



Third Session — Thirty-Second Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

33 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable D. James Walding
Speaker*



VOL. XXXII No. 26B - 8:00 p.m., TUESDAY, 22 MAY, 1984.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**Thirty-Second Legislature****Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, Hon. Andy	Springfield	NDP
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BANMAN, Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BLAKE, David R. (Dave)	Minnedosa	PC
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
BUCKLASCHUK, Hon. John M.	Gimli	NDP
CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.	Brandon West	IND
CORRIN, Q.C., Brian	Ellice	NDP
COWAN, Hon. Jay	Churchill	NDP
DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent	St. Boniface	NDP
DODICK, Doreen	Riel	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	IND
DOLIN, Hon. Mary Beth	Kildonan	NDP
DOWNEY, James E.	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	PC
ENNS, Harry	Lakeside	PC
EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
EYLER, Phil	River East	NDP
FILMON, Gary	Tuxedo	PC
FOX, Peter	Concordia	NDP
GOURLAY, D.M. (Doug)	Swan River	PC
GRAHAM, Harry	Virden	PC
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	—PC
HARAPIAK, Harry M.	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd	Portage la Prairie	PC
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, Hon. Gérard	Radisson	NDP
LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling	Charleswood	PC
MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al	St. James	NDP
MALINOWSKI, Donald M.	St. Johns	NDP
MANNES, Clayton	Morris	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin-Russell	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)	St. Norbert	PC
NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)	Assiniboia	PC
OLESON, Charlotte	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald	Pembina	PC
PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.	Selkirk	NDP
PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland	Fort Rouge	NDP
PHILLIPS, Myrna A.	Wolseley	NDP
PLOHMAN, Hon. John	Dauphin	NDP
RANSOM, A. Brian	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Burrows	NDP
SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SCOTT, Don	Inkster	NDP
SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
SMITH, Hon. Muriel	Osborne	NDP
STEEN, Warren	River Heights	PC
STORIE, Hon. Jerry T.	Flin Flon	NDP
URUSKI, Hon. Bill	Interlake	NDP
USKIW, Hon. Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, Hon. D. James	St. Vital	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 22 May, 1984.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

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

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, it would be my proposal to move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of Supply, but before we do that, Sir, I would like to see if there is leave of the House to dispense with the notice provisions, Sir, on the written question of the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, which we agreed to move under Rule 48.(4) to notice, if there is leave to allow the member to move the Order for Return this evening waiving the notice, otherwise it wouldn't come up until Friday and we're prepared to accept that order.

ORDER FOR RETURN

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed)

The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that an Order of the House do issue for the return of the following information:

1. The total amounts of payments made pursuant to claims filed in 1983 for damage resulting from aerial spraying to combat Western equine encephalitis;
2. The amount of claims received in 1983;
3. The amount paid pursuant to each claim received in 1983;
4. The number of claims from 1983 that remain outstanding or unsettled.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved by the Honourable Member for Minnedosa and seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, the return as read.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, we're prepared to accept this order. I have only one question for clarification, if the member could clarify the intent, with regard to the request. There are probably three different categories of claims, those that relate to agricultural claims primarily the beekeeping industry, both honey and leaf-cutter, and then there are also civil actions with regard to spraying on cars and other civil actions which flow. The details on the agricultural impact would be relatively easily gathered. If it was the member's intent only to have this apply to the agricultural impact of the spraying and not the civil actions relating from the spray in urban areas, etc. I think it was just the agricultural. If that can be clarified it can probably be produced as quickly as the member has requested.

MR. D. BLAKE: I probably should have had a little more clarity in the first question. I'm primarily interested

in the claims paid to the beekeepers. There are other agricultural claims for implement damage with spraying and whatnot, but I'm interested in the compensation paid to the beekeepers of Manitoba.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Minister of Employment Services and Economic Security that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY — EMPLOYMENT SERVICES AND ECONOMIC SECURITY

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: Committee please come to order. This section of the Committee of Supply shall be dealing with the Estimates of the Department of Employment Services and Economic Security. We begin with the opening statement from the Minister who is responsible for the department.

HON. L. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm pleased to present today the 1984-85 Estimates for the new Department of Employment Services and Economic Security for the consideration of the members. I'd like to take the opportunity, as is customary, to make an opening statement to give you a bit of an overview of the department and some of the programs that we are now engaged in.

The department was created last October combining the employment services function which was formerly a part of the Department of Labour and Employment Services with the responsibility for economic security initiatives that were previously a function of the Department of Community Services and Corrections. In addition, the responsibility for the Manitoba Bureau of Statistics was transferred to the department earlier of this year, January of this year.

The combination of these responsibilities means that the new department of Employment Services and Economic Security will play a leading role in the development of the government strategies to assist the economic growth in Manitoba. The composition of the department reflects a new emphasis on development and delivery of initiatives to provide improved jobs and

career opportunities for Manitobans. It also reflects the continuing concern for maintaining and improving economic security, that is, the provision of crucial financial support for individuals and families in this province who are unable, for many different reasons, to meet the financial requirements to maintain an adequate standard of living.

Placing the responsibility for these two areas of activity in one department emphasizes this government's intention to develop useful interconnections between them, to make a new concerted effort to develop the opportunities to bring into the labour force many of those persons who are now dependent on Social Assistance because of a continuing inability to find jobs. In spite of continued improvements in Manitoba's unemployment rate over the last year and other positive economic indicators, concern about the economic issues is presently paramount, both for the Manitoba public and for this government.

My department will be involved in the continuing development of provincial policies and initiatives designed to strengthen Manitoba's economy and to improve the economic condition of individual Manitobans. It will be much concerned with tracking the economy of Manitoba through its research and statistical capacities and will be planning and seeking out public and private sector in opportunities for the development of new productive jobs which will bring more Manitobans into an expanded labour force.

Through the Employment Services Division, the department will be the lead department in developing a provincial training and retraining strategy in support of the province's economic development initiatives. This strategy is to complement the existing post-secondary educational system. Employment Services and Economic Security will be receiving input to this process from the Department's of Labour and Education which will be responsible for the delivery of most of the initiatives.

Through its Training Agreement Administration Branch, my department is also responsible for Federal/Provincial negotiations on training matters. It is responsible for provincial participation in the Canada-Manitoba Labour Market Needs Committee which assists in administering The National Training Act Agreement, assessing training requirements and means, and overseeing related federal-provincial initiatives including the General Industrial Training Program for delivery of adult on-the-job training; the Skills Growth Fund for the provision of improved training facilities and equipment; the Training Allowance and Unemployment Insurance Programs.

The two-and-a-half year term of the present Canada-Manitoba Training Agreement expires on March 31st of 1985, and my department will be seeking to negotiate a new training agreement to replace it. We will be concentrating on the co-operative development of training programs that are relevant to the development of Manitoba's economy and to the needs of Manitobans. Current initiatives of the department are participating in the development and delivery of training initiatives as well.

The new Careers Program is continually developing new training programs to provide useful skills to persons who've experienced barriers to employment and

education, and to train local residents in areas of the province where certain skills may be required. These carefully tailored programs are designed to and do regularly achieve graduate employment rates of 100 percent.

A new initiative for the northern component in this program in the coming year will be the introduction of a two-year course for Native retail store managers.

Other departmental initiatives support job training for individuals with special needs. The Human Resource Opportunity Program provides a wide variety of counselling and placement services on a regional basis to assist persons experiencing unusual difficulty securing employment or training opportunities.

The Selkirk Training Plant is operated by the department to train and counsel unemployed individuals with special needs while manufacturing a variety of wood and metal products. As well as the extremely important development of training initiatives the department's Employment Services Division will be closely involved in the job creation efforts of the Provincial Government.

Young Manitobans, particularly hard hit in times of more limited employment opportunities, will be a special target for assistance. Special opportunities for summer employment and work experience will be created through departmental initiatives such as the Student Employment Program, otherwise referred to as STEP; The Northern Youth Core Program; The Northern Summer Education Program; as well as Manitoba Jobs Fund Programs administered by the department such as wage assistance programs including Manitoba Careerstart'84, which has now approved assistance for over 6,000 new positions this summer; and the Science and Engineering Grants Program which is dedicated to strengthening in specific business sector while creating new permanent jobs for highly skilled Manitoba graduates.

My department is continuing to develop and co-ordinate further youth employment programs with the Jobs Fund and will administer their delivery as well.

It may be mentioned here as well that the Department of Employment Services and Economic Security will be taking the lead responsibility for the province in co-ordinating International Youth Year '85 which will denote a broad range of youth issues, their perspectives, contributions and problems which will include their employment prospects.

As well as the training initiatives I mentioned earlier which are aimed largely at Manitoba's adult population, the department has participated in and will continue to develop programs which encourage new job creation for adults. With funding from the Manitoba Jobs Fund, the department administers the provincial half of the Federal-Provincial New Employment Expansion and Development Program, otherwise referred to as NEED, which has assisted private project sponsors in creating 2,649 jobs over the past 18 months for unemployment insurance exhautees, those receiving Social Assistance and those on union layoff lists.

Another Manitoba Jobs Fund initiative, the Manitoba Employment Action Program was administered by the department last year. It encouraged private employers through wage assistance to create new job opportunities for Manitobans of all ages. This year, the department will be involved in the development and delivery of more Jobs Fund programs which will provide new jobs

for many individuals and new physical assets for many communities in this province.

Through the description of Employment Service initiatives, I made frequent references to programs of the Manitoba Jobs Fund. The relationship between the department and the Fund is a close one. This department is one of several that are represented on the Economic Resource Investment Committee of Cabinet. The department has been given a mandate by the committee to develop certain strategies and programs to encourage the immediate creation of jobs for Manitobans, as well as the longer-term benefits through training and the creation of capital assets.

In the coming weeks, we will be announcing a number of programs which will be carried out by the department on the funds we have. Instrumental in the delivery of these programs are the department's 11 Regional Offices. I don't think I will read these off, but we have offices scattered throughout the province.

In addition, I might refer to the Immigration and Settlement Branch that we have in our department. It provides the government with information on the pattern and impact of immigration for Manitoba, as well as a wide range of services for newcomers to our province. These services are particularly concerned with furthering the language development and employment of immigrants.

The department will also be concerned with the continued provision of important economic security measures for the people of Manitoba. My department will be reviewing the changing needs of recipients of Social Assistance, as well as prevailing social and economic conditions with the objective of developing stronger links between income security measures and training and employment programs.

The Economic Security Division will continue to provide, through its Social Allowance Programs, assistance to cover the cost of basic necessities of those Manitobans in need who are eligible under The Social Allowance Act. An increase of 6.2 percent over the 1983-84 adjusted cost requested to provide this assistance in 1984-85 based on price increases and an estimated 2 percent increase in caseload.

A second tier of assistance is provided through cost-sharing with municipalities who have the responsibility of assisting persons within their municipal boundaries who are not eligible for provincial Social Assistance.

Last December, the department received the Report of Recommendations of the Manitoba Task Force on Social Allowances which focuses on the fundamental elements of the Social Assistance system in this province. My department is responsible for evaluating the recommendations in light of the impacts on recipients and the administration of the system, as well as cost implications. We will be proposing prompt attention to some recommendations and concerns, and considering future reforms as resource and economic circumstances allow.

As well as maintenance of our Social Allowance Programs, the department will continue to maintain current levels of service for the Child Related Income Support Program, otherwise known as CRISP, which assists nearly 10,000 Manitoba low-income families with the costs of raising their children, and also the Manitoba Supplement for Pensioners which provides a quarterly income supplement to pensioners with little or no personal income.

The last area I would like to refer to, Mr. Chairman, is in the area of statistics and research. We have a statistics and research capacity which is extremely important for planning by the department in the government. The Manitoba Bureau of Statistics plans, develops and disseminates integrated social and economic statistics relating to the province on behalf of the departments and agencies of our government. It also interfaces with Statistics Canada and responds to requests for information from the private sector and general public. Its recent development of extensive economic information on the province will provide the Provincial Government with an important tool for designing economic and development strategies. The department's Research and Planning Branch also provides regular analysis of trends in the Manitoba Labour Market and forecasts for the Manitoba economy and we'll be using this valuable information to make recommendations on government planning.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I would observe that I have provided you with a brief overview of the department's activities and the priorities that the department will be pursuing in 1984-85. I thought this would be useful in as much as that it is a new organization. The department will have total expenditures, we are proposing in our spending estimates, a total expenditure level of \$173,181,000, and as I mentioned earlier, a number of the programs the department will be delivering this year will be receiving, in addition, funding from the Manitoba Jobs Fund.

I would like to take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to thank the staff. We're still in the process of putting together a team, but I'm very pleased with the organizational efforts to date. We've got some excellent people and I want to take this opportunity to thank them for their dedication and their loyalty and their service.

Mr. Chairman, I would refer the Department of Employment Services and Economic Securities 1984-85 spending Estimates to your committee. I look forward to the members' comments, questions and contributions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Consistent with past practice in this committee, the Chair now calls upon the leading opposition critic to give her reply.

MRS. C. OLESON: It's a pleasure to take part in these Estimates with the responsibility that I hold in this department. I just wanted to make a few comments. Some of them may have been covered already by the Minister and they were drowned out in the excitement of both sides chattering while they were being said, so if I repeat something or ask you something that you've already answered well, that's probably the reason.

During the course of the debate on these Estimates, we'll be looking for several things and one of the major things we want to hear from this Minister - and I didn't hear it clearly in his opening remarks - was a justification for the creation of this department, or justification for the creation of it on the part of the taxpayers, to why we needed to go to the extra expense. We hope that the Minister will be able to make it very clear to us and to the taxpayers just why the move was necessary.

We'll also be looking for information on exactly what this department administers in the way of grants to employers, employees, unemployed, to youth and to seniors and anyone else who is in the need of assistance.

We want some clarification from the Minister as to why some programs are under his jurisdiction in this department, and why some were left in other departments because it seems to us that there is some interplay between departments and areas that might have been better left, for instance, with Community Services or with Labour, and we'll be interested to hear the Minister's views on why this move was necessary and why, as I say, some programs are in his department and some were left in their original department.

The opposition would also like some clear definition of where the Jobs Fund activities fit into this department and how they relate with it to other departments. For instance, there seems to us to be a great deal of duplication of administrative staff involved between the departments that are handling the Jobs Fund. It seems to us that whichever department we happen to be debating the Jobs Fund comes into it in some way or another, in contribution of funds, or in programs, or in staffing. So we want to get some clear indication of just where the Jobs Fund fits in and this Minister's role in that program.

It's very confusing to Members of the Legislature at least, to say nothing of the members of the public, who are trying to get information from the government on programs, and grants, etc., to know which department of this government to go to, to get them. They're in the habit of going to one department and now they find they're shunted off to another and sometimes I'm told it means several phone calls to find out just who is in charge of what, and when, and where.

Now in an article in the Free Press on May 3rd of this year it stated that this department is made up of elements of education, labour, and community services, as well as economic development.

On Page 4 of the Government Press release on November 4th it stated that training and retraining are crucial and I won't quote the passage because the Minister has already referred to it. So during the review of the various allocations it would be helpful if the Minister would point out which department particular programs were in previously and some of the justification, as I have stated before, for them being in this department. We'd also like to know what special initiatives are being taken to live up to the commitment stated in that press release of November 4, 1983.

For instance, in what area is the training and the retraining taking place, and for what jobs? For example, is there assistance forthcoming to day care centres in the form of training assistance? We know that the day care isn't under this department. We perhaps would maybe learn why during the course of these Estimates. But the new day care regulations are in force and in order to live up to the commitment, the day care centres are having to train staff and perhaps it would be a good idea if this sort of training was included in the Minister's plans for training and retraining. So that is something we want to hear about because they're going to have trouble conforming to the regulations in time if there isn't some help, I think, in that area.

It would be helpful if the Minister would supply to this committee a list of staff positions and their

respective responsibilities and allocations, as, of course, this is a new department and we would like to know the staff allocations and probably it would save us asking line-by-line how many staff and where they were from. If the Minister could indicate when he's talking about how many staff, whether they were employed before and in what department or if they are newly created positions in his department.

I would like to thank the Minister for providing me with a list of the job creation programs, and in turn I didn't find on my desk and I had to get another copy from him, but in that confusion, that was my fault, not his.

Since the Minister has responsibility regarding the Jobs Fund, it would be helpful if he could indicate, as we progress line-by-line, just where that program fits into this department, in what connection, the funding or the administration or the Minister's input or just where the Jobs Fund fits in.

Before I leave that, I'm wondering, first of all, some of my colleagues are interested in where the Careerstart Program fits in here, could you give us the heading and the line for that please?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed any further, the Chairperson cordially invites the member of the departmental staff of the Department of Employment Services and Economic Security to please come forward and take their respective places.

We shall defer consideration of Item 1.(a) on the Minister's Salary and start with Item 1.(b)(1) and 1.(b)(2) relating to Administration and Finance, Executive Support: Salaries and Other Expenditures - the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: As I had stated before, Mr. Chairman, we'll want to know how many staff and what the positions are, because of course it being a new department, the statement of last year's spending, for instance, probably doesn't really relate - I wouldn't think it does by the funding there - if the Minister could clarify that for us from the beginning.

HON. L. EVANS: First of all, in answer to the specific question that the Member for Gladstone asked, which item Careerstart was under - specifically, it's under 3.(b)(3).

With regard to the staffing, I can give you a list of the staffing by various sections of the department. I haven't got information which indicates in great detail where it comes from but I can tell you generally where the personnel come from, and as you can appreciate, being a new department, there are certain administrative positions that are new, of course. But I can certainly give you this copy - we'll just pass it down to you.

MRS. C. OLESON: All of the first group are in this appropriation then - the top line?

HON. L. EVANS: The top line - well, we're looking at 1.(b)(1) Executive Support. We're looking at eight staff years here and that's the line that's shown on the listing.

MRS. C. OLESON: Then we can move on to - the Executive Support is supporting the Minister and just

that department in administrating the entire department or is that strictly . . . If you could explain.

HON. L. EVANS: It includes my own office and the Deputy Minister's office and various secretarial and clerical support to our two offices.

MRS. C. OLESON: That's the Deputy Minister and how many Executive Assistants?

HON. L. EVANS: Each Minister has one Executive Assistant and one Special Assistant and the Deputy Minister has one Executive Assistant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask then, this increase from \$23,700 last year to \$316,600 this year, what positions are involved in the new staff complement under Executive Support for the Minister?

HON. L. EVANS: Of this money, there are eight positions that I said, seven are new and one was transferred from Community Services and I think that was one clerical position.

MR. G. FILMON: So there's one clerical support staff which was the \$23,700, seven additional positions that are new. Could the Minister indicate what where the specific positions?

HON. L. EVANS: Well, that includes the Special Assistant to the Minister, the Executive Assistant to the Minister, the Deputy Minister, the Executive Assistant to the Deputy, the secretary to the Minister, the secretary to the Deputy Minister, and clerical support of two.

MR. G. FILMON: One to each, the clerical support?

HON. L. EVANS: I think they would be available to each but essentially they're attached to my office but they're available for . . .

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could just briefly give us the rationale behind why the new department was set up with this very heavy administrative complement for the Executive Support to the Minister. There must have been a rationale why a new department was created that had not previously been there, so could the Minister give us a brief review of the rationale for this move?

HON. L. EVANS: I think the staff complement is similar to other offices. There may be one exception and that is that my Executive Assistant is located in Western Manitoba, as are the other EAs for the Regional Cabinet Offices that we had. There's an Executive Council Office in Thompson, Dauphin and Brandon, so that I believe one of these clerical positions is in that office, but other than that, the complement is the same.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, this Minister's Executive Assistant is located in Brandon. Whose Executive Assistants are in Dauphin and Thompson?

HON. L. EVANS: I don't know their names but there would be - I believe they're attached to those Ministers, but I really don't know their specific names. But there was a news release last year some time, outlining the establishment of those offices and the personnel. I suppose we could check it but I don't know that. I can't give you the answer.

MR. G. FILMON: In view of the fact that the Executive Assistants to the particular Ministers are working in their particular constituency areas, are you saying that they're primarily doing political work on behalf of the Minister in his own constituency? Is that why they're located there?

HON. L. EVANS: The three Executive Council Offices - it's an Executive Council Office. I recall there is one in Thompson, as I said, for the Norman region. There's one in Dauphin for the Parklands area, more or less, and this one serves the Westman area and it serves the entire Westman region. It doesn't serve one specific riding.

I might mention that these offices had been in place in the past. I remember Mr. McMaster having his office in place in the City of Thompson, serving the Norman region - an Executive Council Office that is.

MR. G. FILMON: By the same token, I don't recall an Executive Assistant previously having been located in Brandon or Dauphin. The Minister indicates that they're attached to the Executive Council really, but they're assigned to his department and they show up in the Estimates for his department. Is this not an indication that basically these individuals are doing political work on behalf of the particular Minister whose riding they're now located in?

HON. L. EVANS: As I indicated, they're Executive Council Offices but a decision was made that the support staff would be located in that particular department of that particular Minister. They could have been, I suppose, itemized under Executive Council. It's a matter of bookkeeping, I suppose.

MR. G. FILMON: Have these positions in these locations been there prior to this year's Estimates?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes.

MR. G. FILMON: Oh, they have been. Had they been attached to the Executive Council Estimates in previous years?

HON. L. EVANS: No. As I said, the practice is to attach them to the department that particular Minister has, so last year they were in the Department of Community Services.

MR. G. FILMON: In effect, Mr. Chairman, since last year they were attached to the Minister of Community Services and this year they are attached to the Minister of Employment Services, there is no question that they're attached wherever the constituency of that particular Minister happens to be, because last year's Minister of Community Services and this year's Minister

of Employment Services are one and the same. So they are really political support staff out doing work on behalf of the member who represents that constituency in that area.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, the Executive Assistant does what an Executive Assistant can and would do in any government, but I am suggesting to the member that the office fulfills an Executive Council function and we represent and serve the entire Westman region. We have delegations, people phoning up who, for whatever reason, are not satisfied with dealing with the Civil Service and they phone up and have complaints or criticisms or suggestions or questions, and indeed we service the whole Westman area.

I might also add, Mr. Chairman, that there is a system for various Cabinet Ministers to use that office, and they do. I can think of the Minister of Natural Resources there receiving delegations and receiving people from the Westman area with their particular concerns. The present Minister of Community Services has utilized the office, and was given support by the staff that are there in arranging the appointments, etc. There has been quite a long list of Ministers who have utilized the services of the staff and the office and I think it's bringing government to the people. Now that's repeated in Dauphin and Thompson.

MR. G. FILMON: Did the Minister indicate that the Executive Assistant also has a secretary in the Westman office?

HON. L. EVANS: That's the clerical support, as I referred to.

MR. G. FILMON: So there is a clerical secretarial person out there as well?

HON. L. EVANS: That's included in the eight.

MR. G. FILMON: Then, Mr. Chairman, is the Minister indicating that one of the prime reasons why a new department was set up was so that it could justify having a secretary and an Executive Assistant out in the Brandon area to do political work on behalf of the government and this particular Minister in his constituency?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm just wondering if there is a particular function that this office for instance, in Brandon, is it directly related to this department?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, in the sense that we get a large number of Social Allowance problems for the Westman area, people on welfare who have got all kinds of problems. We get them from Souris, Virden, Neepawa - you name it.

Also we have had people who are concerned particularly about our Job Creations Program. You mentioned Careerstart. We get calls on that and so on.

But also, we service the people of Westman with regard to other problems they have with regard to any

government department. We get a wide array or wide range of queries and problems from wherever, whether it be setting up problems they have in getting a house for the mentally retarded at Virden or whatever.

MRS. C. OLESON: It just seems to me just a little different that it should be credited - or debited would be the better word - as an expense to this department to have that sort of an office; that it should be called an expense of Employment Services and Economic Security to have that kind of an office in Brandon and elsewhere. I don't think I have any more remarks on that particular area.

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

1.(c)(1), 1.(c)(2) Resource and Planning: Salaries, Other Expenditures - the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: We would also like to know the staffing on that area please, specifically to the Research and Planning.

HON. L. EVANS: Yes. The 10 staff years that show on your list there combine seven positions transferred from the previous Department of Labour and three positions transferred from Community Services. This includes one director, three senior analysts, one program and planning analyst, one labour market economist, one planning and research analyst, one research assistant, one secretary and one clerk-typist.

MRS. C. OLESON: So those coming from the Department of Labour and from the Community Services probably mean that they have to be replaced in those departments to some extent.

HON. L. EVANS: Well, that is not the case. For example, the service of the labour market specialists are no longer needed, as I understand, in the Department of Labour. My understanding is, there is no replacing of them because we have taken those programs over.

MRS. C. OLESON: Then in cases where the Department of Labour needs this sort of information, they get it from this department now?

HON. L. EVANS: That's right. For example, we put out the Labour Market Bulletin, you know, that monthly report on the labour force survey.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, a few weeks ago I asked the former Minister responsible for Employment Services about a particular contract that was entered into by the government and WMC Associates with respect to personal services. The former Minister undertook to bring me a response in the House, and unfortunately has not and it's been a period of going on four weeks. I wonder if, since it was my understanding that the topic of consultation was in the area of Research and Planning, whether or not the Minister can indicate to us at the present time what the purpose of that contract was, and what particularly was produced by WMC Associates on behalf of the government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the Minister wish to deal with this question?

HON. L. EVANS: Well yes, I'll have to take it as notice and get the information for the member. I can't outline for him the purpose of the contract. I believe that was your main question. But I will get that information for the member.

MR. G. FILMON: What I am looking for in particular is: what was the purpose of the contract? What was the nature of the services provided? Is there a report that has been produced as a result of the contract? Did the full amount that was authorized by the Treasury Board approval of \$67,500, was it expended in the less than six-month period of the contract?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, we'll take that as notice, and provide the Leader of the Opposition with that information as soon as possible.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether or not he might be able to provide this information by tomorrow while we are still dealing with his Estimates.

HON. L. EVANS: We'll try to do that, Mr. Chairman.

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

1.(d)(1), 1.(d)(2) Communications: Salaries, Other Expenditures - the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I take it from the listing you gave me that there is one staff person in this department.

HON. L. EVANS: That is correct.

MRS. C. OLESON: And what is the function of this area? Is it for press releases for the Information Services, or what communications are you talking about in this area?

HON. L. EVANS: It would be from time to time, yes, to put out general information about the various employment programs, Social Allowance programs, but also to oversee the various pamphlets that have to go out, the Manitoba Supplement for Pensioners, the Child Related Income Support Program otherwise known as CRISP, the various programs on the employment side, various pamphlets of that nature, pretty well in line with what other communications' personnel do in the other departments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(d)(1) - the Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. After having heard that, I can't let this go by, but I have to point out that when in opposition, this member as well as members of his party, chastised the previous administration for having any communications' people who weren't housed in the department which is now headed up by the Premier and I would just point that out as a matter of public interest. It's interesting to

note how suddenly when one is put into a different position as the Minister is, suddenly it becomes okay and now we have communications' people in every department, not confined to one area within government.

HON. L. EVANS: I guess this debate went on last year and all I can say is, this is a policy decision that was made by the government based on the Wepler Report and the organization here. The set up is the same, I believe, as in the other departments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(d)(1)—pass; 1.(d)(2)—pass.

1.(e)(1), 1.(e)(2) Financial and Administrative Services: Salaries, Other Expenditures - the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Mr. Chairman, I notice from the listing that this department has 40 people. Could you explain the function of this department and why is it so labour-intensive?

HON. L. EVANS: Okay. First of all as you can imagine, it provides a centralized accounting service, a centralized financial service for the department. It has a particularly large group because it administers the Social Allowances Program, the Health Services Program of Social Allowance recipients. It administers the municipal assistance rebate payments to municipal governments and it generally monitors departmental expenditures in relation to the budgets, and prepares claims for cost-sharing agreements.

I might add that it has one of the heaviest loads of this type of organization of any department because we deal with virtually hundreds of thousands of voucher claims, cheques and so on. We have about 20,000 Social Assistance recipients on the provincial rolls and, of course, we cost-share with the municipalities and there are thousands of additional recipients under the municipal welfare rolls. So, all in all, there's a very heavy administrative function.

I just might add, we're trying to get towards some more automation and we're moving in that direction, but there's still a great deal of paperwork to be done regardless.

MRS. C. OLESON: Does this have any connection at all with the city, the Social Services Department, or are they completely separate from this, the City of Winnipeg, I mean?

HON. L. EVANS: The City of Winnipeg, as all large municipalities in Manitoba, have their own Welfare Department or Social Assistance Department, if you like, and they administer payments under The Social Welfare Act of Manitoba and they do their own thing. We cost-share with the municipal government under a formula.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(e)(1)—pass; 1.(e)(2)—pass.

1.(f)(1), 1.(f)(2) Personnel Services: Salaries, Other Expenditures - the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Would the Minister just give a summary of this department also? Am I correct in assuming there are six staff members there?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes. As it indicates, it is the Personnel Department and carries on all the work required in the hiring of people that are transfers or promotions and so on. We have a manager, two personnel administrators, one secretary and two payroll clerks for a total of six.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(f)(1)—pass; 1.(f)(2)—pass.

1.(g)(1), 1.(g)(2) Systems and Computer Support Services: Salaries, Other Expenditures - the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: This Computer Support Service staffed four?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes.

MRS. C. OLESON: This probably ties in with (e), with the Financial and Administrative Services, does it, with the Computer Services?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, but it goes beyond that. All manual systems and all automated systems are developed in concert with recommendations or concerns of the Provincial Auditor. Generally, all control and support systems are developed in this particular unit, so it can liaise with any other branch of the department.

It undertakes administrative operational reviews and develops administrative systems including forms design, various forms that we use, operational manuals, computer and word processing implications on various information requirements.

It has the responsibility of developing new and revised automated systems to support our new programs or existing programs. It provides ongoing maintenance and upgrading of all existing computer programs. It generally liaises with other agencies too, such as Manitoba Data Services.

MRS. C. OLESON: Are the Social Allowance payments on computer or is that something that's coming in, or at what stage is that?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, we're quite concerned about this. It is in the process of being developed. It was recommended by the task force on Social Allowances and monies had been set aside and it is being developed. It is a very complicated procedure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(g)(1)—pass; 1.(g)(2)—pass.

2.(a)(1), 2.(a)(2) Economic Security - Administration: Salaries, 2.(a)(2) Other Expenditures; 2.(a)(3)(a) Social Services Advisory Committee - Salaries; 2.(a)(3)(b) Other Expenditures - the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Now I want to know staff numbers for each of these in No. 2, as well, starting, of course, with (a)(1).

HON. L. EVANS: There are 27 staff years.

MRS. C. OLESON: I see, yes, okay, 27.

HON. L. EVANS: I can give you the breakdown as follows: We have an Assistant Deputy Minister, of

course, in charge of this division of the department; one administrative secretary to the Assistant Deputy Minister; one Administrative Officer; three Program Analysts; four, Social Allowances Central Directorate; eight, Audit section; two, Central Records; two clerical support; 1.5 term positions; and we have 3.5 positions, 3.5 staff years as you will for The Social Allowances Automation Project which I just referred to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Going down to (3) Social Services Advisory Committee, or Social Services Commission. Could the Minister give me some information on that? Was it under Community Services before? Is it the same mandate as it had before? Give us some indication of just what this Commission does.

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, the Social Services Advisory Committee is set under legislation under the provisions of The Social Services Administration Act and The Social Allowances Act, and it is frankly a requirement of the federal cost-sharing assistance that every province has what amounts to a Welfare Appeal Board. This committee is indeed our Welfare Appeal Board. Anyone who is in receipt of Social Assistance in Manitoba, whether it be provincial or municipal, and is unsatisfied or has any complaint about decisions made by the staff, has the right to go to the Social Services Advisory Committee, the Appeal Board in effect, to have the case reviewed. So it's a very active board. It has to meet regularly. It meets usually in small groups to hear appeals, and I believe under the legislation it has to deal with the appeals within 15 days of written notice of appeal. The committee's decision orders are handed down within 48 hours of the appeal hearing.

MRS. C. OLESON: How many are on that committee? If you said it, I missed it.

HON. L. EVANS: Well, there are 10 or 11 or 12. The reason I'm giving different numbers is that from time to time people resign, there's a vacancy and we have to look for someone else - but between 10 and 12.

MRS. C. OLESON: Is that set by legislation?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, it is. It's established by legislation. They normally meet in groups of three to hear the appeals. We have somebody, for example, for Thompson who will sit down with the Chairman and some other member to hear appeals in the North.

MRS. C. OLESON: This program is cost-shared with the Federal Government under what agreement, and what's the funding formula?

HON. L. EVANS: The program including the cost of the Social Service Advisory Committee is shared under a program called the Canada Assistance Program, otherwise referred to as CAP, and the funding formula is 50-50.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In previous years we've been informed that there are varying degrees of assistance given by different municipalities. Can the Minister tell me, is the assistance more uniform at the present time or do we still have that problem of varying degrees of assistance?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, unfortunately we still have varying degrees of assistance, as the Member for Rhineland describes.

The Task Force on Social Assistance headed up by Professor Ryant indicated this as a problem and suggested that we work towards a uniform system, perhaps providing some incentives to the municipalities in doing this. It's a matter that's under consideration but there hasn't been any move to date.

MR. A. BROWN: Then I would expect that the appeals that have been made, most of the appeals would have been generated by assistance received from municipalities.

Can the Minister tell me how many appeals were made towards the department?

HON. L. EVANS: In 1982 there were 337; 1983, 434; and for this year 1984, we anticipate more or less the same number. I don't think I have a breakdown here whether they're provincial or municipal. It doesn't follow that they're necessarily municipal complaints. They could just as well be provincial.

MR. A. BROWN: Well then, can the Minister then tell me what was the nature of these complaints? What were these complaints about if they were not against municipalities then, what was the nature of the complaints?

HON. L. EVANS: Well, putting it in a nutshell, usually that they're not getting enough money. It varies; it can be very very minor, such as allowance under a special needs category that they should have some money for baby-sitting while they go to the doctor - that's sort of a petty example - all the way to a question of whether they should get more money for food because of special circumstances.

The idea of the board is to take care of various special circumstances and while you have the regulations that are administered as well as we can by a staff that I think is very dedicated and very concerned, nevertheless, there are areas for judgment and there are areas for some disagreement and sometimes the regulations have to be looked at again and that's what the Appeal Board does.

MR. A. BROWN: Can the Minister give me some kind of indication, in a general sort of way, as to what would the percentage be of cases between the City of Winnipeg and their rural municipalities or rural Manitoba?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, the member is asking for a breakdown of the appeals of the municipal category and having that broken down between the City of Winnipeg and the rest of the province. I don't believe I have that particular set of statistics with me,

but I would venture to say that they probably break down on a population basis at least. The City of Winnipeg has 60 percent, using the census definition of Winnipeg which includes just a little bit out of the Perimeter, such as Headingley. The City of Winnipeg has about 60 percent of the population of the province, and it probably has a little bit more than that in terms of welfare cases because, for whatever reason, many people who are unemployed and are in different circumstances seem to end up in Winnipeg.

I would say that of the municipal welfare you could probably break it down on that population basis. We can try to get the information, I don't have it with me this evening.

MR. A. BROWN: The reason I am asking this, I was just wondering whether there were more appeals coming forward from the rural area because some municipalities over there could be accused of not living up to the assistance which was expected of them, and where the City of Winnipeg is always looked upon as being more lenient and that is the reason why I am asking this question, whether there are more appeals coming forward from the City of Winnipeg or from the rural area, just to get some kind of an idea what is going on.

HON. L. EVANS: Well, as I indicated, there are fewer recipients in rural Manitoba, that is, fewer recipients outside of Winnipeg. So, therefore, if you have fewer recipients you have fewer complaints and appeals, but we can try to get that breakdown for the member. I don't have it handy, but we'll get that statistical information for the Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: I would appreciate that information, Mr. Chairman, because I think that it's rather important to see where these appeals are coming from and who the unhappy people are within the system, because I know that we all realize there are some municipalities that are probably pretty frugal with the assistance that they give. Yet I know that all the rural municipalities in Manitoba really look upon the city as being more lenient, and it will be interesting to see where these complaints were coming from. So I would appreciate that information, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)(1)—pass, Economic Security, Administration: Salaries; 2.(a)(2)—pass - Other Expenditures; 2.(a)(3)(a) Social Services Advisory Committee, Salaries—pass; 2.(a)(3)(b) Social Services Advisory Committee, Other Expenditures—pass.

2.(b)(1) Social Allowance Program: Social Allowances; 2.(b)(2) Health Services; 2.(b)(3) Municipal Assistance - the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. How many staff are required to administer The Social Allowances Act?

HON. L. EVANS: We have 200 in '83-84; we have 211.5 staff years in field operations, and 4 staff years in the program Central Directorate which is part of the division's directorate. The request for '84-85 represents a decrease of five staff years in field operations and the same staff at the level in the Central Directorate.

MRS. C. OLESON: In the Task Force Report that the Minister referred to, it was suggested that the province move to a one-tier system under the jurisdiction of the province, a one-tier system of paying Social Assistance. I was wondering if the Minister could comment on that idea and tell us how he sees it.

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, Manitoba is in the minority of provinces in Canada; 7 out of 10 provinces administer the entire Social Assistance Program. In other words, all welfare is paid out by the provincial government and no municipalities are involved. I believe it's Manitoba, Ontario and Nova Scotia where there is some form of municipal involvement.

We are prepared to look at replacing municipal assistance with provincial assistance, in other words, going to a one-tier system. One problem, of course, is that it would cost a lot of money and money is rather short these days. On the other hand, we would wish to give some consideration to some kind of incentive or voluntary system, and I believe Professor Ryant suggests that you have some kind of a voluntary system so that if and when we move in this direction, you would allow the municipalities to come in or stay out of a combined or integrated system. I think if there are, therefore, some municipalities that wish to stay out of it, well, they could do so.

On the other hand, I could advise the member that there have been one or two municipalities who would be interested - for sure one or two or maybe many more - of getting out. I am thinking particularly of the rural municipalities which have very few cases and it's more of a nuisance to them than the bigger cities and municipalities that have a full-time staff dealing with it, such as the City of Brandon, for example.

MRS. C. OLESON: I think the Minister touched on one important point with the rural municipalities. Some of them have so little to deal with that they're not really equipped; their staff isn't equipped to deal with it maybe in the way that it should be - I am not being negative about them - they just haven't the training and they have to deal with it so infrequently that it is a problem.

But I am wondering why the Minister mentions that it would be the cost. Does he see it as a more expensive way of providing the assistance and why would it be more costly, if he thinks it is.

HON. L. EVANS: At the present time, we cost-share municipal assistance with the municipality. It can be a complicated formula but in some cases we pay half, let's say. So if municipality X, which now pays half and we pay half, and we pick up the entire bill, that's an additional burden to the provincial taxpayers.

We estimate, and I don't have the numbers here, but I believe the estimate is that it could almost double - wait a minute, I shouldn't put it this way - it would almost double if we implemented all of the Ryant Report recommendations. He goes beyond just taking the municipalities.

I would say this very safely, that it would add a substantial amount of expenditure to the provincial budget if we moved in, but I think there is rationale for this. I think it would relieve the urban municipalities

or rural municipalities, of a certain burden and at the same time provide for a more uniform system throughout the province.

MRS. C. OLESON: I think in referring to the fact of the cost almost doubling, if that's the Minister's words, I think he is forgetting that there are taxpayers already paying some of it. So if he took into consideration that it's the same taxpayers, in essence, so doubling might not really be the exact picture when it was paid in one place and put into another because it's being paid for at one level or another now.

I am wondering if the Minister has had any feedback or comments from the municipal people since the task force came out, or how widely publicized is the Task Force Report?

HON. L. EVANS: Just to go back to your very first item, I want to clarify, when I talked about doubling our expenditure, I was referring to implementing the entire Ryant Report. The estimate of takeover costs, if you want to use that term, is \$12 million to \$14 million if we moved out.

The last question you were asking how widely distributed is this information, we sent a copy of the report to every municipality in Manitoba plus to other interested organizations and parties and associations, etc. We distributed over 1,000 copies throughout the province.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the member asked another question and I forgot.

MRS. C. OLESON: I asked you what feedback you'd had from the report, what sort of opinions did people express about the proposals.

HON. L. EVANS: Is the member talking about the entire report or just on municipal assistance?

MRS. C. OLESON: Mainly the municipal assistance.

HON. L. EVANS: Well, my information and impression is that we haven't had as much feedback as I would have liked to have seen. It hasn't been that great. But what feedback we've had, there's been no opposition to the idea that the Provincial Government should move into this field, not that I can recall. In fact, some have specifically stated or asked, when are you going to take it over?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Portage.

MR. L. HYDE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My question to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, is, when a municipality is approached for assistance by an individual, as often is the case they refer the person to apply for provincial assistance rather than municipal assistance, where is the line drawn as to who supplies the assistance in a case like that? Is it a case of how long the person would be established in that given area, or how is it approached?

HON. L. EVANS: Well, there is a time factor and there is a factor of the type of situation that the individual finds himself or herself in. Normally, the municipality

is the first line of assistance, particularly short-term assistance, somebody who's transient or somebody who just needs help for a few weeks. That normally is dealt with by the municipal government, and of course, we cost-share with them.

On the other hand if they're deemed to be employable, unemployed employable, and they continue to be in that category, then they remain on the municipal welfare role. However, if they're deemed to be of the category that is not employable, then they become a provincial responsibility. That includes, I might add, of the 21,000 to 22,000 cases that we have presently, about half roughly of them are of a disabled category, people who are mentally handicapped, people you see around in wheelchairs and so on. Many of those people are in that category of disabled, about half, roughly of our total.

Another large category is what is referred to as Mothers' Allowances. According to our legislation which goes back many years, in Manitoba if you are a mother without any means of support, no husband to support you, you can automatically apply for Social Assistance. It's an automatic provision in the act. Last year, the estimate was a little as 7,000 out of the 21,000 - 22,000, and it's about the same this year. It's between 7,000 and 8,000.

There's another category referred to as the Aged. There are some people who are 65 years of age and over who get supplementary Social Assistance even though they may have the old age security and the GIS, they've got some special needs and we help them through this program.

We also have categories, believe it or not, there are certain categories of children and then there are some other miscellaneous categories, but the two largest areas are Disabled and the Mothers' Allowances, those are the two largest categories. So those are the people who are on the provincial, the rest are municipal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Another item mentioned in the Task Force Report was some incentive for people on Social Assistance to earn some money toward their own maintenance. I'm wondering what is currently being done, if anything, to give people some incentive. It seems sometimes from what you hear about it that people who do earn some amount of money, some kind of work, it's really a disincentive because then they get so much taken off their Social Assistance. Is there anything the Minister can say that will help this problem?

HON. L. EVANS: This is a good point. We would like to do more to help people get off Social Allowances, particularly the Mothers' Allowance categories, because in some instances you have women whose children are grown up to a stage where they can get out of the house, indeed want to get out of the house, but they have some difficulty because they've been out of the work force for so long.

Under another program, the Human Resources Opportunity Program, we are attempting to make some assistance available. It's called the VIA, Voluntary Incentive Allowance, whereby these people could, in

effect, receive some allowances. They could receive them as Mothers' Allowances and obtain some supplementary or they could come into these projects, the Human Resource Opportunity Projects, such as WestBran in Brandon, and there are six others around the province, and through that organization come under assistance there and obtain a supplementary form of incentive. They would get some life skills training. We'd place them in a work situation, either in a sheltered workshop or a real work situation with some employer or some institution. But that's one specific program.

Presently, we have a work incentive program where a recipient can receive 30 percent of their gross earnings or \$50 a month, whichever is greater.

There's another element too, we have a Student Social Allowance Program which is considered to be the best in Canada, where we're trying to get people who can get some advantage from going to college or university, and give them some assistance to get that training so they can get off welfare.

MRS. C. OLESON: I think this is very important because the government and the taxpayers, to say nothing of the person on Social Assistance that people, as soon as they can, become self-sufficient, I'm sure the people who are on it in the most part are anxious to have that happen and any help in that regard would be useful.

I'm wondering, there have been articles in the paper once in a while about fathers applying for Social Assistance, that's single fathers who are taking care of youngsters, I'm wondering how many of these cases the Minister would know about. In the Attorney-General's Estimates I asked about this in connection with one news item and he said there was legislation forthcoming to do with this. I'm wondering if this is part of a legislative package under this Minister, or is it the Attorney-General's department that the legislation would be under. I would just like some comments on this from the Minister.

HON. L. EVANS: The answer is both, Mr. Chairman. It will be included in the Statute Law Amendment Bill this year, which is an omnibus bill with miscellaneous and a variety of measures that affect various departments and there will be one section which will ensure that The Social Allowances Act does not contravene The Human Rights Act, which it does now, and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

There has been quite a bit of discussion about this and we've had many complaints with regard to how sole-support fathers are being discriminated against. At any rate, that will be addressed, as you've indicated, by the Attorney-General when he brings it in under The Statute Law Amendments Bill.

MRS. C. OLESON: I believe the Minister may have referred to this a moment ago, but in last year's Estimates there was reference to a work activity project for people on Social Assistance. They made a dollar an hour in basic training. Is this still ongoing, this program, and is it still a dollar an hour?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the incentive is still provided. It's not a dollar an hour; it's \$40 a week.

It was calculated because we had to take into account the minimum wage in Manitoba and the allowances we provided the clients in the Human Resources Opportunity Program.

We can discuss this further when we get into that particular section, but there are some technical problems and we think that the \$40 - we don't regard it as a wage, we regard it as an incentive allowance that really helps offset some additional costs, that people who are coming out of the home and having to go to work now will have, whether it be transportation costs, bus fare, car, extra clothing or whatever.

MRS. C. OLESON: There was reference made in last year's Annual Report of the Department of Community Services about emergency social services. It said that this department is responsible for providing five essential social services to disaster victims and where municipal and provincial services are unable to meet their needs. These are lodging, food, clothing, personal service, registration and enquiry. Is that something that is under this Minister and still in operation?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I think the member is referring to the Emergency Measures Organization.

MRS. C. OLESON: It was under Community Services last year.

HON. L. EVANS: Perhaps the member is referring to assistance that we do provide to some people who are in special need. I think, for example, of the crisis shelters for women in Manitoba that we have, whereby some women with their families may not have any means of support and we would provide them, under the Social Allowances Program, with some financial support to enable them to have food, clothing and so forth and to enable them to live in the shelter. Perhaps that's what the member's referring to.

MRS. C. OLESON: I don't believe so. This is disaster victims, if there's a flood or . . .

HON. L. EVANS: We do provide the food vouchers and I guess other emergency financial assistance for those who qualify, but it's co-ordinated - as it says in the report - by the Emergency Measures Organization.

MRS. C. OLESON: That would be under the Department of Government Services then.

HON. L. EVANS: The co-ordination is under EMO. I guess we get the bill. They dish it out and send us the bill.

MRS. C. OLESON: It eventually bounces back to you.

HON. L. EVANS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My question is, have the qualifications for the Social Assistance Program been changed so much as to who qualifies for Social Assistance from the previous year, because

I notice there's a \$6 million increase. I was just wondering if the Minister could explain this \$6 million increase which is well above the 3 percent guideline which the government has set.

HON. L. EVANS: No, it doesn't relate to a change in the criteria. It's essentially because of an increased caseload, plus an increase in the rates of assistance.

Each year we take a look at the changing cost of living. We look at food, clothing, personal needs, household supplies. We have information from Statistics Canada and also from the Federal Department of Agriculture and we make an analysis of this cost of living as it would impact on our average Social Allowance recipient and make an adjustment; so we adjust the rates from time to time.

We do pay the utilities at cost. In other words, if a welfare recipient was in a house, we would pay the electricity bill that the recipient has and we would pay the gas bill if they had natural gas and so on, so those costs are increasing. Basically it's a combination of these price increases and then of course, as I indicated, there could be a work load change, that is an increase in caseload and I believe we projected a 2 percent increase caseload in here, so of that \$6 million I would say, about \$4 million is attributed to price increases and \$2 million to anticipated growth in the case load.

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, what the Minister is really saying is that he doesn't have too much confidence in what the other Ministers have been espousing from time to time, in that we have nothing but blue skies ahead, that the economy is picking up.

The Minister of Natural Resources says things have never been better and they're going to keep on being okay. The Minister of Agriculture has things under control; the Minister of Housing says that we have a huge increase in housing, that everybody is going to be employed. We will see no unemployment. The Member for The Pas has corrected the problem of crooked two-by-fours and he says that sales are going good and I'm glad for all of these things, Mr. Chairman. I'm extremely pleased that things are looking so good, but my problem now is, if things are so good, then how come this Minister is predicting a 2 percent increase in caseload. Something just doesn't fit.

I'm just wondering whether the Minister does not share the confidence that I have in the Ministers who've told us that things were going to be just rosy from now on. Obviously, the Minister doesn't share the confidence that I have in the government. I wonder if the Minister can explain how he arrived at a 2 percent increase in caseload.

HON. L. EVANS: The increase in the caseload, I think, can be attributed to three factors, one of which is the increasing number of Mothers' Allowance cases. For whatever reason, we have more single-parent families. I guess it's the changing nature of our society, but for whatever reason, that is one big area of anticipated increase. Remember, we're talking about 2 percent, so when I say big, I say it in a relative way.

The other, we do have some increases anticipated among the disabled category and again, that's a projection, just based upon the pattern of the last few

years. I don't know whether we're going to be right or wrong, but these are the two areas we see as increasing.

There's an overriding consideration as well, I suppose, and that is the fact that Manitoba's population is increasing. Our rate of population increase has been the biggest the last year that it has been since the Second World War and the post Second World War period - so what we're doing is sort of projecting on the basis of our past experience and this is where we've seen the increases, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you. I wonder if the Minister has the figures on what size of a case load there was on Social Assistance in 1981 and what the figures are now, 1983.

HON. L. EVANS: Yes. In 1981 the Provincial Social Allowance cases were 19,057; 1983 there are 20,864; 1982 they went up to 19,483. Now as I said, they're 20,864, but the pattern is there. The pattern is that the increase is in Mothers' Allowances and the Disabled category. I don't know why we have more disabled. Maybe in that particular category because of more mentally retarded living in the community, being independent and so forth, but that's what it is, it's a projection of the past trend that's been evident for a couple of years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(b)(1)—pass; 2.(b)(2) - the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This is Health Services. Was this formerly with the Health Department, or has this always been with the Social Services?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, this has always been with the Social Services Division.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(b)(2)—pass; 2.(b)(3) Municipal Assistance - the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you. There's a line here that says Recoverable from Canada. Could the Minister tell us what agreement that is and what is the cost-sharing then as the payment to municipalities for assistance in paying their welfare payments, is that correct?

HON. L. EVANS: Just to clarify. Mr. Chairman, is the member talking about the Recoverable from Canada or the recoverable by the municipalities for Manitoba?

MRS. C. OLESON: Well, in the first instance, the heading - we'll go back then, I'm sorry, to the Municipal Assistance heading - I take it that means your department pays the municipalities the cost-sharing?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, and in turn we cost-share that with the feds.

MRS. C. OLESON: And in turn it's cost-shared with Canada. What agreement is that and what is the cost-sharing?

HON. L. EVANS: As I indicated before, that's the Canada Assistance Plan.

MRS. C. OLESON: Yes, that's the same plan.

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, it's the same agreement and it's 50-50.

MRS. C. OLESON: 50-50.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(b)(3)—pass.

2.(c)(1) Manitoba Supplement for Pensioners, Salaries; 2.(c)(2) Other Expenditures; 2.(c)(3) Financial Assistance - the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Could the Minister indicate how many staff members there would be in this department?

HON. L. EVANS: Well, just as indicated on the list then, Mr. Chairman, there are four people.

MRS. C. OLESON: Oh, I'm sorry, yes, four people. And this is also under the same agreement as the Municipal Assistance, with the Federal Government that is?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, there is no cost-sharing with the Federal Government on this program.

MRS. C. OLESON: Just under Line 3 it indicates Recoverable from Canada, so is that a direct grant from the Federal Government?

HON. L. EVANS: Apparently there is some aspect. The program itself, the moneys to the pensioners is provided by the Manitoba taxpayers, but there's some elements of the administration that we can cost-share under CAP. So wherever we can cost-share, we cost-share and get as much as we can out of Ottawa.

MRS. C. OLESON: Yes, that makes sense.

HON. L. EVANS: But the money itself, the actual pension to the pensioner, is Manitoba taxpayers' money.

MRS. C. OLESON: It's a direct payment by the Manitoba . . .

HON. L. EVANS: By the province and its paid quarterly, yes.

MRS. C. OLESON: This shows a decrease in funding, could the Minister explain that?

HON. L. EVANS: One of the reasons is, we have a criteria for pay out and as the Old Age Security has gone up with indexing and the Guaranteed Income Supplement has been enriched over the years, there's been a reduction in the eligibility for the Manitoba supplement and therefore we're estimating a slight decrease for those 65 years of age and over. This is eligible for those between 55 and 65 as well. We don't anticipate a decrease there. In fact, we think that there'll be a bit of an increase.

The other thing I forgot to mention, there are more people who are eligible for Canada Pension Plan, CPP, and that's a big thing, the Canada Pension Plan.

MRS. C. OLESON: Could the Minister just indicate for the record what the criteria is for that supplement for pensioners. How much is it and what . . .

HON. L. EVANS: Okay, there are two components. The 65-and-over component is for Old Age Security pensioners who are in receipt of certain levels of the GIS. The other component refers to the 55-and-over and it's for pensioners, as I say, for 55 years and over who don't get any Old Age Security benefits but whose income falls within a certain specified range and is derived at least 50 percent from pension sources.

At any rate, those who are 65-and-over are automatically enrolled in the Manitoba Supplement for Pensioners Program on the basis of their application for the GIS. The pensioners in the 55-years-and-over category must apply for the supplement each benefit year which begins on July 1st.

The income eligibility levels are increased periodically and in accordance with the changing cost of living and so on. The amount that we pay out is a relatively small amount. The maximum benefit available at the present time is - this is annually - \$187.68 for a single pensioner and \$202.32 for each member of a married couple. So it's relatively a small amount but those who get it certainly seem to be very desirous of continuing to receive it because they ensure that they reapply each year. If you're under 65 and if there's any holdup if you're over 65, we sure hear about it. So people seem to appreciate it even though it's a small amount.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry I was at another meeting and I just got back a bit late to catch the Social Allowance Program and I just want to ask a couple of quick questions.

I wonder if the Minister might revert. First of all, I just wonder what ratio - Recoverable from Canada \$75,879,000 - I was just wondering what ratio . . . ?

HON. L. EVANS: It's 50-50.

MR. D. BLAKE: It's 50-50?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, it's 50-50. The Member for Gladstone asked me that question.

MR. D. BLAKE: 75 plus 75 comes to 150 million and there's only 137 million being spent; I thought it was 50-50.

HON. L. EVANS: Okay, it's a little complicated because of the municipalities. It's 50 percent of the total but you have to take also into consideration the municipalities pick up a portion.

MR. D. BLAKE: You probably covered the study that was done on the welfare system? You've covered that previously and I can get that in Hansard?

HON. L. EVANS: Well, there was some discussion. The Member for Gladstone asked some questions about the implementation of that report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions have been answered before, Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: As long as I can get it in Hansard, Mr. Chairman. That's my point because I have some constituents that have asked me to question the Minister on that.

HON. L. EVANS: Well, if you have some specific questions, I'd be glad to answer it or you can send them to me.

MR. D. BLAKE: Well, no. It was just a couple of municipal people that asked me what happened to the study. They were looking for some results from it. Was the report going to be tabled? Could they get a copy of it, and what was going to be done with it? When would it be implemented?

HON. L. EVANS: Well, we distributed a copy to every municipality, Mr. Chairman. In fact, we distributed over 1,000 copies to various organizations, including municipalities.

As I've indicated to the Member for Gladstone, we are looking at some kind of a phase-in system where it would be voluntary, but it would increase our costs \$12 million to \$14 million if we took over all municipal welfare. Half of that, of course, is the City of Winnipeg and it's an additional cost for the provincial taxpayers, yes.

MR. D. BLAKE: I will get that out of Hansard, Mr. Chairman, then. Thank you.

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

2.(d)(1) Child Related Income Support Program: Salaries; 2.(d)(2) Other Expenditures; 2.(d)(3) Financial Assistance - the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We are at 2.(d) Child Related Income Support Program?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, that's right.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you. A staff of 16 looking after that?

HON. L. EVANS: That's correct.

MRS. C. OLESON: What are the income qualifications for families applying for this program?

HON. L. EVANS: The level is adjusted each year, depending on the cost-of-living change, or the Consumer Price Index. It varies, but if you have one child under 18, the maximum benefits are paid at or below \$10,388.00. Now it will go up as you have more children. If you have six children under 18 years of age, we will pay the maximum benefit at or below an annual income of \$13,495.00.

MRS. C. OLESON: How much is it per child then?

HON. L. EVANS: It's \$30 per month per child.

MRS. C. OLESON: This also is cost-shared with the Federal Government. Is this on the 50-50 basis also?

HON. L. EVANS: If the family who has applied for CRISP is on Social Allowances, we can cost-share the CRISP payments. If the family is not on Social Allowances, there is no cost-sharing. I would suggest the bulk of this money is paid out by the Manitoba Government.

MRS. C. OLESON: The Provincial Government, yes.

HON. L. EVANS: Yes.

MRS. C. OLESON: There is a reduction in funds allocated this year. Can the Minister explain this?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this is based on our experience. We believe that - no, it's related to the response - the takeup of that money that was provided last year was less than 100 percent. Although \$8.55 million was provided, we didn't spend as much as we are asking for this year. There was another expenditure of \$1.853 million approximately, so we believe that this amount is realistic.

MRS. C. OLESON: I am just wondering, Mr. Chairman, if the Mothers' Allowance comes into this department.

HON. L. EVANS: Well, as I indicated, if you are on Social Allowances, say, as a Mothers' Allowance category, you can get some CRISP money.

MRS. C. OLESON: Yes, but I am not just referring to the CRISP; but is this the department under which the Mothers' Allowance falls?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, it's the same division.

MRS. C. OLESON: So it's administered through this same area.

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, Economic Security.

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

2.(e)(1) Economic Security Field Operations: Salaries; 2.(e)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Could the Minister indicate the staff numbers for this? I am just confused by this list here. And also, could the Minister explain the function of this department?

HON. L. EVANS: The Field Operations, as indicated on the list there, show a little over 206 staff years. This is the Field Operation; these are the people who actually deal with the recipients.

MRS. C. OLESON: The caseworkers.

HON. L. EVANS: They are the actual caseworkers, yes.

MRS. C. OLESON: That's what I was getting at.

HON. L. EVANS: They are scattered throughout the province, well dispersed throughout the province to deal with the cases. They are dispersed in accordance with the population.

MRS. C. OLESON: How many offices does the department maintain throughout the province?

HON. L. EVANS: There are 14 offices.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, some time ago there was, and maybe still is, some consideration given to taking away some of the welfare responsibility from the municipalities and placing it solely with the province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The member is supposed to be notified that this has been discussed before he came.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, it may be discussed before I came, but are we not in that area right now?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, just for clarification, the question that the honourable member posed, indeed, was posed by the Member for Gladstone and the Member for Minnedosa and was discussed in terms of the policy implications of the Ryant Report.

What we are discussing now is the Field Operations, the actual delivery. These are the people that receive the applications and oversee the payout, etc. I don't mind discussing it, but we have discussed it at least on two other occasions this evening.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can always discuss that again under Minister's Salary.

The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister satisfied that the way the system is working is satisfactory, that there won't be any changes? He can answer it in a short manner.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied. We would like to implement many of the recommendations of the Ryant Report. The problem is they tend to be costly. Just to move into the municipal welfare field, as I indicated twice before, would cost us between \$12 million and \$14 million.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Just while we are on that, has the Minister considered turning the welfare roll back to the municipalities in full?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, as I indicated, 7 out of the 10 provinces handle all the welfare. There is no municipal assistance in 7 out of 10 Canadian provinces. Manitoba, Ontario and Nova Scotia have a municipal system in place.

I suppose we could consider doing that if the municipalities want to shoulder the extra cost. It's something to consider, I suppose. I don't think they would be very receptive. Any correspondence I have had it's the other way around.

MR. D. BLAKE: It's not under active consideration then?

HON. L. EVANS: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(e)(1)—pass; 2.(e)(2)—pass.

Resolution No. 60: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$154,971,400 for Employment Services and Economic Security for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1985—pass.

3.(a)(1) Employment Services, Administration: Salaries; 3.(a)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am seeing here that there are seven people employed in this area?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, this is the Administration of the Employment Services division.

MRS. C. OLESON: Does that reflect an increase in staff over what it took to administer that program in the past, these programs in that department?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I should clarify. I have a note here that actually that number should be eight, if you include an additional person from another area, but it is essentially the same as last year. We had seven last year in Administration and there are seven this year, but there is this one additional staff position . . .

MRS. C. OLESON: This was lifted out of the Labour Department, I take it, the entire operation?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: The Member for Gladstone is finished then?

MRS. C. OLESON: Yes, that's fine.

MR. D. BLAKE: Mr. Chairman, I gather the Minister's own remarks at the Selkirk Plant came under this particular section in Employment Services?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, (d)(3).

MR. CHAIRMAN: It will come under (d)(3) on Page 61. The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I notice that this particular section looks after the immigrant workers and has that responsibility for that area.

Can the Minister indicate at what stage the Portage la Prairie immigrant workers, is that the Mexican labour type employment comes in and the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We haven't reached that part. That will be in 3.(c).

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, you know, it says in the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are still in 3.(a)(1) . . .

MR. J. DOWNEY: It says in the outline, if I may, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . and 3.(a)(2).

MR. J. DOWNEY: If I may, in the outline, it suggests - and that's what we're being asked to debate are we not? - Employment Services, 3.(a) Salaries. Well, you can deal with wherever you want if you want to put it off, but it says in the preamble "Immigrant Employment."

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, just on a point of order, that description which the Member for Arthur refers to relates to Item 3. It's a description of everything under 3. What we're suggesting is the item that the member is interested in, which is described in that paragraph, is delineated under section (c) of Item 3. The description pertains to the whole of No. 3.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We can pass this one and go to 3. The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, there's been a precedent set and this is the time when the present government were in opposition, that they insisted that they could talk about anything under a preamble that is as wide as that. I want it brought to the attention of the Chairman and the committee that if I feel that I'd like to debate it under this, I think the Minister should be prepared to do so. It's listed in the preamble and should be debated if that's the desire of the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Rule 64.(2) states: "Speeches in the Committee of the Whole House must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under discussion."

The item or clause under discussion is 3.(a)(1) Salaries, Administration and Other Expenditures. We haven't called Immigration and Settlement Services. The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, how many people are employed in looking after the immigration people that come in to work in the Portage vegetable fields or other vegetable fields . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We haven't . . .

MR. J. DOWNEY: . . . in the Salaries in this department, Mr. Chairman?

HON. L. EVANS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the four salaries, if we're discussing 3.(a)(1) Salaries, those Salaries are comprised of the Assistant Deputy Minister of the entire Employment Services Division, plus three support staff that he has, plus an additional four clerical support. So, they provide the overall administration, the central administration for the entire Employment Services Division of the department.

These people specifically do not deal in the front line with this particular question. If it's within our jurisdiction - because I haven't heard the whole question - it would be dealt with by the Immigration and Settlement staff.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Which one of these people that he's mentioned is responsible for the Immigration Department or Immigration Program?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to continue answering questions when it's not . . . ?

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, somebody's got to be responsible and that's what they're doing.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, there is a Director of Immigration and Settlement and that person's salary is under (c)(1). I'll be glad to give you that information, it's not a problem of giving it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think for the purpose of orderly proceeding in this committee, we have to wait until the item is called out.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I want the record to show that this Minister is not co-operating with the committee as far as dealing with the preamble is concerned.

I went through an harrasment under his people when they were in opposition . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, that's exactly what it was. Read the record if you can read. I'll wait, Mr. Chairman.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I want to put it on the record, if the committee so desires and directs me, I'll answer his question right now; if the committee so desires. I want to co-operate with the member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Committee has to operate under certain rules. Either we obey the rules or we don't. If we obey the rules, there'll be order; if we don't, there will be chaos. Which one do you want?

MR. D. BLAKE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I think the point that the Member for Arthur is trying to make is that under many other Estimates discussions, we had a wide-ranging discussion on all the items under the subheading 61, and then the whole thing was passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll call the whole thing if that's what you want. I think it's better to focus on certain numbers, certain clusters of items that are related.

So, let's pass 3.(a)(1) if you want; 3.(a)(1)—pass; 3.(a)(2)—pass; 3.(b)(1) Employment Development and Youth Services: Salaries; 3.(b)(2) Other Expenditures - I'm calling them out - 3.(b)(3) Employment Program; 3.(b)(4)(a) Northern Development, Manitoba Careers Travel; 3.(b)(4)(b) Less: Recoverable from Northern.

MR. D. BLAKE: Fine, we're back to (b)(1) Salaries, are we?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(b)(1).

MR. D. BLAKE: Can I play with the card or do I have to use a sheet?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm calling all the b's.

MR. D. BLAKE: How are we going to get bingo if you only call b's?

HON. L. EVANS: You have to have the right card.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are on (b) Employment Development and Youth Services and all the subitems under it.

The Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: I just want to clarify what staff are involved in this - 27?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes. Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

MRS. C. OLESON: That is to co-ordinate and deliver the programs, for instance, in the list that you gave me?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, it is the general administration. We do have other people involved in delivering programs, but to some level, they do deliver and are responsible for the administration of programs. They're mainly senior managers, program managers and employment officers in the department. We do have field staff in addition to this.

MRS. C. OLESON: In addition to that? In the 27?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you. Now, when we get down to (3), Employment Programs - that is the listing you gave me - are there any other programs in that apportionment as well that we should be looking at?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there are various programs that this item covers, including STEP, the Student Employment Program; also the Manitoba Youth Jobs Centre Program whereby we have 42 students as managers of Youth Jobs Centres throughout rural and Northern Manitoba; and it includes volunteers in the public service, there is some money there to increase volunteer utilization; and it includes Careerstart.

MRS. C. OLESON: There was a program called Hire a Student. Is the name being changed to the Job Centres? Am I correct?

HON. L. EVANS: That's correct, Mr. Chairman. Excuse me, I omitted the Northern Summer Education Program, as well is covered by this item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(b)(1) - the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: You said that the Hire a Student had been changed to the Jobs Centre. Has the thrust of that been changed in any way? For instance, does that include people who are not students? That's a Youth Job Centre, am I correct in that?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, it was last year. There are 42 Youth Job Centres throughout Manitoba, including Glenboro. There's one in Glenboro; there's one in Treherne - I don't know whether that's your riding or not.

MRS. C. OLESON: Yes.

HON. L. EVANS: Well, I can read them all off. Let's see - Melita is in there. There's Killarney, Boissevain, Deloraine, Melita - I am just reading the Westman ones.

The southwest area is Brandon, Killarney, Boissevain, Deloraine, Melita, Hamiota, Glenboro and Treherne. I can give you the whole list if you like, but they are pretty well the same as in last year's Estimates.

MRS. C. OLESON: How much money is allocated to that program?

HON. L. EVANS: The Youth Jobs Centre Program is run in the summer, Mr. Chairman, by 42 students, and the expenditure is \$177,400.00.

MRS. C. OLESON: Okay. How many staff are required to operate this program? Is that information available, a breakdown of that?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, 42 students hired for the summer.

MRS. C. OLESON: No, I mean in the department, from the department point of view, not from the Jobs Centres themselves.

HON. L. EVANS: There is no staff from the department in the youth centres. There is a qualification, I guess, in the larger centres where there are Federal Manpower offices, employment offices. I think we may share some space with them but, as such, I don't believe that we have any of our staff in these youth centres.

We had utilized one person part-time to organize the centres.

MRS. C. OLESON: That was orientation for the . . .

HON. L. EVANS: Yes.

MRS. C. OLESON: Training for the 42 students requires - what did you say - one person?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes. For that specific program, I might add that we had the general administration of this division and these people are available also for lecturing the students, etc.

MRS. C. OLESON: The STEP program, I am just wondering if the Minister could indicate how many people were employed under that program last year.

HON. L. EVANS: Last year there were 862; this year we anticipate 868.

MRS. C. OLESON: Could the Minister indicate how long these students work, what length of time?

HON. L. EVANS: They are essentially over the summer. The average salary this year is anticipated at being \$2,300, so that would give you some idea; yes, approximately 14 weeks upon average.

MRS. C. OLESON: How many weeks was it last year?

HON. L. EVANS: Slightly more than 14 weeks.

MRS. C. OLESON: It was slightly more than 14 weeks. How many people were involved last year?

HON. L. EVANS: As I said, there were 862 last year. I gave that.

MRS. C. OLESON: Well, how many this year then?

HON. L. EVANS: 868.

MRS. C. OLESON: Sorry, I missed that. So actually then there is a few more people working for less time?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, a few more.

MRS. C. OLESON: How much money was allocated last year and how much this year to the entire program?

HON. L. EVANS: Last year the entire program was \$2,377,000; this year it's \$2,249,100, a decrease of roughly \$128,000.00.

MRS. C. OLESON: A decrease.

HON. L. EVANS: A slight decrease; it's generally the same level, a very slight decrease.

MRS. C. OLESON: One complaint there has been about this program is that the wages, from year to year, don't reflect the cost that students have when they go back to university, that their costs are rising and other wages, of course, in community are rising, but this, it doesn't rise to meet their needs. Could the Minister comment on that?

HON. L. EVANS: I guess the students would always like to receive a bit more money than they do, but we thought we should maintain the same salary levels because we wanted to keep as many jobs available, we wanted to spread the money around as much as possible, and we felt it would be prudent to keep the salary levels the same and try to keep the same number of students as in 1983 and that, generally, is what happened.

I think one feature of the program is, of course, not only do they get employed but they very often find some very useful experience related to their future career in government. There is a very, very wide variety of occupations and career challenges for the STEP students. It's distributed among the different departments, of course.

MRS. C. OLESON: This program didn't always apply just to government jobs, did it? At what point did it change?

HON. L. EVANS: Six or seven years ago, Mr. Chairman.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Minister could inform us whether the pay scale for STEP students remain the same or has it increased.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I thought we'd just answered that. It's the same this year as last year.

MR. R. BANMAN: Would the Minister confirm that the students have been reduced from 16 weeks to 14 weeks?

HON. L. EVANS: The average job duration last year was 14 weeks and we anticipate the average job duration to be 14 weeks this year.

MR. R. BANMAN: Would the Minister confirm that students that did have 16-week jobs last year have been sent notices that they would only be paid for 14 weeks this year?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, there may be a few cases whereby one or two positions have a lower number of weeks available this year but, as I say, the average is the same this year as it was last year.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, we have a reduction in the amount of funds being provided for STEP students and I want to point that out to the Minister because had this been done four or five years ago, the then opposition, of which he was a member at that time, would have screamed long and hard that the government of that day was not only not keeping up with inflation, but was actually cutting back in the amount of money that was being provided to people who are unemployed in the youth segment of our population.

So we have an example here, Mr. Chairman, of the government not only not keeping up with inflation, but actually cutting back on the STEP program in this province. At a time when they are advertising the Jobs Fund, of all the money they're spending for job creation, this Minister has cut the STEP Program in his department. I want to tell the Minister that cutting back the amount of time that a student is allowed to work has enabled him to get up on the floor of the Legislature and say that he is employing six more students this year. When one looks at a statistical basis, that might be good, but what has happened is that it is being done at the expense of a lot of students who require those two extra weeks of work to pay tuition, to pay their expenses to put them through school and many of them have now received notices that they will not be paid for the 16 weeks, which they were the year before, but have been cut down to 14 weeks.

Mr. Chairman, from a government, from a party who when in opposition cried long and hard about cutbacks, we once again have an example of what they do when they are given the reins of government. You've got a Minister here who used to produce reams of statistics showing what was happening in the unemployment field. He once again is juggling the figures and we see an example here of when given the authority and the confidence of the people of Manitoba - what do they do? - they cut back the STEP Student Program by \$130,000.00.

Mr. Chairman, I think this Minister should have a good long look at what he said three or four years ago and see how that squares with what he's doing now when he's left in charge of programs, and actually is

causing reductions which he decried when he was in opposition.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I indicated that the number of students this year will be slightly more than the number of students involved in the program last year. I would point out that what we're talking about here are jobs inside the Provincial Government. In addition to that, there is considerably more money that's going to be made available for young people in Manitoba in job creation. They're in the Estimates. We haven't announced all the programs. They will be announced, as I have indicated in the House, in the near future, but we will be spending more money on youth employment programs this year than ever before.

We have some new initiatives that we are exploring. I would say that there will be more young people put to work through various programs in the coming year than last year. We can go into a lot of detail on that, but STEP is only one thrust. It's a thrust of jobs in the Manitoba Government. We believe there are jobs in the private sector that should be supported and we're supporting that more than ever before.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, let the record be very clear that this Minister has taken funds from the STEP Program to introduce what he calls new programs and bolsters some of the other programs the government is advertising in the Jobs Fund and he cannot today sit here and say that he has created more jobs and that slipped out. In the statistics that he was putting forward, he says he created six new jobs. Well, if you want to create another 800 new jobs, cut everybody back to seven weeks and employ another 800 people and only pay them for seven weeks. If that's the type of bookkeeping juggling that you're going to do, the people of Manitoba are finding out because we're getting calls from students who worked 16 weeks last year and have said, I've been cut back to 14, what's happening?

So what we're seeing here is that the government is cutting back on an existing program, is using those funds either in Jobs Fund or what they call innovative programs, and really what we're seeing is that the government is using the same amount of dollars that they probably would have used under normal conditions with normal increases and using them and spending more of the taxpayers' dollars in advertising those new programs and new initiatives. But what has happened here, there is a cutback of close to \$150,000, the students are working shorter durations of time for the government. No matter how he fudges the figures, the fact of the matter is that this Minister has cut back the STEP Program and is justifying the cutback by saying those moneys are going to be used in other areas.

Mr. Speaker, it's politics, it's cheap politics as the Member for Arthur put it, and I want to tell the Minister that in no way is he going to be able to use those figures and use those justifications to try and prop up this ailing government.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, the bookkeeping here is very complicated. There was an adjustment. It's a little more complicated. There is some money for

Student Exchange Programs and there are bookkeeping adjustments. But, essentially, the program is not cut back. The STEP Program, in terms of jobs in the Manitoba Government, is the same and the average payout per student is roughly the same. So there is no cutback and the member says that it's not the case. There has been a reduction in the STEP budget by \$127,900.00. That is tied into some other aspects of the program including Quebec exchange students and so on.

All I'm saying is in terms of jobs in the Manitoba Government is approximately the same, in fact, it's a few more. The average payout is the same, roughly speaking. So the observations of the Member for La Verendrye are incorrect, with all due respect.

MR. R. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, here we have a classic example. Last year, they spent \$2,377,000 on the STEP Program. This year, they're spending \$2,249,000 - that's what the Minister told us. In my books, that represents a cutback of \$125,000.00. Now if he's saying that's not really a cutback, we can understand why when he was in opposition, he really didn't understand what was happening. But, Mr. Chairman, this government, this NDP Government, who was the champion of all these job creation programs when they were in opposition is here today, by his own figures, admitting they are cutting back the STEP Program by \$128,000 to be exact. Let the record show, that is the type of action we get when we elect New Democrats.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, since the member's repeating, I think I can afford the luxury of repeating as well. I said that there are various new initiatives allowing for more young people to be employed than ever before, particularly in the private sector, and there will be more job opportunities created through this department than ever before.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(b)(1)—pass; 3.(b)(2) - the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: We're still on 3.(b)(3), Employment Programs?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm trying to call 3.(b)(2). 3.(b)(2)—pass.

3.(b)(3) - the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: What we've been on is Employment Programs, Careerstart is one of them and I'm sure most of the members in the opposition have some questions on that aspect of employment.

One of the ones I was wanting to ask is, what staff in this department are directly involved in administering the Careerstart Program?

HON. L. EVANS: We don't have a staff delineated especially to carry out the Careerstart Program. They carry out various programs that the department has, so Careerstart happens to be one job that they deal with, primarily in the summer months. In the winter months there are other programs that they've administered. Last year, for example, the Manitoba

Employment Action Program was one of them, for example.

MRS. C. OLESON: Who were the forms sent to this year? Were they sent to people who had applied and were unsuccessful last year, or to everyone who had applied, or what was the criteria for sending out the forms?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, we sent them to all previous applicants, plus others who expressed an interest in getting an application form.

MRS. C. OLESON: What was the wage assistance with this program and is there a wage differential? Last year, I remember there was a wage differential between Native students and non-Native students. Was that the case this year also?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, it's not the case this year. We pay \$4.00 an hour, which is the minimum wage, plus 10 percent for employee benefits if we're dealing with a non-profit community organization. If we're dealing with a business, we pay \$2.00 an hour plus 10 percent of the wage assistance for employee benefits such as CPP, UIC, etc.

MRS. C. OLESON: Does this program employ only students or is it other unemployed youths as well?

HON. L. EVANS: It includes other unemployed youths as well.

MRS. C. OLESON: How many applications were received for Careerstart this year?

HON. L. EVANS: We received 5,802 applications for 9,603 positions.

MRS. C. OLESON: That was the number of situations they requested in their 5,802 applications.

HON. L. EVANS: Yes. If we'd have approved every one, we would have needed in excess of \$15 million.

MRS. C. OLESON: How many did you approve and how many did you reject?

HON. L. EVANS: We approved, in terms of applications, 4,648 applications for 6,086 jobs, for a total of \$8,468,827.00.

MRS. C. OLESON: And then you rejected how many applications?

HON. L. EVANS: We rejected 1,066 applications, involving 3,207 jobs. The rejects amounted to roughly \$5.1 million.

MRS. C. OLESON: How many positions were approved last year? How many applications? Give us the same figures for last year as you gave me just now.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised, I don't have the exact numbers in front of me.

A MEMBER: Oh, yes you do.

HON. L. EVANS: Well, the numbers that were given to me, the table I just had was for this year.

A MEMBER: Oh, yes he does. He's the Minister in charge of the Bureau of Statistics and he can't tell us?

HON. L. EVANS: The number of positions filled last year was approximately the same, 6,082.

MRS. C. OLESON: How many applications were filled and how many rejected last year?

HON. L. EVANS: Last year the total expenditure was \$7.3 million.

MRS. C. OLESON: But how many applications did you approve last year and how many did you reject?

HON. L. EVANS: We haven't got the exact figure, but it was over 4,000 applications.

MRS. C. OLESON: Which? Approved or rejected?

HON. L. EVANS: Approved.

MRS. C. OLESON: Over 4,000?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes.

MRS. C. OLESON: From what we hear this year, and I believe the Minister may have said this in the House, that apparently the practice is this year not to approve applications of people who received help last year. Can the Minister explain this policy?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, this is not exactly correct. What we had to do, because we've been trying to spread this money out as evenly as possible - as you can see we've had more applications than we could possibly accommodate - we did use some criteria. If an employer happened to get a large federal grant, a Summer Works Canada Grant, then we felt we should favour the employer who wasn't getting any federal assistance.

For example, if an employer had had some help in the past year and another employer had had no help in the previous year, we'd be inclined to favour the one who had no money in past years. What we had to do therefore in some cases, instead of let's say approving three, we might have approved two or one, in order to be as fair and equitable as possible and to spread it around as much as possible.

MRS. C. OLESON: I'm sure the Minister must realize that this has caused a hardship for a great many places that have come to rely on this kind of help.

For instance, in information booths, for tourist booths and this sort of thing. But in my constituency I'm particularly perturbed about the Austin Agricultural Museum because that is one of the major tourist attractions in this province and they applied for help, for students for guides, and their administrator wrote to me and he indicated in the letter that he had also

written to you about it. He said, "The Careerstart Program did not give us any students and had not indicated if we will get any should additional funding become available."

They have school tours that they book; they are open seven days a week. It is absolutely essential in one way for the protection of that place to have guides taking people around because they do have a problem. If people go on their own to tour, they find themselves that they're missing some of the valuable museum pieces that they have there and that alone, that one element in their need for students - I don't know whether the Minister is aware or not - but particularly in the days of their annual reunion as many as 700 people volunteer their services to run that, and it seems to me a shame to turn down a request of that nature particularly, because they probably in their budget included the fact that they would get help for tour guides this summer and other help through Careerstart.

They also applied to the Federal Government and they said that they had been under STEP, and they were referred this year to Careerstart, but they have been allocated two students for Summer Works through the Federal Government, but this just isn't enough to operate their facility and I am sure there are other cases like this which some of my colleagues will mention to you.

The Member for Roblin-Russell had brought me newspaper clippings where in his constituency there were two or three different cases. For instance, in one of his towns, I believe it was Roblin - I stand to be corrected - last year they got 60 students under their Careerstart Program; this year they got 32. So the communities are sort of sitting up and taking notice and saying, what is going on here? We have been relying on this sort of help and, in turn, the students have been relying on it and they have been turned down. So I am wondering if the Minister could justify that sort of action.

I can see perhaps there is some rationale for businesses not getting it every year, maybe; but I can't see it for volunteer things of this nature. Specifically, as I say, I am concerned about the Austin Museum because of its huge potential as a tourist attraction.

HON. L. EVANS: Well, Mr. Chairman, as I indicated before, the applications far outweighed the budget that we had for this program. We expect to spend some more money this year than we did last year. It's a matter of being equitable and fair as much as possible and, as I indicated, if an organization such as the Austin Museum would receive federal assistance, then that puts them in a lower category. But I would agree with the member, it's an excellent facility, I have been there many a time, and there is no question about it being an interesting tourist attraction as well.

I can point out one very fundamental factor and that is, in the past the City of Winnipeg, which the Metropolitan Winnipeg area has 60 percent of the Manitoba population, and in the past years it was getting between 25 and 30 percent of the money. We have looked at the population distribution, we have looked at the unemployment rates throughout the province, and we have tried to distribute moneys equitably on that basis. I think that it's just not good enough to

spend 27 percent of a Provincial Government program in a city that has 60 percent of the population. So therefore, I believe that there is justification for an increase in the Winnipeg expenditure.

It's a difficult decision to make. If we had double the amount of money, we wouldn't have to say no to anybody and we would have accommodated everybody in Manitoba, but we don't have that amount of money available to us. So that is a problem. There has been more money spent in Winnipeg, not anywhere nearly 60 percent, but there has been an increase over last year.

But again I say it's a matter of being fair and equitable in trying to distribute the money as fairly as possible and it's just an impossibility to maintain the same level of support as some people got last year. In fact, we couldn't do it and accommodate everybody unless we double the budget and I didn't have that kind of money.

MRS. C. OLESON: Could the Minister tell me how many jobs in last year's program led to permanent jobs? Have you any statistics of that nature?

HON. L. EVANS: No, I don't have that kind of information. Mr. Chairman, that information is difficult to obtain. It's essentially a summer program. A great percentage of them are students; a great percentage are going back to school. Many of them don't look upon it as sort of permanent, but if the employers see fit to carry it on, that's great.

The other programs that we have such as MEAP, Manitoba Employment Action Program, and also under the NEED Program - particularly under MEAP, I guess - there was a fair percentage who carried on in permanent employment and that is very desirable, of course.

MRS. C. OLESON: Is there an evaluation process for the Careerstart Program? Do you have someone, for instance, go to some of these work sites and evaluate the type of jobs being done? Is there anything of that nature that goes on with it?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, there is a form of spot checking that goes on, but we don't have the staff. Given the amount of persons involved, the number of employers, thousands of employers, we couldn't do an on-the-spot check with everybody without having a lot more civil servants, but we do a spot check and there is other follow-up by mail and asking of questions, surveys, etc.

MRS. C. OLESON: So your main information as to whether or not it's a worthwhile program that's being financed is through the application form and through any follow-up forms. Really, that would be the main way that you would be able to tell if it was a worthwhile program.

HON. L. EVANS: I should point out that the decisions to approve the application are made in the field, and we assume that the staff in the area is familiar with the organizations or the employers and can verify, and should verify, the worthwhileness of the application.

MRS. C. OLESON: Could the Minister give us an indication of the cost of advertising the Careerstart Program this year?

HON. L. EVANS: We don't have the breakdown of that figure. It was tied into some other Jobs Fund advertising.

MRS. C. OLESON: That was going to be my next question. It wasn't advertised, then, strictly as Careerstart; it was advertised through the Jobs Fund, am I correct?

HON. L. EVANS: It was advertised under the umbrella of the Manitoba Jobs Fund.

MRS. C. OLESON: So the advertising wouldn't be sent out, or rather, be charged under this Minister's department, it would be charged under the Minister in charge of the Jobs Fund?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, I'm advised that it's partly charged to this department and partly to the Jobs Fund.

MRS. C. OLESON: But you can't indicate how much to this department?

HON. L. EVANS: I haven't got a figure here, I don't think the staff have a figure available.

MRS. C. OLESON: I know it seems to me from reading last year's Estimates that we had a great deal of difficulty finding out what Careerstart cost last year. I guess we'll try again when the Jobs Fund Estimates are on and see if we can find some more answers. Sometimes it seems to some of us that the advertising costs are horrendous with some of these programs and you could hire more people if you advertised less.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, we'll try to get the information for the honourable member, give it to her tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister, particularly dealing with some of the reasoning behind why they would just blanket send the applications to last year participants in this particular program and then turn around and reject them. I have a certain number of constituents who have an extremely hard time in understanding it, particularly on the basis that there really hasn't been an explanation go along with it. There have been commitments made to last year employees or people who have been on the programs and they made commitments, and now find that they are rejected without having a sound reasoning.

I wonder if the Minister has a written policy on the approval process, on the guidelines, or is all just strictly a verbal basis at the department? It's a wishy-washy thing, the Minister makes a determination or somebody in the department. Does he have a policy and, if so, would he table it? I think it would be extremely important and clear up a lot of the misunderstanding as to how this program is administered. It really is a shambles at my estimation, and I thought this Minister, given the fact that he hasn't got much else to do, could at least make a reasonable job of this one program.

HON. L. EVANS: Well, it's in the interests of the program to get as many applications as possible so

that we can pick and choose the most worthwhile applications. — (Interjection) — Just a moment, I'll answer your question, you've had a statement, and you can make a statement.

Usually we get so many enquiries early on about the program, we felt that it was administratively efficient to just send everybody who was in the program last year a copy of a form. They are assessed in accordance with priorities and some with low priorities were not approved this year.

We have established criteria. The field staff make the decisions. There is some review. We're reviewing the Austin Museum one now. But there are criteria and they're set out in the pamphlet on Manitoba Careerstart, the assessment approval procedure and indicating the basis on which the job approvals would be given. One, of course, is that it is additional to what would normally be happening. If you have an ice-cream stand and you're going to hire two people anyway, I don't think we want to spend the taxpayers' money for hiring of those two people if you were going to hire them anyway. We want to get net additionality.

We look at the kind of work involved, the kind of duties performed. We find out whether there is the level of skills required in the training. If there is some training and skill learnings opportunity for the employee, we would be inclined to favour that type of job over another one that didn't offer that type of skill training. We look at the possibility for continuation of employment beyond the period of wage assistance. We look at the unemployment rates in the particular region. We have to look at the supply and demand for labour in the particular region.

We should also look at the suitability of the prospective employee to the position being requested. We also want to have criteria to give some priority to the disadvantaged people, the handicapped person who may have a difficult time getting a job normally, and if an employer is prepared to hire somebody in a wheelchair or handicapped in whatever way, we want to give that employer preference. We are not very keen on employers hiring immediate relatives. We'd want to get further substantiation of that.

Then, of course, the general limitation is the amount of money we have available per region. As I indicated, the City of Winnipeg, which has 60 percent of Manitoba's population, received something like one-quarter of the program money in past year and perhaps the year before. It's a matter of being more equitable. The greatest amount of unemployment in Manitoba outside of Northern remote communities is in the City of Winnipeg. Members of the opposition brought that point out, I believe, in some debate or questioning some weeks ago. The unemployment rate in Winnipeg is higher than the unemployment rate for Manitoba as a whole. This is where the greatest concentration of unemployed youth in Manitoba is. It seems to me that it's prudence and wisdom on the part of any government, on the part of any responsible party in power, to ensure that the fund has the greatest impact on the area where you have the greatest problem.

What has happened in the past is, in trying to respond to everybody on a first-come first-served basis perhaps, is that we haven't been flowing sufficient moneys into the areas where you have the highest levels of unemployment. That is the challenge and we are trying

to meet that challenge. I think we've got a higher quality of job approved this year than ever before. We think that we've got more net additionality than ever before, and we're giving some disadvantaged people opportunities, more than they've had ever before.

At any rate, that is basically the situation. It is prudent and rational to tackle unemployment where you have the greatest concentration of unemployment.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, because of the numbers of people have been rejected, could he tell us what the normal appeal process is if people have been rejected and they meet all the criteria? How they go about putting their appeal forward? Is there a process which he could recommend to have them follow?

HON. L. EVANS: I think the best policy is to approach the regional manager on an appeal basis.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the concern I have is a comment the Minister is making that his policy and objective, because 60 percent of the people live in the City of Winnipeg that it is his objective - I guess it is - to get 60 percent of the money spent on this City of Winnipeg or to go to that target. I get concerned when I hear a Minister of the Crown separating the Province of Manitoba - city, rural. Does the same thing apply when you come to collecting the education taxes, that because 60 percent of the people live in Winnipeg that 60 percent of the education tax should come from the City of Winnipeg? Is that the kind of breakdown, is that the target that this government sees that they should be following?

I get a little nervous when I see a Minister of the Crown say they're going to provide special privileges for one particular region. I don't particularly think it's the way in which we want to go in this province. If this is government policy, then I think he certainly stands to be criticized on it. I think we're in a different kind of community than that and we're prepared to share, give and take a lot more than what he's pointing out. I hope it's not a precedent that he's setting up that this kind of thing would be established. He would have to tell me different at this particular point so I would think differently.

HON. L. EVANS: Well, Mr. Chairman, you can have different approaches. It seems to me that a department that is trying to alleviate unemployment to some extent for young people through this type of a program, should be concerned as to where the unemployed youth of Manitoba are. Certainly, this is the greatest concentration of youth, not only in terms of the senior high schools but also, of course, in terms of the universities and colleges.

The statistics that we have show that the rate of unemployment is higher here, in general, for the total population, not just young people; and other information that we have would indicate that this is where the major problem is.

Having said that, I would still suggest that the various smaller towns and municipalities in Manitoba are still getting a disproportionate share of assistance through this program.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, because the assistance is provided in the country or the rural part of the community or say, the City of Brandon, doesn't stop those unemployed people from applying and getting those jobs in those particular regions. The money doesn't have to be spent in Winnipeg to create employment here. I'm sure you're dealing with a very mobile group of people in society and I would hope that, because the Minister feels that he's got to continue and increase the support for Winnipeg, that it has to be that way. I would hope that the support for other communities would be equally considered as the City of Winnipeg and I'm extremely disappointed.

One final point I want to make, Mr. Chairman, that I as well, supporting my colleague from Gladstone, want to say that the Agricultural Museum at Austin has played a pretty important part of the summer tourist attraction and has, I think, added a lot of pleasure to visitors to Manitoba as well as a lot of the people who get enjoyment out of that type of thing; and I would hope that there'd be a reconsideration for the funds to be used in that particular project.

I know in our time of office that I was faced with going to my colleagues in Cabinet getting some \$100,000-and-some to pay off a debt that was incurred at that particular operation and that's our kind of commitment to carry on with the facilities that are there. I would hope this Minister could see fit to not even question their application and to immediately pick up the phone or send a letter approving their request.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I'd like to know - I think the Member for Gladstone asked this question but I don't remember the Minister giving us the answer - could he tell us what the advertising costs were to advertise the Careerstart this year?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, that question was asked by the official critic, the Member for Gladstone, and we undertook to bring that information tomorrow.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could also then tomorrow, because I can't believe the great statistical whiz of the New Democratic Party, when in opposition, can't provide us with the figures for the number of applications last year and the number of job applications last year and the number of applicants approved last year. I find that very difficult that he wouldn't have that at his fingertips, because if you're doing an analysis of the program, that of course would be prime statistical information that one would request. Now if he hasn't got it, maybe he could provide it to us tomorrow when we come back, but as I said, I can't believe that this member, who is so up on his stats, doesn't have those at his fingertips.

I wonder if he could also, if he doesn't have it with him today maybe he could bring them back tomorrow, what the budgeted amount was in this program last year. I believe there was a certain amount budgeted and additional funds put forward and I think the same thing happened this year. There was so and so much

put in appropriation, then he added some funds to it. So if he hasn't got those figures maybe he could provide those for us tomorrow also.

HON. L. EVANS: I thank the honourable member for the compliment.

MR. D. BLAKE: Left-handed as it might be.

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, you've got to take them wherever we can get them, Dave. But we will undertake to give the honourable member that information that he requests. We just don't happen to have that type. We've got all kinds of other statistics. We've got pages and pages of statistics, but we'll certainly get that information for the members.

MR. D. BLAKE: Mr. Chairman, just a couple of quick questions. I think maybe we're all getting tired and maybe we should have Committee rise. But the Minister had announced there was \$5-million-something in the program, he announced in the House one day and he was adding another \$5 million to it. You tell me now that you've spent something like \$8-odd million. Was that the answer you gave us a little while ago?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, essentially what we had in our department was a small portion of our spending under Careerstart and we supplemented that with an amount out of the Jobs Fund allocation. We think we're going to be spending . . . You see, this has to be an estimate. You can approve some positions and for whatever reason, an employee may quit in the middle of the summer or an employee may decide that's it, he doesn't want to carry on or she doesn't want to carry on, so you don't always get the take-up that you approve; but we think we're going to have a greater take-up this year because we think we have a higher quality of applications that we approved this year, so we will be spending more money this year than last year.

I'd like to get from the staff the amount that was allocated last year - I think that was the question that was asked - as opposed to this year, but I think the more important thing was, how much was spent last year and how much do we anticipate to spend this year. As I said, I guess the amount of money we spent in 1983 was \$7.3 million for Careerstart and we anticipate spending over \$8 million this year, so there will be a greater level of funding for this program.

MR. D. BLAKE: I think we have more discussion on this, Mr. Chairman, but in view of the hour, I would move, if it's the wish of the Committee, that Committee rise.

HON. L. EVANS: I was just wondering, did the members want to finish this one particular item, 3.(b)(3)?

MR. D. BLAKE: No, there are some other questions to be asked by some of the members that are tied up in the other committee, Mr. Chairman, and we'd like to cover that and then finish the Estimates in the next Session, hopefully.

HON. L. EVANS: Okay, agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise? (Agreed)
Committee rise.

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: Committee come to order. We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Education.

Item 5.(a) Post-Secondary, Adult and Continuing Education, Division Administration.

The Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister can indicate what changes, if any, that there might be within this first appropriation in the Division Administration area?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the major changes in Division Administration are related to some decentralization of administration. One of the things we identified through the review of colleges was that we were administratively heavy and we are decentralizing and reducing that administration; so that accounts for some of their reduction; and the major increase is coming through the Manitoba Technical Training institute which is \$1,131,000, and this is a major agreement for the delivery of computer training. Those are the major changes in this section.

MR. C. MANNES: The Minister just indicated that there was a major increase in the one area, the technical training area, which relates to computers. Is that the part that's significantly Recoverable from Canada?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: 100 percent.

MR. C. MANNES: Can the Minister indicate which of the community colleges are the benefactors of most of this expenditure? Is it apportioned on some basis through all the colleges or is it concentrated in one area? Where is the location of the benefit that's provided by the Government of Canada?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, the increases that are in the entire PACE area do come in a number of places and they come through each of the community colleges, that they do not come under Division Administration. In other words, you'll see a line for Red River and changes for Red River come through there.

The Manitoba Technical Training Centre is a separate institution that we have set up where we have 150 students sponsored by Employment and Immigration, 55 students sponsored by business, industry and the Provincial Government that are receiving training on computer programming. It's not attached to a college; it's a separate institution that is funded through the Federal Government.

MR. C. MANNES: Maybe the Minister could tell me specifically. I remember reading last year's discussion through this area and there was some reference to this training centre. I'm wondering if the Minister could, for

just my personal edification, tell me specifically where this is located. I can't say that I know.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: It's located on Main Street in the old Century Motors building. It was renovated for this project.

MR. C. MANNES: Does this have a specific time frame as to how long this particular project will continue? Is it open-ended? Is it a new school, in effect, that will be in place for many years to come?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, this was the first project that we funded under the Skills Growth Program that we announced last year. It has a five-year life under the existing contract.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(a)(1)—pass; 5.(a)(2)—pass; 5.(b) Programming Branch: - the Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I see again a sizeable decrease in staff. I'm wondering now if the Minister could tell me whether this area of programming, whether it's for all post-secondary adult and continuing education areas or, again, is it specifically directed to the community colleges.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Community colleges, Mr. Chairman.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, I'm curious then, Mr. Chairman, how and why there would be such a significant decrease when, in view of the Minister's announcement, April 27th, indicating that there would be a major job training expansion and that there would be a new role for many of the community colleges that was going to provide to students and those people in our society who required the latest training within any skill area, that announcement and this major decrease in appropriation, how does the Minister reconcile those two facts?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: The major activities that I announced, the increase in activities are simply not being delivered through this line. It's just a function, I suppose, of determining the line and what comes under it. Our new thrust comes at a later date there. The 1.2 million increase in program thrust will come under a different line and I can go through them all then.

Also, one of the things that we are doing is turning over more of the function for programming into the colleges. We literally had two sections that were operating; one in the Department of Education post-secondary branch and the others over in the colleges. A lot of it was duplication and the reductions here that are showing are twofold. We're reducing administration once again, which you will find in almost every sort of category, every department. There is a reduction in administrative costs and activities and a reduction in the level of services to the regional colleges. Now that doesn't mean that we're not bringing in new programs and emphasizing the role of colleges. It means that the function of this branch is being downgraded, I suppose, to some point and being picked up by the colleges themselves.

MR. C. MANNES: Could the Minister indicate who is responsible for deciding which areas of programming fall within the department and which more directly fall within the colleges themselves? Secondly, what areas in the programming is the department, which is covered under this appropriation, specifically what areas of programming are they responsible for?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, the responsibility of this branch is to help determine some of the overall priority needs for program and to evaluate existing programs at the community colleges and the priority needs to be delivered through the colleges in total. We're changing the role of that branch from a support role, where they were providing a lot of support services to the colleges, and we are moving them out of that to a broader strategic planning and support role to the entire college system.

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

5.(c) Red River Community College - the Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I propose that we consider all three of these community colleges as a total group. I think that has been done in the past and, certainly, I would invite any of my colleagues who wish to offer any comment or ask any questions with specific reference to any of the colleges to do so at any time.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister if she can be more definitive than she was in her news release of the 27th, indicating some of the goals and objectives of the change that the department and the colleges were considering at this point in time.

There are many words here but I'm just wondering, first of all, the time frame for specifics, when will all the changes in the - and I imagine there will be some areas in which instruction will no longer be offered and there'll be some new areas in which there will be, and of course the Minister has made reference to guidelines where the concept of satellite schools within certain regions are going to be on, I can understand that - but I'd like to know more specifically the time frame for programs. When are some programs going to be phased out, when are some going to be brought in and when will this total change, as covered by this news release, when will that have been totally brought into being?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I think as a general answer, the time frame for all of the changes would be about three years for all of the satellite centres to be in place, for all of the major change.

However, we started last year. Even before the major announcement we had identified a number of the deficiencies and problems and we did begin last year. The question of when will all the courses be changed and the old ones be out and the new ones be in, I suppose the answer to that - and I don't mean to be facetious - is never, because that actually is something that we undertake every year.

We've got something like 1,500 courses that we're delivering in colleges. That's a tremendous amount of courses. We also have a tremendous demand to keep pace with critical needs, critical skills, manpower needs,

changing programs to meet social needs in technology and in order to bring those in, we've got to get rid of some of the old programs that should be eliminated; so we've developed a criteria, a seven-point criteria, and that criteria will be applied every year. In other words, every year, in order to bring in new programs, we're going to have to consider what programs should be eliminated and we apply the seven-point criteria and those that meet the highest number or percentage of criteria are the ones that eliminate.

I can give you an example. Last year - the first year we applied it - nine courses went out in order to bring seven courses in and this year we are not eliminating any courses but we have course reductions. We have intake reductions in 16 courses that are reducing the student capacity by 200. However, we also have expansion in 10 areas that is increasing the capacity by 200 and through the \$1.2 million New Thrusts, there's \$200,000 there for new programs that have not yet been identified but will be in the high need, critical skills area; so that we actually are opening up more spaces and more programs than those that we're dropping. That will be done every year.

MR. C. MANNES: The Minister makes reference to a seven-point set of criteria for judging the relevance of specific programs. I'm wondering if she could indicate to us what those criteria are and are they all objective criteria.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: We think they are, Mr. Chairman. We developed them very carefully and after a lot of thought. We have also checked with other provincial jurisdictions and we've actually found that we have, I think, one of the most comprehensive criteria to apply to program evaluation of any province.

One of them would be student demand. If the student demand is half the capacity, then that's one of the things that should be looked at. High cost is another. Sometimes we have some programs where the enrolments are so low and the cost is so high, that we have to give some consideration to that. Employment prospects, whether they are just general interest or whether they actually lead to employment or there are reduced employment opportunities, the revenue that we are able to receive from the Federal Government, while that doesn't determine totally our willingness to continue with the program, it certainly has an effect on it because if the Federal Government stops buying spaces in a certain area, then it often means not just that they don't feel like buying but that the employment opportunities are reducing.

If the program can be delivered by another institution, and I give you an example there where we have some of the same programs being delivered through our vocational schools as are being delivered through the colleges, and if we can say this program is being delivered through other institutions then we don't have to keep delivering it, don't have to duplicate. That's another of the criteria.

We look at regional — (Interjection) — well, I'll deal with that. I don't know why all of the vocational schools and the regional schools should be delivering the same programs. An example, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that various of the trade schools, like Success, are able to

train an adequate number of people in that area successfully and it isn't necessary for us to duplicate the program.

Regional impact is something else that we measure because it's possible that we could have a program like hairdressing, for example, where we can reduce its impact in the urban area, in the southern, because there are institutions and other people who deliver, where if you do it up north and it's one of the few programs, then the reduction of that program up north has a serious impact on students and on their ability to have access. So regional impact has an effect.

I guess one of the last ones is if the program can be modified, if it can be demonstrated that the way it exists now it doesn't meet a lot of the needs, it doesn't meet employment opportunities, it's high cost but, by some small modifications, we can improve it, then we will look at changing the program. An example there might be looking at the regular typing programs, or the old sort of shorthand, and looking at the word processing skills required for a lot of those jobs today, simply adding an element to it so they're being trained to meet with the jobs for the future.

So that's the criteria. If we find programs that are low-student demand, high-cost low employment opportunities brought in by another institution or organization, the Federal Government is not buying a number of those, three or four of those elements, we'd look seriously at reducing the intake or eliminating the program in order to bring in other ones.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I can't argue with any of the criteria. I suppose I'm more intrigued as to how they're applied.

One course, for instance, can find employment for 200 people a year, and one can only find employment for 40 a year. Obviously there has to be some different weighting that goes on, but what is the break point? Does every course have its break point, or indeed is there a weighted factor put on every one of these criteria and the sum total of a score comes forward?

Again, I guess what my question is, that then leads to some subjective measurement, and maybe the Minister can tell me specifically the methodology now behind giving these various factors some type of weight.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I suppose we use a grid where we would look at - I know you can't really see it from here - but we would have all of the criteria listed and the programs, and those programs or those courses that had the highest number of highest proportion of what we call negatives or things that make you seriously consider, those are the ones that we consider first. So we would start with the ones that had five or six of the elements and then we would go down to ones that carried four or five of them, but it would be those that had the highest proportion of negative elements.

MR. C. MANNES: The Minister hasn't answered my question. How is determination made as to whether one program receives a negative factor or not? For instance, if Course A at a college - and one of the criteria is high cost - if Course A costs, let's say, \$3,000 per student, and Course B costs \$2,000 per student,

where is the break line as to whether one course receives a negative mark on the grid or whether one doesn't?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: First of all, Mr. Chairman, to use that example, with one high cost of \$3,000 and one of \$2,000, that wouldn't be the only thing you would take into consideration. That would be one factor that would identify that course as one that you should look at; but if it had high employment opportunities, if you were training graduates in an area where there was high need, where there was high employment, then even though the cost was higher than other programs, you would still continue to offer it.

The criteria is criteria that is being applied for the very first time in the province. There was no evaluation of programs before and no criteria for elimination, nor indeed was there any elimination. We just kept teaching them regardless of their usefulness. This criteria is a step towards some way of measuring the continued need for those programs to exist.

It is not so cut and dried that I can tell him exactly what would be the judgment because there's a judgment part to it, too. They would have to look at all of the things. If it happened to be delivered regionally, if there was high unemployment, then some of those other factors would be, I suppose overlooked, you might say. So it's a combination of looking at all of them and applying judgment, and that judgment will be made by people who know what the needs are and what the highest priorities are.

MR. C. MANNES: The Minister either conveniently wishes not to answer my question or doesn't seem to understand it, and I'm well aware that all the criteria are given some type of mark or some subjective, some waiting, and then it's decided on a course-by-course basis whether or not that course is redundant or whether a new one should be developed. I have no argument with the criteria and I have no argument with the system being a new system.

My question though is how does one judge as to whether, first of all, an area has high employment? Could it be because, for instance, in an engineering or a technical fashion, we may see 10 advertisements for employment in one paper and only one for another opportunity?

I suppose the point I'm leading to, Mr. Chairman, is that obviously these criteria, at this point in time, unless the Minister has some definitive methods for which to evaluate them, is pretty subjective. Obviously, it's very subjective, or can she give me some broader answer, a more definitive answer that indeed in a specific course, for instance, because one-half of the people from the year previous have found employment or two-thirds of them have found employment, that that's given a different weight versus another course where maybe only one-third have found employment, or is it specifically subjective in all these criteria factors, where somebody sits in judgment and says, well, the cost is roughly \$4,000 per student versus \$2,000; therefore, I judge that particular factor should be given a black point specifically in that area. So that's my only concern.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, we use the best information that is available, and we don't use our own

only and we don't use only subjective, although that doesn't make the basis a totally perfect basis in order to make the decisions.

We do survey graduates. We get information from a wide variety of places. We get information from Manpower studies and statistics; we get them from Federal Government projections and statistics about needs in the different skill areas. We do follow up our graduates and we do surveys in the field. For instance, if it was in the medical field, we would actually go out and look at the placement of the previous year and check out with people in the medical field related to that job what their needs were for the coming year.

It's a combination. It's not perfect, but we use all the information that comes from all of the areas - federal, provincial, Manpower, surveying and from the fields themselves. We also get information from advisory boards that work with us, that come from business and industry, that give us information from their field and area about their projected needs and information they have.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I am wondering how many courses, going into the fall 1984 term at the community colleges, at the three community colleges, will be eliminated because of the score that is offered to them by way of the usage of this criteria system. How many courses will be eliminated?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I think that, in my overview, I indicated that we had eliminated courses last year. We eliminated nine and brought in seven new courses. This year we are not eliminating any courses; we are reducing the intake in quite a number of courses. So there are no course eliminations, and I can give you the breakdown college-by-college if you were interested.

I'll just give you a few examples. In Red River Community College, Machine Shop at Tec-Voc, one SY with 15 student reduction; Commercial and Industrial Sales, one SY with 35 student reduction; Business Administration, one with 40; Auto Body with 20 students. So there is a list of, I guess it looks like about 10 or 11 at Red River, 3 at Keewatin where the course reductions, where the intake reductions are coming. We also have program expansion in about 10 areas.

So we are reducing a number of student intakes in the areas where they either are not enrolling or where the courses don't need to be maintained at the high level and we are bringing in new program expansion.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister if she could provide that list for me, not maybe this evening; although I could be interested this evening, too, if she could provide that for me and then it would save some time.

Mr. Chairman, more specific to the press release, the Minister in her very own words says, "When courses are eliminated, staff will require retraining." Now she said there were some eliminated last year. She said, also, that there will be none eliminated this year. Are we to read, then, out of that statement that the major elimination, the major course removals, will occur in 1985 and 1986?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, Mr. Chairman. First of all, none of the courses are being eliminated, although they

are being reduced and that does affect staff. Last year, in order to deal with the program reductions, we instituted a retraining program and we retrained about 36 staff. It is a very interesting program because we have been able to retrain most of them while they are on the job. Some of them have only required about three or four months of training, almost all have been retrained while they are carrying on with their regular jobs, and I think we retrained 36 people for a cost of about \$150,000.00. We felt that it was an exceptionally good program and one that we all should be looking at in terms of retraining.

This year we have the combination of new programs and new positions that are coming through as a result of the new thrust. That allows us some flexibility and redeployment opportunities and some small amount of retraining, perhaps. Minor retraining is going to allow us to redeploy or place all of the existing staff whose jobs have not gone but whose positions have been eliminated. We have something like 1,200 positions in our colleges and we are looking at removing 25 of them. There will not be any layoffs. I think we have already redeployed or found positions for 15 of them so that we are well on our way.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, then the tense used in this press release obviously is incorrect because when courses are eliminated, when you hear that type of wording, that indicates that that's to come. The Minister is suggesting that's already happened, and that the final two years of this program will not involve any other elimination of staff.

The reason I want to dwell on this for a second is that I've had calls from two or three staff individuals and I am led to believe that, for instance, the laboratory training area which is sort of a joint program, I believe, between Health and Education at Red River College, somebody indicated to me in a phone call about a month ago that one-half of the instructors were about to be laid off. The caller didn't indicate that there would be retraining associated with, I believe, four or five of those individuals. Those comments don't seem to any way bear any consistency to those offered by the Minister.

Can the Minister tell me specifically whether all staff that have been in areas in which there will be some reductions, whether they all know now what their position will be within the next two and three years?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I was just saying that I wish I had had a copy of a letter because if he got a call four weeks ago, they clearly have had very direct information from me since that time. I wrote a letter to all of them and in that letter I indicated that even where there were course reductions that there would be no layoffs. In other words, every individual has received that direct commitment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions on the Day Care Program. I am wondering if the Minister knows approximately how many day care workers will be required to have two-year diplomas by 1988.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I'm sorry, I didn't hear the last part of it.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: How many day care workers will be required to have the two-year diplomas?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I think that we need about 1,200 to meet the standards but within the legislation, we have a five-year period to meet the standards. That means two-thirds have to be trained, two-thirds of the staff. We are hitting at that in two ways. One is a challenge credit that is being offered to people in the field who have lots of skills and experience and don't have to go back and take the entire two-year program, and the other is that we have increased our capacity at Red River. We have almost doubled it and I think we are up to about 120 students per year.

The University of Winnipeg, through the Skills Growth Fund, has brought in - we identified that as a priority for the Department of Education and we have a child care training program there. The combination of the challenge credit and the increased staff in the two areas make us believe that we can meet the requirements to have two-thirds of the staff trained within a five-year period.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Did the 1,200 include the one-year certificate, or would that be extra staff?

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

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Could the Minister indicate, has there been any experience in what salaries that the day care workers are getting after a two-year diploma course, approximately?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Approximately \$18,000 a year, Mr. Chairman.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Is that the top end of the salary scale or does it range broadly, say, from 12 to 18 or?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: That's about the average salary, Mr. Chairman.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, in one of the press releases, or at least an announcement in the Winnipeg Free Press had indicated that the day care workers would be getting about a \$4 an hour minimum and that there were hundreds of students on the waiting list.

Are all the students that come out of these courses, are they being placed, are they able to get jobs?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, it's my understanding that most of them are able to get jobs and that some of them in the field require retraining in order to keep their jobs.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: How are the day care workers being evaluated, the ones that need the extra credits, and by whom?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, that's a joint committee between ourselves and Community Services.

We handle it by almost on an individual basis where we look at the training, the skills, the knowledge of the individual. There is some testing to find out what their knowledge and skills level are.

I'm just informed that they are tested in accordance with the requirements of the act, and if they have sufficient, they are given the credit.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: In the press release put out by the department, it indicates that the assessment will include on-the-job appraisal. I guess the question I'm asking is has it required more people to be hired to assess these people? Just what has happened in the training here, and how can they get to all the day care centres? I guess my question is will there be extra staff assessing these people?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, Mr. Chairman, it isn't going to require extra staff. The people responsible for the program in the colleges work very closely with the supervisors who supervise the actual day care centres in the field. We use them to work with us to help assess the qualifications.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Evidently, in the day care field, the turnover is about 50 percent, actually less than two years for 50 percent of the people. There isn't the stability in the day care field and one of the reasons, obviously, is the salaries on the whole. When we're training all these day care workers, obviously, they're not going to stay in the field. So does this mean just a continual turnover in this field, or is there any way that there can be some stability brought to . . .

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is a little bit difficult for me to deal with the issue of salaries. I know that there is a relationship to the training requirements, but the level of funding in salaries is under Community Services, and, of course, we are required simply to meet the training requirements and capacity to meet the needs of the legislation.

However, I do think that the turnover rate is decreasing, and that there is some improvement in the salary levels, and that there seems to be a reasonable interest in students going into the program knowing what the salary levels are and I suppose keeping their fingers crossed and hoping for improvements.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have some particular comments, but the Minister indicated that it's probably best raised under the specific allocation of Keewatin Community College, so I'll raise it then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(c) - the Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I have now before me the ministerial statements on major changes to post-secondary training opportunities.

Page 2 of that statement, the Minister indicated that there would be a change in the design of training programs which will break them into smaller 2-4 week units which people would be able to enter at various

points during the year. Can the Minister indicate which programs, which courses, in fact, will have that new type of formula?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the decisions about which courses will be the first courses to go into the modular-unit structure is presently being determined by committees that are being set up with administration and staff. In other words, we haven't predetermined. We have some idea about some of the areas that might be the most useful or the most important to move into modular instruction. We'll be having something - I think it's what - about 30 courses, we're looking at initially, going into modular instruction for about 20 or 30 courses, but the committees with faculty and staff will be helping us make decisions on which funds are the most appropriate to go into.

Another thing that will determine which ones we go into is where there have been modular curriculum developed by other provinces, we are not the first ones to move into this method. We have no intention of inventing the wheel over again and, if they have good programs that are already prepared, we will probably use those. So that will have an influence on which courses.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister then whether an individual coming on stream at any time during which a course is offered, will the length of time devoted towards teaching that student the total component of the course, working towards, of course, a final certificate, will that change at all?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, Mr. Chairman. The length of time doesn't change, nor does the quality of the program, the content of the program. It's simply a way of taking pieces of an entire curriculum and breaking it into modular units that make sense so that people can identify the units that they need, that they haven't received training before, and perhaps with different courses and information and experience and knowledge they have, they may only need two units out of one course. If that can be demonstrated, and it would have to be through a challenge credit or assessment program, then they would only have to take the two units. That's one of the main purposes for moving into modular units is to not unnecessarily make people take training or courses that they already have taken through one way or another.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, I have no quarrel with that, Mr. Chairman. My question is, though, if it's somebody new to a whole area, then obviously that person will have to begin the groundwork at the beginning of the course year, or can that person, who is totally new to this whole area of instruction, have the opportunity to join the course halfway through?

Secondly, then, will occasions ever occur where people, groups in the same room for the purposes of the same overall course, be offered different units or will the same unit be taught in that same room at the same time?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I'm trying to remember what the first question; you had two questions there.

MR. C. MANNES: A new person introduced into the area . . .

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, they wouldn't be able to come in and start half-way through if they hadn't had any grounding or any basis in that curriculum; they would have to start at the beginning and go all the way through. It is going to be possible, though, for people to be on different units at different times because it will be a fairly individualized instruction.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, moving down the list of points that the Minister offered within that press release - and I think a couple of them are related - but moving down to the sixth point, the Minister indicates that there will be an increased emphasis on on-site industrial training through a co-operative approach with business and labour. Certainty that's most acceptable. But I would question as to how an approach is being made today to solicit the increased support of the business community? What is being done to approach the business community and more importantly to entice them to be more actively involved in an apprenticeship system?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, we'll be doing that in a number of ways: one, we are setting up advisory committees and the advisory committees have - well, the member smiles, but I can tell you that the business and the industrial people are not smiling at all, they're very pleased, because they've been telling us that we've been training people and not paying any attention to their needs for years, so they're quite pleased with this involvement. So we have the advisory committees. We also have consultants who are going into the industries. We've got training consultants who are visiting the industries right now and talking to them about what their needs are. We are working with them to try and identify which industries have the capacity to do training on-site. There are a number of them that are interested in doing that, where instead of using and buying new equipment, and sophisticated expensive equipment, we have an agreement with them to train on-site and to do testing and give credit for the training that is received on-site.

I'll just go through a very quick list, or just touch on it and these are ones that are interested in training programs with us: the Winnipeg Jets, WestFair Foods, Gibson Labels, Bristol Aerospace, Winnipeg Sewer and Drain, Central Canada Aircraft, Murray Krovats Agency, J & A Murrow, Via Rail, Workers Compensation, Multi Foods, Associated Auto Auctions, and Standard Aero. There is a list of about 20 businesses that are looking at joint training programs. These are examples in the computer-assisted learning, but it's an example of the joint development.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, is any incentive being offered to businesses at all by way of grants to convince them of the worthiness of helping to train on-site students? Is there any monetary assistance being offered businesses?

Secondly, I would ask the Minister what the goal is as far as the number of these positions, the number of on-training site positions covering the various

multitude of courses for let's say a couple of years, what is the goal and how far are the committees along in convincing businesses that this is a worthwhile project and having businesses offer their place and location to further train students?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, in terms of whether or not there is any financial incentive, there is and they're able to receive 75 percent of the salary through the industrial training program that is a Federal Government program. So if we have a joint co-operative program and they train on-site, they can apply for and receive 20 percent of the training cost of that individual.

Mr. Chairman, I would say at this point, that we have received some positive reaction, initial reaction, from people in business and industry and we're in the process of coming down to, I suppose, actual negotiations for delivery of programs and since the program was only announced something like a month ago, then these specific negotiations could not take place until then, but I think there is an indication of a general interest.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I just want to be very clear as to what support businesses are able to apply for under this program. The Minister said 75 percent, then she said 20 percent.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I didn't say 20 percent.

MR. C. MANNES: Oh, yes, you did. Maybe in a different reference, but 75 percent. Then could the Minister indicate what portion of that is provincially funded or is it all totally federally funded?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: It's a federal program, Mr. Chairman.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, then the Minister is saying, as far as all the business involvement, as far as offering their places of business for on-site training, the fact that the Federal Government is paying all the grants and all the assistance to those employers who so decide to use that particular program.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, the point the Member for Morris is making is true if he refers to the involvement and the activity of the Federal Government in terms of dollars or ability to apply for dollars, but the role and the responsibility that's undertaken by the colleges and by us is to develop the programs. I mean if we don't develop the curriculum, develop the programs, develop the testing and do the assessment, then those people can't be trained on-site. So it is a fairly major commitment on our part to train off-campus site and on-site for business and industry. I think it's to their advantage and ours.

MR. C. MANNES: Moving on, Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicates, not only in her statement but also some of the opening remarks she made into the whole Estimates or the Estimates process, that there would be a development of a network of community college satellite centres to be located in every region in the province. I'm wondering if the Minister can be a little more definitive as to the concept, not only the concept

but how in fact the concept would be brought into reality. I'm wondering if she could give me a little bit more to go on as far as that particular concept.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: First of all, we have two areas that we're moving in to decentralize our programs on campus. One will be regional centres and we'll be establishing three of those in the first year. They're sort of satellite centres to existing colleges, so each of the colleges will have a satellite centre. In ACCC, for instance, it will be in Dauphin.

In those centres, we will actually deliver 10 to 15 programs right in the community where the people can receive their training in the community instead of having to, not only not have to come to Red River, but they will not even have to go to Brandon. We will be determining the programs by talking to community people and doing a needs assessment on the community. For instance, some areas - I think we had a child care program in Dauphin that was determined by the needs in that area and we delivered the program in that community, so that's the first thing we will be doing. We will ultimately have six centres, we'll be starting with three this year. The satellite centres, there are going to be about 30.

I've covered the centres and the other method of delivery is going to be through distance education, through the delivery through distance education and telecommunications through technology, and we will be determining which communities and which programs will be delivered that way.

MR. C. MANNES: Maybe the Minister can tell me specifically what the physical building requirement will be now that we're setting up these satellite areas? Does this require additional teaching space in those areas or will this be held within community centres that volunteer their halls and whatever? I would also ask the Minister whether my perception is correct, that in fact many of these satellite centres and satellite courses will have to be ones, particularly the courses, that would not be capital support based. In other words there's no way, I would hope, that we could see where in those educational areas, requiring heavy reliance upon capital items, that in fact would not require duplication in some of the satellite areas.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Morris is quite right. There are two main reasons for doing this. I think one is to give increased accessibility to people from rural, Northern and remote areas, so they're not all forced to come down to the big southern institutions; and the other reason for both the satellite centres and the co-operation with business and industry is to avoid the need to build million dollar buildings to put 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 million dollars into building new facilities designed just to teach those programs.

In the communities we will be using space that exists and it will vary from community to community. It might be school space; it might be community centres. It will depend on what space is available, but we will be using existing space and do not intend to build.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering if the Minister can clarify an earlier statement where she

said there were some 1,500 courses being offered through the community college network.

I don't suggest that I have a total list in front of me, but I have for '83-84 all the courses, not all, but a listing of the courses offered at Red River Community College, all the prerequisites required, and I believe I have a total of 50 in front of me. Where do we have this vast difference in numbers? I'll show you the stack that I've got in front of me.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, when I was talking about courses I was talking about all of the courses being delivered through the colleges, that's day courses, evening courses, extension courses. It's a combination of programs delivered night and day in all three colleges.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister as to whether the Department of Education has any policy, I suppose any concern, as to private institutions, and I realize I'm treading on a fine line here, but I am told for instance that the DeVries Institute of Technology which is an area of high tech computer use - I suppose it's a private company that's setting up an educational training, guaranteeing positions to graduates on the belief, at least from the private company's view, that the public system is not offering the real goods, that private industry will do it much better, particularly in the area of computers and the area of computer languages. Does the department have an official position on that, because obviously there seems to be a tremendous demand for that type of expertise and in the mind of some, and I would say more than just a few, private industry is offering a graduate who is more skilled in the language and in the requirements within the computer industry?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, it actually is the other way around, that although they are able to offer programs and courses, that unless they meet our criteria and we evaluate them, we do not sort of give certification or indicate that they are, and I don't know whether to use the words, but sort of legitimate programs in terms of their being licensed and their curriculum and programs being approved. They have to be approved by us, so they have to meet our standards basically and they are not bringing in standards of their own that are superior to ours.

I think that the information that I gave earlier about the Manitoba Technical Training Institute and our capacity there, and it's a co-operative program with business and industry for training computer technicians and programmers, clearly shows that and the activities that were the Skills Growth Fund money which we are addressing to computer program, establishing a network of computer hardware, I would say that in Manitoba we've got more development in computer programming and in establishing a computer network and in computer training than through the combination of the college programs, the Skills Growth Programs and our computer technical training centre than any other province in the country.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister then cast a jaundiced eye upon an organization such as the DeVries Institute, which I believe has training

centres in Toronto and in Calgary. This group, I understand, is out talking to potential high school graduates, in some cases offering scholarships and certainly to a large degree guaranteeing, to the degree that you can guarantee, I suppose a position upon graduation. Does she have a general feeling - I'm not talking about the private institutions within the province, per se - I'm talking about specifically some of the ones outside of the province who feel and make the statement that the public system is not doing the job and preparing graduates, particularly in this high technical area, for the real world of work?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: First of all, Mr. Chairman, I think that while I wouldn't like to agree with the point they are making if the point they are making is that they are doing a heck of a lot better job and they are providing better trained students who are going to get employment, I don't agree with that. I think that we are providing the top quality grade student in computer programming in Manitoba that is second to none, and I really believe that.

However, they have a place and they have a role and they have a right to exist. We have some degree of involvement - not total involvement. They do have to be licensed. They have to be registered in Manitoba, but if they are guaranteeing jobs, they're in violation of the act and are not allowed to do so and if we found out we would have to ask them to stop doing it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(c)(1)—pass; 5.(c)(2)—pass; 5.(c)(3)—pass; 5.(d)(1)—pass.
5.(d)(2) - the Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: I'd like to ask the Minister whether it might be appropriate to raise my comments under this particular item.

My comments are about the general problem that exists in my area. It's probably in the constituencies of many of the members opposite as well in terms of educational access. I've chosen to raise it under this particular item because a large part of that access does relate to the access to community college courses, but I would like to indicate that problem is not strictly confined to such access, or certainly my constituency at the present time. It includes both the need for greater access to community colleges courses and also to university courses as well.

It's my view that there is something of a critical problem in terms of educational access at the present time and I would like to cite a couple of examples of just how critical that problem is. One is the result of a survey I conducted several months ago of recent high school graduates which indicated a rather concerning shift in the financing of education and the access that those students had to post-secondary education.

The survey results indicated that as many as 90 percent of the students who responded were receiving some form of support from their parents in either furthering their education at community college or at university, and in comparing that to my own experience, when I was going to university back in the '70s, I can say that's a pretty dramatic shift. During my period, a lot of people were able to finance their education strictly out of their own savings, their own summer earnings.

Certainly that's the way I went through. I have never had to rely on anything other than my summer earnings and various scholarships to go through university. So, it indicates that students are having to look more and more at either Student Aid or, in particular, support from their parents.

This is a particular problem in areas such as Thompson because the costs of going for additional education are that much harder. It costs probably about \$4,000 a year now to either attend a university course or go to community college because of the costs of moving to the major centre to take those courses, and also the living costs associated with that. A number of people indicated, in response to that survey, that they were unable to continue their education because of this cost. That's one indication of the need for access.

Another is the response to a number of programs that have been introduced in Thompson in response to the concern to bring education to people in that area. For example, the Social Work Program; more than 150 people applied to the Bachelor of Social Work Program recently and only 15, of course, could be accepted. That means that more than 10 people were unsuccessful for every one person that was successful. I know in talking to those people, they're usually people who have gone through the Thompson school system and find it difficult to continue their education elsewhere, it's often people who have families in Thompson who just can't move to major centres, can't leave their families. They've indicated if they had the chance they would take additional post-secondary education.

Those are just two examples and I can say that those examples have been repeated to me many times by the students themselves, and also particularly by parents, because they indicate I think perhaps the greatest concern. They're seeing the frustration of the kids involved.

I say that as being the situation in Thompson, but I'm sure it's the situation in many other communities in rural and Northern Manitoba. We, in Thompson, probably have more access than some. We had the Inter-Universities North Program, for example, whereas people in rural Manitoba don't have that. It does give some access to the post-secondary courses. We also have some KCC courses which do give some access at the present time.

I think there has to be a three-pronged attack on this lack of access. There's a particular need in my constituency for a technical-vocational centre, both for high school students and for adult students as well. I know the Minister's aware of this from my own lobbying in this regard and also that of the local school district. There's need for more community college courses in some of these technical areas, but also generally as well. In response to that survey I ran of high school graduates, there were a whole series of courses which people said they would take if they were available in Thompson.

There's also a need for more university courses as well and that's been brought to my attention on many occasions. The Minister has indicated some new initiatives in this regard. I would appreciate whatever information she could provide on that to me at the present time.

I would also like to ask, in doing so, whether some of the new initiatives in terms of community colleges

will also be extended to the universities. There's a couple of possible models that do exist. I know in B.C. and Alberta they've pioneered some of the new techniques in having basically what are open universities which use television courses, also new technology. For example, in Alberta too, I believe, and a couple of other jurisdictions, they also have junior colleges in isolated areas whereby people can take one or two years of university and can then go on to finish a degree at a major centre. Certainly, that would be of assistance to a community such as Thompson and I would recommend it be looked at.

In general, there seems to be something of a revolution going on in terms of education and educational access because of the use of some of the innovative technologies that are out there today, including teleconferencing for running courses, or some of the computer-assisted courses.

Also, we're very close to being able to use two-way satellite systems to beam courses from one major centre, not just to say Thompson or any of the major centres, but to people throughout the province. In fact, you could, using that kind of technology, offer a course to 15 or 20 people in 15 or 20 different centres across this province. I happen to think personally that could offer some advantages in terms of the financial aspect of it, but my real concern is access to make sure that people in rural and Northern Manitoba do get the same kind of opportunities as the people in Winnipeg.

I'd like to ask the Minister what initiatives are currently in place and what initiatives she sees taking place in this area, not just in the upcoming year, but the upcoming five years or so?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, since giving all of that detail would require quite a considerable amount of time, I'm going to give an overview or a general comment, and then I'm going to suggest that perhaps I give follow-up information as we often do in Estimates and indicate exactly what's happening in each of the colleges. In other words, each of the colleges has a variety of new programs that affect accessibility and I'll give that in print to the member.

In general, I'll touch on three or four of the points that were made. First of all with Student Aid and the question of accessibility and the high costs of living and of coming down south, and we recognize that as a serious problem, we are, I think, doing a better job in our Student Aid programming of assessing living allowance needs and of providing enough support to cover those needs and that is particularly important to both rural and Northern students, because where we were not covering them at a reasonable level before they clearly couldn't come and train or study if they didn't have additional resources. So, having adequate living allowances for students who come in from the North and the rural area is one of the things that we have done and that we've improved.

The question of the kinds of programs and activities needing more courses, we agree that we do and they need to be related to the needs of the community. One of the things that we've done is set up advisory committees to each of the colleges because as the Member for Thompson knows, one of the criticisms was their isolation from the community that they served

and the inability of the community to be involved or to indicate what they thought the needs were. So, that's going to be a very important change I think where members of the community and a broad-based representative group will be able to have influence on the additional courses and programs.

We have, in terms of the university, there are some university programs built into this, although most of it is related to training in the colleges. We now have the University of Manitoba agreeing to offer an external B.A. degree where people will not have to set foot on campus in order to get that degree and that will be offered to all remote and rural areas.

We're giving money through the Skills Growth Fund and there's two projects; the Natural Resource Program has a capacity of 87 people and the Industrial Electronics Program has the capacity of 30.

The outreach satellite centres, there will be two in the North. I think probably there is one in Thompson and perhaps Flin Flon. So, there will be two outreach satellite centres and there will be 10 distance education centres planned for the North and we'll be announcing those fairly soon.

I think we need more co-operative programs and I think there was some mention of KCC and the school division. I am still not only hopeful but prepared to encourage that kind of joint program for vocational, because to tell you the truth, we can't afford to put new vocational programs in the college and build a new vocational program for the school system. If there are some problems there, I think it's important that we try to work them out because I'd like to see a co-operative program there.

We've expanded our Northern Social Work and our Northern Nursing. The BUNTEP, we now have six centres for the training of teachers. We've trained something like 450-500 Native teachers that are going back into reserves and into remote Northern communities. Our Pre-Medicine and our University of Manitoba Access Program we've increased so that all of the programs where they are access programs, whether they're for Medicine, Dentist, Nurses, Social Workers, or Doctors, we have increased the capacity in all of those programs.

We've got through the Skills Growth Fund a mobile that will take computer training into communities instead of having them come out. We're definitely using technology and distance education to deliver into remote areas. I think the combination of all of those thrusts; decentralization out into the community; satellite community centres; advisory boards; the use of distance education in Teledon; the expansion of the access programs all indicate a major thrust by us, to not solve the problem, but improve the accessibility for students regardless of where they live in Manitoba.

MR. S. ASHTON: I thank the Minister for that information. There's just one final comment in the area of extending university education, I would particularly like to push for the broadening of the present concept of Inter-Universities North to basically become an Inter-Universities Manitoba Program because I know only too well from my own experience in talking to people in rural Manitoba how desperate the need for university access is in many rural communities in Manitoba. I have a brother-in-law in McCreary, for example, who

considered at one point in time moving to Thompson to improve his access to university education. That indicates to me, as I said earlier, that there is a critical need for access in Thompson. There's got to be even that much more of a need in other communities. I would recommend that particular concept to the Minister particularly using some of these new technologies since it would make it feasible to offer courses in McCreary or Virden or any number of smaller communities throughout Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(d)(2)—pass; 5.(d)(3)—pass; 5.(e)(1)—pass; 5.(e)(2)—pass; 5.(f) Personnel Branch: 5.(f)(1)—pass; 5.(f)(2)—pass.

5.(g) Student Aid - the Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if the Minister can tell me why salaries that are used or that are directed towards staff to administer this particular program, why they are such a large portion of the total and not offered by way of student aid. — (Interjection) —

Well, the Minister asks why that's such a large staff. I guess I see where assistance offered is 6.5 million and yet it takes over \$1 million to determine who will be the beneficiaries of that particular aid.

Can the Minister tell me why that proportion of salaries to assistants seems to be so large?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, certainly one of the reasons would be the large number of applications that we process - I think last year it was 20,000 applications individually processed - that we have built into the process much more monitoring and - I am trying to think of what the word is - more monitoring in order to determine needs so that we have eliminated the number of applications that need to be audited before.

Our information wasn't as good up front, the verification wasn't as good, so we had a much larger amount of money going out on auditing, for instance. So what we are doing is we are doing more up front; it's giving us better information to make the assessment and it's reducing the amount of activity at the other end.

MR. C. MANNES: The Minister indicated that this particular branch received some 20,000 requests for student aid. Could the Minister tell me how that breaks down as to requests for university students and community colleges and vocational schools?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: It's 30 percent secondary, 45 percent university and 25 percent colleges.

MR. C. MANNES: On many occasions the Minister has made reference to the fact that the Federal Government is increasing the level of loan, not making any attempt to help students by way of bursaries. Of course, the Minister has been most critical of the Federal Government for doing that, saying that the province then has had to sort of step into the breach and assume that responsibility.

Is the province involved in loaning student funds at all, or any perspective, do they have a mandate to do

that, and what is the total amount of outstanding loan funds to students in existence right now?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, while we are getting the specific amount of outstanding loan, the provincial program is a loan and a bursary program, but all of the bursary money that the students are able to get comes from the province.

He's quite right when he said I have been very critical of the Federal Government for making all of their money in loans. For instance, when they increased their loan from \$56 to \$100, we matched that increase but our increase was in bursaries. It makes you wonder how serious they are about making a contribution when they require that they get all of the money back from the students.

The total loans outstanding is \$900,000.00.

MR. C. MANNES: \$900,000.00. Mr. Chairman, I guess I am a little surprised at the smallness of that amount. Are we not loaning as much as we used to, or is that number coming down, or is it increasing? I suppose I am somewhat surprised and I would wonder then if the Minister is now fully committed to free post-secondary education such that she's totally opposed to the concept of student loans?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, Mr. Chairman, we are not opposed at all. I think I have been informed that the amount of loan is double the amount that it used to be. Where the confusion might come in is that is the amount just of provincial loans; it doesn't deal with the amount of money that is going out from the Federal Government. We administered that. It's one of the additional reasons for the staff, that we administer both the Federal Government's loan program and ours, and 6.5 million is our money and 29 million is the federal money. So that's a lot of money to administer. It was one of my major complaints about the part-time program, for instance, that it was such a bad program and we were administering it and it was costing us to administer a very bad, a very poor program.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, is the Minister saying because of some difference in ideology, that she is going to refuse to administer a Federal Government program that offers upwards, and I think by her estimation, of \$30 million a year of student loan into Manitoba? Is that really what she is trying to say?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, Mr. Chairman, I am quite prepared to administer the existing, or the \$29 million that is the federal loan money that has been there and we have been administering for years.

Where I am concerned about continuing to administer is the new program that was brought in last year which is the only student aid for part-time students. In fact, it was brought in because Manitoba communicated to the Federal Government how great the need was. Half the students in our colleges and universities are part-time students. We had no Student Aid Program for them. They brought one in, but it is so bad that we had - I'll just give you a couple of figures so that you can realize how bad it is. First of all, it's all loan; there is no bursary at all. So this is one of the highest-need

student target populations and there is no loan - I mean no bursary - it's all loan.

Secondly, incredibly, and I think this is one of the biggest deficiencies or negatives of the program, they require the students to start paying back the interest as soon as they take out the loan. So they are not given the normal exemptions. I mean the other loan programs do not have that requirement. They are allowed to study and they are given a period of time - about a six month period after they graduate before they have to start paying back the loan.

In the part-time Student Aid Program, they have to start paying back the interest and the principal as soon as they start studying. So it makes it almost useless. If they need it, they can't meet it. We have only 27 applications. I mean this is a clear example of the deficiencies of the program. We've got 18,000 part-time students and we had 27 awards and 40 applications, and we figured out that the cost of processing the 27 awards was \$370 per award and the awards range from \$270 to \$2,500, so in some cases it was costing us more to process than the students got in the first place. I think the deficiencies of this program are clear.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister raises some debatable points I suppose. She talks about the cost of processing her application, I suppose I may ask her by her calculations what 20,000 applications into a million works out to be? Would that be \$500 or such, and maybe I'm skipping over a number of applications? Has the Minister ever wondered why there's a change in federal stance and, further to that, is the Minister saying that program, requiring students to begin to pay back a share of the total immediately on taking and becoming involved in that program, that's better than no support at all? It seems to me that's where we're possibly leading in this stand-off of sorts. I don't know to what degree the Minister is going to carry out her threat but certainly, if she's sincere in carrying it out and the Federal Government pulls away from its support, then obviously not even the 27 students or how many have applied to this point will not have a program available to them, or is the Minister going to stand in that breach again and support part-time students?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, first of all, I have taken a fairly strong position and made my points fairly strongly and clearly, because it's important that we do so, that we identify the major deficiencies of the program and that we communicate what they are.

There is going to be a task force or a conference in July which is a federal-provincial conference, and it is dealing with Student Aid in general and specifically this part-time student aid program is high on the agenda. I might say that the things we have identified are recognized I think across the country as major deficiencies of the federal program. So while it's important to recognize the support and the good things in the program, in general, when there are major problems in a new program I think - and we're administering them so we see them - then I think it's important that we pass on that information. We intend to communicate fairly clearly in July that the program

as it presently exists is hardly worth it. Now that's a judgment call.

Well, what about the 27? It clearly should have far larger numbers in terms of the 18,000 students who we know are the high-need students. These are the single parent. These are the people who have families, because the reason they're going part time in the first place is because they can't afford to go full time. So we know this target population is one of the high-need student population. The need is there, the program is not meeting them.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, I find that comment humorous. The Minister is so totally convinced there's need there and yet, and I don't know the details of the program, but obviously there is some benefit to those people that are in such dire need of that support. There would have to be some benefit even if they were required to pay back now. I say that if there's a benefit to people that are in such dire need, using the words of the Minister, then in fact people would rush to it and wouldn't be prevented from doing so by the fact that it may not be a program that is as suitable as the existing one to full-time students.

Mr. Chairman, I would just ask again, regarding the \$900,000 that is loaned, where within our Estimates is there an appropriation? Does this require additional borrowings by the Provincial Government in a non-budgetary sense, or are the proceeds of former loans that are coming back providing the base for new loans in totality?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, Mr. Chairman, and yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm very impressed with the brevity of her answers. It's a rare occasion indeed, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the final question then regarding the assistance. What has been the default percentage? What's been the experience over the last four or five years as to percent of loans that have been taken out over a period of time are not being paid back?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, the figure is 9.5 percent nationally and 8.5 percent provincially. I was just additionally informed that half of those that default originally that are in those original percentages ultimately do pay.

MR. C. MANNES: Can the Minister indicate how many applications were turned down in 1983? I suppose they come in all through the period of the year, but how many applications were turned down in 1983?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, about 3,000 out of 20,000.

MR. C. MANNES: How many applications is the government expecting in 1984?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, we are expecting an increase this year. I think it was about 17 percent last year. We're looking at about 12 percent this year.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I would then ask the Minister, in that 12 percent, whether she's building

in the same percentage increase of denials into that assumption? To this point in 1984, are the projections that were used with which to determine this number, are they still on schedule or are there any surprises in the numbers of students applying for student aid?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, in general I think we expect that there will be more that qualify. We have broadened some of the qualifications. We broadened living allowances, for instance, so that more students will probably qualify. There are more going back to school, more going into the colleges and the universities and more qualifying.

I might give one additional piece of information. When he asks about the numbers that didn't qualify, it's important to know that there is an appeal board mechanism for student aid applications. If they are turned down, they can appeal to the board. Out of the 3,000 who were turned down, we had about 1,000 of them, one-third of them, appealed. Out of those who appealed, about 35 percent are given awards on appeal. So that there is an outside body that looks at every case individually and reviews the initial position.

As you can imagine, when you've got a very wide-ranging and complex criteria and 20,000 applications, it's good I think to have a second review of that decision because it's so important for students.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I had a colleague that was wanting to ask a question specific in this area. We'll pass it now, but I'm wondering if the Minister would consent to answering that question if it comes.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: We can pass it and come back. Yes, sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: If I may, there was one question I wanted to ask about the child care training that I missed. Is there any training available for workers that are in the school-age field, like the before noon hour and after school programs?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, that's one of the areas that we are looking into. There aren't any programs yet. There are requests for programs, and we are looking into it through a number of programs. One that I can think of - in fact, there may even be a project there - and it's the special 1.3 Program of the Education Institute in the core. There are some proposals there I think for lunch and after school programs, there isn't an overall program. There are some proposals and projects that are coming forward that I think will be funded through some of the special programs.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Is the program so terribly different that it couldn't be included in the present day care programs that are available?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I think the major difference is that it presently doesn't have to meet the same standards, so that the legislation and the standards requirements for training do not necessarily

apply. It doesn't mean it wouldn't be a good idea or it doesn't mean they perhaps shouldn't be as well-trained, but presently they're not covered under the requirement. So if there was a program that came in that improved the requirements or the standards, that would be a good thing. It presently isn't included.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: (g)(1)—pass; (g)(2)—pass; (g)(3)—pass; (h)(1) Student Aid Appeal Board, Salaries—pass; (h)(2)—pass.

(j)(1) Northern Development Agreement - Canada-Manitoba - Post-Secondary Career Development, Salaries - the Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I see where all the appropriation under this section is recoverable from another department of government. I'm wondering if the Minister can tell me specifically what area of education and what locations are covered by this appropriation?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, this is the department that carries responsibility for all of our programs that are delivered through the Northern Development Agreement and they are delivered in a number of places and a number of locations. But they would be such programs as the BUNTEP Program; the Access Programs for Native Medical; increases to the Northern Social Work Program; our Northern Nursing Program would be there; the Student Allowances - we pay the student allowances for these programs under this department. It's generally BUNTEP access. It's those programs that give accessibility to professional degrees or programs that the people wouldn't ordinarily have access to - it's teachers, social workers, nurses. I think we have our first Native doctors; we have dentists being trained. That's the general overview.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I may have missed it in the Minister's remarks, but does all the training then take place within institutions in Southern Manitoba?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: They take place in a variety of areas. The social work and the nursing take place in Thompson. The BUNTEP Programs, for instance, we have had six BUNTEP centres. They have been in a variety of areas across the province, remote communities. What we do is go into a community, train for a period of time until they have enough teachers to meet their needs and then we close that BUNTEP centre down and we set one up in another area.

So things like BUNTEP are being delivered - some of them are being delivered on campus at the universities, like the Access Programs for dentistry and medicine, some in Thompson and some in smaller centres. Yes, the centres for BUNTEP, for instance, are Cross Lake, Thompson, Norway House, Grand Rapids, Fairford, God's Lake Narrows and Berens River. That's the locations of the BUNTEP Centres.

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

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

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering if the Minister can me whether there's any change in the program that's being offered here, whether there's a change in thrust or any other changes involved in this area?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I would think that the major change in this area would be its increase in number of projects and training spaces that have recently, through the Core Agreement and the three partners, been allocated an additional \$6 million for new programs. We presently have about 500 training positions and we have projects at some stage of approval in about 15 areas. I'll just mention a few of them: gerontology workers, chemical dependency workers, a correctional worker for court communicator, a Native women's transition centre, community workers, respite workers, family service workers, storekeepers, retail wholesale management, carpentry, printing trades, housing managers, literacy trainers and day care workers.

In general, there are a large number of programs coming in, many that are being initiated, some through the different levels of government, some through community organizations, and some to meet needs in fields like Medicine, for instance, where the training of gerontology workers is a new area where they've decided they need a training program. The respite workers, people working with handicapped children - there's a large burnout and little training for workers in a very important area. We're developing a program there.

So I would say, in general, that we have 500 positions in place now, and in these projects we have another 500 training spaces that we will be filling with projects like the ones I have listed that are in some stage of approval. Most of the ones I read out are close to completion, I think, within the next two or three months.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister to give me a little more detail. I don't pretend to have even a basic understanding of this area. When the Minister says there are 500 new training positions, the funding - I can understand the support offered by way of funding parties, but what I don't understand is specifically positions. The government is obviously the main instrument of offering positions, but first of all where are these training positions located? Are they spread out again through the community colleges and through the vocational schools, and also how does industry or business tie into this program specifically?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, the training is delivered in a variety of places and once again, when we looked at this program, we made a decision not to spend a large amount of money on building a major institution. There was originally, as I recall, something like \$7 million set aside for the building of a building. We said we'd rather have that go into the training of people and that we would use existing space, so that's basically what we do. We train with agencies; we train with the colleges; we train with other institutions. We have 29 projects and sort of 29 locations where they are being delivered. In some cases, the training areas or locations might be a school, it might by the college,

it might be with an agency, but each project is negotiated with the agency or people requiring the training and with the three levels of government, and all of the terms of the project are very unique. The amount of time of training, the location of training, the certification and built into the program is employment at the end of it, employment opportunities.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, who's eligible to be part of this program and what criteria is used to evaluate the merits of one person versus another?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, there is a definite target population. The target population is in two areas: one, it's geographical; and the other, it's kind of people. The geographical is inner core, so its purpose is to provide training to inner-core people living within designated boundaries; and secondly, it is identified high-need target populations and those are Native. Those are the so-called disadvantaged and they are Native women, handicapped, and low levels of education, people who presently have low levels of education or training opportunities, so it's to give training opportunities for people in the inner core who are in the high risk, disadvantaged target populations, both inner city and group.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, having signed the original Core Area Initiative Agreement, I would like to ask the Minister if she could indicate in any way the success of the training program, how many people who are going through the training programs are obtaining employment?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I think I said that we've got presently 29 projects going that covers about 500 training positions, 221 people are presently in training and 81 are still to be trained of those projects that are approved, 77 have completed and are not employed, and 108 have completed the program and are employed. I have a detail - three of the programs have not turned out to have the employment opportunities that were expected and I'm sorry to say that there are three projects that are related to the City of Winnipeg where they had asked for specific training programs in three areas that we had built in the employment requirement and there has not been the amount of employment. Out of the 77 people that were trained and unemployed, I think about 67 of them are related to the City of Winnipeg projects. There's high employment in almost all of the others.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I assume from the Minister's answers, those are employment statistics from Day One of the training programs. Did she indicate these training programs will be expiring at the end of this fiscal year?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, March, '86, is the expected end of the program.

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

5.(m) Inter-Provincial Training Agreements - the Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Could the Minister indicate whether there are any significant changes in this program? There doesn't appear to be in a funding sense, but whether there is in any other sense.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, basically our inter-provincial training agreements are in the same areas that they were previously. It's optometry, veterinary medicine, surveying engineering, visually impaired and hearing impaired. We are looking at the possibility of phasing out, I think it's the visually impaired, although that's not determined yet.

Presently the agreements are in the same five areas and we do have a reduction in intake, I think, in veterinary medicine, but basically they're the same programs with the same potential for training of numbers of students.

MR. C. MANNES: Does the Minister see a greater opportunity to use agreements such as this? I'm thinking again of economizing in areas between provincial Prairie provinces whereby we have low enrolments in some courses and a trade could be effected between provinces, giving each province something in the training perspective, but also of course allowing greater economy.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Absolutely. I think, just as I made the point before, that we don't want to duplicate within institutions within the province, we're not only prepared, but wanting to have agreements between provinces if it will be easier or cheaper for us to have our students trained there than to set up our own programs. It's a joint thing. Right now we train in nuclear medicine and we provide training programs for other provinces that don't have that program so that's one of the places that we can provide help and also in the hearing impaired. Those are our two major areas.

We are prepared to expand it to avoid expense and duplication and we're looking at the dental therapy with Saskatchewan, so that if other provinces are doing it, we don't automatically step into it. If we can send students there at a less cost and a good existing program, we're prepared to do that.

MR. C. MANNES: I'm glad to hear that, Mr. Chairman. The Minister has of course given us some examples of occupational areas where this is occurring. She also mentioned the veterinary area and of course I would think that maybe borders more on not only professional training, but also scientific training from a university perspective. Although we're coming into the university section, I'm wondering whether there isn't also large and great opportunity, particularly in some of the specialized disciplines within universities, for this same type of concept to be adopted.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I'm informed that our universities have post graduate programs in the universities in these areas.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 5.(m)—pass.

5.(n) Continuing Education Programs - the Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I see a significant increase in the Salary component, but no doubt it is used of course to offer this service. Can the Minister indicate what the major increase in thrusts, as exhibited not only by Salaries but by the increase in grants? What specifically is the new objective of this particular branch?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Actually it's expansion in existing programs; that is, there are two, I guess three major areas that would account for the increase. One is that we have an increase in student allowances and that's a 5 percent increase over the existing student allowance rates and that is built in for all of the programs that qualify for student allowances, like the Inner City Nursing Program.

We have an expansion and increase in the Inner City Nursing Program in the North and in Inner City Nursing Program in the south, so that those are two areas where we've increased our student intake and that accounts for a major increase. We've transferred the immigrant English-as-a-Second-Language Program from the Department of Education Public Schools Finance Board into the Post-Secondary Education Branch because we feel that English-as-a-Second-Language for adults more appropriately belongs in post secondary and that is a \$644,000, actually a transfer, not an increase.

I think that accounts for the major — (Interjection) — I said southern students.

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

5.(p) Training Initiatives - the Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, this represents a new allocation, at least a new breakout. I'm wondering if the Minister can indicate whether it's a new program or whether it's just a breakout from an existing line estimate?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, this is the area that I had talked about previously when he was asking about the new initiatives coming through the training proposal that I announced a few weeks ago and I said that most of the new thrusts were in another line. This is the line; it's called training initiatives. It's the \$1.2 million increase and we have something like seven or eight areas or components that make it up and I can just give them to you quickly.

The Learning Support Centres is \$100,000.00. The Outreach Satellites that we have been talking about is \$50,000.00. The external degree that's being delivered through the University of Manitoba is \$250,000.00. We have a major thrust in Adult Education in three areas, English as a Second Language, Programs for Seniors and a Literacy Program and that's .5 million. The Critical Skills Programs, we're identifying 10 critical skills and high manpower needs and then we will be developing special programs to meet those critical skills and we've allocated \$250,000 for that.

Job Displacement Technology is where we are going to have a pilot project with an industry that is moving

into high tech and the proposal is to retrain and train people that are presently working so that they don't displace the existing workers and bring in highly-trained people; and we're going to do that as a pilot project to demonstrate, I suppose, to business and industry that when they're bringing in high tech, they should be retraining people that are presently working instead of bringing in others from outside that are trained.

Integrated Student Services - we're just simply bringing all of the supports that go to students and they are everything from academic, to personal, to counselling for courses and studies and financial help. We're bringing those all together into integrated student centres and we have put in a student, a Native consultation or student advisor, and we've found from that one person that we've increased the retention rate in that one program by about 30 percent; so it seems that a lot of the problem is not the ability to handle the program, but giving the necessary support for people who haven't studied for a long time often, to get through the programs and to get that kind of help.

The International Office that we talked about when we announced the Kenya project is funded through this and it's \$50,000 and of course it's all recoverable from the \$5 million program; and the Curriculum Redesign Development, that's the modular unit, we've allocated \$100,000 to begin the redesign of 20-25 courses; so that comes to \$1.2 million. That's sort of new money and new thrust to meet the goals of the training program.

The rest of them were done within the existing money through things that didn't cost money, like Challenge for Credit, looking at our admissions policies, bringing in a universal credit system for all of our colleges, because incredibly we had a college system where we had three colleges and each one of them might have the same program but not give a credit to somebody who didn't take it at their institution; so we brought in a Universal Credit Program for both day and night programs between our three colleges. This is the new program money to meet the goals.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I can't help but rise, after I hear the Minister mention the announcement she made the other day as far as the agreement reached with the Federal Government - I believe it was CEDA - to provide professional instruction in some areas to Third World Countries.

As I remember that press release - and I do not have it before me - it seemed to me the Minister was making great play upon the fact that this represented potentially a — (Interjection) —

HON. M. HEMPHILL: \$5 million.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you. I'm now provided with . . .

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Your leader has come through.

MR. C. MANNES: . . . the press release. Reference was made to the natural outcome of course, providing for Manitoba businesses potential contracts. I'm wondering if the Minister believes that this is the first time that this may have happened, the first time that

the general thrust in providing education would provide a spinoff to Manitoba businesses. Would the Minister say that she's aware that's the first time that has occurred?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure I said that it had never been done before, nor that the colleges had not been involved in providing help to underdeveloped countries before, nor that with that help there wasn't any spinoff. I think it's the level. I don't think there has been a contract of this size that has built in the amount of benefit to Manitoba business before; and if he knows of one, I'd be glad to hear of it and I'd be the first to say that there was another one.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, that's exactly what I thought, because the Minister makes proper reference to the fact that there have been projects before that were largely agriculture-based, and she says, previous to that, that Manitoba businesses will be given first opportunity to tender for \$1.3 million in contracts for equipment and other goods. I might remind her that, in an agricultural sense, that Versatile is one of the agriculture firms and Massey-Harris is another one and International another one that were provided with tremendous opportunities to move agricultural equipment, particularly into Kenya.

My point in raising this is only such that the Minister will begin to remove a little of the embroidering that she does on this press release. This isn't something new and that Manitoba firms and Canadian firms certainly in years past have benefited to some degree because of agreements such as this.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I don't disagree, Mr. Chairman. I think the point we're making is one that I'm not sure there were formal agreements, that there might have been some understanding and some spinoff. I'm not sure it was built into the contract, and I quite agree the point about Versatile too because they're meeting with the representative from Kenya who was introduced to us today and he is very serious at talking about and looking at buying more equipment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 5.(p)(1)—pass.
5.(p)(2) - the Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, maybe we could pass this item and then call for the vote on Resolution No. 55. I believe my Leader, the Member for Tuxedo, would like to pose a question that we may have passed some . . .

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Is this Student Aid?

MR. C. MANNES: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: I've been sitting patiently this evening, enjoying the discussion between the Minister and the Member for Morris and others.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Are you missing it?

MR. G. FILMON: Yes, indeed. In fact, I've been missing the sudden withdrawal from participation and discussion on educational matters with the Minister and, because of that, I'm needing a fix right now so perhaps I could ask her. I've had a couple of questions that I've wanted to pose, but I'm not certain as to where they fit in and they may have in fact . . .

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Throw them out and I'll try.

MR. G. FILMON: . . . have already been covered. One has to do with support for the Manitoba Association for Children with Learning Disabilities Centre and the other has to do with the Public Schools' Finance Board which I suspect will come under Item 8, Capital items.

The other item I wasn't able to see by the listing where it might come and may I pose a question on that area? Is that something that has been covered?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: It has been, but you can . . .

MR. G. FILMON: Okay. In the past, governments and I guess, particularly through the vehicle of the Department of Education, have supported the Manitoba Association for Children with Learning Disabilities Centre and I'm wondering whether that support continued this year and if so, what is the amount - The MACLD Lions Learning Centre?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, the centre itself is in the process of being turned over to school divisions. This was by, sort of, joint agreement and discussion between ourselves, the Winnipeg School Division, and the centre. It's taking place slowly and I'm not sure if it's totally turned over right now, but we continued last year to support the association. I think we gave them a grant of \$20,000 to support the continued work of the MACLD Organization, because they are still very heavily involved in the program and in maintaining the quality of the program.

It is being picked up by school divisions, and if I don't remember every bit of the detail and you need more I can get it for you.

MR. G. FILMON: Well, Mr. Chairman, obviously the 20,000 was just some sort of transitional . . .

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Oh yes it's just for the organization.

MR. G. FILMON: . . . organization cost because my recollection was that they had supported it in the range of 600,000 a year and more in previous years.

Can the Minister go over the rationale for me as to why this is sort of being divested from provincial support when, in particular, I know of the Minister's stated commitment to early identification of learning disabilities and all of the things that centre did in the past, it seems to me, are objectives that the previous Conservative Government wanted to support, and according to the Minister, in previous discussions in Estimates over the past two years, was a prime objective of this government. I'm surprised that the Provincial Government is somehow divesting itself of the responsibility for this centre.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I did suggest that it might be a good idea if I refresh my memory on this. It did come awhile back and there is a lot of information and detail in Education Estimates as the Member for Tuxedo knows.

Just to answer in general, it isn't something that we decided to do. There was general agreement that this kind of program should be delivered by school divisions, and that at some point the MACLD Centre would be turned over and taken over by school divisions. It wasn't something that we decided to divest ourselves, or we decided should be done. It was done through mutual discussions between ourselves, school divisions, and the MACLD organization.

I may need a little bit of help in refreshing my memory about the details of the timing and the funding, and the sort of negotiations that took place. In general, it's a transition that everybody agrees should happen. What we're very concerned about is that there would no loss of support to the children because of the removal of the group that is the advocacy group, the parent group for the children. That's why we continued to fund them last year, so they could maintain that position.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I would be more than willing to allow the Minister to get the full information, because I think it's a matter that I would like to discuss in some detail with her, not at any length but at least to satisfy myself, that the proper thing is being done. I am concerned with the potential loss of the co-ordination and umbrella service of the parent group, who really were the ones that I guess I got involved with many years ago.

But more so than that, I am concerned with the prospect for divisions supporting it and the possibility of independent school students not being able to be serviced because they don't fall within the aegis of any particular school division. On a fee for service basis they might, for instance, find it prohibitive to be able to utilize the services of the MACLD Learning Centre, and as well the prospect that if it's done on a fee for service basis divisions might opt out of it and so on and so forth. It seems to me that it is the only institution or organization that provides us with the opportunity for early identification of learning disabilities and the ability therefore to deal with them early on and allow children to be dealt with in the mainstream of the education system. I am not satisfied at the moment that we have covered all that, so I'll accede to the Minister's wishes and just leave it till she can bring back the information.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I recall, as he's talking, a little bit more of it is coming to mind. I think that the dollar figure was about \$100,000, \$120,000.00. That was the range, not the \$600,000, but I think it was down around there. I think what we started to do about two years ago was to identify that there would be a transition and we maintained the grant, as I recall, for either one or two years to allow the transition.

I am not saying that the concerns you're raising aren't legitimate, or if there are any problems I'd certainly like to hear about them. But we did allow a fairly significant phasing-in period where we notified everybody that we would maintain the grant for an

additional, it was either year or two, from the first communication that it would be going over to divisions to allow for both an orderly and a reasonable length of time for the transition and the overseeing by the parent group. But any more than that, I'll have to get.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 5.(p)(2)—pass.

Resolution No. 55: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$54,406,100 for Education, Post-Secondary, Adult and Continuing Education, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1985—pass.

What is the will of the committee?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I'm game.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 6. Universities Grants Commission, (a) Salaries - the Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could explain the rationale behind increasing funding for universities by some 2.5 percent in this fiscal year, while other increases even in the area of education have been increased greater than 5 percent.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: First of all, Mr. Chairman, it's not correct to say that universities got an increase of 2.5 percent. They got an increase of 3 percent, and I'll explain that in a minute.

Our public school system and our universities got 3 percent increases this year. The college program and the training program did receive an increase of 5 percent. That was by using the Critical Skills Growth money coming from the Federal Government in terms of, I think, 8.4 million, the 1.2 million that went in the new thrust that I just announced, and the increase in the computer technical training centre, the 1.1 million.

So what I'm saying is that overall funding was at 3 percent except for colleges, although the money that came to them was by giving access through Federal Government funding for new programs in the college training. The difference between the 2.5 percent and the 3 percent is this: They got a 3-percent increase. I believe the University of Manitoba took both their miscellaneous capital money and their operating increase and factored it out, and said that they got a 2.5 percent increase.

They got a 3-percent increase in operating as did school divisions. There was a reduction in miscellaneous capital for all universities from the previous year. When we first came into office, we took a \$3 million miscellaneous capital grant, increased it 66 percent by \$2 million because of our concern for the level of facilities and equipment. We maintained that \$2-million increase for two years at \$5 million, and this year we reduced it to \$4 million. Overall it was still a major shot in the arm for miscellaneous capital, averaging I think - and I'm not sure if we have got the figures, average over the three-year period. It's a significant increase.

But what the University of Manitoba did was they took the reduction in miscellaneous capital, put it in with operating and said they got a 2.5-percent increase.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is reported as saying I believe in her announcement that

with the grants to the universities, universities should be able to maintain existing programs and expand in selected areas. President Naimark of the University of Manitoba in the regular university paper has outlined - and I'm sure the Minister is now aware of the very significant staff positions that are being cut and other budget reductions that are being made - and, more importantly in my own view, the enrolment limitations that are being imposed in various departments of the university, does the Minister wish to modify or amend or substitute or withdraw her statement in her announcement that with the grants to universities this year they should be able to maintain existing programs and expand in selected areas?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, first of all I think that my comments were related to overall funding. One of the things that I didn't mention is that we have given access to the universities to the Skills Growth Fund, which gives the universities an additional \$2.5 million over and above what the province has allocated.

Each of the universities has selected a top priority program, and the University of Manitoba, I think, has a \$1.2 million microcomputer program going in. The Brandon University has the Distance Education Telidon Program going in, and the University of Winnipeg has a Child Care Program at about .5 million.

I might say that we were the only province in the country I believe that used the Skills Growth money, the Federal Government Skills Growth money, to give access to education, particularly post-secondary education institutions. I'm not sure what the others used it for, but they didn't use it for education.

So what this did for our colleges and our universities is it gave them money for new programs that we may not have been able to give during a period of limited resources. I think that when I was saying that they can continue to develop in new program areas, it was recognizing that we have given the money to do it through the Skills Growth Fund.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister support or have any concerns with respect to the limitations in enrolment that are being imposed?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I suppose first of all there have always been enrolment limitations in some faculties. That is not anything new. There have been enrolment limitations imposed for years in most faculties. What we're talking about is putting those limitations on some faculties that were previously not limited.

I suppose I'm always concerned about the question of accessibility and we have indicated that. However, the Boards of Governors have to make decisions about how to use their money, how to allocate their money, and what programs to bring in, and whether or not to have enrolment limitations in place. It's not a decision of government, and I suppose that it's one of those tough decisions, and I'm sure they give it a lot of thought before they make a move in that direction because it's something that nobody wants to do.

MR. G. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I recognize that there have been limitations on enrolments in various,

particularly professional, courses for a number of years. But for the first time, as I understand it, there's a significant limited enrolment imposed in the science courses, a general science course, which I believe is the first time.

As I look at the Annual Report of the Universities Grants Commission going back to 1978-79 the enrolment was 1,695. Of course, it's increased significantly in the last fiscal year to 2,739. Now, if I recall correctly, the enrolment in science has been reduced somewhere in the area of 1,400 to 1,600. I believe that is the correct figure, and that is a substantial reduction in enrolment in what is a general course. It's not a specific professional course and it doesn't cause me problems, but I've heard from a great number of constituents with respect to that matter who are concerned about their children being able to obtain a university education. I don't think the Minister can take a hands-off attitude with respect to something like that. The government has got to take some responsibility for that.

I think the government perhaps should be looking at the long-term plans, functions and priorities of the university. I don't defend perhaps even what took place within our own government. I don't think universities should be governed by ad hoc decision-making from year to year. I think any government of any political stripe should attempt to be adopting for the future some long-term planning.

This concept of limited enrolments has caused in the minds of some of my constituents a concern with respect to the lack of departmental exams. Is the Minister satisfied that students coming from various high schools throughout the province are being treated equitably, or can they under the existing system when standards may very well vary from school to school? Marking may very well vary from teacher to teacher, it may be subjective, and it may be that as a result of some differences in various areas or with different teachers that a student might be getting lower marks than perhaps they would be getting at another school and thereby not meet the requirements imposed under these limited enrolment situations. Could the Minister indicate whether she's given any thought or concern to this particular problem which exists in the minds of a large number of students? And I've talked to students - their parents are concerned - but many students have expressed to me a concern in this particular area. I wonder if the Minister has given any thought to it.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I guess I can only say, although there isn't any perfect system, that I think that the high school marks as determined by teachers and people in the school division is still the best determiner of ability, and that I have not at this point given any serious thought to going back to what is a system of departmental exams that had such serious deficiencies and problems related to it in order to address this. I think the negatives of that system far outweigh the positives.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, in connection with this let me simply refer to some statistics that are in the Universities Grants Commission Report.

On Page 11, with respect to International Enrolments, they show a fairly significant increase particularly

from '81-82 to '82-83 in the number of international enrolments. I don't think anyone - there may be some - but I don't think in general anyone would want to if they didn't have to impose any restriction on international enrolments. People coming to the university from other countries certainly contribute to the richness of the educational experience for many students, and the experience, and it's good for the system, it's good for everyone who goes there.

But I express a concern that's been expressed to me by a number of constituents again. If there are limited enrolments, and there are at the same time significant increases in international enrolments, has the Minister given any thought or consideration to limiting those international enrolments in favour of Manitoba high school graduates?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, it's something that we both have been aware of and looking at in the last few years. I think until last year our enrolment was fairly stable, in other words, the numbers of students coming in was not increasing greatly. I think there is a significant increase that has taken place in this last year, and while I wouldn't go so far as to say that because there is we are going to do something - because I agree with what he said that all things being equal you'd like to leave that door open and allow those opportunities for students from other countries - I can simply say that it's an area that we've identified we have to look at and we will be doing so in the coming year.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I think one last question depending upon the Minister's answer.

Can she indicate whether her department is giving any attention to the long-term role and function of universities in Manitoba, and how they can be dealt with and treated with on a long-term basis instead of the ad hoc decision-making, particularly with respect to funding, that has gone on under her government, under our government, and previously under the previous NDP Government?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Well, I think there were two points there, Mr. Chairman. One was were we looking at the role and function of the Grants Commission? The other seemed to be related to the question of some ability to predetermine what the levels of funding would be.

I suppose, especially in times of limited resources, it's very difficult to say ahead of time or to give commitments that there will be increases. I suppose the best attempt at doing that was made by the members opposite when they brought in the Education Support Program for the public school system and for the first time built-in inflation factors that would be automatic in the coming years, that for boards was a help.

I suppose that all agencies and institutions receiving funding including hospitals and others would love to have that sort of built-in guarantee ahead of time. I guess it's difficult for you to do it and it would be difficult for us to do it too. I guess we can say though that we've done a fairly good job of making the money that was available, allowing distribution and availability to the education system, either through direct provincial funding or through access to other federal programs.

In terms of the role and function of the Grants Commission, we have not I suppose taken a serious look at it to date and I would say that that has been for two reasons: One, in the first year we organized the Department of Education and took that on as a priority along with the Education Finance Review, which was a major, major responsibility. This year we clearly are concentrating on the colleges and the training program. The changes we've made are wide ranging, they are quite profound and very deep, and that clearly is going to take I think the large amount of time and attention by my department to implement them. Until we've got the Ed. Finance Review and the College Training Program in hand and under our belt, I can't see taking on another major review activity. There's a limit to what a department can handle in terms of reorganization and change and review.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, is the reduced level of funding that universities are getting now related in any way to cutbacks in transfers from the Federal Government?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I suppose not directly in that we didn't say if they had followed the formula that was in place we would have received \$5 million more last year and we would have received \$12 million this year, a total of \$17 million. I think that the difficulty of coping with the reduction of money from the Federal Government has had a serious impact on our ability to fund not just education but other institutions where the province has had to make up, sort of the deficiencies or the shortfall, in both health and education areas.

Overall, it has caused us problems in amount of money available to distribute with the Provincial Government having to make up the shortfall. It's not the direct result in that we said if we get less we're going to cut down to this degree, but it had an effect on the funding level.

I think the other thing that affected it is the fact that education had received what was recognized to be a higher level, higher percentage and level of funding, in the first two years than had almost any other department. That was both at the public school level and at the university level where they received 10, 11 - we're talking about with the addition of Skills Growth money - 10 percent increases, 11, 12 percent increases. The universities I think with their tuition revenue, their Skills Growth, were up around I think it was 10 or 11 percent. There are a number of reasons: One, they got an excellent share of the money in the first two years, higher than most. We are being hit hard by the federal cutbacks and education simply this year, along with everybody else, has to deal with the same limited resources, limitations and resources.

MR. B. RANSOM: During the election in 1981, Mr. Chairman, there was considerable discussion at the time about the possibility of Federal Government cutting back on its transfers in the area of post-secondary education, and the New Democratic Party at the time promised the university teachers' organization, I recall specifically the group from the University of Winnipeg,

that in fact the universities would not be cut back as a consequence of any change in post-secondary funding from the Federal Government. Is this some new found understanding of economic reality that the Minister is demonstrating?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I suppose the term "cutback" is the question of interpretation on what cutback means. A 3-percent increase is less than a 9-percent increase, but it is still an increase in funds. When I think cutback, real cutback, I'm thinking of what's happening in other provinces where they are taking \$100 million off the top of the education budget and saying you go find it. Never mind lowering the percentage increase, but they're reducing the base by large amounts. I'm thinking of other places where they are closing down educational institutions; those to me are what I would call cutbacks. I would call what we're doing this year as decreasing the amount of increase that the education system is getting.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, does the province expect to get more money this year than they did last from the Federal Government in the area of post-secondary educational financing?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I think a little less.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister agree with the level of funding for universities approved by Cabinet?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, when you're a Minister in a Cabinet you wear two hats. I don't mind saying that when I'm wearing the hat of the Minister of Education that I put forward to the best of my ability the needs of the education community and the education system. I try and demonstrate that they should be getting - because I believe education is that important - both a fair share and as much as we can manage to give them. That's my job. Having done that, I then sit as a member of Cabinet who has to make decisions on distribution of money right across the province to all institutions and agencies and accept the fact that education was treated exceptionally generously in the previous two years, more generous than any other province in the country, I believe, and that we perhaps in education can't always maintain that exceptionally high amount of increase. What they're being asked to do is really no less than many other institutions and agencies are being asked to do this year. I believe it's a little easier on them because of the level of funding they received in the previous two years.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, if that is the case, then why is the Minister reported to have referred various individuals or groups to other Ministers in Cabinet to lobby rather than defend the decision taken by Cabinet with which she said she had to agree?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Because I did not do that, Mr. Chairman. If I understand the situation that the Member

from St. Norbert refers to, it was students, and it was students coming in to lobby for or to make presentation about the level of funding. When they came in they were actually - and they had set up meetings with all of the Ministers or with as many Cabinet Ministers as could attend the meeting. Something happened, I can't quite remember what it was, but some meeting was called at the last minute that made it impossible for all of the other Ministers to attend who had expected to be at this meeting with the students. I met with the students alone. They were very disappointed not to have had - because they see me often, I mean I had met with them a couple of weeks before and while they didn't mind meeting with me again, they said, you know, we've already met with you, that the purpose of that meeting was to meet with a large number of Ministers to make their point directly. What I did say to them, and they said, "Does it make any difference, does what the student's position or the student's information or what the students feel make any difference?" And I said yes. We were getting very short of time in terms of making decisions. I said to them it is important for you to get your position and whatever it is you feel that Cabinet should know on behalf of the students prior to making a decision. If you are not able to set up another meeting, then perhaps you can make your position or present it to them in a written, either a short document or a letter. There was some confusion over the way it was reported when the students came out of the meeting. I did not at any time tell them to go and lobby. I was commenting on a meeting that had been set up for the purpose of communicating with Cabinet that didn't take place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate how much money they expect to get under the established programs cash transfer this year for the area of post-secondary education as compared to last year?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I know what we're not getting. I mean I know that we had 5 million less last year than we expected to get through the formula, and that has increased to \$12 million less. I don't have the figure of what we are getting. I think we would have to get that from Finance. If you would bear with us, I think we would have to get that information from them. We don't have it here with us tonight.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated earlier that you're actually getting less money than you got last year. Is that less money in dollars, or is that less money than you expected to get? If the Minister knew that, then how come she doesn't have the answer to this question?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, the formula, previous, to determine the money that the province would get was based on gross national product. When we say we're getting 5 million less or 12 million less, we are getting less money than we expected to get or would have received had the previous formula continued to apply.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, my question to the Minister was: do they expect to get more dollars this year than last year?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, in actual dollars, there may be an additional increase. We can get the specific figures for you.

MR. B. RANSOM: Then, Mr. Chairman, there has been no cutback in the Federal Government financing of transfers to the province. What we get from the Minister of Finance continually is talk about cutbacks in the area of established programs' financing. I see in the revenue projections for this year, they're expecting 369 million under Established Programs Cash Transfer as compared to 329 million last year.

The Minister of Finance continually talks about cutbacks and, a few moments ago, the Minister explained to us, I thought very rationally, that indeed if you get more than you got last year, it's really not a cutback. If it is less than you expected, that's one thing, but if you actually get more, then it's not a cutback. I must say, I tend to agree with her.

I wonder if she would take the opportunity to speak to her colleague, the Minister of Finance, and see if he would accept the same kind of reasoning that the Minister of Education uses.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I can only make one distinction, because I'm glad he accepted my rationale in terms of the percentage increase as being lower but not being a cutback. There is one difference, and that is the formula that applied, for instance, with the funding to universities. We had no formula that built in a percentage increase that they could expect to receive. It was opened up for discussion and decision each year on what they would get.

With the Federal Government, we had a formula that was approved and agreed to and understood, that was based on gross national product, and I say to him that I'm not sure that it is unreasonable to expect or to count on money that is there through an agreement that has a formula attached to it.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister was aware that the Established Programs financing arrangement expired at the end of fiscal 1982, I believe it was, 1981-82, so the province really had no more right to expect the continuation of that formula than the universities have to expect that they're going to get the same level of funding as the government is funding its own operations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering if the Minister could provide a breakdown of the \$152.7 million worth of grants. Is that available to her and, as such, could she make it available to me?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, we do have it. It's a matter of digging it out with a lot of information, but we can get it for you.

MR. C. MANNES: While I'm waiting for that then, Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering if the Minister could tell

me how many faculties, at the three universities within this province, are going to impose enrolment guidelines, enrolment restrictions?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I suppose the obvious one that is new - I don't have a list here before me of faculties that have imposed for years, Law, you know, that have imposed limitations on their faculties for years. I suppose, we can try and get that for the member. The most obvious new one is at the University of Manitoba. I'm not aware of enrolment increases coming from the University of Brandon. There aren't any that we know of, new ones. The most obvious one is the University of Manitoba, and I think the numbers - it's a reduction of 200 are the figures that I have. The first-year intake was 1,500 this year and it was 1,700 last year, so it's a reduction of 200.

I have the allocation now. The University of Manitoba is 121 million - these are the broad numbers; Winnipeg is 15.8 million; Brandon University is 10.285 million, and St. Boniface College is 2.528 million.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister whether any of the allocation to the University of Brandon includes sums of money that may be required to fight a legal battle that is now before the courts.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. C. MANNES: Is there a contingency built anywhere into the Minister's Estimates regarding outcomes of any court-imposed decision regarding the present court affairs regarding the former President of the University of Brandon?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering if the Minister can tell us why she saw fit to remove from the University of Brandon Board of Governors two appointed positions from, I believe it was, the University of Brandon Association, a long-standing tradition since the change of the college to a university status in 1967; why she saw fit to no longer listen to the Brandon community, by way of that association, for bringing forward those two appointees and to change the status by which and the process by which they were brought forward.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I am going from memory on this, because there were a fair number of appointments and changes, but I will just give a very quick overview about why the changes were made in the first place. I think basically we wanted to bring the Brandon University representative board in line with other universities. There were a number of areas where they did not have the same amount of representation, and others where their programs were quite unique and we felt that there needed to be some additional representation. So we increased the student representation from one, I think, to two to give the students the same number of representatives of the board as had all the other universities. We increased the faculty or the senate to meet the same numbers

as other groups. We gave two positions open for appointment of Native representatives, recognizing that Brandon University delivers the bulk of Native programming to students in the Province of Manitoba and receives a fair amount of money specifically for those programs. It seemed important to have some representative of a large target population who was being served.

In terms of the removal of the - was it the Westman - there isn't anything like that in the other universities. In other words, there is normal faculty representative, there is normal senate representative, but there is not any special representative as the one that was just described. So I think it was simply to bring them in line with other boards.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister then tell me how the Board of Governors in the University of Winnipeg are - and whether or not a sizeable portion of their total are names referred to by the former college association, in a situation that isn't an awful lot different than what the community of Brandon in Western Manitoba used to have, by where they could name two individuals who would then be appointed by the government? How many individuals on the University of Winnipeg Board are people whose names or positions - whose names are offered by the University of Winnipeg former association? I'm sorry I don't know what it was called previously - I know what it was called, but I don't know what their association was called.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, the question was, how many are appointed from the . . .

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I would like to maybe find a letter that would have the specific detail which I could pose to the Minister or maybe it can wait. It's my understanding that the University of Winnipeg has a large number of governors and out of that total some five or seven in number - I can't remember specifically the number - are names and positions that are offered to the Minister from the former school association, remembering its past and its traditions. Now maybe the Minister or her staff seems to be indicating that's not quite correct. Could the Minister then tell me on what basis all the governors on the board of the University of Winnipeg are determined?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: We're frowning because it doesn't ring a bell. The representation that you mentioned doesn't ring a bell with either myself or my staff, so either we're misunderstanding or that isn't an appointment that is designated. Basically, they're senate, student, alumni appointments by the government. The president is ex officio, there's a chancellor, and there are United Church representatives.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, there that was the key - United Church representatives. Of course, we all know the history of the University of Winnipeg. How can the United Church maintain its responsibility of naming individuals to the Board of Governors, whereas the Brandon University Association now has lost that opportunity, particularly in light of the statement that has allegedly

been made by the Minister written up in "Canadian Dimension" by one Errol Black, who said and I'll quote. I'll quote from this document rather extensively through the next number of minutes, but it said at that time and I'm quoting on Page 36, ". . . where a submission was forwarded to the Minister of Education, the two NDP MLAs from Brandon and the Premier," and he says, "In January 1982, a meeting was held with the Minister of Education, Maureen Hemphill, in Brandon. She heard our submissions and the submissions were . . ." and earlier on it indicates the attempt of what this group were asking of the Minister, ". . . were to (1) call for the immediate replacement of all Tory appointments to the board, and (2) the abolition of the right of the board to appoint two members recommended by the Brandon University Association."

This was the submission made to the Minister of Education. I'm wondering now how the Minister, who was obviously - at least by way of this document or this article that was written in Canadian Dimension - a major player in the role to remove the opportunity by the Brandon University Association to name two people to that particular board, how she can reconcile her action in that case, and yet in the case of the University of Winnipeg, continue to allow appointments from the United Church in reference to the history of that particular institution? How can she treat these two institutions in a different manner?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, first of all, I think I want to refute the suggestion that somebody else or somebody who lobbied for appointments or changes in representation determined what those changes would be. We had a lot of representation from a lot of groups and a lot of individuals, and as I recall, the recommendations went from wiping out the board completely, which a lot of people would sometimes like to do, to more minor changes and the decisions that were made were based on listening to all of the groups and making decisions on what seemed to be reasonable and fair at the time.

The Brandon University Association, it seemed to me because they are mainly made up of faculty and faculty members, was already represented. In other words, the faculty were well represented through their regular faculty appointments. That association is largely, I believe, faculty and administration and I suppose that the United Church has a long-standing tradition in history and relationship with the university.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, is the Minister absolutely certain that the Brandon University Association isn't representative of faculty people? Is she absolutely convinced that she has the right understanding of that particular association? I'm led to believe, Mr. Chairman, that in fact that particular association is made up of numerous people from the community as a whole and from the district as a whole and certainly in no way is what we would call a faculty association. Would she care to change her comments on that earlier statement?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I don't disagree with the point the Member for Morris made. There is some broader basis. It's my understanding that it's

largely faculty and administration and that there would also be some businessmen or community representation in there.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, does the Minister not know that the Brandon University Association were the owners of the college up until 1967, and as such were the association totally responsible for all the activities on that campus up to the time when that college became a university in that year? As such, having a long association with the college that came to Brandon in 1890, starting off as a Baptist College in Rapid City, that in fact that particular association has had not only a longstanding association, it was totally responsible for the activities of that particular college for decades. I again question to the Minister as to how she could remove their direct input to the Board of Governors of that university?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I think that we have made some attempt - and I was searching among this myriad of papers, I can see everything except the one I want to see - for the information about the last three appointments to the Brandon University, because I think that it is quite possible and we have made an attempt to get a broad base of community people with a wide variety of sort of backgrounds and experience with demonstrated capability and credibility in the community and appointed them to the board. So that I think there is opportunity there for that broad-based community representation in board appointments, and we have been attempting to do that.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, that's specifically why I asked the Minister what broad base of support, using your argument, allows her to accept appointments from the United Church because of its history, particularly as it relates to the University of Winnipeg Board of Governors? When in 1967, once the ownership of the college was transferred, I suppose to the province, that in return for that happening there was a tacit understanding that the Brandon College Association would retain two seats on the Board of Governors, maybe not written down somewhere, Mr. Chairman, but obviously in the minds of many Brandon residents, very definitely an agreement that was to survive forever. I am wondering whether the Minister at all pays any note to that type of history.

Again my specific question, how can she, using her argument, regarding to the wide cross-section that must be represented on a board of governors, not use that same logic when it comes to the University of Winnipeg?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I suppose that we could stay here and argue this point all night as to why decisions were made and why one was made and one wasn't made. I think I have given about as much information about what the decisions were and what the rationale was and what we've been attempting to do with the openings that came up in the Brandon University.

I must say that I think that in the previous set of appointments that we were able to get some both highly qualified and very credible people in the entire Brandon community to sit on that board who had both the

respect and the confidence of the community at large. I think that's a very important part of our job, and I think we have tried to do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, the Minister might like us to drop this issue and let it go away, but there are some serious inconsistencies in the answers that she has provided and the statements she's made. She said that they have made good appointments with respect to the openings that came up. We have been talking about two openings that didn't come up, Mr. Chairman. They were created by this government when they went against the longstanding agreement with the Brandon University Association to knock out two of those positions so that this government could appoint them.

Is the Minister telling us that was purely coincidental, that Errol Black happens to be writing in the Dimension Magazine and says that is a recommendation that he made to the Minister in January of 1982? Is she telling us now that's purely coincidental that she did away with those two appointees and gave the province the power to make them - herself, the power to make them?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I don't think I said it was incidental. I said that a number of groups, individuals and organizations made representation. They put forward their positions and we listened to all of them. We did not accept or follow through with any individual position, but determined ourselves what we thought were reasonable changes to make to the representation of the University of Manitoba.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, had the terms of those people in those two positions expired at the time that the Minister changed the Order-in-Council to terminate their appointments?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I'm not sure. I think not, but we'll have to confirm that.

MR. B. RANSOM: Well, I think not too, Mr. Chairman. I think it wasn't coincidental that the Minister and this government did away with those two positions at the same time as they had the recommendation from Errol Black who seems to run the university. It wasn't coincidental that one of those people who occupied one of those positions was a candidate for the Conservatives in the last election.

This government couldn't move fast enough to terminate the appointment of those two people, one of whom was a candidate for the Conservatives in the last election. They couldn't wait to terminate that, Mr. Chairman, they had to have the rules of the game changed so that they took on the power themselves to make those appointments. They couldn't leave it with the community. They couldn't believe that the community would make that kind of appointment, so they changed the Order-in-Council, terminated them before their term had expired on the Board of Governors, and did it in such a way as seems questionable to us and questionable to a lot of people whether the government even had the authority to do that or not.

Mr. Chairman, I have another line that I would like to follow up with the Minister, because she said that she received recommendations from some people that the Board of Governors should be done away with. Who would make that kind of recommendation to the Minister that the Board of Governors of a university should be done away with?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: To tell you the truth, Mr. Chairman, I can't remember. I was perhaps being a little bit facetious in giving a range of recommendations that were made. At the time, I can remember meeting with large numbers of people: faculty, students, members of the community, many of whom had quite a wide variety of suggestions to offer us. I don't specifically remember anybody saying do away with them. I am saying there was a very great range in terms of positions taken about what an appropriate representation of a university was.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, how did the Minister decide which of these recommendations then to accept, ones that ranged apparently from doing away with the Board of Governors on through a whole spectrum of recommendations? How did she decide which ones would be acceptable?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I think I tried to indicate that in my earlier statement when I said that one of the things we had tried to do - and I know there is some difference of opinion from the members opposite on whether we were successful in doing that or not - was to look at some of the representation at the other universities. When he makes the point that we did away with two people and two positions in order to open up positions for our own appointments, I would like to suggest that is not an accurate reflection of what happened. Because the increases were not in the area of direct government appointments, but the increases were in areas where the selection was done by other people.

I indicated we increased the student representation by one, the faculty representation by one, and we created two positions for appointments of Native representatives. In all four of those areas, which were the increased positions, the government did not select although we always have to appoint. We went to the students and the students determined who their representative would be; we then appointed that person. We did the same thing with the faculty, and we consulted widely with the Native community and did the same thing with their appointments. So the appointments were made, although by us, the choices were made by the groups they were representing.

MR. B. RANSOM: Is the Minister saying that the appointees for Native people are somehow made by the Native community, as opposed to being made by the government?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, Mr. Chairman. I was quite clear that the government makes all appointments, that we have to make all the appointments. What we do is consult, and we consult with the students and we consult with the faculty and we consult with the Native

community. I think for a government to name anybody to represent a group, without some discussions with that group about who they think capable representatives would be, would be a poor process in terms of selection.

MR. B. RANSOM: The Minister then accepts full responsibility for the appointments that the Executive Council makes to the board of governors? She is indicating, yes. That comes back to the point that I made before that they couldn't wait to change the rules of the game so that they would be able to appoint two more people to the board of governors who were sympathetic to their philosophy and approach to running Brandon University. I suggest the philosophy that is outlined by Errol Black in the Dimension Magazine. I don't think it's coincidental that there are so many similarities between the way this Minister has acted, and the way that Errol Black has outlined his position in the Dimension Magazine.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Chairman, one final comment, the Minister talks about meeting with many groups, associations who were offering her input as to possible changes on the board of governors. Did she herself meet with the Brandon College Association, and ask for their input and their feelings on the situation regarding the removal of their two positions? Did she meet with them at all?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure. I can't remember. I don't remember meeting with the group. I cannot guarantee that I did or did not, but I don't recollect it.

MR. C. MANNESS: Well one final question, does the Minister not consider it ill-advised that she would ignore the group that had fostered the development of this college and university for literally decades? Would she not find that ill-advised in retrospect? Would she not also consider it the height of poor manners to ignore a community in its broadest sense demonstrated by way of that particular association? Does she not realize that's the basis for so much of the problem that exists within that university now?

Mr. Chairman, the Minister by not answering, I suppose, speaks volumes.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister who are the governors on that board today, and maybe she could tell me whether they're government-appointed or not.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, the Chancellor is Stanley Knowles. The Interim President, and I say Interim President, because the Search Committee is still searching for a permanent president, is Dr. Earl Tyler.

I just wanted to clear that up, because there was a question about a week ago. At the time, I said that I understood that the board had a Search Committee, and I had not been informed that they had appointed the acting president as president. What I think happened is that, through a regular university convocation ceremony, they appointed him as president. There had never been a ceremony where he had received any swearing-in even in his interim capacity. So they had a swearing-in ceremony, and I think at the same time

- it might have been a nice thing to do - they appointed him as Vice-Chancellor. However, he has not been appointed nor hired as a permanent president. He's been sworn in to fill the position of acting president. Whether or not that was an appropriate procedure, I am not sure.

I do know that they're still searching, that the Search Committee is still searching, and that they are proceeding and, I think, hope to have something under way or have that process completed towards the end of June or early July. I just give that for additional information. He has not been confirmed or selected, regardless of what they did in that ceremony.

Mr. William Potter, Mr. David Campbell, Mr. Isaac Beaulieu, Ms. Bev Peters, Dr. David Stewart, the Rev. Art Seaman, Mr. Gordon Morisseau, Mr. R. Jackie Skelton, Dr. Donald Keith Hurst, Mrs. Joan Johannson, Mr. Garry Miller, alumni, Dr. Patton, Senate, Mr. James Mendenhall, Senate, Mr. Jess Agard, students, and Mr. Andrew Patterson, students. The three most recent appointments were Dr. David Stewart for Killarney, Mr. David Campbell, Q.C. in Brandon, and Rev. Art Seaman from Neepawa.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister still have an appointee on the senate, either the Deputy Minister or Assistant Deputy Minister?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, although I think this came up before. We indicated that it was - I'm not sure what we called it - pro forma. He doesn't actually function in any capacity on the board. It is still in the act, and I suppose it's one of those things that you should change but we haven't gotten around to it.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, did any member of the board of governors discuss the firing of Dr. Perkins with the Minister before that action was taken?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. B. RANSOM: Is that kind of thing not of interest to the Minister? Would she not expect to be consulted before the board of governors fired the President of the University of Manitoba, the President of the University of Winnipeg?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Actually, Mr. Chairman, I suppose that if they felt that it was important, they might inform me out of courtesy. However, there isn't anything that I know of that suggests that they should get in touch with me or contact my office when they're considering doing that. They don't when they are considering hiring. In other words, they don't come to my office and say, we want to hire Arnold Naimark; he's fantastic; he is the previous President of the Faculty of Medicine; he has all these credentials and all these abilities, and we're going to give him a five-year contract with a house and expense account and a car.

In terms of the University of Brandon President, I think it was something like a four-year or five-year contract with a very significant expense account and an \$85,000-a-year salary, no cut, in terms of saying that if a review did not take place at a certain time,

and I think it was after four years, the contract was automatically renewed. I think, a highly unusual way of continuing a major contract of a top position is not to have an evaluation, but simply say if a period of time passes and you haven't evaluated or done anything about it, the contract goes on for another four years. They don't contact me or ask me how I feel about the contract or the person or the conditions because it is their job to do the search, to do the selection, to do the evaluation and if in their judgment they're not satisfied with the job that is being done to do the firing. They are the ones that have the responsibility. I would not have in my possession any information that would allow me to pass a judgment on the decisions that they have made, since they are the ones that are receiving the direct information and making the judgment in the first place.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that a good bit of the move to fire Dr. Perkins came from Senate. It would seem to me that it would have been advisable for the Minister to have had her representatives sitting in on the meetings of the Senate so that that person could keep the Minister informed. This Minister, it seems to me, to have a remarkable, almost shocking, reluctance to inform herself about the affairs at Brandon University or I fear at either of the universities in the province, that somehow she sees her total responsibility as circulating some names around the Cabinet table, making the appointments - and we all know that a great many of those appointments are the most partisan of political appointments - and there it ends and she doesn't seem to know what's going on. Why wouldn't she want to at least have her representative on the Senate, attend the meetings to keep her informed if no one on the Board of Governors keeps her informed?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, to my knowledge, and I stand to be corrected on this if anybody knows otherwise, the wording in the O/C that says Minister or designate, or that designates the Deputy Minister, as a delegate to the Senate has been there - and not just in the recent appointments - but has been there previously, and to my knowledge has not been used. When I said pro forma, I meant that it's one of those things that is there, but has never been exercised. It is not only recently that it is not exercised, it wasn't exercised previously. The fact of the matter is I, nor the Deputy Minister of our day or your day, have ever taken the time or gone to Senate meetings. If it was normal procedure and something that you did automatically or it was part of your activities, then it should be done. If it's something that's never done, then I fail to see the reason for suggesting that just because there is some concern by the member opposite for a decision that the board made that I should have been using that clause and sending in the Deputy to sit in and find out what was happening. Had that been the case in another situation and you'd gone in, I'm sure you'd be screaming "government interference." You know, the Deputy has been directed to go and sit in meetings and give direction from government. It's never been used before, it isn't being used now, and I don't see the purpose for that designation being in

the O/C. I think we should withdraw it which is exactly what I said when you raised it months ago.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is either naive or she thinks I'm naive, if she's going to put forward the argument that I would scream "interference" if she sent her Deputy Minister to fulfill a role which was set out in an Order-in-Council. What is interference or political guidance, whichever way you want to call it, political involvement in the affairs of the university is the appointment of people to the board of governors. That's where in this case the government controls what happens. If the Minister doesn't realize that that's the government controlling what happens when they control the majority of appointees, then she is indeed naive.

Mr. Chairman, I ask her two questions then: One, is she going to change it so that she doesn't have an appointee to the Senate anymore; and more importantly, is she satisfied that she has an adequate knowledge of what is going on at Brandon University, that she has an adequate knowledge of how the decisions are being made, that affect a major, major learning institution in this province?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to make the point that governments always appoint representatives to the board of governors, so to suggest that this is political interference - or it almost sounds as though we are doing something that is abnormal - all governments appoint, and you appointed yourself, and you appoint whom you believe to be the best representative and to be the individuals you want to appoint. To that end, we're doing what has always been done; that's the way we get boards of governors.

MR. B. RANSOM: You changed the rules, so you could stack it more.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I'm trying to think of what, in terms of am I going to change the O/C, I think that I recognized before and we discussed it and said why is it there if it's never used? And it's probably not the only thing that is there in O/C that is pro forma and that is not actually used. I think unless we can find good reason to maintain it, and I don't know what it is right now, that we should eliminate it to avoid any misunderstanding of the position of the Deputy Minister in sitting in the Senate. Either it's something he should do, in which case it should stay, or he shouldn't do it and isn't doing it and never has done it, which is what I believe to be the fact. If that's the case, we should probably remove it.

In terms of knowing what's going on at the university, there isn't anything that I know of that tells me that the controversy that has resulted from the firing of the president has interfered with the operations of the university. There's been a lot of hollering from the community outside, and particularly from the members opposite, but in terms of the ongoing functioning of the courses and the programs and the activities of the university, inside the university, I don't have any information that indicates to me that they're not proceeding with business as usual and continuing to do their usual adequate job.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I didn't ask whether what was going on was good, bad or indifferent, I asked the Minister if she felt that she was adequately informed as to how decisions are being made with respect to the operation of Brandon University? Does she feel that she is adequately informed?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, there are a number I suppose of - I'm trying to think of what the issues are that would require direct information to me. The major responsibility for reporting and accountability is through the Universities Grants Commission.

The Universities Grants Commission, both directs and oversees the distribution of money and the expenditure of money, the approval of programs and the accountability for delivery of programs and expenditures of money. I have received no information from the Universities Grants Commission that suggests to me that they are concerned about the activities of the Brandon University in terms of their responsibility to carry out their programs. To that extent I feel adequately informed, because if there was something in the Grants Commission, through both staff and their requirements for financial accountability, is overseeing on a regular basis the affairs of both Brandon University and the other two universities. If there were any problems or concerns related to that, they would inform me immediately. In the absence of having been informed by the Universities Grants Commission, I believe that I am or would be adequately informed if there was a serious problem with the programs or the functioning of the university.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister advised by anybody on the Universities Grants Commission that at this point in the long history of university freedoms in universities in this nation that a university president had never been fired up until November, 1983?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I can remember having that information in my head at an earlier date, and I can't recollect right now. I think there was something previous and it might have been by mutual agreement that the president left, but I can't recall. I'll have to check on that.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, mutual agreement is that, it's mutual agreement. Of course, with mutual agreement or we use the word "leave," in this House you can do anything.

I would also ask the Minister whether she was aware that now 10, I believe, out of the 17 positions on the Board of Governors in fact are government appointees? I would ask her whether she feels a little bit used, because after all she was a big player in this according to Mr. Black, as to changing the rules, whether she feels a little bit used in this whole situation and maybe now is paying the price for having listened to those individuals who thought that they would change the situation in Brandon at the university to their favour? I'm wondering if she could comment on that.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I think that I feel quite satisfied in terms of increasing the representation

for both students and faculty and Native groups. I have absolutely no apologies to make on that basis and those are the increases that were brought in. I mean, giving the students at Brandon the same representation as the other students have doesn't require any apology, that those I think stand on their merit. You may not accept them, but that's the reason for them and I don't feel badly about increasing student faculty or Native representation on the Brandon University.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to review some of the government appointees. I understand that Mr. Bill Potter, the librarian at Vincent Massey High School, is a government appointee; and Ms. Bev Peters, the vice-chairman and co-ordinator of Manitoba Action Committee Status of Women, was a government appointee; that Dr. Patton was not, but interestingly, Dr. Patton was also formally a McKenzie Seed vice-chairman and still is, and was once the acting chairman; Keith Hurst, I understand was a former government appointee; Jackie Skelton, a farm labourer at Sinclair, was a government appointment; that Mrs. Joan Johansson, housewife, Plumas, is a government appointee; as was Mr. Isaac Beaulieu, and I don't know if he's still on the board. I believe that somebody, one of the government appointees, I understand, resigned. Mr. David McConkey, househusband as I'm told, is a government appointee, and on and on.

I'm wondering if the Minister now will acknowledge the concern of Brandon residents who see it as a major NDP conspiracy in many respects in many of the institutions within Brandon, and again I ask the Minister if she doesn't feel that she's been used, to some degree, as an instrument to whatever end it is of some of the people who are involved in a political fashion within that community?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I think, quite rightly, that the student's union, the student's group might be offended to have described their selection as a student representative as an NDP sort of person. Now the student may be, I don't know, because we don't ask about that, but to have sort of statements made that the people that they selected were NDP sort of either hacks or appointments . . .

MR. C. MANNES: You said the word, I didn't.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Well, I was paraphrasing what I felt you were saying. Both the faculty, I think, would have very different grounds or rationale for their selection; the students would for theirs; the two representatives of the Native community would also.

If we look at the last three appointments, let's talk about those for just a minute and just give a little of background of the last three appointments to the University of Brandon.

Dr. David Stewart from Killarney has been very active in the community. He's a former dean of the Faculty of Medicine at the University of West Indies, a former faculty member at Brandon University, strong advocate of the peace movement, belongs and active in the United Nations Association, a widely-respected member who's been very involved in a large number of community activities.

Mr. David Campbell, Q.C., also very active in the community, and Reverend Art Seaman from Neepawa, a respected Catholic priest. He was very active in getting the community swimming pool in Selkirk. He's been on the board of Legal Aid for a couple of years. He's done a lot of community work through Corrections. He's been involved in work with the child welfare system and involved in church councils.

I suggest to the members opposite that they are discrediting very respected, very capable people in the community . . .

MR. C. MANNES: I didn't mention those three.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: . . . who are serving - you're making comments about appointments and I am saying that when you make those comments, you are making comments about all of the people that have been named, and I think that it's very unfortunate that you're tarring and raising questions of credibility of very concerned, very involved, very hard-working representatives who are highly respected throughout the entire community when you do that.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to accept the Minister's lecture. I did not mention those three individuals that she named last and if she wants to take the inference that I included everybody, I mentioned specifically the ones that I was concerned with and I ask her not to take from that an extension that covers also the last three appointments. So, Mr. Chairman, I won't accept that criticism from the Minister, because in no way did I make any reference to the last three people that she read off.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister what contingency the Universities Grants Commission are asking the department to come up with by way of additional funds should this present court case prove successful?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No request, Mr. Chairman, it's never been discussed.

MR. C. MANNES: Has liability ever been discussed, as to the liability of the present Board of Governors, or at least those that were actively involved in the decision - personal liability on those Board of Governors? Are they afforded any protection whatsoever?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, they are making decisions that are in the area of responsibility of a Board of Governors. They are tough decisions. They will stand by those decisions and there's been no discussion of personal liability. They are carrying out their responsibilities as they see fit.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, in view of the grave concerns expressed by people and agencies responsible for fund raising at the Brandon University, particularly as to their capacity to solicit significant amounts of funds in the present climate of turmoil, can the Minister confirm whether or not she's included the sum of \$1.6 million in her Estimates for the completion of a new Music Building, believing, as some do, that that figure will not be raised now by the university?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We have included in our Estimates the \$1.6 million that the government was committed and indicated they would give to the university. I believe that they also have access to the \$1.4 million that's coming to them from the NEED Program, and we have said that we will give them another .5 million through the old Anniversary Program, and the basis of that program was supposed to be that they raise \$1 and they get \$1.00. At the time we made the decisions on funding they had pledges at that time for about \$250,000.00. We said regardless of that we would provide .5 million through the Anniversary Fund. I believe that construction is not only under way and on schedule but may actually be a little ahead of schedule and that they may be coming back to us and saying that they would like some advancement of the .5 million that was budgeted in next year's budget because we anticipated that that timing of construction to mean that they wouldn't need the money 'till then. I can only say that if that turns out to be the case, that construction is moving faster than they thought that the government, I believe, would be sympathetic towards giving the amount of money they have pledged in order for them to continue construction.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to return a moment to the appointments that the Minister has made. I think that was something less than I expected from the Minister to hear her try and say that we were casting aspersions upon her last three appointments to the Board of Governors which was not the case at all. In fact I can commend the Minister for the last three appointments that she made to the board and I draw a parallel to those appointments with what the Minister of Finance had to do with McKenzie Seeds.

He had to admit that the first political appointees to the Board of Directors of McKenzie Seeds were disasters and that indeed he had to go outside of Brandon to find a competent person to appoint. He didn't feel that he could take anymore NDP'ers from Brandon and put them on the board and expect them to do a job. So he went outside and got some people that as far as I know are non-political people, selected them for their competence, and put them on to the Board of Directors and we hope they're doing well.

I think that if the Minister had put as much care into selecting her first appointees to the Board of Governors of Brandon University as she did into the last three that they might have had a lot less problems today and she wouldn't be having to make facetious comments that some people might like to see the Board of Governors eliminated completely. I wouldn't be surprised if that recommendation was something that it sort of flickered across the Minister's mind herself, her own mind from time to time as this situation has developed. The government has to accept the responsibility of people that are appointed to run institutions, or corporations. I think that perhaps through the Minister's inexperience early on that she allowed herself to be influenced by people such as Errol Black, and the Member for Brandon East and such because I don't think that the appointees that were made early on are the kind of appointees that this Minister would make if she really had an opportunity to make her own decisions. So I'm somewhat heartened by the later

decisions, and I would be heartened even more if I saw some evidence that the Minister was going to say: I am the Minister of Education, I'm responsible for what happens ultimately in these institutions because I appoint the people that run them. If I saw some greater interest on her part to provide direction then we could see that we could have some further hope for the future.

One question with respect to the Brandon University Foundation. Is the Minister contemplating any change in legislation respecting that foundation?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister aware that that piece of legislation was vehemently opposed by NDP members on the committee when that legislation passed through the House about three years ago?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No.

MR. B. RANSOM: Has she had any recommendation to this point to make changes in that legislation? Any recommendation that might come from the Board of Governors or others of her acquaintances or people who might offer her recommendations from the Brandon area?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, the Minister, and we're talking now about the Brandon University School of Music Building, the Minister indicated the government may be prepared to direct additional funds towards that project. Maybe the Minister could tell me, it seems to me that there was a \$5 million ceiling placed upon that building and the university was expected to raise \$1.1 million. Is the Minister now saying that the university will not be expected to raise that total amount?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, Mr. Chairman. I didn't say we would give additional money. I said we would speed-up the money that had been committed. We've built in \$1.6 million which was part of our commitment. The additional commitment that we made was the .5 million through the Anniversary Fund. The \$1.6 million is in this budget. The .5 million we expected not to be required until the next budget year. What I'm saying is if they need it earlier we will speed-up the pay out. I believe we would be willing to do that, speed-up the pay out to allow them to continue construction.

However, when the approval was given - I'm sure the members opposite will remember because I believe that when they were in government that they also refused to approve the \$6 million building as we did because they didn't see that it was justified. They approved, I think it was, the \$4 million but I'm sort of searching. I know they didn't approve the \$6 million but they, the same as we did, they said if you want to build it you can go ahead and do it but we will approve the level of support that we think is justified for the building of that nature. That's exactly what we did.

What they decided to do was to proceed with the higher cost building but to design it in such a way that the basic requirements were met within the initial design

through the money that they were getting through the NEED and the Provincial Government and that the additional floor or two would be left unfinished until they had successfully completed their fund raising activities and that was the basis upon which they proceeded. We agreed with them proceeding with the understanding that the level of funding they would get from the government was this much, and that if they proceeded they would finish the building when they had completed successfully their fund-raising activities.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister whether she's aware that the present Board of Governors itself estimate that a minimum of 175,000 of the approximately 530 in cash and pledges raised to date by the Brandon University Foundation, and the American Friends of Brandon University, in support of the new music building will be withdrawn by donors. Has that information been passed to her by the present Board of Governors? If it has what is the government's course of action at that time if, in fact, the money is not there as indicated earlier, or has been removed?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: First of all, Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding, and I did have it on a piece of paper written down and I can't pull it out, but I'm going from memory. It's my understanding that a couple of the large pledges that have been referred to in terms of being withdrawn were not actually confirmed pledges but were pledges that were in the process of being negotiated, staff is confirming that, that they were not pledges in hand, and of course a pledge in hand isn't even cash in hand. But they were in the process of negotiating reasonably large amounts from a couple of sectors that have not come through but were not confirmed previously.

We said at the very beginning that we thought it might be difficult for them to raise that amount of money. I mean we were not under any illusions that it was difficult times, and that it's difficult to raise that amount of money in the private sector. In fact, we communicated our concern, you know, for whether or not they would be able to do that and suggested seriously that they should consider modifying their design to fit the cloth. In other words to bring it in within the dollars that they knew they would have available. They chose not to do that. They chose to go and stay with the \$6 million facility and to agree to bring it in in stages. They said they had designed it in such a way that that could be done without prejudice to the existing program and the provision of basic facilities for the existing program. They can do that if they want but they don't do it with either our approval, or our indication of support. They sort of go on their own hook. The information that I have tells me that they now have \$250,000 in hand and that they got about \$150,000 in pledges in their campus drive that they recently undertook, and that in a recent meeting both the Foundation and the Board agreed to work co-operatively together on additional fund-raising activities. So they have close to half-a-million and I suppose that it's not surprising that they haven't been able to raise the entire amount. We weren't sure that they could in the first place; they chose to proceed regardless.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I don't know if the Minister is referring to the meeting between the Board

of Directors of the Foundation and the Chairman of the Board of Governors plus the Vice-Chairman that was held in Winnipeg on May 7th or not, at which time the Board of Governor representatives at that meeting were, I understand, severely criticized for some of the statements they were making to the government. I guess that begs the next question. Has the Minister or anybody in her department talked directly with the Directors of the Foundation or are they receiving all their information specifically from the Chairman of the Board of Governors, one William Potter?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, in terms of both accountability and communication on programs and fund raising and financial accountability, it's done through the Universities Grants Commission by the university, and the information that I have about what they have in hand and what they have in pledges has come to me through the normal route, through the Universities Grants Commission, who I suppose is receiving its information from staff at the university.

MR. C. MANNES: That's exactly the point I'm trying to make. Doesn't the Minister deem it wise to meet with the Directors of the Foundation who are to a large part responsible for collecting and for assuming responsibility of collecting a significant portion of this money, particularly in light of so many problems that have developed under the existing Chairman of the Board of Governors? Would she not deem it wise to meet directly with the Directors or certainly the Chairman of the Directors of the Brandon University Foundation? I am specifically referring to Dr. Robert . . . (inaudible) I say that because even the Interim President, Dr. Tyler, is on record as saying that until this Perkins' situation is resolved and credibility is re-established at that university that fund raising is going to be a most difficult and, in cases, a futile situation.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, first of all, I wouldn't agree that it's futile. I would agree that it's difficult and they're not raising money as quickly as they would like to, maybe not getting as much in hand as they thought they would, but it certainly isn't futile because they have close to half-a-million dollars in pledges. When Dr. Tyler, to the point that was made, that until the credibility increases or things settle down, and I don't disagree with that - I think it is important that the university be allowed to get on with its business and I wish we would let them do that.

I would like to remind the members opposite that when this fund-raising activity first took place, it was much earlier. It wasn't in the last year because they had decided on a \$6 million building several years ago. They undertook the fund-raising drive for the \$6 million building because they didn't get approval of it from you either and Dr. Perkins was the Chairman of that fund-raising drive. If my memory serves me right, that for at least a year and perhaps a year-and-a-half, the first year to year-and-a-half, of that fund-raising drive under the chairmanship of Dr. Perkins they did not raise one cent. So while the half-a-million dollars might look like a small amount or you would wish it were more, they've been a lot more successful in spite of the controversy in the last year or so than they were

prior to any of this coming up when things were quiet, when there was no controversy and Dr. Perkins was responsible for leading the fund-raising drive.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, will the Minister not acknowledge her shortcomings in this whole situation and will she not acknowledge that she made a basic mistake by considering, or is she considering in any way removing any of the appointees that she has made earlier on to this Board of Governors?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I suppose that I can use both the last question and a point that was made earlier by the Member for Turtle Mountain when he indicated that he was concerned - it was the Member for Morris - that I had given information on the last three appointees and suggested that they were complaining about them when what they were doing was complaining about the other appointees. I responded that way by giving that information because I believed that the points that were being made were related to NDP appointments. I didn't hear a very finite distinction. I heard a lot of criticism and complaint about government appointees to the Brandon Board in general. I was responding to what I believe to be a general criticism.

While there have been a lot of general criticisms and statements about the appointments and about the question of representation, I don't know of any individual who is a disaster. I mean I really don't. I've heard general comments about the change, distribution or representation, general comments of concern about NDP appointments, but I really think that both in concert and in group and that the individual members are acting responsibly, or are carrying out their duties in a responsible manner, and I don't know of any one individual who is not carrying out their duties. If there were, or I have that information or knowledge, I would be willing to reconsider the appointment that we've put on any board, that they're either not carrying out their duties, or they're carrying them out in an unacceptable way, but I don't have information like that about any of those individual appointees which is what it gets down to, the bottom line is the individual.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, the Minister said, I believe, that she has not met with any representatives of the Brandon University Foundation. Has anyone from the Universities Grants Commission met directly with someone from the Brandon University Foundation?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: To my knowledge, no, Mr. Chairman, and if you'll just let me make sure I'll confirm that.

Mr. Chairman, the information I have is that there hasn't been a meeting. There has been a discussion by telephone but no direct meeting with staff and that one of the members is also a member of staff at the Brandon University and they've had some discussions with that person.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, doesn't the Minister see the significance of this situation, of her failure to take this in hand and deal with it directly? Here is a group primarily responsible for raising the funds upon

which the government has made a commitment, that's really part of the basis of the government commitment. Well, the Minister says no way. Mr. Chairman, in fact, it is, it's entered into some of the government's decision making that so much money is going to be raised outside of government. She knows full well that if that money isn't raised and there's a hole in the ground and the walls are starting to go up and the money doesn't get raised, there is going to be a tremendous amount of pressure brought upon this Minister and upon the government to pick up the slack.

How can the Minister stand here and make ill-informed comments about that foundation and their fund raising efforts, to stand and say "Oh well, they never raised any money in the first year or so when Dr. Perkins was the president of it." Doesn't she realize the ground work that has to be done to raise this kind of money? You don't go and knock on somebody's door and say, "Are you going to put 50,000 or 100,000 in today?" Are you not giving the Brandon University Foundation any credit for having done any work in the first year-and-a-half of its existence? All of the fund raising efforts, were they all based upon something that happened within the last year? I don't know how the Minister can make those statements when she hasn't met personally with the Chairman of the Brandon University Foundation and I gather from the information that she's given us, that the Universities Grants Commission really hasn't had what I would call a serious in-depth kind of meeting with that foundation to see what's going on.

Normally, you like to do a little more than have a discussion over the phone when you're talking about '100's of 1,000's of dollars that are being raised that would take the load off the government's shoulders. I find at every turn, Mr. Chairman, that this situation has been dealt with in a less than satisfactory fashion by the Minister and by the government.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, as I said previously, I suppose we could continue to argue these points all night and if we're going to continue to do it much longer I'm going to have to ask for a two-minute break in the proceedings.

I'll just touch on a couple of the main points that were made by the Member from Turtle Mountain. He says that they took on the responsibility and that that has something to do with the government's commitment, I want to make it clear that when the decision was made, we communicated very clearly that that was not the government's commitment and we suggested that they not proceed with the building. In other words, they had this amount of money guaranteed or committed by government, either through the NEED or through the provincial government and that they should either scale down their facility to what we thought to be a reasonable and a justifiable level for the numbers of students and the needs of that faculty, or they should not build it until they had the money in hand, and that if they started the building prior to having the money in hand, that they wouldn't be bailed out because we clearly stated the level of our commitment and funding to them very clearly at the beginning. It was their idea to stage and because they wanted to get going with it right away and they said, "We know we don't have

the money, we're going to stage it, we're going to design it so that we can build it in two stages and we'll build what we can build with the money we've got coming to us, and what we've been able to raise as the first stage and we'll build the rest when we get the money. We will be able to manage what is required for the basic facility to deliver the program in the first stage." That was their decision on how to proceed with it, and that's what they're doing. They had a clear message from government on what our financial commitment would be, both through my department and through the Universities Grants Commission in terms of determining the level that we thought was justifiable.

MR. B. RANSOM: That clear message that they have received from the government, was that the same clear message that the NDP gave in the election of 1981?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Might I suggest that now the Member from Turtle Mountain is being facetious.

MR. B. RANSOM: I am not. Mr. Chairman, I'm most certainly am not being facetious. This happened to be a major issue in the election in 1981 in Brandon, that our government was being accused of not getting on fast enough with the Music Building and promises were being made right and left by NDP candidates and by the leader of the NDP Party.

I'm asking in all seriousness whether or not this was the commitment that the NDP made at that time, that, yes, we think all you need is the \$4 million model and that anything over that would be unnecessary and indeed extravagant.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, it's probably because it's very late in the hour and I may be having trouble getting the point that the Member from Turtle Mountain is making, but I think both governments, first of all, they froze construction, I think that was the point that was made, is that all construction including Brandon University was frozen, but when you did give approval, you did not give approval for the \$6 million building, on the same basis, I'm sure as we did not give approval for the \$6 million building. It was not in the Department of Education and the Universities Grants Commission's mind justifiable to approve a building of that amount. You didn't do it and we didn't do it. Each one said, "You can go ahead if you want to, but you'll go ahead knowing that you're only going to get a reduced level of funding from the government." I can't remember what it was; 1.6 million from the Provincial Government is the commitment that was made?

MR. B. RANSOM: You've got one policy in the election and one when you're in government - a two-policy system.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman is the Minister happy with the funds that have been spent by the University of Brandon in the area of special audits? I know the Minister will claim that in fact that's the responsibility of the Board of Governors to decide how they spend their money. Is the government happy or I suppose does it have any influence whatsoever on universities

as to how many dollars can be wasted particularly in a witch hunt of trying to prove impropriety against an ex-employee?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, as to the question, am I happy about the distribution or the use of funds related to one particular issue, without going into details - I'm not always happy about decisions that a school division may make or a university may make in terms of if I was there sitting on the board I might like to have made them differently or distributed the money differently or I might have different values or different attitudes. I don't agree with or like, nor is it required that I do so, all of the decisions are made by all boards. There's 56 school boards in the province. Is he also wanting to know if I'm unhappy about . . .

MR. C. MANNES: Do you appoint them?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, but they are boards that are set up that are elected or appointed that have by law responsibilities to oversee the operation of the schools or institutions under their authority. So, in that form they do not differ, nor is it required that they always make me happy with their decisions.

MR. C. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of loose sort of reasoning that we get from this Minister repeatedly and during Question Period she gets away with it, of course, but this is the review of the Estimates that we're in now and so we have an opportunity to follow up on it.

What she has just done is try and draw a parallel between an elected school board and an appointed board of governors of the university. My colleague says from his seat, "The school board can be held accountable." Exactly, if the public doesn't like what the school board is doing, the next time there's an election, they'll boot them out. How are your appointees to the Board of Governors of Brandon University held accountable?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, the way we get school boards is to elect them; the way we get Boards of Governors of universities is to appoint them. That is the tradition and the way of getting them. They do not differ in terms of having legal responsibility for overseeing and for jurisdiction of either the university or the schools in their school division. To that end, although they may get there in a different way, one elected and one appointed, they end up having legal responsibility for overseeing the management, the control and the accountability of the operations of that university.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, how are they held accountable? How is this appointed Board of Governors held accountable if it isn't through this Minister?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, the accountability comes through the overseeing, as I mentioned earlier, of financial management, the development of new programs, the operations of the university through the Universities Grants Commission. The Board of Governors provides and is required to provide

information to the Universities Grants Commission on their operation, on their expenditure, on their programs. That is the role and function of the Universities Grants Commission to oversee and to recommend to the Minister if there are any deficiencies or any problems which they have not to date done.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, there is a difference between the accounting and accountability. A school board can be adhering totally to their legal requirements, and the electorate can be unhappy with what they're doing. They don't like the way they are running the ship. So they can take action the next time there is an election.

A Board of Governors at Brandon University can be completely within their legal rights to spend money on witch hunts if they want, but how are they held accountable to the public out there? This is their institution. How are they held accountable if it isn't through the Minister?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I think I indicated before that, as far as I know with the information that is coming to me, Brandon University is carrying on their business of educating students in spite of the controversy, much of which I believe has been generated not by real problems but by the members opposite trying to generate controversy. As far as I know, it hasn't interfered with the programs of the students, the ability of the students to study or the ability of the university to provide programs for students. I have no information that suggests any of that is taking place.

If the member opposite does know, then he should provide it to us. I don't have it. The Universities Grants Commission doesn't have it. So as far as we know, they are carrying on with their job and doing the business that they are there to do.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I am asking the Minister how they're held accountable. Does the Minister accept responsibility for the actions of the Universities Grants Commission? I assume she does. If she doesn't accept responsibility for them, perhaps she will get up and tell me so.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, Mr. Chairman. I was talking about what the role and function of the Universities Grants Commission is, and it is to be accountable, to oversee, to provide information and to provide it to me. So they do fill that role, and they are filling that role.

With all of the information that they have and I have, there is no information that I presently have nor that they have informed me nor, I believe, that they have that suggests there is a problem with the University of Manitoba carrying out the business and the responsibility of educating students.

MR. B. RANSOM: My specific question was: does the Minister accept the responsibility for actions of the Universities Grants Commission?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I'm sorry. I didn't hear the last question. Would the member mind repeating it?

MR. B. RANSOM: Does the Minister accept responsibility for the actions of the Universities Grants Commission? Are they accountable through her?

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

MR. B. RANSOM: Is the Board of Governors at the Brandon University held accountable through this Minister?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I think that the accountability is there in terms of the procedures that I have indicated that are set up and carried out by the Universities Grants Commission. They are there. They have been carried out and, to their knowledge and my knowledge, they have been carried out adequately to date.

MR. B. RANSOM: It's not a question of adequacy that I am trying to get from the Minister. I am trying to find out what's the line of responsibility. If the Board of Governors is accountable to the Universities Grants Commission and the Universities Grants Commission, the Minister says, is accountable to her - she is responsible for their actions - is she not, therefore, responsible for the actions of the Board of Governors of the university?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, this is the last question I would like to answer before I ask for a two-minute break if we're going to continue. I would like some discussion on what the intentions of the members are if that's all right, how long they want to continue to go on tonight because we have staff that are being kept on the understanding that we intended to try and go through all of the items. If that's not the case, I would like to know now.

The Board of Governors is responsible to and reports through the Universities Grants Commission to me but they, like school divisions and school boards whether the member likes the analogy or not, have within their jurisdictions responsibilities that are theirs, while we oversee and audit and monitor to make sure that new programs that are there are delivered or that the programs are in place, that the money that is allocated is used in the way it is distributed, that it is accounted for in terms of our requirements for accounting. There are areas that we do oversee, but there are other areas that are clearly their responsibility to determine. Whether the members like it or not, and I know they don't, the selection of, the hiring of and firing of university presidents is one of the things that the Universities Grants Commission nor the Department of Education monitors or oversees, because it is not in those areas that we should be following through and having them be accountable for.

So there is different jurisdiction. There are areas of responsibility. They are carrying out theirs; we carry out ours; those that we have a responsibility to determine and oversee, we do. One of them is not the selection of or the evaluation of or the firing of university presidents.

MR. B. RANSOM: I can tell the Minister this, as far as I know, is going to be the last question that I have. I'm only asking some of these questions because I am not getting very precise answers from the Minister.

I would ask her a different sort of question then, and preface it by saying that in our society, the public should

always have some sort of control over institutions. Those institutions have to, in some way, be held accountable to the public, to the people. There are many ways that we can see that some institutions are held accountable. The Minister has said, the Universities Grants Commission is held accountable through her. That's fine. But what would the Minister recommend then to the public if some members of the public don't like what the Board of Governors, in this case at Brandon University, are doing, but it might be in some other case? What does the public do to try and change a situation like that if it isn't to hold the Minister accountable for what has happened?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure - in fact, I'm quite sure that the member won't like the answer, because I am giving answers that I think are reasonable and I am trying to answer directly. I could probably repeat those answers all night, and he wouldn't like the answers any better through the repetition.

I am not sure what he is suggesting in terms of democratic process. If a board that has legal responsibility, whether they're elected or appointed, makes a decision that concerns some members of the community, and I say some because it is not demonstrated the level that they want. I mean, does he want us to have elections? Does he want people to be turfed out if they make a decision that people don't like?

Members of government, elected representatives, sometimes make decisions that sections of the public or members of the public don't like.

MR. B. RANSOM: You get a chance to vote.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: You always have that situation where you have boards, whether they be school boards or boards of governors of universities or MLAs, members of government. — (Interjection) — When you have tough decisions, you cannot make a decision really that is a tough one without causing some concern and there may be some areas of concern or disagreement with some members of that community.

So I don't think the case can be made that just because there is some controversy over this issue, or there is some concern about what is happening, that is ultimately going to be resolved by the courts, I believe. That means the whole system of appointment and accountability is one that should be thrown out. It's imperfect but it served us reasonably well and it will continue to do so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the indulgence of the committee to take a five minute break and reconvene in five minutes, if that's agreeable?

RECESS

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I listened with great interest to the debate between my colleague and the Minister. What I find interesting

is the Minister trying to deflect the discussion to her definition of accountability, it's as if she fails totally to acknowledge the fact that within a democratic system every public official is accountable to somebody, ultimately the government becomes accountable to the people, the highest authority, and yet I have not heard the Minister indicate for one moment that she's accountable for the actions of the Brandon University Board of Governors.

Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering if the Universities Grants Commission is at all concerned about the internal budgeting procedure now being used by the Brandon University, whereby no fewer than 11 of the members of that Budget Committee are members of various campus unions - it should be the faculty union, on which neither the president nor the vice-president for administration and finance sit ex officio. Is the Minister concerned that there's potential conflict of interest where the major part of the university budget of course is directed towards the staff and 11 out of 14 members on the Budget Committee in fact are faculty staff members?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, they confirmed what was my understanding. The board names their own committees. The Universities Grants Commission does not question nor judge the composition of committees, as long as they're representative of the Board of Governors and this issue has not been dealt with by them.

MR. C. MANNES: Well that's why I bring it up, Mr. Chairman, specifically it hasn't been dealt with. That's my reason for the question. Does the Minister and the Universities Grants Commission - do they see a potential conflict of interest. They are, after all, responsible, accountable to all the taxpayers of this province, to make sure that funds that are directed towards the University of Brandon are spent in the best manner providing the best quality of education standards? We have a situation now where the Budget Committee, the people that determine how those funds that will be spent at the University of Brandon, are composed of 14 members, 11 of which are the benefactors of any salary increases. Does the Minister or the Universities Grants Commission see any potential conflict of interest?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, in terms of the process, whatever the Budget Committee's decisions are or the make-up of the Budget Committee, they would only have the authority to recommend decisions to the Board of Governors and decisions on any salaries or increases would have to be made and could only be made by the entire Board of Governors, so while they do play a role, they don't have the authority to make the decision.

MR. C. MANNES: Well you're right, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister. In most universities that is correct, but there's a move afoot and I understand it's been the procedure through the '70s that within that particular university that indeed this Budget Committee were solely responsible for developing the final draft of the budget. Right today, I'm told, that

there's a move afoot, by some of the governors on the university board, to propose some major organizational changes that will remove completely positions such as the president and vice-president and deans and replacing them with committees of workers.

So I ask again the question, seeing that it was in effect, I understand it, in the early '70s, that this Budget Committee determined the final draft - as a matter of fact that was one of the major areas of contention between the former president and the university, it was one of the changes that he brought about, the fact that the budgeting process would be conducted within the administration and the board. If the Minister, hearkening back to the words of wisdom offered by my colleague, would become totally involved in the situation, she would understand some of the history. Again I ask her, does she not see a potential conflict of interest situation arising?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I think that the key is in the words used by the Member for Morris when he said draft budget. Even if they had prepared the budget in committee, it is a draft budget and that draft budget cannot be determined by the committee. It can only be ratified by the board as a whole, so that the board may give some of its authority or some of the advance work to a committee that they established, but they carry out the responsibility for and must make all the final decisions.

MR. C. MANNES: Further to my other point, Mr. Chairman, is the Minister at all aware that the Brandon University Board of Governors is currently considering some organizational changes which in time will do away with the positions of president and vice-president and deans and replacing them with committees of workers? Is the Minister aware of her own appointed university Board of Governors dealing with those areas?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, is the Minister at all concerned that I bring that to her attention? Will she be looking into it further?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, it's difficult to respond to information that comes by way of a third or fourth party and say what are you going to do if, when the if is hypothetical and not confirmed. If information came to us that was a fact, not they were considering it, boards of governors and governments consider many things and probably carry out about a quarter of what they consider. So if it becomes more than a consideration and a reality and it's anything that we would be concerned about and if it's a fact, we would look at it.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, that brings up a lot of statements that I can make and obviously the Minister knew well of the intentions of the board to dismiss Dr. Perkins and of course, as reiterated by or stated on a couple of occasions by the Attorney-General, that in fact he was the problem at that university, I suppose the Minister and all members were not surprised at all with his dismissal.

Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering if the Minister is at all concerned with the stated wish by the Chairman of the Brandon University Board of Governors that the residence owned by the university be sold off? I'm wondering if she sees that as a potential shortcoming in attempting to attract competent individuals to apply for that position in the future.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, first of all the information that's being provided is not either clear or is not known to us, so it's difficult for me to respond to saying are you concerned about something. We're not clear about what it's to be concerned about or we have no information related to that.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, that's the point we're trying to make. Mr. Chairman, we're trying to relate some information to the Minister; she says she doesn't want to hear it third or fourth hand. I guess that's why we asked earlier that the Minister meet directly with the Universities Grants Commission, so in fact she not hear whatever news they have to offer secondary. I think that's, using her own words, a fair request on our part.

Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering whether or not the Universities Grants Commission sees any change in the student flow through that institution over the next two years because of its recent problems.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Student which?

MR. C. MANNES: Student enrolment numbers through the University of Brandon.

HON. H. HEMPHILL: Absolutely not, Mr. Chairman. The enrolment - in fact, I'm trying to remember the enrolment increases, while they are reasonable at all institutions. My memory is that they're 26 percent in Brandon - I mean higher than the other two institutions - so there is not any indication or confirmation of a drop. The opposite seems to be the case.

MR. C. MANNES: Is that university experiencing any difficulty whatsoever in attracting and recruiting new faculty members and administrators to replace those who have either resigned or been fired?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, we're not aware and the Universities Grants Commission isn't aware of a problem of filling positions or hiring faculty.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering then if the Universities Grants Commission has knowledge of the fact that the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada has in the past three months informed the interim president of the university that the institutional grant awarded by that organization to the president's office has been decreased to almost half of what it was two years ago. I'm wondering what she'll do to try to address that situation. It seems that university has done particularly well in that area of research funding from the National Council. I'm wondering whether or not she has looked into why that funding has been cut in half.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure that the Member for Tuxedo, the Member for Morris

- pardon me, old habits die hard - isn't going to like this answer. I can't help it because it's the truth. The research money that goes to universities is totally outside of the activity knowledge usually except in overall terms or involvement of the Department of Education or the government, and research funding goes up and down depending on what research they want to carry out and what research the funding institutions want done and where they want to put their money, so that I'm not sure that the assumption can be made that if there's a reduction. I'm not sure one way or the other that the assumption could be made that it's related to this issue. It may be related to decisions in redistribution of money into other areas or other universities that are meeting or are more able to meet high priority research projects.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, will the Minister of Education clarify the status of the position of president within that university. Is Dr. Tyler only the acting president of that university?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I thought I did that. In fact, I took time, I stopped when I was discussing the entire board to take time to address questions that were asked in the House about a week ago because I hadn't addressed them, and that I said as clearly as I could that regardless of the swearing in, regardless of the ceremonial activities that were undertaken through the convocation ceremonies at the university, that Dr. Tyler was still an acting president in an acting position. They were still actively searching for the permanent appointment and were continuing with that process in the normal way. They didn't expect with all of the requirements of advertising across the country, receiving applications, reviewing them, interviewing, short listing, they didn't expect to have that procedure completed until the end of June or early July. They're continuing it and it's following the expected process. I said clearly he's still an acting president.

MR. C. MANNES: Has that university given the Minister any idea whatsoever as to when their process of selecting a new president, a full-time president, will be completed?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I think it must be the lateness of the hour because I realize that I'm having - we may be all having problems in communicating and hearing - I said clearly at the end of that statement I explained that in terms of what they had to go through, advertising nationally, receiving all the applications, screening them, interviewing, short listing that they didn't expect to be finished that process until the end of June or early July and that it was following the normal course, that they didn't expect to have it done by this time. They're continuing with the search and it's proceeding as expected.

MR. C. MANNES: It's funny, Mr. Chairman, I just asked for a specific date and I received another 200-word answer.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I said end of June, early July.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, that's all I needed to hear.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: That's what I said before.

MR. C. MANNES: So, Mr. Chairman, I get lost in all the verbiage.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: That's what I said before.

MR. C. MANNES: I get lost in words. If I can receive a three-word answer to a question, I have no difficulty.

Now, Mr. Chairman, changing the subject, and I suppose the only criticism I have in the general major area is that if the Minister had provided for me a breakdown of the universities, and she has verbally into four areas, but I have before me a press release where she says the Universities Grants Commission also funds the Inter-Universities North Program which provides university courses in Northern communities. Can she tell me now how this flows out of one of these four breakdowns and what the program specifically does?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, this is a special program. It's an additional grant. My recollection is that it's about \$385,000; that it's for a special specific program related to Inter-Universities North Programs and that it's over and above the money that is allocated to the universities. It's an ongoing program that's being funded at the same level through a contract, and it's over and above the money that's allocated to them.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated in a press release dated September 30th that she'd established a ceiling of 9.5 percent for tuition increases. The tuition increase, do they end at 9.5 or did they increase to 9.7? I'm wondering, regardless of what figure that they ended, how the Minister came up with that magic figure. What did she use as a rationale to develop a figure? Where did she pull that figure from?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, it probably was not based in a criteria that would be totally unsubjective or sort of - as the member might like because I know he likes very strict criteria, that you apply very strictly - But what we did was look at a number of things. One, we wanted to keep the tuition fees low. I don't think there's any question about that. Given better financial times and more financial resources, we probably would have preferred to have them frozen as we were able to do in the first year. Although they weren't really frozen, the government paid the tuition for the students in that year.

So we would have a number of goals, one is to keep them low. Right now they're the lowest in the country except for Quebec and we like that. If they could be lower, we'd be happier and so would the students. We met with representatives of the universities, the administration; we met with the students; we looked at the tuition rates in the Province of Manitoba and other provinces and came up with a figure that we thought gave a reasonable amount of increased revenue to the universities. I think it's about a 1.5 percent increase in revenue, so that it gave the universities additional revenue and didn't cause too big a burden on the backs of the students or have them carry a

heavy cost, because, as we know, tuition costs are only something like about 20 percent of their overall expenses. They're a very small part. Their living expenses, their books and their other financial requirements are the highest proportion. So I think it was for all of those reasons and maybe some more that I can't think of at this hour.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister to tell me what increase in student numbers are expected for the Fall of 1984 at our universities.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: What increase in?

MR. C. MANNES: Student enrolment numbers.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, we're saying we haven't been able to locate these specific figures. We do have them here somewhere. We believe it's in the area of five to six percent.

MR. C. MANNES: On that point, Mr. Chairman, and I'm prepared to bring to an end this particular session in dealing with the Estimates, the Minister has promised, or at least it's stated on the record, that she's prepared to provide various amounts of information in a whole wide breadth of areas and I'm wondering whether she or her staff are collecting that information for me? I'm just not talking specifically within the university areas, I'm talking over all the areas that we've covered up to this point.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, we certainly have been trying to record, as staff has been instructed to do so, we have, as we've been going along, made available a fair amount of the information that was requested and I know there is still some outstanding and we will make an effort to deliver everything we've recorded, hoping that we've recorded everything and if we've missed anything, I simply ask him to remind us. Certainly, it's our intention to provide the member with all the information he's asked for.

MR. B. RANSOM: One final question for the Minister, Mr. Chairman. She made what may have been just an offhand remark, and maybe it wasn't, when she said that she'd like to see tuition fees lower and she was sure that the students would as well. It crossed my mind, Mr. Chairman, that perhaps the students would sooner see restriction limitations on enrolment removed as opposed to holding down tuition. If holding down tuition means that they're going to be limited in the enrolment into a whole range of faculties, then I'm not sure that is a considered statement the Minister made and perhaps she could just explain whether indeed it was a considered statement or whether it was one of those little pieces of conventional wisdom that sometimes flow off the Minister?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, it may have been or seemed as a bit of an offhand remark, there was some reason for it. I received representation that had a number of meetings with student representatives from each university, not just once but on a number of occasions, where they had a number of things to

present. One very strong one was their position on tuition fee increases and while they may have some concerns about enrolment limitations, and I say again that it was a 200 limitation, not the numbers that were suggested earlier, that may be of concern to them, it wasn't their major concern, nor was it presented in any of the meetings where they met with me where the purpose of the meeting was for them to present their priorities and their agenda so that they could have at any time raised the issue of enrolment limitations had they wanted to. They chose as a top priority, presented by every group in every meeting that I can recall, to identify tuition fee increases as, I think, the major issue of concern. I think they felt that it wouldn't be too great a burden or students would be carrying their fair share, I suppose, in their mind, of the revenue raising at 10 percent, but they would have preferred it at 6.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I promise this is the last question, irrespective of what kind of an answer I get from the Minister, but the students that she talked to were no doubt all registered at university. They had already been accepted into courses of study. What about the students who haven't been accepted and who won't be accepted into courses of study? Has she talked to them to see whether they might prefer to pay a little more tuition and be able to get into their chosen course of study?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I was dealing with what I thought was the question and that was student representation and the issue and the position of students, and when I was thinking students, I must admit, I was thinking of students that are presently in the university.

No, it is quite possible that an individual student, who is not able to get in, might have an alternate position, but we've already dealt at length with the question of enrolment limitations and funding limitations, and I'm not sure that we can add to what has been said.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 6.(a)—pass; 6.(b)—pass; 6.(c)—pass.

Resolution No. 56: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$153,036,900 for Education, Universities Grants Commission, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1985—pass. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

The Chairman reported upon the committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker, and requested leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Burrows, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

Tuesday, 22 May, 1984

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Morris, that the House do now adjourn.

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