



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

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)**

40 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XL No. 32B - 8 p.m., MONDAY, APRIL 29, 1991



MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fifth Legislature

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

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, April 29, 1991

The House met at 8 p.m.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY—CULTURE, HERITAGE AND CITIZENSHIP

Mr. Deputy Chairman (Marcel Laurendeau): This section of the Committee of Supply meeting in Room 255 will resume consideration of the Estimates of the Department of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship.

As was announced in the House this afternoon, this evening the committee will be considering Resolutions 21, 22 and 23.

As was agreed by this section of the Committee of Supply this afternoon, the critics from the opposition and the second opposition parties will be allowed to give opening statements relating to the areas of Culture and Heritage, with the official opposition critic, the honourable member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen), having the opening remarks relating to Culture and Heritage.

* (2005)

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): Mr. Deputy Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to divide things in this way. It did enable us to also attend the constitutional committee as well, and we had a very good meeting there, so I think that was very useful.

I want to start by talking about the restructuring of Canada that has been going on without, as I believe it, the consent of most Canadians. It is a restructuring which has affected culture as well, and I will be applying it to culture.

We have seen it through the Free Trade Agreement, through the development of priorities within the federal government for the funding of programs in areas of particular political concern to them, particularly Alberta and Quebec. We have also seen a restructuring in terms of population in Canada, particularly to certain large metropolitan areas: Vancouver, Toronto and Montreal. I think this kind of economic restructuring has begun to have an effect upon the way in which we think about Canada and the way in which we think about ourselves as regions.

What we have begun to see across the country is what amounts to a disregard of poor regions and something which is paralleling the changes in society as well, that we are becoming a nation of relatively rich regions and a nation of relatively poor regions. We have always had those kinds of distinctions, but what we are beginning to see in the last five or six years is certainly a much more rigid approach to that, and I think we see it particularly in things like the CBC cuts, changes to transportation policy, things which make it much more difficult for us to know each other and to know in that sense what Canada could be.

So the first thing, I think, that affects culture is the economic restructuring, both in urban terms and in regional terms, across the country, and I think it is something which makes it much more important, much more significant for the provincial government of Manitoba to maintain and in fact to expand its cultural policies. There is nobody else doing it for us and, in fact, what the federal government is doing is making it much more difficult for us to even know ourselves.

The second area that I would like to comment upon is the impact of cuts to culture generally and also specifically in the context of this particular budget. We have seen quite a wide range of cuts across the budget, but I think we have seen, and to this extent I think I sympathize with the minister, considerable cuts in culture, in a department which, at least in the last budget, had managed to maintain itself to some extent by drawing upon the Lotteries budget, so that what we have seen here is extensive cuts to large institutions like the Museum of Man and Nature, which have compounded some of the problems that they have had with the federal government, in fact that all museums across the country have had with the federal government.

We have seen also cuts by choice to small institutions, such as the Gas Station and to a whole range of cultural organizations and institutions in Manitoba. When we cut cultural programs, we are not only cutting the means to understanding ourselves, we are not only cutting the means to self-expression or at least the public commitment to that, but we are also cutting jobs, and that is one of

the things, obviously, that would concern our party very much.

We believe that one of the benefits, not the only benefit by any means, and I am in many ways quite uncomfortable with discussing culture purely in economic terms, but it is something which is part of the public agenda, and it is one way in which the public does understand culture. Cultural industries, cultural activities, cultural expression are very job intensive, and we have a number that the Arts Council provided of two years ago, which indicated that there were over 1,800 people involved in culturally related organizations in Manitoba. That is not just the performing arts, it is not just the visual arts, but it includes all the organizational efforts as well.

* (2010)

When you start to cut jobs to small institutions and small galleries, then you begin to, I think, not only lose those kinds of jobs and those people, many of them young people, but you also lose the multiplier effect, which comes from public investment in these kinds of activities. We see the same kind of multiplier effects in sport and in other activities. It is not just in culture.

From the few government dollars that you can invest in an organization, in an event, in a festival, in a particular artist, in a particular area of cultural expression, you generate two to three times as much from private sources and from the spinoff effects in other areas, such as food, entertainment, transportation, all the other things that bring people to that particular cultural event.

I was struck by this recently. I attended for a day a conference on The Forks. This was a historical conference which got no support from many institutions which have been approached for funding. It was a one-day conference which was to address the history, the postcontact history of The Forks. Two hundred people came to that. They paid their own way. They paid for their meals. They paid for room rentals, and the spin-off effect—in the end The Forks corporation did provide a small amount of money—for that donation of probably \$200 or \$300, the spin-off effects on the Manitoba economy of that one-day conference of a relatively small number of people would have been in the \$2,000 to \$3,000 range just in Manitoba, let alone the amount of money that would have been spent

on the air fares that people paid in fact to bring themselves here.

In economic terms alone, and that is not the only way in which we should speak of culture, the multiplier effect from a very small investment of money is significant. It is very shortsighted I think, and let us hope that it is short term, but certainly it is shortsighted for the government to begin to cut even in small ways, 3 percent here, although it amounts up to 20 percent in some cases, the variety of organizations involved in culture in Manitoba.

The second thing I would like to emphasize, and I began to talk about this last time in introductory statements, is that culture, the arts in particular, are part of a new global economy, and that is something obviously that Conservative governments are very concerned about. I think they should look at culture in those terms as well, that entertainment, and again somewhat uncomfortable in speaking of the arts as entertainment, because there is a clear and should be a very clear distinction between those two things in terms of function and in financing.

Certainly some arts are part of a growing entertainment sector. If you look at corporations, for example, like Paramount and Universal, you are essentially looking at service sector industries which do have an enormous potential for growth and which in the climate, and I mean the public climate, of Manitoba, there is potential for growth and for expansion. We have the talent, we have the education, we have the people, we have actually had the products over the past 10 or 15 years that could begin to make a difference and could become part of that type of growth sector of entertainment as part of the arts world. It can employ people here, and I think we have the people and we have the public support for those people to make a difference.

One of the reasons I am emphasizing the employment of people here is that for the long-term prospects of Manitoba, one of the things that this government, any government in Manitoba has to address is that we have to keep our people here.

* (2015)

It has become a commonplace in economic terms to suggest that the jobs go where the people are. Once you start losing your people in Manitoba, which we are doing—there is no doubt about it, and we are losing young people, just as Saskatchewan is. If we do not keep up the educational institutions, and in this case I am suggesting the cultural

opportunities, we are not going to have the opportunities for the other jobs that can be attracted. The jobs are going to Vancouver, to Alberta and, to a lesser extent, now to Toronto and Montreal.

I think it is important when we are discussing culture, whether we are discussing it in my caucus or in the minister's caucus, to emphasize that the jobs go where the people are and that not only is culture a means to an end, but it is also a means to keeping people here as well. When we cut culture, and there are considerable cuts in this budget, when we underfund culture, as I believe we have been doing for a number of years in some areas, we undercut essentially the local community and, by the absence of action, we favour the opportunities for the international or multinational aspects of culture, so that the underfunding is an important thing to look at in a relative sense, because it gives the advantage to homogenized, and I will put "Americanized" in quotes, but it is essentially an Americanized culture that we face, and we are not giving the support to our own institutions to compete.

We ought to be able to have a system or at least have the supports whereby people will choose for the ballet or for Contemporary Dances or for Rusalka over a homogenized, Americanized sitcom, which is what they are being offered.

When we consistently underfund the Manitoba dance companies, the theatre companies, our libraries, the other means to self-expression in Manitoba, what we are doing is essentially saying to people, what you have left is what you see on television. It is a homogenized American culture which tells us very little about ourselves and in fact even distorts our own vision of ourselves.

So what I am saying I think, Mr. Deputy Chairman, is that culture is important. It is not just entertainment, but that is a part of it, and that culture is more than the arts. I talked about that last time so I will not repeat myself.

What it helps us do is to develop a fundamental view that Manitoba is our home, that it is not a way station; it is not a place where you come just to make money to create your industry and then essentially take it away when you find that jobs can be created more cheaply elsewhere.

Culture is something different that stays with us. It is something that helps us to create Manitoba and also gives a very different perspective of what kind

of community this is. So with those general comments we will turn to the department.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: We thank the honourable member for those comments. Does the critic from the second opposition party have an opening remark relating to Culture and Heritage?

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Yes, Mr. Deputy Chairperson. I will try and be very brief. Many of the comments that the member prior to me spoke I would echo. There are a few areas that do concern me.

We talk about the importance of Culture and Heritage grants, the different organizations. We have to recognize it is in Manitoba's best interest that these grants be there for the many different organizations and agencies which operate provincial facilities.

It was at the beginning of the month when we were at the Manitoba Museum of Man and Nature tribute dinner. I know the minister was there, as was I, and they talked about the importance and the important role the provincial government has to play in the future of the Manitoba Museum of Man and Nature. They stressed their concern, that the financial support be there for them in the future in order for them to maintain what they have today and possibly expand. It is through organizations such as this that we, as Manitobans, are better able to know what our background is all about, our heritage and so forth.

* (2020)

In terms of the libraries, we have had discussions regarding the public libraries. I, for one, called the minister saying something earlier today in her opening remarks about literacy. Without libraries, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, in certain areas of the city, the literacy fight that the government is going to battle against will be lost if they start closing down inner city libraries, unless the government has something in the wings we are not aware of that is going to be filling that particular gap.

In terms of the positive things, one of the positive things that came out of the department I thought was the home video classification system. I think that is a step in the right direction and I commend the department on doing that.

Our party has some concern in terms of us being in a recession and realizing that there have to be some priorities. We have at different times suggested areas which we should be looking at and have received some criticism for doing that. One of

those areas that I think we can look at is the Community Places Program. We have to look at programs that are ongoing or grants that have been allocated and projects that are in midstream. We are not suggesting they be halted in any fashion, but projects that are not ongoing and that might not be as essential or as high a priority the minister might want to at least look at and possibly re-evaluate some of the applications. She is privy to having those applications; we in opposition are not. I would suggest given the times and given the cutbacks that we have seen that might be one of the areas she might want to give some look at, and I will leave that with my remarks. Thank you.

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

Debate on the Minister's Salary is traditionally the last item considered for the Estimates of a department. Accordingly, we will defer consideration of that item and commence consideration of the Culture and Heritage portion of this department by considering item 1.(b) Executive Support: (1) Salaries, \$306,100. We also invite the minister's staff to come back to the table and be introduced if necessary.

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship): Yes, I would like to introduce my deputy minister, Tom Carson, and director of Finance and Administration, Dave Paton.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Item 1.(b) Executive Support: (1) Salaries, \$306,100.

Ms. Friesen: This is the area, I assume, where we can discuss policy. This is the policy support.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, I wonder if the minister could perhaps give us an idea of where she sees the department going over the next five years, particularly in terms of the Culture and Historic Resources section? I am looking in particular—I noticed in her opening statement there was very little of this kind of vision. There was a report on a number of elements of the department, those which had been maintained and one or two which might have been enhanced, some discussion of the relationship with the federal government, some relationship to the Arts Council. What I do not get is a sense of where the department is going over the next five years and how the minister perceives the changing cultural environment of Manitoba, and what role she thinks the state should play in this.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I think that when we look at Cultural Resources branch we have to look at what has been accomplished since we have been government, and I know that this is a tough year, has been a tough year and a tough budget year. Difficult choices had to be made on programs we could fund, organizations we could fund, and there were some grants that were maintained. There will be the odd one that will be enhanced, and there were some reductions, but that does not mean to say that the Arts Policy Review that we undertook as a government is not a framework for the arts community over the next decade. We did indicate that it was not a policy to have all the issues and recommendations addressed in the short term, that it was something that we would have to use as a yardstick to measure our success over the decade.

* (2025)

I think we will continue along that path. There had to be a slight pause in moving ahead with any extra financial commitment at this point, and I think it is very obvious when you look at a zero percent growth in revenues in the province that priorities for this government, as stated many times, have been health care, family services and education. Those were the departments that basically got increases. There had to be a shared responsibility throughout government, not only within government administration, but by some of the organizations that we fund also.

I will say that we did take a close look in the department at administrative costs. I think I indicated in my opening remarks that in Administration and Finance areas of the department, there was a reduction of over 20 percent. That was a major reduction in a department, I believe, that works very hard and has a committed staff that has the best interests of Culture and Heritage at heart. No question at all that the decisions made were tough decisions but they had to, in this economic time, be made.

When we look at Historic Resources, I guess we have come a long way since the act was introduced some five years ago. We are going to have to look now at providing core funding with greater community involvement. I know, as the member indicated—was it a seminar at The Forks or a whole-day session at The Forks, discussing the future?—that 200 people showed up to that. I know she alluded to no government support, but I guess

the success of the event did indicate that there was major community support and I think that is really commendable.

In times when finances are tight, I think that it is incumbent upon the community to share in the responsibility. If in fact there is a community that has a basic interest at heart, whether it be in the heritage community, in the cultural community, that the volunteer component in those communities is going to have to—I guess, as we in government are going to have to work a little bit harder with some of the staff reductions that have been made. I guess we are asking for that community support, through the volunteer community, to rise to the occasion, if I might say, and share in the responsibility of getting us through these tough times.

Hopefully, we are all optimistic enough to expect that the economy will improve sometime down the road. I do not have any magic answers; but, as things change and as we see more revenue being generated, then those are the times that we can make the decisions to do a lot of things that we would like to do.

This was a year that we had to look very seriously at the things that needed to be done, and those were the kinds of things we had to fund as a government.

Ms. Friesen: The last part of my question dealt with what role do you think the States should be playing over the next five years, and the only answer I heard, Mr. Deputy Chairman, was that the community has to do more.

Could we look at the other side of that again and ask what the government should be doing in these times? There are some things which the community can do. There are some things which only government can do. What do you think the government should be doing at this stage?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I guess some of answers will lie in the Estimates process as we go through line by line. As I indicated, none of the decisions were taken lightly. There were areas and instances where we were able to maintain funding.

You will see, as we go through, that there have been some increases in a few grant lines to organizations for specific reasons, and you will also see that there has been reduction. I guess what we want to do is to ensure that—and I think in the overall process, we took a look at those organizations that we felt could survive through these tough times with some minimal decrease.

There were some that—well, quite frankly some organizations that will not receive funding. I think, as we go through line by line, we can discuss each one of those as they come up, and I will give you the rationale and the reasoning for the decisions that were made. You may not agree with all of the decisions that were made, but we took a serious look at everything, and, as I indicated, where we can afford to maintain support or we felt it was absolutely critical to maintain support, we did do that.

* (2030)

I think in this year's budget exercise we did as much as we could do to maintain, to occasionally enhance and to reduce where we felt that organizations would remain viable with those reductions.

Ms. Friesen: What I am trying to get at is, what things can only government do? For example, taxation. There are certain ways of dealing with taxation, for example on books, journals, library issues. Admittedly, it is a form of forgoing revenue as well, but is there something there that you believe the state could be doing in these times? I know that you have been approached by groups who are concerned about the taxation on books and journals and who are particularly pointing to the Quebec issues and looking at the possibility of some role for government there, something that the community cannot do.

Another area I think that you might think of the kinds of things that only government can do is in arts education, and your own DeFehr report, the minister's own DeFehr report did talk about that. That is another area I think where the role of government is such that it has the opportunity to enter all schools, it has the opportunity to deal with the public media in a way that no one single community group or institution can. So that is another area where you might want to think of what the government could do in these, as you believe, difficult times.

Another area might be audience development for whatever aspect of culture that we are talking about, and again the role of government, it seems to me, the opportunity for leadership, for co-ordination, for dealing with both regional interests and what you might call central opportunities from the point of view of planning that the government can do things there that no one single institution or community organization can.

Those were the kinds of things I was getting at. Even though you may believe that you have to cut certain types of arts organizations and institutions, there are some things which those institutions cannot do. Some of the things would not cost government that much. Have you thought of ways of developing the role of government at this point to at least in this time make some initiatives?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Well, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, if my interpretation of development is spending more money, the answer is absolutely not at this point in time in our fiscal climate, in our economic situation.

Ms. Friesen: Do I understand the minister then to believe that looking at policies such as Quebec has in the taxation of books, at looking at opportunities for curriculum development in education, for arts education and in developing audiences through the co-operation and bringing together of existing organizations, the government has no role to play?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, if it is a leadership role, if it is a co-ordinating role, if it is that type of policy initiative, certainly we are not just going to stop and stand still because there is no financial resource. The fact of the matter is that we cannot in this fiscal year or this fiscal climate put additional dollars, because that money would have to come from somewhere else, and you know, I know we are not going to take it from those crucial departments like Health, Family Services, and Education. If it was a matter of reprioritizing within the department and making reductions in other areas so that those areas could be enhanced, we could certainly look in those directions, but as far as adding additional dollars at this point, it is just not possible.

Ms. Friesen: Mr. Deputy Chairman, well, that is what I was looking for. At a time when you are cutting back on the direct monies to different organizations, institutions and community groups, it seemed to me that there might be some leadership role for the department to play, for example, in encouraging joint purchasing, in encouraging sharing as the government has done in the past in the area of conservation, of sharing facilities, sharing opportunities that, well, things like purchasing again comes to mind. I know that some groups for example in other areas have—theater groups will have one costume production area that all theater groups can share.

It seems to me that there is a leadership role for government, using existing staff, existing sources, and I did not see any comparable initiatives from this department. So I am looking at this from the perspective of the salary of the deputy minister and looking at the opportunities for policy planning initiatives and development that do not necessarily add dollars.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, good comments, and I—you know, as I said initially, the choices that we made were difficult choices, and some organizations and institutions will received reductions. We have not just sent a letter out to those organizations and said, you have been reduced X number of dollars and that is it. What we will be doing is meeting with those organizations, trying to work with them to see whether in fact we can find innovative ways to work with them to ensure that they remain stable and viable through these tough times. That is the type of leadership and the type of innovative thinking that takes more than one mind, and if we have the department working with the organizations that are going to need that extra little bit of assistance or innovative thinking to get them through this tough period, then that is the kind of thing we will do.

Ms. Friesen: You can always count on the opposition for this kind of creative thinking. We would be happy to put our collective minds to this.

To move to another area, one of the things that you did respond with when I talked about funding, of course, was the opportunity, as the government would phrase it I am sure, for further community development and volunteer opportunities. Obviously what the government has done by cutting a large number of groups like this is to assume a number of things. They are assuming first of all that the organizations are going to be able to find the money from other sources or drop their program. Let us assume that your assumption is that they are going to find the money from other sources.

What I would like to know is: What is your evidence for a belief or an assumption that that money is there in Manitoba, let us say for example in the corporate donations?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I guess my answer to that would have to be to look at the reductions on an individual basis, because my department and staff in my department are in very close contact in monitoring from year to year the budgets of those organizations

that we fund. We know which ones have a surplus. We know which ones have been operating in a deficit situation. We know what the audience participation is, what organizations seem to have a large audience, where others have over a period of five or ten years had a very sort of stagnant or low audience participation.

Each one had to be evaluated on an individual basis, and we are hoping and I am hoping that the analysis that the department has done on these organizations is one that will see us through this year and on to better times in years to come.

* (2040)

So I think that, to answer that question specifically, it is not necessarily more corporate sponsorship in some instances that is going to be the answer. There will be answers individually as we go through each of the lines in the department.

Ms. Friesen: I take your point that it is not going to be all corporate donations, but some of it is. Where is the evidence to suggest that there is that kind of opportunity in the corporate sector? For example, since we are looking at policy here, did your policy advisers look at The Winnipeg Foundation, one of the major granting agencies. Did they look at the changing nature of the Canada Council donations or of the changing nature of the Secretary of State's support?

The number of things that we are looking at here, what is the evidence to suggest that the finances for some to make up the difference of some of these cuts exist?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I do not think we are looking at any of them to make up more. We know that the demand is great out there, and we know that through the Canada Council there have been reductions and there will continue to be in all indications. So we are not expecting the foundations or Canada Council or other sources of grant money to be available.

What we are saying is that in some instances if there was a surplus, maybe we will have to ask them to use that surplus throughout this year, if in fact it was an organization that had an audience base where they could maybe generate enough revenue to offset the grant by charging an extra dollar per ticket. That might be an option that we looked if it was someone that we felt was going to generate more revenue as a result of programming that they have planned for the next year based on ticket sales.

All of those things were taken into consideration, grant by grant.

Ms. Friesen: I am still looking for the underlying policy assumptions here, and then from what you said I understand that your underlying assumption is that it is user pay.

Mrs. Mitchelson: We still as a government department have a role to play. If in fact in some instances there might have to be increased ticket costs, I think that might be a viable solution in some instances depending on the cost of the ticket, but I think what we have to do, I guess, in these times is focus on doing what we do well even just a little bit better. I think that management throughout the province of Manitoba has been good and that we have learned to manage well and a lot of our organizations have learned to manage well. We want to just say in these times, as all of us are going to have to, just work a little bit harder to ensure that we are delivering the same through the department. We are going to ask those who are out there to just try to manage a little better.

Ms. Friesen: So the assumption then is, in part, user pay, and it is also, in part, those where the user cannot pay, you are prepared to let go?

Mrs. Mitchelson: As I indicated earlier, as we go through and look at reductions line by line, we have every confidence we do manage well in Manitoba, that we have developed through some of our board development and some of the training seminars good management and, in fact, we are hoping that our managers will rise to the challenge out there and just manage a little bit better.

Ms. Friesen: I am not doubting good management at all. I think it has been there for a number of years in most agencies. If the issue then is user pay, does the department still have a commitment to widening access to Manitoba's cultural opportunities?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I guess I might ask for some clarification on that question as far as widening access.

Ms. Friesen: If your principle then is that some people have to pay a little more, an extra dollar on the ticket or however you phrased it, what happens to those people who cannot pay the extra dollar on the ticket? What kind of principles and policies, since that is what we are discussing, what is the departmental policy on broadening the access to cultural events?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I guess what we have to look at in a year that we are looking at, as I said, with no increase in revenues, is attempting to maintain what we do have. When we talk about broadening or widening access, if in fact there are people who might be paying \$5 or \$6 for a ticket, and the cost might go up to \$6 or \$7, and if it is unaffordable, I suppose there will be a few less people during this time, or people will make choices. I guess they will choose whether taking the family out to McDonald's—and sometimes there are instances where a family cannot afford to go to McDonald's and take the whole family out. Whether it is a choice of going there, of going out to a movie, of going to a cultural event of some sort, those are choices that people do have to make. I know within my household, I have two children who are growing up, and as taxes increase and we have a little less disposable income, we would love to do everything for our children. We would love to give them everything, but we do have to make choices within our own households.

When we have a little less disposable income, we have to choose what we might want to do, and nobody is going to tell us in our family life what our choices are going to be. We make those choices, and I guess within the community, just as we as government have had to make difficult choices, sometimes those choices have to be made.

Ms. Frlesen: I think what I want to do then is to draw to the minister's attention that what we are doing in this case in this kind of policy is giving people the choice of going to a musical or a theatre production or whatever aspect of culture it is, or staying home, turning on the major cultural determinant of Manitobans' lives, which is television. For the most part, it is not Canadian television, or it is not Canadian television programs.

That is one of the things that I would like to emphasize that I did at the beginning, that when we start to undermine Manitoba or Canadian culture, particularly by this user-pay philosophy, then what we are doing essentially is creating a situation where the homogenized, North American culture becomes even more paramount than it is. So it is not just a question, it seems to me, of cutting this organization or that organization this year or last year. It is a question of what the long-term implications are for the cultural expression, sense of place, sense of purpose, of the whole community.

Mrs. Mitchelson: I think that you will find that within choices—I mean, there are other options and there are other alternatives. There are theatrical performances, but there still are those activities that are cultural and have a cultural component that those who are on very limited incomes or really cannot afford to do a lot can participate in, and we still have funding for the Labour Day Symphony Orchestra performance, which is free of charge. We have the Children's Festival, those kinds of activities that—

An Honourable Member: It is not free?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Well, there are still parts that can be participated in that are free of charge, and there are options to turning on the TV. I suppose that might be going for a walk in some of our beautiful parks that we have, down to The Forks, one area that has a great amount of park space and a walkway right along the river. There are those options and those choices, and I know that you still can lead a fairly active life culturally.

There are people who probably in society could never afford to go to the ballet. I bet there are many people in society who have never been to the ballet, but it is still an art form that we support financially because we have a great deal of pride in what the ballet offers through tourism and what it offers to the rest of the country and to the rest of the world.

So you know there are instances where people cannot always afford to do the things that they might culturally like to do, but there are still other options.

* (2050)

Ms. Frlesen: I appreciate there are some things that one can still do, even in Winnipeg, for free, but I wonder in the answer that you gave, Mr. Deputy Chairman, is not the minister confusing recreation and culture? Going for a walk? I mean, you are talking about leisure, you are not talking about cultural expression.

Mrs. Mitchelson: I guess recreation in its broad definition is all of those things that you do in your leisure time activity to enhance your quality of life. I would say that a sporting event, whether it is active or passive participation in cultural activities and sporting activities and heritage activities, whether it is reading a good book or going to the library, that is all recreational as opposed to when you get into the professional culture or if you happen to be talented enough to be able to write or to paint or express yourself in that way, whether it is in visual

art, or participating. I mean, those are special talents that are developed, I suppose, but when you look at recreation in its broad definition, it includes culture, it includes heritage, it includes libraries, it includes museums, all of those things that you do in your leisure time to enhance your quality of life.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I just had a couple of questions on this particular line. The minister did say during her opening remarks that they were looking at a 20 percent decrease in the administrative side. I notice on the Communications, because of the government's readjustment on Communication, not only within this department, but other departments, is she calculating that in towards the 20 percent?

Mr. Mitchelson: Yes, Mr. Deputy Chairperson.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: I would like to remind the honourable member that the Communication line does come under (c), and we are dealing with (b) at this time, which is Executive Support, \$306,100.

Mr. Lamoureux: Okay, but, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, with all due respect, and it is not to reflect on the Chair, if you will, we are talking about Administration and Finance, which is on (b), which is a part of Administration and Finance.

The 20 percent cut, how is it that the department is able to cut 20 percent? What has happened? Was there duplication of services? What type of duplication, or how could she come up with a 20 percent cut at that particular line?

Mrs. Mitchelson: With all due respect to the critic from the Liberal Party, I think that the Deputy Chairperson was right when he indicated that this (XIV) 1.(b) does deal with my office and the deputy's office. When we get into Finance and Administration, in which Communications is (c) and Finance and Administration is (d), we can go through all of those things and indicate where the reductions were that add up to the 20 percent. It is for the entire division of Finance and Administration.

Mr. Lamoureux: I am a patient person and I can wait till then. I would suggest that (a) through (f) added up give you administrative finance and that there would be an appropriate time to ask the question, but I will wait for it and she can give me the explanation when she feels it is most appropriate.

I noticed the minister has said, in terms of the grants that she has cut on different organizations, her justification in cutting those grants was based

on organization by organization. She looked at each one, whether it is a sports federation, whether it is a—whatever organization it might be. I am wondering if she might be able to let the committee know in terms of—was there a standard policy of the government that, if an organization had a surplus, they would receive a cut of their allocated amount from the previous year?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: I would like to bring the member to order. That is under Resolution 22, which will be 2.(b) Grants to Cultural Organizations with the grant formula, and that is where that would be dealt with.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I do not mind attempting to—there was no hard and fast rule or magic formula. There were organizations that we had been dealing with over the last number of years and have worked with to get them on a sound financial footing, some that maybe five years ago were in deficit situations year after year. The department worked with them and maybe they changed their venue or their way of operating so that, in fact, they were in a surplus situation now. There are organizations there that will not receive funding next year, and that is mainly because they have gone from a deficit situation into a surplus situation year after year.

I suppose if you take a look at what government grants do, they are to subsidize and to provide grants to those that need assistance. If you have an organization that has become so successful that there are surpluses year after year, it is a possibility that they do not need government assistance.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, if at one point an organization has a surplus and other organizations have a deficit, how does the government hold these organizations accountable? What is the message that the government is sending to the organizations if they are, in fact, cutting back because of a surplus in any given year?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, we do not penalize those that have just a momentary surplus. If someone has a surplus for one year, we certainly do not say, well, you have a surplus so we are going to cut your grant. I think that if they have shown that over a period of a number of years they have increased their surplus year after year after year to a point where they have money sitting in the bank, on a regular basis, I guess you have to look at it philosophically whether in fact those are

organizations that need to continue to have government funding.

I think I might philosophically think that very often organizations need money, start-up grants and that they need money for a period of time. I know a lot of cultural organizations will never be self-sufficient and will always require some sort of government funding or financial assistance. That is very often the basis on which we do continue to fund forever. But if, in fact, there is an organization that requires seed money to start up and requires money for a period of a number of years, and then it becomes self-sufficient and tends to generate enough revenue so that they do not need government money, I think that is great. I think that those are the kinds of organizations that we would discontinue funding to.

* (2100)

Ms. Frlesen: In this section last time, we looked at some public comment that had been made about the purchase of artworks, not for the art bank, but for the government collection. At that time, the minister indicated that she was reviewing procedures and practices. I wonder if the minister could tell us how these purchases were made this year.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, we had a committee that was struck. There was an invitation sent out to all of the galleries asking them if they wanted to participate in a selection process. I think the objective of the process was to take a look—we had a fairly good idea of what artists were included in the government art collection, and what we wanted to do was see what was out there, what new artists should be included. The committee travelled around, throughout the city mainly, to the galleries, and looked at the purchases. They had an artist along with them to give them advice on what might be of significance. The top two choices at each gallery were chosen, and then within the budget limit we chose certain pieces of art for the collection. The ones that were not chosen will be put on a list for future consideration in years to come as the budget permits.

Ms. Frlesen: Could the minister tell us who was on the committee?

Mrs. Mitchelson: There was Doreen Millin from my department; Noella Muruve, who is an artist from the Arts Council; Jack Reimer, who was my legislative

assistant; Rosemary Vodrey, the MLA for Fort Garry; and Judy Parry, my executive assistant.

Ms. Frlesen: So there is one artist. Is she an artist or an arts educator or in interior design? What is her background?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Visual artist.

Ms. Frlesen: Visual artist. Could the minister indicate what the qualifications of the two MLAs are for the selection of art pieces? What experience, or was this a building up of experience for future expeditions?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I guess there was some concern about public input into the process, and I would say that they would be members of the public along with an artist and along with someone from the department who is the visual arts specialist in our department. So there was a good mix of people. They were just general citizens. Certainly, political decisions were not made on pieces of art. They were artists that probably are from all political backgrounds and maybe some from no political background at all. I think that we chose artists' works that were not part of the government art collection, those that were of some significance in the province of Manitoba as determined by the artist, who is quite a renowned artist in her own right, a woman—I do not know if you have ever seen any of Noella Muruve's work, but it is wonderful—and Doreen Millin from the department, who had some expertise.

It was a committee that we struck to visit, and I think that they worked very well together. I think that most people would agree that we have a good variety of art, with some craft pieces, some watercolours, some oils. There is a good variety and a good mix of different sizes that I think will be a great addition to the government art collection, and there was not any one specific gallery that received any great amount. There was a variety, and we asked the galleries to pick for us the pieces that they felt were of significance out of 10 or 15 pieces. The committee, together with advice from the artists on the committee, picked the top two out of that choice that the gallery presented to us then within the budget, which was a limited budget, by the way. There is not a lot of money in that program.

Ms. Frlesen: What I am trying to get at is that the process—should there ever be an exhibit, should there be a collection, I am sure we will all have the opportunity to evaluate the choices, but it is the

process that interests me, particularly since last year the minister had committed herself to undertake a review of the past process and to provide some options for other processes. I wonder, were there other types of committees that you looked at and then chose this type of committee?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I think, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, there was a committee within the Department of Government Services before it was transferred over to our department, and obviously that committee made a decision to purchase art from one gallery. So I suppose that was an option that I did not want to choose. I wanted to give every gallery the opportunity to submit to government the pieces that they felt were most significant within their gallery. So I do not have any problem with the process that was followed, and I think that we ended up getting some significant artwork as a result.

Ms. Frlesen: I think it is unusual though, Mr. Deputy Chairman, for a committee like this to have 50 percent of its members as directly political. I appreciate your point about going to a variety of galleries, and I am sure eventually you will want to expand that to all of Manitoba, not just Winnipeg, perhaps on a rotation basis, but it is still the composition of the committee. For example, are you familiar with the workings of committees in other provinces, Ontario, for example, or Quebec, where some of them I know have quite large and unwieldy committees, and I wondered if you had considered that and rejected it.

Mrs. Mitchelson: I guess what we were looking for was a committee that could go out and purchase some art. When you have about \$20,000 to spend, you do not want a committee that has a large overhead, spending most of the money on travelling around, and what we wanted to see was some significant artwork bought for the limited amount of money that we had. So I think we wanted a very low-cost, low-budget committee that would in fact utilize the resources that were available to purchase art.

Ms. Frlesen: We are still back then to a committee which is 50 percent political, and my impression is that it is then a committee that is not an interim committee, it is one that you have chosen over other examples.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Absolutely, I did choose the committee, and I guess you would have to speak to

the galleries that were involved in the process to see if they felt it was a political process. I do not think we have had complaint from any of the galleries that chose to be involved, that in fact it was a political process and those politicians that were there interfered in any way with any of the art chosen by the galleries to present to the committee.

Ms. Frlesen: No, this is not a comment on the behaviour or choices of the people involved at all. Again, it is a question of policy, a question of judgment. We have to ensure that things appear to be as they are in reality, as you are assuring me, that there is no political judgment here. A committee which is composed of 50 percent of directly-elected political people and three of their civil servants seems to me not necessarily representative.

Mrs. Mitchelson: I guess maybe the opposition critic next year would like to be a part of that committee.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Item 1.(b) Executive Support: 1.(b)(1) Salaries \$306,100. Shall the item pass?

Ms. Frlesen: I had one more question, thank you. We are voting on all salaries at this point?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: We are voting on the salary of the Executive Support at this time.

Ms. Frlesen: But the managerial, professional and administrative or just the managerial?

Mrs. Mitchelson: All three.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: All three.

Ms. Frlesen: I have one question about the managerial salary. Could you give me an idea of where this fits within Civil Service structures? Is this the middle, top end of deputy ministers?

Mrs. Mitchelson: It is the middle area.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Item 1.(b) Executive Support: (1) Salaries \$306,100—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$77,900—pass.

Item (c) Communications: (1) Salaries zero.

Ms. Frlesen: I assume now that we are looking at Reference No. 3, Subappropriation XIV 1.(c), the Communication branch section, that has been cut.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: (1) Salaries, zero.

Ms. Frlesen: Okay. I would like to ask the minister for some indication of how these duties have been reassigned. If you look at the annual report for this department, it makes quite a number of large claims

for this section. The PRIX Manitoba, departmental programs, departmental identification, media liaison, special events—I mean, I thought this was a going concern. Where has it gone?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I guess with the choices that had to be made as a government there was a major decision to reduce communications functions within departments of government and consolidate them into an area where there were those with very special skills. I guess, quite frankly, we just did not feel that there needed to be a communications division within each department. We were able to accomplish a staff reduction throughout government of about 57 positions and \$1.8 million. That was money that we felt could be better utilized for vital programs like health care, education or family services.

* (2110)

Those were the decisions that had to be made. We felt that a restructuring and a consolidation of Communications, which happens to be—and we can discuss in greater detail later on, in whatever appropriation it is, how the new Communications Branch or the expanded Communications Branch can function within my department, and the new structure for that, as we come to that. In this instance, we will have Communications staff that we will share with three or four other departments. We will have one Communications officer which will co-ordinate all of the Communications activities whether it be publications, whether it be press releases, whether it be speeches, whether it be specific activities within the department, but she will co-ordinate that and channel it into the right direction. There will be pools of people who will do that kind of work for government as a whole.

Ms. Friesen: The way in which the minister responded to that then, to me, indicates that this was a government-wide decision, not one which specifically came out of the needs of this department. So my impression is—I am left with the impression, I should say, that some of the needs of the department will not be met under the new programs.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Absolutely not. All of the needs of the department will be met. I think that if you will look through departments, and there has been—you know, we have been sort of compiling over the last couple of years the number of publications that are done, department by

department. There can be some consolidation of cost-effective management of that kind of thing with different departments working together to do a publication or a newsletter, rather than each department doing that individually and spending staff time doing that.

Speech writing will be able to be done centrally for two or three different departments, and there will be specialists rather than generalists working specifically in specific areas.

Ms. Friesen: So you do not see any reduction in the functions? For example, will the newsletters be maintained? Will the same number of publications be coming, information publications, from the Library, from the Archives, from Historic Resources? Will you still be doing the same number of media events, for example, around Manitoba Day?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: I would like to inform the honourable member that this will be dealt with under Resolution No. 23. The reason I am bringing that up is the staff will then be available at the table, and it might be easier to bring some of that information forward for the minister.

Mrs. Mitchelson: I think I can answer some of these general questions, but if we get into specifics of the new structure and how it is going to work, I think that I will want to have staff here from that branch, and they are not here right now.

I cannot guarantee that the same number of publications will be out there. I think that we have to look at, and government is looking, and has been over the last while, compiling all the publications that are done in all of the different departments. I think if you looked at it, you would find that number overwhelming. Probably money that could be better spent if in fact we had some co-ordination of that; if in fact there were departments or branches that together could produce publications. Whether it be as often or not, or trying to ensure that we get the information out to the public, but maybe in a more co-ordinated fashion so that in fact there is no duplication, no redundancy, and more cost-effectiveness.

Ms. Friesen: This is the level at which I wanted to discuss it here, in the level of policy, and I wanted to ensure that we understood that the so-called streamlining of personnel was also going to mean changes, we would say reduction, in services. The minister may have another way of describing it.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I have not said reduction in services. I would say services that will be provided in a more cost-effective way and if, in fact, we have several departments that are doing newsletters, maybe there could be a combined newsletter that was sent out so the postage would be instead of four different departments doing a newsletter, if it was something to do with recreation and rural development, which both deal with rural Manitoba, that could be combined into one newsletter. You would not have the postage and the mailing for two newsletters on a regular basis. Those kinds of things in the whole overall context of government are being looked at right now.

Ms. Friesen: What you lose, of course, in those kinds of streamlinings is the opportunity to target audiences and in fact to be effective in that way of targeting specific audiences for specific purposes. We can look at those elements when we come to look at the specific points.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Item No. 1. (c), Communications: 1.(c)(1) Salaries, zero—pass; 1.(c)(2) Other Expenditures, zero—pass.

Item 1.(d) Financial and Administrative Services: 1.(d)(1) Salaries, \$671,500.

Mr. Lamoureux: Given this is likely the line that the question is best put, I would once again ask the minister in regard to the percentage cut of Administration and Finance, why or how is it that she is able to cut so much yet be able to have the same services that it was previously.

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

Mrs. Mitchelson: In Administration and Finance, excluding the Film Classification Board because the Film Classification Board is cost-recoverable, in Administration and Finance, Salaries, Executive Support, Communication, Financial and Administrative, and Human Resources, we have made a reduction of 22.6 percent.

Mr. Lamoureux: Well, that is my point. You have not really made a 22 percent saving in Administration, because the communicators who have been actually reassigned the positions, from my understanding, have not been cut. That is incorrect?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Acting Chairperson, no. There will be a communications officer who will manage four departments. That communications officer will have a salary and one department. It

does not happen to be within our department, so the communications officer who will be serving the four departments will fall in our group, will be paid a salary out of one of those departments. It does not happen to be out of Culture.

Mr. Lamoureux: Okay, so you have one person who is going to be doing the work of four departments. At this time last year, it took four individuals to do the same work as that one person?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Acting Chairperson, I am just trying to get some information, but 57 Communications positions throughout government were cut for a total saving in salaries of \$1.8 million. So there actually were 57 positions that have gone, and they happen to be three positions out of Communications in my department.

Mr. Lamoureux: What I am finding hard to understand is that last year, at this time, you would have had four of those 57 positions, in particular one position in this department and three other departments that the now co-ordinator is using, administering what is reported in the annual reports and in fact the Estimates as their objectives and purposes and so forth. What has changed, what type of workload has happened to justify that type of a decrease?

* (2120)

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Acting Chairperson, there were 18 Communications directors within government, one for each minister's office, so there were 18 directors, and they are in many—and I cannot say how many other Communications positions every other department did have. I do know within my department I had a Communications director, I had a term position in Communications and I had a support staff person in the Communications division of my department. Each department had at least those three positions. Some had up to four or five or six Communications positions.

What we are saying is that not every department needs a Communications director. We will have, I think, four, basically, Communications directors, in essence. They will not be called that. There will be job descriptions that will suit the job that they do, and they will be co-ordinating, for four different departments, communications activities.

So there will be less management and more hands-on communications, which I think in today's time, you know, a saving of \$1.8 million in that area

if in fact we can deliver the same service with 57 people less with a decrease of \$1.8 million, I think that we are serving the taxpayers of Manitoba very well.

Mr. Lamoureux: I too would say that you would be serving them quite well if you are saving \$1.8 million and offering, as you say, the same services. My question, and I guess she might have in part already answered this, but I wanted to make it very clear, has the government re-organization of that particular area, has that, in her opinion, hurt her department in any way?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I believe, Mr. Acting Chairperson, that we will be able to deliver the same kind of service, Communications service, in our department with staff that we have allocated to it. Yes, I think it is an innovative way. I think that there is some excitement out there in how this is all going to work. I know that I did meet the person who is going to be working with my department, and she is extremely excited about how the new system is going to work and the challenge that lays ahead. I have every confidence that it is going to work very well.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Acting Chairperson, I believe we are on our fourth budget in the last number of years, three years, and always wanting to save the taxpayers' dollars is something whether it is in good times or bad times economically, is something that we would all like to see. I ask the minister if this is something that has been going on for the last number of years, why did we not see this two years ago? What were these people doing with their time a year ago?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Well, Mr. Acting Chairperson, this is almost the second phase of reduction. Over the first two years we were in government, we cut about \$1.7 million from the Communications budget throughout government. I guess we did not receive too many accolades in the past for that. This year we were able to find another \$1.8 million in savings. So in total we have saved \$3.5 million over the last three years. It was not something that had to be looked at in the overall context of what was happening within government.

You must know by now that things do not change overnight, that there is usually a period of time where things are evaluated. In fact it is deemed to be the way to go, to find more efficiencies and more effectiveness, then by all means we make that

move. It is not the first saving that we have found on the Communications side of things. We have managed to trim some \$1.7 million over the last two budgets.

Mr. Lamoureux: The minister made mention of phase two and what came to my mind, of course, was the fundraising letter that was sent via the Conservatives prior to the last election where the letter was calling on contributors to contribute in order that they can form a majority government and, lo and behold, I think we have discovered part of phase two. Is this part of the Tory hidden agenda, I guess? I guess, the proof will be in the pudding when we do approach the Estimates next time round and see if in fact there has been any noticeable difference in this area, if you will. So we will have to leave it at that.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Reimer): Item 1.(d)(1) Salaries.

Ms. Frlesen: I wanted to ask about the range of transactions that occur, the 10,000 transactions annually, processing of 1,500 grant requests from 11 departmental programs. Can you give me an idea of how this compares to other departments, and how the staffing of those other departments are?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I am informed that we have the largest grant list of any department, that we know for sure, but we do not know how the staffing compares to other departments in this area.

Ms. Frlesen: Could that information be provided, or is it—

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Acting Chairperson, I am informed that Executive Council would be the right place to ask for that kind of information.

(Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair)

Ms. Frlesen: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am interested in the last Expected Result listed on page 24, the completion of analysis and design specification for a Grants Administration System. Does this mean that we have not had a Grants Administration System up till now? What is happening here?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, this is a computerized system.

Ms. Frlesen: I see.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Just for further clarification, that was recommended in the external audit—how many years ago was it?—two years ago.

Ms. Friesen: Is that completed now, or is that something you expect to complete at the end of this year?

Mrs. Mitchelson: It is just starting in this fiscal year '91-92.

Ms. Friesen: What kind of savings do you expect from that system? Is it going to be a saving in time or a saving in money or both or in service?

Mrs. Mitchelson: It will be a saving in time for the turnaround of the analysis of requests, but there will not actually be any dollar saving.

Ms. Friesen: In the same paragraph then, the completion of the Video Classification System for the Film Classification Board, I looked at that when the minister provided it and—unfortunately, I do not have it with me—when the minister provided it with the Orders-in-Council, so I assume that is completed now. Is that the classification system, the different coloured tags and the addition of a new 18-plus classification?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, in fact, we have the system started to be implemented. There is a phase-in period whereby stickers will not, in some instances, have to be visible until September 30. So we have given some of the retailers the opportunity to phase it in so that they did not have to hire extra staff to do it, that it would be able to be done in a timely fashion. The X-rated or the 18-plus product is supposed to be now segregated and out of view from minors, and they are prohibited from renting to minors. There was a temporary licence that was put in place until the beginning of the fiscal year, and all retailers should have a licence visible, a permanent licence as of this fiscal year.

* (2130)

Ms. Friesen: I was interested in the kinds of classifications that you offered in that system, and I do not know if this the right place to discuss it, but it is—were they taken from somewhere else? Were they adopted from somewhere else, or were these entirely Manitoba-driven?

Mrs. Mitchelson: In some instances they were adopted from other jurisdictions. A lot of the product that was on the shelf was theatrical product, so that would have been classified by the Film Classification Board previously. For years they have been compiling a catalogue as they viewed films. There were some classifications that were

borrowed from other provinces that had a classification system or some system in place.

If, in fact, there was product on the shelf that had not been classified and was not in the catalogue, and the catalogue had been compiled over a number of years, if there was any product in there that was not classified, it was to be submitted to the Film Classification Board for classification.

Ms. Friesen: What other jurisdictions were these derived from?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Primarily Ontario and Saskatchewan.

Ms. Friesen: To such an extent, will it be possible to "harmonize" eventually with those jurisdictions as we tried to before? Have we made any progress there?

Mrs. Mitchelson: No, there has not been much progress, and I guess that was the reason we decided to go it alone. There has not been a sense of co-operation or a sense of all provinces moving in the same direction. We tried to get that up and running, but there was just no way. The last discussions I think that were had indicated that we might have a system ready and up, ready to start within about five years.

Well, I guess, the issue was of concern here. We had, you know, public, I suppose—what is the word I am looking for—concern, public concern about access to videos by minors. There were groups out there in the community who had real concern that we attempt to get some control. It is a step in the right direction. It does not go as far as some organizations would like.

Ms. Friesen: I think I would agree, Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is a step in the right direction. I am very glad that the department has pursued this.

I wanted to look again in the same paragraph, the addition of security features and minor enhancements to the departmental correspondence tracking system. Have there been some problems in security?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, if I understand this correctly, it is that each—we have not had any problems with security. What it does is allow for—I do not understand computer systems. Each branch has files that they would like to keep secure for their own branch, like personnel files and that kind of thing, and this just allows for that security to be put into place. It is in place in the minister's

office and the deputy's office, but it is not down into the department.

Ms. Frlesen: So this is a new system that was not there before, and there is a new need for this kind of security?

Mrs. Mitchelson: It is an extension of the system through the department that was not there before. It is there between the deputy's office and the minister's office, but it is not there to Finance, Administration, to Personnel, to other branches in the department.

Ms. Frlesen: We are speaking now specifically of electronic records, are we?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Yes.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Item 1.(d) Financial and Administrative Services: 1.(d)(1) Salaries, \$671,500—pass; 1.(d)(2) Other Expenditures \$105,200—pass.

Item 1.(e) Human Resource Services: 1.(e)(1) Salaries, \$182,200.

Ms. Frlesen: This is one of the departments which has not had any reduction, and I am wondering why that is so. In particular, I am interested in the 20 to 30 vacant positions that are awaiting that, plus request for classification, the effectiveness of staffing that this department also receives and given the current Phase 2 of the government slashing of the public service, what is the role for this department, and why have they not been cut in accordance with the reduction in their duties?

Mrs. Mitchelson: The department reductions were about 20 staff years. We still have 300-and-some employees within the Department of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship, and all of those employees still have to be served.

Ms. Frlesen: What was the staffing complement of the department three or four years ago, Mr. Deputy Chairman? What I am trying to get at is that the department has been consistently reduced, this time a larger chunk than others, I recognize that, but the complement of this department has remained the same. Am I right?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I guess over the last four or five years, there have been about 25 staff reductions. In the department this year there were 28, but also this year we received 25 new staff with the amalgamation of Citizenship with ESL Programming and Immigration and Settlement. So

basically, I guess, we had 28 reduction, but a 25 increase; so we are basically the same size.

Ms. Frlesen: So the total numbers remain the same. What about the 20 to 30 vacant positions that remain? Is that still the case, or is this printed before the Estimate?

Mrs. Mitchelson: That is, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, about the annual turnover of staff within the department, so there would be 20 to 30 staffing requests that would have to be processed. Yes, that is over the whole year. As people resign or move to another department, take another job, there become that many vacancies throughout the department that have to be filled through a staffing process and that all falls to the Personnel department.

Ms. Frlesen: So this is a hypothetical or average number?

Mrs. Mitchelson: That is a yearly average.

Ms. Frlesen: Does the minister anticipate that in this particular year of cuts that there are going to be 20 people turning over?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I guess that has been an annual average, and we will have to wait to see what happens. There still could be people who are leaving for whatever reasons.

Mr. Lamoureux: I always think that this is one of the departments when it comes to affirmative action should be taking a lead in government, and I would ask the minister if she can give some type of breakdown on the past hirings of the department?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I guess in some instances we have had an increase and in some areas we are not doing quite as well. The number of women in the department is 67.5 percent, and the government target is 50 percent. For Natives, the government target is 10 percent, and for 1991 we have 1.8 percent. The disabled target is 7 percent and we, in 1991, are 4 percent. Visible minorities, the government target is 6 percent, and we are at 6.7 percent.

* (2140)

Mr. Lamoureux: There have been some comments in regard—and this might not necessarily be pertaining—it would be a combination of this line and the Administration and Finance, in regard to the layoffs that have occurred from all of the departments. I am interested in knowing what this department's role, or if they have had any

participation in terms of the numbers that have been laid off, any type of a breakdown of the visible minorities, women and so forth.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, these figures are after the layoff notices went out in the department, and if you want comparisons to last year, that might give you an indication of what happened. Do you want those figures for 1990?

Mr. Lamoureux: There is no other change?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Well, visible minorities were up 0.7 percent over last year, disabled we are at the same percentage. Native was 2 percent last year. We are at 1.8 percent this year and women were up 3.5 percent.

Ms. Frlesen: Pursuing the same topic of affirmative action, do you have a sense, does your staff have the sense of the number of people who are at the entry level in these target groups and the numbers who have come in at higher levels or have moved into higher levels?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, we do not have those figures here. We can get them for you, but I can indicate that for division heads, 50 percent of those are women in our department. At the director level, 47.3 percent are women.

Ms. Frlesen: I think last year, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I raised the issue of aboriginal representation in this department, and I wondered what gains you had been able to make in that area? I think last time you talked about it as a problem of outreach, that the applications were not there. Has that changed?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, my deputy has written to the Affirmative Action Committee indicating that we do need an Outreach program for Native people and, in fact, they are working on that now.

I do want to indicate, and I think I did say this last year, too, that although we may look low in numbers, one of the initiatives that we have initiated since we took over as government was, of course, the recruitment and hiring of recreation directors for remote and northern communities and, in fact, to date we have hired—and they do not show up in these statistics because they are hired as an initiative through the Department of Northern and Native Affairs and the Department of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship, and it is a pilot project.

We have hired 23 Northerners to date, and I believe the majority of them, at least 22 out of the 23, are Natives. So those are people who have been educated with help from the Department of Education and are now actively going back into their own communities to provide recreational opportunities for those communities. So that is a major success story. I think that out of the total number of, how many was it, 26, originally, there are still 23 in that program who will be going back into their communities as recreation directors.

Ms. Frlesen: Yes, I remember we talked about that last time when they had just been appointed. It is an important move and commend the department for that, but the point I am trying to make is that the future of Winnipeg is also aboriginal. I am trying to emphasize the importance of professional level employment for aboriginal people. It seems to me that this is one of the departments that would benefit by the presence of aboriginal people at a variety of levels.

You are responding that your deputy has written to the Affirmative Action Committee on this, and I am wondering why these initiatives cannot be undertaken within your own department?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is our department's Affirmative Action Committee that is going to be addressing this. There are certain areas within the department, I guess, in the Archives and libraries that traditionally have been very hard areas to fill due to the academic requirements, but in fact we are working on it and we are asking for solutions actively.

Ms. Frlesen: Congratulations. We will look for some results there next time.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Item 1.(e) Human Resource Services: 1.(e)(1) Salaries, \$182,200—pass; 1(e)(2) Other Expenditures, \$17,400—pass.

Item 1.(f) Manitoba Film Classification Board: 1.(f)(1) Salaries, \$87,000.

Ms. Frlesen: I just wanted to clarify the video retail outlets and video distributors licensing. I have noticed recently, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that laundromats are showing videos. I wondered if they are being licensed for this? -(interjection)- Laundromats.

Mrs. Mitchelson: I was not aware of that. I have not been to a laundromat recently. I was not aware that laundromats were showing videos. We will

check with the film review classification board and see what is happening in laundromats. I was not aware that we were licensing laundromats.

Ms. Frlesen: I think, Mr. Deputy Chairman, to be quite fair, these are also laundromats which are video rental outfits. It does mean that you have a different clientele in there who are staying much longer. I wonder it might be something your department might want to look at to see how widespread it is, and what kind of social issues are involved.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Absolutely. If in fact they are a laundromat that is also a video outlet, they should be licensed. If they are not, we will certainly look into that.

* (2150)

Ms. Frlesen: The inspection of theatres, bars and video stores with the balance to be inspected on the basis of a complaint—what proportion of this essentially then is left up to the public to report? You are inspecting at the end of this year 400 video stores. How many are there?

Mrs. Mitchelson: This number here is about 40 percent, so about 60 percent would have to be based on complaint.

Ms. Frlesen: What are the plans for the future? Does the minister anticipate a regular inspection cycle so that every video store would be inspected once every three years or something like that? What is the growth rate anticipated of these video stores? What is the long term? I realize you are phasing it in and this is the first year, but I am looking for some indication of long-term plans.

Mrs. Mitchelson: It is a system that is cost-recoverable, so we want to attempt to keep the licence fees and the costs down for the retailers, so we will be looking at some innovative ways of getting in to inspect. One of the ways that we are presently looking at, and we do not have a definite sense of where we are going, is that we could be using the tax inspectors from the Department of Finance as they are touring to stop in. It is an innovative way of utilizing the people and the resources that we do have to check on the video outlets.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Item 1.(f) Manitoba Film Classification Board: 1.(f)(1) Salaries \$87,000—pass; 1.(f)(2) Other Expenditures \$149,800—pass.

Item 2. Culture, Heritage and Recreation Programs: 2.(a) Executive Administration, 2.(a)(1) Salaries \$221,800.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Could the committee have a two-minute break?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Just a two-minute break, and if I could ask the other two members to come here for just a minute.

* * *

The committee took recess at 9:55 p.m.

After Recess

The committee resumed at 10:01 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. The time is now 10 p.m. What is the will of the committee? Proceed? Agreed? Agreed.

We are now dealing with item 2.(a) which corresponds with item 6.(a) within the next resolution on grants.

Ms. Frlesen: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am interested particularly here in the response to the recommendation of the Arts Policy Review Committee, the DeFehr Report. The minister suggested last Estimates—I realize it was not last year, but in the last Estimates—that she was preparing a response to this.

How is that response coming? Now it looks as though it is a process to respond. Is this a step forward or a step backward?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I would hope it would be considered a step forward. We have indicated in this year's budget that we were able to maintain funding to the Arts Council, that within the department there were some reductions in some grants and some increases in some.

I have indicated, and the Premier (Mr. Filmon) has indicated also, that this year there is absolutely no option but the decisions that we have made because the priorities have been placed with no increases in revenues on health care, Family Services and Education. It does not mean that, in fact, we are not going to proceed with the recommendations that are in the Arts Policy Review.

We are working very actively with the Arts Council to redefine our roles. We are looking at forming an arts branch. I think that those are things that will be ongoing, and we will continue that type of consultation.

As far as new money as such, there will not be new money this year. I know that there will be some increases in capital. As I have indicated, the Centennial Centre is having some problems with the exterior cladding, and there has been a study done that indicates that it will probably cost up to about \$5 million to repair just the exterior. That is a major commitment, and it is something that we are going to have to do in the context of public safety. We are going to have to ensure that that work is done and done in a timely fashion.

There is also some sense that there may be some problems with the Planetarium and the museum. We have asked that the study be furthered to see what the implications might be for repairs to the museum and to the Planetarium. Those are major capital commitments, plus our other ongoing capital that has been committed.

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

Ms. Friesen: Mr. Acting Chairman, I was specifically asking about the DeFehr Report. My understanding of your response seemed to indicate that you agree with all the recommendations and that you will proceed to enact them. Are you picking and choosing, and there are some recommendations you are proceeding with and some you do not intend to?

Mrs. Mitchelson: About one-third of the recommendations in the report indicated that there could be some immediate response to. There was another third that required a bit more study, but that we were supportive of, and the other third required a lot more study before we would consider implementing those. We are still moving along that path.

We are still talking about introducing an arts act. We are talking about restructuring the department and forming an arts branch. We are dealing with multicultural funding to the arts in that context, and we have someone from the branch right now working with the Multicultural Secretariat on that recommendation.

We are working with the Arts Council on festivals. We have a working committee with the deputy from my department and the Department of Education on arts education, and the one recommendation to maintain support to our Cultural Industries of course, we have committed to.

Ms. Friesen: Thank you. Could you give us some indication of the timing on this? When do you

expect to bring in an arts act? When do you expect to restructure the department? When do you expect to implement the arts education proposals?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Yes, the restructuring of the department into an arts branch could happen later this year. The arts act will be after that sometime.

Ms. Friesen: This year?

Mrs. Mitchelson: It will not be this year, no.

Ms. Friesen: Can I pursue then the restructuring of the department? That is the one initiative then that you are going to pursue this year?

Mrs. Mitchelson: That is, yes; and that is clearly in the works.

Ms. Friesen: The minister has done some restructuring of the department already this year. A further restructuring to me seems quite destabilizing. How do you propose to accomplish this in terms of the staff morale at the moment?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Well, the staff will be absolutely involved in the restructuring of the branch. I think that it is initiative that they are looking forward to as a challenge. As far as the other part of the restructuring, I know we have Citizenship and ESL programming, and Immigrant Credentials, and that will be a separate division. So there will be sort of two divisions. We do not have the final structure in place, but that is what we are looking at. So there will be two separate divisions.

Ms. Friesen: In this restructuring of the arts part of the department, do you anticipate a reduction in staff?

Mrs. Mitchelson: No.

Ms. Friesen: Do you anticipate an increase in staff?

Mrs. Mitchelson: At this point in time we have no plans for increasing the number of staff. We just want to ensure that through the restructuring we are serving the community to the best of our ability.

Ms. Friesen: In the restructuring of the department, is your plan to follow the underlying assumptions of the DeFehr Report, essentially suggesting that the department fund and administer the nonprofessional programs and that the Arts Council deal with the professional programs?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Basically, yes, but we will be testing the impact of the multicultural component on the multicultural community.

Ms. Friesen: So the government's new arts policy essentially will be based upon professional and nonprofessional components? That is the philosophical focus of the arts in Manitoba from your perspective?

Mrs. Mitchelson: We will retain the peer review process with the Arts Council, and we will be looking at another system for the rest.

Ms. Friesen: It does maintain the principle then that professionals are reviewed by their peers, nonprofessionals are reviewed by civil servants.

Mrs. Mitchelson: I guess within the branch we are looking at development and audience development, not necessarily a peer process of evaluation. It has not been finalized. As I indicated before, we were working closely with the Arts Council to develop a means of incorporating this. As far as the multicultural component, I think that there is work that remains to be done, and that will have to be a process whereby there is consultation with the community.

* (2210)

Ms. Friesen: Audience development was something I mentioned right at the beginning of this evening. I am interested now that it is the focus of departmental programs. It was not something that was mentioned earlier.

Mrs. Mitchelson: I guess I just might seek some clarification on exactly what you are asking.

Ms. Friesen: I am curious as to why this did not come up earlier. I asked specifically about audience development. What was the department doing in this? This was one of the things that government could be doing. There were very few responses at that point, and now it seems to be the focus of departmental future plans, so at one stage or other we perhaps miscommunicated.

Mrs. Mitchelson: I guess maybe we did because what you were asking more for were new initiatives, and I think that audience development has always been a focus of the department and it will continue to be. I guess I was interpreting your question as meaning something new, and, in fact, it is something that the department has been doing on an ongoing basis.

Ms. Friesen: Looking at the future then, those people who are going to be applying to the department for grants would be wise then to include

as a major purpose audience development, rather than performance, creativity.

Mrs. Mitchelson: I guess it is a little bit too early in the process to make that conclusion.

Ms. Friesen: I assume then that during this next year we will be looking at those proposals.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Absolutely.

Ms. Friesen: I am still looking at 2.(a) and the Expected Results of this department's programs.

It is a department which has reduced by two people. In what way have you reduced the expectations of this department—I am sorry. In what way has the minister reduced the expected results of this department?

Mrs. Mitchelson: The reduction of two was one vacant position and one was a term position.

Ms. Friesen: The purpose of my inquiry was to get at the relationship between staff and programs. Obviously, the point that I am making generally here is that the government is trying to have us believe you can reduce personnel and not reduce programs by the use of words such as streamlining and the use of that kind of vocabulary.

We have cut the communications section here, and the minister has argued that there will be no reduction in programs. Now we are looking at an administrative section which has cut two people. Whether the positions were vacant or not, there are still two positions which were there before and which fulfilled and developed programs that were there before. Which programs have been cut as a result of this reduction in staff?

(Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair)

Mrs. Mitchelson: In fact, the one position was one person that we were going to put another person on the extradepartmental agencies officer program, and we decided that we would make do with one position instead of adding a position to that. The other one was an administrative support position. That was for automation, and we are almost fully automated, so there was not a need for that position.

Ms. Friesen: Mr. Deputy Chairman, the area that you have reduced programs in then is in external relations with agencies?

Mrs. Mitchelson: We got an extra position in the budget last year. We never did fill that position, and we decided because of the budget exercise that we would not fill that position.

Ms. Friesen: Perhaps that should have gone under—what was it, item 1.(c), deputy minister's planning and policy. You had a spare pawn there, did you?

I wanted to ask about the community heritage outreach and awareness initiatives which is something that is planned here and not in heritage resources.

Mrs. Mitchelson: On the Activity Identification, this is the activity identification for the ADM of the whole branch of Cultural Resources, Historic Resources, Recreation and Regional Services. In fact, we are talking about results at the ADM level, but the planning is still done within the Historic Resources Division that falls under the ADM.

Mr. James Carr (Crescentwood): Mr. Deputy Chairman, this is the fourth set of Estimates that I have had the pleasure of debating with the minister—same minister, same issues.

I would like to ask the minister, in line with the recommendations of the DeFehr Report, what percentage of the provincial budget is devoted to cultural affairs this year in comparison to last year, and just how on target we are with the recommendations of the DeFehr committee, which I believe was quite specific in its goal of moving towards a certain level of provincial expenditure that ought to be devoted to culture?

Mrs. Mitchelson: For the fiscal year 1990-91, I think that was the answer last year, was .38 percent. For the year 1991-92, it is .35 percent.

Mr. Carr: Mr. Deputy Chairman, that means that we are sliding down the hill, that aside from all the arguments that one can make about restraint and the necessity of the government to make tough choices, it is clear by the minister's answer that one of the casualties of those choices is her department. We are not only moving too slowly towards the targeted goal in the DeFehr Report, but as a matter of fact, we are worse off this year in relation to the total expenditures of the government than we were last year.

How can the minister stand idly by when the major recommendation of the task force that she appointed has not only been ignored, but apparently the government's choices has taken not a small step forward but a fairly major step backward.

* (2220)

Mrs. Mitchelson: I think we indicated that the goal of the Arts Policy Review was a 10-year goal, and at the end of that 10 years, we would have to measure where government was in relationship to the overall government budget. I will say that, yes, it is a bit of a step backward at this point, and I will say over again what I said at the beginning of my remarks, was that we are faced with a situation in this province where we have no increase in revenues. That is a zero percent increase, or what is it, half of whatever percent. It is minimal.

There are no new revenues in the province of Manitoba, and faced with that fact, government had difficult choices to make, and there were choices that had to be made. Our No. 1 priority was \$90 million extra into health care, increased money to Family Services and to Education. Those were the only departments within government that received additional resources, and the rest of us had to share in the responsibility of reductions.

No matter how you look at it, those are the facts and the realities today, and if there were more money to go around, you know, I am sure that we would all be in there and be receiving our portion of the extra money, but the fact of the matter is, there were no increases in revenues.

We still had major increases that we had to provide for. I guess nurses' salaries were one of our priorities, and we indicated when there was a 14 percent increase over two years that it was going to be a considerable cost to that settlement.

You know, those were priorities, those were choices. I will say that the decisions were difficult. We all had to share in the responsibility, and as the recession ends and as we see more light at the end of the tunnel, then of course priorities will have to be chosen, but I suppose I cannot say anything more than that at this point, but there were decisions that had to be made.

Mr. Carr: Mr. Deputy Chairman, we have just had a startling admission from the minister responsible for Culture in Manitoba and that admission is that Culture is not a priority with her government. -(interjection)- The minister just told us that other departments had a higher priority. The result is that Culture has less of a percentage of the total provincial budget this year than it had last year. I can only conclude, therefore, that Culture is not a priority. It may be an admission that other ministers

would want to make, but I am surprised to hear it from the Minister of Culture.

The minister also says that there is a 10-year goal to achieve the targets in the DeFehr Report. Well, what comfort or assurance does the minister have that she can communicate to members of the committee that it is going to be any better next year or the year after that? Presumably, the best objective criteria that we can use to judge how the minister is doing at the cabinet table is the percentage of total provincial spending that is going to her department.

The minister has told us tonight that it was .38 percent last year, and it is .35 percent this year, which means that she is losing ground to other departments in government. I would like to know if those figures relate to both government appropriation and lottery funds or just appropriation?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I did not catch the last part of the question, but maybe I could just respond first and then you could re-ask that question.

It is very simple. It is very clear cut. If health care, Family Services and Education receive higher priorities, every other government is going to get the smaller share of the pie. It is plain, simple mathematics. Quite frankly, I think that in the overall picture, as we go through the Estimates, we will see that in the areas that we could maintain funding, we maintained it.

There is the odd area where there will be an increase in funding. There are some organizations that had to take a reduction. Those are the realities of today. I think I heard the member say that Culture was not a priority. It certainly is a priority for me and for my department. This is not the year that we can increase funding. Unfortunately, as I have said, difficult choices had to be made.

I will tell you that when it comes right down to determining what the people of Manitoba want and what the taxpayers of Manitoba want, I will tell you that if in fact they had the choice of a grant to—whether it be a cultural organization or to a recreation district or to something in Natural Resources, the choice between that kind of a grant and having a hospital bed when they had a ruptured gall bladder, they would want that hospital bed. They would want that health care service. I do not care how you dice it or slice it, that is Manitoba's top priority.

The member can sit there and say that we are not putting Culture as a high priority. We have managed to sustain funding in a lot of areas in the Department of Culture. When times are better, there will be more funding and there will be increased funding. This was not the year that we could do that.

Mr. Carr: The minister is committed to the goal of doubling the grants to cultural organizations or the expenditure of her department over 10 years, doubling as a percentage of the total provincial budget. I do not know what logic she is using to persuade us that next year or in two years or in three years she is going to be any more successful at the cabinet table than she was this year.

Let me get back to my question, and that is the total of which the numbers she gave me is a percentage. Is it total resources, lottery and appropriation, or is it just appropriation?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is both sources, but I do want to indicate that when we took over government in 1988, the total overall funding for the arts was .29 percent. We as a government have increased our priority to arts funding. Over the last three years it has been anywhere from .34 percent to .38 percent. Certainly we have placed a higher priority on the arts than the former administration did.

Mr. Carr: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am interested in the relative reliance of the department on lottery funds and appropriation funds. Could the minister break that down, please?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I know we have had this philosophical discussion for the last four Estimates processes, and I know the feelings of the member on this issue. He feels that there should be a commitment from appropriation to the arts, and we have a greater increase of arts funding coming from Lotteries again this year. There has been a progressive increase, but I will tell you that in today's economic times our Lotteries funding over the last few years has been more stable funding than appropriation has been. I will say that the arts community has been well served by Lotteries revenues. I know exactly where you are coming from, and we have had this discussion year after year.

Mr. Carr: I have not been very effective, have I?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Well, quite frankly, no.

Mr. Carr: It is nice to be reminded every once in awhile from the minister how ineffective I have been. I will not throw it back at her and talk about her relative effectiveness at the cabinet table either.

I am interested in knowing where we are relatively vis-a-vis lottery revenues and appropriation, because if I am not mistaken, and the minister will correct me if I am wrong, another major recommendation of the DeFehr Report was to move away from reliance on lottery revenues. Am I right?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Yes, that was one of the recommendations of the DeFehr Report too, and I guess if you really want to look at—as I indicated just a moment ago that we are probably more reliant on Lotteries revenues. As a matter of fact, we are just slightly less reliant this year when I get the numbers in front of me. Last year, 76.8 percent of arts funding came from Lotteries, and this year, 76 percent does.

* (2230)

Mr. Carr: If we take the two major recommendations of the DeFehr Report, one on the movement away towards reliance of lottery revenues and the other the percentage of the total provincial spending on Culture, we are backsliding.

Mrs. Mitchelson: No, we are batting 50-50. In one area we are less reliant on Lotteries than—

Mr. Carr: I am interested in those two figures as it relates to one of the expected results in the activity indicator here, the development of a process to respond to the recommendations of the Arts Policy Review Committee. Since the minister has been singularly ineffective in moving towards the recommendations of the DeFehr committee, can she tell us just what kind of development, of what kind of process, in what kind of response to the recommendations of the DeFehr committee we can expect?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Well, first of all, I guess we had better clarify one thing. The DeFehr Report did recommend a certain percentage of the provincial budget for arts funding, and I do not believe there is any province across the country that ties the percentage of their arts funding to the provincial budget. I think it was a laudable goal, and I said that at the outset of the Arts Policy Review. I do not believe you will find a province across the country that does tie its arts funding, because, you know, we could say it should be 1 percent of the overall government budget. So then are you addressing

the real needs that are out there in the community or are you throwing a figure out there and saying, we are going to meet this target whether the need is there or not?

I think we have to look at the needs within the community, and there are some very legitimate needs, and I believe that we should support the arts in a substantial way as the Province of Manitoba. We always will need to support the arts; I have no question with that. I indicated that it was a laudable goal, but I never did indicate or say that we would be at 1 percent of the total provincial budget in any one specific year.

The Arts Policy Review was done to provide a framework for funding to the arts and for arts initiatives over the next decade, and I indicated that at the end of that decade, there would have to be an assessment done of what the overall provincial budget was and where we sat in response to that recommendation.

There were many other recommendations of the report that have been started to be initiated. We are working with the Arts Council right now to determine what our roles and responsibilities are. We are looking at multicultural arts funding; we are looking at developing an arts branch within the department, and I think my commitment was to deal with the needs as they arise in the arts community. The needs are there. The money, unfortunately, the revenues are not here as a province to make major increases.

In some areas, I indicated there had to be some decreases, and we will have to work with the community through these tough times to ensure that we maintain some stability within the arts community, but we have made commitments and substantial commitments in some areas. We have, as I said, just indicated earlier that we have a major problem right now at the Centennial Concert Hall with the exterior cladding, a major safety hazard for the public who visit that building, a \$5-million project that is going to have to be started and commenced and worked on very quickly to ensure public safety.

We do know that the Museum of Man and Nature and the Planetarium may have very similar problems. We are extending the review to find out exactly what the cost implications of that might be. Those are things that, in the past—I mean, we have facilities that are 20 years old, and those facilities have had very, very minimal capital work done to

them over the last 20-some years, and either we have to repair them and maintain them or let them fall apart.

So there are certain decisions and there are certain priorities, and those are very basic needs and real needs right now. That involves a fairly major commitment of capital expenditure over the next period of a couple of years. We are going to have to take a look at the needs as they arise. We want to maintain where we can, and there is not going to be a lot of enhancement. We can argue and you can say that there is no commitment to the arts, but in fact we will maintain what we can this year, and when we can see a brighter light at the end of the tunnel, then we will have to look towards enhancement.

Mr. Carr: I am sure it is my fault, but the minister has me a bit confused. She says that there is no other province that ties cultural funding to total provincial expenditures, and then in the next sentence she says it is a laudable goal.

Is she implicitly saying that because no other government does it, it is not a goal of her government? Is 1 percent of total provincial funding for culture a goal of her government, or is she saying it is impossible, no other province has been able to do it, therefore she has no intentions of doing it?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Well, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, as I indicated, it was a laudable goal, and I am not sure whether it will be able to be achievable.

Mr. Carr: Ah.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Okay. I just want to indicate and clarify that, because Québec had a goal of 1 percent of their provincial budget going to culture, but that was going to culture which included heritage and libraries in the province of Québec. This is strictly arts funding in the province of Manitoba, so when you look at Québec, which is probably the most culturally oriented province in the country, and their goal was 1 percent for the arts, for heritage and for libraries, 1 percent of their total provincial budget, I think that 1 percent might be very laudable, but I cannot really say today that it could be achievable.

Mr. Carr: Well, I thank the minister for at least the candour of her response. So if the 1 percent goal is not achievable, what goal is?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I have indicated already that we would look at the needs as they arise, and I do not know if you tie a percentage or if—you know, it is fine to say we will spend .5 percent or whatever on

arts funding, and are you then creating a need out there to spend that money? Are you actually addressing the real needs of the community so that we can provide a cultural climate in this province that we can be proud of? I cannot put a percentage figure on it. I think that we have to look at the needs as they arise, base our decisions on those needs, and provide the kind of program that we can afford to provide and that we need to provide to keep us at the level that we are at today.

Mr. Carr: So I take it from the minister's answer then that all of the needs that she and her department have analyzed have been met?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, no. I am saying that as needs arise, we will analyze and we will determine what we can fund within the fiscal realities of the day.

Mr. Carr: So the needs have not yet been met, and the minister is not sure whether .5 percent will meet the needs or what? So I guess we can conclude from this discussion that the government has no goals that it can quantify, and that the cultural community will have to content itself on backsliding from .38 percent to .35 percent, and the minister herself has said that cultural affairs is not a priority of the government. She said that Health is a priority, that Family Services is a priority, and Education is, and her ministry is not, and the cultural community of the province will have to suffer as a result of it.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Well, I guess the member is trying to put words in my mouth, because I did not say that culture was not a priority. I said the highest priorities of this government were Health, Education and Family Services, and I will tell you that if you went out and polled the people of Manitoba today, you would find out that those areas would be very high priority areas for them, and I think that in the overall context of no increases in revenues, to be able to maintain in some areas and to achieve what we did, was not too bad in the situation that we are in today. But I am not saying that all the needs are being met, because if in fact we knew that all the needs were being addressed, we would not have successive governments that every 10 years do an Arts Policy Review to determine what might need to be done out there.

* (2240)

Ms. Friesen: Mr. Deputy Chairman, the minister keeps putting on the record her view that there are no more monies and that there is no growth in

revenues. I think I do want to respond by saying that our perspective on the other side of the House has been that, in fact, part of the reason there are no more revenues or the government believes that is it has chosen not to tax fairly, that it is choosing not to tax its corporate friends, that it is not creating jobs which would bring in revenue in terms of taxation, so that there are certain reasons, political choice reasons, for not having the kind of revenues that the government would like to see.

The minister proposed the choice between health care and culture. She said that when any Manitoban wanted to have a bed for a gall bladder operation rather than something cultural, they would prefer that. I do want to suggest to the minister that in fact the reason that we do have the beds there for all Manitobans is a cultural choice. We have a medicare system to which all Manitobans and all Canadians are deeply attached. One of the reasons we have that is that we have chosen, both Conservative governments and NDP governments over the past years at the federal and provincial level, to have a different culture.

We have maintained that culture through communication, through journals, through political debate, through communications such as the CBC, for example, and I will point out to the minister, created by a Conservative government in the beginning. So it is that culture, those cultural standards, those cultural ideals that Canadians have set for themselves and maintained are one of the reasons that that bed will be maintained.

The choice between culture and a hospital bed is not presented in the same way, I think, that the minister would have us believe. There is an alternative perspective. Culture is not entertainment. It is not recreation. It is not leisure. It is the way in which we have created and maintained our society.

The second thing I wanted to say, and it is following on from the DeFehr Report, the minister, in response to an earlier question, suggested that she was not necessarily in favour of encouraging or directing those groups whom she has cut to go to corporate sources for their funding. That was not necessarily what she was suggesting to them, but this is one of the -(interjection)- am I misinterpreting, sorry, Mr. Deputy Chairman? Let me finish the question. I am sorry if I have misinterpreted you. I understood that you were not expecting corporate donations to pick up the slack.

Yet one of the major themes of the DeFehr Report was in fact that culture should become much more, not dependent, but certainly allied to private funding, and that it should look much more to private funding of the arts, much as the Bovey Report suggested at the federal level. I am wondering what the consistency is there.

Does the minister agree with the DeFehr Report that private funding is the way to go for Cultural Industries? Did I misinterpret her on an earlier comment that the corporate sector is not expected to pick up the slack for the cuts in the departmental grants?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I guess it is sort of a yes and no. I mean, I do not think there is anything wrong with the corporate sector being a partner in culture, in our province, in the country. I have absolutely no problem with that.

What I was saying, in these economic times there are great demands on resources, whether they be foundations or the private sector. We are not justifying the decisions that we made based on saying, oh, well, the corporate sector will pick that up. We are not discouraging people from attempting to generate revenue from whatever source they might be able to generate that revenue, but we are not saying that, in fact, we believe that we can reduce you because the corporate sector will do that. We are not making that supposition, but I have absolutely no problem with the corporate sector being involved in partnership with arts and culture and whatever.

Ms. Friesen: I understand the distinction that the minister is making, but could I pursue the importance of corporate funding that the DeFehr Report maintained, given the current climate that the minister understands is there is private funding? Is your 10-year commitment to the DeFehr Report going to include the increased reliance upon private funding?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I think in the overall context of funding, you know as much as the private sector wants to be involved, I would encourage them to be involved. I have said before that the arts will always be dependent on government for government funding, and I think that we believe it is a government responsibility to fund the arts.

So we will continue to do that, but I think I have said publicly in the past, too, that as much as the private sector wants to be involved, we would

encourage them to be involved. I think with more private sector funding and a commitment from government to ongoing funding that all we can do is enhance our arts and our cultural community.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Item 2.(a) Executive Administration: 2.(a)(1) Salaries, \$221,800—pass; 2.(a)(2) Other Expenditures, \$60,000—pass.

We will now move onto 2.(b) which is connected with 6.(a) and will be dealing with the two items at once, as previously agreed.

An Honourable Member: Which page is 6.(a)?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Item 6.(a) is on page 34, and in your Estimates book, it is on pages 34-35. Do you have those two sheets there?

Ms. Frlesen: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would like, under this section, if it is appropriate, to look at the cuts to or the grants withdrawn, as it is entitled, to arts and culture organizations. Is this the appropriate place to do that?

I am going from the press release list actually.

Mrs. Mitchelson: The Grants to Cultural Organizations 2.(b) includes—14.2(b) is Grants to Cultural Organizations, that is to the Arts Council and the Museum of Man and Nature, and 6.(a)(1) is grants to the other cultural organizations. Did we want to do possibly the Arts Council and the museum and then just go on through?

Ms. Frlesen: All right, could we start with the Museum of Man and Nature then? Could the minister indicate—it is a 3 percent cut, is it not, to the Museum of Man and Nature?—what the impact of that is going to be upon the museum? Did she meet with the board beforehand? Did she discuss this cut with them? Did they indicate whether it was going to mean any reduction in staff or reduction in programs and, if so, which programs?

Mrs. Mitchelson: If I can just indicate at this point, it is 3 percent of our grant to the Museum of Man and Nature and it is 1.7 percent reduction to their total overall budget. The total grant to the Museum of Man and Nature will still be \$2.46 million. The reduction will be \$80,000, and I guess to date we do not know exactly what the board of the museum will decide on where they will make reductions in expenditures. We will be working with them as a department and meeting with them to determine what that might be.

I do want to indicate, when we talk about the Museum of Man and Nature, that we have a

commitment of \$500,000 in capital to them this year that has not been expended. That is probably more money than they received over the last 10 years for capital improvement. That is for expansion to Alloway Hall, and that is traveling exhibit space, and also upgrading of the gift shop. In that capital money that is being put into the Museum of Man and Nature this year, there will be additional ability to generate revenue also, so that is a help. It does not make up for the operating reduction that there has been, but the board will have to determine where the reductions will be made.

* (2250)

Ms. Frlesen: Mr. Deputy Chairman, when the minister says generate revenue, surely Alloway Hall is one of the only free elements of the museum left. They do not charge admission to Alloway Hall on a normal basis.

Mrs. Mitchelson: That might be the case right now, but with the expansion and the upgrading of Alloway Hall, there are major traveling exhibits the museum could take advantage of that they do not take advantage of now, that they could generate revenue with, charge admission for.

Ms. Frlesen: Does that mean then, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that what the department is doing is encouraging the museum to move towards a blockbuster kind of policy, which is one that has been much criticized in the cultural area?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I think that we are asking for a mix of both, that there are some exhibits at times that could be taken advantage of, that could be revenue generating, but certainly we would expect that there would still be those that are free of charge, so I think a good mix could be quite feasible.

Ms. Frlesen: Just continuing on the question of admission, the government or the people of Manitoba contribute \$2.46 million at least to this museum, and it is a museum board which is 50 percent appointed by the government. What provision is there for free public access to the museum?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, in 1989-90, the museum contributed over 22,000 museum passes and over 16,000 planetarium passes to not-for-profit groups throughout the province of Manitoba.

Ms. Frlesen: So that the policy then that the government is following is essentially a charitable distribution of certain passes to certain groups.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Yes.

Ms. Frlesen: Well, I can only express my—I do not know how to do it—shock, horror. It seems to me that for \$2.46 million that the general public of Manitoba ought to have more than 20,000 single passes in a year.

Why, for example, has the government not moved to introduce a free day at the museum, such as the Winnipeg Art Gallery is maintaining and which is done on a standard basis in most cultural institutions around the world?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, those are board decisions just like the decision at the Art Gallery would be a board decision.

Ms. Frlesen: There is a difference, however, between the gallery board and the museum board. The museum board is 50 percent appointed by the government. Has the minister ever considered meeting with those members and suggesting that for \$2.46 million there ought to be some public access to the—(interjection)-

Mrs. Mitchelson: I do meet with the board on a regular basis, and, you know, we are putting a lot of public money into the museum. I think there have to be ways and means for the museum board to generate the other portion of their revenue that they need to run. They have to make the decisions based on the amount of revenue they receive and the amount of revenue they need to maintain the operation.

Ms. Frlesen: Again, Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is a user-pay philosophy, that the public, the taxpayer, puts in \$2.46 million and then has to pay for an additional entry fee into that institution with no free day, not even one a month.

Mrs. Mitchelson: I do not think that is—

Ms. Frlesen: No. We want something for \$2.46 million.

Mrs. Mitchelson: —that unusual. We could, I suppose, allow free admission to the museum on a regular basis, and it would cost the taxpayers of Manitoba a considerable amount more if we wanted to have the same type of facility. I guess those are choices that the board does have to make.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. Those members wishing to carry on a conversation, if they want to carry it off in the hall, we would appreciate it.

Ms. Frlesen: The Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) and one of his colleagues are suggesting that when the NDP was in government, this did not exist, but I was, in fact, on the board of the Museum of Man and Nature, proposed that resolution for a free day once a month. I am very disappointed with past—it was maintained for some years, and I am very disappointed, in fact, to find out that now it does not exist.

I did have a very personal reason for asking. It is something that the various members of the board, and I was not, I do not believe at that point, an appointed member of the board, did encourage. It was a responsibility that we felt was there for institutions which are so extensively and magnificently funded by the public.

I wanted to move on, Mr. Deputy Chairman, to look at the grants to arts schools, performing arts festivals and ethnocultural organizations in Winnipeg, particularly the performing arts festivals.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: That is 14-2.(c).

Ms. Frlesen: Is it? Sorry, we will come back to Grants to Cultural Organizations. We were looking at the Museum of Man and Nature and the Arts Council.

Mrs. Mitchelson: If I could just provide a bit more information, that is, we are dealing with 14-2.(b) and 6.(a)(1) at the same time. The Arts Council and the museum are in 2.(a), and in 6.(a)(1) there is the Centennial Centre Corporation, the Western Manitoba Centennial Auditorium, the French Cultural Centre, CCFM, the Winnipeg Art Gallery, the Public Events Sponsorship Program, the Skills Transfer grants, Deficit Reduction, Hospitality Grants, Major Agencies, Capital Grants and Critical Repair Emergency Capital Grants.

An Honourable Member: Yes, which page is that, in this one?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: It is not in that book.

An Honourable Member: That is why I am having problems with this.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Where is 6.(a)? Is it there in 6.(a)?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: In this book here? On page what?

Mrs. Mitchelson: On page 34. Some are Lotteries funded and some are appropriations.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: It is right under 6.(a) Grant Assistance. Go down that list.

* (2300)

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, in terms of the Grants to Cultural Organizations, I was looking at the report for '89-90 Annual Reports for the grants to organizations which is on 12 and 13 where we get a listing of the different organizations. I am not going to ask for, in terms of the current list that you might have right now, but if possible I am wondering if I can get a copy of what the allocations have been for these different organizations. Is that possible?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Which organization?

Mr. Lamoureux: The dance, literature, music, theater, organizations, where you have given grants for organizations.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I think that is the Annual Report of the Manitoba Arts Council, and they are an umbrella organization that we fund out of the department and out of Lotteries. They distribute grants as an arm's-length organization. We could give you their next Annual Report, but we do not have direct—

Mr. Lamoureux: You have the '90-91?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Not yet, but when we do get it we can give that to you.

Mr. Lamoureux: Okay. In terms of the Major Agencies Operating Grants, is there a listing of where those agencies—where this \$4.4 million is going to?

Mrs. Mitchelson: The Manitoba Centennial Centre Corporation is getting \$2.162 million. The Western Manitoba Centennial Auditorium, that is in Brandon, \$59.8 thousand, and the CCFM, that is the French cultural centre, \$296,000.

An Honourable Member: Is it a very extensive list?

Mrs. Mitchelson: No, or do you want me—

An Honourable Member: I did not want to go through everything if there are 20 or 30.

Mrs. Mitchelson: There is—is there only one more? Is that capital -(interjection)- These are all operating grants. I do not know why I was thinking capital. Okay, you have the Art Gallery—

An Honourable Member: Which is?

Mrs. Mitchelson: 1.9. That is the major.

Mr. Lamoureux: Of the four that were listed, can the minister tell me, are any of those decreases from the previous year?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Yes.

Mr. Lamoureux: Which ones?

Mrs. Mitchelson: There is one decrease, and that is the Centennial Centre Corporation.

Mr. Lamoureux: The percentage of a decrease to that, it was 2.162 or it is—

Mrs. Mitchelson: It is a 10.9 percent decrease.

Mr. Lamoureux: Can the minister tell us why they received a 10.9 decrease?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Again, I guess this was one of those difficult choices that had to be made. The Centennial Centre Corporation, this year, has retained earnings or a surplus of \$160,000. Okay? It is anticipated that this year the Centennial Centre Corporation will generate more revenue as a result of Les Misérables that is going to be playing very shortly. Indications are that they might generate an extra \$100,000 in revenue as a result of this performance.

We have put in a lot of money for capital upgrading of their new heating plant, so there may be some efficiencies and a way that they can cut back on some of the operating costs that they have had in the past.

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

I guess that is basically it, so what we are saying is that this is a tough year for us. We believe that, with their retained earnings, with the increased revenue that they generate from performances, larger venues and from savings that they might encounter as a result of the new heating plant that has been installed, we are hopeful that they will be able to manage through this year without a deficit. We will be working very closely with them.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Acting Chairperson, this is one of the areas in which I tried to say earlier I have some concern with when the government decides that they are going to cut back on one organization because they have managed well, they have retained earnings, they are moving in a progressive fashion, in the sense that they are going to be seeing an increase, in all likelihood, of revenue. I think that is a positive. Those that tend to manage and create some type of surplus of sorts are being penalized. I am wondering if we are sending, if not directly, indirectly, a message that the money that has been allocated out to you should in fact be spent or you risk losing it at a later year.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Acting Chairperson, they have had a surplus for a number of years, and we have allowed them to carry it. I guess at this point in time we are expecting that they are going to be able to generate more revenue as a result of productions that they have attracted to the city of Winnipeg. I indicated we are looking at about \$100,000 more just from *Les Misérables* coming to Winnipeg.

I have indicated too that next year—is it next year or 1992?—Phantom of the Opera will be coming to the Centennial Concert Hall. Last year they did not have any major productions that would have generated a lot of revenue for them. They have the ability to generate more revenue this year and next year.

I do want to indicate too that we are flowing money because we are back on a more regular budget cycle. We are flowing the money to the Centennial Centre Corporation in a more timely fashion because of the approval of the budget process, and they have already saved \$17,000 in bank charges because of money flowing on a more timely basis to them. That is an improvement.

We are not necessarily penalizing the Centennial Centre Corporation. We are going to be working through this year with them. If, in fact, they had a deficit at the end of the year, we would certainly have to take a look at what we could do to work with them to get rid of that deficit. We are not anticipating that if, in fact, all of these things come to be, they will have to have a deficit at the end of this year. If they do, we will work with them to get rid of it when times are a little better.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Acting Chairperson, moving on to the Hospitality Grants, can the minister give me an example of what a hospitality grant is and entails?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I will just get a list and read them for you.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Acting Chairperson, while we are waiting, maybe the minister can explain why the decrease from 16.8 to 3?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Acting Chairperson, these are discretionary grants, and they are grants that are sort of a formula-based grant for different organizations that are holding banquets. It would be government sponsoring a portion of their banquet.

(Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair)

I will give you a list of the ones that we supported last year: The Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers got \$2,000; the Canadian Association of Festivals and Events got \$5,000; the Farm Women's conference got \$500; the Manitoba Association of Community Arts got \$3,500; the Manitoba ex-RCAF Women's Division got \$1,000; Westarc Group Incorporated got \$1,000; and the Winnipeg Musicians Association got \$1,000.

These are for annual conferences or events, and they apply on a one-time only basis to government for funding for usually conference-banquet costs. We are just saying that next year we just do not have the discretionary money to provide a lot of hospitality grants. Organizations that do hold their banquets will just either have to increase their ticket price for the cost of the dinner or downsize some, not have as expensive a banquet.

Mr. Lamoureux: Is there a set criteria that is used for the annual conferences, an application that has to be filed?

* (2310)

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, there is a Hospitality guideline in the general manual of administration that indicates that we allow so much per person, I think, who attends the banquet.

Mr. Lamoureux: What scope does this cover? Are we talking virtually any arts organization?

Mrs. Mitchelson: They are usually national or very significant conferences. I was just noticing by the list last year that they were not all national.

Mr. Lamoureux: I am curious as to how they would find out about this particular grant, the different organizations. Is this something that was promoted in the past, or is it something that the minister or staff recommend to different organizations?

Mrs. Mitchelson: No, I am not quite sure how organizations find out, but I think every department within government basically would have a Hospitality line of some sort; and it is by application, if someone writes to the department. As you noticed the Farm Women's Conference and there was another women's organization which probably came through the Women's Directorate as a request for some funding. The others, I suppose, if they are a national organization they probably recognize that every government across the country has a Hospitality line of some sort. I am sure national organizations do apply for funding to various levels of government.

Mr. Lamoureux: And lastly in terms of the Community Initiatives line there is an obvious question in terms of what has happened in that area, if I can get the minister just to comment briefly.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Those are, I know, one-time-only grants to organizations, and I do have a list of those grants. It is project grants, one time only, and what we are saying is that in order to maintain the core funding and sometimes with slight reductions throughout the department, we are going to have to say to some of the one-time organizations that apply for a project grant that we are not going to be able to do as many this year.

One of the examples of that and maybe one of our success stories was the Public Archeology program at The Forks. We funded that actually for two years in a row out of this Community Initiatives grant. We now have a line in the department where we are going to grant money to an organization at The Forks. It is The Forks Public Archeology Association. We are going to provide money to them this year in grant form to provide, or to continue with the Public Archeology program. Not normally do we provide two years in a row, but we did provide funding out of this line in the budget two years in a row. Now we have included that in our base budgeting.

Mr. Lamoureux: What other type of organizations are the initial core area?

Mrs. Mitchelson: The Kelsey Tri-Centennial in The Pas, it was a festival in The Pas and we gave them \$2,500 out of this line; the Association of Manitoba Museums for a training program, and we gave them \$9,000; the International Children's Festival for an historical play at The Forks, we gave them \$5,000; the Music Festival of Canada, when they held their festival here in Manitoba, we gave them \$25,000 out of this line; the Manitoba Historical Society, Planning Study for Dalnavert Museum, we gave them \$3,900.

These are project grants—and to the Folk Arts Council for grants to help develop the special grants we gave them for their cultural displays for their 20th anniversary, we gave the Folk Arts Council \$10,000 to co-ordinate the money that we gave to the pavilions so that they could co-ordinate enhancement of their cultural displays.

These are one-time-only project grants that are applied. They come to the department, we assess them and we provide grants. What we are saying is

that we are not going to be able to do as many of these one-time-only projects this year, based on trying to maintain some of our core funding.

Mr. Lamoureux: In the past, under this particular line, has it always been around \$183,000, or has it been going steadily down?

Mrs. Mitchelson: It has dropped a bit. The most it has ever been, and that, I believe, was several years ago, was \$250,000. It is now down at under \$100,000. It has been declining over the years.

Mr. Lamoureux: Is it a program that you ultimately see phasing out of the department?

Mrs. Mitchelson: As I said, it is project-by-project grants, and there are sometimes one-time initiatives out there. It is meant to be only one time only. I think that there probably always will be a program of some sort, because those are things that we cannot find within the budget. As you look at the list of activities that we have funded, I think a lot of them are very worthwhile projects, that there would be no money in the baseline funding for these projects.

Mr. Lamoureux: Is the number of applicants who are coming forward for this particular program increasing or decreasing?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I am told it has decreased possibly a little, the number of applications. I would imagine there are certain things that cannot be planned over a year in advance and certain organizations that cannot let the department know that, a year down the road, they are going to need money, to enable us to try to get money put in the budget. It is those things that come up that might require a little bit of assistance or support from government that we are able to provide through this line in the budget.

Ms. Friesen: I wanted to ask about the Skills Transfer program, which has a considerable cut. Well, first of all, why was the decision made to cut this particular program? Was it not being used where there is a decline in applications? Did the minister feel it was not cost effective?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Yes. They are small project grants designed to cover instructor travel costs for up to 50 percent of instructor fees for one-time-only workshops in rural Manitoba. There will still be some funds left in the program, but I guess these are—I do not know if we have a list of the number of grants that were approved under the Skills Transfer program.

I think I have my answers here. Last year there was a budget allocation of \$95,000. Only \$70,000 was spent. There were 543 applications and almost all of them received funding.

There are many applications that were under \$100 that received funding. This is one of these programs that I have been looking at and evaluating since we have been in government actually because it is a program that costs an awful lot to deliver when you are sending out a cheque. I have sent out cheques for \$10, \$50 to an organization that costs at least \$100 to generate that cheque to the community.

* (2320)

What we are trying to do is to amalgamate some of the grants that are going out to the communities, to the Arts Council. There are organizations that apply 15, 16 times a year and get little grants on a very regular basis, and it is costing more for government to generate that. It is not only for the bureaucracy within government and the cost within government, but it is taking volunteer time in the community to fill out 16 different applications that might give you a total of a couple of hundred dollars over a year's period of time.

What we are trying to do is consolidate the funding to the Arts Councils in rural Manitoba. I have discussed this with MACAC, the Manitoba Association of Community Arts Councils, and what they are saying is a lot of their time is going to filling out applications for little grants to run their organizations.

We are looking at a mechanism whereby we can consolidate the grants and give them a block grant rather than having them apply time and time again. In fact, we can evaluate at the end of the year whether they have been accountable for the dollars they have been given, and if they have been accountable, then we will provide them with the next year's grant or block funding.

What we are trying to do through this whole process is get rid of these little grant programs that are very costly to administer, and in that way we should be able to get more money into the community's hands to do the projects that they feel are worthwhile.

Ms. Friesen: I understand what the minister is responding with is essentially an administrative issue, the cost of administering relatively small grants on a continuous basis throughout the year.

It seems to me that this particular program had a very special purpose. Its purpose was to, as it says, transfer skills across the province, to bring people into communication with each other across northern, rural, eastern, southern Manitoba at a relatively low cost, to give them the sense that the skills they were developing in one part of the province would be valuable in another, to promote communication, to promote transactions of use and value to both the donor community and the receiver community that went beyond the value of the small grant, that had much more to do with ensuring that Manitobans learned about each other, that they were able to give each other benefit of particular skills developed in one region, that they were able to learn about standards being developed in one region and to presumably emulate those or at least through training programs to imitate some of the standards being developed in different parts of the region.

Its function, it seemed to me, was an important one so I am disappointed to see that it has been reduced. It seems to me to have been reduced at a much greater level than the underspending of last year, for whatever reasons, would necessarily indicate. I wonder if the minister has some comments on that particular function.

I can see that what you are doing is transferring it to the rural community arts councils, but that is not necessarily going to ensure the kind of cross-fertilization that we are looking for, were looking for, in particularly multicultural programs, that sense of not necessarily ghettoizing people but making sure that they are talking to each other and communicating with each other across the province. If you are giving it to the rural arts councils, it is going to remain within there in much the same way as the minister was talking about it, as another small grant to another part of the arts community.

My understanding was that this program was different.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, it might have different in some way, but it is important I think that we get all organizations out in the community working together and sharing resources.

You know we have Regional Services. We have regional offices throughout the province of Manitoba that deal not only with arts councils but with recreation districts, with libraries and with sport

organizations too, that deal with all of the activity out in rural Manitoba.

I guess the challenge ahead of us is to ensure that either through the regional delivery service program or through all of the different arts councils, recreation districts, libraries that we fund out there, that there is a co-ordination and intermixing of the services that are available.

After all, I guess no one organization, whether it be arts or recreation or sport, should be working in isolation of trying to provide an overall benefit to the community. So I think that with amalgamation of funding to the arts councils to enhance their long-term programming, maybe in fact we will encourage more co-operation within the community.

Ms. Frlesen: Obviously we would certainly want to support long-term funding of rural community development, but how do you get the transfer?

Have you not lost that sense, has the minister not lost that sense of the transfer of what is learned for example in the Tiger Hills Arts Association into a new northern community arts organization for example, or the skills that are developed in an area where there might be specialized museums, having them transferred to an area where there are no museums? I mean, that was the point of the program. Has that been lost?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Absolutely not. I think that the reason we fund arts councils with an operating grant is to look at the types of skills that are needed to be brought into the community and in fact through the Arts Council. Those skills can still be brought in. So we are not in fact saying that skills cannot be transferred from one area to another.

What we are saying is, it is the Art Council's responsibility or the recreation district's responsibility to determine what the needs of the community are, based on what the community is telling them, and then bring those skills in to deal with those specific needs.

Ms. Frlesen: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I do not want to belabour this too much longer but essentially what the minister is saying is that the community decides what it needs and then it brings that in.

The purpose of the Skills Transfer program was to say, here are skills we have developed which are good, which we have to offer to other people.

Mrs. Mitchelson: No, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, they were not setting their skills up. What they were

doing was bringing in skills that the community needed for community development to the Skills Transfer program. So the community would apply for funding to bring someone into their community.

Ms. Frlesen: So it had become essentially a Winnipeg program going out to the regions.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Yes, more than anything else.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, maybe if the minister at some point in time could get me a copy of the hospitality grants and the community initiatives, just a list of those who have received it for the last couple of years, not now but some time in the near future.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Sure, no problem.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Okay, we are now dealing with Item 2.(b) Grants to Cultural Organizations, \$4,207,800—pass.

We will move to 6.(a) Grants to Cultural Organizations: 6.(a)(1) Grant Assistance, \$4,928,900—pass; 6.(a)(2) Grant Assistance - Capital, \$2,940,000—pass.

We will now move on to 2.(c) which is connected with 6.(b). It is Cultural Resources and 6.(b) is under Lotteries.

* (2330)

Ms. Frlesen: I want to talk about access and initiatives which provide Manitobans with the opportunity to become involved in cultural activities at the community, regional, provincial and national levels. I wonder if the minister could perhaps provide, essentially on the basis of an annual report, in what ways have the activities of this department expanded the initiatives—which new Manitobans have had access to cultural programs and cultural initiatives? How have you expanded this area?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Are you talking specifically about access to new Canadians?

Ms. Frlesen: No, I am not. What I meant was, what new initiatives have there been which have brought new cultural activities to new—in what way to new groups? For example, have you introduced—no, that is a frivolous example. How have the cultural activities of seniors been expanded? How have the cultural activities of young people been expanded? Have you taken particular types of exhibits to the workplace? Have you involved people in the workplace in cultural initiatives? Has there been the commissioning of new types of works which might

be introduced to schools or to elementary schools? Where are the new initiatives that have brought enhanced opportunities to different groups of Manitobans who did not have it before? As I understand it, that is what this section of the department does. It enhances access.

Mrs. Mitchelson: All right, I think I have—I suppose the arts schools program enhances access to new people, new groups. Festivals are another area of enhancing access. I guess you might go down to the film support, support for our cultural industries, because as we produce Manitoba films and we have access—we even had access to *The Last Winter* on television where all Manitobans had the opportunity to see a Manitoba made film which we are extremely proud of.

You know, I suppose publishing support grants when you have books that are published by Manitobans that are accessed by Manitobans, that is access by new groups or new people to cultural activities. Artists in the schools program.

Ms. Friesen: That is the kind of thing that I meant, Mr. Deputy Chairman.

Mrs. Mitchelson: It took me a while to—

Ms. Friesen: So which of those that you have listed, the arts schools, festivals, film support, publishing support and artists in the schools, which of these are new initiatives? How has the department fulfilled its mandate of expanding access? My assumption is you did all of this last year, 10 years ago, 5 years ago.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Well, I suppose people have had access to festivals, have had access to arts schools programs, but I think that, you know, as audiences increase to some of those venues, you are going to have more access. I think that in the last year, if you want to call *The Last Winter* a successful movie, there has been enhanced access by all Manitobans. All those that chose to watch a made in Manitoba film had that opportunity. So that would certainly be new initiative, new access with dollars that were provided in support.

Ms. Friesen: The Activity Identification that we are looking at says, assists initiatives which provide Manitobans, and I do not see any new initiatives coming from the department. You are certainly continuing with some, although I note that some of the ones that are mentioned here, festivals for example, artists in the schools, some publishing

support and certainly film support has declined as a result of this budget in terms of overall support.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the film support this year, I suppose, is exactly the same, maybe just a slight bit up.

Ms. Friesen: From the provincial?

Mrs. Mitchelson: No, it is the same. Last year the federal government reduced its commitment to half, and this year they are in at the same level as last year. So in fact it is half the commitment they had previously. So it will be two years in a row that it will be reduced from the previous year because of the federal reduction but maintained by the province, and maintained reduced, if I could say that, by the federal government.

Ms. Friesen: Yes, I accept that point, but the areas that you have mentioned, a number of them have been reduced through this budget and there are so far no new initiatives in expanding public access.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I guess this year would not be the year for new initiatives and new expenditures because if we are having difficulty maintaining and enhancing those things that we already fund, I have difficulty trying to determine where we might find the money. I suppose I could ask for some suggestions on where we might take money from in order to fund new initiatives in this area. I would be willing to listen to those suggestions, whether in fact we are funding things that do not need to be funded. What I am saying is that if there are new initiatives, we are going to have to reprioritize from other areas.

Ms. Friesen: The second area that this department looks at is encouraging particularly Francophone, indigenous populations and ethnocultural people to preserve their culture and heritage. I will not deal with ethnocultural, because I think that you have answered the questions on that earlier, but Francophone and indigenous populations, could the minister indicate in what ways the department is encouraging indigenous populations to preserve their culture and heritage? To what extent are they participating in departmental programs?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the public library services a pilot project in Norway House. It is a new initiative, and it is a two-year initiative to expand library services into a northern community, something that has not been in place before. We are pleased to say that we are funding that pilot project again this year.

As I have indicated before, the Northern Recreation Directors pilot project is one area that we are very proud and pleased to have funded. As I said earlier, there are some 23 Northerners who have been trained as recreation directors, part of a Northern Affairs, Department of Education, and Department of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship initiative. Those recreation directors will be going back into their own communities to provide recreational opportunities.

The Oral History Grants Program, there has been a reduction in that program this year, but nonetheless we have refocused it. We finished the review that I talked about in the last set of Estimates, and we are focusing all of the grant allocation to Native communities.

The Sunshine Fund is an area that we support as a grant in our department, and it provides camperships for children whose parents have applied for assistance and have demonstrated need. I guess out of that program approximately 7 percent of the camperships are awarded to Indian and Metis children. I guess those are basically the initiatives within the department that are Native oriented.

* (2340)

Ms. Frlesen: Specifically, the purpose of this section of the department is to preserve culture and heritage, and I am not quite sure in what way the recreation program preserves culture and heritage. I can see tangentially you might argue that the library offers some access to culture and heritage, although it will not be entirely an aboriginal culture and heritage that is provided through those library services. In fact, if it is 7 percent, which is what the Sunshine Fund is offering, I would be surprised.

I am not quite sure that you have really suggested anything, other than the Oral History, which actually preserves culture and heritage, and I do have some question about the Oral History Program. It may preserve some elements of indigenous history, but does it actually give people access to it? I mean, is it being published? Can people go in and listen to the tapes? Are they being sent back to the communities, for example?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I guess I might argue that a recreation program for Northerners is certainly geared toward culture. There are a lot of cultural activities that are going on within communities that are recreational, oriented if we go back to the broad

definition of recreation, so I might argue that a recreation director certainly could be promoting and providing cultural awareness within northern communities.

The specific question was on the oral histories. Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I am told the communities that do sponsor the Oral History Grants program do get the tapes, that the tapes are available through the archives and the communities do publish some of the results.

Ms. Frlesen: Could the minister indicate which communities, how many communities, have published the results of their oral histories?

Mrs. Mitchelson: We can attempt to find that out.

Ms. Frlesen: Okay. The other point the minister made was that the recreational directors could be promoting aboriginal cultural activities. I think that, if you could provide some information on that, I would be interested as well at a later date.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Sure, that is not a problem. They will be promoting cultural activities. I suppose we could get a list of the various different communities and what types of cultural activities might be going on.

Ms. Frlesen: For the Francophone community, what activities are there that are preserving their culture and heritage?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I would imagine that the grant to the French cultural centre, in fact, would be promoting the Francophone culture to a great degree.

I suppose it could indicate that the museum in St. Boniface will be applying for the Heritage Capital Grant program, and certainly that will receive a very favourable response.

We are working with the Franco-Manitoban archives to look at a feasibility study on preserving their archival heritage. We do have an arts development project with Cercle Moliere. We fund the Bureau d'animation theatrale. Through Regional Services I guess we have French libraries that we fund, and they have videos and books for loan which are French books and videos.

Ms. Frlesen: One of the most important elements for the Francophone community is the maintenance of its school system, and I wonder what connection the department has with the Bureau de l'education francaise. What materials are you making available

in French through them or what program development are you involved with, if any?

Mrs. Mitchelson: We are just initiating a three-year project in co-operation with the Manitoba Education to produce a special edukit, Northern Native Lifeways. That is the Native one, that is not Francophone. We are talking Francophone.

Sorry, that is one that we can revert back to, because that is one initiative, the edukit, Northern Native Lifeways aimed at the Grades 3 to 5 curriculum level.

We liaise with the Francophone community on the official language agreement but as far as specifically—

Ms. Frlesen: I just wanted to make the point that there are two agencies in government which are involved with Francophone education. One obviously is the Department of Education but the other is the Department of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship, which has a responsibility or identifies an activity of preserving the culture and heritage of Francophones. I wondered what areas of co-operation, partnership were possible then. What you were looking at for the future?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I guess it is mostly staff consultation, but we do work with the Festival du Voyageur and there is funding provided through Lotteries as a special agreement group to the Festival. The department, we meet with them. Who else do we meet with? With the SFM, normally, to update us on activities and to share information.

Ms. Frlesen: It seems to me that there is a considerable opportunity there for expanding your activities with the Department of Education, in fact, essentially using materials that you already have because a fair amount of the heritage materials has been translated. I am sure that is true for some of the arts materials as well. There may be ways of essentially recycling that material into the schools and making it available more directly and in appropriate formats to Franco-Manitoban schools.

You mentioned arts festivals, and I want to move on to look at performing arts festivals in the context of cultural development. The minister has mentioned before the role of arts festivals in expanding audiences, and I think, certainly in terms of the development of cultural policy, that is the main purpose and function, not the main one, but it is certainly an important function that they do perform.

I wonder if the minister—I am not sure how to phrase this. Is there any intention to transfer arts festivals to another department of government?

* (2350)

Mrs. Mitchelson: I guess the question you might be asking in the context of tourism and—

Ms. Frlesen: Yes, and the DeFehr Report referred to tourism and arts festivals as well. That certainly alerted me to the possibility of some changes.

Mrs. Mitchelson: That certainly has not been in the planning stages or in the works. I think that through the Canada-Manitoba Tourism Development Agreement there were a lot of festivals that were funded through that vehicle. Unfortunately, that money has run out, and the tourism agreement has just about expired. You will see that festivals that depended on that money from the tourism agreement will no longer have it.

I know that the Fringe Festival is one festival that we have increased funding to this year just because we believe it has been very positive for the city of Winnipeg and for the province of Manitoba. It has had a great tourism impact also but, unfortunately, there is no more money there. That was one, I suppose, that you might call a success story of this budget, where we are able to increase and pick up—I do not know if it was all of Tourism's portion, but the major part of it anyway.

Ms. Frlesen: Does the minister have any policy comments or any policy principles that she would like to talk about at this stage on the relationship between tourism and her department and the encouragement and development of festivals? What I am getting at is there is a difference when festivals go entirely to tourism. They then become oriented towards external participation to a different market than, for example, the Fringe Festival originally developed to attract.

When it remains within Culture, Heritage and Citizenship, there is the opportunity and, I think to some extent, the obligation to maintain a sense of the internal market that the festival is for Manitobans; it is for the development of Manitoba artists. I know that you had those kinds of guidelines for the Arts Council, for example, or at least they have developed them. Are there any reflections that you have had over this relationship between tourism and culture on festivals?

Mrs. Mitchelson: I guess probably the situation that we are sort of exposed to, you might say, as the

Department of Culture is a sense that sometimes there has not been a lot of consultation and co-ordination before tourism, through the agreement, gets into funding of a festival. It has left us in a situation where at times there has not been enough support, because we have not been able to provide it as a department.

I do want to say though that I believe that festivals can be a great tourist attraction and a great boon to our province. Not only do we have to think about—I guess the differences in the two departments are the types of staff that we have in the departments.

The Tourism staff is more oriented towards bringing people in and having it generate a revenue and I suppose a sense of pride, but more on the economic side of things in that respect, whereas within the Department of Culture and Heritage we take pride in development of our artists and maintaining the creativity and the artistic component to the festivals. I think there can be a good mix too. We want to have festivals that are of significance that we would attract tourists to. This makes Manitoba a fun place in which to be for Manitobans and for those who want to visit.

I think that somehow co-ordination and co-operation between the two departments with maintaining the artistic side of festivals while developing a component that makes it significant enough to attract tourism is probably where I would like to see us going and where I would like to see us be.

Ms. Frlesen: Well, I am glad the department is maintaining its concern for festivals because there is an important, well, major role in fact I believe, that the department has to play in this. It is artist development, audience development, not simply tourism dollars. If it has the opportunity to develop those as well, fine, but not as the primary purpose. I would be reluctant to see the festivals move to another department.

This department, still looking at (XIV) 2.(c) is also expecting to review the policy and guidelines of the Arts Purchase Program which we have talked about earlier -(interjection)-

I was asking about the policy guidelines for the Arts Purchase Program. I think I suggested last year when this came up that one of the best forms of evaluation of such a program would be public exhibition and the publication of a continuing catalogue. Can you tell me what you are looking at

in terms of policy guidelines? We looked earlier this evening at the kind of committee which you believe is appropriate for selecting arts purchases. What kind of guidelines and policies are you developing for this committee?

Mrs. Mitchelson: This is the first year we have had the program. We were towards the end of the fiscal year and you know that money does not stay there from one year to the next. I think that we wanted to ensure that we supported some artists in the province of Manitoba by purchasing some of their pieces of art. We put a process in place whereby we could do that in a fairly timely manner.

I cannot say forever and a day what the policy will be. We will develop that, and it might be the same type of committee. It worked well and I have no problem with the committee that went out. I think they did a good job, and, as I said, I think, if you talk to the galleries that were out there, you would find that they would be very pleased with the process that was followed in the purchase.

There is a problem, there is a concern in my mind as to the government art collection and the maintenance and the record, the permanent record. It has not just happened over the last couple of years. Many different governments and different administrations I do not think have paid quite enough attention to some of the pieces that we have and a process whereby they are logged in and maybe possibly pictures taken of pieces of art so that there is a permanent record somehow. I know that they are all numbered and catalogued to a certain degree, but I think that there can be more emphasis placed, and that maybe what we want to do is take a look at whether, in fact, we could find help through the university, maybe even in finding students who might, as part of their curriculum activity—you know, I think that we do not want, at this point in time, to be looking at extremely expensive ways, but we have to make a start in some way, and the department and I will be working together to see if we cannot develop something as a result of us having the ability in the department.

Before, we have never had any art purchase program at all. It has all been through Government Services. I think it rightly belongs in the Department of Culture and that since we, over the last year, have taken over a part of the art purchase program, it has made us more aware of the condition that some of our art might be in and the lack of that permanent, public record.

So it is something that we are going to have to develop and try to find some innovative ways of trying to create that log of what we might have and maybe get some photographs of the pieces of art that are part of the collection.

* (0000)

Ms. Friesen: Is there any thought being given to co-ordinating with the Arts Council Art Bank? It is a similar purpose.

Mrs. Mitchelson: We have certainly not taken joint administration over the Arts Council. I know what you are saying though. You are saying is there any way that we could work together on this, whether there are resources that—

Ms. Friesen: For selection purposes, for conservation purposes, you have got the—

Mrs. Mitchelson: Yes, and we have the gallery too. I think that what I need to have is a list of options that might be feasible. We will have to take a look at what the cost implications are and what might best serve our needs, and that is something that will have to be put into process. It is just something that has been brought to top of mind, I suppose, with us having some responsibility for government art purchase.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Are you ready to pass these two?

Ms. Friesen: No, Kevin has some.

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

Mr. Lamoureux: Committee rise.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Oh, let us go another couple of hours. Come on, Kev.

Mr. Lamoureux: No, no.

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

Mr. Lamoureux: Committee rise.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Is it the will of the committee that the committee rise? Agreed? Agreed. Committee rise.

* (2000)

SUPPLY—EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Madam Chairman (Louise Dacquay): Would the Committee of Supply please come to order. This section of the Committee of Supply has been dealing with the Estimates of the Executive Council.

Would the Premier's staff please enter the Chamber.

We are on item 1.(b) Management and Administration: (1) Salaries, \$1,581,500. Shall the item pass?

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Madam Chairperson, in the past the Premier has been prepared to give us a list of his staff. Certainly we got that on October 20, 1990. Will that be made available this evening?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Yes, Madam Chairman, I do have a list. I am prepared to have one for each of the opposition party Leaders.

Mrs. Carstairs: Madam Chairperson, I have a number of questions that I want to ask specifically with regard to some of the functions of members of his staff and particularly of one at the table.

Some time after the Meech Lake Accord was passed, my office received a phone call from Mr. Eldridge in which we were requested to provide a signed photograph of me. I turned down that request because the individual who was to receive the picture was one Norman Spector, and I did not want a picture of myself to, quite frankly, go to an individual who had treated the three Leaders in Ottawa with such disdain. My secretary was told, because we kept notes of the conversation, that it was time to bury the hatchet, and he was being celebrated at a festivity in honour of his new appointment as the principal secretary. However, it was not left at that and subsequently some days later another phone call was made and the request was for an unsigned picture. Again the request was denied.

The point is that we now have pictures on his desk, all three of us, and I would like to know under what authority pictures of the Leader of the second opposition party were sent, quite frankly, to an individual when I made it clear that I did not want such pictures sent.

Mr. Filmon: I am informed that -(interjection)- no, I was not there for the roast—it was not an official government get-together. It was a group of associates who had been involved with Mr. Spector in a variety of roles over the years, who got together in Ottawa, somewhat in jest, to provide him with a roast. In conjunction with the roast it was thought to be somewhat humorous, given the fact that it was well known publicly the disdain that all three of the Manitoba Leaders had for his involvement in the

Meech Lake process, that the photographs be given as part of the roast to him. I understand that the photograph ultimately that was given of the Leader of the Liberal Party was clipped from a newspaper.

Mrs. Carstairs: Madam Chairperson, I would like to know if it is customary for staff of the Premier's to go directly against the instructions given by Leaders when requesting a picture. At any other time I would be more than willing to provide such a picture, but it was very clear I did not want a picture to go in this case, and made it clear. I would like to know why the staff of the Premier would think it was acceptable to countermand the information they were given by phone?

Mr. Filmon: Frankly, the Leader of the Liberal Party has the right to deny a photograph being given, but I do not think she has the right to deny someone the right to clip a newspaper.

Mrs. Carstairs: No, but I do have the right to expect a certain amount of respect from the Premier's staff. When the Premier's staff deliberately goes out of its way to do something in contravention to what I have indicated I would like done, then I do not think, quite frankly, I have been shown the kind of courtesy and respect that one should receive from the Premier's office, and I wonder how other Manitobans are treated by the Premier's Office as a result. If you cannot treat your colleagues in this House with the appropriate form of respect, then how do you deal with the public at large?

Mr. Filmon: I acknowledge that I was not aware of this request nor of the Leader having turned down the request, the Leader of the Liberal Party. I am informed that the staff member involved misunderstood the views of the Leader of the Liberal Party and spoke only to her secretary in the matter and therefore did not get the feeling that it would be impermissible to clip the newspaper and send it as part of the joke on Mr. Spector.

Mrs. Carstairs: Madam Chairperson, but it was very clear through my secretary exactly what my feelings were because she reported both conversations to me and both answers were given to her.

The Premier has obviously gone through a number of staff changes judging by the list in comparison to between October and the present time. He indicated earlier in the afternoon that he had, I think it was three positions that were not filled.

Can he tell us exactly what those positions are that have not been filled?

Mr. Filmon: There is a research officer position in intergovernmental affairs that is vacant. There is a co-ordinator in the Premier's secretariat that is vacant and a secretarial position in the Premier's secretariat. As is the case in these events, there are positions being vacated and positions being filled at any given time and a staff of the complement of the size of 46. I would think that it is fairly normal that there is some transition at all times in these positions.

* (2010)

Mrs. Carstairs: I was informed by the Premier earlier that there were 46 staff persons, there were three not filled, 43 obviously, but the list that he has just given me has 45 names on it. One of them is Mr. Turenne, and I gather that is at the end of April, but presumably there is someone else who has been terminated or is to be terminated who is not on this list.

Mr. Filmon: Libby White was on the first sheet. As the Leader of the third party is aware, we have a double counting with Mr. LaBossiere who is replacing Mr. Turenne, having overlapped by two weeks, so that there could be some transition period.

We have Christina Nowak who is filling in on maternity leave for Sonia Stubler. Again, it is an overlap. When that one is on maternity leave, one is filling the position.

Mrs. Carstairs: Can the Premier tell us what will be the status of Order-in-Council appointments such as these with regard to wage increases? Will they be kept at zero? Are they just to be classified with the Civil Service and whatever classification they hold, they will also get the increase as well as their merit increases? Can the Premier tell us exactly what the status of these staff people will be?

Mr. Filmon: I think it is important to note that much of the staff who are listed in the Executive Council staff listing are nonpolitical, that is traditionally clerical staff, support staff, even positions such as the Deputy Minister of Federal/Provincial Relations have been in place over several administrations. So they are treated in the same respect as would any other civil servant.

I might also say that it has also been traditional that because they work side by side with some who are political appointments, there is not a different

policy in place for the salary relationships with them. They would get whatever increases are called for under an MGEA settlement. Subject to the recommendation of their supervisors, they would be eligible for a merit increment which is sometimes given and sometimes denied.

Mrs. Carstairs: Madam Chairperson, the Finance Minister has indicated that if the settlement is more than the government can cope with—and one assumes that means an average of a maximum of 3 percent—that there will be further layoffs and cuts.

Will that be the position also taken to the staff of the Executive Council?

Mr. Filmon: I think it is fair to say, yes, Madam Chairman.

Madam Chairman: Shall item 1.(b) Management and Administration (1) Salaries—

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): I would like to ask some further questions in this section, if I might.

First of all, I want to put something on the record in responding to the Premier dealing with the whole area of corporate revenues. I think he tried to leave the impression that it was the Pawley administration dealing with the revenue decline. I would note that the '82-83 corporate revenue budget went from \$54 million to, '83-84, \$110 million and kept going correspondingly up quite a bit, up to \$200 million and then down, of course, in this budget. So I just want to get the record straight on that issue.

Madam Chairperson, can I ask the Premier, what is his office's involvement in the Maple Leaf Fund?

Mr. Filmon: None that I am aware of, Madam Chairman.

I also want to say just for the record that the figures I gave about a drop in corporate income tax revenue can be verified from the public accounts of revenues. They will show that in 1981-82 the revenues in corporate income tax were up \$115 million and in 1982-83 they were \$54 million, a drop of some 53 percent under the Pawley administration.

What they do not say—and if he would like to look into the Estimates—is that during that year in which the Pawley administration had revenues of \$54 million in corporate income tax, they had provided for and estimated in their budget \$146 million. So they dropped to literally one-third of what the Finance minister then, Vic Schroeder, estimated

they would be. That was the effect of the recession on the Pawley administration's corporate income tax revenues.

Mr. Doer: Madam Chairperson, I would ask the Premier, the decisions to get in terms of the Immigration Venture program of the federal government, do they not—the joint agreements between the provincial government and the federal government dealing with investments, the federal government investment fund, do they come to the cabinet table, the last agreement that the government had with the federal government, or is it just approved by the minister alone?

Mr. Filmon: I do not want the member taking this out of context. We will have to verify, but I do not recall. I know that we have at least seven Immigrant Investor funds operative in Manitoba. I do not recall them coming to the cabinet table. I believe they are on recommendation of the Minister of Industry, Trade—I am informed by the former Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism, they do not come to the cabinet table. They are not approved formally by the minister. They go on recommendation of senior staff of the Department of Industry, Trade and Tourism to Ottawa.

Mr. Doer: Madam Chairperson, the officials in Ottawa are stating publicly that Manitoba has the worst record for monitoring these agreements. I was wondering whether the Premier, in light of that, in light of the fact the second agreement could be up by the federal government, whether they are changing their policy and are going to take a more active role in this program to ensure the maximum job content, which is part of the federal criteria, is available to the provincial government and to the public of Manitoba?

The government has asked, on the one hand, for a greater role in immigration policy in this country. Part of that immigration policy, as the federal government has it, is the visas for capital program of the Mulroney government, but there are criteria for investments in the province. I was wondering whether the Premier is concerned about—I wrote the Premier about this issue when it became public, asked him to investigate it—whether he has, through his investigation, become concerned, and is he going to change the policy of his own government to ensure that we get the maximum investment in the province on behalf of the people?

* (2020)

Mr. Filmon: With respect to the Immigrant Investor funds, I believe that Manitoba has one of the best records with respect to ensuring that the investments of the immigrant investors are put in secure vehicles and secure investment opportunities. I know of none that have eroded or lost the capital of the investors in Manitoba, and I know that has been a complaint in virtually every other province that has used Immigrant Investor funds.

One of the primary concerns that we have had, because we know full well that if there was any insecurity in the capital invested on behalf of those foreign investors, the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the third party would be the first two to jump up and scream in this Legislature that those investors were being bilked and that they were being dealt with in an underhanded way. There have not been any instances in Manitoba—repeat none—in which to my knowledge there has been an erosion of the capital. That capital has remained secure, because we have been extra careful to ensure that no investments on high-risk items took place.

As a result, they have not been able to place all of their capital in Manitoba, because we have been extremely cautious as to the kinds of investments that we are prepared to allow them to take in Manitoba. So I do not know where he is coming from on this issue. I do not know. He has not quoted any officials in Ottawa. This is some unnamed, unsubstantiated position that he is putting forward, and I suggest to him that the alternative to that is to put out all the money and then really be put into the position of bilking the investors, and we want no part of that. That may be a New Democratic way of operating.

Mr. Doer: The Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Stefanson) has indicated that the complete review of this situation, in light of public concerns that were raised, will be undertaken by the government. Will that review go to cabinet to the Premier, given the fact that he is the Minister responsible for Federal/Provincial Relations, and also the Premier who has been calling for a changed status on immigration policy for the province?

Mr. Filmon: This is not an issue that the minister is investigating because he has any evidence. He has had the kind of political rumour-mongering of New Democrats and Liberals on this issue, and so he is looking into it. It is a matter of relationship between the minister and the government in Ottawa. Since

it was not approved by the cabinet in any respect, the issue did not come to cabinet for approval of these funds. He will investigate and report, I am sure, publicly on what his findings are to see whether there is any shred of truth whatsoever in the political allegations being made by the member for Concordia.

Mr. Doer: Madam Chairperson, I do not want the Premier to get—he uses the term scream, or yell, or whining, and all these other terms. I have only asked for an investigation so I do not want the Premier to -(interjection)- Well, when will the Premier be making the investigation that his minister has undergone, making it public?

Mr. Filmon: This was not called for by me. It was initiated by the minister, and I suggest that the member for Concordia deal with the minister directly. He can ask that question of him either in Question Period any day or in the Estimates as it rightfully falls within his jurisdiction.

I might say he is also luring and misrepresenting what has been said about immigration. We have said that we want more influence on the immigration process as it affects Manitoba and our ability to attract people who have the skills, the knowledge, the training and the experience to help us build our economy in specific sectors. We have said, for instance, that independent immigrants are left out of the mix with respect to today's priorities.

The priorities within the immigration system, as he is well aware, are firstly, refugees, secondly, family reunification and thirdly, immigrant investors, entrepreneurial immigrants. That leaves out a whole category of people, the like of which really built this province in the first two-thirds of this century—people who came here as independent immigrants with skills, knowledge, training and experience that fit the skill shortages in our province and were able to really make a strong contribution to the economic growth of our province. Under current immigration policies that have changed substantially since the days when my father came to this country, the likelihood and the opportunity for an independent immigrant to come here has been lessened dramatically to the extent that it is in our judgment affecting our ability to target immigration to the needs of our growing economy. Consequently, that is the kind of change that we are looking for in a federal-provincial agreement on immigration.

Mr. Doer: Madam Chairman, the Premier today supported a proposal, the Pines proposal, for a seniors' project in Winnipeg west. We had asked the Premier some questions about the advice he was getting from different ministers about this project, because clearly on the public record there are different comments from different ministers at different times on this issue, and that is fair enough.

I would ask the Premier: What did the Department of Highways and Transportation recommend against this project to the cabinet and is there any public report? We asked for a report today, and we were told the process was fine, but we were not told what the recommendation was from (a) Transport Canada, and (b) the provincial government Department of Highways and Transportation. Can the Premier give us some information on this so we can be accurate in our assumptions?

Mr. Filmon: Madam Chairman, I do not have such a report. It is a matter again that should be addressed to the minister responsible.

Mr. Doer: Madam Chairman, I would assume a decision of this nature with public funds, a \$4.75 million loan with a certain amount of cash as part of that, would have a cabinet submission to either the chair of Treasury Board or the Premier of the province to cabinet. I would ask, when did the cabinet make the decision to go ahead with the project?

Mr. Filmon: Madam Chairman, that matter, subject to the approval of funding globally for the Seniors RentalStart project, which would have been approved in last budget, the total amount up until March 31 of this year, the global amount was approved. The project's specific approvals then came forward from the department to Treasury Board and cabinet sometime in late February or early March, and the member identified, I believe two projects, was it Niverville and the Pines, and both of them were put forward by the Department of Housing in submission to cabinet.

Mr. Doer: I would ask the Premier, was there a separate report from the Department of Highways and Transportation, and did that report recommend against the project given the public concerns articulated by the minister on November 19, 1989, and other comments he has made to the federal Minister of Transport? Was that their

recommendation from that department not to proceed with the project?

Mr. Filmon: Not to my knowledge.

* (2030)

Mr. Doer: We move on to the tourism agreement. The tourism agreement is quite a bit less over the next five years than the last five years. I would ask the Premier what was the last tourism agreement, what is this tourism agreement, and what are the implications for Manitoba jobs and Manitoba potential in the tourism industry?

Mr. Filmon: Again I say that the details of the individual agreement and the comparisons ought to be discussed with the minister responsible for Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Stefanson). I will say this, the figures that we have been given consistently when we raised the issue about federal-provincial cost-shared agreements in the economic development round, the figures that the federal government puts forward consistently show that when you lump in Western Diversification with all of the other federal-provincial cost-shared agreements that this five-year period will produce and is producing a greater total dollar commitment spent in Manitoba than previous five-year agreements.

Mr. Doer: The Premier gave us a bit of a passive answer there. What figures that we are given indicate that when we are— (interjection)- It is Norman Spector! It is Norman Spector! It is coming to get us all for our pictures!

I thought it quite hilarious he would honour us in that way after all of our collective comments. However, I want to go on the record, I did give my picture to him, but I thought it was kind of curious that he did not put it on his wall.

I would ask the Premier, what is the specific tourism agreement? I mean, it comes under federal/provincial affairs. It is one of the major (interjection)-

Mr. Filmon: No, no, no. It was signed by the minister

Mr. Doer: I am getting a tough time you know. I tried the feisty way this afternoon and could not get any answers. I am trying the low-key way tonight and cannot get any answers. I asked the number of the break down 15 times, over and in and out, about how many people were laid off outside of the city of Winnipeg, cannot get those answers.

I ask about some of these agreements and they are pretty straightforward. Now I would ask the Premier (Mr. Filmon), he chairs—he takes the oath of office on federal/provincial relations. Now that is not a—you know you take an oath. You are sworn in to do something and federal-provincial agreements have typically been asked to the First Minister. I have gone back even over his statements years ago.

I would ask the First Minister, what was the old tourism agreement? What is the new tourism agreement? How much are we down on what we had, and what we are getting from the federal government?

Mr. Filmon: With respect—and I do not want to cause any fireworks here—but the line that we are dealing with is Management and Administration of Executive Council. No one within that area has been involved with either the negotiation or signing of any of the agreements that he is talking about. That is why I say, he ought to be raising that with the administration and the ministers who were involved in those negotiations and those agreements.

I repeat for him, on the global sense the figures that Ottawa consistently produces are that they are putting more money into our province in cost-shared spending, when you take into account WDO and all of the other things that they have together, than they were in this five-year block that began last year than they were in the previous five-year block. So the money is in different areas. Most of it is being delivered through WDO.

We in fact had funding for tourism at The Forks. We had funding for Oak Hammock Marsh. We had funding for Keystone Centre. All come through WDO that in the past would have come through Tourism, would have come through forestry agreements, would have come through other agreements.

They are now, because in all likelihood I believe that they feel they get a better profile, better recognition when it comes through WDO. So they have globally funneled all of those things through WDO. That is why the money, in their figures, is greater than it was before, but obviously they feel they are getting a greater profile by having it come through WDO. Even such things as the recent agreement of training at Portage la Prairie, funding of that nature is all coming through WDO that in the past would have come through all sorts of other

arms of government, training agreements and all those sorts of things.

So it is a question of how they have chosen to deliver in order to get the profile that they want. For my perspective I cannot quarrel with them asking for a profile. I just want the money spent here.

Mr. Doer: Madam Chairperson, maybe we have had the best admission in the Premier's sets of Estimates in some time: No one in my office has been involved in negotiating these agreements with Ottawa.

This is exactly the point we have been raising for the last three years. That is exactly the point we have been raising for a number of years, that nobody—the Premier is not taking responsibility for these negotiations and going head of government to head of government in terms of getting results in the province. The tourism agreement, as the Premier knows, is about one-tenth of what the old tourism agreement is on an annual basis. We do not have the numbers from the Premier so we will have to continue on with our own material.

I would point out to the Premier that he is the one who has said that the federal government is giving us flat increases of money, and then we read a Conservative pamphlet after the federal budget and it says we are giving you 3.7 percent money. Then we get the Premier, when we ask questions in the House, saying we are getting no money from the federal government. In fact, the education announcement to the university said flat money from the federal government.

Then when we come back again and ask a question on tourism and economic development, he gives us the Western Diversification numbers, the federal numbers. I was not asking for the federal numbers, I was asking for the Premier's numbers and so -(interjection)- you know, every time I ask a question that has some detail to it, I get this minister, that minister, the budget. I know the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) knows this, but this is the chief executive officer of the government. When we have problems going to one department or another, or one line to another, that is where we come, right to there, right to the Premier. I think that is appropriate. -(interjection)- That is right, that is why we asked the Premier how many—

Mr. Filmon: I do not have the detail of his Estimates.

Mr. Doer: I am assuming you had the detail when you made the decisions on the cutbacks and layoffs this afternoon when I asked you. I am assuming that you had that detail before you made—

Mr. Fillmon: We did and we had all 23 departments in front of us at Treasury Board—

Mr. Doer: That is right.

Mr. Fillmon: It is not just on my expenditures here. You know that.

Mr. Doer: I know that, and I also know you made the decisions.

Mr. Fillmon: Do not play games.

Mr. Doer: I am not playing—

Mr. Fillmon: You are playing games.

Mr. Doer: It is not—Madam Chairperson, if you could tell me how many positions out of 400 permanent Civil Service positions are outside of the city of Winnipeg—

Mr. Fillmon: I told you that.

Mr. Doer: I know you know how many of those other positions are outside of the city of Winnipeg. All I want to know is the numbers and where they are.

Mr. Fillmon: That is somebody else's Estimates . . .

Mr. Doer: Oh, okay, here we go again. You know, if I wait to go to the Department of Rural Development, I could tell you I will wait a long time when asking the Deputy Premier, the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Downey) for an answer to a question. I have to admit at least the Premier gives us the odd answer to an odd question. The Deputy Premier—I would be here until the cows come home, if he pardons the expression.

I would never find—have you ever heard the Deputy Premier answer a question? -(interjection)- No, okay. I mean, I cannot imagine being shunted off to the Deputy Premier, the Minister of Rural Development, the co-chair of the election planning committee, the Minister of Northern and Native Affairs—what else has he got?—the minister responsible for decentralization, the man -(interjection)- I am not saying anything negative, I just do not get any answers from him.

An Honourable Member: A heartbeat away.

Mr. Doer: A heartbeat away, as Lyndon Baines Johnson once said, very prophetically unfortunately.

I guess I cannot get the answer to the tourism questions -(interjection)- I got the answer on forestry. It was pretty similar to the last agreement. I already acknowledged that in my questions. We will just keep trying to get those numbers.

I would ask the Premier, to whom did the government and the Premier award the tourism advertising agreements, and when approximately were they awarded?

Mr. Fillmon: Madam Chairman, we are going from the ridiculous to the sublime. I do not know who the department gave those tourism awards to, for heaven's sake. That is in the Department of Industry—if I did get involved in those, he would be the first one to jump all over me telling me I was making a political decision on it. That is why there are ministers in departments to do that, for heaven's sake.

Getting back to the tourism federal-provincial cost-shared agreement, nominally the old agreement was for \$30 million cost-shared. The new agreement is to be for \$10 million cost-shared but, as I said, all things have changed because now we are having the Keystone Centre expansion federal money come out of WDO instead of out of the tourism agreement. The work of the federal government funding at The Forks instead of coming out of Tourism is coming out of WDO. The Ducks Unlimited facility for the interpretive centre normally should have come out of the tourism agreement, but it is coming out of WDO. The way they are handling it is for their own political purposes to get a profile. Much of the money that formerly would have come under the Canada-Manitoba Tourism Agreement is coming out of WDO. So the two are not comparable any longer because they use WDO as a supplement for all federal-provincial project funding.

* (2040)

I might tell him that when you look at some of these ERDA packages, much of the packages were inflated by the former federal government to try and make the numbers look bigger. For instance, the transportation agreement was almost all federal airport maintenance and expansion, which would have happened in any case, so close to \$100 million was brought in under a so-called federal-provincial ERDA agreement that the federal government was responsible for in any case. You know, these are very difficult.

The only thing you can do is come up with a comparison of how much money was spent in this five-year period versus this five-year period, and any figures that I have seen from Ottawa indicate that more money is being spent in this five-year period than was spent in the previous five-year period.

Mr. Doer: I am a little surprised because I would have thought the tourism advertising agreements, which were very major expenditures, would go to cabinet. Is the Premier telling me that those decisions do not go to cabinet?

Mr. Filmon: Normally, they do. In this case, they were just a reappointment of the former agencies.

Mr. Doer: If tourism is down considerably, as it is this year, and some of that is a cross-Canada phenomenon, does the Premier feel, in approving the former agency of record, that we are getting sufficient benefit for our tax dollars? With the bottom line numbers that are evolving this year, it seems to us that we may have to re-evaluate.

In fact, numbers in his own statistical reports indicate a very massive decline. I think the member for Crescentwood (Mr. Carr) did mention 19 percent, which I think was fairly consistent with our analysis from Tourism Winnipeg, I believe, annual report. So I would ask the Premier -(interjection)- StatsCan, and there are some other reports from Tourism Winnipeg, so I would ask the Premier whether there is any evaluation of the advertising contract based on results?

Mr. Filmon: Yes, Madam Chairman.

Mr. Doer: There have been written publications and there has also been the Chamber of Commerce brief that says recently that Manitoba's per capita numbers, public employees in 1990 from the federal government, was last in Canada, and there are other reports from StatsCan that indicate the majority of loss of public jobs, close to 5,000, took place in the three years that this government was in office.

Is the provincial government worried about its loss of federal jobs in relationship to the rest of the country, and what does the Premier do about that in terms of the strategic considerations of that? I mean, we know that many of the jobs are going to other western Canadian communities, for example—

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): Stettler.

Mr. Doer: Stettler. That is a good example. I was not going to mention that one; Stettler is one—thanks, Harry. Did you want to come over here and give me some more questions? You are going to get your Ducks Unlimited building cut off, Harry, if you do not watch out—the military bases, et cetera, but the Chamber of Commerce now is going around saying we are last in Canada.

What is the Premier's counterstrategy to deal with that reality?

Mr. Filmon: Madam Chairman, I do not accept the musings of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) with respect to the numbers that he claims that he recalls. I do not accept that.

I will say this, that when I went in August of 1989 to visit with the Prime Minister to protest specifically reductions in both Kapyong Barracks and Portage la Prairie, I was criticized by both opposition parties saying I should have gone and talked to him about other issues and that these were not the things, the priorities and so on. Now he is raising them. I did speak with the Prime Minister.

I might say that none of the moves have taken place with respect to Kapyong that were originally in that budget. With respect to Portage, Portage la Prairie was designated by the federal government as the site specific location for its request for proposals for training, for externalizing its training of flying in the armed forces, with a whole host of other initiatives at Portage aerospace centre taking place.

There is a great deal of optimism that job for job they will be very close to the original complement when they get all of the various elements of the package together. In fact, the long term may provide for even more jobs depending on the infrastructure for training that is set up there. So we have been working to counteract them.

I might tell him that I do not know where he gets his figures from, because when the cuts were taking place across the country in CBC, we fared better than all of the other prairie provinces. They lost substantially more jobs than we did. When the cuts were taking place for Air Canada, we fared better than virtually any other region in the country. The losses here were minimal, I think, down under 25, and other provinces the losses in Air Canada jobs were in the hundreds. So I really would have to question his figures. Unless he can show me some concrete evidence, I have difficulty accepting them.

Mr. Doer: I would refer the Premier to the data in the most recent Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce brief and other analysis from Statistics Canada that show the decline.

An Honourable Member: In every province? There are fewer public servants right across the country.

Mr. Doer: That is right. There is. There is no question about that. We are talking about the decline per capita per province, and where we are now is last per capita in Canada.

A further question to the Premier, the position paper that the government is taking to the Western Premiers' meeting. Last year we saw a press release issued by the Premier and the other Premiers of western Canada. Then we saw a number of documents released publicly and some released privately that came out. I would say that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) did release a supplementary report. I want to make that very clear. It was not something that leaked out. The Minister of Finance made that public.

There is—I think the Premier would acknowledge—a difference of opinion between the Provinces of British Columbia and Alberta where they are going on health care and post-secondary education, and where Manitoba is going. So I would ask the Premier, does he see a difference?

We now have the Minister of Health in Alberta talking about different rates for seniors in Alberta, most recently another paper that has just been released in Alberta. Does he see the western provinces on health care and post-secondary education as a homogeneous group in terms of their position, or does he see them as we see them—and maybe we are wrong, we are not in the meetings—but based on the information we see, is a diverse group where Manitoba and Saskatchewan have obviously got a different set of realities and traditionally have had a different set of values and principles than the other two western provinces.

Mr. Fillmon: I might say that I am informed by my senior staff, who helped my predecessor prepare for these conferences, that I will have a briefing book with a myriad of tabs and briefings on perhaps 25 or 30 current issues that will likely come up for discussion at that meeting.

As in the past, we will have a preconference news conference, issue a news release listing various topics of concern to us, and we will carry on exactly

the same as has been done previously, not only by this administration, but by previous administrations. During the course of that Western Premiers' Conference various reports may well be tabled by other ministers who have been working in committees of ministers on issues, and if there is any update, for instance, on the Finance minister's report, that would be the time when we would receive it, and we will respond appropriately.

* (2050)

I will say to him very straightforwardly that it is unlikely we are going to have a homogeneous or a consensus position on the financial issues because we do have very, very different perspectives. Two of our provinces, Saskatchewan and ourselves, are recipient provinces in equalization. Our concerns are for instance that in Manitoba this year, as a result of those caps that have been placed on equalization transfers from Ottawa, we have \$121 million less than we would have without the cap. That is a massive, massive problem for us.

As I said earlier, we have a \$32 million cut in cash transfers under EPF, year upon year from Ottawa—(interjection)—pardon?

Mr. James Carr (Crescentwood): \$100 million more in equalization.

Mr. Fillmon: Well, the member for Crescentwood (Mr. Carr) is saying \$100 million more—

Mr. Carr: Than last year.

Mr. Fillmon: —than last year, but the fact is it is still \$121 million less than the formula would produce for us, had it not been successively capped by both the Trudeau administration and the Mulroney administration. That began in 1982, and it is of serious concern to us. It strikes at the heart of unity issues in this country, and I believe that the Prime Minister was right when he said that all of these various matters, the equalization, the transfer payments for health and post-secondary education, were part of the essential fabric of this country. He was right when he said that, but he was wrong when fiscally he allowed his Finance minister to tear apart that fabric by limiting transfers and reducing transfers from the federal government to the provinces.

We, as a recipient province, of course, in equalization, feel it more, because there is not only capped, there is not only EPF, but there is also equalization for us. There are three ways in which we can be damaged by the current federal policies.

They are very damaging to us, and I can say that should our colleagues in the West support us in fighting those cuts in EPF transfers, in fighting those limitations in equalization transferred to us, then we will have some things that we can agree on. If all they want to talk about is user fees, if all they want to talk about is provinces funding health care and post-secondary education, obviously we will not have anything upon which to agree.

Mr. Doer: Yes, in the provincial budget tabled by his government, it stated clearly that on May 13 or 14, the western Premiers would be reviewing an update of the Finance ministers' meetings dealing with those matters that were discussed at the last western Premiers' meeting, not the annual meeting but the special meeting at Lloydminster. I would ask the Premier: Has he received the update from the Finance ministers and when will it be received by the ministers? I am sure it will be prepared before the First Ministers' meeting. Will it be made public prior to the Premier going to that meeting in Nipawin, Saskatchewan?

Mr. Filmon: Firstly, I have not received a copy of that update, and secondly, I honestly do not anticipate that we will get it prior to the meeting. I believe it will be presented at the meeting. That was the case in Lloydminster as he may recall, that the report was presented and updated there. In fact, the report was presented in draft form and the Finance ministers hurriedly appended four or five points that were added to the end of it that were recommendations. It initially was presented to us without recommendation, just sort of as a synthesis of all of the information that made the case about federal offloading, federal limitations of transfers and all of the problems in federal-provincial financial and fiscal arrangements.

Those four recommendations that were hurriedly appended to it within a matter of hours while the western Premiers were meeting were probably what generated most of the heat and most of the controversy, and probably were inappropriately presented, I might say. That is why we have the dilemma and the debate that we do have over it.

Mr. Doer: Obviously, all of us are working for renewed federalism in our country. All of us want to see our country stay together, and all of us are going to do everything we can—we have in the past and we will in the future—to prepare for a successful, I guess, next 30 months. I know we are all waiting for the Manitoba task force report, and I know we have

heard from Manitobans at those public hearings, but I would ask the Premier—things may change radically in this country in the next few years. We may see Quebec leave. We may even see other regional blocs look at contingencies of where they are going in the future.

The Pacific Rim provinces, the Pacific area is looking at contingency plans of what their status would be in a renewed federalism. Does the Premier have any—is his office doing any work on all of the doomsday scenarios that none of us want to face; is the government doing any work on any of the possible scenarios that may develop if the worst-case scenario develops? Are we doing work so that when that day comes, we will be able to debate the options for Manitoba in a very public way?

Mr. Filmon: I think the first thing that should be said is that all of us ought to keep our sights focused and our intent focused on the opportunities and the desire to see Quebec and all parts of the country remain within our constitutional family. I might say, I probably share the thought with others in this Chamber that, you know, with these constitutional evaluations that are going on, there is growing unease, there is growing irritation in other areas of the country.

I have been in British Columbia in the last six months and, like others, they have a different perspective of this country. I do not know what it is about the mountains, but they almost have a separatist mentality of a different sort, and they are gearing so much of their working to the Pacific Rim, to that Pacific-Northwest relationship, and all sorts of economic and trade arrangements and so on, and you have a lot of this going on in the country. You have the talk in the Maritime provinces about that.

We believe that it is not productive to be seriously studying or looking at alternatives to Canada, to federalism. I believe that this country has so much more to offer than any other possible alternative, that I would consider the prospect of other arrangements as being a doomsday scenario, because it really does contemplate the breakup of a magnificent nation.

So, consequently, our efforts and those of my staff—I mean, their support to the task force in the federal/provincial relations area were providing support, backup, research, numbers, all sorts of things for the task force, and at the same time we

are trying to, through this process, ensure that we have a positive view of the future of this country and that we come to the table with the desire to realistically come up with an answer as to what do Manitobans want in Confederation, what are the things we are prepared to discuss, and what are the things that we believe are principal priorities of a renewed federalism in this country?

* (2100)

Sure, I have sat and talked with senior staff who I think are knowledgeable from their years of experience in dealing with these things, who have good contacts, I might say, with senior staff in Quebec and other areas of the country. We talk with them about, what if, what if, what if. We go through all of the mental gyrations, but at this point we are going to be putting all of our efforts in the next 24 to 30 months into an effort to try and be a positive player in seeking a constitutional renewal and a renewed federalism that allows all parts of the country to be productive and to look positively at federalism and at being part of this great country, and that is really what we are attempting to do as our first and foremost responsibility.

Mr. Doer: I am pleased to hear that, and I would join with the Premier in stating that all Manitobans want all our energy to be faced with the task at hand. I do know that people in other governments in Canada—underneath the public surface, there is a lot more talk and work going on about “what if” than the public probably realizes. I know that all of us will put all our efforts into Canada, but most Canadians now make the assumption that if things fail, the doomsday scenario takes place, it is a nine-one proposition, nine provinces being a part of Canada and one province being out of it. I do not think, unfortunately, we can assume anything. I would agree with the Premier that all our efforts should be addressing a positive resolution of this situation.

Finally, I have one other question on the federal/provincial relations as it relates to the future goal of the Constitution. The Premier in 1988 expressed concerns about aboriginal self-government and the fact that it was, in his opinion, undefined. I was wondering, Madam Chairperson—we have been on committees, public forums, and all of us went through a lot in the Meech Lake process—whether that is still the position of the Premier, the 1988 position he took, or whether we have as a government and opposition and all opposition parties moved beyond that point in terms

of our ability to reach out to Canada's first peoples on that very important fundamental issue.

Mr. Filmon: My position has not changed in respect to support for the principle of aboriginal self-government. I believe that over a period of time we will see devolution of further and further authorities into the hands of the aboriginal people so that they will indeed have control over many of the decisions that affect their lives. I still have not seen a definition of self-government that puts into focus what is the entire concept, and I believe that there would be considerable difficulty with respect to accepting self-government as an undefined concept and then trying to work out the definition sort of on the go.

I just cannot imagine how constitutionally something of that nature, of that magnitude, in terms of the effect on the future of this nation of ours, could be just simply accepted without any particular definition, without knowing whether this is a third order of government—if so, how does it fit in with the other orders of government—a fourth order of government, I suppose, when you consider municipal? How does it fit in with the other orders of government? How do you constitutionally divide its authorities and responsibilities when you have not even defined where it fits in terms of an order of government? I have great difficulty with that.

With respect to the overall objective of putting more authority, more responsibility into the hands of our aboriginal people to manage the affairs within their control and jurisdiction, absolutely I think that is the way to go. We are seeing, I think, some very positive results of that already happening, and I think we ought to work very seriously to have more of that happen.

As a government, I think a number of the agreements that we have entered into with respect to their authority and control over gaming, with respect to their involvement in new development of programming for their people, you know, northern Native education, nursing education and that sort of thing—there are many, many areas in which authority, co-management of wildlife resources—many things that we are doing that lead to that inevitably, so the concept, the principle, is correct.

The definition, it seems to me, is impossible to be accepted unless we have had some discussion on that, and I think a lot more discussion has to take

place, probably among First Ministers and with our aboriginal leadership in this country.

Mr. Carr: Madam Chairperson, as the Premier knows, there is a myriad of constitutional task forces and commissions currently trying to plumb public opinion in the country. There is the Allaire report, Belanger-Campeau in Quebec, the task force in Manitoba. There is one in New Brunswick; there is one in Ontario; there is one in Alberta; there is one in B.C.; there is a Joint Senate Commons Committee on the Amending Formula. Did I mention the Spicer commission?

Eventually, there is going to have to be some co-ordination of all that governments and their delegates are hearing, but I am interested in knowing if the Premier's staff in Federal/Provincial Relations have had any discussions with the the committee of deputy ministers we hear about and read about, if there has been any formal or informal contact with the government of Manitoba from this committee of deputies in Ottawa, and if so, what is the nature of the contact?

Mr. Fillmon: Some of our senior staff had some informal discussions when that committee was about to begin its work. They talked informally about ideas. There have been ongoing contacts, but no formal reports from them, no formal sharing of information as to any directions that they are heading. As we try to do on an ongoing basis, there are ongoing contacts between our senior staff and senior staff of the various administrations provincially and federally in this country. We keep in touch, but we cannot report on any formal knowledge that we may have of the process or where it is heading.

Mr. Carr: Madam Chair, can the Premier tell us at what level the contact was made in Ottawa? Was it from the Prime Minister's Office, and if so, what were at least the subjects of conversation? What is the position of the Premier's Office in participating in any formal or informal committee of deputy ministers that has been established by the Prime Minister at a time when so many other constitutional task forces are doing this work?

Mr. Fillmon: Because it has not been done on a formal basis, I think it is only fair to say that these are senior level people who are having discussions with our senior level people, informally. I do not think it goes beyond the sharing of information that has already been in the news media.

Mr. Carr: The Premier says senior levels. Is that the Prime Minister's Office? Has the initiative come from the Prime Minister's Office itself?

An Honourable Member: Privy Council Office.

Mr. Carr: Privy Council Office. Can the Premier share with us a sense of what the agenda might be of discussions between those senior officials from the Privy Council Office and the Premier's own officials here?

Mr. Fillmon: I would say that even to use the word "agenda" puts more into the discussions than are really taking place. It is no different than you talking to friends and contacts in Ottawa to say what is happening and that is the level of discussion.

*(2110)

Mr. Carr: Is there any plan that the Premier knows about to move these informal talks along? Is there a sense that contact between the two governments will increase towards the summer or is it haphazard and ad hoc without any objective in mind that is discernible to the Premier and his staff?

Mr. Fillmon: It is my understanding that the federal government is not prepared to formalize anything. Any discussion we have is like pulling teeth. Nobody there is interested in really sharing very much, and so I suppose we try and verify whether or not anything we read about or hear in the media is accurate and that is about the extent of it.

Mr. Carr: Is the Premier staying in touch with other Premiers? In particular, we would be interested in knowing if he is maintaining contact with politicians from the Province of Quebec in order to maintain some continuing contact?

Very often we are misguided by myths and perceptions between provinces in the country and certainly any informal contact at the highest level would be encouraged. Can the Premier report on any conversations or pattern of conversations he has had with other First Ministers on the Constitution?

Mr. Fillmon: I think the member for Crescentwood knows better than for me to report on conversations I am having with other First Ministers. The way that I can maintain a sense of trust and a good relationship is not to report on those discussions but carry them on as a basis of keeping informed on their points of view.

I do attempt to keep in touch with other Premiers and would say that I have had a number of

discussions with the Premier of Newfoundland over the course of the last few months. I have talked with the Premier of New Brunswick and a couple of meetings in the last six months with the Premier of Ontario, conversations from time to time with some of my western colleagues either in preparation for meetings or in conjunction with my trips out there.

I have not regrettably talked in recent months with the Premier of Quebec, but I know that senior officials from my Executive Council have been in touch on an ongoing basis periodically to try and just talk about the mood in that province and relationships that are going to be needed to be in good repair whenever we get down to the table for further discussions.

Mr. Carr: Is the subject of the Constitution expected to come up at the Western Premiers' meeting in two weeks time and, if so, is the Premier taking a position with him?

Mr. Filmon: Yes. The subject is on the agenda. It is one of three agenda items and, obviously, the position I am going to take is to report on the progress to date of our Constitutional Task Force. I appreciate the efforts of the member for Crescentwood (Mr. Carr), and I would hope that all of us can share what we are hearing through our task forces and from that perhaps at least have an understanding of what the topical issues and concerns in the four western provinces are. That will be the position that I will share with them, what is happening in the task force.

Mrs. Carstairs: We have obviously decided to have a very free-wheeling discussion. We have gone from line to line, so I have a number of questions that I would like to ask in a more philosophical vein. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) touched on the Maple Leaf Fund. I would like to touch more on the whole concept of entrepreneurial immigrant funds, and I would like to ask the Premier what kinds of guidelines does he believe those kinds of entrepreneurial funds should have? What kinds of things is he hoping they will bring to the province of Manitoba?

Mr. Filmon: There are two areas that I would hope that we have some positive—I suppose three things. One is that I would hope that ultimately it interests some entrepreneurs in coming to our province for the purposes of making investments, creating jobs, helping our economy grow.

Secondly, I would hope that the capital that is brought to our province by virtue of Immigrant Investor funds is invested in positive economic development opportunities, ones that provide facilities and/or businesses and industries that can add to our business infrastructure in this province.

Finally, I would hope that the Immigrant Investor funds would as well result in our being recognized as a good place in which to invest and, therefore, create not only stability and security for the investment and the investor, but opportunity for economic growth. I would say that, in terms of our own objectives of the kinds of things that we talk about with respect to economic opportunities, we want to be assured first and foremost that they choose potential investments that are secure investments, not high-risk investments that may result in the fund collapsing or the investor losing their capital, because that, to my way of thinking is a very negative view of the province and indeed the Immigrant Investor funded operations.

It has happened in other provinces and we have been very, very reluctant—I recall when the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs) criticized us for not getting enough of these funds in here. One of the reasons is we have been very selective. We have not encouraged people to set up Immigrant Investor funds if we felt there was any sense that there was risk involved or that they were trying to attract funds for ventures that they could not, in the ordinary sense, convince local investors to do because they were too much of a high flyer.

We have not been unhappy that on a so-called share basis we have not had as much as others, because we do not want to encourage that kind of thing. It gives provinces a black eye; I think it gives the whole Immigrant Investor fund system a black eye, and I am very happy that has not happened here.

Secondly, when we talked with those who are running the funds—and regardless of whether you like these people or not, you know there are people who I think are highly respected as business people in this province, who are involved in those funds, whether it be Jack Levit of Lakeview corporation, whether it be David Richardson or others. When I have had an opportunity to express views, either directly or indirectly through the department, I have said, we want this to be good investment. We want this to be positive, economic development initiative for the province.

As a result, the kinds of things that they have invested in, and I did not bring with me all the summary on the Immigrant Investor funds, but I recall for instance that Maple Leaf Fund has invested in an expansion at Pollard Banknote. They have invested in an expansion of Chip and Pepper outerwear, which is a very aggressive young firm. I mean, you just look at all the young people these days on the beaches and in the streets in the summertime. They are all wearing Chip and Pepper and they have now gone, as I understand it, to Hong Kong to manufacture a line of shoe wear, of running shoes and tennis shoes, that sort of thing, in the Chip and Pepper line. They now are expanding in markets dramatically in the United States, mostly because of the Immigrant Investor fund expansion. I think those are positive things.

In addition to that, there have been a number of hotels. The Radisson executive centre, the Country Inns, both near the airport at Gimli and one that is possibly going to be done at Grand Beach, are all by virtue of Immigrant Investor funds. Now hotels are pretty major generators of employment. They may be McJobs, as the member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) says in his judgment, but the numbers of people who work in a hotel are pretty impressive in terms of employment figures. We have four or five hotels, fairly significant-sized hotels, courtesy of Immigrant Investor funds.

* (2120)

So under those circumstances, I think that they are finding investments that do meet our test of job creation and economic investment in our province. I have been very carefully watching this from a distance because we do not have direct control, but certainly I am giving the Liberal Leader (Mrs. Carstairs) the advice that I am given when asked about what kinds of investment I think they ought to seek out in order to ensure that there are some real economic benefits to our province as a result of these funds coming.

Finally, of course, I also share with them my desire to see the immigrants themselves encouraged to stay here, to settle here, and not just put the money here for the purpose of getting a visa and then perhaps locating somewhere else in the country.

So all of those things are part of the discussions that I have put forward on those funds.

Mrs. Carstairs: Madam Chairperson, there was one glaring absence from the list that the Premier

submitted, and it has in fact been the basis in theory of why many of the entrepreneurial funds were established, and that is the whole investment in research and development. We have, indeed, seen a lot of investment in real estate, and we have seen monies going into the development of things like car washes, which are the employers of one or two people per unit. We have not seen from these entrepreneurial funds, regrettably, R&D investment in our health industry, our aerospace industry, our agriculture industry and our high-tech industry, and I think that is, indeed, a glaring error.

I know that the province has been consulted when these funds have been established. Certainly, the Maple Leaf Fund clearly has as one of its components the investment of R&D, but we cannot find any investment in R&D in any of the monies that they have spent to date.

I wonder what the Premier is going to do to ensure that those kinds of funds in Manitoba are spent on research and development in that we are doing very little of it at any level of government. It is certainly high on the list of projects for Winnipeg 2000 in terms of what is essential for our economic development into the future.

Mr. Filmon: Well, I have to disagree with the Leader of the Liberal Party on this one because all of the information that we have in an economic development sense is that R&D is basically a high risk investment. In fact, it is incompatible with assured, secure investment that will protect the capital of the investor.

I mean, we only need to look at the SRTC program that the federal Liberal government brought in, which was probably the biggest disaster in recent time in trying to give incentive to people to invest in the highest risk area of economic development. That is what got us into this turning-wood-into-sugar facility in Morris and all of those absolutely way out, wild and woolly schemes that essentially just dumped down the toilet the hard-earned funds of many, many investors in this country.

I would not want that to be the kind of welcome mat that we put out to an immigrant wanting to get started in this country, to say we are going to take your money and put it into the most high risk ventures that the ordinary Canadian would not put his money into. I am afraid that is what R&D, as the principal vehicle or one of the principal vehicles of this fund, would do. I have never been one who has

pushed that because of that very reason, that we would end up with egg all over our face, a black eye and some very, very unhappy new immigrants.

Mrs. Carstairs: Madam Chairperson, but when a prospectus is in fact distributed to investors and part of that says very clearly that the monies will be used for R&D, then does this Premier not think that, as a province, we have a responsibility to ensure that some of those monies are indeed used for R&D? Further, do we not have a responsibility to direct that R&D into areas that have already been clearly defined as potential growth industries in the province of Manitoba of a high-tech nature? I indicated what some of them were: health industries, agricultural research projects, the aerospace industry.

If we are going to have these funds, and if they are going to, in fact, go to Hong Kong and say, this is where we are going to put our money, this is the kind of fund we have and that X percentage of it is going to go into R&D, do we not have a responsibility to make sure that some of it goes into R&D?

Mr. Fillmon: I am not certain what the member is referring to. I have not seen a prospectus such as she is referring to, but I do say this, that it really is not compatible with the requirement on the funds that the capital be secured for a five-year period. If there is erosion of capital, then the fund becomes deficient, and there is a serious problem for the operators of the fund.

Areas like new health care related research would have a long payback, if ever. I mean, people have to invest millions of dollars. All you have to do is look at what pharmaceutical companies do. I mean, they grind through 100 different ideas in hopes of finding one combination that is going to be a good combination. The fact of the matter is that it just is not compatible, so I do not know how that fits in with this.

I am telling the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs) what our objectives are, what our very, very serious reservations are and, therefore, why the kinds of investments that have been made in Manitoba have been made in Manitoba, for security of capital, for job creation and for economic development that is going to have a long-term employment benefit to us—all of which are in the interests of the investor and in the interest of the province.

Mrs. Carstairs: Madam Chairperson, but I think that most people who have serious investments in downtown property in the city of Winnipeg know that their capital is not secure. Much of that property has been severely devalued because the resale potential, at the present moment, is simply not there; and if we can say that these are well-secured investments for a three-to-five-year period, and it depends on the particular fund as to whether it is three or five years, I think we certainly can see some investment in R&D.

The question is that if we are not going to look to this fund for some research and development in the province of Manitoba, and there is nothing in the budget for research and development of any consequence, then where is the money going to come from in the province of Manitoba for the research and development that we all pay lip service as necessary if we are going to go into the 21st Century?

Mr. Fillmon: I want to make two points. Firstly, Madam Chairman, the funds have to secure the value over a five-year period, and obviously that takes into account that there may be recessions. If you ask virtually anybody as to what kinds of investment should have a likely prospect of maintaining their capital value over a five-year period, real estate may go through cycles but real estate presumably has one of the better track records for maintaining over a longer period of time. If you have to sell it overnight in a recession time, yes, you would be faced with some difficulty. But this is not the case of these funds which are to maintain their capital for a five-year period and that is why these kinds of investments are indeed approved by many, many people as an appropriate investment.

* (2130)

I take by far the security of an investment in downtown real estate than I would in an R&D project when the chances are about 10 percent that you will maintain your capital on an R&D project that is basically a high flyer risk of taking a chance that you may find something that has some commercial value, entirely different from downtown real estate. I do not buy what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) is saying. We are investing as a result of this budget the \$10 million proceeds from the sale of Manitoba Data Services into the area of technology development with respect to computer related and other areas of high technology development in

Manitoba. That is one element of the budget that will provide certainly some funding for that area.

Mrs. Carstairs: With the greatest respect to the Premier, we do not know exactly what is going to happen to that sale because we do not exactly know what the ramifications of the merger with IBM is going to have and what impact that might have on our needing to look at using our options in that particular contract. I am not suggesting that the entrepreneurial funds would even have a potential to raise money if every single cent of it went into R&D. People who look at a portfolio of investment look at a portfolio which covers a number of areas. One of them happens to be real estate, but there is no reason why we cannot make a section of that fund earmarked for research and development.

In fact that is exactly what the Maple Leaf Fund says it is going to do. They have not put any money into R&D, but that is what they went to the investor initially and said they would do, that they would be investing some money in some real estate. They would be investing some money in R&D, they would be investing some money in specific job creation projects. If that is the case, if they are prepared to go to Hong Kong to sell it on that basis, then what kind of leverages are we using in order to ensure that the money that they have collected on the basis that some of it will be used for R&D is indeed used for R&D in the province of Manitoba?

Mr. Filmon: Madam Chairman, with respect, I think I have been patient in trying to talk about the principles of the Immigrant Investor funds, but we are way off into details talking about the specific prospective prospectus of a specific fund. That has not really to do with the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Stefanson). I do not think I can take this discussion any further.

I have told the Leader where the principals are that we apply to it. If she wants to argue the case further with the minister she is welcome to, but this really is not anywhere within the Estimates of Expenditure of Executive Council.

With respect to the money that I referred to on the MDS scale, that is money that has already been paid to government, half of which has already been earmarked to the Innovations Council, and the other half will be in further high-tech development of areas compatible with the information processing field in Manitoba, so the money is already there.

It has nothing to do with what happens out of the sale or any of the aspersions she wants to cast on ISTM's marriage with IBM and Westbridge. We already have that money. It is earmarked in the budget for the expenditure purposes that I have told her.

Mrs. Carstairs: I have to put on the record that I am disappointed the government does not see fit to ensure that monies that are brought into this province do not have a component which is research and development. Obviously, they have made the decision that it need not be spent in that way and that does not bode well for future research and development in the province of Manitoba.

I would like to now deal with the whole issue of Winnipeg 2000, and I know that the Premier has met with Winnipeg 2000 as a group. Can he tell the House the ongoing relationship between his office and Winnipeg 2000, and what initiatives are they jointly working together on to ensure better economic development for the province of Manitoba?

Mr. Filmon: Just to correct the Leader of the Liberal Party, I have not said they cannot invest in R&D. I have said that because of the fact that, generally speaking, most R&D proposals have a high-risk component, I can understand where they might not find any that they can feel secure about the preservation of capital. That is not our choice or our decision. If they came forward with an R&D proposal that met those criteria, we would be delighted to see it happen.

Secondly, with respect to Winnipeg 2000, I have talked about Winnipeg 2000 on many fora including in other locations in the country. When I went to speak with a group of the senior finance community in Toronto, there was the chairman of Winnipeg 2000 there with me. When we held a Manitoba reception in Toronto for potential investors, both the general manager and the president of Winnipeg 2000, our chairman, were there with us. They took a group of people to Ottawa with respect to a number of issues.

They have been involved with us in courting a number of major potential investors in this province and have been instrumental in some of the decisions that have already been announced and others that will be announced shortly with respect to new investments in this province, so we regard them as being a very effective partner with us, because

they can convey the view of the business community as to why they are here, why they have major employment and investment committed here in Manitoba. They can really talk on a business level with a lot of these people about the advantages of doing business in Manitoba.

With respect to specifics about any arrangements or ongoing relationships with respect to their funding and provincial involvement in that, I would suggest that is another matter that is within the budget of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Stefanson).

Mrs. Carstairs: As the Premier knows, Winnipeg 2000 has met with all of the caucuses and there was one specific area where we spent a considerable time in our discussions—and I can only assume that went on in the other two caucuses as well—and that was with regard to our aboriginal community in Winnipeg, our aboriginal community throughout the province of Manitoba, and their very grave concern that the situation in our work force will be that one out of five entering that work force by 1995 will be aboriginal, and their concern that many of our aboriginal peoples lack adequate training. That is why many of us were dismayed at cuts that we saw to the Education budget, particularly as it affected our aboriginal peoples.

Can the First Minister tell us what is the role, as he sees it, of the Premier's Office in affording better opportunities including education and training to our aboriginal community, particularly our urban aboriginal community, so that they can take not only a more active role, but one at a much more high-skilled level than they would be potentially able to do right now?

* (2140)

Mr. Fillmon: The Winnipeg 2000 group and various representatives have been involved in development of our Workforce 2000 plan and the preparation of a plan for future development of our human resource capital in Manitoba, so that we can support the efforts of Winnipeg 2000 and others who want to attract investment here. I know that the chairman of Winnipeg 2000, Mr. Hawkins, is also very much involved in the Native Economic Development Program and has a very committed respect for the need for economic development in the Native community. We are certainly supportive of that.

I might say that after the Prime Minister made his speech in Vancouver and indicated that there was

an ongoing commitment of the federal government to training of Natives, I wrote directly and said put your money where your mouth is, in effect. We need that money, because it has been cut here for ACCESS, for BUNTEP, for all these support programs for Native education.

Manitoba has suffered dramatically as a result of these cuts. We are not able to keep up all of the programming that was done heretofore, because on our own, having suffered offloading and cutbacks in direct transfers from Ottawa, we cannot now pick up for program cuts as well. We are hopeful that the Prime Minister will follow through with his commitment that he spoke of in his speech in Vancouver, because we believe that is the way that the federal government ought to be going. We will press very hard for that.

Mrs. Carstairs: I, too, hope that the federal government is going to live up to its commitment this time around to our aboriginal community, but in order to be able to use those dollars wisely, I am somewhat dismayed that the Curriculum branch of the Department of Education has chosen to once again cut Native education. But I will take that up specifically with the Minister of Education and Training (Mr. Derkach) in Education Estimates.

The other issue that was raised in terms of the Winnipeg 2000 group was, of course, the use of our airport, and they have outlined carefully the selling features of our downtown site, and also the fact that it is operational 24 hours a day. Just this weekend, there was a report, which, we hope, will come to fruition, that United Parcel Services is considering Winnipeg as its cargo centre, and that would be very, very positive news.

That is why the decision to build the Pines project, which, quite frankly, is a violation, we believe, of transport regulations and transport interests in our airport, is such a negative step. We question why the Premier and cabinet have made a decision to allow the construction of a building which clearly is on the flight path and which clearly violates the agreement—although it has been violated in the past, there is no question about that. The city itself has violated it, but there is no reason to violate it further if we are, in fact, going to continue to have one of the most viable downtown airports in Canada.

Mr. Fillmon: Madam Chairman, we have met with a number of interested people in using our airport. We believe that there are two very current prospects

for setting up facilities that will use our airport in an increased way. I think that the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs) is a little off base when she talks about right under the flight path. It is four blocks west of the flight path. There are 17 buildings closer to the flight path—high-rise, high-density buildings, closer to the flight path, closer to the airport—currently existing. There are thousands of dwelling units currently right under the flight path between the river and the airport, all of which currently exist, and 80 dwelling units four blocks west of the flight path are hardly going to change the entire focus of the airport or its use. It seems to me that the Leader of the Liberal Party is just trying to either make a case that does not exist or is deliberately misrepresenting some information on that matter.

Mrs. Carstairs: Madam Chairperson, but I clearly said that there had been other violations. What the studies have indicated is that it is time to stop. The time has come not to progress further in violating the air space, because decisions may be taken out of our hands that this is no longer a safe airport and we look for a site like Edmonton has looked or Calgary has looked, putting their airports decidedly either right outside, as Edmonton's is, or very much on the fringe of the community, as Calgary's is. That will not bode well if one reads the material of Winnipeg 2000 and how they envisage our airport could be a unique airport in western Canada.

Once we have made this decision, how many other decisions are made before we come up with a legislative plan as Alberta now has, which says that the zoning decisions are taken out of the hands of the city and put in the hands of the provincial government to ensure that this protection of the airport as a source of wealth for the entire province is violated further?

Mr. Filmon: Madam Chairman, we agree that it is a great potential source of economic development activity for the province, but we do not believe it is violated by this proposal.

I just want to correct on the record: I said 17 buildings; I meant 17 blocks of residential development between the Pines and the airport. There are four high-rises within two blocks of the flight path much closer than the current Pines building is to the flight path; and, as I said, there are thousands of dwelling units that are under the flight path or closer to the flight path than the Pines. It is

not going to be violated by an additional 80 dwelling units four blocks west.

Mrs. Carstairs: Madam Chairperson, I just want to get into an area which concerns me, as it concerns all of us. I do not think there is any difference there. That is, can the government or can the Premier tell us if there is any philosophy spreading through the government that we could start to make better use of paper? Little thing, but I picked up Supplemental Estimate booklet this afternoon for Status of Women. It has 18 pages. Quite frankly, it could be done in six without any difficulty by using both sides and by combining some headings.

I have here a series of press releases, conservation projects, one after another, instead of just listing them all at the top; they are exactly the same press release, except for a different community. Why is it necessary to use this wastage of material? I do not think it is the government that is guilty; we are all guilty of abusing the paper supplies which add up after a while to a great deal of wasted money for all of us. Is there a strategy in place whereby we can cut down on some of these announcements made over and over again, to kind of tighten up on the use of supplies that we are making throughout government?

Mr. Filmon: I am going to confess that I believe in and I practise what the Leader of the Liberal Party says. You see, I write on both sides of my paper before I throw it out, and I believe that we ought to do that. I frankly have the same kind of sense that as much as we are moving in a positive direction—we did take a decision to print news releases on both sides of the news release paper, but we do not always do it, regrettably. When it comes out of different departments and they only have a one—I also have a thing about short press releases, and I believe if you cannot get it on one sheet you should not have a press release. So, if one department is putting out a press release and another is, they rarely get them back. So I accept that criticism; there may be ways that we could look at it to improve that.

Government is doing things. You know, we have the recycling paper bins that are being collected and sent to the fine paper plant that is recycling. I am trying to remember the name. I was there during the election campaign, but in any case we are encouraging all of that. You know, the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs) referred to a de-inking plant in Manitoba, and I still believe that there is a

place for adding de-inking of newsprint in particular. Through our Environmental Innovations Fund, I believe that ultimately we will find somebody who is interested in creating a de-inking facility for newsprint.

* (2150)

We should do more recycling, and the Leader of the Liberal Party is right in pointing that out because government departments tend to, I think, follow the practices as well as they can but not always consistently. Although things may be better today than they were five years ago, they are still not nearly good enough. She has pointed many instances to us, and I appreciate that.

Madam Chairman: Item 1.(b) Management and Administration: (1) Salaries, \$1,581,500—pass; 1.(b)(2) Other Expenditures, \$590,900—pass.

Item 1.(c) Intergovernmental Relations Secretariat: (1)—

Mr. Doer: Have the departments been requested by the government in the area of intergovernmental relations to keep track, to keep a specific list and forward to the office of the Premier all federal cutbacks that are taking place in the province?

Mr. Fillmon: Yes, they do it as an ongoing practice.

Mr. Doer: I wonder—and we have been informed that direction had come from the Premier's Office and, I think, appropriately so—I wonder if that list could be made available, made public, so that all of us could take a look at it and, again, rather than asking a question and then being told that is a federal cutback, we would at least be operating under the same goal post, so to speak.

Mr. Fillmon: I might say that the instructions have been given verbally by me to the deputy, and he keeps me posted and sends in a note every time he becomes aware of it. It is on an episodic basis, so to speak, so I do not know if there is a collective list on the matter.

I am informed that we have a compilation that may not be up to date. It could be cleaned up and perhaps shared with the opposition Leader. It will give him more information for the next round of Estimates.

Mr. Doer: Thank you very much. This is revolutionary here in these Estimates. We are going to get a list from the Premier of the episodic cutbacks of the federal government on an updated basis notwithstanding the fact that it might be a

touch out of date. That is getting pretty close to some stuff that we wanted to look at. We are keeping them, too, on an episodic basis. -(interjection)- Madam Chairperson, I would admit that our list is much more episodic than the Premier's episodic list and probably not as up to date as the out-of-date list that the Premier is keeping up to date with the intergovernmental affairs secretariat.

I know the Premier gave us—we asked him a question on French language services in his last Estimates, and in a very timely way he sent that material to us. I would assume then from the answer that we will get a list from the intergovernmental affairs secretariat through the Premier shortly.

Mr. Fillmon: In the vernacular of government, soon.

Mr. Doer: Well, I will keep the Premier's so-called "businesslike attitude" with the answer he gave me just now.

Madam Chairperson, can the Premier tell us the status—the Leader of the Liberal Party asked some questions on Native education and our members have been asking that question too. I mean, all of our Native people in our caucus and all our people are very concerned about that program.

The federal government has announced new money. Have we put that on fast-track negotiations? Some of the enrollments and other parts of ACCESS are coming to a very close and crucial deadline. We have already cancelled the Winnipeg Education Centre. There are other enrollment considerations going on in many of the ACCESS programs. I think we all have to admit it has been probably the best, most successful aboriginal training program in North America.

I would ask the Premier: Have we put it on the fast track, and can we get any specific answers on the federal money that the Prime Minister announced last week?

Mr. Fillmon: Madam Chairman, from memory I can say it was either a day, or two days, after the Prime Minister's speech that my letter went to him, more or less taking him up on his offer that there would be money available and indicating, from our perspective, the areas of aboriginal programming that have been immensely successful: BUNTEP, North American-wide recognition for its success in training teachers for northern and Native postings, putting role models in the classroom, giving us, I

believe, one of the best returns on investment in education anywhere in North America for aboriginal people; ACCESS, finally, giving us the opportunity to have role models in significant areas of professional development. That of course includes law, medicine and engineering.

I might tell you that one of the things that has angered me most is the fact that the federal withdrawal of funding has not left us enough money to maintain the integrity of some of that programming and that we in fact have had to make reductions, because we could not make up, as I said earlier, not only for the 32 million less of cash transfers on EPF funding but also—not only for the 121 million less of overall equalization payments that we are not getting—the fact that they are also offloading in a whole host of areas, whether it be RCMP, whatever have you, and now then simply unilaterally withdrawing out of a whole range of programs in areas that if there are any constitutional responsibilities, it should be as it affects aboriginal people.

I, for one, do not accept it. I do not understand it, and I have not only written to the Prime Minister, but have a separate letter to our federal representatives in Ottawa, from Manitoba, saying that this is an area that they have a responsibility to carry through on Manitoba's behalf because it is the best investment that we can make in our aboriginal people.

So the effect of our letter to the Prime Minister was—I think he said a \$325 million increase in training funding, that is what he announced, to bring the federal total to over a billion dollars in five years. We said that money ought to be used first and foremost for programs that have proven themselves to be effective, such as BUNTEP, ACCESS and the Northern Youth Corps, and that is the essence of what we are conveying.

I believe that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) and his party and members in the Liberal Party are absolutely right. There is nothing that has been more upsetting to me than to see the federal government withdraw from those areas of investment in the long-term future of our aboriginal people.

Mr. Doer: Madam Chairperson, can the Premier (Mr. Filmon) indicate the present status today of the federal funding for New Careers and where that is in terms of possible uptake in a number of spots or

is it in limbo with the negotiations? We are hearing rumours and I just want to know what is exactly going on.

* (2200)

Mr. Filmon: Madam Chairman, it is not a matter of detail that I have with me. It would be in the hands of the minister and I would have to ask that that question be conveyed to him in Question Period tomorrow or with his Estimates.

Mr. Doer: Some other matters in federal/provincial relations: The Free Trade Agreement for negotiations with Mexico, the Premier indicated earlier in his Estimates that they have sent a letter to the Prime Minister—no, he shakes his head—a letter to—

An Honourable Member: The minister who is the head of I,T and T sent a letter to the Minister of Trade—

Mr. Doer: I would ask the Premier whether he is considering writing the Prime Minister, as head of government to head of government, about this. During the election, when this item did come up in the Leaders' debate, the Premier indicated that he is opposed it.

The former Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology—it is nice to see the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) reading a New Zealand labour book, notwithstanding their policies—indicated that he had a number of concerns about that when we asked a question in the fall of '90.

I asked the Premier whether he is considering writing the Prime Minister about our concerns, Manitoba concerns, because as we know with the Free Trade Agreement with the United States previous, the Prime Minister's staff were directly involved in the final negotiations and what was given away and taken back, et cetera, was made by the head of government, the Canadian government. So I would ask what the strategy of the Premier is with the Prime Minister on this issue?

Mr. Filmon: Madam Chairman, as I indicated previously, we have some grave concerns about a potential Free Trade Agreement with the United States and Mexico. There are areas of incompatibility, of lack of competitiveness, with Mexico in respect to their cheap labour situation that will give significant advantages to them.

Having said that, I think that the federal government, in self-defence, has to be at the table

in those discussions. For the very reason that if we stayed out we could be sideswiped by any aspects of the deal by virtue of the fact that we already are in a free trade situation with the United States. If Mexico then had a separate agreement with the United States, we could see the prospect, for instance, of the United States utilizing cheap Mexican labour to manufacture components for, let us say, automobiles which were assembled in the United States and could then be produced in final-product form cheaper than those that we produce in Canada. They could blow us out of water in terms of that whole automobile manufacturing competitiveness.

I think that there are far too many opportunities for us to be negatively affected by not being at the table and attempting to protect ourselves in this respect. I recognize the federal government is attempting to do that, but that should not say that in any way at this point we can see advantages or opportunities for us in the free trade agreement. I think we are there out of self-defence to attempt to protect ourselves.

From Manitoba's perspective, to really try and put the case to Ottawa, what we are doing through the ministry of Industry, Trade and Tourism is doing a sectoral evaluation, just as the Pawley administration did leading up to the Free Trade Agreement with the United States—a sectoral evaluation of how it might have effects in Manitoba.

I know that the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Connerly) has grave concerns about the effect on the vegetable industry in Canada and rightly so from his own experience. There are going to be potentially different effects: manufacturing sector, high tech sector, energy intensive sector, labour intensive areas, vegetable growing, other aspects of agriculture and so on.

That kind of sectoral analysis in our judgment is essential for us to put the case forcefully to Ottawa that these are the areas that we need to have protection for; that these are the areas that we need to have considered when you are at the table.

We are taking that approach for the good and valid reason that the Pawley government took that same approach. You have to fight it with fact, and you have to fight it with information as opposed to just rhetoric and emotion. Hopefully, we will be in that position when that sectoral analysis is done.

Madam Chairman: The hour being after 10 p.m., what is the will of the committee?

An Honourable Member: To carry on.

Mr. Doer: I would point out to the Premier that—

Madam Chairman: The honourable Leader of the Opposition—are you agreed?

An Honourable Member: I beg your pardon? Yes.

Madam Chairman: Agreed?

Mr. Doer: Agreed. I would point out to the Premier (Mr. Filmon) that in reading John Crosbie's press release, he said and I quote: We have to build on the positive experiences Canadians have felt from the Free Trade Agreement with the United States and the positive experiences of the GST. Now, you and I disagree about the Free Trade Agreement with the United States, but we do not disagree about the GST. I would point out that it did not sound like a very defensive mode and announcement from the former Minister of Trade.

An Honourable Member: You have certainly come a long way.

Mr. Doer: No, I have not. Please do not accuse me of coming a long way. But even we would not agree on the GST, so it was not a very defensive position that the government took. It talked about all the wonderful things that would happen with free trade in our North American continent. So that is why I am worried that the Premier's position is—or articulated that the fact that Canada had to be there for defensive reasons. When I read the rationale from the former federal minister, it was for "offensive and qualitative reasons".

So I refer the Premier back to the original press release, and I am pleased that he is doing a sectoral evaluation. I think that is proper because we should know the losers and winners in terms of a trade agreement. -(interjection)- Beg your pardon? That is right. We did, and most of the predictions we made about losers were correct.

Madam Chairperson, I would ask the Premier when that sectoral evaluation will be completed and whether the Premier would share that information with the public through this Legislature?

Mr. Filmon: That is an initiative that is being overseen by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Stefanson), the consultations and the development of the profile and potential effects. I might say that I would think that he would share it

because it should be the basis upon which we make any public commentary to the federal government on the issue.

I might say as well, I recall that the Pawley government's sectoral analysis said that the furniture industry was going to be a huge loser under free trade, and it has turned out to be one of the areas of biggest growth in trade with the United States from Manitoba. So these analyses are imperfect at best. I still think that the analyses should be carried out.

Mr. Doer: Madam Chairperson, the movie is not over on the furniture industry I would point out. I would also point out that if you read Art DeFehr's comments prior to the Free Trade Agreement with the United States, a person with a fair degree of knowledge of this topic, I think you will find that he was equally worried. In fact, I think much of the analysis—

An Honourable Member: He still is.

Mr. Doer: He still is, that is right.

Much of the analysis that did come, came from people in the field, and I would refer him to—in fact, I recall that Mr. DeFehr, I believe, was an observer at the First Ministers' meeting dealing with trade with the former Premier and very concerned, as I recall it. I may be wrong. I am just going by memory. -(interjection)- Well, I have been wrong before and -(interjection)-

Well, he was before and he is now, and the question is, how much is he making south of the border now and how much is he making in Manitoba? Hopefully he will do very well, because nobody wants to be right or wrong on that issue. We want to keep people working in the province.

So I am pleased the Premier will make that available through his minister, that sectoral evaluation, and I am sure even in there that he will have advice on the vegetable industry and other industries from people in the field. -(interjection)- Well, I do not even want to start to begin to agree with the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Connery). It would—however, he does know that industry better than I do, but we have had disagreements about the Campbell Soup plant and the food processing side in his—so I am pleased he is going to make that public. I think it is very important because that is very important.

The Premier is involved—we have lobbyists in Washington on the Mid-Dakota project and the

Garrison Diversion project. Do we use those lobbyists for other projects and, for example, have we talked to that lobbyist about the slow track or fast track of free trade with Mexico with the matters that are before the US Congress and Senate? Have we taken a position to put her on the slow track so that the kind of sectoral evaluations that are so crucial are dealt with prior to another leap of faith by Canada?

* (2210)

Mr. Filmon: I am informed that the previous administration used different lobbyists with respect to free trade and Garrison, because they are highly specialized areas, and you want to get law firms that have an expertise in environmental water issues, and one that is in trade issues. We have not yet made any arrangement with respect to the trade matter with a lobbyist in Washington. We have, as the member indicated, retained the lobbyist with respect to Garrison and the Mid-Dakota proposal and so on.

Mr. Doer: The Premier and his ministers have conversations with a number of U.S. politicians and decision makers which would be natural in his position and in his position of authority. If his government has asked their advice about matters such as fast track versus slow track, do we have any official position? Are we encouraging a slow track process? It seems to me that is one of the crucial decisions before the Congress and Senate now, and it is a matter that may be determined before the summer of this year.

Mr. Filmon: We have not taken a position with respect to that matter, Madam Chairman.

Mr. Doer: It leads me to the next question. Could the Premier advise us of the status of the Mid-Dakota project, components of which are very similar to, not identical to, but similar to some of the concerns we had in Garrison, what the status of that is with the U.S. Corps of Engineers and other projects that are being developed in North Dakota?

Mr. Filmon: It is in the technical review stage still by representatives of the Canadian government and all other interested jurisdictions. -(interjection)- They say it is still in the technical review stage. Staff from Natural Resources are evaluating and monitoring the process, and I would think that the minister would be able to give further information on it during his Estimates.

Mr. Doer: I have a further question on the RCMP negotiations. Obviously, the government at first talked about the feasibility of a western Canadian police force. It seems to me that they have moved off of that position publicly. We are now talking about withholding money.

Will this be a matter of the western Canadian Premiers at the western Premiers' meeting, and will we look at the option of mounting what I would consider to be a necessary, an important, western Premiers' populist fight on this project? I believe that the federal Conservative government is vulnerable in western Canada. God, it is vulnerable all over the country. -(interjection)- Thank God. That is right. They are trying to allegedly shore up their support in places in the West. One of the biggest, I think, one of the more important symbols of western Canada has been the Mounties, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

It seems to me that we are always—the former minister and the present minister are from the province of Quebec, and they have very little appreciation for what these police forces mean to rural western Canada, probably Atlantic Canada as well.

There is very little appreciation for this program given the fact that a Quebec minister is dealing with the QPP or whatever else. It seems to me to make sense to have all four western Premiers demand a meeting with the Prime Minister to go back to the original cost-sharing agreement. I mean, it seems to me that we should be fighting some of these western issues in a populist western way with the united western voice.

I would ask the Premier if we have considered that option and if, you know, we will start using our western populism to fight for western programs in western Canada.

Mr. Filmon: Understanding that this matter is being handled and handled, I think, very well by our Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), I will say that we have been playing hardball since Day One on this issue despite the fact that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) ridiculed my statement that as a contingency there was always the option of setting up our own police force.

I would never want to suggest that as a preference. In fact, I believe, just as the Leader of the Opposition has stated, that the RCMP are a very important symbol to national unity. You know, when

we went to Minneapolis with the Royal Winnipeg Ballet, one of the things they asked for, that we were able to comply with, was to have an RCMP officer in full red serge outfit present Evelyn Hart with the roses at the end of her pas de deux and that was the bigger hit, I might tell you. The RCMP officer was asked for his autograph more than anybody else in the whole performance.

An Honourable Member: Including Evelyn?

Mr. Filmon: Yes. I mean it is unbelievable the effect of it. You know, sure they are a tremendously important national symbol, and they are tremendously important to us. In my judgment, they are probably one of the best, if not the best trained police force in the world. We want to have them, and we will undoubtedly be talking at the Western Premiers' Conference about having a joint concerted effort.

I might tell you, though, that by virtue of some of the statements that were made and some of the proposals our Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) put forward, there has been very, very strong, unanimous resolve amongst the Justice ministers, and they have backed off the federal government on a number of ultimatums.

I am sure you are aware that the Solicitor General came forward and said, we will withdraw them on the first of April some time ago. When we called his bluff on that one, he backed off. Then he has put other ultimatums forward about cutting back services and about doing unilaterally all sorts of things.

I am sure that the member is aware that this is one of the few areas in which they deliver the service and we actually pay them. So we are withholding the funds because we are playing hardball on this issue. There is no question that Ottawa has changed its tact and changed its approach, and that we have had much more conciliatory messages given to us by virtue of the changed position in Ottawa.

There is a new Solicitor General in place, and we are hopeful that finally we will get down to some reasonable discussions, and that we will not have to go through the kind of nonsense that we did with the former Solicitor General. I can say unequivocally that I believe that the western Premiers will stand together on this one, as the western Justice ministers are, in ensuring that we fight Ottawa together on this issue, because it is very important

to all of us and it is also terribly unfair unilateral offloading that just ought not to occur.

Mr. Doer: Madam Chairperson, we wish the Premier and his government well on these negotiations. I think the municipalities cannot afford the extra costs; the province cannot afford to pick up the extra cost. We wish him well, and we hope the new Solicitor General and the tough strategy works. I would say that I personally support the strategy of withholding the money as opposed to the other option, so I think this is a better position to take. I wish him well. I really do, and I think we would rather stand up with a statement in the House and say, "Great!" than have this thing fail.

Last year I asked the Premier some questions about the status of the Simplot plant in Brandon and the massive infusion of provincial money in Saskatchewan that could potentially affect a number of our jobs. I was wondering if he has had any success with the Premier of Saskatchewan in this regard. Does he consider this a major liability as an intergovernmental issue to the signed joint position that the provinces signed with the other—the western provinces started on so-called free trade with provinces? What is the status of the Simplot plant which I know is upgrading in Manitoba? We have questionable capacity in our markets with these two plants now, just the capacity, whether he will be raising this in very strong and unequivocal terms in this Western Premiers' meeting.

* (2220)

Mr. Filmon: There is no question that this whole issue is something that I think Manitoba will be raising with all the western provinces with respect to buying industry away from other, adjacent provinces. I would like to say that the year before last in Camrose there was a bit of a dustup between Premier Vander Zalm and Premier Getty over—I believe it was Alberta attempting to draw a glass plant away from British Columbia. That was the allegation. I do not think it proved to be correct, but that was the allegation at the time.

We have seen a whole series of measures undertaken by provinces to the west of us to attempt to buy away industry from all the other areas of the country, but it is blowing up in their faces. I am sure the member has read about Mag Can and that loss, that closure of the Magnesium Company of Canada Limited that Premier Getty was very proud of getting

away from Quebec. Now I believe it is a \$127 million loan guarantee on his hands on a plant that has closed down.

It goes further than that. Take a look at the packing industry. In today's Winnipeg Free Press is the announcement that Canada Packers is closing its plants at Lethbridge and Calgary, and the direct result of the Cargill plant in High River, with a \$10 million grant from the Alberta government plus other loan guarantees and so on. The loan guarantee issue has become a major issue with the Alberta government because their exposure is in the billions of dollars of guarantees to companies that are failing left, right and centre—Gainers—and on and on and on.

So I am saying that as a position we want everybody to come clean on this issue. We cannot fight each other with the taxpayers' money to try and attract away business, but the reality is that I have raised with Premier Devine on a number of occasions—and I know industry spokesmen, Esso for one, because Esso is likely to have to close, if they have not already, a plant in Alberta as a result of the Cargill liquid fertilizer plant at Belle Plaine.

There is going to be a rationalization in the western Canadian market, and the only hope for Simplot is to upgrade its production capability to more modern technology, to lower its unit cost of production to be able to compete. It is insane that they are competing against taxpayers' dollars in Saskatchewan that have put in 70 million capital and over 200 million loan guarantees to a plant that I believe would not have proceeded without massive, massive government support.

I say to the member opposite that this is something he may want to talk to his New Democratic colleague about in Saskatchewan as to what they are going to do with that plant because if they have any influence on the matter—I do not know what their public position is, but I think that they ought to be raising the issue as one of what you do with taxpayers' money. I do not think it is the right way to go, to be honest with you. We have said so and will continue to say so, and I believe that among the things that Manitoba intends to raise, it is going to be this issue with all western provinces because we are the cleanest. We have not put money into drawing plants and fighting with taxpayers' dollars for economic development opportunities.

These are the kinds of things that I would assure the member for Concordia we will raise as part of our agenda in the Western Premiers' Conference.

Mr. Doer: I would agree with the Premier that Manitoba is the cleanest of the four western provinces. I think B.C. is next, and then, surprisingly, Alberta and Saskatchewan are not clean at all, if you use that vernacular.

Madam Chairperson, just one other question, and it is actually two questions but I promised the Leader of the Liberal Party that I would only ask one more, so I am going to wrap two into one in full disclosure before I do it.

The provincial office in Ottawa—can the Premier tell us whether he still feels we are getting value for money with the expenditure and the Manitoba office in Ottawa? I think we are spending \$300,000. Secondly, when you really get down to it, and I say this to the Premier, have we not really been let down by the federal minister in our cabinet? I mean the bottom line is, out of Ottawa, the rumour is that nobody is fighting for Manitoba in the federal cabinet. Is it not now true, and can we not now admit together that the federal lead minister of Manitoba is just letting us down day after day, project after project?

Mr. Filmon: With respect to the Manitoba office, I can confirm for the Leader of the Opposition what he probably already knows, and that is that we have a minimal staff there compared to the complements of many, many provinces. Many of them have far more staff and spend lavishly on their Ottawa operations. It is considered by six other provinces to be an essential part of their operations in not only federal/provincial relations, but really in economic opportunity. I am sure he has seen the figures that say that Quebec has gotten something in the range of \$242 million worth of contracts in the last three years from CIDA and Manitoba has gotten \$4 million. We have a long way to go in terms of getting our share of procurement and economic development spending in this province.

We are regarded by most people as having one of the most senior and one of the best-known people in Ottawa. John Blackwood, through the diplomatic service and the trade side of things, is better known in Ottawa than literally any other provincial representative, certainly of the smaller provinces. So I think we are getting value for money. If the truth be known, if it were not for his federal pension, John

would not be available to us as economically as he is. In that respect, we do have some significant advantages.

We have other staff there again who, by virtue of circumstance, are able to service and service well, and are familiar with Manitoba. Nancy Houle, who is also in the office, was formerly a management consultant with a national firm here in Manitoba and moved there to be closer to family, and so consequently she is also very appropriate for the circumstances because of her knowledge of Manitoba and ability to access people in Ottawa.

We have, for instance, as I said earlier, one of the smallest offices. Saskatchewan has a much larger presence in Ottawa than we do. I think the member opposite and others have suggested that with a federal election on the way, we ought to be stepping up our lobbying efforts with respect to Ottawa, that they are going to be much more receptive to messages, demands from other parts of the country.

We intend to be more aggressive in Ottawa over the next little while, because we believe during the next little while this is the time for us to settle up some accounts that we think are owing to us and get some initiatives going here in Manitoba that have not been undertaken for a while. So I would not see us backing off on the Ottawa initiative. I would see us being more aggressive in Ottawa than we ever have been.

Mr. Doer: Madam Chairperson, I ask the Premier a question, and I know he would love to answer it. I think we have been let down, and many senior Conservatives are telling us, and senior members of other political parties are saying that we have one of the weakest federal lead ministers representing Manitoba in Ottawa.

I was wondering, the Premier mentioned a number of projects where we have been let down. Does he feel that we are not getting our fair shake from our lead minister in this province in terms of the federal fairness in the country?

Mr. Filmon: I am not going to get into personalities on the matter, but I will say that we have not received a fair shake from Ottawa for some time. Whether it goes back to Meech Lake and the role that Manitoba is perceived to have played or whether it goes to other issues, I am not in a position to judge. What I do know is that we are not receiving a fair shake from Ottawa on a whole host of issues, and if you want to talk forest fires, you can talk about that. You can

talk about various economic development initiatives, decisions being made on federal staffing and federal units of operation in the government, where they are placed and how they are moved and so on.

* (2230)

All of those matters, I believe, reflect what I consider to be an unfairness in Ottawa's approach to Manitoba. We are making that case right now. As I say, as we get closer to a federal election, there may be more people listening to us.

Mrs. Carstairs: Madam Chairperson, I have a comment and then a couple of questions.

First, with regard to the comment, I was interested in the question with regard to the Ottawa office. Last fall when my daughter was travelling in eastern Europe, or just before she went to eastern Europe and before her leg to Asia, she happened to be using our High Commission in London as the bed and breakfast, because the High Commissioner is a friend.

I had sent a package of materials on Manitoba, some pins and some buttons and postcards of things, because she wanted to distribute them. I was quite shocked, I have to say, when I got a Fax from the High Commission saying Cathy has left, and we know she is headed back to Canada. Can we keep these things, because we do not have any materials on Manitoba?

I tell the Premier that because I think that we should be looking very carefully at giving a package since we do not have an office. We are one of the few provinces that does not have an office in Britain. The High Commission is apparently quite willing to distribute information for us if we give it to them. So they have some, care of my office, but by accident, not by design. Perhaps, we could move to make sure they had some by design as well.

Secondly, I would like to ask a question of the Premier with regard to style and that is, I would like to know why the Premier and his staff—I assume it is with the staff—made the decision that the Premier is not going to appear at rallies in front of the Legislature? I happen to agree with the Premier completely when he objects, as I object, to unions publishing his telephone number or associations publishing his home phone number. I do not think that is acceptable at all. I do not think his family should be subjected to that kind of thing, anymore

than I think people should picket out in front of people's homes no matter what they are.

I do think that when they come to this Legislature, they have a right, when they have invited the First Minister to appear, to have him appear if he is in the building and if he can free the time up. There seems to have been the decision made that he will not appear at any of these things. I wonder why they have made that decision and if they are considering changing that policy?

Mr. Filmon: I might say that not only will I look after getting the information on Manitoba to the High Commissioner in Britain, but I may even deliver it myself and take them up on their invitation to stay with them as well.

Madam Chairman, there is no such policy that I will not address any group on the steps of the Legislature. It is a case-by-case basis. I might say that oftentimes the rally is scheduled and all sorts of arrangements made, and in 48 hours or less I am expected to change my schedule and go out there to their demands. The fact of the matter is that they are usually on issues that are not the sole purview of the Premier.

For instance, a rally protesting the budget is appropriately addressed by the Minister of Finance. He is the one who delivers the budget. He is the one who is the chief spokesman on the budget and ought to be. A rally protesting university funding is appropriately addressed by the Minister of Education. He is the minister responsible for that area of budget. It is different being in government. As a matter of fact, I cannot recall during the six and a half years of government Howard Pawley addressing rallies or protests. I can tell you that even with respect to constitutional issues like French language or any of that, even with respect to closure of the school of psychiatric nursing at Portage la Prairie, with respect to Autopac; I cannot recall Howard Pawley ever having done that.

I have done it, and I would continue to do it on a case-by-case basis, if the request is appropriately one that I am the one who represents and should address. I would do that with respect to constitutional issues or other matters that are clearly within my purview or other matters, but there is no such policy as to who will or will not. I think it is who is most appropriately responsible for what the protest is about.

Mrs. Carstairs: Finally, I have a question from one of the Premier's constituents. I know that he has corresponded with this particular individual, because I have seen copies of this correspondence. It has to do with the casino, and I am sure he will quickly know who I am referring to.

There is apparently a policy at the casino that casino authorities can ban individuals from appearing at the casino. Unfortunately, there does not appear to be any kind of appeal procedure except to the very people who have instituted the banning procedure.

Can the First Minister explain why there is not a procedure, and why it seems to be totally within the manager of the casino's right to ban an individual from attending? There are apparently seven or eight of them, at last count, that have been banned from the casino without any right of appeal from that banning.

Mr. Filmon: Since the Leader of the Liberal Party is very quick to point out people who have contributed money to my campaign or my party, I will say that I hope his \$1,000 has been repaid by virtue of this question in the Estimates.

Because the individual has protested to me, I have had the matter investigated and that, I suppose, is the appeal process. I do not think we should discuss the whole case of the individual, but he has made continuous unsubstantiated allegations about dishonesty and improper handling of public monies at the casino. Those matters have been thoroughly investigated by security people. We can find no substance to the allegations, yet they are continuing to be made. The casino people have considered that they are making the appropriate decision in banning him from attendance at the casino.

I have asked for a review of the matter. The review seems to substantiate reasons why he has been banned, and that remains the case.

Mrs. Carstairs: I will just let it go at this, but it is a philosophical question here. If somebody is going to be banned from a public place, if they are going to be denied access, surely there should be some form of appeal procedure to someone other than the individual who has banned them. Now maybe it is to senior people at the Lotteries Commission, but it seems inappropriate that there is not a mechanism that can in fact review to make sure that the individual has been treated with due process or

some form of due process. At the present moment that does not exist.

Mr. Filmon: I can say, as a result of the appeal, that I have discussed it with the minister. The minister has discussed it with senior staff in the Lotteries Commission. It is their recommendation that the banishment remain in place for the reasons that I have alluded to in the discussion.

* (2240)

I do not want to get into the detail in fairness to the individual, but if you want to see copies of the file and their assessment of the allegations he is making without any substance. They have spent a lot of time and effort in trying to, through security, understand his allegations. His allegations continue to be made with no substance. Their feeling is that he is a disruptive influence therefore to the casino.

The appeal has, obviously, been looked at because I have asked senior staff through the minister to do that. I have the memos that say they are confident that the banishment should remain in place, because he continues to make these unsubstantiated allegations with no evidence to support them.

Madam Chairman: Item 1.(c) Intergovernmental Relations Secretariat: (1) Salaries \$292,100—pass; 1.(c)(2) Other Expenditures \$70,000—pass.

1.(d) Government Hospitality \$15,000—pass.

1.(e) International Development Program \$474,600—pass.

1.(f) French Language Services Secretariat: (1) Salaries \$111,700.

Mr. Doer: Madam Chairperson, I may have missed it in the Premier's opening statement. Can the Premier indicate the major increase in this department in terms of salaries?

Mr. Filmon: I am informed that there is a merit increase for existing staff, that there was a one-month overlap between the hiring of Edmond LaBossiere and the retirement of Roger Turenne, and that, because of Mr. Turenne's retirement, he has had a payout of accumulated vacation pay that also adds to the costs in this fiscal year over and above the normal. So all of that together results in the increase on the salary side.

Mr. Doer: I would ask the Premier whether this division is involved in the whole issue of governance

of school boards. I know the government has a commission, but is the Premier receiving advice on this issue from that secretariat as well?

Mr. Filmon: Generally speaking, yes, the person who was chosen to chair the committee was recommended, I believe, by Mr. Turenne originally in consultation with the community.

Mr. Doer: I noted in the Education policy paper that it was noted that there are a number of areas for legislative changes contemplated and one of them was on the issue of school boards and French language governance. I would ask the Premier when the report on the governance issue from the committee will be released publicly?

Mr. Filmon: The report is not expected to be submitted before midyear, so it will be some time between midyear and the fall. The evaluation will take place. A determination will then be made as to whether or not any legislative requirement is necessary as a result of the recommendations of the report. If so, we would intend to proceed with any legislative changes in the session of 1992 in anticipation of a new governance structure being in place by the fall of '92.

Mr. Doer: A further question to the Premier: Can the Premier give us a status report on the number of bilingual positions in the public service? I believe he gave us an update last year.

Mr. Filmon: The approximate numbers of bilingual-required and bilingual-preferred that I gave last year continue to hold. They may have been adjusted by a handful, less than 10, as a result of changes in various departments, but the numbers that are filled by bilingual staff are not updated at this point. If the member would like that information, I will try to have it provided within a matter of weeks. I believe last year I said 60 percent or so of those positions were filled by bilingual incumbents, but I will get an exact number for the member.

Mr. Doer: Yes, last year 56 were filled with bilingual staff, 362 positions, where knowledge of French was considered an asset but not a requirement, some 23 percent had bilingual incumbents. The Premier further went on to state that a year-end survey of those positions will be carried out by the French Language Services Secretariat and I will forward the results to you as soon as available.

I would ask the Premier, has that survey been conducted and will we get the copy of that?

Mr. Filmon: Apparently the year-end survey, as the end of the fiscal year is underway, and should be close to completion so we can have it sent to both opposition Leaders as soon as it is available.

Mr. Doer: Is the whole issue of French Language Services and the historic role of St. Boniface, which has been a provincial government consideration under The City of Winnipeg Act, has that been amalgamated together in the policies of the government? There have been announcements of reducing the size of City Hall by various parties and different options have been put forward in the Order-in-Council.

There has been a significant recognition of provincial governments because The City of Winnipeg Act does include French Language Services, and historically there has been a consideration of historic St. Boniface and any map that we are looking at, at demographics we are looking at, in anticipation of the government's final report and therefore legislation session may include, in our opinion does include, major changes to historic St. Boniface in terms of the old city concept of St. Boniface.

I was wondering if there has been any co-ordination between the French Language Secretariat and the Premier's Office and the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst) and the policy of government to reduce the size of City Council which by definition increases that more dramatically.

* (2250)

Mr. Filmon: That matter certainly is something we are aware of and the boundaries are going to be set as you know by the independent Winnipeg Ward Boundaries Commission. Certainly they will have to take into account the requirements of The City of Winnipeg Act that the historic St. Boniface area be a French language designated area. Say Winnipeg is well aware of it, we are well aware of it, and the final boundaries will have to respect that requirement for French Language Services in that historic St. Boniface area.

It is not materially different from the current circumstance in which historic St. Boniface is one ward—Tache ward, rather, is one ward that comprises historic St. Boniface within the community committee area of St. Boniface-St. Vital. They operate various aspects of their functions in that whole community committee area in French language in respect to Tache ward's requirements

and The City of Winnipeg Act, so the same kind of relationship would have to prevail depending on how the new boundaries are structured.

An Honourable Member: As long as you keep the community committees.

Mr. Filmon: Well, you could have a larger ward that included that as a part of it and I mean there are ways of looking at it.

Mr. Doer: I thank the Premier for that answer but the Premier knows that there are differences between the services required in the historic St. Boniface, i.e., Tache ward and the community committee, major differences.

Will the Premier then, by increasing the size of the Tache ward, be increasing the requirement of the City of Winnipeg for French Language Services to fulfill its historic commitment to historic St. Boniface?

Mr. Filmon: I point out that before Council was changed from 50 members to 29, Tache ward was not Tache ward. There was a different configuration, and they still respected, within that, a requirement to have services in that area that included old St. Boniface as being bilingual. So whatever new configurations they come up with, I am sure that there will be a ward that includes historic St. Boniface that will have and respect the bilingual services of The City of Winnipeg Act.

Mr. Doer: Yes, but the Premier well knows that nobody, except for the developers in '82 and Bernie Wolfe before that, had envisioned pie-shaped wards, which by definition changes the way in which historic St. Boniface will be dealt with.

I would ask the Premier, does that then argue against one of the options in the Order-in-Council that was uncovered, dealing with the pie-shaped wards, or does the opposite therefore hold true, that if you go to the pie-shaped wards that, by definition, increases the requirement on the city to provide French Language Services and therefore increase the number of bilingual positions in that area, and therefore increase the cost to the city?

Mr. Filmon: There are significant numbers of bilingual positions even within the St. Boniface-St. Vital community committee area. You have to have a reception in that whole community committee area. You have to be able to be received in either language. You have to be able to be served in either language. So the community clerk in that area has to be bilingual and so on and so on.

Many of those positions in that entire community committee area are already bilingual by virtue of the fact of their association with Tache ward. I would have to look at the final outcome, but it does not necessarily mean that we are going to give bilingual services or advance them to greater areas. It may well be that a configuration of a pie-shaped ward may be smaller than the St. Boniface-St. Vital community committee area.

Mr. Doer: I have met with the mayor over legislation, when in my previous job. I have met with the former deputy mayor in my previous job, and other former members of Council. They pointed out, quite clearly, the difference between communications in the community committee of that area of the city and services. They also pointed out, very dramatically, how services could not be imposed in the changes of The City of Winnipeg Act dealing with French Language Services.

I ask the government, the Premier, will he be co-ordinating and bringing in legislative amendments to deal with the French language sections of The City of Winnipeg Act, consistent with the advice he receives from his own secretariat in this part, as he deals with the ward boundary proposal that his minister is bringing in?

Mr. Filmon: We will respect our commitment to ensure that French Language Services are provided in areas that require them, in areas for which there is a demand for the services and for which the government is in a position to provide those services on a common-sense basis, just as we have done.

I honestly ask the Leader of the Opposition not to try to engender some sort of kaffuffle over this because we have been very consultative with the SFM, with people in the community at large. It has resulted in good reports and good programs being developed for social services, and health care services being provided for our Crown corporations, providing bilingual services for highways, districts and others throughout the province and we have managed to meet that need on a common-sense basis without making people angry or upset about expansion or contraction or whatever. We have worked it out on a common-sense basis.

We will respect the intent of The City of Winnipeg Act. The minister has two commissions reporting to him, one of whom has, as one of its three members, Rénald Guay, a prominent member of the francophone community, a son of Senator Guay and

a former chairman of the school board in St. Boniface and so on, who I think understands and respects the requirements of the act as well as anybody. So I think that the report will allow us to respect the act and at the same time, not make any major changes that are going to upset people on either side of the spectrum with respect to French Language Services.

Mr. Doer: I do not have a question, but a brief comment. It is a little ironic that the Premier would be lecturing those of us in opposition not to raise a kafuffle about French Language Services considering some of the history of the province, but thank you very much for the advice.

Mr. Filmon: I appreciate the point that the Leader of the Opposition has made, and I might say that he and I agreed with respect to what was happening in the Pawley administration back in the '83-84 period. I do not think we have changed in our agreement today.

Madam Chairman: Item 1.(f) French Language Services Secretariat: No. (1) Salaries,

\$111,700—pass; 1.(f)(2) Other Expenditures, \$21,800—pass.

At this point, I would request that the minister's staff please leave the Chamber before we consider item 1.(a).

Item 1.(a) Premier and President of the Council's Salary, \$26,600—pass.

Resolution 5: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,184,200 for Executive Council, General Administration for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1992—pass.

This concludes the Estimates for Executive Council. Committee rise.

Call in the Deputy Speaker.

IN SESSION

Madam Deputy Speaker: The hour being past 10 p.m., this House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow (Tuesday).

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

Monday, April 29, 1991

CONTENTS

Concurrent Committees of Supply

Culture, Heritage and Citizenship	1339
Executive Council	1375