

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Mr. Deputy Chairperson (Marcel Laurendeau): Order, please. Will the Committee of Supply please come to order. This section of the Committee of Supply meeting in Room 255 will resume consideration of the Estimates of the Department of Education and Training.

When the committee last sat, it had been considering item 1.(e)(1) on page 36 of the Estimates book.

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): I wonder if the minister could give us just a brief outline of the major interprovincial initiatives, other than the national testing development that has taken place, that this office would co-ordinate.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I do not know whether there is some reference to interprovincial, but to the best of our knowledge, this section deals surely intergovernmentally and interdepartmentally within government and some intergovernmental activity within the province. I

am thinking specifically as between the department and school boards.

Mr. Plohman: My reference is actually to the Planning and Policy Co-ordination, but we have completed that already, so I will leave this. We are prepared to pass this section.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson: Financial and Administrative Services 1.(e)(1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$877,600—pass.

1.(e)(2) Other Expenditures \$158,300.

Mr. Plohman: Is this the right place or the next line that would provide us with information on the amount of and the extent of lapsed funds from the previous year's budget in this department?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, certainly if we had them available, it would be the group of people around this table here that would know those figures. I mean, we will not report on that, of course, as a government until the unaudited fourth quarters. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) will usually report on that usually in July.

Mr. Plohman: I think that the minister would be in a position at this point, knowing how these reports are put together, to be able to indicate for the '93-94 fiscal year how much was spent in the department out of the funds that were allocated. I am not talking about the public schools and the independent agencies that are at arm's length from the government, but within the department, where the greatest amount of lapse occurred in general terms first and the rounded figures of lapsed funds within the branches of this department.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I am not trying to be coy here, but I want to indicate to the member that those numbers are just starting to be worked on, because indeed some of the accounts have just closed momentarily in terms of days. So we have not started to begin to add up the lapse factor at this point in time.

The way the process works, I can assure the member, having been the minister in charge of lapse throughout the whole government, that we begin to call for these numbers now. We get a first cut sometime in late June and final numbers in the beginning of July, through all departments.

I do not have that information available and the department does not have it. As a matter of fact, we cannot even indicate to the member where we think there might be some lapsing occurred in significance.

Mr. Plohman: I am surprised at that if that is the case, because Treasury Board would want to keep a tighter handle on what is happening in the departments I think than that. So there should have been quarterly figures that were prepared and also, maybe, lapsing targets. Is the minister saying there was no lapse target for this department or for any departments, no instructions from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) on lapsing whatsoever?

Mr. Manness: This year there were no directives like there were the year before when I was Minister of Finance. As you can remember, in November we issued directives to departments to review all accounts and to begin to provide options around lapsing. That did not occur this year but, beyond that, the Treasury Board always calls, I believe, in late January at times for all departments to review their accounts and to indicate what requirements there might be for supplementary funding.

* (1430)

That exercise was done. So we are within our budget. At that time—was it a half a million? Did we request supplementary funding? Yes, for the Francophone governance area as a special studies, which is 100 percent passed through anyway to the federal government.

The point I am trying to make is, we were within budget; secondly, the areas of lapsing, and I even forget how many dollars lapsed last year in terms of '92-93—around \$11 million. I would assume that would be much reduced, because last year it was forced upon them by the Minister of Finance at the time. This year it will be much reduced, but there is no way at this point in time I can even begin to indicate what that number might be.

Mr. Plohman: So I am hearing clearly from the minister that there were no guidelines for lapsing or directives from the Department of Finance, Minister of Finance. Did the minister make any

requests of Treasury Board for reallocation of funds from within for reprioritized spending?

Mr. Manness: Yes, we did some normal requests for subappropriation transfers I think to satisfy some additional costs associated with the Boundaries Review Commission.

Mr. Plohman: Could the minister have a sheet with those prepared, so we know exactly what the budget was in effect last year as opposed to what was printed, for a subsequent sitting of this committee?

Mr. Manness: No, I cannot provide that at this point in time. That has to be released by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) as part of a total government statement of the financial standing of the province.

Mr. Plohman: To be clear, the minister prefers not to release that at this time. It is not that he cannot by law.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, again, it is not my call. These are financial issues that are not the purview and indeed not the monopoly of the Minister of Education. These are part of government numbers passed by the Legislature. This is not my call; this is the call of the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Plohman: Well, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the minister should not be loose with his words there. The reallocations are not passed by the Legislature. This is a change from what is passed by the Legislature, and they are done as a result of initiatives by the minister in the department, not by anyone else. Therefore, the minister is not taking responsibility. By refusing to reveal where he has made these requests and where in fact they have been granted, he is not taking responsibility for his own actions; he is saying someone else has to. That is, I do not think, appropriate.

Mr. Manness: No, I am totally responsible, but the member uses a correct term when he said the initiative comes from the department, but ultimately the blessing and indeed the responsibility for allowing subappropriation transfers lies within the Treasury Board, ultimately passed by the cabinet, with the Premier the presiding officer.

In fairness, although it might be Education initiative, the reporting of that and indeed the decision around that occurring is very much an Executive Council matter. The reporting around that is very much a matter that rests with the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Plohman: I think the minister is being unduly close to the vest on this when he does not need to be, but we will find out perhaps sometime why he is not feeling comfortable in just releasing where he has made requests for reallocation of funds, what kinds of priorities dictated that, and the amount of money for each of those. He mentioned something about boundaries, but that was about the only reference.

I also wanted to know about the vacancy rate for staffing. Is there a specific vacancy rate that has been required by Treasury Board as a directive? If not, what has been the vacancy rate for the department?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, there is a guideline and it is still at 5 percent. In our department it was very close to that, slightly under at 4.8 percent.

Mr. Plohman: And the 4.8 percent, is that the current vacancy rate or is that just the average vacancy rate?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, if Mr. Gillespie was still here when we dealt with human resources he would have had all that information, but I would have to think that the vacancy rate as of March 31 year-end was actually 7.2 percent, but the average throughout the year was a lesser number. It varies anywhere from 3 percent to 8 percent within a year.

Mr. Plohman: Just one further question on the vacancy rate. Is that the same rate or in the ballpark of the same rate that has been in place for several years running?

Mr. Manness: The guideline has been 5 percent a couple of times. A couple of times, about three of those years, they were more than guidelines, they were hard numbers, and no department could go under that unless they had special permission. We are back, I believe, to a guideline policy now.

Mr. Plohman: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the minister, this section has office space, and I wonder if we could have specific information about the—it was referenced yesterday—decentralization, any of the moves of operations in this department out of the city as to the amount of office space, the costs, and whether there were new facilities built to accommodate. Something tabled on those moves as opposed to.

Mr. Manness: The member, I guess, is the end point that he wants to reach an attempt to find out what new space or what space we have taken because of decentralization? If that is the case—[interjection] Well, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, we would have to provide an analysis then. We do not have it totally under one heading in that fashion. I mean, the questions he asked we have answers to, but they are kind of spread around.

Mr. Plohman: Those are all the questions I have at this time on this section, Mr. Deputy Chairperson.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Deputy Chairperson, again I would look to the minister. I want to ask some questions with respect to general revenues and the full financing of education. What would be the most appropriate line to ask?

Mr. Deputy Chairperson: Next section.

Mr. Manness: No, further than that. School programs, Section 5. Support to Schools. It is the big item, \$620-some million.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson: Item 1.(e)(2) Other Expenditures \$158,300—pass.

1.(f) Management Information Services (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$581,100—pass.

1.(f)(2) Other Expenditures \$234,000.

Mr. Plohman: The co-ordination of departmental technology planning and policy development, does that involve distance education and that kind of use of technology only for departmental purposes?

Mr. Manness: No, this is not a distance ed component. This is purely for internal management of all of the financials and all of the statistical bases.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson: Shall the item pass? Pass.

We will move on to 2. School Programs (a) Division Administration (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$239,900—pass.

2.(a)(2) Other Expenditures \$49,300.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, this is the area and, in reading through it, in terms of the co-ordination of policy programs and budget issues within division and facilitate interdivisional linkage in these areas, here we are talking about school divisions. I was wanting to ask the minister if he can give us some sort of indication of what it is that the government is actually doing here.

* (1440)

Mr. Manness: This is Division Administration, School Programs?

Mr. Lamoureux: Yes, 16.2.(a).

Mr. Manness: Page 37. Mr. Deputy Chairperson, at this time I would like to introduce to the table Carolyn Loepky. Carolyn is the acting assistant deputy minister in charge of this major area of school programming, and 2.(a) basically refers to the office of Carolyn.

Mr. Lamoureux: What I am looking for is to get some sort of indication from the department. There are a number of issues that different school divisions have, in particular, with respect to transportation between different school divisions.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, that is way back. Those issues, again, are in big Section 6 under the programming, the formula in place, to deliver those types of programs.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, then I would ask the minister in terms of what is it then that this particular line is an objective, it says, to co-ordinate policy, program and budget issues within the division and facilitate interdivisional linkages in these areas.

Mr. Manness: This is the area where we should deal with curriculum, services to students within school, program development, program implementation, again, student services, Manitoba Textbook Bureau, deaf and hard of hearing, that area of Outreach, distance delivery unit, Manitoba School for the Deaf, instructional resources. These are the areas where education and the need of education are housed. This is not the function or

the process of taking students from point A to point B. That is developed in other areas. This is programming.

Mr. Lamoureux: Is this area not responsible for co-ordination between the different school divisions at all?

Mr. Manness: Co-ordination in what context?

Mr. Lamoureux: Co-ordination in terms of providing communication between the different school divisions and the Department of Education.

Mr. Manness: Well, yes, with respect to Distance Education, with respect to shared services, we can try and help divisions work together. Yes, we have a co-ordinating effect to the extent that we develop curriculum, and we take it out to all divisions. The answer is yes, but I cannot be more definitive than that at this point in time.

Mr. Lamoureux: Just for clarification then, the only communication out of this area to the school divisions is with respect to strictly Distance Education.

Mr. Manness: It is with respect to curriculum, implementing curriculum, changes in policies around the program side.

Mr. Lamoureux: Okay, so then there is communication in those areas with the school divisions within this particular line. So an appropriate thing to ask would be in what fashion or what methodology is there, if the minister can further explain, in terms of how are they communicating the government's thoughts on ensuring that all the school divisions are in fact being somewhat consistent with some of the actions that government would like to see taking place?

Mr. Manness: Yes, this is not governance. This is not money. This is purely program. This is the guts of education, and to the extent that there is dialogue between the department and school divisions on changes within basic curriculum, implementation associated therewith. Yes, this is where it is all housed.

Mr. Lamoureux: Then I am wondering if it would be fair then to ask the question, what is the department doing to ensure that there is dialogue occurring between school divisions with respect

to, for example, interdivisional problems such as students living outside of a school division, bussing, those sorts of things?

Mr. Manness: Well, again, this division is not involved in the governance or all of the questions around the student either being part of a school division coming from elsewhere. Where this division is dealing is once the student is in place at school, then this division is responsible for taking the lead in developing and imparting and making sure teachers have the know-how to impart to that student the best way possible the Manitoba curriculum.

This department is not responsible for the governance or the administration around how it is a student comes to be at the school location. That is another division that we will deal with in the larger area. We could have dealt with it I suppose back here, but once the students are in their places in the classroom, then this department is not responsible.

Mr. Lamoureux: Then if we go to some of the areas that the minister then had talked about in terms of curriculum, could the minister then indicate if it would be appropriate, if he has the staff individuals here, to comment in terms of the Curriculum Branch and the number of individuals that are working on the curriculum?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I certainly will ask staff to provide that specific number. We will be moving into it, I dare say, as soon as we—probably there are sections coming up that are specifically dealing with program development, and I think of 2.(e), for instance, 16.2.(e).

To answer the question specifically, there are 31 staff years in the area of Program Development, i.e., curriculum development, but the committees that we draw into place, of course, are guided by these people and many people from outside the field.

There are 40 such curriculum committees that are in place dealing, again, with all of the subject area that we try and cover, and to indicate to him that we have the process in place then where we have regional meetings to discuss issues and curriculum and schooling with numbers of

individual school divisions, usually larger groupings of school divisions, and then there are person-to-person contacts, group meeting workshops, monitoring and documents that are put out.

This is how then, after the curriculum is developed, the implementation process is put into place so that the word is moved out within the field so that everybody then is basically provided with the same information.

Mr. Lamoureux: Can the minister indicate in terms of on the education reform package and the impact that that is going to have on the Curriculum Branch in particular how the minister foresees the dollars that have been allocated out for education reform to facilitate the necessary changes that the minister has been talking about?

Mr. Manness: Well, after the governance issue, there is no doubt, this is the division within education that will be impacted the greatest. I mean, ed reform will have, obviously, a great impact on school programming. If the member was in attendance last night when all of us were talking, the very essence of what it is we are trying to do is to build curriculum frameworks, and we are trying to, within that, develop curriculum that has applicability to the technology encompassing distance education.

I could talk about library linkages. I could talk about sharing and developing curriculum with other jurisdictions.

I could go on and on and on, but the focus of once we have decided what it is we want to teach in the classroom and what focus we want to give the classroom and to what degree that we want to include the parents and the community in once again having a greater influence on the school, once we have dealt with those matters, the very essence of everything is the curriculum.

It is the imparting of that knowledge, it is the testing for how it is a student is understanding and coping and coming to grips not only with the essence but is now taking the essence of the curriculum, but taking that and now being able to develop a thinking process.

So the basis of it all, once we have put into place the foundations, is certainly curriculum and its development and, ultimately, it is implementation and acceptance by those practitioners in the field. I mean, we have 12,000 practitioners, i.e., teachers, and obviously everybody—we have to bring in a system that is acceptable to that group of people.

* (1450)

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, curriculum development is in fact something that is an ongoing process, and I am wondering if the minister can just give some sort of indication on how the government currently addresses changes to the curriculum.

Mr. Manness: Well, I do not know. This could be a long discourse but, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the traditional way, I understand, and the staff will correct me if I am wrong, is that we basically for many years now have developed our own Manitoba curriculum. Generally speaking, around that once—and this is always evolving. I imagine for the last 30 years there has always been an area that has been focused, and the decision to actively engage in either rewrite or redraft or review started two or some years previous. As everything comes through the queue, a subject then is dealt with for various grade levels.

Of course, once it is decided whether it is a two-year process or a year and a half to deal specifically with one course over some number of years, then I imagine the process is the same. We take the lead, but we call out to practitioners in the field. We reach out also to university for expert advice. So we take the lead, but we certainly reach far and wide for those who are considered to be experts in the field. They are brought in over a period of—we also of course study what is happening in other jurisdictions.

We set up the committee approach. We then ultimately do a draft or a write, and everybody has input into it. We put out a pilot document. Business and labour have also of course been involved in this whole process too, so we reach out more than within the field of education. Then we come up with a pilot document. We take that into the field and do some selective testing, more as to how the document itself, the curriculum itself, stands up or

whether there are any weaknesses within it. Then revisions are made, and ultimately you reach a final document and it then becomes the final curriculum for that subject area.

Mr. Lamoureux: The minister indicates that the process really starts with the government taking the lead.

Mr. Manness: No, the process does not start with the government taking the lead. The government takes the lead with respect to reforming or reviewing or redrafting the curriculum. We take the lead. That is our responsibility. It is enshrined in legislation, but that may not be initiated with our call. You may have practitioners in the field, you may have others making representation say, hey, you were planning to review social studies, we notice, eight years hence; we think it is more urgent that you deal with it today. That is brought to our attention and we react accordingly.

Mr. Lamoureux: The reason why I ask, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, is that I am trying to get a better understanding in terms of why it is that, at least on the surface, we hear a lot now about the changes that are needed for the curriculum and what allowed it to get to this point where we get the strong statements being made and concern about a number of the different curriculum courses that are out there. I would ask the minister what has failed from within the bureaucracy to allow us to get to this point that we are currently at?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I do not think anything has necessarily failed within the so-called bureaucracy. What we have to do is study society as a whole to answer that question. We have put into place more or less a decentralized, good-faith model. As you know, we have moved away from rigidity around individual textbooks, and that is the way society wanted it. This is not a Manitoba phenomenon. It is the way the education community generally sensed that it was the way to go.

So we moved away then from commonality of reference books. We went to guidelines in place. We gave greater flexibility to educators to use their own sources of material, but the guidelines said that whatever it is or however it is you taught, you generally had to cover these areas.

With no standards in place to determine whether or not schools were all following the curriculum, and of course the ways and means of enforcing whether or not schools were all following the curriculum, and if they were not, what were we doing about it? I mean, that is a weak area.

The good-faith model in some respects has broken down, and it has some time ago because there are no standards in place. Without the ability to deal with it, schools have not used test results consistently. There has not been uniformity. When we did our curriculum assessments, which we have been doing for a number of years, it has not always been or very often been reaction to the shortcomings as found within assessment, and so consequently there is no standard of achievement. It became very convenient of course to make the curriculum the whipping boy, to use a term, for that.

(Mr. Jack Reimer, Acting Deputy Chairperson, in the Chair)

I am not going to stand here and say that our curriculum is totally in keeping with what it should be. I know one thing, that the curriculum, if it were all taught, regardless of what methods were in place and if there were standards in place, the curriculum today, even though it may be short in some areas, still there is a wealth of knowledge there that would provide the foundation for all of our students. There is no question in my mind. But saying that, we have other pressures today to modernize it, to make it accessible or usable in a computer sense, and thirdly, beyond that, I think to work—and this is the pressure coming from outside—to work more closely with other jurisdictions, other provinces, so that there is some uniformity across the land.

We are not going to be able to say, well, Manitoba believes the curriculum should be this and the heck with the Alberta. No, no, this is a kind of a compromise. It is give and go. That is what we are working harder on, and that will be the new process that will be in place.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Acting Deputy Chairperson, I am wondering if the minister could walk me through this. If he never embarked on the whole reform package of education and we

received the mass exam results, for example, when we did, what would then have been the process to try to rectify that particular problem? Does he see that problem coming from the curriculum, the teaching methods?

* (1500)

Mr. Manness: Mr. Acting Deputy Chairperson, notwithstanding the fact that there was a national indicators test done with respect to math—I mean, our department was started long before I was here and began to review and revitalize math curriculum several years ago. [interjection] I thought it was longer than that. The process started years before that, but the revisions came into place in '93, K-4 and the interim guide. The change process around that time would have started years before that and the realization that we had to update the curriculum.

We started more or less on our own, and then part way through that process, I am led to believe, we struck a working relationship with other provinces, particularly Alberta and Saskatchewan, to make what it is we now are presenting to the classroom in terms of the K-4. It is consistent with what is in place in the other provinces, and we are continuing to do that for the higher grade levels, I am led to believe. So the renewal process is in place in that subject area, and the protocols are in place now to begin to do that in the other areas of curricula.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Acting Deputy Chairperson, the minister did mention he has full faith in the current curriculum, that if in fact—I do not want to be misquoted. He indicated that the curriculum was in fact good in many areas. I am wondering if he would comment in terms of time. Is there enough time in the day for students to be taught the current curriculum, or is it a question of, yes, we have a wonderful curriculum but not enough time to be able to teach that curriculum?

Mr. Manness: That is right because the wording around the comments have to be very careful. I think that it is always good to continue to revitalize your curricula, so that is an ongoing area and that has been happening for years. My greater concern though is how that curricula has been treated in the classroom, and today you have an awful lot of

variation. I know there are those out there who, of course, really find shortcomings in certain of our curriculum, and I guess I could too.

My greater and higher concern right now is that what we have in place in a lot of cases is not being taught.

We talked about hours in instruction last night. I mean, we think to do justice, for instance, to some of our basic core areas there should be generally 110-120 hours in high school devoted towards those core subjects. We have nothing that can force that. There is not a policy or legislation in place, and there are jurisdictions today who are not directing that much time to those core areas, and we are going to have to address that. To me that is as much of an issue as the curriculum, if not more than the curriculum itself.

Mr. Lamoureux: Can the minister indicate in terms of—he points out an area in which the minister does have potentially some authority to be able to ensure that those core subjects, if you like, are being taught the number of curriculum hours that are in fact being suggested. Last night when I talked about it I had indicated, and I was quite surprised that the minister refuted what I had indicated, but a number of math teachers had implied to me that, look, 110 hours, that it is not feasible. There is just no way that they have 110 hours to teach math.

Is the government looking at doing something to ensure that math and other core, linguistic and language arts are in fact given the proper amount of time in the classrooms?

Mr. Manness: Yes, we will be looking at that. That will be, obviously, one of the cornerstones of any ed reform package.

Mr. Lamoureux: Could the minister indicate in terms of, what format is there right now? I understand it is under—is it regulation that says that you have to do 110 hours? There is actually no onus of responsibility from the school divisions or the principals? Where is it falling apart right now?

Mr. Manness: Well, when you say we are falling apart you are making a general statement. I mean, I do not think we are falling apart. I do think that we in some situations, too many, the guidelines are

not being followed. So that indicates that it is not provided in legislation, and certainly if it were even in regulation that would not be the power in itself. We are going to have to find, and we are studying how it is we best ensure that the desire of the government is indeed followed in this whole area, and if it has to be by way of legislation, then it will be.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Acting Deputy Chairperson, if I were a math teacher, which I am not, and I am only teaching my math students, let us say, 90 hours as opposed to the 110-120 which is being recommended, what recourse do I have? Do I go to the principal, the school division? How do I ensure that I am being given the appropriate amount of time to teach what it is I am supposed to be teaching?

Mr. Manness: Well, obviously the principal does the timetabling in the school. So that is one person you can approach. Ultimately if you do not think that you have had a fair hearing you can go to the board and to the extent that individuals—and when I say the board, you know, that is the superintendent, but let us say the board—and ultimately I guess if a larger number of you believe that nobody is listening to you you petition the Minister of Education.

Mr. Lamoureux: Has the minister or the office ever been petitioned about this particular problem?

Mr. Manness: Not formally, but certainly we have had representation made to us as to the amount of material that has to be covered, of all description, during the school day. Yes, reference to that has been made on several occasions. Again, not on a formal—I mean, I hear the same thing that the member is bringing forward by way of his questions.

Mr. Lamoureux: When the minister refers to all the material that is being required, would the minister be of the opinion that maybe we do have too much, we are asking too much of our schools to be able to administer the required hours on those basics?

Mr. Manness: Well, I said as much last night. That is why I honestly believe, where the emphasis of change is, the school community itself should be

a greater determining factor as to what areas in totality should be covered. I am concerned about the core subject areas, and beyond that the school community should decide what it wants to add to it.

Mr. Lamoureux: Just to continue on, you have, and I made reference to it yesterday, other reports that have come down and to ask the minister if, in fact, the department has been acting on those reports. One was the Pedlar report with respect to domestic violence being incorporated into the curriculum. Can the minister comment on that?

Mr. Manness: There is no doubt that we are moving into a period of pause. I mean, up until a while ago, society said, and it spoke very forcefully through the judiciary and spoke very forcefully through other vested interest groups, that it wanted the public school system to include as compulsory programming some subject material. I have put that on pause.

I have said, listen, it is time to sit back here and see what is of greater import, and that, I guess, may ask the silent question. Once we bring forward the blueprint of society, how do they want to handle this, because there are only so many hours in the day, and right today I cannot envisage taking the school day and making it two hours longer, and to make the school year longer I really think itself is a simple solution that leads nowhere in itself, so ultimately something is going to have to give. It is time for society to once again resurrect the discussion around that issue.

Mr. Lamoureux: Are there other issues—we made reference to domestic violence—other suggestions that have come forward that the minister has also put on pause, and I am wondering if he could indicate which ones those would be?

* (1510)

Mr. Manness: Well, we had a call last year that be fed into the curriculum and I gather on a compulsory basis, something in Grades 5 to 8, violence against women, that that should become a compulsory dimension of curriculum. We have not developed anything new so we move in this area of violence protection and codes of conduct.

I know we have a large cross section of people who want us to, for instance—this has not been formally presented—certainly give renewed focus to entrepreneurship. I am not troubled by that, but I would have a hard time setting a course up, as much as I believe in the creation of wealth, and I want to see our students have an understanding of what entrepreneurship is and what wealth creation leads to. It leads to great equity, much greater equity in our society. I think our students should have an introduction to that, and it should sort of be woven into the curriculum but to have a subject on it in Grades 5 to 8, as some might suggest—I would have difficulty with that. These are the continuing pressures that come to bear.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Acting Deputy Chairperson, does the minister, in fact, have a list? I know it would be beneficial for myself to hear, because no doubt different people approach the minister that might have some different concerns with respect to the curriculum, and I would be interested in knowing what other pressures of inclusion are coming in terms of the curriculum.

I know, as I said last night, the Manitoba Intercultural Council's report made the suggestion that combatting racism be incorporated into the curriculum. I am wondering if the minister could comment on that particular report or that particular recommendation, and secondly, comment on whether or not he could provide for me some sort of a listing of areas, like he has mentioned, codes of conduct, violence against women, entrepreneurship. Are there other areas which the minister could enlighten me on?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Acting Deputy Chairperson, the member is well aware we have been at this now for 10 years, a society—this is not a Manitoba issue. When you talk about the issues of education and AIDS awareness and area of family life and drug-alcohol, racism, multicultural, entrepreneurship, society has been trying to come to grips on how it is we impart greater knowledge around these areas over the last 10 years.

In some jurisdictions, more or less, these areas now become compulsory units or add-ons in either health courses or so on and so forth, but all of it to the extent that it is add-on and it is compulsory. I

think of skills of independent learning, I guess, has been the last mandated compulsory course that we have put in at Senior 2. It all again has to, by definition, begin to take away from the core subject area. So I think it is time to stand back and to begin to charge our own thinking as to what is the most important.

Mr. Lamoureux: Can the minister indicate whether the blueprint for education will give any consideration at all to the expanding curriculum or some sort of indication on some of those areas in which he just mentioned?

Mr. Manness: At this point, no, I cannot see that. I say that again the government, indeed, everybody is going to have to decide whether or not the issues that I have just mentioned are of great central control. You must remember, most of the issues we have talked about were pushed by members opposite to include them in the framework of study. I can remember the member's leader, Mrs. Carstairs, of course, pushed very hard that compulsory instruction on AIDS and family life be a mandatory part of the curriculum.

All I am saying is that before this government is going to continue to follow that process where society believes that, hey, let us fix it in the schools, it is more important or is important—I mean, when they say it is as important, a lot of people are saying it is more important because right now to find time for it, you have to take away time in some of the core subject areas. It is time to revisit that whole discussion.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Acting Deputy Chairperson, over the weekend I had an interesting visit from an individual who at least took the time to go through a textbook. I believe, at least the minister is somewhat familiar with this. At least he had indicated to me that he had let former ministers know about this particular book. It was the Science Dimension Grade 7. I understand it is part of the curriculum in Grade 7.

He went through it from the front to the back and again—I am not a scientist myself—so it was interesting as he went through the number of mistakes. He pointed out quite a few of them, 735 and some were very, very minor mistakes or not necessarily mistakes, sometimes in poor judgment.

He gives a number of examples. I guess, what I would like to know from the minister is what sort of a process do we have in place that sees that there is in fact review of materials that the curriculum is actually teaching?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Acting Deputy Chairperson, I am well aware, at least I think I know who the individual was. I have dialogued frequently over many years with the individual to whom the member I think is referring.

I would indicate that there are some major errors in the text which is two years old. That is somewhat unfortunate. I would point out the process though by which this text comes into existence. We are a very small province. Publishers, of course, are very reluctant to—and it is one of the dilemmas of trying to develop your own curriculum, because of course that textbook would not have a large run. So you have publishers of course for their own efficiencies who are involved somewhat or are not involved in catching errors. Many of the major errors that are identified are actually not department errors at all, but were ones that came into place through the publisher. But we are held accountable for that, I understand that.

There are some other areas of interpretation where some individuals would quarrel with the emphasis put into place and indeed maybe some of the conclusions reached. We have tried to go out and bring in third parties to reflect upon who is right or wrong, and there is disagreement obviously.

But I want to say with respect to the errors we certainly take no pride, even though I am led to believe that an erratum sheet was produced by the publisher who obviously had great responsibility, we still are embarrassed by the book.

(Mr. Ben Sveinson, Acting Deputy Chairperson, in the Chair)

We will do everything we can to improve the text development. I say that as soon as we become involved in having a text now that will apply to many more students across, not only Manitoba but western Canada, many of these problems will be eliminated.

We now use outside subject experts. We meet repeatedly with the publishers, and we try to send out, before final publishing, these draft texts to outside experts for final review so that this problem does not happen again.

It is unfortunate, we feel badly about it. We have to obviously be held accountable for it. But the flip side to that, if our students learned all of the right material that is in that textbook, they would have a grounding for science that would make them untouchable in any comparison. We cannot forget that fact. If our students came away from school with the grounding in that book that we would all hope them to have, they would lead the nation very quickly in their understanding of this.

So we are trying to review texts and curricula from the United Kingdom. I know the member in particular talks about the European model. I too believe that we have something to learn. We are looking at texts and curricula from Bavaria, Czechoslovakia, Australia, anywhere in the world.

* (1520)

Part of our problem is we are not the nation of Canada, we are the province of Manitoba, and it has been the practice in this country for a long period of time that everybody has their own curriculum. That is part of our problem, and we are going to have to regionalize the development of our curriculum.

We have been talking about it and trying slowly. I might share with members I had a meeting today, a conference call, with Ministers of Education across western Canada, from 12 to one o'clock. We spent a good 15 minutes on this area. I asked everybody again if they were committed to common curriculum. As we proceed through the rest of these decades and of these years in this last decade into the next century, was everybody committed from a western and territorial point of view towards a common curriculum? The resounding answer came across the telephone line, yes, yes, yes. We are moving in the right direction.

Mr. Lamoureux: I am not too sure given this one particular text and just the number of errors that I would share the same opinion that the minister has

in terms of if the students knew this book that they would in fact be the best in Canada.

In looking at some of the mistakes, there are some very significant mistakes in here. Long graphs that are being used, for example, to display what Sir Isaac Newton's theory on light as through two prisms. It makes reference to the shadow, one being longer in the summer, shorter in the winter, and states some—well, that is just not accurate, many of the statements that are being made.

Then it has some of the simple mistakes, for example, where it shows pictures, and instead of having the pictures being from, let us say, the same angle so that a student would get a better appreciation in terms of the differences that are trying to be demonstrated.

The question I would ask the minister is that given that he is familiar with this particular text, and I did make a commitment or I would allow the minister to have it. I believe he knows the individual. Maybe the individual would lend it to the minister so maybe his staff can actually go through the many different mistakes, or after I am done speaking on it, I will hand it over and you can maybe page through it, if you so choose. I am wondering what the government is doing in particular when it finds something of this nature.

Is it good enough to continue to let the students learn the amount of what is not necessarily accurate information in such a very important area of study?

Mr. Manness: Well, the member is not imparting any new knowledge here. I mean he may want to be able to wave the record around that he has brought it up as an issue, but if the member thinks that he is going to try and tell the education community that he now is becoming the shining knight and he has found, in secret with somebody else, weaknesses in this particular—I mean, this was brought to the attention of the ministry a year and a half if not two years ago. A full analysis has been done and all of the shortcomings presented.

The department has tried to react in the fashion it has to correct some of the areas of significance, but there are other areas of less significance. Some have used the term "quibbling" because you come

around to interpretation. I must say, I mean, this is not the curriculum. This is a text, and —[interjection] No, it is not the material that is being used in all places. Now that may engender discussion in a number of areas. It is one source. Because teachers today have license to use various sources, as long as they cover the subject material, they do not have to use that.

Now I can enter a dialogue and say that I am kind of troubled with that too, but that is a different issue. When the member says the curriculum, I mean this is a text that is out and the teachers tell us it is the best source they have ever had in science. That is what the teachers tell us, I mean, as a compendium of the scientific issues that are to be dealt with and imparted by way as knowledge.

So I have to say here that I am not proud of the fact that there are some errors here, but the teachers have passed judgment on that particular document, that reference, and I am led to believe that—and it is used, but there are other sources. I mean there is the Addison-Wesley science text that is used, the 1980 edition, and then, of course, the '84 edition of the same area. There is the Let's Find Out text published by D.C. Heath, Science 5/13, Heath Science Dimension, Science At Work series, Nuffield series. These are all other references and texts that are used in the middle years.

Again, that maybe is cause for concern because there is not a common document of reference. The principles of science have not changed a lot, but there are always new developments in that area. So we have supplemented the Grade 7 program with the major infusion of resources in the Rocks and Minerals Kit. I mean this is—as you can remember, the new minister of minerals, one of his first announcements was that whole area of minerals and rocks—catered towards Manitoba. That is how we try and supplement documents. Of course, one of the authors of that, believe it or not, was I believe Mr. Macek. I mean, he did a review of that particular piece of material. We are trying to do the right thing. We are trying to take into account the sensitivities and some of the weaknesses.

Beyond all, again I restate, if our students using that text or the others I have mentioned came away knowing 70 percent of the scientific theory in place, I mean, as the Minister of Education I would be overjoyed.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Acting Deputy Chairperson, so would I, especially if I knew that it was accurate information that they were in fact taking. I know it is a considerable amount of money. I believe it was somewhere around a half million dollars to purchase this particular textbook, to circulate it to all of the different schools so that it would become a part of the resources to teach this particular curriculum. The minister indicates that, well, we have known it, that I have not uncovered anything new, that the minister knows about the book, that it was brought to his attention a year or a year and a half ago.

I guess my question is, if you knew a year, a year and a half ago, two years, what has been done about rectifying the problem with this book? Has the minister, for example, had contact with the publisher of the book? The member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) suggested a refund.

An Honourable Member: No, a recall.

Mr. Lamoureux: A recall, I am sorry. Is there some sort of a factual where the errors are significant, some sort of a factual sheet going out to supplement the book so that all the Grade 7 teachers would be aware of some of the mistakes that are not necessarily acceptable or at least pointing out? For the average student, and I would even suggest, Mr. Acting Deputy Chairperson, for the adults, that when they look at printed material such as a textbook, they have confidence that what is in here is in fact accurate.

* (1530)

Mr. Manness: Mr. Acting Deputy Chairperson, it must be my problem. It must be a weakness that I have in communicating. I should go back to school.

The member for Inkster has difficulty either in understanding what I say or tunes out instantly when I begin to talk or thirdly is thinking of the next comment.

An Honourable Member: I think he is thinking of Question Period.

Mr. Manness: That is right. This is a precursor to Question Period tomorrow.

I said this: This was old news. This has been discussed. This has been discussed broadly and widely within education circles.

I said, and I repeat, that the publisher put out errata sheets that have gone to all the schools where that book exists. I said that, No. 1. I said there was a whole listing of other texts. There are many Grade 7 students who do not use that text, because that is not a prescribed provincial textbook. Some would argue there should be a prescribed text, but it is not. I dare say that is not used in many of our schools. Thirdly, there are other resources that are used by departments and I read the whole listing of them.

There are workshops and in those workshops we have identified some of the weaknesses. We asked teachers whether or not they are using that text. If they say yes, we indicate where some of the problems are. We have met the publisher. I said this, that we have met the publisher and we have asked him how it is that this could have happened—his responsibility—but more importantly, we said, what is going to happen next time. What process is in place so that it does not happen again? So we have set up a new process of text preparation.

That is the second time I have answered that question. I do not want to have to answer it a third.

Mr. Lamoureux: Maybe I can ask the minister in terms of the process that is in place to ensure that it does not happen again.

Mr. Manness: Sorry?

Mr. Lamoureux: Can the minister then indicate in terms of what process is in place to ensure that things of this nature are prevented in the future?

Mr. Manness: We are going to firstly, in the sense it is a pure Manitoba curriculum, in the sense that continues to happen and that will be happening less and less as we now work collaboratively as provinces, so you are going to have now many, many more people reviewing it within a regional context, but certainly we will be sending it outside

the province. If it is to the other provinces, or we will work on it together and then they will come back and forth, so you have many, many more people beginning to review these drafts.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Acting Deputy Chairperson, I wanted to pick up on something that the minister had earlier indicated about working with the provinces on this issue. I ask the minister, what is currently in place to facilitate discussions on sharing text book productions into the future?

Mr. Manness: Well, two issues, and I referred to them last night. We have a protocol with the western provinces and territories. That covers eight subject areas I believe, math and science being only two of them, distance education and a whole host of others I do not have them right before me. That protocol of course puts into place a mechanism to set up working committees so that there is work done on a continuing basis, and it assigns responsibilities to who will take leads and what years for a certain curriculum.

Then of course, within the broader context, within the Ministry of Education ministers across Canada, CMEC for short, we have the national test. We are looking, too, about now making more comparable curriculum across the land. Whether that is a result of regional blocks, Atlantic Canada, Quebec, Ontario and the West, basically four regions, making more compatible their curriculum, or whether it is done individually. I mean we are just beginning in the national context, but we all want to go to the same place but within regional blocks. In Atlantic Canada and western Canada today we have the mechanism in place to work together towards more of a common curriculum.

An Honourable Member: The Bloc Quebecois.

Mr. Manness: Oh, jeez, you are swift today, John.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Acting Deputy Chairperson, sticking with the region, can the minister indicate I guess the make-up to a certain extent or how that works? Does the minister make appointments? Is it just different departmental staff that sit down to review—the curriculum consultants? If I can just get the minister to comment in terms of how it is happening within the prairie region.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Acting Deputy Chairperson, certainly the co-ordination comes from the assistant deputy ministers across the western provinces and territories. For instance, to use math as an example, the working parties then would be responsible for developing the curriculum for making sure materials are published and an assessment of those materials before they are ultimately—developing the materials and then assessing before ultimate publishing.

The K to 12 are broken into three basic groupings: middle years, early years, senior years. Manitoba staff, to this point, in the math area has been a staffer from our department, and in most cases I would think would be a staff member from the department. It does not necessarily have to be that way. We may reach out to the field for somebody we know and ask them to give a year or two of their time, paid of course to represent Manitoba in the dialogue with the other western provinces and the territories.

Mr. Lamoureux: The working parties that the minister refers to, have there been any meetings since then of these working parties?

Mr. Manness: Oh, several, several, Mr. Acting Deputy Chairperson. As a matter of fact I am signing travel documents all the time, and certainly we are the furthest along in the process in the area of math, but we are also, and I am going to ask Carolyn to give me what other areas that we are actively working together—so the ADMs met three weeks ago. The math group has met once this year, aboriginal group had met in February, and this is all attempting to come together and set into place a reference mark and ultimately curriculum in these subjects.

Mr. Lamoureux: So are there then working parties that would be in place to cover the different subjects?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Acting Deputy Chairperson, that is what the protocol in place does, and that is why the ministers now are quickly trying to come together and set into place, motion these same types of activities in more subject areas. For instance, the distance education, especially computer-assistant learning projects have regular contact, and we are trying to move as quickly as

possible into other subject areas, including science and all of the other areas that are important to all of us.

Mr. Lamoureux: Does the minister have some sort of a time frame when he would see some sort of results coming out of this whole process? Is that part of the protocol?

* (1540)

Mr. Manness: Well, results are starting to come out now in mathematics, K-4. The '93 effort was a direct result of this process. I would hope by 1995, we will be beginning to have a steady flow of regionally developed curricular materials.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Acting Deputy Chairperson, I would ask the minister, does he see this then eventually working out that, for example, with a textbook, that it would at the very least be a prairie-oriented text material and possibly be all joint purchases or bulk purchases? I know the minister had made reference to that a bit earlier, and I wonder if maybe he could just comment in terms of what he sees as some of the benefits of having the Prairies working together on this.

Mr. Manness: Most definitely. I can think of 11, exactly 11, 10 and a half years ago when I ran for the leadership of our party. That was a basic plank of my leadership run at that particular point in time, so there is nothing particularly new here, but I want to indicate that never has the atmosphere been better in the willingness by certainly ministers, again, expressed as recently as today, to get on with this. Everybody is very happy with where we have gone so far, but to speed up the process, to deliver those materials even more quickly than has been the norm.

Mr. Lamoureux: I am wondering if the minister could indicate whether or not there is something that is going to be more of a permanent structure. I refer to some of the discussions I have had on the concept of prairie integration, for example, where there would be offices located in one province that would deal with the three provinces on a particular issue. Is there that sort of a discussion that is taking place where there is a centralization of some of the resources from all three interested provinces?

Mr. Manness: Well, Mr. Acting Deputy Chairperson, the member should really pose that question to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon). I can tell the member, offices are tenth in line of things that have to happen before you meaningfully move on. There has to be basically the will there. I sense there is today in larger measure.

For instance, when the University of Alberta closes its school of dentistry and today is trying to buy spaces in other areas, that may be a hard action in one province. I can tell you, provinces had better come up to speed and decide—per the discussion we had last night with the member for Wolseley—what their expertise is because within the prairie context not all of us can do it all.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Acting Deputy Chairperson, I was wanting to pick up on where I started off, with respect to the curriculum office itself. The minister had indicated, I believe, that there were 31 staff people. I wonder if you could indicate the actual breakdown, or I guess that might be better off if we wait till we get to that department. I will put a pass on that.

Mr. Plohman: Mr. Acting Deputy Chairperson, I am going to leave the extensive discussions on some of the government priorities to the second line, which was Reform. I think actually under Reform we could probably discuss the whole works, at least this whole branch, and therefore I was going to leave it to there. I just had one question on this line dealing with administration, and that is dealing with the consultation and communication with education stakeholders, shareholders and the general public what the major priorities and primary functions here are at the present time. What kinds of particular tasks are ongoing in this area right at the present time and what are the priorities for the minister and for his department in this area?

(Mr. Deputy Chairperson in the Chair)

Mr. Manness: We are meeting quite regularly with the stakeholders and laying before them our interpretation firstly of some of the things that they have said in the past publicly and reinforced privately, trying to meld it with our general view and desire to see a greater focus on some certain areas. Of course, there is fallout from that with

respect to governance issues. So we are taking the lead as the province but looking for reaction from the stakeholders in a half dozen, if not more, major areas. We have covered about half of those areas in fair detail and will continue to follow that process, hopefully yet for several weeks.

Mr. Plohman: Is the minister talking about his own consultations with MAST, MASS and MTS, or are there other parallel things happening besides those direct consultations that the minister is having with the senior people from those organizations?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I am talking about the former, my own consultation, as far as the division after the reorganization, and certainly the assistant deputy minister and her staff are attempting, in the field, to explain the organization of the new schools program division and of course how the regional teams will interact with the field. We are out in two, I would say, related but unrelated areas. I am out doing reform and the assistant deputy minister, of course, in regional meetings, scheduled to explain the reorganizations, has completed one to this point in time. Another is tomorrow and the rest scheduled through May and early June, to explain the renewed emphasis with respect to programming.

Mr. Plohman: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, we will get into that book and the reorganization in some detail in the next lines of the department, but I wanted to find out what is happening here. The minister is saying that he is meeting with the senior people of these organizations and, of course, there was the forum, I guess, would have come under this particular area, the responsibility of this area in terms of planning, is that correct, as part of the consultations?

Yes, just a couple of questions on that forum, Mr. Deputy Chairperson. The minister was rather surprised that I would find anything to criticize in that forum. It was just such a super day. Everything was so great. There is not anything that you could possibly say that could be negative. I mean, that is the way he reacted in the House anyway. I was wondering—

An Honourable Member: Oh, you are paraphrasing. You had me worried for a minute.

Mr. Plohman: Yes, well I can see why you might be worried. The minister did say that he felt there was not really much that could be criticized.

An Honourable Member: Right.

Mr. Plohman: Well, we expect that from Jack.

On that, there were a few things, and I just want to ask the minister, I mean, I did address the concerns I had about the freedom. There are two different consultations—I guess I should back up a bit—one where there is a specific agenda and the minister wants reaction to that agenda. Another would be more wide open where there would be a kind of brainstorming on issues and prioritization of those issues so that the parents would decide what the important issues would be. I did not feel there was much time for that as the program was structured. The minister said, well, on question seven there was room for that, except that it referenced the issues raised in the other questions as opposed to making it wide open. So I do not know whether it was as wide open as the minister would have led us to believe.

I thought one of the things that was not covered there in terms of the minister's actions was this issue of how education should be funded. I guess maybe the minister thought that was a little complicated or maybe he just did not want to deal with it because it would draw attention to the fact that there had been some cuts the last couple of years and he would rather not talk about that. As he said, it is not an issue wherever he goes.

* (1550)

I thought that might have come forward if the minister had made it more wide open. That would have definitely been an issue that the parents would have felt was an important issue.

The other criticism I might have of that day of the program was the invitations to it—I guess not the program, but the invitations to it. I did get a letter sent to me from a school division, which had been sent by the minister to the principals of schools. That letter the minister sent out on April 8, and the criticism they had about it, and it may not be as valid as some would think. It may be valid, and the minister may want to comment as to

whether it was a deliberate choice of words or perhaps just an oversight.

He specifically asked the principal to hand out the application forms to those who requested them as opposed to perhaps encouraging the principal to select parents that he knew would have opinions on education, who have been involved in the parents' councils and so on and maybe would have been good representatives of the schools.

I think that would have been the way to do it in a democratic way to ensure kind of a broad cross section. This leaves it open to perhaps parents being approached by the minister's staff or others to say pick up an application and go to this and represent your school at this forum as opposed to coming from the bottom up. If the minister feels that is not a valid criticism, I would appreciate his comments on that. I thought it was worth raising with him because it was brought to my attention, and I believe the minister could have been more open in terms of his suggestions to principals as to how these people could be selected.

Mr. Manness: Well, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I beg to differ with the member. Firstly, I must indicate that 90 percent of the people who applied to come, if not 95 percent, were unknown to me or my political staff.

An Honourable Member: Are known or are not?

Mr. Manness: Are not—are unknown. So I do not know whether the member said that we went out to try and fudge—he did not say that, and I am putting words in his mouth. I dare say, around this question of not encouraging principals to go out and select parents, I mean to me that would have been—if that is what he means by bottom up, that the principals should do that, I say nonsense.

I tried to get this publicized, but I guess I can be criticized for doing one thing. I can be criticized, as I told somebody in the Liberal Party, I think, for not spending \$30,000 or \$40,000 in buying ads for greater publicity. I think that is what it would have cost us. I refuse to do that.

An Honourable Member: I was not criticizing you.

Mr. Manness: No, but some would, and that is because of my nature.

I just could not see scarce dollars to buy ads which then would have been—I pleaded with the media to make this as a public service announcement so that parents everywhere would have fair access to the knowledge that there was a forum going to be held, and all they had to do was go to the local school and pick up a form, not with the cajoling, not with the prompting of a principal, not with the prompting of a trustee, but to just purely go down if they were interested at all. Believe it or not, most did, and I do not know what can be a purer system. I would have to think that if principals were going to do the prompting that that would be less pure than the system that we followed. I think the system we followed was the best under the circumstances.

Mr. Plohman: I would just differ with the minister in that. I think there could have been some balance between the two. Certainly parents, principals and teachers would know from their experience in working with it, particularly in areas where there are active parent councils, where they have been involved, would know who the people are that take an interest in this kind of thing, are involved and want to be involved, have good opinions or are willing to express their opinions, that kind of thing in terms of input. [interjection] Well, I am just saying that if he is going to the principals, that might have been suggested to them to try to solicit some.

I just wanted to ask the minister how he has responded to the criticism that was levelled from, at least the Dauphin Ochre School Board. I do not know if it came from others. It is not something that they approached me with. It is something that I saw in the paper that was discussed, and that is the fact that those people who would have to come from a great distance would, because of the early start, have to come in the night before, and there was no provision made for their expenses. Of course the criticism was on that basis then, was the government really sincere about having people come from greater distances?

Well, something we all face in committees of any kind in any organization that is provincially based is, how do you balance your representation geographically? It is always expensive to do that,

but it is a criticism that has been brought forward, and I just want to ask the minister whether that was addressed in any way or whether he considers in retrospect that that should have been dealt with considering that the minister did not have forums all over the province? There was just one in the city of Winnipeg.

Mr. Manness: Well, I am sensitive to that criticism but, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I want to indicate to you that out of the 450, I do not know what the final tally was and maybe my assistant can list them. Of the between 400 and 500 people who were there, I am led to believe that a strong 40-45 percent were rural based and they were scattered pretty symmetrically across rural school divisions.

Now, not every school division was represented. There were a couple of school divisions that did not have their prorated accurate number, but most rural school divisions did. The wonder of it, and Mr. Thompson tells me now that of the 50 or 60 people who are eligible for the \$40 subsidy, only 20 so far, and indeed I would have to think that very few additional would be coming, applied for subsidy. I just found this out. That says an awful lot about the commitment from the people who came in, because they came in their distance and I did not cover all the costs, I recognized, of somebody putting in gas and maybe spending the night over, but we had some individuals who stayed with friends and all that, and let me say with respect to item No. 7, and this is where the member started on the forum, yes, the way the question was phrased, it sort of gave an indication that you should comment on the numbers before. Two-thirds of the people there filled out those sheets, and I can tell you, their comments were all over the map. They did not feel restricted to talk specifically about the comments that were there. They were everywhere.

Mr. Plohman: Since the minister raises that, that was one of the criticisms that I heard, was that the final summation did not provide any reference to so many of those comments, and that is difficult to do in summarizing. I hope that in subsequent summaries, the liberty that delegates took to in fact provide advice on areas that were unsolicited will

be considered and that they will be listed, and indications will be made as to what action the government is taking on those, because I am sure there were some common themes.

I just want to say one other thing to the minister. He might want to check with his Conservative candidate who sits on the school board in Dauphin, to ask him about where this came from and this concern. Is this an isolated concern from the Dauphin, well—[interjection] The new one, yes, yes, Gord Ryz. Yes, he is on the school board, and it is kind of ironic that it is that school board that is raising this concern about a—as a matter of fact, they indicate they are sending off a letter to the minister to express their dismay. I do not know if the Minister has that letter yet, but this is apparently coming.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I am prepared to pass this line and get on to the Education Reform line.

Mr. Manness: I will not react to the members because I want to pass this line too, but I just think I want the record to show that out of the 400 people who registered for the forum, 45 percent were from rural and northern Manitoba.

* (1600)

Mr. Plohman: Again, it depends on the geographic representation. The distances being great, maybe there would have obviously been less from further distances. I just wanted to ask the minister, though, one question on the questionnaire, and we referenced this yesterday, why he felt the issue of involvement should be linked with choice in Question 3, because it seems to be a leading question, as if to say: Well, if you want to be involved, you should have a choice of schools, and then how would you get choice? And it leads the discussion in that line.

It says: Do you agree or disagree with parents having more involvement and choice in the school to which they send the children? I have no problem with the issue of involvement, but why is choice linked as if it is synonymous or has a major role in involvement?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, we recognized the weakness around that question or the lack of clarity around that just before the

conference. As I recall, because I was part of the discussion, Dr. Anderson asked the facilitators that when they came to that question, they take choice to mean much more than just choice of location but choice of programming also, and that the emphasis of that question should be directed to choice of programming. I am hoping that occurred in most of the breakout sessions. I acknowledge that comment, and we tried to correct that shortcoming right that day.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson: Item 2.(a)(2) Other Expenditures \$49,300—pass.

2.(b) Education Reform (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$505,400.

Mr. Plohman: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the \$2,250,000 that we are talking about here is referenced in the budget. I wanted to ask the minister for a breakdown of that, a further indication of where and how the money would be spent. Could the minister do that? Is it the same as was put into the press release dealing with \$300,000 for apprenticeship training, \$650,000 for curriculum development, \$750,000 for a pilot project in distance education and so on, and is there a further breakdown from that if that is part of it?

Mr. Manness: No, there is no further breakdown, but we certainly have greater definition around those points, as I referenced in that press release. For instance, what we are talking about is basically nine positions. Six of those will be in the curriculum framework area. We are also talking about one in the library linkages area, and then trying to integrate in the curriculum this whole focus on identification, acquisition, development of new media courseware. By that, we mean integrating computer software print, video and other emerging technologies, in other words, trying to prepare ourselves for curriculum in the new distance education technology area, two staff positions there.

Those are where the human resources are going to be, but still there will be some pilot projects put into distance education. We are hoping to do a provincial special education review again in the area, naturally, of special ed and some other study

in the middle years. So that is where we contemplate using the \$2.25 million.

Mr. Plohman: The minister talks about nine staff. Are all the previously vacant positions in the branches that are now encompassed within this section under reorganization to be filled and then nine additional staff added?

Mr. Manness: No, these are not shifts. These are new positions, and those who were on the redeployment list as a result of decisions taken on previous budgets have an opportunity to apply for these positions.

Mr. Plohman: What about the existing positions? I understand with this reorganization that has taken place, from looking at the spreadsheets and at the Estimates book and so on, that the Child Care and Development Branch, the Curriculum Branch, the Distance Education branch, have all disappeared and replaced with the branches that are listed here. Are there other branches that have disappeared? What is the comparison of the staff allocated for each under the new organization versus the old? Where will the reform staff be housed?

Mr. Manness: This is a stand-alone unit, although obviously the subject material that I have referenced would dictate that this unit is going to have to work closely with other human resources within the department.

The member asked about what are the nets. You built here but you probably made reductions elsewhere within this major division, and the net through all the changes is a reduction of one and a half staff years.

Mr. Plohman: So we have an additional \$2.25 million in this area, but we have a net reduction of one and a half staff. Well, the increase overall of the whole area is about \$500,000.

Mr. Manness: In the whole division.

Mr. Plohman: In the whole division and one and a half fewer staff, but \$2.25 million allocated to education reform with nine staff attached to it.

Mr. Manness: The member is correct.

Mr. Plohman: Well then, just because Education Reform is so broad, and I think that for the purpose of discussion there are many areas that we can

discuss, I wanted to discuss some of the staffing changes as a result of the reorganization.

Can the minister indicate what has become of the positions that were vacated and how they are being filled at the present time? Is there still an industrial arts consultant? Is there still a guidance consultant? Is there still a phys ed consultant, English as a second language and a co-ordinator for heritage language programs? The director, Gail Bagnell's spot, who is doing that right now?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Deputy Chair, if the member wants to bear with me, I will try and give him an indication of basically what has happened. The division administration started with four, but there has been a reduction of one, and that one has gone to Program Development. So within the administration of the division we are down now to three.

I will start again, Mr. Deputy Chair. The administration once was four in total, now it is five. We sent one to Program Development, but we brought in one from Distance Ed and Technology and one from Student Services. So four, building to five, that is the administration side.

Curriculum Services—in that area we started with 47, but we reduced it by four to 43. Of those 43, now 12 are in Assessment and Evaluation; 13 and a fraction are in Program Development; two are in program implementation administration; 10 are provincial specialists; two are in the South East region and four are in the Winnipeg region. You add up all of those and you come to again a total of 43 within Curriculum Services.

* (1610)

Native Education has remained unchanged, although there is a split-out, if the member wants, of 13 before, and now they have split into Native Education directorate, three; three have gone into the Program Development area; two have gone to the South Central region; four have gone in—and this will make the member happy—the Parklands-Westman region and one into the North region. So that is where the 13 have now gone.

Child Care and Development—there originally were 62.5 positions, but there has been a reduction of one and one-half, so now there are 61 positions.

These 61, under the new reorg, 41.5 of them have gone to Student Services, two to Program Development, eight to provincial specialists area, two to the South Central, two and a half to the South East, three to the Parklands-Westman region and two to the North. Adding up all those numbers comes to 61, again, the total complement under the reorganized Child Care and Development area.

Instructional Resources—originally there were 31 but one has been allocated to provincial specialists, leaving within the Planning Implementation, the new category, 30. It used to be called Instructional Resources, now it is called IRB, Instructional Resources Branch Planning Implementation, so that is the complement now of 30.

Distance Education—under the old system 38 positions, two and a half have been reduced, leaving a net basically of 35.5. Those now are allocated this way. One went to the division administration and we talked about that earlier, nine have gone into Program Development, four in provincial specialists, one has gone to the South Central, two to the South East, one to Winnipeg, one to the Parklands-Westman region, one to Instructional Resources Implementation and 15.5 in the distance delivery implementation branches which would be Winkler. That is 15. That is where the core mass of that Distance Ed thrust is centralized. So again, that is the 35.5 positions.

There is one other area and that is the Student Support. Originally there were nine in that branch. There has been a reduction of one, leaving a total of eight. One of them is in the division administration, two are in the Program Development, four are in Winnipeg and one in the Parklands-Westman region for a total of eight. That now makes up the total complement of staff within the division, a total of 274.

I would just like, if the member does not mind, to give a brief introduction to the reorganization. The seven branches I have just talked about, each with a particular focus and with responsibilities for development, implementation and assessment functions for the specific focus area, are what we used to have. Now we have reconfigured existing staff into three main branches as well as several

units as identified below. The branches are Program Development, Program Implementation and Student Services.

The Program Development area will bring together staff and functions involved in all aspects of curricula and material development. We have spent most of today talking about the Program Development area.

Program Implementation will bring together all the staff and functions involved in the implementation of programs at the school and school division levels.

The third area is Student Services, comprises most of what formerly was known as the Child Care and Development Branch with the exception of most of the provincial special education consultants and the regional co-ordinators. Also, the financial officer from the Manitoba School for the Deaf becomes part of the financial administration team. What we have tried to do, quite frankly and most simply, is to just try and remove some of the labels and some of the confusion and to put it into basically areas that are digestible by anybody who peers in or is interested.

Furthermore, an Assessment and Evaluation unit and a Native Education directorate will be attached to the assistant deputy minister's office. That, of course, involves the relocation of a significant number of staff from 1181 Portage Avenue to 1970 Ness. That is happening right now. As a matter of fact, I was at Ness last week and I could still see some of the manifestation of the moving with all of the boxes. Basically in Education we are trying to take three buildings and ultimately take them down to two. Of course, we have talked about how it is we plan to book the savings on the lease cost for the whole department.

The reorganization also involves the establishment of regional teams to serve all areas of the province. It integrates the program development functions with respect to curriculum, technology, aboriginal content, resource-based learning, multicultural and antiracist education, diverse learning needs of students, and again, there was focus in these issue areas here earlier on.

Again, I guess I double underline the word "integration," because it is bad enough when departments of government begin to set up their own barriers and there is not a lot of cross fertilization that occurs between them. It is unspeakable when divisions and departments and, beyond that, branches within divisions begin to set up their own areas. So what we have attempted to do here through this change, in part, is to break down some of those barriers. Again, I insist that staff recognize that if we work together in an integrated fashion, obviously, we will provide a better product.

Program Development will produce a curriculum framework. It incorporates learner outcomes and standards. Again, this is one of the building areas of ed reform. We have talked a lot about it, and I am sure we will want to talk more about it. Program Development will produce a curriculum framework that incorporates learner outcomes and standards.

A major thrust will be a response to the Distance Education Task Force Report with regard to the development of curriculum-based technology. Again, as we have talked about the \$2.25 million, the member indicated where two staff at this point, but more to come—because I have told Treasury Board that we will need more resources in this to make ready our curriculum to make it applicable and usable on the network, on the information highway, if you will, to use a name.

* (1620)

The Native Education directorate will be a unit within the assistant deputy minister's office to ensure the needed attention to aboriginal issues. This is a mandate that has come more directly, if not indirectly, from the Premier's Office, again wanting those units within all our departments with a responsibility towards providing services to natives within our province to have a greater direct opportunity to be heard at these higher levels.

Also a greater emphasis and expectation will be placed on staff to work with schools and parents. Again, this is a thrust of the whole ed reform package that we will be making public. We are going to be expecting that school communities, if we are going to give them not necessarily powers,

but a greater focus, that there is going to have to be in place a fostering mechanism from the department, not to tell them what to do, but tell them how it is to organize if they so choose to want to do that.

A new focus area will include, of course, a program evaluation framework. The discussion last night was around the word "effectiveness." Well, surely, programs, basic education—I use that word—core area education, however you want to talk about it, surely it too should be measured in some measure of effectiveness, how well it is delivering. We are going to have to begin to build a framework to evaluate what it is we are contemplating in the new thrust.

An expectation, of course, will also be to work with school divisions and regions to set priorities for service delivery. We are going to be called into obviously taking the lead with school divisions and implementing the conclusions of ed reform. Lastly, but not necessarily the final statement, establish processes and procedures to ensure that we engage in continuous improvement. That is internal scrutiny of our own activity.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I hope that with the detail provided firstly and secondly in overview we have tried to lay before the committee the intent and indeed the expectations of the reorganization within the division.

Mr. Plohman: I thank the minister for that detail.

Would he say that all of that information is in here in this booklet in one form or another, the booklet I imagine that the assistant deputy minister is out consulting and informing the public about or the partners?

Mr. Manness: The macronumbers are there obviously, but it has not been itemized in that fashion. That is why I deliberately took the time and the effort to make it part of the record.

Mr. Plohman: Yes, it is part of the record, but it is not as concise as the sheet that the minister was working from. Is there any problem with just distributing that particular sheet on the staffing changes? I know I took notes, but I do not trust them as being as accurate as I would like them to be.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, no, it is part of the record. We will provide that, but we want to provide a better copy than that. We have just torn it out.

Mr. Plohman: I thank the minister for that undertaking.

Just to go back to my first question though, insofar as consultants for subject areas, are we going to see that concept continued under this new configuration and to the same extent? Is there going to be more?

I understand, for example, a couple of years ago there were two math consultants and now there is only one; there were two science consultants and now it is down to one; language arts had four and it is down to one. Is some of the work that these people were doing going to be included in the regional teams as opposed to consultants that are centrally located as subject consultants so the integrated approach absorbs some of those people? Can the minister explain that a bit?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, my attitude is, first of all, that we probably have to shift the emphasis a little bit from development to implementation. I am only talking with respect to numbers within the department. I am very mindful of the development work that needs to be done.

As I dialogued previously with the questions, we expect that to become a greater shared responsibility as between provincial jurisdictions. Therefore, we do not have the need necessarily, certainly within some of the core areas, to try and resurrect what we had in the past if indeed we are not going to be working to a purely Manitoba curriculum. So I am holding in abeyance the filling, and I have deliberately, of the developmental side, but there is no question on the implementation side.

We have to now take the regional concept that we have built into the reorganization, and we have to give higher priority to the staffing of those positions, because we have to do a better job in the field in carrying forward the message. That is why there is a slight shift of focus. We still have to do both. I mean the development will only occur within the province. It will be a team-shared

responsibility because of the protocols we have in place. We will also have to give greater focus to computer-assisted learning development and that area so we have applications ready for distance delivery.

I guess to answer a question specifically put by the member here about 10 or 15 minutes ago about are you going to replace the specific consultants within the area of physical education, and I forget all the areas, I have to say in their order of priorities, that those areas I still will hold unfilled for a period of time because the higher priority still is in the side of implementation and development within the course subjects.

Mr. Plohman: Would the minister, being quite straightforward, say that he has not, in conjunction with his staff, determined which consultants specifically will be replaced and which ones will not? Would that be fair to say that has not been determined? The minister said he wants to keep them open in terms of priorities. I do not understand whether that means additional people dedicated to these teams will in fact take those positions.

I know the minister is consulting with his staff. He knows very well, for example, and I am not saying that this is the highest priority for replacement, but the minister has received a lot of letters with regard to the phys ed consultant.

I was talking with the heritage language Nepal representative groups at the forum that they had last Friday night. They indicated to me that one person had talked with the minister and said that he did not get near as many letters about the vacancy in heritage language as they did in phys ed.

It is interesting though whether this is the kind of gauge that the minister is going to use as to whether it should be replaced or not. I mean they were concerned that the minister was perhaps inadvertently or deliberately measuring the importance of the two by the number of letters he got.

He knows very well that there can be organized responses to certain decisions and that in other areas people may have just as great a concern, but

they may not have chosen to manifest it in the same way.

I would be concerned as well if the minister is starting to pick and choose now between the two and gauging it by how many letters he received. I think all of those are important, and I just wondered if the minister has replaced some of those now and whether those positions are in fact going to be filled. It is just a matter of knowing whether they are going to be filled or not, so the public knows.

* (1630)

Mr. Manness: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, it is important that the member remind himself or remember something that was said earlier on. We still have a guideline of 5 percent vacancy. I mean, that is a general guideline. Right today, if he wants to know what priority we have in place to fill, right today it is to fill the regional implementation teams. That today is No. 1.

If letters were going to drive me to make decisions, I would have to have three or four consultants in physical education because I have never ever seen so many letters on an issue. Yet I have to follow my own plan, and that is the regional teams are where the focus has to be.

Beyond that, the vacancies, yes, there is a vacancy in the consultant in the special ed area; there is a vacancy in the English language arts area. But when the member talks about heritage languages, in the languages area we have Tony Tavares who is supposed to be covering that. That is a combination of languages in the antiracist thrust that we are trying to deal with. [interjection]

But again, through these amalgamations, I mean things change, and as I have said for the record, those are the thrusts. Heritage language, yes, as a consultant, as you said. Physical education, now we have asked Joyce MacMartin to sort of try and do double duty, and she has now become the contact in that area; and the gifted area, Dennis Lucas.

Mr. Plohman: What we find though is that they are doubling up now or tripling up on these things rather than having separate consultants for each area. If that is a conscious decision, then that is a

decision that is going to be left in place, or it is just temporary, while the vacancies are sitting there. That is what I am trying to find out from the minister, whether this is something that he sees as being maintained in the foreseeable future, or is it just a matter of getting by until the vacancies can be filled?

Mr. Manness: No, I see this, in all honesty, continuing for some period of time. I have listed the priorities. Of course, a new priority is the nine staff positions that have gone into the Ed Reform side. That is where the priorities are today.

Mr. Plohman: Well, just a quick question on that. Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I do not think that the nine new positions would fall under the vacancy rate. This would be an addition. These would be separate from the existing 5 percent.

Mr. Manness: No, it is hard to factor 5 percent of nine, but this is a complement within the total department, and so it is the number of nine factored into the base.

Mr. Plohman: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the minister said that the priority will be the regional implementation teams, that is, to fill. Can he give us an idea what they will be made up of? What kind of specialists, what kind of people will form a team?

Mr. Manness: Well, let us say, I guess the team, for instance, in the Parkland Region would be made of—again, it is just a detail provided. There would be four individuals who would be focusing on Native Education, who are curriculum consultants; there would be one regional co-ordinator; there would be one technology technician, who is a material consultant; three administrative secretarial support positions; and then always, of course, an opportunity for some casual support. So the Parklands-Westman regional team would theoretically involve nine people.

An Honourable Member: Plus casuals.

Mr. Manness: Yes.

Mr. Plohman: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, how many of those would be located in Brandon?

(Mr. Bob Rose, Acting Deputy Chairperson, in the Chair)

Mr. Manness: Mr. Acting Deputy Chairperson, I can understand why the member asked the question. Certainly, our intent is to keep those that are in Brandon in Brandon and those that are presently in Dauphin in Dauphin.

Mr. Plohman: Then maybe I can get some clarification now. How many of these are new positions, not just renamed positions? I take it the majority of those are existing positions; they are just being amalgamated and renamed as a team.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Acting Deputy Chairperson, I have to point out to the member that we are not adding people; we are doing a reorganization. The only people that were added would be on the Ed Reform side. So, again, I asked that the global numbers were down within the division ones. We are not adding new people; we have done a reorganization, with no impact to Dauphin and/or Brandon, using the example we have been using.

Mr. Plohman: What I was asking, Mr. Acting Deputy Chairperson, was whether there was any decentralization, because you could see that, if you are going to have regional teams, maybe some of the centrally located consultants would be moved out to be part of these teams. I thought maybe that was a component of decentralization involved in this.

Mr. Manness: There is nothing to stop us from looking at that in the future. That was not the purpose here. As a matter of fact, we try to do this with the least disruption as possible to individuals. I think we are successful in keeping everybody in their existing location.

Mr. Plohman: Insofar as the enhanced Curriculum Development of \$650,000 of the \$2.25 million, if the minister has given us this already, I apologize; if he has not, how is he going to spend the \$650,000? There is existing staff, so is this going to be used to hire consultants from outside government to help develop this curriculum?

Mr. Manness: It almost splits down half and half, salaries of the six people plus other expenditures, and the other expenditures, of course, will be under the old system to call people in from the field and pick up their salaries, and/or, of course, the growing emphasis on working and the costs

associated working with other provinces and jurisdictions.

Mr. Plohman: Yes, out of the nine staff, then, six additional staff are going to be in the curriculum area, and their salaries will be paid from the \$650,000; in addition to that, additional dollars into working committees and for interprovincial work and development.

I have to ask the minister, then, why he needs perhaps \$100,000 or \$200,000, I guess I am just guessing, as of the half of the \$650,000 that it will go towards those committees. How much of it will go to those working committees, and why did he need a major increase here if this has been an ongoing effort by the department? Have there been major cutbacks in these working committees over the last couple of years that now have to be replaced with new money?

* (1640)

Mr. Manness: I guess, by definition, there have been reductions. We have always said that we were going to begin to dismantle this section and rebuild it. We have done that by design, but still the greatest amount of the money the member references would be towards the much additional costs associated with working at a distance now in development. Of course, there is also the advent of the technology, the Distance Ed side, too, which has additional costs. We have had to put a factor in here not with complete certainty, but when we are moving into this new realm of technology, we put this money aside to deal with the contingencies as they come forward.

Mr. Plohman: Mr. Acting Deputy Chairperson, perhaps I misunderstood then in reading the press release; it refers to \$650,000 for curriculum and then has another \$750,000 for Distance Ed. Now the minister has included reference to Distance Ed in answering the question regarding the \$650,000. So is there some part of that \$650,000 going towards Distance Ed as well?

Mr. Manness: The answer is to the affirmative. Yes, the \$750,000 referenced in the press release was more directed to specific pilots as they are developed.

Mr. Plohman: Okay, could I ask the minister some questions about the consultation? Am I to understand from the information in the discussion paper, in the book's School Programs division section, which have been used to explain the new organization to those concerned, whatever the case may be—am I to understand that there was a consultation process with the stakeholders, as we call them? Maybe the minister could tell me how long a period of time, and was it formal surveys, was it meetings, was it a combination of those? What else did it involve over the last—how long a period of time?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Acting Deputy Chairperson, it lasted basically two months, those being May and June '93, a year ago. I can read into the record a series of dialogues and consultations that were held with the key stakeholders so that they could receive information about strengths of the current service delivery and to articulate areas for improvement.

The management team of the division studied the results of the consultations and the recommendations of the business education think tank sponsored by the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce and the Distance Education Task Force Report. Relevant literature as well as information on a variety of government issues was also reviewed and considered.

So the reorganization design was developed based on the findings of the above consultations and reviews. The management team of the division was involved throughout the design process. Now once approval to proceed with implementation of the organization was granted—in other words, once government approval was given—all members of the management team were advised and informed of the acting appointments to the two new director positions. This took place on April 11, 1994.

On April 12, a meeting was held with all the members of the divisional leadership team for the new structure of this team, which, of course, comprises the directors and all the co-ordinators within the new structure. On April 14 and 15, all staff within the division were advised of the reorganization and of their individual placement

within the division. On April 19, senior staff and directors in other divisions of the department attended an information session.

On April 21, a ministerial letter with attachments providing an overview of the reorganization was sent to the education organizations. Staff relocations from 1181 Portage to 1970 Ness took place from April 18th to the 20th, and informational meetings will also be scheduled with stakeholder organizations in May and June. It has been basically a one-year exercise.

Mr. Plohman: I thank the minister for that information. Insofar as the initial consultation, he mentioned a business forum of some kind and a Distance Education Task Force. Did I miss that there were also formal consultations with MTS, MAST, MASS and so on and with teachers in the field?—because they work with the Curriculum Services Branch so closely and then for services. Were they consulted as well?

Mr. Manness: What can you do other than going to the representative of all teachers, that being the Manitoba Teachers' Society? Of course, they have an incredible organization to get that information done. That is what we did.

Mr. Plohman: It was done through the formal structures as opposed to surveys of teachers and things like that directly?

Mr. Manness: Yes, it was.

Mr. Plohman: I find that some of the results of the consultations bear out some of the concerns that I have held for some time and also would seem to need some answering, at least some addressing by the minister. For example, it was stated that communication between and among all division staff, schools, educational organizations as well as other interested groups and the public needs to be improved; that is one of the problems.

So I guess we look at that and say there have been some inadequacies there. I do not know whom we point to as to why that exists. But the one that does give me some trouble is the seventh one that says: There is a need to rebuild an atmosphere, rebuild an atmosphere that allows for freer discussion and trust amongst all the players in the education system as well as with the public.

Now, I just wondered whether this is a reference to some deterioration of that insofar as government actions, or is this something the minister would attribute to a failing between organizations separate from the government? Does he take some blame in the fact that this has to be rebuilt? When was it torn down?

The ministers prior to him, I believe the minister that was in place last year and the previous minister, under this government, have said they have been consulting. Is it a fact that this dialogue showed that in fact it was not realistic consultation on important areas, that there was a gap, that the government was lacking in real consultation with the shareholders, with the stakeholders in education?

Mr. Manness: Well, we are moving into very sensitive areas here now. I mean, I honestly believe that the ministry and the department—I sense at least that there has been a cooler relationship between the department and the field. There are many reasons for that, not the least of which is the state of education today in the province and everywhere for that matter. We are caught up in a lot of reform. Our government, yes, has done a lot of consulting out there. We have brought forward a lot of studies and analyses. There has been meaningful input, unquestionably, to all of those efforts.

Through that time, though, there has been a wanting of decision making which has not occurred, because we have always been feeding into the larger model. That is not the fault of the department. If there is going to be blame of portion, I guess, you can portion some of that to the government, because this takes time. These are significant policy matters. You just do not come in one day and know how it is you are going to reinvent education or reform it. I mean, this takes significant input. During this time, I sensed there has been through this period of uncertainty, and leading up to that, when there may have been more of a heavy-handed central approach, there has been a straining of relationships.

(Mr. Deputy Chairperson in the Chair)

I acknowledge that, and that is what, of course, the reorganization is attempting to do. It is

attempting to put a fresh face to government outreach. Beyond that, it is also trying to do that in sync with the ed reform. That is why it is timely. So, yes, it is important that there be a trust re-established.

Do I say that there may be a lack of one now and it is all our fault? Absolutely not, I will not accept that. This is built over decades, but it is something that we might as well face and we might as well try and deal with. Part of the reorganization, the effort of the organization was maybe directed towards that goal.

Mr. Plohman: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I am sure the department will be trying very hard to rebuild this atmosphere. I think, of course, as the minister knows, he has to take leadership in it. Perhaps with a blueprint, as the minister says, the intentions of the government will be more clear, and therefore there can begin to perhaps be an atmosphere of trust built again.

I think that whether the minister wants to admit it or not, perhaps there has been some lack of trust in the government's motives and maybe a lack of understanding of the direction that the government was going to take. There has been some, as we would like to call it in opposition, drifting and lack of direction. The minister does not have to feel that he has to take that personally. He was not in the portfolio at that particular time. If he was drifting for the first few months, well, then perhaps he wants to take it personally.

* (1650)

The other things that I would perhaps attribute to it, and the minister may want to make a comment about it, are the funding cutbacks that may have destroyed a large part of the good will because of the impact that they had. I have said, and I believe it to be true, the way that they have been impacting divisions, from division to division, I think there is a lot of disarray, confusion out there. Some divisions have been hit much harder than others with the impact. The teachers and the school divisions have felt the impacts differently. Perhaps what we are dealing with here is more than just the communication between the department and the program development area that we are talking about, but really the government in general. That is

what I am asking about here. Is this really something that the minister and policies of the government in education can accept some blame for, or whether it is just a matter of the uncertainty about change in education?

I think it is more than that. I think it is some lack of direction by the government, the funding cutbacks that led to this. I propose that to the minister. He may not want to agree with that, but I would hope that he would at least be accepting of some of that—and we could call his predecessors or himself—blame and be realistic enough to understand that funding cutbacks tend to have that kind of impact if in fact they are not done fairly and explained well and consultations take place prior.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I categorically reject the member's inference and indeed his conclusions. All organizations today, public and private, of course, if they were at all responsive to their clients' needs, I would tell you, are looking internally at their operations and are changing.

I cannot think of any today in the real world that are not. I cannot think of many households today that are not reacting to the reality of the times. The member can say, well, maybe it is a funding issue, and that is what is eating away or eroding the spirit and therefore the willingness to work more closely together. I do not expect anybody to be particularly happy, but today, if you are a professional today, if you are a professional, I do not care if you are a hockey player, I do not care who you are, you have to fight at the moment to get the best you can. After you do not succeed or if you do not succeed to the level you would like as a professional, you get on with the task.

That is the definition of a professional, and I cast no aspersions on teachers or superintendents, politicians. I guess, I say, we all fall under that same umbrella. When it comes to a funding issue, yes, sometimes these decisions are hard to swallow, but if you are a professional, you swallow it and you move on, and that is what a professional is.

Mr. Plohman: It is interesting, the minister's definition of a professional. I think that would still

have a component, impact on the general atmosphere of consultation, but if the minister really wants to talk about professionals, and I will just digress for a moment, he wants to deduct one two-hundredths of a teacher's salary under Bill 22 for each date out of the classroom, yet by definition, a professional puts in a lot of additional time and has greater responsibilities than just the time that is spent in the classroom. Yet when they are told to stay home for one day, they are deducted one two-hundredths of their salary as if they are not paid for anything else that goes beyond what they do in the classroom.

As a professional, their wage cannot be reduced to a one two-hundredths deduction. [interjection] I know that traditionally that has been used and, I guess, has been argued. I would say maybe one-fortieth, one three-hundredths, one four-hundredths; there could be a way of doing it. It does not seem to be fair to say, if you are professional as a teacher and you have responsibilities to children, perhaps as much as 24 hours per day, that you should be deducted one two-hundredths for missing five and half hours of school. In fact, that is the nature of Bill 22.

I think, if the minister could recognize the contradiction within his own definition of what a professional is in his continual demands that teachers be professionals and act like professionals because they want to be treated like professionals, that when he has in fact put in this legislation, he is not treating them like professionals. So he has to understand why there might be some concern and drop in morale, difficulty with the minister's decision making and direction when he does not consider professional from that broader sense, in that broader definition for teachers who are as others who have a responsibility far beyond what actually happens when they are actually in the classroom teaching, in terms of preparation, in terms of interaction with other professionals, involvement after school, in other activities, all these other things. Yet in a simplistic way we are just zapping them from 1 to 100 based on missing the five and a half hours of in-classroom activity.

Surely the minister would recognize that he is contradicting himself in how he is treating the

teachers as professionals and what he perceives to be a professional by definition.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, Bill 22 and indirectly policies flowing therefrom, of course, took that into account. The member uses the argument around one two-hundredth. That is why he and I, as public paid servants, took 10 days; we had a reduction equivalent to 10 days. The policy guidelines and indeed the recommendation was that no school division should go beyond eight. That is taking that into account. We tried to do that.

The greater question he brings about, extra work beyond the classroom hours, I dare say that is one of the main reasons that interviews are done at the time of hiring. That is the basis on which selections are made to hire one person or another, and it happens that way in the corporate world and in many other dimensions of life.

People are selected on the basis of the commitment they make beyond the classroom, and people are selected in the corporate world often on the commitment they will make to the well-being of the community, on the basis of the interview. So there is nothing new here; it is all within the sphere of professionalism. Within the five and a half hours, as the member talks, that is the commitment that we make to a better place to live.

I am sorry, but to me I still think my argument stands. I think we try to take it into account as a government, but indeed my comments made earlier were not directed to teachers. My comments were directed to professionals within the area of education. Yes, teachers happen to be the largest group, but it is equally meant for anybody who draws remuneration from the field of education.

Mr. Plohman: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I hope the minister will at least be cognizant of that if he had not thought about why some might react to the way he has classified professionals.

I wanted to say one other thing—

Mr. Deputy Chairperson: Order, please.

Mr. Manness: I just wanted to table this, Mr. Deputy Chairperson. There were questions yesterday with respect to affirmative action put

forward by the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux). We have some copies of material we would like to table in response to that question.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson: I thank the minister for that.

The hour being 5 p.m., time for private members' hour. Committee rise.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY (Concurrent Sections)

HEALTH

Madam Chairperson (Louise Dacquay): Order, please. Will the Committee of Supply please come to order. This section of the Committee of Supply is dealing with the Estimates for the Department of Health. We are on item 2. Healthy Public Policy Programs (a) Administration, page 82 of the Estimates manual. Would the minister's staff please enter the Chamber?

2.(a) Administration.

Ms. Avis Gray (Crescentwood): Madam Chairperson, I was wondering if we could begin this afternoon with a general question. I do not have the quote in front of me because I am not sure we have that Hansard yet, but the minister referred, yesterday afternoon or yesterday evening, that there was a move toward community-based services which is why, with the closing of a number of hospital beds, the studies through the Centre for Health Policy and Evaluation had shown that there were not any changes in terms of death or readmissions, et cetera.

I am wondering if the minister could begin by outlining in general what specifically are the community-based services that we have seen that have been put in place so that in fact hospital beds can be closed, or people can be discharged earlier from hospital.

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Health): Madam Chairperson, in addition to changing technology which affects the average length of stay of people in our acute care facilities which is a very significant matter which is ignored by those who are critical of our reform initiatives—in addition to that, which I again underline is a very significant part of all of this, I will come back to it.

In addition, we have become involved in delivering services in the communities, i.e., away from acute care facilities.

The honourable members in the New Democratic Party continue to insist that we treat our hospitals as if they were hotels, and that is not on. That is not something that we can afford to do, or want to do, as people do not enjoy staying in hospitals. There are some people who seem to think that is where all our people should be. Anybody that has the slightest illness ought to be in a hospital.

* (1440)

In 1993-94, the government of Manitoba supported adult day clubs in Manitoba, sometimes it is called adult daycare, to the tune of \$1,915,000. In 1983-84—this is something that deals with prevention, but it is important—the breast screening for cancer, \$1,787,500. This is the line that the member and I talked about yesterday, prenatal community public health services, including nutrition, \$440,000, last year, and \$45,000 was spent on prostate care.

With regard to Support Services to Seniors projects in Manitoba, in 1993-94, we spent \$1,056,500, and then with respect to acute care mental health alternatives in Winnipeg \$2,956,000 in the Winnipeg area.

In addition, it will be of interest to the honourable member to know that perhaps while these people previously were looked after in the hospital, 550 people are at home on oxygen, 32 adults are at home on ventilators, and 350 on continuous positive airway pressure.

If honourable members in the New Democratic Party had their way, these people would all be in hospitals. That is not where they belong. [interjection] The honourable member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak) suggests that I am really hurting on this point. Well, I guess we will never get him to understand, and maybe it is my fervent wish to get New Democrats to understand, what is really happening. That does frustrate me, their wish that hospitals should be hotels in Manitoba. That is not what hospitals are supposed to be.

With respect to Home Care, that is another community alternative. Spending in Home Care has increased very significantly over the years, certainly in the last six years—I do not have those numbers in front of me, but they are in my other House book, I know that—to deal with the growth of expenditure in the Home Care program from the mid-'70s when it was zero to the something around 70 million that it is today.

With the postpartum referral guidelines now being used in five Winnipeg hospitals, and if this year's births match last year's, 11,831 families will have the transition from hospital to the community according to the guidelines. In 1992-93, there were 11,831 births.

The postpartum referral guidelines provide a framework for postpartum discharge and community follow-up that is based on assessed need for health care services and is the result of collaboration among the woman, her family and health care providers. Early discharge of obstetrical patients that has reduced the length of stay in hospital is possible within this framework.

The guidelines were used in the development of a co-ordinated discharge program proposal by Brandon General Hospital and Westman region.

This is the kind of thing honourable members in the New Democratic Party are against, Madam Chairperson.

A co-ordinated postpartum discharge program in Brandon has been in effect since October 1 of '93, with a total of 132 families involved as of December 31, 1993. In 1992-93, there were 1,086 births in Brandon, so an additional thousand families will make the transition from hospital to the community based on assessed need using the guidelines. It is important, I think, to understand that the things we do are based on need as opposed to perceived wants.

The provincial guidelines for postpartum discharge and community follow-up were introduced by the Women's Health Branch to hospital and community representatives in Thompson last September. That was 1993. The 13-member postpartum discharge planning committee of Thompson examined methods of

improving the postpartum referral process. Ongoing planning will utilize the guidelines in developing a program of postpartum follow-up for women and families in Thompson.

The Diabetes Education resource program is offered in 12 community settings throughout the province, Youville, Selkirk, Morden, Carman, Brandon, Thompson, The Pas, Dauphin, Beausejour, Steinbach, Portage la Prairie and Winnipeg. Last year there were 1,179 new clients. One hundred and eight of those, or 9 percent, are aboriginal Manitobans.

The antenatal home care program provides an alternative to hospital care for women with pregnancy complications. It was piloted at the St. Boniface Hospital to care for women with pregnancy-induced hypertension and expanded to include other high-risk conditions in November 1991. The program then expanded to include the Health Sciences Centre Women's hospital on April 1, 1993.

The Health Sciences Centre Women's hospital antenatal home care program steering committee was established to explore the feasibility of implementing the program at the Health Sciences Centre with representatives from the hospitals, Winnipeg Public Health, Manitoba Health, and federal Medical Services. In 1992-93, a total of 113 women with high-risk pregnancies participated in the program, for a total of 1,627 days, averaging 14.3 days for each woman. From January 1 to December 31, 1993, 204 women have participated, averaging 15.2 days per woman, saving 3,101 patient days or 8.5 beds at 100 percent occupancy.

The number of women in the program who are aboriginal women is not separately identified, Madam Chairperson. Projected to the end of this fiscal year, there is potential for 246 women to participate. The projected increase is likely due to the addition of the Health Sciences Centre as a location for the program.

The movement of Street LINKS from the City of Winnipeg to Mount Carmel Clinic has been completed and is now known as Street Station. The change was made in November of 1992 as an effort to consolidate the service with similar

services that were being offered by the Mount Carmel Clinic. The clinic now provides the service as Street Station.

I would like to compare July '92 average activity of Street LINKS to July '93 Street Station confirmed activity. There does not appear to be a decrease in activity due to consolidation. The differences among the activities may be due to the Street Station being open at night and on Saturdays. Street LINKS was closed on Saturday. With its expanded hours of service, Street Station appears to offer service to at least the same volume of clients at a time of peak demand.

I guess, by July of 1992, there were 1,300 contacts by Street LINKS; by July of 1993, there were 2,900. By July '92 at Street LINKS, there were 5,700 condoms distributed, and by July of 1993, there were 10,639 condoms distributed.

With respect to the needle exchange program, by July of 1992, there were 2,956 needles issued, compared with July of 1993, with Street Station, 12,304. In 1992, 2,857 needles were returned, and by July '93, there were 12,079 needles returned. That exchange rate compares in 1992, 96.7 percent, to 1993, 98.2 percent. You have to understand the importance of those percentages. Every single little bit of a percentage point can be extremely important. That percentage is improving.

* (1450)

With respect to the Cardiovascular Health Program, a first draft of the policy paper on cardiovascular health is expected in January 1994, with a final paper likely by February 1994. Disposition of the paper is dependent on the internal review of the paper conducted by the Healthy Public Policy Programs division. Some of the supporting strategies include the consolidation of tertiary services, the heart health project in rural Manitoba, the submitted Carman cardiovascular project, the submitted Brandon cardiovascular project, an environmental scan of services related to chronic diseases and legislation and education on smoking initiatives.

That is a number of things that have been happening, Madam Chairperson, but I think the

emphasis on the shift that has been and is taking place ought to remain and not be given some emphasis because that is what is going to save our health care system.

I have been worried in the past about how our health care system is going to survive what with the declining federal participation and more and more pressure, some of it unnecessary but pressure nonetheless, being placed on our system.

When I could see the direction that we were going, I felt that there was a likelihood of success that we would save our health system. Then I look at what is happening elsewhere, not only in Canada but in the world, and I say I am really glad that we have consulted so many Manitobans here in Manitoba because we are not only going to save a health care system, but we are going to improve it while we are at it. That is really gratifying.

Anybody who thinks about it long enough will recognize the contribution of so many thousands of Manitobans who are part of this process and playing an important role in advising government and working with government. It does leave one feeling somewhat gratified for the future.

Ms. Gray: I would like to go through some of the items that the minister has referred to, beginning with the adult day clubs. Could he tell us how many spaces there were in the last fiscal year, and what is the number of new spaces that he is proposing in this budget?

Mr. McCrae: Day clubs improve the quality of life for our fellow Manitobans who have taken part in these clubs. I had the opportunity to visit one and to talk to the people there and listen to their comments about how they feel about it. They are delighted with it. It gives them a chance to get some exercise; it gives them a chance to get some companionship.

Everyone was in such a good mood the day I was there. I remember it well because there was a lot of humour flying around. You get to know each other, and it becomes quite a place of fellowship. I think it is very nice that we can make these things available. Many, if not all, of the people who are involved in the adult day clubs are seniors who

really appreciate the opportunity to get together with other seniors.

It helps keep people interested in their lives and in the lives of other people. It helps people maintain a healthy diet and some exercise, the kinds of things that can delay things like hospital admissions and delay things like admission to personal care homes, because people, I think their lives are enhanced by their ability to remain in their homes and to be as close as they can with loved ones.

There are 52 adult day clubs in the province of Manitoba. There are 15 programs in Winnipeg, 37 of them rural, 1,262 spaces province-wide. While we do not have a number yet for 1994-95, we are reviewing the potential to increase that number.

Ms. Gray: Madam Chairperson, can the minister explain, if there are 1,262 spaces in adult day clubs, what is the expansion in community-based services if he does not yet know the numbers?

Mr. McCrae: I am doing a little arithmetic here, Madam Chairperson, because as I pointed out, we are looking to expand this program and we have \$1,144,000 with which to do it. So we are trying to do a little arithmetic and go by averages to give the honourable member a ballpark kind of figure in terms of the number of spaces we can expand to from the present number.

Ms. Gray: Madam Chairperson, can the minister then tell me what exactly is the budget line for adult day clubs for this fiscal year of these Estimates?

Mr. McCrae: This appropriation is not identified, Madam Chair, as a specific line, but when we get to Long Term Care and we have the appropriate documentation in front of us, if the honourable member will remember to come back to this, we will answer these questions.

Ms. Gray: Madam Chairperson, the minister did refer to some \$1.1 million. Is he assuming that is an approximate amount of dollars that are spent on adult day clubs?

* (1500)

Mr. McCrae: I assure the honourable member the number I gave, I am reassured, is an accurate one, \$1.144 million for day clubs, expanded. My

officials arrive at that number because of their experience in seeking and obtaining, with my assistance, the approval for that number.

When we get, Madam Chair, to the Personal Care Home program we will be able to split out for the honourable member this amount and identify it directly to the day club expansion.

Ms. Gray: Can the minister tell me though, this some \$1 million, is that a total budget for adult day clubs or is that just the expansion piece? If that is the case, what is the original budget before the expansion?

Mr. McCrae: I am going to seek direction from my colleague on this. Should we pass all the Estimates up to Personal Care Home so that we can then—it is either do that or send staff that we have here out to get the information for the honourable member. I am assured that there is an increase here for adult day clubs in the amount of \$1.144 million, which is very significant. I recognize that. The honourable member wants to know the base amount. Frankly, so do I. Let us either get that when we get to the—I see someone is assisting us now and is going to shoot that number into us, and when I have it, I will share it with the honourable member.

Ms. Gray: Madam Chairperson, I would be interested in the numbers only because, as I listened to the minister go through what he considered community-based services and new initiatives are an expansion, I know some relate to Mental Health which I can leave, but some of them do relate to Home Care.

While the minister is getting that number, he may want to make a note that one of the sheets that he was reading from the other night, unless Hansard recorded it incorrectly, was that there was \$1,915,000 redirected from hospitals to adult day clubs, and that is a different number again, so he may want to—[interjection]

Madam Chairperson, \$1,915,000 has been redirected from hospitals to adult day clubs, so what I am trying to ascertain is what is the base budget, how much is the expansion and how many spaces does that mean? Can the minister tell me

does he know, or does he have the staff here, if there are waiting lists for adult day clubs?

Mr. McCrae: There has been significant interest, and we do have a waiting list. That is why we have money in the budget to increase our commitment to the proliferation of day care spaces. It is in response to that. If there is a list and we can tell you how many people are on that waiting list, I will share it with the honourable member, if such a thing exists.

Ms. Gray: Madam Chairperson, I think I will move down to postpartum services because I know the staff are here who can answer the questions, if the minister does not happen to know.

In regard to the postpartum referral guidelines, the minister spoke about that program that was in place and gave some figures of individuals who were discharged early.

Can the minister tell us: Is that an increase in the number of individuals who have been discharged early, and if that is the case, has there had to be extra resources put in place to accommodate the increased number of women who are discharged early from hospitals?

Mr. McCrae: Yes, there has been an increase in the number of people benefitting from postpartum discharge and community follow-up, and the services are provided by our public health representatives and has been done without increasing the number of public health nurses we have out there, but prioritizing their workloads.

Ms. Gray: Madam Chairperson, does the minister feel that there could be discharge of more women postpartum if in fact there were other kinds of support services that were in the community, or are we at a maximum in this province in terms of women who are safe to be discharged early?

Mr. McCrae: Unless further indicators have become available to show that we can safely step up this program, we do not presently have that intention. For example, the honourable member might be interested in knowing the adjusted mean LOS, length of stay, across Winnipeg hospitals for vaginal deliveries without complicating diagnosis is as follows: for '92-93 from Victoria Hospital, discharge after 2.6 days; Health Sciences Centre,

2.9 days; St. Boniface General Hospital, three days; Grace General Hospital, 3.1 days; Misericordia General Hospital, 3.5 days.

We are not pushing this issue further than this at the present time. If we were to do that we would have, of course, to make available appropriate staff in the community, depending on how busy the people who are presently in the community are. I mean, if there is ability to do that, that is one thing, but if there is not and we want to shorten the length of stay, and there is good medical evidence to show us that we should or can, then that would all happen.

I remind you that Dr. Frank Manning, a noted expert in the area of obstetrics, through his report tells us that Winnipeg is the safest place in the world to have babies. That is something I am kind of proud of, considering three of our children were born at the women's pavilion. That is very encouraging. However, we would like to keep it that way, too. So we do not want to push things further than safe practice would say we should.

* (1510)

Ms. Gray: Madam Chairperson, what about the antenatal home care program? What type of numbers are we looking at, and are there more potential women who could be not in hospital if in fact there were resources available for them, or are we servicing all of the women who would fit in a criteria for the antenatal home care program?

Mr. McCrae: Madam Chairperson, physicians practising in these matters tell us, make the referrals to our program of high risk prenatal patients, and we still have capacity to take more in our present program. How many more, I am not clear, but we have not reached a point where we cannot take more. We could take more, depending on how many were referred to us.

Ms. Gray: Has there been an expansion to this program for this budget year, the antenatal program?

Mr. McCrae: This program, Madam Chairperson, was expanded last year to include both teaching hospitals, and it is not being expanded, as I understand it, this budget year. We had last year

built in enough capacity in the program that we can still take more subscribers to the program.

Ms. Gray: Madam Chairperson, the minister referred to the cardiac health program that was running in Brandon and Carman, and he may have mentioned a couple of other communities. Is there a dollar figure that is attached to this program in terms of what the department is spending on that, and could he perhaps give me some more information on who delivers that program, what exactly it is? I am not that familiar with it.

Mr. McCrae: When we get to the Health Services Development Fund, we can talk about the funding for these programs in Brandon and in Carman. I do not know if the honourable member saw the W5 program. I am going to make it available, I made tapes of it. The W5 program ran several weeks ago, a couple of months ago, on CTV. It dealt with a number of health issues. I would like to share a copy I made of that with the honourable member. It dealt with cardiac issues, and it drew a very interesting comparison between, right here in our own province, two communities, Brandon and Winnipeg, and how—I cannot remember the precise percentage, it would be on the tape that I will make available to the member—in Brandon the practice pattern is different with respect to the heart patients from Winnipeg.

You are far more likely, if you lived in Winnipeg, to have an operation than you would be if you lived in Brandon. That was only one thing of very great interest in that film, which I will make available to the honourable member and the honourable member for Kildonan, if he wants it.

Ms. Gray: Madam Chairperson, I did hear about the program, but I just did not have the opportunity to see it or tape it, so I would be interested in that tape of the W5 program.

The minister has also referred to some programs in the area of Diabetes Education resource. Again, my question would be, and he talks about those programs being available in 12 settings, is that an increase in this year's budget in terms of the Diabetes Education resource programs?

Mr. McCrae: In the past, we increased the number of sites to include, I will run through them

again: Youville, Selkirk, Morden, Carman, Brandon, Thompson, The Pas, Dauphin, Beausejour, Steinbach, Portage and Winnipeg. Last year, there were 1,179 new clients. That was last year, and in '91-92, there were 7,289 clients. In '92-93, there were 8,468, and that is an increase of 1,179 clients. We do not have the numbers in for '93-94 at this point. I do not think this budget calls for further community settings. If I am wrong, my staff will correct me, and I will bring that information forward to the honourable member.

Ms. Gray: Madam Chairperson, if we for the moment do not talk about Mental Health Services or services to the elderly that relate to home care, such as the adult day club, Support Services to Seniors and the Home Care program, when you look at disease prevention and health promotion community-based services within this section and you look at any kind of expansion, there has certainly been some expansion in the last couple of years, and the minister refers to the Diabetes Education resource program, there really is not very much expansion at all in terms of any type of community-based health promotion kinds of services.

I have not asked the question yet about cardiovascular health because I understand there is a program. That program is in a draft state, but when we look at these programs, there has been an increase, in some cases, of the clients that are being serviced by these programs, but there really has been no major shift to really look at health promotion activities in the community, where we are actually educating the population and actually teaching them about health promotion, disease prevention. Now I would love for the minister to be able to tell me that I am wrong; if he can clarify that or tell me that, no, I am not cracked, I would hope that he would do that.

Mr. McCrae: Madam Chairperson, I cannot help but observe that it is not very fair to say, leave out all the improvements to Mental Health, leave out all the improvements to Home Care, all the improvements to Support Services to Seniors and day clubs, leave out any discussion of Diabetes Education resources, leave out all of the things we already talked about, and then to conclude at the

end of all that that there is not very much growth at all here. That is all that we have seen in the last three years is growth in all these areas, so I do not know how you can leave all those things out.

* (1520)

Basically, what the member is doing is going through the list of all the things we have discussed and said, well, now do not mention those again, but you really have not done anything. I do not think that is a fair comment. Besides that, I think the honourable member, with regard to health promotion, will agree that the programs you do put out there ought to be evaluated to find out, to determine whether they are working, whether they are getting results, whether there are outcomes that you want to get.

Attached to our Community and Mental Health Services division of the department, we expect in the future to have an epidemiology unit which will do that, which will help us with regard to studying the potential for outcome of all the efforts that we are engaged in. It is not good enough just to start new programs and throw money at them just to be able to say that you have done that, even though we have started a lot of new programs and injected huge amounts of new monies into these various areas, because we know in those areas that these things work.

In terms of other health promotion efforts, for example, the honourable member asked me yesterday about tobacco ads targeted at certain groups or the effectiveness of certain kinds of tobacco ads, and the jury is out on whether some of these things are effective. That is something everybody seems to agree on, that we are not clear on the value of some things we do. So we do need to have an epidemiology unit. That is coming, and with that we will be able to measure the value of the programs we get into.

In the meantime we have certainly laid down enough programs and got enough people working on them, and we are helping enough people with them to know that vast improvements have been made in the community from what we had six years ago. So I do not mean to complain too much about the honourable member's question, except to say that you cannot go through a whole list of

things that we have done and then say, leaving all that aside, you have done nothing. Yes, that is true, leaving everything we have done aside, throwing away the Estimates book, we will do nothing. That is right.

Ms. Gray: Madam Chairperson, now, the minister knows full well he is twisting what I said, because—and we will get to the Mental Health line and we will get to the Home Care line, and I know there has not been expansion in the Home Care program—but this section, Healthy Public Policy Programs, deals with Health and Wellness, some \$9.3 million; Women's Health, some \$1.2 million; Healthy Child Development, some \$1.2 million. That is a fairly substantial section of the entire Department of Health, and I find it very disappointing that in fact we have not seen any major expansions. I would ask the Minister of Health: What are the three main causes of death here in Manitoba?

Mr. McCrae: I do not know if this is a quiz or not, but I think it is well known that cancer is a major cause of death, as well as heart malfunction and heart disease. Of course, accidents cause many, many problems and deaths in our province. We know that the department has been involved, along with its many partners, in prioritizing these particular conditions for work to be done. I mean, we are into all kinds of heart health issues. We are into cancer programs. We are into working with various organizations in the province in dealing with these things, and all of these things will be the subject of epidemiological evaluation in the future too, so that we will be spending our dollars wisely.

In the past decade, my department tells me that because of efforts made in the area of diet, in the area of lifestyle and so on, death from heart disease has decreased by 14 percent. These things do not just increase and then all of a sudden decrease because there is nothing happening. Success of governments, I suggest, have been involved in trying to do things about these things, and this government is no exception.

Ms. Gray: So what specific programs is this government initiating that actually deal with changing lifestyles of individuals who are

susceptible to heart disease, as an example? What specifically is this department doing?

Mr. McCrae: Madam Chairperson, it has come to a point, I think, in the Estimates where it is important to talk about some things that maybe are not always very popular to talk about but a reality. We have learned through data collection—

An Honourable Member: You are not going to bring them into reality. They are not ready for this.

Mr. McCrae: Some of them, I assure my honourable colleague from Pembina (Mr. Orchard). Some of our colleagues opposite are indeed ready to listen to what is really going on out there. Some steadfastly refuse and will continue to refuse right down to the wire, and then it will be too late for them.

In addition to the heart health project that is being co-funded by the federal and provincial government in the central region, which will deal with issues like lifestyle, issues like healthy habit survey, a nutrition survey is being completed, and educational issues, in addition to that and the many, many, many other programs that we have in place, some working better than others, we have the services of the Manitoba Centre for Health Policy and Evaluation, which continually brings forward information that debunks a number of myths that exist in Manitoba, myths that are, for whatever reasons, still being put forward by some mysterious people in this province, Madam Chairperson. I dare not say "the New Democrats" because the honourable member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak) will get all wild eyed and upset and carried away—[interjection] wilder eyed, I should say.

* (1530)

The Manitoba Centre for Health Policy and Evaluation, as one of its projects, recently brought forward facts dealing with health determinants, dealing with population health issues, made it very clear that people who are living in lower socio-economic conditions than other people tend, statistically, to stay in hospital longer when they get sick. They tend to take longer to convalesce after surgical procedures. They tend to get ill more

often and to stay ill longer than people in higher socio-economic circumstances.

Now that being said, it is not a pleasant prospect, but you see, we have to look at health in a holistic way as we are often told to do, but to look at our society in a holistic way. I always wonder when I know that aboriginal people in Manitoba are among the poorest and live in conditions that are the poorest. They have the shortest life expectancy as an identified group of all other Manitobans. They have the highest incidence of alcohol and drug abuse. They have the highest incidence of infant mortality. All of those indicators are common and more frequent amongst people in the lower socio-economic spectrum in our society.

So what are we doing about that? Well, we have not done enough. In this area, I am very happy to accept any criticism the honourable member for Crescentwood (Ms. Gray) wants to make because, in this area, we as a society have failed miserably for years and years and years, over 125 of them. Paternalizing and treating aboriginal people as if they were somehow less than equal to the rest of us as is promoted by some people in this Chamber is not the way to proceed. Treating our aboriginal population as equals with everybody else is more likely to achieve socio-economic success. [interjection] You will make a speech?

An Honourable Member: No, you are making a speech.

Mr. McCrae: I am giving an answer to the honourable member for Crescentwood who asked about these things, and I felt that we should put some context around this whole issue.

When you consider that Manitoba's aboriginal population is, I think, the highest in the country, that is a real issue here. We hear lip service being given to aboriginal people in debates in this House, and we hear lip service everywhere. I was engaged in lots of it as part of the constitutional debate in this country. We worked very closely with the aboriginal leadership of this country and ultimately failed, in my view unfortunately, but failed in establishing an understanding. Now we have a new federal Minister of Indian Affairs with all the right intentions—I commend him and wish him well—who wants to strike some kind of an

understanding with aboriginal people in Manitoba to use Manitoba as a testing ground for self-government.

If self-government means continuing only doing differently the paternalistic thing that we have done to aboriginal people for generations and even centuries in this country, if that is all it means, then I am sorry, it is going to come to naught. I give the federal Minister of Indian Affairs credit though for having the courage to try to move and say change needs to be made.

It is like health reform, I guess. I remember saying one day, we should throw the Indian act in the ditch and forget about it. An Indian chief said to me, well, great, you will sure have my support. I said, what about the other Indian chiefs? He said, well if they agree with me, you will have their support, too.

We already know they do not, necessarily. My plans are only my plans, and they are not going to be good enough for everybody. It is the same with Ovide Mercredi's plans. They are not going to be good enough for everybody, as we found out in the constitutional debate. The plans of the member for The Pas (Mr. Lathlin) are not going to be good enough for everybody else, too.

So when is somebody going to actually do something that is going to make people mad in this area, but actually do something? Maybe Ron Irwin is the one, I hope he is. If he is he will have my full support. Even if he makes a few mistakes along the way, he will have my support because making mistakes along the way is better than what we are doing now. I see people living in this abject poverty that I have spoken about, and I see their political leaders who are their next-door neighbours not living in the same sort of abject poverty. I do not find that to be very appropriate or right in contemporary society.

However, that aside, if through negotiating self-government, whether it is called self-government or whatever it is going to be called, as long as people who live in circumstances in which they live today, as long as that continues, we are going to continue to have health problems, we are going to have high levels of disease that in some cases is preventable.

The other thing the honourable members need to understand, some of them who refuse to listen, but I would appreciate it if they would listen anyway, once in a while. We also know that even although poor people are sicker than those in higher socioeconomic circumstances, they are able to access our system in Manitoba more often than the rest of the population. There are those who would have you believe that when you are poor you do not get health care. That is not true. In fact, people at the lower end of the spectrum, low wage earners or whatever you want to call them access the system more often than those others, and that is appropriate because they need the system more often. They need to access other things too. This is where the honourable member for Crescentwood, I believe, excels in her presentations in this House because she is absolutely right to put the emphasis on the prevention side of it.

We also know that more health care does not and has not improved people's health. This should be a matter of frustration nationally, and it is, except for some people who choose to try to get in the way of meaningful change as opposed to promoting meaningful change. I agree with the honourable member for Crescentwood that preventive and healthy public policy measures are important and necessary and will be more important and necessary as we try to preserve the best parts of our health care system and change the rest to make them better.

The honourable member will be the first, I think, to agree that research- and data-based change is the kind of change we need to see, the kind that we know we are spending our efforts, our resources, dollars and human resources, on a product that is going to achieve results.

The New Democrats do not care about that. All they want to do is spend money and smile and snicker from their seats, as the member for Kildonan and the fellow behind him like to do. We would like them to take this whole debate seriously; we wish they would. We would like them to play their games, if they like, but do that in the playground where the kids are. This is a place to do the business of the people of this province, not the place to engage in little, petty, political

gamesmanship that tends to get indulged in from time to time. I can understand that happens, but I do not know if we need to make a career out of it. Some honourable members opposite know they are going to be there on that side of the House for many, many generations or outside this House altogether, so they want to play as many games as they possibly can while they are still here.

The honourable member for Wellington wants to make a speech, Madam Chairperson, so I will sit down.

Ms. Gray: Madam Chairperson, I would like to know, I was not quite sure what exactly the point was that the minister was making. He did refer to in the beginning, he talked about the Centre for Health Policy and Evaluation did a study that looked at health determinants, and I know that is true, and I know in talking with Dr. Noralou Roos and Dr. Les Roos—we all know that poverty has a direct bearing on people's health status.

I guess I am not sure what the minister is suggesting. What is he suggesting, that the programs, albeit the few that we have in place, that we should not be continuing to provide those kinds of services? Because poverty is the root of, in a lot of cases, health status or at least it is a direct factor, and we know that.

* (1540)

My other question to the minister is: He has an opportunity as a member of cabinet and as a Minister of Health to really change the direction and look at poverty and what is going on in our inner cities, in some of the regions in Manitoba, where the health status of individuals is poorer than in other areas. I guess my first question is: Is he suggesting that none of these programs that we provide have any effect? Because until you deal with employment and poverty you have not dealt with the issue. What is he suggesting?

Mr. McCrae: I thank the member for seeking that clarification, because I do have to admit that I sat down, and I do not think I fully answered the honourable member's question.

What I am trying to get at is that at no time in the history of this province have we spent more dollars on Family Services than now. At no time in the

history have we spent more on education than now. At no time have we spent more on health than now.

Why is that? I know the honourable member for Transcona (Mr. Reid) has an easy and quick answer. Why is that? Because we do all this, we spend all this money, and everybody is unhappy with the quality of our education system. We spend all this money, and there is a fair amount of unhappiness with our welfare system. We spend all this money on health care, and we have not been achieving the kinds of results we need.

The honourable member for Transcona wants to get in the act again today. Looks like it is going to be a rousing hour and 20 minutes. The honourable member for Transcona thinks it is last night and that he can be his arrogant self like he was last night. He wants to liven things up; he is a little bored. Well, maybe I have that tendency to bore people a little bit, but the point I am trying to make is that things are dismal because we are spending and spending and spending. Who put us in that position? The Liberal and New Democratic governments started the tradition of tax and spend in this country. It has taken governments like ours to try to bring some reason to all of this and try to get some results out of all of this.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Madam Chairperson: Order, please. The honourable Minister of Health has the floor. The honourable Minister of Health, to complete his response.

Mr. McCrae: To make matters worse, when this government does everything in its power to create employment so that we can generate funds to finance things like education, social services and health programs, we get members, like the member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk), who wants to kill jobs in Manitoba, joined by her colleagues in the New Democratic Party, want to kill the jobs. They do not want people working for Ayerst Organics in Brandon. They do not care about GWE and locating jobs in Brandon. They want to kick McKenzie Seeds out of Manitoba forever, and they want to put a stop to Louisiana-Pacific.

The honourable member for Swan River gets up in this House almost daily to speak out against Louisiana-Pacific, and we find that very disturbing because that means jobs which can help drive the economy and drive our social services. We need a reasonable level of spending in these areas. We also need to get results.

The honourable members opposite have always found the easy way out, and that is, say yes to our friends in the teachers union, yes to our friends in the civil service union, yes to our friend in this other union over here and yes to this special interest group and yes to those special interest groups who have vested interest.

The honourable member for Transcona (Mr. Reid) nods his head, accepting the fact that all he does here is speak for people with vested interests. I say that is a conflict. That is a heck of a poor way to represent people in the province of Manitoba, but that is the honourable member's business. If he wants to be that kind of a member and speak out for vested interests, well, so be it, vested interests to the extent that they are people who are my neighbours and your neighbours; those are people who care and who need proper representation. The people in Swan River who want jobs and are being stopped from having jobs by people like the member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk) here in this House, they do not appreciate that approach and neither do I. Because whether it is jobs in Brandon or Winnipeg or Swan River or Steinbach or wherever it happens to be, New Democrats—

Point of Order

Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan): Madam Chairperson, I believe yesterday and previously you admonished the minister and suggested that he keep to the line item in the Estimates rather than going off on his tirades attacking all members in the House. I think it would be more conducive to the function of this committee if the minister would deal with the question asked and not go off on one of his political tirades in an attempt to answer the questions he could not answer in Question Period.

Madam Chairperson: The honourable member for Kildonan does not really have a point of order,

except I would remind all honourable members that answers to questions are supposed to be relevant to the issue at hand. If there was co-operation of all members of the House with perhaps less needling, the points would be addressed more expeditiously.

* * *

Mr. McCrae: I have to admit, Madam Chairperson, that I was going along pretty well, and the honourable member for Crescentwood (Ms. Gray) and I were engaged in meaningful dialogue in questions and answers, and then the honourable member for Transcona (Mr. Reid) wanted to get carried away from his seat. He distracts me, and then I go off on some tangent, and it is awful to have to listen to, and it is worse to have to watch. I realize that. The honourable member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk) did it too, and here I was trying to engage in a meaningful discussion of health care in Manitoba, and those members they distract me so badly that I just could not carry on but had to veer off in some other direction.

When you have people who work against progress all the time in this House, somebody has got to tell the people of Manitoba that every effort they extend is toward destroying the economy and the health care system that we have in this province and this country. I for one am not going to sit idly by and let New Democrats have their way and destroy our health system. I am not going to do that. I have a stake myself, I have a vested interest in this province.

An Honourable Member: What about your neighbours?

Mr. McCrae: My neighbours, too. Which neighbours do you mean? My neighbours too and my children. There are future generations in this province that deserve better than they are getting out of the New Democrats. What they are getting out of the New Democrats is a dead economy, a dead health care system, a decaying infrastructure and basically no country left to govern. But they want to govern, oh, they want to govern. That is all. They do not care how they get there. They do not care how many stories they have to tell to get

themselves into government, but I have to tell them that my reading and the reading of most other people is they have not got a ghost of a chance. Their behaviour in the House today is proof that they are desperate.

Mr. Chomiak: He is still trying to answer the question from Question Period. Give it up, Jim.

Mr. McCrae: It is the first time I raised it this afternoon.

Their behaviour and deportment and demeanour in the House today demonstrated to me very clearly that they are totally, totally desperate, and they have not a ghost of a chance.

A little while ago, the honourable member, just to change the subject for a moment, the honourable member for Crescentwood, I told her I would give her better information about adult day clubs in Manitoba. I told her there were 52. Last year's expenditure on adult day clubs was \$1,992,300. For '94-95, we are budgeting a \$1,144,000 increase to \$3,136,300. That is a significant increase in the spending for—I do not know what percentage that is, but it is quite significant. How many spaces it will result in, I can only speculate at this time, but if we want to do an average in mathematics, we know that there were—yes, I think I said there were just over 1,200 spaces for \$1,992,300, so I think it is a question of getting our calculators out, and we will get a round figure as to how many there would be after we are finished spending \$3,136,300.

Ms. Gray: Madam Chairperson, those dollar amounts are not quite a doubling, but certainly someone would think you are looking at increasing your spaces by 800 to 900. Is that correct?

Mr. McCrae: It is a major expansion. There is no denying that, but in the 52 day clubs. We are not planning to build new day clubs. We are planning to serve more people in those day clubs, and that is significant. We will call them spaces.

* (1550)

Ms. Gray: Madam Chairperson, just getting back to the minister's earlier comments about health costs, he would, I imagine, have this figure accessible. What is the cost of health care per capita to Manitobans currently?

My question to the minister was, can he tell us what is the per-capita cost of health care for every woman, man and child in Manitoba? What is the cost per capita for health care?

Mr. McCrae: Madam Chairperson, again, I take the total spending in Health and divide it by the population, which the population is about a million, and we spend \$1.85 billion. That is about \$1,850 a year per man, woman and child in Manitoba.

I understand that per taxpayer that is something well over \$4,000 a year. I was listening to one gentleman one day talk about how terrible it was in the United States that a family of four there had to put out \$750 a month for health insurance, and of course, that is terrible. I would not want to do it.

However, look at that as somebody is paying that kind of money here in Canada, only more. That is what the cost is here in Manitoba, \$1,850 per man, woman and child for health care. Well, our commitment as a government is a greater commitment than that put forward by the previous government, and that is a factual matter and not something about which there can be any debate. Five years ago it was \$1,300 per man, woman and child in Manitoba and now it is \$1,850. It was about \$1,300 per man, woman and child in 1988 when we were spending \$1.3 billion. It has now moved up to \$1,850 a year per man, woman and child in Manitoba. So somehow we are spending all that money for health care services.

Are we getting value for our money? There are a couple of things that can be said about that. In the United States they spend more money as percentage of GDP on health care than we do. They spend about 13.6 of their GDP on health care, and yet in the United States millions of people are not covered by health insurance. That is not for us here. We want to have a better coverage system than that.

In the United States also, even though they spend more money as a percentage of GDP than we do, they do not have the life expectancy that we do. They do not live as long as we do. They have more problems with infant mortality in the United States than we do—at about 10 percent in Canada, where we spend about 10 percent. But honourable

members should be aware that in places like Japan and France and Sweden they spend as little as 6 percent of their GDP on health care services. Yet in each of those three countries they live longer than we do here in Canada, and they have still a lower infant mortality rate than we do.

So what do those things tell us? They tell us that we are not doing everything right even though we think we are doing a lot of things right. We think we have the greatest system in the world. We might very well have the greatest system in the world if we tuned it in and used it properly. We do not, and those who think we do are not telling the truth. So we have to address health care issues from an outcomes standpoint, in my view, and I think that must be what is happening in some of those countries where they are getting greater results and not putting out as much money to get those results.

We can learn from those jurisdictions; we can learn from our own experience; we can learn from the American experience too. We can learn from the experience elsewhere and apply it to our own situation. It is not helpful to refer to Canadian companies being involved in the health care system as the Americanization of health care. It is not helpful to anything.

In Hong Kong, I am told, they have 66 doctors per 100,000 population. Remember people from Hong Kong live longer than we do, and that is a recognized health determinant.

An Honourable Member: Why do they live longer?

Mr. McCrae: We are talking about while they are still living in Hong Kong.

An Honourable Member: But why do they live longer?

Mr. McCrae: I am coming to that, but you did not let me finish what I was going to say. There are 66 medical doctors per 100,000 population in Hong Kong. In Canada we have 222 medical doctors for 100,000 people, and the people in Hong Kong outlive us. It has got to have more to do with than just broccoli. Sure, I think that there is something to be said for an appropriate intake of broccoli, but I am not going to get carried away about it like

George Bush and say it is just not for me. I am not terribly fond of broccoli myself, but I will take broccoli with a moderate amount of cheese sauce on the top, and I do not think that is a bad thing.

In areas where you have a more equitable distribution of the wealth of a nation or of a population, where you have education standards that are more equitably distributed, where people are meaningfully and gainfully employed, where they are happy—maybe I am guessing about that one, but I have always assumed that happy people tend to be healthier people, too.

But you know, if you are poor and your husband just beats you up every week and beats your children up every week, your likelihood of being happy is not enhanced by those circumstances, and your likelihood of having a healthy life style yourself and passing such a thing on to your children is not enhanced by that kind of an existence.

Those are issues that we have to deal with right here in our own country of Canada and in our own province of Manitoba. I wish the federal Minister of Indian Affairs well as he works towards resolution of some of those problems. I have tried in the past without the kind of success I would like to be able to claim, and I think our aboriginal leaders have tried too without the success they would like to claim.

Those economic issues that deal with determinants of health are important, and we have to deal with those along with all of the other issues. But certainly to get back to the honourable member's question about cost, sometimes when I talk about these costs, some people raise the issue of user fees, and why not use user fees to deter people from using the health system and raise money to help fund these programs we do not want you to cut.

Well, the NDP, of course, they do not want you to cut anything unless they are in office, so you do not have to cut. They would not look at user fees either. We know what they would do. They would look at taxes, more and more taxes. They have done that. They can be judged by their performance on that.

So it is a question of making the system work to generate the result that we want. We want to get outcomes from all of this spending that we do. Those numbers are important because they demonstrate that we as a country, we as people in the country and governments have made the appropriate commitment, and we have to find better ways to spend that money.

* (1600)

But on the issue of user fees, I am often asked about that, because a lot of Manitobans think we should have user fees. I would say, well, the only trouble with user fees is that you are going to think that that solves all our problems if they were imposed. All they do is help solve a revenue problem. Everybody says, but make it a very small user fee, so therefore it is basically useless if it is small. If it is big, you are going to cut people off who cannot afford health services. For those reasons, I have not accepted the idea of user fees, because they do not get at the problem that we want them to get at, and they create problems in the meantime.

The worst thing they do, after cutting people off health care, is raise the expectation that we have solved all of our problems by raising some money, when really raising money has not up until recently been the problem. We certainly have been able to—we have known how to tax people. In Manitoba, up until 1988, we taxed them more than anywhere else in the country. Of course, since '88, there has been quite a slide in that, and we are now into the third lowest taxed people in the country, but that is a whole other debate the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) may well want to raise and promote and remind people about.

But even while we have frozen taxes in Manitoba for seven straight budgets, spending for health care has increased as a percentage of total spending, demonstrating very, very clearly that our government's commitment to the health care of our fellow Manitobans is greater than that commitment shown by New Democrats of the past and certainly the New Democrats of the present. All they want to do is destroy our health system, so we are not likely to follow their advice.

I say to you, in terms of spending, that is not our problem. We certainly know how to spend, and now, let us learn to spend smarter.

Ms. Gray: Just a final comment, before I let the member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak) ask some questions. When he refers to the per capita cost, the difference between 1988 and this year, one thing that is different in these budgets is this government is now including the public debt as a cost, which I do not think was done five or six years ago in the Estimates, and I am wondering if that skews at all the cost per capita, if we are looking at different figures.

I do not know if the minister has that information now, but I would be interested in knowing how much of that—because our total amount of spending for this year is including the public debt, and there is nothing wrong with including that as part of the budget figure, but I would make that comment.

Mr. McCrae: I appreciate the comment and it makes me want to check that out, but either way, the significance of the spending by either our government or the previous one should not be lost on anybody. The spending is happening. We are not getting the results that we should be getting from all that spending, and that is why some of the changes we are talking about need to be made.

I am advised, Madam Chairperson, that debt charges, interest charges, are being treated equally, either previously or now. So what I have said stands. Our commitment to health care is unequalled by any government in the past in Manitoba.

Mr. Chomiak: Madam Chairperson, I do not think there is any need for me to deal with most of the minister's offhand comments. I think they are just simply offhand comments, and they can stand for what they are worth, which is simply what people read into them.

I think the member for Crescentwood (Ms. Gray) was getting on to a point that I think was missed by the minister, and I think her point generally was, you have talked about Health and Wellness and promotion of health, and it does not

seem to be reflected for the most part in the programming of the department.

The minister might be familiar with this blue book put out in May, 1992, the health reform plan. I often in my presentations to the public point out to the public, I say, I am going to read the blue book for you and, generally, I would say page 9, and I would say, look at what the government said is the major health determinants in our system, and they talk about environmental factors like pure drinking water, socioeconomic factors like income, housing quality, status in the community, the productivity and the wealth in society as a whole, et cetera. This is from the government's document, some of the things the minister touched on, and I say, do you think this government has dealt with those issues?

Of course, Madam Chairperson, it is a resounding no on any of the fronts. I think that was what the member for Crescentwood was alluding to, and I think generally, it is quite clear from the government's record, although I admit there has been some expansion of some programs and we welcome that, and in fact, in the community-based programs—the government is starting to put in place community-based programs.

I was at a public forum last year when the assistant deputy minister commented that the government was only now beginning to think about putting in place community-based programs. I made that part of the record in the House, and that was no criticism. That was just a fact, that the government only got around to putting in community-based programs last year when they started feeling the heat.

But they are starting. They started to put some of the money back in that they have cut out. They started to put some money back in that they have cut out of the institutions, and that is a good step, but generally, in terms of—and it is a difficult job—generally in terms of health promotion, the record and I agree, concur, with the comments of the member for Crescentwood (Ms. Gray) that the record is not very favourable.

That is why we have real difficulty with supporting government initiatives, and we will continue to criticize where we see failings in the

system despite any efforts of the minister to downsize or to somehow question the integrity of anyone who raises issues. That may be his want. I will accept that. I mean, I cannot change his viewpoint, and frankly, if he suggests that every criticism—if he takes it personally or suggests that somehow it is ill-founded or that members on this side of the House are not as interested in the health care system as he is, I cannot change his viewpoint, Madam Chairperson. I have to accept it for what it is.

My question to the minister is with respect to the epidemiology—the minister indicated that they are going to put in place an epidemiology— [interjection] What do the six people in epidemiology in the Health and Wellness branch do, and how is that different from the tracking that is being put in place that the minister is talking about?

Mr. McCrae: Within the next couple of months, Madam Chairperson, our epidemiology unit will be ready to roll, and it will be the first in the country, and it will not be the first time Manitoba has been first in the health field or in a number of other fields, for that matter. Manitoba is a leader in this country. It certainly is a leader in home care services, setting up of Ten Ten, establishment of Pharmicare, expansion of personal care homes, under various governments in this province.

* (1610)

Let us give the NDP some credit once in a while. Besides hacking and slashing and closing beds, the NDP did do some things that helped keep our health system operating and running. They certainly spent a lot of money. They did a lot of good things, but not as many as they would have you believe and probably not as few as I would have you believe. The fact is they did not build into their system anything that measured the value of what they were doing, and the time for that to happen is now. It is coming. It will come through an epidemiology unit which will be part of our government and will be used to help us focus the programs we have.

You see, sometimes it is right and proper to end programs. Sometimes it is right and proper to change programs. I used to listen with interest as

some politicians argued that every new program should have a sunset clause to it, so that you are forced to evaluate whether you are getting value for your money. It is not good enough just to throw money at a problem, unload the Brink's truck, as the member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) would say, unload a bunch of money and then say, there, are we not special? The fact is we are not very special if that is the way we spend our money.

So I am happy to know that part of our reform plans, part of the blue book I think the honourable member brandished and held up has to do with outcomes. We have to focus programs so that we can get an outcome, we can achieve something, rather than just a short-term political object of telling people, there, we have been able to spend some more of your money, an are-you-not-lucky sort of approach.

That is not the approach of this government. We feel we will be fortunate indeed if we can achieve some results through epidemiological study to help us in making decisions about whether our programs are going to take us to the destination we want to arrive at.

It is no longer any good, I suggest to you, Madam Chairperson, that in the health care field, we play the old-style politics practised in the past in Canada, not only in Manitoba but elsewhere, where we could just spend and spend and spend and keep our vested interest supporters happy. That is not good enough anymore. We have a whole public to look after through our health care system, and so, when that project is up and running, we will have a far better way, year in and year out, to evaluate the kinds of projects we ought to be getting into.

Mr. Chomiak: Madam Chairperson, what the minister is talking about, from his description, sounds more to me like a program audit or something like that, rather than epidemiology. Perhaps the minister could outline for me what the terms of reference are, if he has perhaps tabled what the terms of reference are of this new unit that is going to be established within this branch of the department to carry out the activities the minister indicated need to be carried out.

Mr. McCrae: This is not going to be a program audit. This is a resource for our department to gather and to analyze population health data that we can use to design programs that get a job done, that achieve a result, that promote health, that establish conditions that allow us to build programs that do just the things I am talking about.

So it is not a program audit. It is a population health unit of the department that uses the information gathered from—here we do have a superlative for Manitoba—a very, very fine database in Manitoba that we can use to design programs with.

Mr. Chomiak: That helps clarify my understanding of that branch. So these six people—there are six people in the branch now who will be carrying out these audits, because I am looking in the government directory and it lists six individuals under Epidemiology, and that is under the Health and Wellness branch. Are those the six individuals assigned with this task?

Mr. McCrae: I would not want the honourable member to look at the phone book and be misled. Our department has been undergoing change. The government directory that he is looking at is probably not current, because we have been making changes over the past few months, and there is still to some extent—we are taking people from other areas with the appropriate skills and redeploying them into this epidemiology unit.

Mr. Chomiak: Then can the minister indicate where this unit is located? Is it under the Healthy Public Policy Administration that has 18 positions or under Health and Wellness that has 23.2 positions or some other branch of the department?

Mr. McCrae: I am not sure what the member's question was, but I have an answer all lined up here that I would like to give. I think he is referring to page 39 of the Estimates Supplementary Information book, Healthy Public Policy Administration. SY is 22 reduced to 18. It is in that area that he is asking me about?

Mr. Chomiak: I am asking if the epidemiologists are located in these 18 people. There are 10 Professional/Technical; there are six

Administrative. Are they located in this particular appropriation or somewhere else?

Mr. McCrae: The senior epidemiologist is part of this 18. The reason it is reduced from 22 to 18 is that two vacancies have been removed in our reorganization. One person has been laid off and one person has been moved to another area of the department, but the senior—the honourable member has it in his mind that this unit will have six people. We do not know if it will. We do not know how many it will have, but maybe closer to four or five, but the epidemiologist is one of the 18 of the people he is referring to here.

* (1620)

Mr. Chomiak: So there will be a unit in this branch of the department. There is a senior person involved in this area presently, and there will be several, probably, hired in the future or moved from some other area of activity in order to fulfill the function. Can the minister table any terms of reference of this function or does he have anything in writing with respect to that area?

Mr. McCrae: I think we have talked somewhat about that already, Madam Chairperson. There are no formal terms of reference, but we have talked about the function of that program. I think, basically, we have on record the kinds of work that that program should be engaged in.

It is to help us make sure that policy directions we take are appropriate directions and results-oriented and that those directions are based on solid, factual information, not some perceived need but a real need that can be addressed with appropriately designed programs.

Madam Chairperson: Item 2.(a) Administration (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$1,188,500—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$279,600—pass.

2.(b) Health and Wellness.

Mr. Chomiak: Madam Chairperson, we have covered a lot of the questions that one would specifically ask in this area in the other appropriation. I have a few questions, though, that I do wish to ask with regard to this particular area.

Can the minister outline what the status is of changes to the life saving disease program?

Mr. McCrae: Madam Chairperson, what we have is an increase in our commitment and funding to the Life Saving Drug Program of \$300,000. That will allow for 600 more people to be served under the program. This program has grown significantly in recent years. I have not got a history in front of me of the last 5 years, but I think it shows a continual, upward growth. [interjection] I do indeed have that and I am going to share it with the honourable member.

The Life Saving Drug Program—my goodness, even I did not know these numbers were so big. It is absolutely astounding, Madam Chairperson, based on the fact that people have become aware of this program and used it more, and they have a need, as well. That is what it is based on, and I am glad that the government I represent is able to be part of that process to help alleviate the suffering and the need of people who are not always that easily able to manage for themselves.

The actual expenditure for this program in 1988-89 was \$1.336 million. That amount increased by 9.67 percent in 1989-90 to \$1.465 million. Then along came 1990-91 and our government increased its actual spending in this program by 14.95 percent to a total of \$1,684,600. Along came 1991-92 and our government's spending for the Life Saving Drug Program increased by 23.5 percent to \$2,080,000. In 1992-93, spending for this program increased to \$2,352,900 or 13.1 percent. In 1993-94, spending on the Life Saving Drug Program increased to \$3,150,300 or 33.89 percent more than the previous year.

Now, I can tell the honourable member the number of people, what I have already said. We are going to spend another \$300,000 this fiscal year and serve an additional 600 people.

Speaking of people, in 1991-92, the number of people enrolled for the Life Saving Drug Program was 1,911. That number grew in 1992-93 to 2,142; in '93-94, to 2,304. Do you know what we are projecting for '94-95? All the way from 2,304 people to 3,000 people, and further on, if you want to project into another year after this one, 3,600 people. That indicates that, yes, indeed, the need is growing because of aging populations, but you

have a government which is prepared to be there for those people and to assist them through the Life Saving Drug Program.

The honourable members also should know that it is our intention to include the Life Saving Drug Program into our Pharmacard technology, our new Pharmacare—DPIN, as I call it—program.

Some individuals, many individuals, have been added to the enrollment of the program over the years. Of course, some individuals are removed from the program for various reasons. Either they recover from whatever it was that was wrong with them, or else their financial circumstances improve to the point they do not need to be on this program anymore. The program deals with people on two bases, one of them being their illness and the other being their station in life in terms of financial ability to pay for their drugs.

* (1630)

These figures show a genuine commitment on the part of the government of Manitoba to those people who can benefit under the Life Saving Drug Program and a commitment not only to the numbers of people but also to the levels of support.

I met this morning with the Manitoba Medicare Alert Coalition. I think that is the name of it. The co-chairs, Jimmy Silden and Ellen Kruger, I met with them this morning. I was telling them about our budget, and how spending is increasing for Pharmacare and increasing for Home Care and increasing for Mental Health Services, decreasing for the doctors. This was something they wanted to steer away from, the issue of the amount of money taken out of the budget for the physicians of Manitoba, but they were genuinely interested, I think, in some of the relief that is found in the budget, certainly in Home Care.

I think there is a general acceptance going on out there that indeed we have been serious when we have talked about that, our increased commitment year after year for that program, and the fact is it is quite apparent now, whereas during the growing stages, the growing pains, the stages of transition from emphasis on one form of care to other forms of care, there are times when one could be led to believe that not all is well, and we are not always

headed in the right direction, but it seems to be fairly clear that we are indeed headed in the right direction, and we are doing it at about the right pace.

So many people, when it is brought to their attention—well, we are talking about Pharmacare; let us talk about it. There is no Pharmacare in the provinces to the east of us for people under the age of 65. Manitobans sometimes forget about that or do not know that, never were told that.

There are some people you just cannot rely on to tell Manitobans that this is the way it is, or that the deductible in places like Saskatchewan has climbed so high as to make it so that there is no Pharmacare program for many, many thousands and thousands of people in Saskatchewan. So these are things that are important, too.

The Life Saving Drug Program is an extremely important program if you are in the kind of situation where you are not particularly well off, but you have a life-threatening disease that only some of the pharmaceuticals that are available now can save your life and help with the quality of your life. Well, what would you do if you did not have the government? You would have to go and borrow the money, or you would have to go and beg somewhere or something like that, and that is not the way we deal with our fellow Manitobans in this province. We try to look after each other and that is one of the very special things about our province.

Mr. Chomiak: I sort of thank the minister for that response, because the minister has, as is his tendency, kind of wavered off of the track. I know how proud he is that he found a program that he could go back and track the record of increases. I know he wanted to spend a lot of time on it, and I bear with that, but he did tend to slip off that slope again to getting into other provinces where he may wish he would have been minister too.

In any event, I note that in this area of Health and Wellness, the Activity Identification has developed epidemiological databases to support policy development. Is this the one and the same, the reference to epidemiology? Is this also the same as was in the previous expropriation, or is this something different?

Mr. McCrae: Madam Chairperson, epidemiology has always been part of the function of the Department of Health, but it has never enjoyed the prominence or the focus that we propose it to enjoy in the future, because its role is going to be enhanced, I think. Its reason for being is going to be more and more important as we continue ever to design more and more, and put into place more and more and more programs to serve Manitobans more effectively and better in health care.

So I do not think it is—and I am not assuming, and I would not want anybody else to assume that we have just never relied on any epidemiological findings to design programs, but we are going to put far more emphasis on that kind of planning in the future as opposed to the kind of planning we have done in the past, which has been singularly, in hindsight, totally unimpressive and also in hindsight, a shame, because, in a sense, we have spent so many dollars and not achieved the results. Now we have an opportunity to make our health system into a positive, dynamic and extremely exciting force in the future in Manitoba and Canada, making our country the best, as has been described as such by the United Nations—the best. That is what we want to have.

While I am on my feet, I want to share with my honourable friends some things I said I would share with them. I told them I would provide them with an historical review or overview with respect to nursing studies and nursing reports that have been undertaken in Manitoba, which takes us back over the last many years, certainly all the way back to 1966. It deals with roles and relationships between and among the various categories of nursing personnel. It deals with appropriate models of education. It deals with the need for improved co-ordination and direction of change in the nursing education system.

It goes back to 1966 when there was the report of the Minister of Health's committee on the supply of nurses. It touches on the Manitoba Health Services Commission's nursing manpower committee in 1973, a report on nursing manpower in 1975, a Manitoba Association of Registered Nurses position paper called Challenge and Change back in 1976, the joint ministerial task

force on nursing education in 1977, the standing committee on nursing manpower in 1981 and on and on and on.

I discussed this briefly with honourable members, and if I could, I would ask the page to pass this over to both the honourable member for Crescentwood (Ms. Gray) and the honourable member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak). You can just put it on his desk.

In addition, Madam Chairperson, the honourable member for—

Madam Chairperson: Order, please. I wonder if I could just ask the minister for clarification. Are you tabling those documents?

Mr. McCrae: No, I am just passing them over to my colleagues.

Madam Chairperson: Okay, otherwise the Chair would need a copy.

Mr. McCrae: If you want to read it, Madam Chairperson, just come and ask, and I will make it available to you, too.

The honourable member for Crescentwood asked about some grant details out of the department. I do not propose to read this whole document into the record but I do want to draw—well, I will not read it all, but I am going to make a couple of comments about it. It is a significant list.

* (1640)

Over the years, Manitoba Health has entered into partnerships with large, large numbers of organizations in Manitoba. If you look at this list and you look at the list for '93-94 and compare the one for '94-95, you will see a number of new grantees. I guess we are the grantors, they are the grantees.

The honourable member was asking about smoking and health, there is a small grant—well, I should not say small about any amount of money, but there is a grant to the Canadian Council on Smoking and Health on the first page here, and there are other child health prevention grants here. You will see, as you go through this, a number of new organizations, new in terms of funding from government.

I refer to organizations like the Anxiety Disorder Association of Manitoba-Westman Self Help Centres; the Anxiety Disorder Association of Manitoba-Norman Self Help Centres. These are new grants. The Anxiety Disorder Association of Manitoba-Interlake/Eastman; Canadian Mental Health Association. That is not new, but the program is first-time funding for the Canadian Mental Health Association-Interlake/Eastman.

I am only talking about new ones here, because I do not propose to take the member's time and the House's time dealing with all of them. There are so, so many. Canadian Mental Health Association-Norman Self Help Centres; Thompson Region, Canadian Mental Health Association, \$258,600; \$50,000 for the Manitoba Network for Mental Health Inc.; the Manitoba Schizophrenia Society, again, for the Westman Self Help Centres; Manitoba Schizophrenia Society Inc. That has increased in '93-94 from \$25,000 to \$55,000 in '94-95.

The Manitoba Schizophrenia Society-Interlake/Eastman Self Help Centres; Schizophrenia Society, again, Norman Self Help Centres; Salvation Army for the telephone crisis service, \$50,000; Salvation Army-Interlake/Eastman, \$850,000, first-time grants; Sara Riel Inc.-In-Home Support program, \$60,000; Society for Depression and Manic Depression, again, the Westman Self Help Centres. That is \$28,300 for each of those three organizations. The Society for Depression and Manic Depression Inc. for the Interlake/Eastman Self Help Centres, \$16,665; Society for Depression and Manic Depression for the Norman Self Help Centres, \$25,000, and on and on and on. These are all new ones.

The honourable member for St. Boniface (Mr. Gaudry) would be interested in knowing about some of these developments in the St. Boniface and Winnipeg area.

The reason I want to talk just a little bit about this grants listing—and I can give the member, I will shoot the copy over while I am talking if the honourable member likes.

I am a little bit excited about this grants list because of the new things that I have spoken about, but as Schedule A to this grants listing, the

honourable members will see Support Services to Seniors.

Now, I know that some people in Winnipeg might not appreciate this as much as elsewhere, although we are trying to facilitate the proliferation of this sort of activity in Winnipeg, too. There are some people who really do not appreciate the work done by Support Services to Seniors organizations.

I told one person that these Support Services to Seniors groups do things like shovelling the walks for people and washing windows and things like that. [interjection] Right away. You see, the member for St. Boniface (Mr. Gaudry) is tuned in. A job is a job. I do not know if a union card goes with it, though. Now, you see, that is problematic for some people but not for the honourable member for St. Boniface, because he knows a job is a job.

Sometimes it is a volunteer effort. Sometimes you do not get paid a nickel. You do it because that is your friend, a member of your community, and you want to help. The member for St. Boniface is that kind of person. Many, many, many years from now, when he is older and in need, and I am telling you that is a long time from now, knowing the honourable member is as young at heart as he is, he will very much appreciate someday someone representing a volunteer organization coming over and helping out.

That is what this is all about, Madam Chairperson. I do not know how many we have all together, 180 groups like this in Manitoba. The honourable Minister responsible for Seniors (Mr. Ducharme) is here to hear all this. In 1994-95—oh, the member for Broadway (Mr. Santos) is listening too—we have 29—this is '93-94? What about '94-95? Oh, my goodness, I cannot even keep up with the expansion and the growth in the Support Services to Seniors organizations.

In 1993, well, here we are—and I will put this on the record, because the member for Broadway (Mr. Santos), who knows that he who is without sin ought to cast the first stone, he knows—[interjection] What did he say? You pat on my back and I will pat on your back. Anyway, he will know.

An Honourable Member: Something about the kettle calling the pot black or something like that.

Mr. McCrae: I am not sure I appreciate that reference to black pots and stuff like that. The honourable member ought to be very careful how he talks in this House. [interjection] I heard very well what I heard, Madam Chair. I am not sure I appreciate it after what has been said in this place previously in this discussion.

I will just pass over that comment and get on to what I was about to say, because what I was about to say was very positive. The honourable members opposite have a way of distracting me whenever I want to talk about something positive. They do not want to hear about that stuff. [interjection]

My mother always used to say, and still does from time to time: If you cannot say anything nice about a person, do not say anything at all. That is why I say so little about the honourable member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak), because I remember what my mother told me. [interjection] I made my point, the honourable member said.

* (1650)

I have a point to make and they keep on interrupting me so I will not make it. Let me tell the honourable members what has been happening with the expansion of Support Services to Seniors projects throughout Manitoba. In 1993-94 we increased the number of Support Services to Seniors organizations in Manitoba by 29 and an increased expenditure of \$286,000. In 1994-95 we expect to increase that number by a further 17 projects at a full-year cost of an additional \$221,000. Then in 1995-96 we expect another 12 projects at a full-year increased cost of \$156,000—over three years, 58 new projects, \$663,000.

What has been happening, in addition to Schedule A that you see on this grants listing page after page of support for Support Services to Seniors in our province, in '93-94 we added the Cartier Senior Citizens Support Committee. That is an expansion. For another expansion, Gladstone Area Seniors Support Program. We are expanding the Carberry Plains Services to Seniors program. We are expanding the Louise Community Services program. The Seniors Helping Hand of Alstone

Inc. was expanded. The Seniors Organized Services of Souris Valley Inc. was expanded. Senior's Services For Rivers, Rapid City & Districts expanded. Minnedosa & District Services to Seniors expanded in 1993-94. The Deaf Centre Manitoba expanded in '93-94. Maple Manor, Plum Coulee meals service expanded in '93-94, and, Madam Chairperson, a new one in 1993-94, Glenvilla Seniors Support Group.

Another new one the honourable Whip for our party might be interested in, Teulon Hunter Memorial Health District, a new one there, and in Deloraine a new one, an area-enriched housing. The Oakbank-Springfield Kinsmen Senior Citizen Complex, another new one. Another new one at Powerview Silver Haven Club, and a new one for Erickson/Onanole Services to Seniors, Erickson Health District.

Point of Order

Mr. Chomiak: Madam Chairperson, I believe the minister tabled these documents, or—

Madam Chairperson: No, the honourable member for Kildonan does not have a point of order. The honourable minister shared the documents, did not table the documents, and I believe that is why he was reading it into the record.

* * *

Mr. McCrae: What I am holding up in my hand is what I have shared with my colleagues. What I am holding in my other hand is recitation of those new or expanded programs in 1993-94.

I am asked why I do not table it. I want it very clearly on the record, Madam Chairperson, that this is what we are doing in partnership with all these communities. If this bothers the honourable member, well, I am sorry, but that is what the provision of health care in Manitoba is all about, is sharing information and sharing the facts about our partnerships with Manitobans.

Another one we have expanded, Madam Chair, is the Rhineland CARE. That is an acronym which stands for Community Assistance for the Elderly.

Oh, the honourable member for Transcona (Mr. Reid) wants to make this into a Tory area issue.

Well, is there something about seniors who live in ridings that are held by Progressive Conservatives that makes them somehow less than seniors who live in ridings held by New Democrats or Liberals? [interjection]

I think I have to start this list over again because I think I lost the place.

Madam Chairperson: Order, please.

Mr. McCrae: We have expanded the seniors program at Gimli Seniors Resource Council Inc. We have started a new one in the Rural Municipality of St. Laurent.

A program called MILES in the Treherne-Rathwell-Holland area, maintaining independent living with extended services for seniors—I do not know that every one of those seniors who benefit from this program are Tories. There may be a New Democrat in Treherne. It may happen. There may be. We do not look for their Tory card when they ask for service. That is not the way it is done, although there was evidence of that happening when the New Democrats were in power.

I remember very clearly a \$400-a-plate ticket that, if you were a supplier to the McKenzie Seeds Co., you had to buy a ticket for a \$450-a-plate dinner, spend a little time with Howard Pawley so that you could protect your contracts with McKenzie Seeds. That is the kind of thing we got with the previous bunch and I am telling you, that sort of hypocrisy that we hear about and see and witness daily in this House is upsetting to some of those seniors. Some of them might even be New Democrats who go to these seniors service organizations for help. You know, when you are looking for help, I do not care whether you are a Tory or a Liberal or a New Democrat or a Reformer or whatever you happen to be, if you need help, you need help.

I am sorry my honourable friends have to bring that kind of partisan approach into a discussion of support services for seniors. Imagine. Sometimes I wonder how proud I really am to be an MLA when I have got to put up with that kind of stuff.

An Honourable Member: Rhetoric.

Mr. McCrae: Rhetoric. That is a nice way of putting what it really is.

Yes, **MILES—Maintaining Independent Living with Extended Services for Seniors.** That has been upgraded, has been expanded on. Here is a new one at the rural municipality of St. Laurent, an expanded one, Niverville Senior Services. The honourable member for St. Boniface (Mr. Gaudry) can identify with some of this, Niverville being his home town. Well, there is probably a Liberal or two in Niverville, and they may need the services provided by Niverville Seniors to seniors.

Eriksdale New Horizons, a new one. I remember talking with some people from Eriksdale about that. The Rosenort Housing Corporation has a new seniors for seniors project, an expanded Seniors Access to Independent Living. I am not sure where that one is. [interjection] Another Tory riding, my goodness.

It is interesting that the last one here, the Health Action Centre, Health Sciences Centre—I do not know that that is a Tory riding, but I do not really think it matters all that much. [interjection] Well, the honourable members opposite are the ones who raised it. I am just trying to be responsive to their deeply held concerns that somehow you have to be a Tory to get anything in this province. What a shameful, shameful attitude on the part of the honourable member.

Now here is one—**St. Michael's Villa.** This one is a new one. Now the member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak) no doubt knows where St. Michael's Villa is. It is in Transcona. So does that mean that if I live in Transcona and I am a Tory, I do not get to go to that one because it is in an NDP riding? People over here have gone berserk.

Now where is that **Accueil Columbien.** Here is one that might be of interest to some honourable members: **Accueil Columbien.** Well, there you go. That one is in St. Boniface, which last time I checked we did not win that one. In fact, how close did we come? The honourable member for St. Boniface (Mr. Gaudry) has to be very careful because you never know.

North Winnipeg Cooperative Community Council—which seats do we have in north Winnipeg?

Madam Chairperson: Order, please. The hour being 5 p.m. and time for private members' hour, committee rise.

Call in the Speaker.

* (1700)

IN SESSION

Committee Report

Mrs. Louise Dacquay (Chairperson of Committees): The Committee of Supply has considered certain resolutions, directs me to report progress, and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the honourable member for Gimli (Mr. Helwer), that the report of the committee be received.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

Res. 5—Youth Violence

Mrs. Shirley Render (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Pallister), that:

WHEREAS the increase in youth violence and crime in our communities is causing a great deal of concern throughout the province; and

WHEREAS youth crime causes so much pain and suffering for individuals in every community throughout Manitoba; and

WHEREAS as a community, each and every one of us must take action and we must do it together; and

WHEREAS the Minister of Justice, the mayor of the City of Winnipeg, the Manitoba Association of School Trustees, the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and the Manitoba Association of Urban Municipalities sponsored a one-day forum on youth violence; and

WHEREAS this day-long summit was an opportunity to form a partnership that allowed participants to identify ways of fighting this growing community problem; and

WHEREAS the youth summit held in Manitoba was the first of its kind in Canada.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly support the efforts of the government of Manitoba and the Minister of Justice for initiating the youth summit and taking an important step toward forming an action plan on youth crime.

Motion presented.

Mrs. Render: Mr. Speaker, youth crime and violence is a concern to all of us, not just here in this Legislature but to all Manitobans, and I think all of us would agree that crimes of violence, property crimes, car thefts have been increasing. In fact, almost every day any of us pick up a newspaper, there is usually some reference to youth crime in the newspaper. I give you an example of that: May 2, Winnipeg Free Press headline on the editorial page, Detering car theft, talks about the car theft epidemic and the tragic results that have been happening. Besides property losses and the resulting car insurance costs, two Winnipeggers in this incident were killed.

The Globe and Mail, Monday, May 9, there is another example of another newspaper in another part of this country. In this instance, it is talking about the three Edmonton youths, two of them age 16, one age 15, who have been charged with second-degree murder. This was in the case where a mother who had heard a sound in the middle of the night got up to investigate, and these three youths killed her, did not even know the family. There was no premeditation to murder. It was just that they were looking for something to steal. She happened upon the scene, and it was just a random act of violence.

Winnipeg Sun, May 8, again, another headline: The crime crisis. The Sun states Manitoba had the fourth highest crime rate in Canada with over 11,000 reported incidents per 100,000 people in 1992. Another small headline in this particular article states: In crimes of violence, Manitoba finished second only to B.C.

Mr. Speaker, these are not things that we want headlines on, but the problem is this is a problem, and people are scared, people are concerned and people are frustrated. When I have gone walking door to door in my riding, people, whether they are seniors, whether they are young families, whether

they are school officials, have all mentioned to me that they are very concerned with this.

I raised this concern at caucus and, indeed, most of my caucus members have also spoken that this is a problem in their communities, and this government did something about it.

I am sure you will all remember that in October, the Minister of Justice (Mrs. Vodrey) announced that she would be holding a summit on youth crime, and this was held in December. This was a one-day forum to develop strategies to respond to the problem of youth crime. Over 800 Manitobans were interested in being a part of this summit. Regretfully, the number had to be limited. There were over 560 people registered. Sixty facilitators had been trained ahead of time to make sure that it was time well spent.

Mr. Speaker, the summit was a success. For one of the very first times in the history of this country, the justice system was opened up to allow not just the so-called experts, not just the criminologists, the psychologists, not just the police department, but young people themselves, whether they had been involved in crime or whether they knew somebody or just even whether or not they had any thoughts on the whole problem of youth crime. So young people were involved in this summit. Parents, community officials and elected representatives, all these people came together to try to identify more effective ways to help prevent and to intervene in cases of youth violence.

Now, from this one-day forum, over 700 recommendations were developed to address this complex problem. Also as a result of this summit, a report that was called Community Voices, Community Action resulted. I think the title of this report says something just about the essence of this forum: community voices, community actions. In other words, again, it is not just a matter of somebody from on high dictating and saying this is what the problem is, this is how we are going to resolve it.

Once again, this government has shown that we are prepared to reach out to the community, we are prepared to say, we do not have all the answers, we need help from you, we need input, and this report

shows that—community voices and community actions.

Now one of the reasons this was called community, the word “community” was used is because we recognize, as I said earlier, that we do not have all of the answers, but more importantly, everybody has to take responsibility for this problem. It is a community problem, and the community cannot just say, you solve the problem. It has to be done together.

Now, having said that, we did not wait for the community to come up with all of the answers. The Minister of Justice (Mrs. Vodrey) took action and in February released a nine-point action plan, which builds on the recommendations of the one-day summit.

I would just like to go over these nine points. One of the nine points was, first: Establishing a youth advisory council, which will be consulted on all matters which concern youth within the Department of Justice.

Secondly: To establish a gang and youth contact line. Now, this contact line will provide not only young people, but parents and victims and other concerned people with a confidential method of providing and receiving information on youth crime and gangs from the Winnipeg police department.

Thirdly: We will be creating a provincial council on youth crime. This council will be made up of experts from a wide field of both the prevention and the intervention end of things, to provide assistance and advice to communities who wish to try to combat this problem of youth violence.

Fifth: We will be developing a youth crime intervention team consisting of police, prosecutors and officials working in the fields of corrections, education and child welfare. I think this is absolutely vital, because, too often, left and right hands do not know what each other is doing. It is absolutely vital that a co-ordinated and an integrated approach be made in this area.

* (1710)

One of the very interesting things that came out of this one-day summit was so many people saying that there had to be sterner sentencing measures,

harsher sentencing measures, something more fitting to the crime. It seems to me there was a Gilbert and Sullivan operetta where the mikado said, let the punishment fit the crime. Well, this is what people are saying.

One of the alternatives which has come out of this is known as either the wilderness camp or the boot camp. Another point that came out was to expand the mandate of the community justice committees, to implement the summit report, Community Voices, Community Action; also, the employment of a violence prevention consultant in the Department of Education to assist schools to prevent and respond to school-based violence.

Eighth: A school-based antiviolence workshop, and this was held just a few weeks ago on April 7. It involved over 150 people representing schools, plus the justice and social service agencies.

Now, the ninth point—I think this one was most interesting—was providing amendments to the Young Offenders Act. The Young Offenders Act took effect 10 years ago. April 2, 1984, was the day it was proclaimed. Essentially it was meant to be sort of a modern answer to the problem of delinquent young people. The law that it replaced was called the juvenile delinquents act, which had been passed way back in 1908. The juvenile delinquents act had originally been passed by people who—well, some people called them child savers. They had seen flaws in what was in place before, and these people felt that young delinquents needed to be rescued from bad families and harmful social conditions.

It was necessary, Mr. Speaker, that this act be proclaimed because, up until that time, teenagers, even children could be jailed with adults. However, problems resulted from the juvenile delinquents act. For instance, sentences from judges were often indeterminate, and training school directors had the option of deciding when their charges could be released. Sometimes, if a youth was sentenced to a reform school, as they were known in those days, say at ages 14 or 15, the director of that school might say, well, that young person is not ready to be released into society until he is 21 years of age, and that may not have been fair, Mr. Speaker.

So the Young Offenders Act was a necessary change. As I say, it was proclaimed in 1984, and it gives young people the same rights accorded to adults; in other words, the right to a fixed sentence, the right to bail, to due process, and the right to be informed of those rights.

However, the Young Offenders Act contained a declaration of principle that set out the law's philosophical framework. This declaration of principle, I think, shows the ambivalence of Canadians to what you do with a young person who has committed a crime. This ambivalence—like, do we treat this young person harshly or do we say, this young person comes from a home where it is obvious that he has not been brought up with proper ethical or moral standards. Therefore, we must be a little generous. We must not punish him first off. As I say, there was this ambivalent attitude of how we are going to deal with young people involved in crime.

Let me just give you an example. The very first principle states: While young people should not, in all instances, be held accountable in the same manner or suffer the same consequences for their behaviour as adults, young persons who commit offences should nonetheless bear responsibility for their contraventions.

So you can see that there is sort of a seesawing. On the one hand, they recognize that young people must be punished. On the other hand, they are saying, well, let us back off a little bit.

Right from the start, the Young Offenders Act has really been shadowed by controversy. I think some of the most controversial elements of the Young Offenders Act are that it only applies to those aged 12 to 17. Its maximum sentence is only five years less a day for serious crimes, such as murder. Another thing that people find really frustrating about the Young Offenders Act is that it calls for custody only as a last resort.

Something else—young offenders may not be identified publicly. How much time do I have? Two and a half minutes? Okay.

Young offenders must consent to treatment programs. In other words, a judge may not simply order treatment. If that young person does not

think he needs treatment, the judge cannot do anything about it. So, Mr. Speaker, amendments to the Young Offenders Act are very necessary.

Our Minister of Justice went to Ottawa a few months ago and proposed various amendments such as automatic transfers of youth, virtually automatic transfers of youth to adult court, who are charged with serious offences; creating a category of dangerous young offenders; reviewing methods to ensure parental accountability. That is probably one of the most important aspects—bringing the parent back into the picture, making sure that the parent is accountable for their young children and also targeting repeat offenders under the age of 12 for intervention.

Mr. Speaker, this nine-point action plan responds to the key themes which came out of this summit. It responds to the need for youth involvement, for better co-ordination among agencies, for tougher consequences, for young people who break the law and for community involvement in the prevention and intervention of youth violence.

This resolution urges the Legislative Assembly to support the government's actions to fight against youth crime and violence. I support this resolution, and I urge all members to follow the lead of Manitobans from across our province who have participated in the development of our action plan and to support our efforts to create safer communities. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Gord Mackintosh (St. Johns): The resolution of the member for St. Vital (Mrs. Render) is an attempt, of course, by the government to commend itself, and I guess this government has to look to wherever it can to do that, but I would say that the role of opposition certainly is not always to just criticize and come on to the negative attributes of a government. I would have to say that this side certainly supported the move of the Minister of Justice (Mrs. Vodrey), in particular, and this government in putting together the summit and having that in December.

Having said that, I do want to note some concerns that we have had about the structure of that summit and who participated and how the decisions were made there. First of all, I want to

comment that it was very unfortunate that the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Mitchelson) and, I believe, the Minister responsible for Native Affairs (Mr. Praznik) were not in attendance at that summit. I think that is very unfortunate, and I think it speaks words about this government's shallow view of the dynamics of youth violence and crime.

I attended that summit, and I took full part in the summit. I can say that I was also very disappointed about the underrepresentation of aboriginal peoples there. In 1990, when the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry report was produced, 78 percent of the youth at the Agassiz Youth Centre were aboriginal. Indeed, aboriginal youth are overrepresented as well at the Manitoba Youth Centre. As well, there was an unfortunate lack or underrepresentation of youth and, particularly, youth at risk.

If we are going to deal effectively with youth crime and find out what causes it and what the effective solutions are, we have to involve youth in that process. There were some youth there, but there were not hardly enough.

* (1720)

Finally, unfortunately, there was not good representation from families at risk. I could tell that from the group that I was participating in and from generally speaking with people there. We have to understand the challenges and the difficult environment that families are facing in Manitoba. So, having said that, we nonetheless commend the government. It made an attempt. It was a great first step but no more than a first step.

I would like to commend the cosponsors of the summit as well, the hosts and the donors, the panelists who gave freely of their time, the facilitators and the many volunteers. I thought the facilitators, particularly in my group, were very successful at drawing out many of our experiences and views on youth crime.

I want, first of all, to say that although we are very concerned, and rightly so, about rising youth crime, I do not want the youth of this province to feel that they are under attack. I sense from talking to youth over the last several months about rising youth crime and concerns raised in the media and

concerns in neighbourhoods—I want those youth to know that we also acknowledge that by far most youth in Manitoba are valuable law-abiding contributors to our community. In fact, according to a recent newspaper article, about 41 percent of Winnipeg's youth between 15 and 19 years of age are donating their time to help others, and that is the best record in Canada, twice the national average for their age group.

Indeed, three-quarters of the crimes being committed in Manitoba are being committed by adults and not youth. One of the officers from the youth division at the City of Winnipeg Police Department has estimated that only about 5 percent of Winnipeg's youth are involved in crime in any one year. That does not now detract from what are, what I call, the hot spots in the crime statistics, particularly in Manitoba.

We are facing in Manitoba an extraordinary rise in the number of youths involved in thefts over \$1,000. Essentially that regards car theft. As well, we have a very unfortunate rise of approximately 25 percent in the number of youths involved in violent offences in Winnipeg. In fact, in Canada as a whole there has been a 34 percent increase just in four years in youth being charged with violent offences. So we have these hot spots, and that is why we have to have initiatives that can begin from something like the youth summit.

Now what did the government do with the promise of a youth summit? I think that story is told when the facilitator at the conference at the end of the day, a day of hard work by about 500 people, got up to the front and said that the main theme, in fact almost a consensus, 26 of the 27 working groups, was that prevention was the focus. Prevention was the critical issue.

The facilitator went on to talk about how good parenting is required, how we need parenting skills education, the importance of family values, supports to parents. Then at the end of the conference the Minister of Justice got up and she said, I will take your concerns about the Young Offenders Act to Ottawa. And I thought, wait a minute, was she here? Was she part of the discussions? People in the chairs around me were

saying, oh, I think she did not even hear what the facilitator said.

This government cannot continue to blame the federal Liberal government for the problems of youth crime in Manitoba. There is no doubt that the Young Offenders Act needs change, and I have long questioned why the Young Offenders Act puts so much emphasis on age when deciding on consequences and the treatment of individuals when it should, Mr. Speaker, be looking more at the backgrounds, the records and the types of offences that are committed by the particular offender.

So we have to move away from such reliance on age, where if you are born on March 31 you are treated one way, and you are born on April 1 you are treated another. There has to be a move. There has to be more exceptions to the general rules in the Young Offenders Act while maintaining a commitment to a youth court and to expertise in dealing with young offenders.

Having said that I want to say—there is nothing more important that I can say in my speech today than this, Mr. Speaker. We regret so much that the government turned its back on all the time and all the ideas given by 500 volunteers that day, all of those expectations raised. Those people came to that summit and they talked about prevention, prevention, prevention as the main theme, as the focus that has to be taken by this government. There has to be a new era of youth and family supports in this province. Government initiatives have to be measured against their impact on families and youth. They said that again and again and again.

I quote from the report, page 9: The widely held view of Manitobans at the summit was that higher priority ought to be placed upon programs, policies and initiatives affecting children and the family; governments to place priority in families and children and to analyze every decision on how it impacts on families; re-examine and evaluate the impact and role of daycare, including universal daycare; invest in children between the ages of two and five years; safety net for children at risk between infancy and five years; public education on the importance of family; supports to be

available for parents to help them be better parents; parenting classes; premarital parenting courses; help line to deal with problems at home; homemakers, buddy system for families at risk; life skills for families at risk; child-parent centres.

I can go on and on and on, Mr. Speaker, but what did the government do? It took nine proposals, now the infamous nine-point plan, from about 700 recommendations, and I suppose there should be no surprise in that. We have 700 recommendations dealing with systemic change so that we can have a safe community put on the cabinet table.

You have a right-wing cabinet look at 700 recommendations and we are lucky we got nine. We are lucky we got nine from 700, but that is the insight that the government has into the dynamics of youth crime. It has rejected the dominant messages from that summit. This government turned its back on the hard work and ideas of all those people.

Now, the government did come up with a nine-point plan, and there are some good ideas in there, but the problem is that this is a plan, and it has gone no further, Mr. Speaker. I am not aware of any one of the ideas set out in this nine-point plan having been implemented.

Rising youth crime in Manitoba continues, and still to this day some five months since the summit and three months since the announcement of the nine-point plan, there is no plan in place, and I know the minister in Question Period said, well, there was a province-wide workshop on April 7 talking about school violence and how to deal with that.

The minister knows full well that that program, that workshop, was planned months in advance of either the nine-point plan or the summit. That was a plan put in place by Winnipeg School Division No. 1 and the Women's Directorate. That is not something that came from the summit, and going to Ottawa about the Young Offenders Act is not putting in place in this province a plan, a program, an effective program to deal with rising youth crime. Meanwhile, what we have is rising youth crime.

Point of Order

Hon. Rosemary Vodrey (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): The issue of training for front-line workers such as educators and community workers most certainly did come from the summit.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable minister does not have a point of order. That is clearly a dispute over the facts.

* * *

Mr. Mackintosh: Mr. Speaker, it is my advice that that was planned in advance of the summit.

* (1730)

I was talking about the Young Offenders Act, that it is not enough to go to Ottawa. What we need in Manitoba—if the government was serious about dealing with youth crime and crime in general, it would have proclaimed a long time ago, but it still has lots of time to do this, well, I mean there is lots of time to do it. I will retract that, Mr. Speaker. Time is running very short.

In 1987, The Crime Prevention Foundation Act was enacted by this Legislature. This government failed to proclaim the most obvious way of dealing with a community empowerment so there can be crime prevention initiatives out there.

On February 9 our caucus announced some plans to help this government deal with rising youth crime, and part of that was to greatly expand in number the youth justice committees in the province and, as well, to expand the mandate of those youth justice committees. We have still to see anything happen there, Mr. Speaker. We also called for a provincial role for community-based policing. We have seen nothing there. I think it is unfortunate that the government continues to talk, talk, talk and does not take action.

I therefore move, seconded by the member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett), that the resolution of the member for St. Vital (Mrs. Render) be amended by adding at the end of the resolution the following:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Assembly nonetheless regrets that the government has so far failed to implement any new programs to

deal with rising youth crime as recommended by the youth summit.

Motion presented.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member's amendment is in order.

Mr. Jack Penner (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether I take a great deal of pleasure in rising in this House to address this subject. This is a subject that I think is a concern to each and every one of us in this House and is certainly a concern to most communities or all communities in this province and most people in this province.

It is not a problem that has occurred over the last few weeks or few months. It is a problem that has taken a long time in developing. It has been many years in coming to being, and you can point fingers, Mr. Speaker, at all kinds of issues and all kinds of people and/or actions or inactions taken by governments, previous governments, law enforcement authorities, courts. You could point at all those kinds of things, and it will not resolve the problem that we face today.

What we need to do is dialogue with each other in this House and put forward some firm solutions and concrete ideas and offer ourselves to work with people in communities across this province to come to some resolve. That is the real point. That is what the Minister of Justice did in this province in initiating the forum on youth violence.

I think it is a first in this province. I know it is a first in this province, and I would rather suspect it is a first in this country, that a Minister of Justice has taken the initiative to call together all participants, all the various interest groups in the province and offer to hold an open forum and dialogue not just the problem or the concerns, but to listen to advice from the general public on how to deal with this problem.

That is simply what the resolution speaks to. I am somewhat concerned that the members opposite or parties opposite are even contemplating amending this resolution, because it is simply a resolution that speaks of actions needed and in support of actions taken by our minister.

Vandalism, in many areas of the province, has become a grave concern. Thefts by young people

have become a major concern. The death of one young person we knew, that society knew, who was an offender at the hands of a vehicle is I think an image, a front-page picture, that most of us will never forget.

We can blame only ourselves for creating an atmosphere that is conducive to allowing people like him back on the street to do again what he loved to do, a confession made by himself. He loved to take on cars that drove fast. He liked to operate fast cars.

Simply, we have many young people like that. They go out, and they commit these crimes. They cause concerns in communities simply, many of them, to get a charge out of life. Speaking to many of these young people, they will admit that.

It demonstrates something that I think we heard time and time again at the forum, that many of our young people need to be challenged. Society needs to find ways and means of challenging these young people to do bigger and better things other than causing distractions in their community.

* (1740)

(Mr. Bob Rose, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

I represent an area in the province where car thefts, specifically, and vandalism have been rather rampant over the last three or four months. It is, I understand, a competition between two young gangs of young people to see which gang can cause the most damage in a given night.

Again, I think that demonstrates that there is no real challenge for these young people, no real initiatives for these young people to grasp on to and for them to do things that would be productive. Therefore, they revert to these kinds of actions.

It causes not only fear in our communities; it causes a lot of damage and costs to be incurred by communities and society in general, Autopac, either fixing the cars or replacing these cars that have been stolen. I understand that there have been some 60 or 70 vehicles stolen in my area alone over the last three months, two houses severely damaged over the last couple of weeks, and so it goes on. One could go on.

One of the key things that happened at a meeting that I called in our community to deal with this, at

which we had a number of representatives from the RCMP, from the protection department of our government, one of the things that we heard time and time again as recommendations were to strengthen the Young Offenders Act. They were very much in support of the action that our minister had taken in going to Ottawa and presenting changes, making recommendations to change the Young Offenders Act.

Some of the things that I have heard much support for are the establishment of the youth advisory council, which was, of course, one of the recommendations that came out of the forum.

Maybe what I should say, Mr. Acting Speaker, is that I was somewhat surprised that the former speaker indicated his concern about not enough members of our government being at the forum. Well, the forum was not called for politicians to grandstand. It was not called for 54 members of this Legislature to sit and dialogue with members of society about what should or should not be done. It was called to allow people from the general public to come together to dialogue and debate and make recommendations on what should be done about the action.

I understand that Mr. Gill Tyrrell did not even have a place because we were filled up, the place was filled up, and our minister suggested that she would stay away and he should go, because he is one of the people that is the head of security at Unicity Mall, I understand, and is one of the people that has had some interaction with many of these young people and has made some recommendations and was willing to come to the forum to speak to the issue of youth violence.

Those are the kind of people that we wanted, so many of us stood aside and said we will let other people that have an interest, other members of society come that have an interest and maybe have a contribution to make and suggestions that we should be listening to, and we can, of course, pick up what was said, either through the report or by other means, at the conference. So whether it is the establishment of a youth advisory council, whether it is establishing a gang and youth contact line which parents and victims and concerned citizens could in a confidential way utilize, or whether it is

creating a provincial youth council, or whether it is amendments to the Young Offenders Act, which were all part of the recommendations that came out of the forum, are something that we should be listening to as society.

We specifically, as legislators, have a responsibility to ensure that the security of our people is first and foremost dealt with. If we listen to many of the proposals for changes to the Young Offenders Act that our minister made to the federal government, I believe, if we adopted those changes, it would go a long way in putting some teeth in the law, No. 1, allowing the disciplinary actions to be taken by society to those who cannot live within our rules and our laws, to ensure that there be proper direction and education given to these young people, hence, lastly, that community justice committees be implemented. That is really what I wanted to bring to this House today.

That was one of the key recommendations that came out of a meeting that I held in my community less than a week ago. These people had not been to the conference, but they recommended that a broad-based community committee be formed to dialogue with the justice system, to dialogue with the enforcement system, and to dialogue within the community, and make recommendations and put in place actions that would allow the community participation over a long period of time to try and change the system.

It is largely our responsibility as parents and our responsibility as legislators and our responsibility as citizens to put into place action that will change the way many of our young people have been raised in society. I simply do not believe that putting them in daycare centres and/or institutions or those kinds of things are the real answer over the long term.

The long term is education. The long-term solution is teaching mothers and fathers how to be better mothers and fathers, and I believe that needs to start when these mothers- and fathers-to-be are very small, in other words, when they are children.

I think society must re-evaluate what families are and how we treat children in society and how we raise children in society. Each and every one of us must re-evaluate how we treat our young people

in our community and how we deal with them when they step out of line. Young people must learn what it means to feel the arm of authority when jurisdictions have been crossed, and I believe that each and every one of us has that responsibility to re-evaluate what should happen.

I commend our minister, I commend our government for having taken the first steps to cause these kinds of actions to be taken. I commend our minister for going, taking the time to go to Ottawa to make recommendations on how to change the Young Offenders Act to put more teeth into an act to allow the authorities to deal with young people when they step out of line. I commend our minister for ensuring that not only will the dialogue continue in this manner, but that she has the ability and the will to proceed to cause the prevention of these kinds of crimes in the future.

So I want to thank the members of the Legislature for allowing me this time to speak to this most important issue at this time, and I hope that we can take action in this province to allow communities like my community to cause preventative action to be taken and enforcement measures to be caused that will prevent the vandalism and the thefts and the crime that we have seen over the last three or four months, Mr. Acting Speaker.

Mrs. Vodrey: I am very pleased to have some time—

* (1750)

Point of Order

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Second Opposition House Leader): I know that the government had caught the eye of the Acting Speaker. I just want to make clear to the Attorney General that by her wanting to use up till six o'clock she will not be allowing the Liberal Party to be able to get their concerns about a very important issue, and we would find that that would be most unfortunate, not allowing us to participate in this debate.

As under every other resolution that I am familiar with, the Liberal Party has always had the opportunity to express their concerns about a

private member's resolution. We would like to think that tradition would have been maintained.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rose): Order, please. The member did not have a point of order.

* * *

Mrs. Vodrey: I am very pleased as the Minister of Justice and Attorney General to take a few moments to speak on the resolution which is before the House today.

The resolution recognizes first of all that there is a concern by the people of Manitoba about the issues of youth crime and violence and that these issues and the issues of public safety are of a major concern to Manitobans.

With the recognition of public safety as a very specific concern and particularly the involvement of youth in crime and in behaviour which the public is expressing concern about, this government took action.

We took action quickly and we put together the summit on youth crime and violence. The summit on youth crime and violence, as members before me have spoken about, brought together over 500 Manitobans from all parts of Manitoba. It was a very representative opportunity for people from geographically different areas and also a number of specific interests to participate and to look at three very important issues.

Also, there was representation from young people. There were approximately—well, there were over 100 young people who attended on that day to take part in the summit. I certainly would say that, yes, it is very important to have young people to be available to speak, and we certainly wanted to include those young people as well. We were happy that they were there to give their opinions.

Mr. Acting Speaker, following the summit the community on that day put forward over 700 recommendations, approximately 700 recommendations, and we put those recommendations together in a booklet called Community Voices, Community Action. What it was was the opinions of Manitobans.

So as you look at the booklet you will find that some opinions speak to one particular point of

view and the other opinions speak to another point of view. We did no censoring. We simply put forward the opinions of Manitobans so that they could be used in the booklet, Community Voices, Community Action, as communities wanted to.

The recommendations put forward in that booklet addressed recommendations to family units, to community units, to members of the government at all levels, to the education system. So it is very important to recognize how wide reaching those recommendations were.

The government Department of Justice looked at the recommendations and put some meaning to what we could do. That is how we came forward with the nine-point plan. The nine-point plan addresses a number of the concerns that Manitobans had. We did not just reach in, as the NDP party said, and simply pick out nine little points. We looked at the concerns of Manitobans, and we gave meaning to them through nine points of action. The nine points of action address the issues of prevention.

The issue of prevention was one of the major themes at the summit. It also deals with intervention, and it also deals with the framework, the law, the Young Offenders Act. It also deals with what responsibility I have as Minister of Justice, and that is in the area of Corrections.

So I was very pleased to put forward that nine-point plan of action. As the NDP member has rightly referenced, yes, some of that action has already occurred. There has already been a training program for front-line workers, community workers and educational workers. We already have working the intervention team, which is a group of Crown attorneys, Winnipeg police, educators, child welfare workers. We are working very carefully with all of those representative groups so that we do have a very comprehensive intervention.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Mr. Speaker, because I recognize that my colleague from the Liberal Party would also like to make some comments, I am pleased to provide a little bit of time for him to make his comments as

well, but I certainly offer support to the resolution. Thank you.

Mr. Gary Kowalski (The Maples): This resolution, this issue, is probably what got me interested in being a member of this Legislature. I do not have the legal background of the member for St. Johns (Mr. Mackintosh) from a law office, neither do I have a clinical background as the honourable Justice minister, but I have a lot of background, a lot of knowledge, that I would like to share with this Assembly.

I have tried to work co-operatively with the Minister of Justice while she at Question Period has pointed her finger at me and said, what is your opinion on changing the Young Offenders Act? Yet when I have an opportunity to speak in this House, she takes up my time, the one forum that I have. I am very disappointed if this is what working with the Justice minister achieves.

Points of Order

Hon. Jim Ernst (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice was recognized by the Acting Speaker at the time. The time is not anyone's in this House. The time belongs to all of us. We have an opportunity to be recognized by the Speaker or whoever occupies the Chair. I think the comments of the member for The Maples are inappropriate, and he ought to apologize to the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I think that one should be somewhat sympathetic in terms of where the member for The Maples might be coming from, understanding that he came in believing that he would be able to express his concerns about an issue that is very important to him, feeling that the Liberal opposition would in fact have been given the full 15 minutes to speak. That is all I am saying; just give that some consideration.

Mr. Speaker: On the point of order raised by the honourable government House leader, he does not have a point of order. I listened very carefully to—[interjection] I will deal with this one first. You can get up on another one. I listened very carefully to the remarks of the honourable member for The Maples, and he was not making a reflection on the Chair.

On the point of order raised, it is, quote, whoever catches the Speaker's eye. That is the member that will get recognized. The honourable government House leader is quite correct. It is not a particular member's time. We just try and share it in the House.

There was no point of order.

Mr. Ernst: Mr. Speaker, on a new point of order, what I wanted to say was that the Minister of Justice (Mrs. Vodrey) had, under the rules of the House, 15 minutes of speaking time. She curtailed that time to five minutes at the request of the government to allow the honourable member for The Maples to speak. I think that shows reasonableness on our part. To have him make comments about the Minister of Justice as he did I think was totally inappropriate and I think he ought to apologize.

Mr. Speaker: On that point, the honourable government House leader does not have a point of order.

Mr. Kowalski: If my comments were viewed as being inappropriate I do apologize, but it is because this issue is so important to me and I did want an opportunity to speak. I regret not having had that opportunity.

All I want to say is that this resolution starts off with "WHEREAS the increase in youth violence and crime in our communities is causing a great deal of concern throughout the province." So is an increase in the youth suicide rate; so is an increase in the child poverty rate; so is an increase in the unemployment rate.

At the same time, our teens in Manitoba, as the honourable member for St. Johns (Mr. Mackintosh) said, are leading Canada with the amount of volunteering they do in this province. So youth crime is not the problem. It is a symptom of the problem with our youth. Our youth are in trouble, and right now their feelings are that they are being picked upon, that they are being used for other purposes. They want assistance and help in dealing with a lot of their problems, one of them

being youth crime, because they in fact in many of the instances are the victims of that crime.

In 20 years on the police force I have dealt with both victims and perpetrators. The idea that to get tough on youth is going to be the answer—I could tell you I come from an area, I have worked in an area where this youth crime is happening. I believe every member in this House is concerned about this problem and would like to solve it. Of course we have different philosophical bents, but we are

all interested. I would like to add my view in the future as to how we can solve it.

Mr. Speaker: When this matter is again before the House, the honourable member for The Maples will have 13 minutes remaining.

The hour being 6 p.m., this House now adjourns and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow (Wednesday).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, May 10, 1994

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS			
		Education System Reform Lamoureux; Manness	1433
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees		Louisiana-Pacific Co. Wowchuk; Praznik	1434
Committee of Supply Dacquay	1426	Health Care System Plohman; McCrae	1435
Oral Questions			
Health Care System Doer; McCrae; Chomiak	1426		
SHI Limited Edwards; Downey; Filmon	1429		
Community Health Clinics Friesen; McCrae	1430		
Municipal Board Storie; Filmon	1431		
Air Contaminants Cerilli; Cummings	1432		
Palliser Furniture Cerilli; Cummings	1433		
		ORDERS OF THE DAY	
		Committee of Supply	
		Education and Training Health	1436
		Private Members' Business Proposed Resolutions	
		Res. 5, Youth Violence Render	1485
		Amendment Mackintosh	1488
		Penner	1491
		Vodrey	1494
		Kowalski	1495