



First Session — Thirty-Fourth Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)

37 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XXXVII No. 69 - 1:30 p.m., TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1988.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fourth Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PARTY
ALCOCK, Reg	Osborne	LIBERAL
ANGUS, John	St. Norbert	LIBERAL
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BURRELL, Parker	Swan River	PC
CARR, James	Fort Rouge	LIBERAL
CARSTAIRS, Sharon	River Heights	LIBERAL
CHARLES, Gwen	Selkirk	LIBERAL
CHEEMA, Gulzar	Kildonan	LIBERAL
CHORNOPYSKI, William	Burrows	LIBERAL
CONNERY, Edward Hon.	Portage la Prairie	PC
COWAN, Jay	Churchill	NDP
CUMMINGS, Glen, Hon.	Ste. Rose du Lac	PC
DERKACH, Leonard, Hon.	Roblin-Russell	PC
DOER, Gary	Concordia	NDP
DOWNEY, James Hon.	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert, Hon.	Emerson	PC
DRIEDGER, Herold, L.	Niakwa	LIBERAL
DUCHARME, Gerald, Hon.	Riel	PC
EDWARDS, Paul	St. James	LIBERAL
ENNS, Harry	Lakeside	PC
ERNST, Jim, Hon.	Charleswood	PC
EVANS, Laurie	Fort Garry	LIBERAL
EVANS, Leonard	Brandon East	NDP
FILMON, Gary, Hon.	Tuxedo	PC
FINDLAY, Glen Hon.	Virdeu	PC
GAUDRY, Neil	St. Boniface	LIBERAL
GILLESHAMMER, Harold	Minnedosa	PC
GRAY, Avis	Elice	LIBERAL
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HELWER, Edward R.	Gimli	PC
HEMPHILL, Maureen	Logan	NDP
KOZAK, Richard, J.	Transcona	LIBERAL
LAMOUREUX, Kevin, M.	Inkster	LIBERAL
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MANDRAKE, Ed	Assiniboia	LIBERAL
MANNES, Clayton, Hon.	Morris	PC
McCRAE, James Hon.	Brandon West	PC
MINENKO, Mark	Seven Oaks	LIBERAL
MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.	River East	PC
NEUFELD, Harold, Hon.	Rossmere	PC
OLESON, Charlotte Hon.	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald Hon.	Pembina	PC
PANKRATZ, Helmut	La Verendrye	PC
PATTERSON, Allan	Radisson	LIBERAL
PENNER, Jack, Hon.	Rhineland	PC
PLOHMAN, John	Dauphin	NDP
PRAZNIK, Darren	Lac du Bonnet	PC
ROCAN, Denis, Hon.	Turtle Mountain	PC
ROCH, Gilles	Springfield	LIBERAL
ROSE, Bob	St. Vital	LIBERAL
STORIE, Jerry	Flin Flon	NDP
TAYLOR, Harold	Wolseley	LIBERAL
URUSKI, Bill	Interlake	NDP
WASYLYCIA-LEIS, Judy	St. Johns	NDP
YEO, Iva	Sturgeon Creek	LIBERAL

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, November 1, 1988.

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

PRAYERS ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Mr. Mark Minenko (Chairman of the Committee of Supply): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered certain resolutions, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer), that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

Mrs. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Community Services): I am pleased to table the Annual Report for 1987-88 of the Employment Services and Economic Security Department. Thank you.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Speaker: Prior to oral questions, may I direct the attention of Honourable Members to the Speaker's gallery where we have with us today His Excellency Bruce Brown, who is the High Commissioner of New Zealand.

On behalf of all Honourable Members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. Speaker: Following along with the tradition of our baby boom, I am sure all Honourable Members would like to join me in congratulating the Member for Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) and Sharon Tefs on the birth of their daughter, a sister for Catherine and Sean.

On behalf of all Honourable Members, congratulations!

Mr. Harold Taylor (Wolseley): I would just like to respond to that and thank the Members of the House for their good wishes, and I might ask if the Pages would care to distribute these to the NDP and Conservative Members on the other side. Thank you very much.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD Doerksen & Gronau Limited Loan Guarantee

Mr. John Angus (St. Norbert): My question will be directed to the Acting Premier (Mr. Cummings). Too

frequently in recent months we have been reacting to and reading in the paper of companies that unfortunately have not been able to maintain their financial viability in this economy. For whatever reason, they are tragic stories and Governments oftentimes feel helpless in retrospect to save them and/or do anything in terms of a positive response.

This morning I spent a considerable amount of time at a company in Fort Garry, Doerksen & Gronau Limited. Just for the information of the Members, this company has been in business for 26 years, employs close to 50 people and has \$4 million to \$5 million in sales. Last year, the first time in their history, they showed a loss and yet they were carried by the banks and the financial institutions based on their reputation and their ability to produce.

They have shown a profit in September; they have shown a profit in October. They have gone to both levels of Government, the province and the federal levels, asking for assistance. They have been turned down by both levels, Mr. Speaker. They have gone to the Business Development Bank. They have asked for assistance there and were turned down. They have gone to the Western Diversification Fund and were also advised that there were no programs available for their particular situation.

This Government has an opportunity here to respond and write the headlines as opposed to reading about them in the morning. What I would like this Minister to undertake is to immediately intervene.

My question is, Mr. Speaker: will he immediately intervene to assist this organization with a loan guarantee to help them turn their corporation around? If I may beg your indulgence for just one more minute, the company employees have agreed to reduce their salaries by 50 percent in a lot of cases and 20 percent in the others. They are prepared to make the effort. Will this Government take immediate action to help this organization?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Deputy Premier): Mr. Speaker, no Government wants to hear of or see corporations with large numbers of employees that find themselves in financial difficulty for whatever reason. At the same time, I am not aware of the details of this company and I will undertake to have further discussions with the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst) and make sure that we have left no stone unturned.

* (1335)

Government Intervention

Mr. John Angus (St. Norbert): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Deputy Leader's (Mr. Cummings) position on this. Unfortunately, this company is living under a smoking gun. Their bank has threatened to call their

particular note this afternoon and throw them into receivership. Will the Deputy Leader contact the Royal Bank of Canada and encourage them to give a short postponement while his department is reviewing the circumstances and the facts?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Deputy Premier): Without any kind of detail, without any kind of background, I think it would be very foolhardy on my part to undertake that kind of action on the part of the Government. If the Member were to bring forward the information, bring forward all of the facts behind this situation, and if they had come forward in a logical sequence of time so we could have an opportunity to absorb them, it might be more possible to provide a definitive answer at this time, but to have a Government come in at the last moment without having had an opportunity to receive all of the background would simply not be appropriate action.

Mr. Angus: First of all, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst) is well aware of this, has all of the facts at his fingertips, so that information is readily available. I will guarantee to have individuals from that corporation in this Minister's office by 2:30 this afternoon.

Free Trade Agreement Doerksen and Gronau Limited Closure

Mr. John Angus (St. Norbert): My final question is that there appears to be some concerns from this organization—and I will quote from a letter that I will table—"It seems unfair that after gearing up for export and successfully—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Would the Honourable Member kindly put his question.

Mr. Angus: I am sorry. My question is, given the fact that this company is prepared to make the following statement—may I quote it?

Some Honourable Members: No, no.

Mr. Angus: I cannot. Mr. Speaker, then, given the fact that this company is prepared to go on record suggesting that the Free Trade Agreement is causing some damage, that their company has been labelled, will this Minister get involved in this organization and will he help them? Will he table a definitive plan to help other companies like that company?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Deputy Premier): Obviously, now the Member wants to reveal his true motives for bringing this last-ditch effort to negotiate into the Legislature.

The vast majority of companies in this province will benefit from a free trade arrangement with one of the largest consuming nations of the world. We need access to the markets. We have had a demonstrable difference in the value of the Canadian dollar since the fearmongers and the Liberal and NDP, who are trying to tear down the free trade arrangement, have all of

a sudden realized it might not be possible for the free trade arrangement to pass. We have seen a demonstrable drop in our dollar. We have seen those Members opposite, with great glee, say they want to tear up the Free Trade Agreement. Let them demonstrate the jobs that are going to be lost if we do lose to free trade.

* (1340)

Adverse Effects on Business

Mr. John Angus (St. Norbert): A new series of questions on the same subjects to the same Minister with a preamble.

We on this side of the House have been prepared and repeatedly tried to point out those firms in Manitoba that may be adversely affected by the free trade arrangement. The Government has continually touted the benefits.

My question to this Minister at this particular time is: do you have a definitive plan to assist those organizations, those companies that are going to be "losers" in the Free Trade Agreement, and will you table it?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Deputy Premier): The operative word in what the Honourable Member just brought forward is "may." He has not identified the areas even with the corporation that he brought forward today. We do not have free trade at this time.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Cummings: Every study that has been done regarding the increased trade between this country—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. It appears there are several Ministers attempting to help the Honourable Acting First Minister. I have recognized the Honourable Acting First Minister.

Mr. Cummings: Every study that has been done to examine the benefits of an increased trade between the companies and the population of this province to the larger and more affluent in terms of consumer orientation to the country to the south of us, that larger market, has been beneficial to our manufacturers. It is beneficial to our agriculture. Mr. Speaker, they are simply trying to create a cloud of fear.

Mr. Angus: The cloud of fear that is created is certainly real in the minds of 50 employees and their families in Fort Garry.

Business Closure Speculation

Mr. John Angus (St. Norbert): My supplementary question is that will this Minister contact the Royal Bank and ask them if they have labelled this particular company under the Free Trade Agreement and withheld their line of credit for a perfectly viable organization

because of the impending doom of the Free Trade Agreement?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Deputy Premier): There are an awful of assumptions in the Honourable Member's question.

Mr. Speaker, we have always contended that we are prepared to examine any possibilities of changes associated with the trade arrangement. Let us not get into the situation where we have the Members opposite so adamantly opposed to a free trade arrangement that is based on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, an agreement that will expand our opportunity, an agreement that will get jobs for our sons and daughters, an agreement that will allow us to continue to export our agricultural products. Let him not forget that the more he tries to bring up the spectre of losses, the more he clouds the fact that there are a great many gains for this province.

* (1345)

Doerksen and Gronau Limited Government Intervention

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert, with a final supplementary question.

Mr. John Angus (St. Norbert): Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary question is: Given all of the politics aside of who is right and who is wrong, will this Minister investigate today the circumstances of this company and try to rewrite the headlines so that 50 employees of this firm in Fort Garry will be able to feed their families through the Christmas period?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Deputy Premier): Mr. Speaker, this company approached the Industry, Trade and Tourism Minister (Mr. Ernst) on very short notice. Now if this is an issue that has been building up, then why is it that all of a sudden when we get into the free trade debate, that now it is being brought forward on such very short notice?

The Members opposite are demanding that interim stopgap measures be applied without requiring some reasonable common-sense judgment being put forward by the Government. The Minister of Industry and Trade is not here today, but certainly—pardon me, Mr. Speaker. In his absence, I will tell the Members opposite that we will take any of these concerns seriously and this concern will be taken seriously. It is very, very unusual that a Member would bring forward this kind of complaint on short notice in the Legislature without having a political motivation.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Is that an order, Mr. Speaker, that last comment?

Mr. Speaker, I found it rather ironic the comments on free trade. This Government supports free trade to New Jersey and not free trade in Canada, because the issue was never raised on bus manufacturing with the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and the Premier of Quebec yesterday.

City of Winnipeg Act Election Expenses Disclosure

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): My question is to the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme). In the White Paper that was tabled in this House awhile ago leading into reform on civic Government in Winnipeg, there was a recommendation to improve the election expense by-laws in the City of Winnipeg to provide for mandatory disclosure of election contributions at City Hall, the mandatory ceilings and the mandatory limits for the amount of money a corporation may give a person running for council.

The Minister has that information. I know he has a working paper and the start of draft legislation some six months ago that we were prepared to introduce last spring in terms of legislation to reform The City of Winnipeg Act for disclosure.

In light of all the rumours about developers and the relationship with city councillors, the Gang of Nineteen and the developers of this city, is the Minister going to bring in reform of the election expenses provisions of The City of Winnipeg Act to deal with mandatory disclosure in this Session of the Legislature?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Urban Affairs): First of all, the last couple of days it is now the Gang of Eighteen.

However, I have consulted with my staff in regard to The Municipal Council Conflict of Information Act, and there is a section in that Act that provides that no councillor is required to disclose a gift if it is worth less than \$250.00. Therefore, the \$200 provided by the development to the councillor in question during his campaign would not require disclosure.

However, as reported in the last couple of days, the city clerk, Bob Hayes, has also quoted that while there is no legal requirement to file a statement on the election expenses, councillors must, under The Interest Act, declare any future gifts of \$250 or more made to them or a member of their family.

I have asked my staff, in consultation with the municipal council or the Municipal Affairs Branch, to go over that conflict of information that is now in place to the councillors and I will get back. If we are ready to introduce legislation regarding the White Paper, as I have said earlier, I would introduce that as part of the legislation in the next Session.

Mr. Doer: I hope in the Minister's review he will support perhaps the Private Member's Bill on election reform in The City of Winnipeg Act, because I believe we have to pass the legislation in this Session to be ready for the next civic election in the City of Winnipeg.

* (1350)

Mayor's Accountability Chair Appointments

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): A further question to the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr.

Ducharme). The White Paper also deals with the fact that at present a loose-knit coalition, and it is called the Gang of Nineteen, Gang of Seventeen—the Liberal-Tory coalition—meets to decide to who will get the plum spots at City Hall, and comments on the fact that there is no accountability for that group when they assign those very important Chair positions to the various councillors, and a recommendation is to hold the Mayor accountable to the public hearings for appointing those Chairs, a person elected by the whole city.

My question to the Minister of Urban Affairs is: Is he looking at amending the legislation to hold the Mayor accountable and responsible for appointing those Chairs rather than the loose-knit coalition, the Gang of Nineteen coalition, that is not accountable to any members of the public?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, maybe I can give the Member across the way some history. A few years ago there was what was called the ICEC Committee. I remember when a Gang of Fifteen, composed of seven NDPs and eight independents, figured out their committee chairman. I did not hear the Member or that particular Government question it at that time, but I guess right now it is a little different question.

Now to answer his question in regard to whether consideration be given to the Mayor having more powers, I have said previously that I will bring in the necessary legislation so that council can know at the time when they are doing their boundaries, etc., for the next fall, and I will bring in amendments to The City of Winnipeg Act in the next Session. We know that it will be long before the fall of '89.

City of Winnipeg Act Reform

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): The Member well knows there is no member of the NDP on the Gang of Nineteen now at City Hall. The Member knows our position in writing a year and a half ago on civic reform.

My question to the Minister is: The present system of accountability to the City of Winnipeg could be replaced by a system whereby the Mayor appointed the various Chairs of the committees, and the Mayor, instead of just snipping ribbons at City Hall, would appoint those major committee Chairs and would be held accountable by the people of Winnipeg if those Chairs did not fulfill their function. Does the Minister not think that is a more accountable and responsible way consistent with the public hearings that took place during the Cherniack Report?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I do not know. There was one Member that was appointed the other day that was at one time NDP for 25 years or something, but I guess he is no longer considered one of those.

However, we went through the process of the Cherniack Report. Everyone contributed toward that

report. During the process of City Council—the Member over there is now saying that no city councillors are accountable. I do not share that view, the motive that the individual is putting on this floor. I believe that all councillors, like all MLAs in this particular room, are accountable. I will, as I mentioned before, be bringing in changes to The City of Winnipeg Act when we bring in our next Session.

City of Winnipeg Act Increase Councillors

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): I am absolutely shocked that the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme) would support this loose coalition, this backroom coalition.

My question to the Minister of Urban Affairs is given the fact that councillors from the Inner City generally voted against suburban sprawl and given the fact that a reduced number of councillors would reduce the number of Inner City councillors that provided the greatest fight for suburban sprawl that would cost taxpayers millions of dollars, would the Minister reconsider his position on the size of City Council so that Inner City councillors could fight for maintaining a city balance between development and sprawl that cost millions and millions of dollars, a balance that was led generally, not in all cases, but generally by Inner City councillors in terms of the development of this city?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I did not go on record as supporting any coalition. What I am saying is that councillors do face a different type of position and a different type of Government that can be improved on. I did go on record with my letter after the first reading in regard to the subdivision agreement. I have not received a second reading. I do not believe that proper legislation can come forward piecemeal on The City of Winnipeg Act. I will at that time, and I repeat again for the Member, that I will bring in the necessary changes to The City of Winnipeg Act during the next Session.

* (1355)

Rail Line Abandonment Moratorium

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation): Mr. Speaker, last week on October 26, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) took a question as notice on my behalf from the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman), and I would like to reply to that question. I found it ironical that after waiting for two months for a question from the Member for Dauphin, that the day that I attended a funeral, that was the day he decided to ask the question.

The question was regarding rail line abandonment. I want to indicate that our Government and myself are taking the lead role in terms of development and promotion of a responsible rail rationalization program. In fact, I personally discussed this with the federal

Minister on various occasions. At the officials level, the western provinces recently completed a more detailed proposal for our rail rationalization process, including the mechanics as to the implementation of the program. The proposal is being reviewed by the four western provinces responsible for transportation. We hope to have an agreement within the near future.

As a matter of information, two of the provinces have been attempting to limit the abandonment impact evaluation to strict economics. We have been adamant in continuing to press for a process that considers the full range of social and economic impacts of abandonment. This is essential to the interests of communities and shippers. Further, I have asked the federal Minister to delay abandonment process proceedings pending the introduction of a more responsible and less adversarial process. We will continue to take a lead role in this process.

Psychiatrists Manitoba Total

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan): I have a question for the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard). Improving the quality of mental health in Manitoba is my Party's prime objective. But we have a different approach, not the one this Minister has taken by undermining the collective agreement with MMA. To be more effective, this administration has failed to improve the psychiatric manpower in Manitoba. Problems still remain the same.

My question is: will the Minister of Health tell us precisely how many more psychiatrists are practising in the Province of Manitoba than there were six months ago?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I am going to have to check for specific numbers, but I believe it is two or three, and I will provide that for my honourable friend.

Manitoba Medical Association Violation of Agreement

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, given the fact that the doctors are threatening legal action against this Government because of the Minister's desire to violate the Medical Association's collective agreement, can the Minister tell this House what steps he will take to correct his error of judgment on violating a collective agreement?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, let us be perfectly clear who my honourable friend, the Liberal Health critic, is advocating for. It is not the doctors he is advocating for. It is the doctors' union that he is advocating for.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in the statement to the House, and indeed, in answers to my honourable friend yesterday, we take very seriously, on this side of the House, the severe problem at the Brandon Mental Health Centre and we are taking steps, in consultation with the Manitoba Medical Association, the Manitoba Psychiatric Association and the two mental health

centres, in an attempt to resolve that problem both in the short run and in the long run.

Given my honourable friend's question from a short two and a half weeks ago complaining about the psychiatric shortage at Brandon Mental Health Centre, I find this flip-flop in defence of the doctors' union to be incomprehensible.

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Speaker, the Minister is right. I am advocating—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Cheema: Listen to me. I am advocating for a group who is very vulnerable, who is underserved, who have been neglected by this administration for the last six months. I am advocating for the people who are suffering with the mental health care in Manitoba and I resent this Minister's remarks.

* (1400)

Psychiatrist Shortage Brandon Mental Health Centre

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, my question is: Given that the Minister is setting a new tone of violating collective agreements, whether it is for the MMA or potentially others, will the Minister explain how this bizarre approach to mental health will solve the crisis of mental health in Manitoba?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the only bizarre approach that I have seen so far in the House is the bizarre approach of the Liberal Party, and I presume that the critic is speaking on behalf of all 19 other Liberal Members in the House. Oh, I am sorry, I forgot about that other fellow, and obviously you have, as well.

The efforts that I am undertaking to resolve the psychiatric manpower shortage in Brandon is in the full attempt to provide services to the 300 patients who are resident in Brandon Mental Health Centre, as well as the 2,000 Manitobans who are served on an outpatient basis from that facility. I am going to make every effort possible on behalf of those 2,300 Manitobans to resolve a long-standing problem.

I would have hoped, Mr. Speaker, I would have cooperation to do that and to help those disadvantaged Manitobans rather than the doctors' union.

MPIC Complaints Received

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation (Mr. Cummings). At the committee meeting this morning, under some close questioning, senior officials at MPIC were asked how many complaints or inquiries came into the offices of the corporation last year. The answer, Mr. Speaker, was 80,000—not 8,000, not 18,000, but 80,000.

On further examination, that represents an increase of about 30,000 inquiries from the previous year. I

wonder if the Minister could tell the House how many inquiries or complaints his office has received about the operations of MPIC since he has become Minister.

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation): My office receives a considerable number of inquiries from time to time. It varies, and I would be unable to give him a precise number, but something that is of interest, Mr. Speaker—and I think that the Members have probably deduced it accurately over a period of time, judging from the calls that they receive themselves—the majority of the calls that I have been receiving in the last six weeks have all been related to the \$20 late payment fee. That is the one area, of course, that the corporation has already indicated that they are prepared to take some redirection for next year.

Kopstein Recommendations Ombudsman

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): In his report, Judge Kopstein talks about the necessity of asking the Ombudsman and using other forms of mediation to ensure that individuals who are unhappy with the treatment or the service they receive from officials at MPIC have some recourse. Will the Minister tell us how he intends and when he intends to implement those recommendations of the report?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation): The recommendation of Judge Kopstein to use the Ombudsman much more extensively and give him more powers in relationship to MPIC than he presently has is a recommendation that we have indicated we wish to give some further consideration to. I answered this question in committee this morning, but allow me to repeat some of the reasons that we have done it in that manner.

No. 1, there are five recommendations related to the Ombudsman. It would require, I believe, additional staff and certainly would have Treasury Board ramifications to that extent.

The Ombudsman's Office is an office that I respect too much simply to make a decision and dump additional responsibilities into his office and I have written a letter which he will not have received yet, but I have written a letter to him asking him to apprise me of his thoughts and concerns regarding these recommendations.

Thirdly, there are other models that we can look at to determine if there are other ways that can be used to make sure that there is a court of last resort for those who feel that they have not been well-treated by a Crown corporation.

MPIC Annual Public Meetings

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): In light of the fact that 80,000 separate inquiries, many of them complaints, have been forwarded to MPIC and that among the 27

recommendations of the Kopstein Report already accepted by this Minister is to withdraw the annual meeting with MPIC, at which time Members of the motoring public can tell the corporation through its senior officials what its frustrations are, will the Minister today reverse his position and offer those annual meetings to the people of Manitoba who want to communicate their frustration about MPIC?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation): There are several avenues by which the corporation will be out and having public discussions and opportunity for the public to meet. There are several other recommendations from the judge where they will be meeting with the tradespeople in public meetings, where they will be meeting with other people regarding the repair industry and how they relate to the corporation.

If we wait until the new Bill regarding public accountability of Crowns is introduced, you will see that there are ways and means in there in which we can enhance the ability of the public to communicate with the corporation.

I would like to add one last comment. Not to downplay in any way the amount of complaints that MPIC receives; the numbers are large, they are too large, and it is my goal and it is certainly the goal of the corporation that they be reduced, but let us remember that the number that the Member is using is the number of calls that come in on the customer relations line and, as the Member asked this morning, we will be getting a further breakdown of those numbers in relationship to how many of them are complaints and how many of them are information-related.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): I find it interesting that the Liberal Party, which opposed The Crown Accountability Act, is now criticizing the Government for taking away the public meetings, meetings they never supported.

Bill No. 33 Immediate Enactment

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): My question is in regard to the increasing concern in Manitoba over layoffs and plant closures as a result of the slowdown in the economy that has taken place over the last number of months and also because of the impending impact of the Free Trade Agreement. Specifically, I would like to reference the 470 jobs that are going to be lost, 470 people are going to be without work because of the Wescott Fashions layoff.

I recently introduced Bill No. 33 which would improve protection for workers affected by plant closures and layoffs. My question to the Minister of Labour is: will the Minister and this Government support the immediate enactment of Bill No. 33 to ensure that the employees at Wescott Fashions will have the availability of the increased notice provisions, the severance pay, the provision for a job search leave, and also the ability to buy the company that is part of Bill 33 that was introduced recently in this House?

Hon. Edward Connery (Minister of Labour): The situation at Wescott is a very tragic situation for 470 people. It did not come about because we do not have (sic) free trade. It is because we do not have free trade and we do not have adequate trade for these companies that we are finding some businesses failing. What we inherited from the NDP Government with payroll taxes and a bad attitude towards business is the reason why we are having some of the problems.

As the Minister of Labour, we are concerned. This morning, I had a meeting with my department officials. They will be working with Employment Services and with the federal Government to see, just in case this company does close, our Government, through the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst), is working very hard to ensure that this company does not close and that we do not lose the 470 jobs, but our committee will be in place to ensure that these people are looked after.

Mr. Ashton: The Minister did not answer my question. I asked him, and perhaps I will ask it in this context.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Ashton: Has the Minister read Bill 33? Will he be supporting the provision?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member knows that we cannot demand an answer. We do not make reference to such answers. The Honourable Member for Thompson, with a supplementary question.

Mr. Ashton: I am not concerned about whether I get an answer. I am concerned about the 470 employees involved. I asked the Minister: has he read Bill 33? Will he support the provisions in Bill 33; and, further, will he ensure that this Bill is enacted as soon as possible so the Wescott Fashion workers will have the benefits of the protection in this Bill?

Mr. Connery: There will be some time very soon to discuss Bill 33. The Members opposite will have the chance of this Government to get our views on it.

But our concern is the 470 workers at Wescott. Not only Wescott, Mr. Speaker, there are hundreds of people in this province. As the Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Angus) brought up, a company that is having trouble, not a company that was having trouble because they are in free trade but a company having trouble because they do not have adequate trade. It is a very simplistic answer with trade. We will ensure that people like at Wescott, 470 people, and the 50 people that the Member for St. Norbert brought up, that is how we will attempt to ensure that all Manitobans will have a job and a good job. So, Mr. Speaker, that is the role of our Government.

* (1410)

Immediate Enactment

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Thompson, with a final supplementary question.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): My question is to the Deputy Premier (Mr. Cummings). Since the Minister of Labour (Mr. Connery) has, within his rights, I suppose, as a Member of the Legislature, refused to answer my question, will the Deputy Premier commit this Government to do something for the 470 workers and ensure the immediate enactment of Bill No. 33?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have reminded the Honourable Member for Thompson. I have reminded you on two other occasions. Now would the Honourable Member for Thompson kindly rephrase his question? We do not make reference to either receiving or not receiving an answer.

Mr. Ashton: My question to the Deputy Premier was: will he, in his capacity as Deputy Premier, ensure that Bill No. 33, which incidentally will be introduced for second reading as early as today, will be enacted by this Government? They can sponsor it if they want. I am not concerned about who gets the credit for it. I am concerned about the 470 workers. Will he support Bill 33?

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. In addition to giving his impressions of the quality of the answers, the Honourable Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) proceeds to ask the same question three times in a row. We have rules in this House about oral questions being repetitive too, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to thank the Honourable Government House Leader, but I asked the Honourable Member to kindly rephrase his question.

Mr. Ashton: Mr. Speaker, I am asking, on behalf of the workers involved, whether the Deputy Premier (Mr. Cummings) will commit this Government to ensuring that their expanded layoff provisions, severance pay provisions, job search leave and the ability to buy the company, all of which are provisions in Bill No. 33, will the Government introduce those kinds of measures on behalf of workers such as the Wescott Fashion workers?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Deputy Premier): Mr. Speaker, we will assure the Members opposite that as a Government that is responsible and acting in a responsible manner, we will do everything possible to make sure that the viable jobs are kept in this province.

The Members opposite do not seem to have listened too well yesterday when the Premier (Mr. Filmon) indicated that Wescott Fashions presently had someone who was actively pursuing the continuing operation of that plant. If that should come to pass, then we have something far more important than lay-off guarantees. We have jobs.

Native Health Care Services Offered

Mr. Herold Driedger (Niakwa): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Northern and Native Affairs (Mr. Downey). One of the roles of the Minister and his department is to advocate on behalf of aboriginal people on northern issues. What actions has he taken to facilitate the development of culturally appropriate health care delivery such as, for example, the proposal made to the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) by the Swampy Creek Tribal Council?

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern and Native Affairs): Mr. Speaker, let me assure the Member opposite and the House that I have and the department has done everything possible to try to make sure that the health needs, the cultural needs, the educational needs are being addressed. I have to say there has been somewhat a lack of that in the previous years by the former administration—not near enough attention paid to the concerns and the needs. We are now trying to catch up and address those matters.

Mr. Speaker: The time for oral questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, with the Honourable Member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer) in the Chair for the Department of Education; and the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks (Mr. Minenko) in the Chair for the Department of Health.

* (1440)

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY—EDUCATION

Mr. Chairman, Harold Gilleshammer: I would like to call this meeting to order to discuss the Estimates for the Department of Education. We are on section 2. Statutory Boards and Commissions (a) Teachers' Retirement Allowances Fund \$26,514,400.00. Shall the item pass? The Honourable Minister of Education.

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education): Yesterday we took several items as notice. I had indicated that we would get this information back for the committee.

Unfortunately, because of the fact that a lot of the information has to be pulled from a variety of sources, we are not able to table the information right at this moment. I would ask the patience of the committee.

We will table it on Thursday or tomorrow, if Estimates go tomorrow.

Mrs. Iva Yeo (Sturgeon Creek): I just have, I think, basically one question. I hesitate to say that because sometimes one leads to two, it leads to three, etc., but basically one question.

The figure that is represented there is utilized for salaries plus for expenses to those teachers in the province who have retired. Am I correct in making that assumption?

Mr. Derkach: No, that figure represents only the pension payments that are made. That, I might add, is the Government's portion of the pension payments that are made.

Mrs. Yeo: So that Glen Buhr, who is the executive secretary of the Teachers' Retirement Allowances Fund Board, his salary is paid for out of some other allotment?

Mr. Derkach: All the administrative costs and the operating costs, including the salaries, are paid out of the teachers' portion of the contributions.

Mrs. Yeo: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the item pass?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): I have two questions to the Minister. First of all, has any attempt been made to forecast the appropriation dollar figure required under this resolution number for the next number of years? Specifically, where will we be five years from now? You may have covered this yesterday but if you have not, I would appreciate some indication of that forecast.

Mr. Derkach: This was mentioned yesterday, I might add. Staff are preparing those figures presently. We will be able to table that either tomorrow or Thursday.

Mr. Manness: In 1985, when the Legislature of that day was debating the early retirement provision without penalty, it became known at that time that the profile of the teaching profession showed that there was an average age at that time. I am really trying to think from memory, the average teacher was 39 years of age, I think. It was just under 40, if I recall. The argument was made that early retirement would cause that average figure to move down and allow some new thoughts and some new energies to come in. Could the Minister of Education today indicate what the average age is of the profession?

Mr. Derkach: According to our latest statistics, the average age of the teaching profession is 40.

Mr. Manness: I then ask the Minister why that would be, given the fact that this was supposed to be one of the major thrusts behind this proposal? Was there not that big of an uptake by people voluntarily retiring without penalty as was expected and indeed as some of us said, would not occur? Obviously, there has to be some reason for that.

Tuesday, November 1, 1988

Mr. Derkach: The overall numbers of teachers who have retired have certainly increased. However, the numbers of teachers who are retiring, are taking early retirement in the total pool of teachers who retired, are small enough that it does not significantly affect the average age of the teachers that are in the work force.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the item pass? The Member for Flin Flon.

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): I appreciate that it will be difficult to get all of the information together which was requested last night. I reiterate that I am hoping that the Minister will not only provide us with the information that was requested with respect to the concerns that had been expressed to him and to the Minister of Finance federally about the impending changes.

Everything that he will identify for us, the concerns that had been raised to him by his colleagues or others with respect to the position that has been taken on this matter by both the Manitoba Teachers' Society and the Manitoba Organization of Nurses' Association, both of whom have some serious problems with the intent of the legislation and with its impact.

Mr. Chairperson, I had put on record last night my suspicion that the concern, both at the federal level and with some of the Minister's colleagues, was with respect to the revenue loss to the federal Government that, in particular, the reduction of the pension age from 60 to 55 had caused. I have, since last night, had an opportunity to read the remarks of both the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Labour, and it confirms for me the view that the federal Government has laid on the table their desire to reduce the earnings of teachers retiring through 1991 and beyond, to save money.

They have chosen to attack, if you will and perhaps that is too strong a word, the pensionable earnings of teachers and nurses and others as a way to reduce the cost to the Treasury. I find it lamentable that no one on the Treasury Bench and not the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) or anyone else has taken a stand in support of the teachers. I do not think it is fair. I do not think most Canadians view an attack on the pension earnings of people retiring as the appropriate way to address the costs that Governments face.

They have other alternatives and they are spending billions on submarines and billions on tax loopholes, on \$500,000 capital gains exemptions and all the rest of it. I think it is objectionable in the extreme to have these kinds of amendments come forward without consultation, without a real understanding of how they are going to impact on people. I think it is equally as frustrating and as unacceptable to have the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) not stand up and say enough is enough, as I believe it is his job to do. The Minister has given us all kinds of excuses why he has not done that. I think from reading the comments of his colleagues it is quite clear why he has not done that, because he does not have any support amongst his colleagues for the concerns that teachers have expressed.

I note with some regret that some of the Liberals in the Legislature, including the Member for Radisson (Mr. Patterson), have enunciated the same position. They are more concerned with balancing the books on the backs of teachers and nurses, and so forth, than they are on the merits of the case and the justice in it.

I am prepared to pass this item with the understanding that the Minister will answer the questions that have been asked in the next few days, prior to certainly the completion of the Estimates process.

Mr. Chairman: Item 2.(a) Teachers' Retirement Allowances Fund—pass.

Item 2.(b) Other Statutory Boards and Commissions \$30,000—shall the item pass? The Member for Sturgeon Creek.

* (1450)

Mrs. Yeo: I again think I just have one question. The last time one went to two, so we will see. I am looking at the list of five other Statutory Boards and I just wanted to know, are all of these only activated by the direction of the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) or do they have standing dates for meetings? If so, how many times a year do they meet?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Chairman, I will just go through them for the Member's sake. The Board of Reference meets only as required. The Advisory Board meets once every two months. The Collective Agreement Board meets as required. The Arbitration and Conciliation Board meets as requested by schools boards or teachers' associations, or both. The Certification Review Committee meets as required.

Mrs. Yeo: I am not really asking another question. This is part of my first question, Mr. Chairperson. I think I asked when these committees last met. How many times in the last year?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Chairman, the last meeting of the Board of Reference was sometime in October. The next meeting will be on November 6th. The Advisory Board met last on October 3. The Collective Agreement Board met last on October 12. The Arbitration Board and Conciliation Board of course meets on an ongoing basis. The Certification Review Committee met on October 3.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the item pass? The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

Mr. Laurie Evans (Fort Garry): I am still concerned, Mr. Chairperson, regarding the whole aspect of the unfunded liability. Now we passed that but I still have a theoretical question here, and nominally, who actually employs teachers? Is it the school board that they work for or is it the provincial Government?

Mr. Derkach: The school boards employ the teachers.

Mr. Laurie Evans: That is answer I was afraid I was going to get, because it concerns me that if the school

Tuesday, November 1, 1988

board employs the teachers and you are dealing with an unfunded liability, then the responsibility for that unfunded liability is indirectly a provincial responsibility. But I think if you came down to the legal consequences of it, it is a school board's responsibility in terms of that unfunded liability. Is that correct or not?

Mr. Derkach: The Province of Manitoba is a signatory to the Act and it is explained in The Teachers' Pension Act that that responsibility will stay with the province.

Mr. Chairman: Item 2.(b) Other Statutory Boards and Commissions—shall the item pass? The Member for Flin Flon.

Mr. Storie: I do not intend to take a long time. Perhaps my colleague from Sturgeon Creek (Mrs. Yeo) already asked. Has the Board of Reference been asked at this point to conduct any boundary review, and if so, have some monies been set aside to conduct such a review?

Mr. Derkach: No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the item pass?

Mr. Storie: No, Mr. Chairperson. The Minister indicated that no monies have been set aside. Has the Minister met with the Board of Reference to discuss, I guess, their concerns about boundaries? Have they expressed to the Minister any concerns?

Mr. Derkach: I have not met with the Board of Reference as yet, but certainly in the next little while, I intend to meet with them for a kind of an inauguration or a first-time meeting with them, because it is a new board that is in place.

Mr. Storie: Are there any outstanding issues before the Board of Reference?

Mr. Derkach: There are several outstanding issues that the board is dealing with presently. There is an issue at Turtle River, one at Gypsumville and one in St. Vital.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the item pass? (Agreed)

Resolution No. 42: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$26,544,400 for Education, Statutory Boards and Commissions, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1989. Shall the item pass? (Agreed)

Proceeding to Item 3. Financial Support - Schools. Provides financial support to School Boards and assistance to educational organizations. (a) School Grants and Other Assistance \$437,787,900—shall the item pass? The Honourable Minister.

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Chairman, I have a handout that I would like to have distributed at this time. The handout that is being distributed at this time is intended to be an aid in understanding this whole section. It is a brief summary, an easy-to-read reference guide, so to speak, describing the current methods of funding and hopefully it will be of some help as we move through this particular section. This is a booklet that is also distributed to the

trustees or the school boards so that they have a better understanding of this fairly complex area.

Mrs. Yeo: In this area the various aspects of funding are outlined, so I assume that we can talk about such things as High and Low Incidence Funding and the level 1, 2 and 3. Again I would like to reiterate a comment that I made earlier, I believe, about the concern that has been raised by several school divisions with regard to the Low Incidence Funding. Now I think you call them level 1, 2 and 3.

Again I would ask the Minister for assurance that the committee that he has organized, the Ed. Finance Committee, will be looking at better ways of addressing the needs of the individuals in the school divisions who need to have extra funding for various handicaps, etc. I am wondering if the Minister could tell us when he assumes that the Ed. Finance Review Committee will have completed their task.

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Chairman, to the first concern with regard to the Low Incidence Funding, certainly that area will be addressed in the Ed. Finance Review. As the Member points out, she had some concerns about it and certainly I think there have been some concerns expressed by myself with regard to the approach that has been taken. Therefore, this will be addressed in the Ed. Finance Review. The timing, Mr. Chairman, it is hoped that we will have completed the Ed. Finance Review by the end of the year.

* (1500)

Mrs. Yeo: Can the Minister tell us what thrust his department is having with regard to the aspect of mainstreaming?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Chairman, mainstreaming is certainly an important concept because we have heard from various groups about the importance of it. Certainly, in the main we believe that it is a positive step in trying to accommodate as many students as possible into the regular school system. I can say that we are going to be addressing this whole issue in the area of the Ed. Finance Review as well.

Mrs. Yeo: So that at this point in time the sort of philosophical belief of the department cannot be broadly stated. What I am concerned about, is the department looking towards increasing the aspect of mainstreaming or are they looking more towards the segregated type of teaching or a combination of both, the side streaming aspect, if you will?

Mr. Derkach: There is not a significant shift in terms of the concept in either moving toward or moving away from mainstreaming. As a matter of fact, the same approach is going to be taken that is presently in progress, and that is that we will mainstream as many students as we possibly can. In situations where it is impossible to mainstream a child for one reason or another, the type of programming will be provided that in fact meets the needs of that child. If, for example, partial mainstreaming can take place with that individual

child, that is the approach that we will be taking. Certainly, there is no intended approach to segregate children as was the practice before.

Mrs. Yeo: So that if a parent who had a child with, let us say, Down's syndrome and the child was entering kindergarten, that child would have the option of attending the neighbourhood school if he or she was physically able to join in with the other students?

Mr. Derkach: In general, this is the approach. However it is still the jurisdiction of the local school board to make that decision as to whether it is the neighbourhood school that will be attended or whether there is a designated school in that particular area that can handle that particular student, because as you know, we do not have resources in each and every school to deal with all kinds of situations in this point in time. If there are in fact teachers and resource people in a neighbouring school that are specialists, so to speak, in those areas and handling those kinds of situations, that is still a responsibility of the school board.

Mrs. Yeo: What does the department see as the future for such schools as the Softley School, Kirkfield Park, Lord Roberts, etc., where there are some segregated students?

Mr. Derkach: Over time, it is the hope and the intent that those very specialized schools or segregated schools such as the Softley School will diminish in their role in that the regular schools will have within them the capabilities of handling those situations which require segregation, but as much as possible, there will be an attempt to mainstream.

Mrs. Yeo: I must say that I am certainly in favour of mainstreaming wherever possible. However, I do also have some fear or some concern for the rights of the teaching staff. I can see that if you have one child in a class of, say, 20 who requires a great deal of individualized attention, that this could be a very difficult situation in which a teacher finds himself or herself, and I am wondering what particular support services the Minister sees as being available to the teaching staff with the increased thrust of mainstreaming.

Mr. Derkach: That again is a local school board decision, and I guess each situation will differ because there will have to be an assessment of whether there is a requirement for special resource type people in that school or teacher aides or special supports for those students who have learning disabilities and handicaps.

We understand very clearly that we are putting much more pressure on teachers within the regular classroom to try and meet the needs not only of the students that are there on a regular basis but also those special needs students, so certainly we understand that those teachers will require some special supports to assist them with those heavy loads.

I think, Mr. Chairman, it is fair to say that today, even though the length of the school day is the same, we are demanding a great deal more from teachers

because of the shift and the changes of society and the demands of society, but we will still maintain to attempt to move in the direction of mainstreaming as many students as we can. In those situations where we cannot mainstream, where it is impossible, special types of classrooms or situations will have to be established to take care of the needs of those individual students.

Mrs. Yeo: It is my understanding from an explanation the Minister gave the other day that these Level 1, 2 and 3 support grants are block type of grants that go to the school divisions on a per student capita basis and that certainly has concerned me since hearing that statement.

I would hope that the Ed. Finance Committee would look at this very carefully because if, for instance, one particular school division had several students who required additional assistance, I can see whereby the school division would run out of these grants very quickly, whereas another school division may have far fewer.

Is there any assistance available? Is there any sort of appeal type of format for school divisions who may find themselves with the need for additional hiring of educational assistance to help the teachers who may have children with mental or physical handicaps placed in their classrooms?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Chairman, I guess to clarify something, first of all, the block grant is only provided to the Level 1 areas. The Level 2 and 3 areas are still 6,600 and 13,250 or whatever it is. Is it 13,200? There is not an appeal mechanism as such, Mr. Chairman. However, in areas where there is a specific need and it is identified, certainly, it is our responsibility and the responsibility of the school divisions to provide, inasmuch as we humanly can, the kinds of supports that are required for that individual child.

* (1510)

Mrs. Yeo: Does the Minister have the figure on the numbers of Level 1, the numbers of Level 2 and the numbers of Level 3 supported students?

Mr. Derkach: Due to the change and the formula per se and because the Level 1 students are receiving a block fund, it is not possible to know the exact numbers of those students. However, the Level 2, 838, and the Level 3, 120.

Mrs. Yeo: Is there any thought or any effort made to plan for some form of in-services to the teachers in the province to assist them with the integration of handicapped students into the mainstream?

Mr. Derkach: There are ongoing in-services throughout the province through the Child Care and Development Branch which cover all types of situations including the integration of the students into the regular classroom.

Mrs. Yeo: Some school divisions, I believe, have special needs coordinators, and they may be called something

different depending on what school divisions or from one school division to another. Is this something that the department has encouraged or do you just stay away and let the individual school division attack the issue in their own fashion?

Mr. Derkach: At present, there are 46 school divisions in the province that have coordinators and the remainder of the school divisions who do not have coordinators are given services through Child Care and Development.

Mrs. Yeo: I must admit, and it is something I regret, I am not as familiar with the rural set-up with the handicapped students that might want to access the rural schools. Can the Minister tell me if there is any sort of special needs individual who can go out to the rural area and assist school divisions that may have a few students that might need assistance out in the rural setting?

Mr. Derkach: Every school division that has a coordinator is encouraged to do so through a grant that is provided to the school divisions of 34,500. Secondly, through the Child Care and Development Branch, we have personnel who do go out to the school divisions within the province to assist with those special needs students where those special needs are identified.

I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, if I could just correct that. Instead of 34.5, that was 34.1—34,100 instead of 34,500.

Mr. Chairman: I wonder if Honourable Members carrying on a private discussion could withdraw to the back.

Mrs. Yeo: The \$34,100, am I correct in assuming that that amount is available one grant per school division should they wish to hire a special needs coordinator? Is that what you are saying?

Mr. Derkach: Yes, that is correct.

Mrs. Yeo: I did not know that. Thank you. If I can ask a couple of questions with regard to Small Schools. Under the words "Small Schools," there are two words "formula change." May I ask what that means?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Chairman, that formula change refers to a change that was made this year with respect to the cutoff between a small school and what is not a small school. At one time, if you had one more student than the magic number, you did not qualify for a grant under the Small Schools Program. What has been done is there has been sort of a curving out of the enrollment so that those schools who still have small enrollments and are not considered large schools can still receive some funding for small schools.

Mrs. Yeo: Is there a figure, a certain number of students that is in a formula, so to speak, that will identify what is a small school per elementary, junior high and high school?

Mr. Derkach: Yes, and if I could refer the Member to page 6 of the handout, No. 8 which refers to the Small

School Support, and where it says, "Is lesser of the cost of small schools programming or the total of (a), (b) and (c) provided that the enrollment of those grades that qualify for support is greater than 15 percent of the school's total enrollment."

I think that if the Member would want to take a look at that, it certainly is explanatory. If she would like me to explain that step by step, I can do that as well.

Mrs. Yeo: I have got comments and questions made beside that and thank you for drawing that to my attention.

I have one specific small school that I received a note—regarding a school in the Morris-MacDonald School Division. Apparently there is a school at Oak Bluff where there are 34 pupils in two classes. There is a Grades 1 and 2 class, and then there is another class with Grades 3, 4, 5, and 6; 34 students in the two classes. The concern there was that the Small Schools Grant does not provide enough money for an extra teacher and that in fact some of the parents are considering pulling their children out of that school which would obviously result in school closure. It was my understanding that the Small Schools Grant was set up specifically to address concerns such as these.

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Chairman, the Small Schools Grant was really not designed to pay totally for the salary position. If you apply the formula to that particular school, it may result in a Small Schools Grant, but certainly it not large enough to be able to support the cost of a teacher. Nevertheless, it is a formula that is applied equally to all schools who find themselves in the same size relatively speaking as the Oak Bluff School.

* (1520)

Mrs. Yeo: Am I led then to understand that the grant would be given to a particular school division that applied for the grant for a specific school, listing the numbers of students who were in that particular school, or perhaps more than one school in a school division, and then it is up to the individual school division to apply that grant in whatever way they wish to apply it. If they choose to have itinerant teachers, perhaps that is one method. If they choose to have some sort of technological education setup, computer assisted instruction or whatever, if they want to have mobile units, reading vans moving from place to place, in service, whatever, the school division then selects how they want to use that particular grant?

Mr. Derkach: No, Mr. Chairman, the grant that is provided for small schools is what is termed as school specific, in that that grant must go to that school and that school must identify how it is going to spend that grant. It cannot be used by the school division in another area. It is what is termed, I indicate again, as a school specific grant.

Mrs. Yeo: So then instead of it being administered by the school division per se, it is basically a principal administered grant. The principal of the specific small

Tuesday, November 1, 1988

school would decide how he or she chose to utilize those funds?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Chairman, I guess the physical accounting and the handling of the grant could be done through the central accounting of the school division. Nevertheless it goes to the credit of that particular school and it is the school that makes the decision, how that money is going to be spent within that school. There are criteria that have to be followed.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the item pass? The Member for Flin Flon.

Mr. Storie: Mr. Chairperson, a number of questions in this area. I guess the first one, I would like some background on the total spending here that is being provided to schools. There are three components at least to the support that is provided to public schools, the Education Support Levy, the Special Levy, and General Revenue. I would like a breakdown from the Minister as to what proportion each of those areas contribute to the total overall spending?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Chairman, if we could ask the Member to go on and we will find the exact numbers for him in just a few moments, but certainly we can get the accurate numbers for him.

Mr. Storie: Perhaps, if we are going to get that information, we could have some review of, say, the '87 and '88 years. I would like to be able to see what changes, the funding for Education has been restructured in terms of what comes from the Education Support Levy, what comes from Special Levy and what comes from General Revenue. Those comparisons would be, I think, useful.

Also, in the same vein, I would like to know from the Minister how the range of special levies applied across the province have changed from '87 to '88. The range in 1987 and previously was 38-point-some mills and I would like to know what that change has been from year over year from '87 to '88.

Mr. Derkach: The range in 1987 was 28.4 mills, 1988 was 30.1 mills, and if I could go back to the last question that I said we would find the specific response in terms of the percentage of revenue from property and consolidated revenues, it is 42 percent from Property and 58 percent from other Consolidated Revenue.

Mr. Storie: When the Minister says that it is 42 percent from Property, is that from both Special Levy and ESL?

Mr. Derkach: Yes, that is correct.

Mr. Storie: Does that include the tax rebates, the 58 percent? The tax credits, are they—

Mr. Derkach: No, it does not include the tax credit.

* (1530)

Mr. Storie: Just so I am clear on what numbers we are working with, the 42 percent and 58 percent are

a percentage of the \$437 million as referenced in the Estimates Book? Or is that representative of the total expenditure on the part of the province in Education?

Mr. Derkach: It is the percentage of the Consolidated or the \$452,845,900.00.

Mr. Storie: I am too long out of the Education Estimates to remember exactly what is added to this figure to represent the total contribution to Education from Property and General Revenue, but it seems to me the ESL has to be added on.

Mr. Derkach: That is right.

Mr. Storie: Is that correct?

Mr. Derkach: Yes.

Mr. Storie: Could you provide us with that figure? What is the ESL contribution?

Mr. Derkach: \$206.3 million.

Mr. Storie: Just for my own understanding, the 42 percent of that \$437.7 million comes from the Special Levy then?

Mr. Derkach: The 42 percent is of \$924,895,170.00.

Mr. Storie: I am sorry. I was misinformed because I had asked that question previously and was told that it was from the \$437 million. The \$437 million then, could we have a breakdown of how much of that comes from Special Levy and how much comes from General Revenue?

Mr. Derkach: The \$437,787,900 is all from Consolidated Revenue.

Mr. Storie: So if we added up the ESL and the General Revenue and subtracted from the 900-and-what figure?

Mr. Derkach: The total expenditure is \$924,895,170.00.

Mr. Storie: If I subtracted those two figures, I would have the contribution of the Special Levy across the province?

Mr. Derkach: I have to indicate to the Member that also includes capital.

Mr. Storie: Aha! I am very glad that I did not comment on how gratified I was to see that the actual percentage of support to education from property was declining because normally we have not included capital in that overall calculation. Could we have the specific figure for the Special Levy? Is that the one that is difficult to achieve?

Mr. Derkach: The specific figure for the Special Levy is \$208,527,519.00. With regard to the percentage of increase or decrease I have to indicate that the percentage has been dropping consistently.

Mr. Storie: So what the Minister is saying is that the percentage of reliance on property has actually been dropping over the last few years.

Mr. Derkach: That is correct.

Mr. Storie: Contrary to the assertions of some people to the contrary, I think that is an interesting statistic. I thank the Minister for that.

Just in general policy terms, just to move away from the specifics of the funding, I am wondering whether the Minister is concerned about the increase in the 1988-89 year of the Special Levy mill rate range? Does the Government have a policy with respect to the mill rate range?

Mr. Derkach: I guess, over the years, there has been an intent to narrow that range or decrease that range. Certainly, that has been occurring except there has been a slight increase and this has caused some concern. This is probably a contributing factor for the need for the Ed. Finance Review.

Mr. Storie: The Minister is going to have to explain that because I am not sure. Is the Minister saying that is not a valuable objective? Should we not have people contributing more or less equally across the province in terms of the tax on property in support of education? I would assume that we were headed in the right direction when we were narrowing the range.

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Chairman, if the Member was following my remarks, I said that in the last year there has been an increase and consequently some concern and a contributing factor to the need for the Ed. Finance Review.

Mr. Storie: So the Minister is in agreement if I said that the objective would be to narrow the range provincially of Special Levy mill rates. The Minister would be in agreement with that general direction. Is that fair to say?

Mr. Derkach: Yes, that is certainly an objective that one cannot argue with.

Mr. Storie: I am glad to hear that no one could argue with that, because certainly school divisions have taken some exception to a policy which saw that range reduced, particularly school divisions who had intentionally kept their Special Levy mill rate low. I am sure the Minister will be receiving some argument that policy has penalized some divisions. I am not saying I accept that argument, but I am sure he will be receiving that argument.

I was going to ask the Minister as well whether we could possibly have the total capital for the '88-89 year outlined?

Mr. Derkach: That is covered in (XVI) 8.(b)(2).

However, I would like to respond to the comments that were made by the Member for Flin Flon, and that is that certainly we are not going to penalize those

school divisions, who have practised efficiency and have been prudent in the way that they spend money. If the Member thinks that is what our intent is, he is certainly out to lunch. I would have to indicate that we want to reward, as a matter of fact, and certainly it should be an attitude of everybody to reward those school divisions who do practise efficiency in the way that they expend their funds. So certainly it is not a matter of saying, for those of you who spend wildly, go ahead, and we will just move everybody's mill rates up to match yours. That is not the goal of the intended Ed. Finance Review. The Member also asked for the ballpark figure in the capital, and it is \$19,926,900.00.

Mr. Storie: We have a ballpark figure for each of the three areas. I am wondering what the surplus was from '87 to '88 of the ESL. If my memory serves me correctly, every year we estimate how much the Public Schools Finance Board is going to recover through the ESL. Because there is additional property coming on to the tax rolls in various municipalities in the city, we actually get more money than we anticipated. What was that cushion this year?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Chairman, the budgeted amount is \$6.9 million.

Mr. Storie: So there was an additional \$6.9 million available to spend on education because of the difference between the original estimate and what was actually on the tax rolls and what the Public Schools Finance Board received?

Mr. Derkach: No, Mr. Chairman. It is taken out of the accumulated surplus over the years. It is not a one-year surplus per se.

Mr. Storie: I recognize that there is money left in that fund, that it is not all used, but every year there is some additional amount beyond what is estimated. The \$6.9 million would represent what? Two-thirds, three-quarters of that? Was additional revenue generated this year because of extra property on the tax rolls?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Chairman, again a ballpark figure, the \$6.9 million represents something like three-quarters of the figure of last year.

Mr. Storie: Perhaps this is not a fair question, Mr. Chairperson, but what was the increase in General Revenue contributions from 1987-88 to 1988-89?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Chairman, it was 3.8 percent.

* (1540)

Mr. Storie: Roughly \$15 million?

Mr. Derkach: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Storie: Does that include—and again I am uncertain about whether that includes the \$6.9 million that comes about as a result of surplus in ESL.

Mr. Derkach: No, it does not.

Mr. Storie: Mr. Chairperson, moving to the question of the Education Finance Review Committee, when was the last time that committee met? Who are now members of that committee? Who leads the committee?

Mr. Derkach: There is an internal interdepartmental committee which is made up of Municipal Affairs, Agriculture, Finance and Education, which meets on an ongoing basis and has had several in-services now with representatives from the Manitoba Association of School Trustees, Manitoba Association of Business Officials, Manitoba Association of School Superintendents, Manitoba Teachers' Society. Our last meeting with this organization was October 19.

Mr. Storie: One other question that was not answered was who is chairing that currently. Was the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme) as well part of this group?

Mr. Derkach: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Urban Affairs Department is a part of this committee. The committee is jointly chaired by the Department of Municipal Affairs and the Department of Education.

Mr. Storie: Mr. Chairperson, the Minister mentioned a number of groups that are involved in the seminars. Were groups like the Manitoba Association of Urban Municipalities and the Union of Manitoba Municipalities involved?

Mr. Derkach: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Through Municipal Affairs and through the assessment reform approach, they have been involved.

Mr. Storie: I am wondering whether in this review we have moved to the point of putting on the table a new concept for funding education. Have we moved anywhere from tinkering with the GSE, ESP, to something new for Manitoba. Has that been addressed yet?

Mr. Derkach: Certainly, there have been many thoughts and ideas put on the table, and we are getting responses from the various organizations. In terms of putting a definitive formula on the table, that has not happened yet because certainly we want to have as much input as we can from the outside organizations in terms of their views on Ed. Finance and their perceived approach.

Mr. Storie: Just a couple of other small questions, I will be jumping a bit from place to place. The first question is in the support package that was tabled in the Legislature August 26, the Minister notes on page 2 a number of changes. One of them is a 10 percent cap on the increases available on a per-pupil basis to divisions who are using the 1985 Government Support to Education Program. Were there any divisions who would have required more than a 10 percent increase on the basis of that program?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Chairman, I think about two school divisions would have required that.

Mr. Storie: Could we have the names?

Mr. Derkach: One school division being St. Vital, and the other one Frontier School Division.

Mr. Chairman, if I could explain that, that is on a preliminary basis, because once we receive their financial statements, we will better be able to know whether in fact that is the case.

Mr. Storie: The Minister is saying that the question of whether in fact they required more than 10 percent was based on their estimate and we will know subsequently. I am wondering whether the Minister had an opportunity to meet with either of these two divisions individually to discuss their circumstances.

Mr. Derkach: I have not met with either of those school divisions to discuss specifically that problem. However, I have met with Frontier School Division and I have not met with the St. Vital School Board, nor have they raised this issue as being a concern that they want to meet about at this time.

Mr. Storie: Moving to another area, my colleague from Sturgeon Creek talked about the new guidelines for High and Low Incidence Funding. If I understood the Minister correctly, Level 1 is the only level which is, in effect, block funding or categorical funding. I guess block funding is a better term. Has the Minister had any discussions with the Special Ed. Coordinators' Association with respect to the necessity of having categorical funding, targeted funding for Levels 2 and 3? Has there been any discussion of amalgamating the special needs support and allowing divisions the flexibility of providing personnel and programming sort of on an as-needed basis?

Mr. Derkach: I have not met with those specific organizations or associations, if they have one, but certainly I have talked to a variety of school divisions. Certainly in talking to members across the province who are either trustees or who have some interests in Special Ed., this situation has been discussed. But in terms of meeting with a specific group, Mr. Chairman, no, we have not done that.

Mr. Storie: If I recall the argument—and I can assure the Minister there is such a group—the arguments were that the school divisions have become much more sophisticated about the delivery of special needs programming than they were 10 years ago. As late as 1980, there was virtually no special needs programming in most of the divisions and, since that time, there has been a major expansion and the number of dollars that have gone along to support have increased along with the identified need.

I guess the question was whether the very tightly scripted programming, tightly controlled way of handling individual needs is appropriate anymore. We have the department intimately involved in developing individual education plans for students with multiple handicaps, and those who are profoundly handicapped get Levels 2 and 3 funding. I am wondering whether the Minister is getting any feedback that it may be time in fact for the department to pull back, provide resources rather than the kind of administrative support that seems to be part of the process now.

* (1550)

Mr. Derkach: The change in the funding formula certainly provided a greater degree of flexibility for school divisions and allowed school divisions to better utilize the resources that were available. The other thing that happened with the change was that there was a greater amount of money available to those school divisions in terms of the student-teacher ratios. However, it is still an area that there is some concern about and one that is going to be addressed in the Ed. Finance Review. I cannot tell the Member at the present time what type of formula will evolve, whether in fact it will be the same, whether there will be some modification of it.

I can appreciate the fact that there was in the old formula an extreme amount of human energy expended in negotiating whether or not a particular child fit a particular program, and certainly it did not seem as though enough energy was going into actually delivering the program for the child. So certainly there was a need and, as we proceed through the Ed. Finance Review, this area certainly will be one that will be zeroed in on and, hopefully, effective changes will be made so that programming can be delivered in the most effective way to ensure that the child gets the maximum amount of resources for programming.

Mr. Storie: I am glad the Minister raised that point because that is the counterbalance, if you will, to the block funding arrangement. Certainly, we would like to have them have flexibility so they can organize their programming in the most efficient way, but I think there is an equal concern on the part of parents that funding that is targeted for special needs actually show up as special needs programming.

I am wondering whether the Minister has made any firm decision on the necessity for legislative statute changes, changes to The Public Schools Act, whether he is considering or will consider the introduction of amendments to The Public Schools Act requiring the involvement of parents in placement decisions and programming decisions because that, it seems to me, would be the balance. There are many out there that would argue that simply block funding for special needs would be counterproductive because the divisions would end up tapping those funds for some other purpose. That is not something we want to happen. If we are going to go block funding, which I think allows for flexibility and probably a more effective use of the dollars, then the only assurance that the parents can have that the dollars are being spent is if they have some sort of parallel recourse through legislation, more than likely, to demand, to request, to have as a right, programming for their children. I am wondering whether the Minister is considering that balance, because I think it would be a severe mistake to move farther along the road of block funding without that balance.

Mr. Derkach: Certainly the Member for Flin Flon, after having been in Government for six years, finally realizes the importance of parental input and parental information that should exist in the school system.

We have certainly had a fairly significant lobby by parents who claim that they have not been able to have access to information or have been able to participate

totally in the development of a program for their child, especially those parents who have children with special needs. Yes, we are considering that whole area of making sure that parents have appropriate information on their children, that information is timely and that they in fact have some input into the way that programming is developed for their children.

Mr. Storie: I certainly do not need to be reminded of the importance of parents in this process. The Minister probably knows, although he would be loath to admit in a forum like this, that the previous Minister did actually commence developing policies with respect to placement and parent involvement. It is not a new-found interest at all. In fact, as a teacher and educator and someone involved in the school system, I believe in it as a fundamental right. However, we will leave those arguments for another forum.

The question that needs to be left finally is, the Minister mentioned that there had been increases in funding for special needs this year. Strictly from the province, what is the comparison between the '87 and '88 years for special needs funding, not counting what the divisions put into it?

Mr. Derkach: The increase in spending over last year is estimated at some \$4 million in grants to school divisions.

Mr. Storie: Could we have the base so that we can understand \$4 million in comparison to what—

Mr. Derkach: In 1987, the number was \$38,961,200; in 1988 it is \$42,965,145.00.

Mr. Storie: Moving on to another area, the Early Identification Support program, I gather, and this may go back before either of our times, was partly to offset the fact that section 41(q) of The Public Schools Act which was passed back in 1977 or '75 was never proclaimed.

I am wondering how many school divisions receive funding for the Early Identification Support Program. What divisions are those and have there been any changes over last year in terms of the divisions that are participating in that program?

Mr. Derkach: The number of school divisions that are receiving grants for early identification, I can say that all school divisions are receiving some money for early identification. The amount of money, the grand total, has not changed in that it is the same amount as it was in 1987. All school divisions are receiving it.

Mr. Storie: I guess the Minister could indicate how much is being received?

Mr. Derkach: The total amount is \$250,000.00.

Mr. Storie: Obviously, that is not enough money for probably a single division to conduct a complete preschool screening program. I am wondering whether the Minister is aware of how many divisions are currently conducting anything close to a comprehensive prescreening program for school children.

Tuesday, November 1, 1988

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Chairman, we could do this in two ways. Either I can have staff prepare a list of the school divisions that are doing something. I am aware of many school divisions who do a prescreening, but certainly we could get that back to the Member with the specifics under (XVI) (e) or perhaps tomorrow or Thursday, I could get back with the figures.

Mr. Storie: I am not in a hurry for that information, but as long as we get it some time, if we can get it over the next few days.

One other question before I pass it over to my colleague from Sturgeon Creek (Mrs. Yeo). The Inner City Education Support Program, the Minister made an announcement, I believe, of some additional support to the Winnipeg School Division. Can the Minister indicate what support has been added?

Mr. Derkach: Within the program, the Winnipeg School Division gets \$1.9 million and in Special Support it gets \$2 million.

Mr. Storie: The \$1.9 million comes directly from the Inner City Education Support Program and the \$2 million is Exceptional Support. Does that represent any increase, any change over the previous year?

Mr. Derkach: No, Mr. Chairman, there is no increase in that. It is the same as it was in the previous year.

* (1600)

Mr. Storie: A final, final question. The Minister has indicated that the goal now in terms of overall educational support coming from the province is 80 percent. That is the goal. I am wondering how that squares with the desire on the part of the Minister to minimize the range of special levies between divisions. I am wondering if the Minister can square those two positions because unless there is some way to reduce educational expenses that I have not seen, it seems to me that position is ultimately going to mean that some divisions are going to continue to expand their spending. The range is going to get wider and the equality of educational opportunity across the province is going to go backwards rather than forward.

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Chairman, I guess that sort of can be handled through the Ed. Finance Review because the Ed. Finance Review will address some of that, certainly not all of it, and if we are going to get to 80 percent funding, that will mean that the province will have to inject greater funds. Consequently, the school divisions' responsibility will go down. The way that we arrive at that will certainly be heavily dependent on the approach that is taken in the new Ed. Finance Review.

Mr. Storie: Mr. Chairperson, we will leave it at that. I do not think it is very easy to square those two positions, but we will let the Minister certainly have a go at it. It is a difficult problem.

The other question I had was with respect to the private school funding. Out of that \$437 million, does funding to private schools come out of that \$437 million?

Mr. Derkach: Yes, it is part of the \$437,787,900.00.

Mr. Storie: The Minister had indicated earlier that there was that some \$11 million at this point. Perhaps the Minister could extrapolate and provide some ballpark figure for the cost to the public if that commitment to move to 50 percent is achieved, and some again further extrapolation and give us some figures on what that might cost the province in a year if we move to the Liberal goal of 80 percent financing?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to reflect on what the Liberal promises were and how much that was going to cost. I think the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) can figure that one out for himself. With regard to the cost this year, it is \$10,805,672.00. If we want to project to 50 percent, it would be approximately \$3 million more.

Mr. Storie: Mr. Chairperson, that figure means that we are spending now about \$14 million. In my own ballpark figure we would talk about probably close to \$100 million over four years if we were to move to 80 percent immediately.

Mr. Derkach: Just to correct the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), we are spending closer to \$11 million than we are to \$14 million presently. It is \$10,805,672.00.

Mr. Storie: Mr. Chairperson, I recognize that but the Minister was projecting another \$3 million if they move to 50 percent, which would make it \$14 million or \$15 million. My question is, is that commitment to move to 50 percent for next year?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Chairman, the commitment, as the Member well knows, in the election campaign was that we would move to 50 percent within the first year of our mandate.

Mrs. Yeo: A couple of questions on four or five different areas, and forgive me if I do a little page hopping here. On page 3, at the bottom of the page, the \$34,100, for one coordinator per school division, I gather, is listed there, and at the top of page 4 there is another \$31,000 for each remaining clinician. Can you tell me what is defined as a clinician? What would come under the term "clinician"?

Mr. Derkach: Speech and hearing therapists, psychologists, the reading clinicians, physiotherapists, social workers and occupational therapists.

Mrs. Yeo: Any one of the above or would a school division be able to apply for several \$31,000 packages, or how is this arranged?

Mr. Derkach: That is dependent on the formula that is stated in 2.(a), and certainly then the school division would determine the kinds of needs that it has in the school division to apply that grant towards the buying of services.

Mrs. Yeo: The Level 2 and Level 3 definitions are located, but I could not find any sort of statement as

to what might be a definition of Level 1. I am wondering if the Minister could tell us what sorts of students would be classified under Level 1 need of funding.

Mr. Derkach: Those are the students who have not severe learning disabilities but minor learning disabilities compared to the Level 2 and 3. They are mildly disabled students who have learning disabilities. Now, that is, I guess, the whole problem when we face the old formula in that there was so much time expended in negotiating whether in fact this child fit into the Level 1 area or the Level 1 funding.

Now there is more flexibility whereby those school divisions can identify on their own those students who have learning disabilities and then can apply the funding based on the formula to assist those students who have those learning disabilities. But in terms of specifically being able to quantify the definition, I think that is a little bit difficult.

* (1610)

Mrs. Yeo: Yes, I can well recall the school division in which I was most closely involved having a lot of concern with the definition and who would be classified as an individual in need of additional funding. However, I am also very aware of some parents who have grave concerns because their children are not getting what they perceive to be the additional help that might assist their children in achieving better success in school.

I am thinking specifically of a mother who has two learning disabled children in Brandon. She, I believe, has taken one or both of her sons home and is trying to teach them at home because she is dissatisfied with the additional help that her boys are receiving in the school in Brandon.

I am also aware of, I believe Ontario and Saskatchewan have a pull-out system for the teacher. I realize that this would be very expensive, but if a child were placed in a classroom and that child needed a specific kind of education, the school would then send the teacher to a resource centre whereby that teacher would be given additional instructions as to how to deal with the specific type of learning disability that was experienced by the child under his or her care. I am wondering if there has been any thought towards this kind of addressing, if there might be perhaps even some cost saving in the long run towards this kind of addressing of dealing with children who have a learning handicap.

Mr. Derkach: Yes, I am happy to say that we have taken a look at alternatives as providing services to those handicapped children. We have taken a look at other systems outside the province where there is, as the Member indicated, a pull-out system or a different method of dealing with children with special learning disabilities.

We are studying that whole program and certainly will be looking at how we can implement that kind of a program into our school system, at least if you wish, at a pilot level or one where we can monitor it to see how effectively it is addressing the needs of those

students who have special needs. I can say that I am aware of that mother who has pulled her children out of school. We have too many of those kinds of situations in the province where it appears that, for one reason or another, our school system is not capable or has not been able to address those specific needs. I am not saying that is an inadequacy of the school system. Certainly there is a problem there, and perhaps we have not been as innovative as we should be in terms of addressing those specific needs.

I have instructed staff to take a very close and careful look at the other programs, or other programs that are offered in other jurisdictions to see whether or not we can implement them effectively and without too much turmoil to our system here so that we can better address the needs of those specific cases.

Mrs. Yeo: I certainly do not advocate that one should jump and try and establish a program that every parent feels would be right for their child. I think we certainly have to be very careful about the patient telling the doctor how to operate, so to speak. The teachers are the professionals, the educators are the ones who are trained to establish guidelines and to find the education-appropriate settings for the students entrusted to their care.

But I do feel that we are somewhat lax in this province in developing a range of alternative programming for our students with the assistance of the teachers, of the school superintendents, educational support staff, etc. I think we could be doing something a little more effective. We are not talking about the illiteracy aspect right now, but I think that there is a bit of a difficulty, there is a difficulty in the school system in that we are perhaps in some respects, programming for illiteracy. I think we have to be very conscious of that and the need for alternative programming.

The term "Individual Education Plan" is one that seems to be an in term, and we are hearing about the IEP with more and more frequency. Is there any sort of directive moving towards developing individual education programs for students in the classroom?

Mr. Derkach: That is not in the approach that the department directed, but certainly we have had in the past and continue to have the types of models throughout the province which are based on IEP but it is not a push of the department to go in that direction. Certainly, individual teachers and school divisions who find themselves in a situation where that is an effective way to approach an educational program are at liberty to use that kind of a system and in many cases that is working very well.

Mrs. Yeo: If I can just ask a couple of question on the English as a Second Language Program, are the ESL grants exclusive to children within the school division or is that a grant that encompasses the adult-educated individual as well?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Chairman, the ESL grants here are specifically for children within the school system.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the item pass? The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

Tuesday, November 1, 1988

Mrs. Yeo: Where would then be located the grant that would be to assist the immigrant adult who is after English as a Second Language?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Chairman, it would be in (XVI) 5.(j).

Mrs. Yeo: Ah, under PACE, okay.

The Language Development Support for Natives, on page 5 in the particular handout, there is a 1 and a 2, and I am trying to find out what is different in the two of them. Oh, one is to a maximum and one is in excess of. Okay, I found it myself, thank you.

Is there any direction towards establishing some special grants or are there special grants for the northern and remote schools, as well as for the Inner City schools, whereby there might need to be additional funding for the education of the students who have more difficulties socioeconomically, who may come from homes where there is a higher rate of unemployment, where there might be a greater percentage of single parent families, where there might be a higher percentage of public housing or supplementary rental units, where the students may come from a more difficult setting?

* (1620)

Mr. Derkach: There are several approaches, I guess, Mr. Chairman, one being the Compensatory Grants that are given out by the department. Secondly, there are the Northern Allowances Grants and the Inner City Grants.

Mrs. Yeo: So there are additional grants for the northern and remote schools to allow for provision for the isolation factor for the higher cost of living differentiation, etc.?

Mr. Derkach: That is handled under the weighted enrollment aspect which gives them more resources.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the item pass? The Member for The Pas.

Mr. Harry Harapiak (The Pas): I want to ask a few questions in the whole area of private school funding. Before I make my comments I want to share with the Minister that I was a trustee in the public school system and I have also sent a son through St. Vladimir's, so I am aware of the need for funding in both areas.

I recognize that there is a need for a change in our system where we would maybe look at what the Saskatchewan system does. It gives the parents of students the option of putting their taxes towards one system or another where their kids are attending. I was present at St. Vladimir's annual event last Sunday where the parents of St. Vladimir's were having their tea, where the Minister made his comments. I thought they were appropriate comments addressing the parents of St. Vladimir's students. I did not quite understand your statement. You were concerned about the universal approach to the educational public school system. I did not understand what the Minister meant by the universal approach of the education system.

Mr. Derkach: I really do not know what the Member is referring to in terms of funding. I had indicated to the audience at the time that we were going to be moving to—we are at 40 percent. Our commitment was to move to 50 percent funding to the private schools or independent schools within the first year of our mandate. Then we would be sitting down with officials from the independent schools to discuss aspects of funding such as greater accountability on their part to the department because of the greater funding. Also, they have some aspirations to move higher than 50 percent as well, so that we would be sitting down and discussing that whole area of the funding to private schools.

Mr. Harapiak: I understood the portion when you were speaking about the funding, but the portion I did not understand was when you first started your comments. You said that when you moved into the public education system that you were concerned about the universal, and I am wondering if you meant the humanistic approach that the public school system was moving in?

Mr. Derkach: I do not know what that has to do with funding. Certainly, in the aspect of funding, I was not referring to any humanistic or—I do not know what you are referring to. I am sorry.

Mr. Harapiak: That is what I was wondering. I did not understand either. That is why I was asking the question.

Mr. Derkach: I can give you a copy of my notes.

Mr. Harapiak: Okay.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the item pass?

Mr. Harapiak: There is one other area. The school in Easterville is still going through some difficulties between the band-controlled school and the Frontier school system. I know there have been numerous efforts made by Frontier to try and bring the two sides of the community together to have one school system in there. Are there any meetings being planned shortly to try and bring the two sides together and try to approach it from having a one school system? Because of the size of the community, they are not able to offer many options if they are going to be running separate school systems between the band and the Frontier schools. Are there any efforts being made by the department to try and resolve the difficulty that exists in Easterville?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Chairman, yes, I understand that this is still an ongoing situation at Easterville. Next week, Frontier school officials are going to be meeting with the mayor and officials from Easterville to discuss this very situation.

Mr. Harapiak: Is the Department of Education able to help with the assessment that seems to be necessary for the community people to be convinced that the band school has improved the quality of their education? Is there any expertise or personnel that they can supply to Frontier schools to help them do

Tuesday, November 1, 1988

a proper evaluation of the present system being delivered there?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Chairman, I guess the purpose of next week's meeting is to discuss the issue of the assessment that has been done by the band of the programs that are being taught. Certainly, the assessment indicates that there has been an improvement in the quality of education. There is a desire by Frontier and by the department not to be running two separate schools or two school systems in that small community. The desire is to resolve it. Certainly, we understand the differences and that it is not going to be an easy task or one that can be resolved overnight. I think the communication aspect is an important one in trying to come to some common solution.

Mr. Storie: Mr. Chairperson, just a couple of questions that I did not get a chance to pose in the last round. The first one was, of the total Government support to education, how much was provided to school divisions through the equalization program?

Mr. Derkach: The total amount, Mr. Chairman, will be \$112,413,305.00.

Mr. Storie: That is up from how much in 1987?

Mr. Derkach: That is an increase from \$97,021,223.00.

Mr. Storie: The other area where I had some questions was in the area of mining revenue being deducted from supportable expenditures, and I believe that is the way it was finally left. The contributions made by mining companies through grants in lieu of taxes was actually reduced from the supportable expenditures.

Could the Minister perhaps give us some numbers as to the support that was available to school divisions in 1987-88 and 1988-89 for the communities of Flin Flon, Snow Lake and Thompson—the division of Flin Flon, Snow Lake School District and Mystery Lake School Division?

Mr. Derkach: In 1987-88 the total program support in Flin Flon was \$4,967,441; Snow Lake was \$1,456,206; and Thompson was \$12,250,648.00. You wanted '88-89?

Mr. Storie: 1988-89, but more specifically the total of the mining revenue that was subtracted from the supportable expenditures. I could use those figures for the '88-89, the figures that the Minister provided as well.

Mr. Derkach: In 1987, the mining revenue for Flin Flon, \$724,314; Snow Lake was \$363,851; Lynn Lake, \$82,300; and Mystery Lake \$1,730,233.00.

The 1988 figures for Flin Flon were \$5,407,241; for Snow Lake \$1,517,669; Lynn Lake, \$1,517,759; and Mystery Lake \$12,994,551.00.

* (1630)

Mr. Storie: The projections that were used in terms of the mining grant in lieu of tax, or whatever it is called, how much mining support was anticipated from, in the '88-89 year?

Mr. Derkach: The figures that I gave the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) were used in the supportable expenditures for 1988 and the figures that were used for 1987 were as follows: Flin Flon, \$669,556; Snow Lake, \$261,000; Lynn Lake, \$82,300; Mystery Lake, \$1,648,132.00.

Mr. Storie: We are back again. The figures you gave me originally were for this year, now we are moving back, so can I have those a little slower, I had to rearrange my table here. Thank you very much.

Mr. Derkach: Are you ready? 1986 Flin Flon, \$669,556.00.

Mr. Storie: Just round figures is fine.

Mr. Derkach: Snow Lake, \$261,000; Lynn Lake, \$82,000; Mystery Lake, \$1,600,000.00.

Mr. Storie: Thank you. The question is, on what basis are those escalated? How is it determined what the grant in lieu will be in a particular year? Is that a fixed number? I just forget how that is arranged between the community and the school division.

Mr. Derkach: That is determined by what the municipalities show within their budgets.

Mr. Storie: There seems to be a concern amongst some of those communities that the decision to subtract the mining revenue from the supportable expenditure is going to create a problem in the coming year or the subsequent year, an unusual problem.

I am wondering if the Minister could or staff could help the Minister identify what that problem is and what it is going to mean to those divisions that are receiving mining revenue.

Mr. Derkach: At this time, we have had no indication of any problems from those communities and, secondly, this approach was done at the request of those communities. So if they have any concerns, certainly we hope that we will hear from them.

Mr. Storie: I am just wondering, because of the nature of the agreement between the municipalities and the companies, they are subject to change without any input from the Department of Education. I think that is where the problem lies, that those things, the amount that they receive can fluctuate quite dramatically. Given that it was never explicitly put into the formula the way it is, I think there was some fear that adjustments may not happen, should there be adjustments in terms of the revenue that they receive from the municipality. Is that a reasonable description of a potential problem?

Mr. Derkach: I guess it is somewhat of a hypothetical situation and certainly one that has not been addressed

Tuesday, November 1, 1988

to us by those communities. However, I guess the only time you would have that kind of a problem exist is if there were a very significant drop in terms of the mining revenue and then the school expenditures did not drop accordingly. We know that does not happen. Your school expenditures may in fact not drop in tandem with the drop in mining revenue.

Mr. Chairman, if I can conclude by saying that I have not been made aware that there is a concern by those communities to this point in time.

Mr. Storie: So if I could paraphrase it—not paraphrase but leave open the suggestion that if something unexpected did happen in those communities and their mining revenue were to drop that they would be in a similar situation to what the St. James School Division was when the student enrollment dropped, and yet the formula at that time could not adapt quickly enough to accommodate the pressures that the St. James Division felt.

I am just wondering whether I could assure people in those communities that in the event that there are dramatic changes that this Minister understands that revenue can change pretty dramatically and that the province would step in and leave them in a very difficult position with what are already very high Special Levy mill rates in those communities.

Mr. Derkach: I think we have seen this similar kind of situation exist in several areas throughout the province where we had, for example, Native bands all of a sudden pull out of schools and do their own educating and all of a sudden the revenue dropped. The school divisions were unable to adapt in terms of staff reductions as quickly. So we have seen that kind of a situation happen before. Although what the Member is talking about is very hypothetical and it is difficult to address hypothetical situations, certainly if that should happen, I think it is incumbent upon the department to enter into discussions with those local school divisions to ensure that there is a sensible way of approaching the problem and settling it.

Mr. Storie: Just one other question. The capital budget estimate ballparked at \$19 million for the current fiscal year. Could the Minister indicate (a) whether there are any capital projects expected to be under way in this fiscal year in northern Manitoba, particular in Frontier School Division?

* (1640)

Mr. Derkach: I could answer that question better when we get to that section in (XVI) (e).

Mr. Storie: A final question. The miscellaneous grants that are referenced here, have we received a copy of the grants?

Mr. Derkach: Yes.

Mr. Storie: Okay, so it is the same one that we have already received from the Teachers' Society and the Drama Association?

Mr. Derkach: Yes, that is correct.

Mr. Storie: A final question in the area of General Support Grants. That is the support to school divisions to offset exceptional expenses for payroll?

Mr. Derkach: I seem to recall that same question being posed of a former Minister two years ago. As a matter of fact, I think it was the Honourable Jerry Storie at the time that I had asked that question. He danced around it and would not answer it. I can tell him—

Mr. Storie: It just never sunk in what it was.

Mr. Derkach: I can tell him that we will not dance around the issue but assure him that, yes, it is the payroll tax offset.

Mrs. Yeo: It sounds like I missed something a few years ago.

The per pupil textbook grant has been reduced from \$40 to \$35 per pupil. Is that correct?

Mr. Derkach: Yes, that is correct.

Mrs. Yeo: When I looked through the catalogue that we all received, I noted that in 1982-83, as an example, there was a textbook called Exploration of Business that was then at a cost of \$10.95. Today it is \$17.45. The per pupil grant in 1982 was \$30 per pupil. Today it sits at \$35 per pupil and yet there is a fairly significant increase in the cost of the textbooks. There is a French textbook that today is sold for \$9 and then was sold for \$5.50. Is the Minister going to make any move towards assisting school divisions that are having difficulty purchasing the textbooks with this rigid reduction in the textbook grant?

Mr. Derkach: When we took office in April, and when I was sworn in as Minister on May 9, at that point in time, all school divisions across the province had already set their budgets. Therefore, they had adjusted for the decrease in the textbook grant. So therefore it would have been very difficult to try and adjust all budgets across the province to reflect the increase in the textbook grant again to the \$40.00.

Mr. Chairman, I guess I have indicated in the House that I do not take this as a very prudent move in terms of reducing the textbook grant, because we know what is happening to textbooks, and certainly the examples that were shown by the Member for Sturgeon Creek (Mrs. Yeo) are true and there are probably even more glaring examples of the situation. So I can indicate to the Member that in future we will be addressing this situation.

Mrs. Yeo: Yes, I certainly could point out more glaring examples, but I did not think you wanted to go through all the notations that I made in the book. I would be certainly pleased to share them with the Minister if he wanted to look at them. There was only one example where I found where a textbook had actually decreased from 1982-83, the cost of it, and I was madly searching for it and could not find it. I thought only to be fair I should also indicate that, but I could not find it.

Tuesday, November 1, 1988

I understand that the difference has been transferred to Distance Education. I am wondering what sorts of guidelines the department has, or what sorts of interpretation the department has as far as distance education is concerned.

Mr. Derkach: I think it would probably be better if we handled those questions under Distance Education, which is (XVI) 4.(g)

Mr. Chairman: Shall the item pass? (Agreed)

Item 3.(b) Miscellaneous Grants \$258,000—shall the item pass? The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

Mrs. Yeo: Just a minute. Now that is \$283,000, right?

Mr. Chairman: \$258,000.00.

Mrs. Yeo: Okay. Why the drop from 283 to 258?

Mr. Derkach: There was an unallocated amount in that grants listing and that was eliminated in this particular budget.

Mrs. Yeo: Can the Minister tell me what organizations and what projects were fostered under this particular subappropriation?

Mr. Derkach: I provided that list of organizations that receive those grants to the Members.

Mrs. Yeo: Planned Parenthood was not on the list, was it?

Mr. Derkach: Yes, it was.

Mrs. Yeo: May I ask the question—I am sorry, with all my mess around here, I do not have that package with me. It is down in my desk. But I remembered Planned Parenthood and I remembered something specific about it. I am wondering if the Minister, as the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) has just said, would refresh my memory.

Mr. Derkach: I think there were two areas that were asterisked: one was Planned Parenthood, and the other one was the Sexual Harassment Conference. Both of those were grants that were pending at this time.

Mrs. Yeo: Can the Minister tell us what criteria there is for selecting the organizations that are sponsored here, and whether you have developed any other criteria for judging, how much they have enhanced the quality of education in our school divisions?

Mr. Derkach: In most part, those were grants that were given previously. The way that is handled is that organizations apply for those grants to the Minister. Staff and the Minister assess the grant application and then that is forwarded to Cabinet and Cabinet makes the decision as to whether the organization will receive the grant.

Mrs. Yeo: Does the department take any measures to ensure accountability to these particular organizations,

or is that left entirely up to the individual school divisions?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Chairman, yes, the organizations are requested to give us an audited financial statement so that we can be assured that the monies are in fact expended wisely.

Mrs. Yeo: Does the department have anything to do with the type of programming that is presented to the children in our school divisions under these particular organizations?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Chairman, I guess I should point out that these are not grants to school divisions. These are grants to organizations.

Mrs. Yeo: But these organizations do present programs to the school divisions?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Chairman, I guess there is a mix. In some instances, they do, in others they do not. If there is a request from the division, then certainly those organizations can provide programs for the schools.

* (1650)

Mrs. Yeo: These organizations who are given grants may have plays that they put on—may they not?—have pamphlets that they develop, have speakers that they can provide. Is that not what this is all about?

Mr. Derkach: Yes, those organizations can be invited by the schools in the various communities that they operate to come into the schools and to give either performances or programs to that particular school. I can say that I met with the creative retirement group who, in fact, do go into the schools and talk to the students in schools about retirement, about old age, so that there is an understanding of the aging process and how senior citizens can contribute to society and can assist even the youth and the students in schools.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the item pass? Item 3.(c) General Support Grants, \$14,800,000—shall the item pass? The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

Mrs. Yeo: The statement there is “To provide special grants to school divisions to be utilized in pursuit of quality education.” I am wondering the definition of the word “special.” What do you mean by “special”?

Mr. Derkach: That is a term that I guess has been in that particular category for some time. As the Member for Flin Flon indicated, that grant is to school divisions to offset the payroll tax.

Mrs. Yeo: Oh, that is the one.

Mr. Derkach: Yes.

Mrs. Yeo: Under Expected Results, it talks about a formula, and I am wondering if the Minister can review what this formula is.

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Chairman, the formula is 2.35 percent of the previous year's payroll.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the item pass? The Member for Flin Flon.

Mr. Storie: The Member for Sturgeon Creek (Mrs. Yeo) raised a question about support for Planned Parenthood and noted that there was an asterisk. The Minister indicated that approval was pending for that grant. I am wondering if the Minister could indicate whether that grant will be proceeding.

Mr. Derkach: As I indicated that the approval is pending, I also indicated to the Member that that approval or that decision is made by Government and when Government makes that decision we will proceed with it. Yes, of course. There has been no indication to do otherwise.

Mr. Storie: I am wondering whether the Minister can outline what the grant is in aid of. Is this a general block funding grant to this organization or are there specific tasks that this group has undertaken on behalf of the department?

Mr. Derkach: This is a General Purpose Grant and is used for the organization to conduct their programs as they have in the past.

Mr. Storie: It seems to me that the Planned Parenthood group at one point was prepared to provide support services to the department in the delivery of Family Life Program In-services for teachers and I am wondering whether that is part of their mandate currently.

Mr. Derkach: It is not a mandate of the organization, but in the past they have assisted in providing teachers with in-services in the Family Life Program.

Mr. Storie: The Minister indicated that the reduction in this appropriation of \$20,000 was as a result of discretionary or non-accounted, whatever, not directed funding. It was discretionary. Were there any groups who had received funding in 1987-88 who are not now receiving funding through this grant allocation?

Mr. Derkach: As the Member knows, because he was in the position before, there are changes from year to year because there are special events or special projects that are undertaken where groups would apply. However, if he wants to have a list of the former years' recipients, we can provide that list for him.

Mr. Storie: I think it would be useful to have a list of the 1987-88 recipients and a list of the 1988-89 recipients. Yes, if the Minister can provide that, it would be much appreciated.

Mr. Derkach: We will give you that.

Mr. Storie: I have no further questions.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the item pass? 3.(c) General Support Grants—pass.

Resolution No. 43: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$452,845,900 for Education, Financial Support - Schools, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1989. Shall the item pass? (Agreed)

Item No. 4. Program Development Support Services. Consists of activities aimed at providing support for the development of educational programs K - 12, including assistance for children with special needs. Additional means are made available for teacher upgrading, the provision of consultant services, in-service training, instructional media, educational television, distance education, compensatory education, and opportunities for Native people, the provision of General Educational Development Tests and the provision of field-based support to school divisions. Part (a) Division Administration: (1) Salaries \$200,400—shall the item pass? The Member for Sturgeon Creek.

Mrs. Yeo: Under Managerial, Professional/Technical, I am wondering why the increase there is approximately 5.7 percent. What accounts for that?

Mr. Derkach: That is an increment, plus the GSI.

Mrs. Yeo: Under Administrative Support there is a fairly significant increase and yet the staff years remain the same. How much is that due to the pay equity efforts?

Mr. Derkach: Included in that would be pay equity and also the general increases.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the item pass? The Member for Flin Flon.

Mr. Storie: Just one short question on the reduction in Total Other Expenditures. There is a footnote that says it is the elimination or the discontinuation of grants for quality education initiatives. I am wondering if any of those initiatives that were begun by Mr. Riffel, who was responsible for leading those, is continuing in some other area. I am thinking particularly of the one that involved modelling where the concept was that some individual schools were doing some things remarkably well and there was the intention to get other schools involved in looking at those models. The more general question is did any of those survive?

Mr. Derkach: In response to that question, I guess I could say that there are certainly ongoing implementations as a result of Dr. Riffel's initiatives. Certainly, that is being done through Professional Development.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the item pass?

The hour being five o'clock, it is time for Private Members' Hour. Committee rise.

* (1700)

* (1440)

SUPPLY—HEALTH

Mr. Chairman, Mark Minenko: I call the section of the Committee of Supply to order, please. We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Health. Presently item 1.(d)(1) is under consideration.

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan): Mr. Chairperson, could the Minister define the criteria for a study on the Teaching Hospital Review, please?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, the Teaching Hospital Review will centre around a number of areas, including the program, including the identified statistical analysis made in Manitoba Medicare, and I trust my honourable friend has read Manitoba Medicare.

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Chairperson, could the Minister, for the benefit of the other Members of this House, define the criteria for the study under Teaching Hospital Review, please?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Chairman, I just indicated to my honourable friend what is involved.

Mr. Cheema: Well, I think the Hansard will tell. Mr. Chairperson, what is the method that is going to be used to conduct this study, and what staff will be involved, and what is the cost of this study?

Mr. Orchard: I cannot answer what the study will cost, but we may well have to engage outside expertise to make that analysis.

Mr. Cheema: Yesterday, the Minister indicated that the Adult Medical Study could not be released because of the agreement with the hospital. Has he entered into a similar agreement in this study or not? -(Inaudible)-

Mr. Chairman: Did Hansard catch that? Did Hansard catch the answers from the Minister?

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Chairperson, would the Minister describe all the factors involved in the study and most specifically his concept of hospitals of excellence, and what are the specific areas he is concentrating on as reference to hospitals of excellence?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Chairman, we have community hospitals in the City of Winnipeg, each of which has a board, management staff employees, auxiliaries, community support that they are very, very proud of. Each of these hospitals, I think it is fair to say, would like to expand into a wide range of program availability. The question one has to ask themselves is, can we afford that in the context of a million population, or ought we to look at each community hospital in terms of its role function and develop programs of excellence in each community hospital?

I cannot tell my honourable friend today where the program of excellence will come from for each community hospital. That is something that I would like to have them discuss amongst themselves so that there

is cooperation within the system, to develop programs of excellence that I think will serve Manitobans well. That is the purpose of the study and the review.

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Chairperson, we discussed part of that program in the Advisory Network. The Minister indicated that the Advisory Network will be also addressing the same issue. Now, who is going to be in charge of this program, Advisory Network or the Research and Planning?

Mr. Orchard: The Advisory Network.

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Chairperson, then the Minister is contradicting himself. He said the teaching hospital review is going to conduct a study of excellence, and now he is saying that the Advisory Network is going to do it. My next question is, are the postgraduate programs a part of the study?

Mr. Orchard: There is no contradiction. I have always said that the Research and Planning Directorate will provide advice and input to the Health Advisory Network. Has my honourable friend forgotten that? And that the two will work as resource and complementary groups working together to resolve health care problems. I said that Tuesday of last week, Thursday of last week and yesterday, and I am saying it again today. So I hope my honourable friend understands.

Mr. Cheema: My question still remains the same. Are the postgraduate programs in the medical school part of the study on the two teaching hospitals or not?

Mr. Orchard: Yes, as I indicated to him previously.

Mr. Cheema: Can the Minister indicate to us, what are the programs in the postgraduate study he is looking at? More specifically, when we do not have an ophthalmology program, ENT program is in big trouble, cardiology program has had its own problems, could the Minister indicate who is going to be responsible, his department or the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach)?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Chairman, it is the Department of Health that funds the postgraduate program. The Department of Health has the responsibility to determine the manpower needs into the future, so it is my responsibility, the Department of Health's responsibility, as it was a year ago, as it was five years ago, as it was 10 years ago, as it will be five years from now, as it will be 10 years from now.

Mr. Cheema: Could the Minister indicate what is the status of the ophthalmology program? Has he conducted a study or is he going to re-establish this program or not?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Chairman, the ophthalmology program is one program that is under review, not only by the Manitoba Health Services Commission in terms of how we might resource it but indeed is under review internally at the Faculty of Medicine.

Mr. Cheema: The other program which is of great concern to all Manitobans and the Faculty of Medicine

Tuesday, November 1, 1988

is the program in psychiatry. It has been recommended by the Manitoba Medical Association in their report of February '88 that they need more slots in the postgraduate program in psychiatry. Will the Minister tell us, has he been approached? What is his position on that?

Mr. Orchard: I may stand corrected, but the Minister of Health does not direct what slots in postgraduate service are dedicated to what specialty. That is done by the heads of the department of the Faculty of Medicine. We have given them a global number of 326. From that, the resources are allocated to the various postgraduate programs and disciplines. I would hope, given the shortage and given, as I indicated to my honourable friend yesterday, that a Manitoba-grown solution to psychiatric manpower shortage is preferred by, I would say, everyone I have discussed the problem with in the Province of Manitoba, that issue would be addressed internally.

Mr. Cheema: The other area of concern which the Minister has not indicated so far, this program is the In Vitro Fertilization Program, which was being operated through Health Sciences Centre, and this program was not given enough trial time. There was a major financial problem and in spite of the patients' plea to this Government and to the Health Sciences, no action was taken by this Government. On July 22, during the Question Period by my leader, there was a reply from this Minister that this is not this Minister's responsibility. It is the responsibility of the Health Sciences Centre. However, Mr. Chairperson, still this program is a part of Health Sciences. Is the Minister going to review that program through this medical review of two teaching hospitals?

Mr. Orchard: No, Mr. Chairman, that is not part of the review.

So that we are perfectly clear as to what the Liberal Party's position is on in vitro fertilization, does the Liberal Party, as my honourable friend, the critic, indicated in his press release, want it to become an insured service to the Province of Manitoba or, as your Leader indicates, simply the program be continued at the cost to the individual user? Which is the Liberal Party policy?

Mr. Cheema: We have indicated, and our position still remains the same, that this program must be re-established, but the program should be self-sufficient in terms of the patient should be paying a part of the services. This program was not given enough time. This program was terminated within a one-year period and this program had financial difficulties from the beginning.

Could the Minister make some arrangement to have the financial statement of this particular program from Health Sciences Centre so that we could review this program under the heading of Maternal and Child Health because we did promise on July 22 that we will be discussing this program during the Estimates?

* (1450)

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Chairman, I think my honourable friend has clarified the Liberal Party's position, which would mean that his position as put out in his press release was incorrect and that he erred when he said it should become an insured service according to the Liberal Party of Manitoba, because his press release was on Liberal Party stationery and it was he who put it out as the Liberal Health critic. He asked that it become an insured service.

Am I reading today that my honourable friend is saying it should not be an insured service and that he was wrong in his press release?

Mr. Cheema: I stand to be corrected. I did not say that. I am saying that -(Interjection)- just listen to me, please—that part of the services should be paid by the patient as it was done in the previous year.

Could the Minister now provide us with the details of the financial problems of this program so that we will be able to discuss it under Maternal and Child Health?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Chairman, let us not lose sight of what the issue was. My honourable friend, I do not think, ever understood what the issue was in in vitro fertilization. No. 1, the In Vitro Fertilization Program was not an insured service provided through The Manitoba Health Insurance Act funding. Secondly, it was not an approved program. It never received approval for funding by the previous administration. It was selected by the Health Sciences Centre as a project they wished to undertake with their internal resources. As I understand it, in communication with the Health Sciences Centre, they approved funding for the program on the basis it would become self-sufficient.

Mr. Chairman, for whatever reason, after some 18 months of operation, the program not only did not achieve self-sufficiency but it ran up in excess of \$700,000 of deficit. The Health Sciences Centre management and Board of Directors decided they could no longer continue to fund the program.

Here is where my honourable friend does not understand the issue. They did not approach the Manitoba Health Services Commission or the Province of Manitoba or the Government or myself for funding because clearly they said that, if they had to provide funding of \$700,000 or whatever the number was, they had at least two or three other priorities within their program offering that they would dedicate that money to. Therefore, the Health Sciences Centre made the decision to discontinue the program. I tried to be perfectly clear.

I tried to facilitate the user group with the Health Sciences Centre management to assure, as I presume the Liberal Party position was at one time depending on whether you listened to the Liberal Leader (Mrs. Carstairs) or the Liberal Health critic (Mr. Cheema) and that was confusing, but I believe generally the Liberal Party position was that, because it was going to be self-sufficient, it ought to be continued. I did not have any disagreement with that. I tried to facilitate the user group, the proponents and the management to get

together to come up with the appropriate guarantees so that it would be self-sufficient and have no impact on the budget of the Health Sciences Centre. That was not able to be achieved.

The management of the Health Sciences Centre were faced, first of all, with the proposition it was going to self-finance, but it lost \$700,000.00. At the same time, I have to say to you that the management of the Health Sciences Centre, like the management of every other hospital and the administration of every other hospital, is faced with patient demands that they are currently not meeting. They in essence placed \$700,000 of resource to in vitro fertilization which could have been used for maybe 50 open-heart surgeries, bypass surgeries, I do not know how many hip replacements. I mean, those are the raw statistics.

They chose, because they could no longer have faith that the program was going to be self-financing, to cancel the program and rededicate the resources to other areas of patient care which are in demand as well. Quite frankly, I agreed with the analysis of the Health Sciences Centre management, the same people who made the decision to go into the program in the first place, knowing full well there would be no Government support. I hope that is clear to my honourable friend.

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Chairperson, the In Vitro Fertilization Program was given 12 months to 18 months. Out of that 12 months to 18 months, there was a period of, I believe, about six weeks to eight weeks when this program was not in operation. It takes about nine months for a success for even the first pregnancy to be there. This program was not given enough time. That was our position, and that is our position right now.

The Minister is confusing the position here. We said from the beginning that this program should be given enough time to evaluate it. This program was not given enough time. The Minister was approached by the people who were involved in this program. It may not be the people from Health Sciences Centre, but the patients and the families have approached the Minister. An emergency debate was requested by the Honourable Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan) and that day we promised that we are going to discuss the same program during Estimates.

That is why I am requesting the Minister to provide us, and he has the authority to request all the statistics from Health Sciences Centre and table in the House so that we could discuss under Maternal and Child Health. We do have about five days to seven days still to go until Maternal and Child Health. Could the Minister do that?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend is not exactly correct in some of his points. First of all, the program did run for approximately 18 months. The maximum number of cycles that an individual goes through is three. If a pregnancy does not occur during those three cycles, then the woman is no longer enrolled in the program.

I want to quote for my honourable friend on a news release from the Liberal Party: "Cheema demands

supports for IVF program." I want to read the last paragraph back to my honourable friend. "The Government should not allow this important program to die after such a short time. It should be a basic medical service provided to all Manitobans," Cheema concluded, a basic medical service like open-heart surgery, hip replacement which are all insured services. Now that is an interesting position for my honourable friend to take, a basic medical service in in vitro fertilization. His Leader did not even take that position, Mr. Chairman. So who speaks for the Liberal Party in health matters?

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Chairperson, the press release that the Minister is reading says exactly what he said, but basic medical services provided to all Manitobans does not mean that we were advocating for totally insured services. The Minister is trying to go around in circles and I have seen him not pinpoint exactly and just blame other people. That is not the question.

The question I am asking, will he provide the financial statement from the Health Sciences Centre so that we could review this program in this House under the Maternal and Child Health, because I think it is a responsibility of all of us to review that program so that we can answer to the public of Manitoba?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Chairman, it is not me that on— there is no date on this news release, but I presume about three-and-a-half months ago. It was not me who was trying to confuse the public of Manitoba, to raise false hopes, to say something that he did not mean. It was, in fact, the Liberal Health critic where he, in his press release, says it should be a basic medical service provided to all Manitobans. That means an insured service to anyone who understands and knows the medical system. Surely, my honourable friend as a medical doctor would know what he was telling the people of Manitoba with that line, raising false hopes that within one day even his Leader cut him down on. Who speaks for the Liberal Party?

* (1500)

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Chairperson, my question still remains the same. When will we have this statement from Health Sciences regarding this program, total statistics, so that we could review that program under Maternal and Child Health? Will the Minister provide that statement or not?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Chairman, I will be pleased to give my honourable friend the financial information that I received through the Manitoba Health Services Commission regarding the In Vitro Fertilization Program, if my honourable friend will admit to the people of Manitoba that he did not speak for the Party when he said that this should become a basic medical service that his Leader then denied a day later. If he will come clean with the people of Manitoba instead of holding out false hopes like this press release did, certainly I will provide that information to him.

Mr. Cheema: Still the Minister has not answered my question that we need that information to discuss the

In Vitro Fertilization Program. The Minister is trying to create a personality conflict here. That is not the question. The question is, we want to discuss that program because we promised and we feel that program is important and must be evaluated to the fullest extent, and 12 to 18 months' time is not the proper time to evaluate that program. That was my Leader's position and that is what I am saying. Will he table that statement so that—he still has five to seven days to do that. We are giving him enough time to do that. Will he table it or not?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Chairman, I already indicated to my honourable friend that I would provide that information. Is that not what he asked for, the financial information on which the Health Sciences Centre based their decision?

I just simply want to tell to my honourable friend that I appreciate that he has more knowledge on the program than the management and the administration of the Health Sciences Centre, who made the decision with a full basis of knowledge and experience in the program. I am glad that he has such efficient knowledge that he can second guess those professional managers.

Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill): Just to follow-up on that briefly and then I want to go to another issue, when we asked for the emergency debate in the House, which was voted down by the combined forces of the Liberal Opposition and the Government, we did so because we thought at that particular time it might be possible to review this issue carefully as legislators, to debate it in this House. Our intent was to convince the Minister to continue on with the program for a period of time so that a careful evaluation over a longer period of time could have been conducted. We felt that was the appropriate course of action.

We were concerned and we said we were concerned at the time because the Liberals did vote with the Conservatives in defeating the resolution, even though they said they felt there would be another opportunity to debate it. I believe that the time which has transpired between the closing of the operation and today mitigates against a quick reopening or a speedy re-establishment of that operation.

I would ask the Minister if it is not true that many of the staff who were involved with that particular operation are now redeployed, some have left the province, and if the equipment that was in place in a clinic-type situation has now been removed and the space is being used for other activities. So if one were to start up the operation at this late date, one would have to start from scratch again, whereas before there may have been a possibility to continue on with the process.

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Chairman, I can answer, I think in part, a lot of my honourable friend's questions. Yes, staff has been redeployed. I cannot indicate whether any have left the province. I am simply not knowledgeable of that. At the time the program was under discussion, indications were made to me that some of the equipment—and I do not know what

percentage of investment value—but at least a portion of the equipment could be used for other purposes within the hospital setting. I would presume that has been done. Whether it has been moved from the physical location or not, I simply cannot confirm.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Chairperson, we too look forward to the financial information which will give more information to us as legislators with respect to this very complex and difficult area. I would have liked to have seen, as would my colleagues in the New Democratic Party Opposition would liked to have seen, a continuation of the program for a period of time so that a more thorough evaluation of it could have been accomplished. I recognize that the Minister has to make those decisions and I recognize that we are going to disagree from time to time on decisions. He is going to fight hard to defend his decisions, and we are going to fight hard to try to convince him to change his mind or to take a different course when we believe that decision is inappropriate.

That is all, as the Minister full well knows, within the general process which is followed here. Sometimes you have a window of opportunity, and we thought we did have a window of opportunity before the operation was dismantled and the staff were redeployed. We think that window of opportunity has diminished significantly since that time. We regret that, but we accept the fact that the Minister made a decision and he is going to stand by that decision.

That does not mean, however, that there is not opportunity, although it will not be the same window, opportunity nonetheless. The whole area of reproductive technology is an area where we all have a great deal to learn. The In Vitro Fertilization Program was a part of new advances which are being undertaken in the whole field of reproductive technology. Now in the Province of Manitoba, in the country as a whole and as a matter of fact globally, the amount of information which is available to us is expanding exponentially.

The new developments which are taking place, I think, are new developments that no one anticipated 10 years ago or 15 years ago or sometimes even five years ago. The opportunity for assisting individuals who have difficulties in conceiving children, such as was the case with the In Vitro Fertilization Program, as well as helping individuals in many other circumstances, are becoming more and more apparent.

That gives rise to some very serious financial questions but I think, more importantly than the serious financial questions, because we can find money to do things if we really want to do them—it is a matter of priority and that is what we said at the time of the debate, that we felt that the Government did not consider this to be a priority and we accept the fact that they have other priorities.

There are also some ethical, moral and legal questions that have to be addressed as well. I think that one of the things that we have to do as legislators is to take note of those questions, to think about them carefully, to do so with the best possible information and data which is available to us, and then come to some

conclusions. Those conclusions in some instances may be quite focused and concise and crisp; in other instances, they may be less focused and more diffused. But we have a responsibility no matter what the conclusion or the type of conclusion which we may come to in the end to at least undertake that discussion and undertake the debate and give thought ourselves to these very serious questions.

I do believe that there has to be progress in this area. I do believe that there are opportunities for childless couples who want to have children that will enable them to have children. I think that we have to seriously consider how that can be accomplished and the ramifications and the ethical and more on legal questions that go along with it as well as the financial considerations. It seems that with health care generally now we are more and more focused on the financial considerations because of the global nature of the system in which we operate and the fact that there is only so much money and that we want to provide the best quality care and that the ability to provide better quality care is sometimes exceeding our ability to finance that type of care.

So those financial considerations and more on ethical and legal questions are not just confined to the In vitro Fertilization Program and reproductive technologies generally, but they also extend to new technologies that prolong lives, new technologies that make it able for people who are not able to live before to live in dignity and comfort, new technologies that allow us to deal with health problems before that would have been fatal or at least debilitating and to do so in a way that is humane, compassionate and do so in a way where there are cost considerations that have to be taken into account.

Moving back to the area of reproductive technology, I would ask the Minister if Research and Planning Division has done any work in this area to define at least what the questions are, because I think that is where one starts, with the definition of the issues in the form of questions with respect to more of the ethical, the legal, the financial cost and the efficiencies of these technologies. Has this department undertaken any work in that area with respect to reproductive technologies specifically?

* (1510)

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Chairman, not specifically in terms of the direction my honourable friend probably is indicating, I just want to straighten something out lest my honourable friend leaves an impression that would not accurately reflect the history of In Vitro Fertilization Program on the record. Clearly we have the Liberal critic at odds with his Leader, when he is saying that it should be a basic medical program and insured service and his Leader is saying no.

Listening to my honourable friend, the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan), would leave you the impression that as Minister of Health and this Government made a decision reversing a decision of the administration of which he was part, of which he was a Treasury Board Member, of which he was a Cabinet Member. Now he

is shaking his head, no, in the negative, but the impression one would get from reading his remarks that he just put on the record is that we did something different as a Progressive Conservative Government than he did as a New Democratic Party Government.

I want my honourable friend to make sure he full well realizes what his Government did with in vitro fertilization. It was proposed to his administration as a service that would be funded by Government. It was refused by the NDP Treasury Board process, Cabinet process and the Government. There was no public funding made available by the NDP. The impression one might get from listening to my honourable friend is that we made a decision somewhat different than the previous NDP Government did.

We did not, Mr. Chairman, we made exactly the same decision as the previous Government did which was the correct decision that there were higher priorities in health care spending and we could not put taxpayers' dollars directly towards the In Vitro Fertilization Program, exactly the same decision made by the then Minister of Health, Mr. Desjardins, and his NDP Cabinet colleagues, including the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan). So I just want to make sure, in my honourable friend's skillful use of words and leaving impressions, that no listener and no reader of his remarks would get the impression that they funded the In Vitro Fertilization Program because that is not accurate, factual or true.

Now, what I did try to do is exactly as both my honourable Liberal friends and my honourable NDP friend have suggested. We, I as Minister of Health, tried to get the proponents of the program and the deliverers of the program at the Health Sciences Centre together to make sure the program continued. I spent some considerable effort, as did staff in my office spend some considerable effort, as did the Manitoba Health Service Commission people to attempt to get the two sides together to make the program survive as a self-financing program which the proponent said was possible and which the Health Sciences Centre said, if that is possible, we have no objection in continuing the program. But the two sides could not come to an agreement which did not expose the Health Sciences Centre to further financial risk.

I have to indicate to my honourable friends that they probably made the correct decision in absence of that kind of financial guarantee and facing the fact that they had already lost in excess of \$700,000, their decision without the assurance of self-financing was the correct one. I simply want to indicate to my honourable friend from Churchill (Mr. Cowan) that the decision we made was the same decision that was made by the NDP Government two years prior to my making the decision that I made, that was not to put in public funds, to try and get the program to be self-sufficient, lest anyone reading my honourable friend's remarks might have gotten a different impression.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Chairperson, I will have to review my own remarks, but I think in doing so, I will find what I believe to be the case and that is that I never, never said, implied, suggested, or in any way inferred that

we had funded this program as part of the health services of the province, nor did I suggest that it should be a fully funded service in my comments. So the Minister is overly defensive and anticipating, I would suggest, something that is not going to happen because he wants to deflect attention away from the decision he made.

Never have I seen a group of individuals, as the Minister and his colleagues on the Government side of the House now, fight so hard to become Government so that they would have the opportunity to make decisions and then so quickly turn around and say that, well, we are not making any decisions that are any different than the previous administration. They fought for the opportunity to make the decision as to whether or not to continue with this program, because that comes with the territory of being Government. Being Government is just a matter of making choices—rational, well-thought-out, hopefully logical choices as to how to approach some very difficult and complex issues. Those choices are not static. You do not make the choice once and then never have to rethink that choice.

There is a yearly Estimates process. Everything is on the table during the yearly Estimates process. You can choose to change a Highways Budget around entirely if that is what you want to do. You can choose to take projects out of one area and put them in another area each year. You can have projects that are started and you can choose not to continue them.—(Interjection)- I know because we did it and I know because they did it. The Minister of Highways (Mr. Albert Driedger) in a feigned—I believe it is feigned, I do not want to impute motives—shock, says that —(Interjection)- “Me,” he says, as if he did not. Well, the Highways Estimates will come up soon and we will find that they have changed priorities.—(Interjections)- There are a number of interjections.

I am trying to make the point that being a Member of Government, and I do not think even those who are interjecting will disagree with me or those who have not had the opportunity to be a Government yet will disagree with me, but the matter of being a Government is making choices on a continuing basis and rethinking those choices and re-evaluating them and shifting priorities and trying to make the best use of our limited resources, whether they be financial, human or otherwise.

The Minister of Highways (Mr. Albert Driedger) from his seat says, give him a licking, and I think that is very indicative of the style and what they expect and what others have come to expect of this Minister. When you are involved in a debate which should be reasonable, logical and well thought out, the intent—

Mr. Chairman: I hesitate to interrupt the Honourable Member, but I would ask all Members to direct their attention to the Estimates of the department which we are discussing, considering—all Members.

* (1520)

Mr. Cowan: When it comes to a matter of a debate of this nature they strike out rather than say let us

figure out how we can reasonably approach this issue and try to find a common ground if common ground is possible and, if it is not possible, at least try to enunciate our ground, our individual ground, and let the public decide over a period of time.

I think that has been somewhat lacking in the debate but I hope that it is more a part of our discussions here, because there is in this particular instance a philosophical approach. There is a practical approach. There is a principled approach that may not be all that different in all instances, but certainly does differ in some cases.

The Minister said that he, we, he did—I have to get this right now so that I do not misrepresent him, that we did exactly what they are doing. That is not exactly the case. You see, when the proponents of the program came forward we said, no, we will not fund it as a service, and if you can make it operate as a viable service, that is a decision the hospital should take along with the clientele group, and that is what happened. It was found that they could not, in the time period that they allowed for, make it a viable service, so they came back to Government.

Here is where the new Government was in place and the new Government had to make its own choice. It has made its own choice in many different areas where it has reversed the decision that we made. It has had the courage to make its own choice and reverse a decision that we made with respect to highways. It has reversed a decision that we made, and made its own choice when it came to a matter of priorities with the Department of Community Services. It has reversed priorities that we had put in place and decisions we had made with respect to legislation.

It reversed priorities and took a very courageous stand and gave money back to Inco and CPR, different than we had done in our Budget, because it felt philosophically that money should go back to those large corporations at the expense of others who have to pay taxes —(Interjection)-

That has happened all along and what the Minister is saying now, that even although they did all of those things and he has reversed decisions that we have taken with respect to Health and changed priorities, on this particular decision which was a new decision that was brought to them, they relied entirely on the lame excuse that it was the previous administration that made this decision. We are only following through on that decision.

The fact is that the decision at the point in time that this issue was more timely was whether or not to allow the program to continue, knowing that it had worked up a deficit. There is some question as to how much of that deficit was applicable directly to the program and how much of that deficit might have been rolled in and was not directly applicable to the program.

That is why I believe my friend, the Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema) has asked for the financial statements. We will know the answer to that question once we receive that information, or hopefully we will know the answer to that question once we receive that

information, but what happened was the Government had to write off a deficit in any event. If the program stopped for the hospitals—someone had to write off that deficit because, if the program stopped, the amount of the deficit at that time was frozen, there was no way of reimbursing and it had to be written off.

(The Acting Chairman, James Carr, in the Chair.)

I think it might have been possible, although I am not certain, for the Government to come forward and say, okay, we are going to have to write off that amount anyway, and that happens all the time, so let us see how we can continue on this program for a period of time to have a more thorough evaluation of whether or not it is a good program and whether or not it is being implemented and structured in the appropriate fashion, and they chose not to and that was their decision. They may base their decision on what they thought the previous administration would have done had it been in power, but they cannot say what the previous administration would have done had it been in power, nor is it fair for them to suggest that because a decision was taken two years previous that decision would stand bound for all time. So I disagree with his analysis, and I think that is a legitimate disagreement. I understand the position he brings forward, but I think that it is one that is not entirely logical. I think that he will attempt to defend it and appreciate that and look forward to hearing what he has to say. But the fact is, when they had the opportunity to make a choice, they made a choice not to continue the program and that is the reality.

The Minister has received from Llyn Willms, Health Liaison Coordinator of the First Nations Confederacy, a proposal for the establishment of a professional organization for the purpose of reunification of community health representatives in Manitoba. In that proposal, which is dated September 23, the First Nations Confederacy is requesting the funding be provided to obtain this objective, and has asked the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) and the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) to become involved.

The Minister of Northern Affairs, I believe this was the issue to which he was speaking earlier today, indicated that he has advocated on behalf of Native people with respect to this proposal. I would ask the Minister of Health if the Minister of Northern Affairs has asked for his department to undertake research on this proposal to provide an analysis as to whether or not it should be pursued, and if he has asked his department, either with the support and encouragement of the Minister of Northern Affairs or without the same, if it has not yet been forthcoming, to undertake that sort of research.

Mr. Orchard: Before we leave the In Vitro Fertilization Program, again I simply do not want the record to be left with my honourable friend from Churchill, again with his skill of the English language, to leave a false impression on the record. My honourable friend went through the decision-making process. It was exactly the same decision-making process we made that they made.

For instance, as I have indicated earlier to my honourable friend, the Liberal Health critic, if the

program could operate and break even, we encouraged the two sides to get together to make sure that would happen so the program could continue. The deficit of \$700,000 at the Health Sciences Centre was sunk costs. We recognized that. The communication with the Health Sciences Centre was that if you can operate and break even, the money is already lost. You do not have to recover the deficit from operating costs. That is the same position my honourable friend laid on the record.

But the one thing that he attempted in his skillful use of the English language, he said, and I want him to check Hansard to make sure, he said they came back. Now he is going to probably fumble around and say, you know, who are they, etc.? But one reading the Hansard record would assume that they would be the Health Sciences Centre, came back to Government to ask for money. Mr. Acting Chairman, I simply want the record to be clear, the Health Sciences Centre did not do that. That is another impression that my honourable friend would try to leave on the record, maybe inadvertently, but I certainly would not want him to leave that inadvertent, incorrect impression on the record. I know he wants me to correct him when he does that.

Mr. Acting Chairman, in terms of the second matter my honourable friend raised, the answer to the first part of it is "yes," and no decision has been made to date, and no communication with the organization to date from my department.

Mr. Cowan: In their proposal to the Minister, they indicate that there needs to be an evaluation of the role of community health representatives, because of the issue about which we spoke yesterday in these Estimates on the debate of the Department of Health. That is with regard to local control and self-government and more control over services such as health services which are provided in Indian and Metis communities, both reserves and Northern Affairs communities.

I just want to quote from the proposal briefly. It says: "With the eventual self-government of the Indian people, the community health representatives are the logical body to establish primary health care needs and services within their communities." I would ask the Minister if he agrees with that statement and if he has asked for any analysis from his department with respect to the role which the community health representatives see themselves playing over a period of time as we move more and more towards self-government?

* (1530)

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Acting Chairman, that is an issue that certainly we wish on this side of the House, as Government, to have further discussions with the Native community on.

Mr. Cowan: The proposal also goes on to say: "Confusion arises because of conflicting expectations from within the community as well as from the Government." They suggest that it is essential and the consensus of the community health representatives that mechanisms be developed to allow for future changes.

"To accomplish this basic management training as well as board development training is essential."

The community health representatives are saying, from what I read into the letter and from what I hear, is that they want to play a valued role in those discussions which the Minister indicates are necessary. In order to do so, they need some assistance in preparing themselves and preparing their communities to ensure that when they enter into those discussions, they have well-developed positions and well-thought-out ideas and concepts which might be helpful to the Government.

The Government, of course, has the mechanisms available to it to develop its own opinions and to develop its own background information and data through this very section that we are discussing right now, the Research and Planning section of the department. The Native organizations and particularly individuals employed by different groups do not have that research always available to them. That is why they come to Government to ask for money to assist them in developing that research.

In this particular proposal, they are asking the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) to provide \$64,255.95 and they are asking the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) to provide the same. That is an estimated budget which would provide for the establishment of a professional organization of community health representatives.

Other health representatives in the province have professional associations as well, so I do not believe that they are asking for anything that is out of the ordinary or anything which is not standardly accepted in many other areas of health care in this province. I would ask the Minister such as he has indicated that he believes discussions must begin, and the paper itself, if I could it quote again, says: "This professional body is long overdue and discussions must begin. They must focus on the development of standards and implementation of these standards," and for that reason they are proposing the funding be allocated to them. Is he prepared to ask his staff to immediately undertake an analysis of this particular proposal, and can he commit to responding very quickly to Lyn Willms and the First Nations Confederacy with regard to their request for a proposal and funding for the organization?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Acting Chairman, the Government currently provides some financial support to Native agencies in a number of ways, primarily however through my colleague's department, the Department of Northern Affairs.

We have an interesting scenario. We have a Native Justice Inquiry ongoing wherein a similar request is made for funding to be present at. We have a request for funding here to myself and to my colleague, the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) to undertake research, etc. I guess that is fair and reasonable to make those requests but it is not dissimilar—and I do not want my honourable friend to leave the impression that with other professional organizations Governments put in money to support them. Government does not put in money to support unions, to support the MARN

as a professional association of registered nurses or the MMA. That is done by membership checkoff and they are self-financed. I do not want the impression to be left that this is a request which Government normally accedes to throughout different professional jurisdictions because it is not.

On the larger issue, all special interest groups and lobby groups that are funded in some way or another by Government have more desire for funds than they have funds, not dissimilar to Government. It is the job of those organizations to prioritize the monies that are provided to them by the taxpayer, determine what their priorities are and where they want to put those monies. If this professional organization is a priority of the First Nations Confederacy, they may well think it appropriate to allocate internal resources to achieve that study. That would put them in the same league as other self-governing professional bodies or special interest groups or lobby groups that are funded in some way or another by Government.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Acting Chairperson, would the Minister not agree that on occasion and probably quite frequently the Government provides financial assistance to be explicit funding to organizations, all sorts of organizations, to undertake specific projects, to develop proposals, to do research that benefits not only that organization but the Government as well? Can he not further agree that the Government does this in many instances with respect to advocacy groups, with respect to organizations similar to the First Nations Confederacy and MKO and tribal councils, organizations that speak out on behalf of particular groups on particular issues?

I would suggest that he is going to have to say yes, that Government does do this, because I know Government does this. If that is the case, then he is going to have to say with this particular instance that no, we do not want to do it because we do not have the funding to do it, we do not consider it a priority or, yes, we are going to seriously consider doing it. We will enter into discussions with the representatives of the First Nations Confederacy to flush out the detail of the proposal and to determine whether or not we want to assist them, and to what level we would want to assist them if that is the case in the future, or he is going to have to say yes, we think that \$128,000 or \$130,000 roughly is a good figure, and we are prepared to fund the First Nations Confederacy to that amount right at the present time.

There is ample precedent. He will agree that there is ample precedent. There is a choice there. I would recommend to him that if he has to do any of those three things that he immediately sit down with the First Nations Confederacy to examine their proposal in more detail or have his staff at a high level within the department sit down with the First Nations Confederacy to examine that proposal in more detail so that he can respond to them as to the position the Government is going to take. I would encourage him to provide some funding because I think it is an important area, but they have to make that decision.

The letter is about a month old now and it is probably time that it be answered. The Minister has indicated

Tuesday, November 1, 1988

that he has not had an opportunity to answer it yet. I would ask him if he is prepared to write back to the First Nations Confederacy and say, okay, let us take a harder look at your proposal. We want more detail on it. We want to see if in fact it is a viable proposal and, if so, we are prepared to fund it and, if not, we are prepared to tell you why we do not want to fund it.

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Acting Chairman, as I indicated, that proposal is under review and I thank my honourable friend for his advice.

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Acting Chairperson, we will move to another topic because we will be discussing the In Vitro Fertilization Program at a later date.

Under the Mental Health Information System Project, will the Minister please define this topic for us?

Mr. Orchard: The 1983 report of the Mental Health Working Group identified the need for an improved mental health management information system, (MIS). Subsequent reviews specified MIS deficiencies for the three mental health centres—Brandon, Selkirk and Winkler—and the community mental health program delivered in all regions. A blueprint for the required information system has been completed and is now ready for implementation. Senior management has recently recommended approval of the required software and hardware for the computer system. Expenditures to implement this Management Information System are included in the 1988-89 Health Estimates. This development will satisfy the 1983 recommendation arising from the report of the Mental Health Working Group to monitor service activities and benefit patients and clients.

Mr. Cheema: Could the Minister indicate the recommendations from this project, please?

Mr. Orchard: To provide a management information service.

Mr. Cheema: Could the Minister tell us what was the cost of this project?

* (1540)

Mr. Orchard: The annual costs for operating, I am informed, are \$70,000.00. The federal Government paid for the development cost and we provided the staff time to make those development costs.

Mr. Cheema: Is that cost included in the present budget?

Mr. Orchard: Yes.

Mr. Cheema: Could we move to the next topic? The investigators on various National Health and Research Development Grants, will the Minister tell us what this heading means?

(Mr. Chairman in the Chair.)

Mr. Orchard: This is one in which we enjoy some substantial cooperation with the federal Government and the federal Minister of Health in terms of we are into a competition basically on proposals that we make out of Research and Planning on behalf of the Department of Health and MHC regarding health research projects in which we compete on a national scale for funding. We have been reasonably successful in achieving some fairly substantive federal support for research funding.

Mr. Cheema: Could the Minister indicate how many staff are involved in this process and what is the cost of these positions, the investigator in these grants?

Mr. Orchard: It is a portion of the \$499,000 staff budget and the \$94,000 operating budget of Research and Planning which goes to fund all these activities in there. At present we do not—that this hour is for this project and the hour from now on is for the next project. That is not done. It is part of the Research and Planning budget.

Mr. Cheema: Is this study being done for the first time? If this is not the first time, how often was it done in the past and what was the recommendation from the previous studies?

Mr. Orchard: The Research and Planning has been a division of the Department of Health, I guess, for about six years now, since 1982 I think, and they have had that responsibility since that time.

Mr. Cheema: My question is, what were the findings from the previous years, and why is it important to continue these investigators' positions to study this grant from the provincial as well as from the federal Governments?

Mr. Orchard: To access national research funds. There is a pool of national research funds that we are able to access, depending upon the quality of the proposal that we develop and put in for specific research topics, and we have been reasonably successful on the national competition.

Mr. Cheema: I move to the next topic under Child Forensic Services. What does that study intend to achieve, and who are the participants in that study?

Mr. Orchard: That is just a general review of forensic services as they are available in the province and resourced within the Province of Manitoba, and hopefully will tell us, I guess, whether we are on target in terms of adequate resourcing or where the priorities within forensic services ought to be placed.

Mr. Cheema: What are the basic issues affecting the services, and what are the Minister's main objectives as a part of the study?

Mr. Orchard: To make sure that the service operates effectively, efficiently and provides forensic services in the adolescent field.

Mr. Cheema: Are the families of the patients to be surveyed by this study, are those families being notified?

Just going back to my same question again, are the patient confidentiality kept?

Mr. Orchard: This is a management review, not a program review.

Mr. Cheema: I have a few questions on the Indian health care. Can the Minister indicate to us what areas in specific he is going to undertake in his Research and Planning to provide certain—like the northern and Native health, there are a lot of problems they are facing in terms of their nutritional values. They are suffering from vitamin deficiencies. There is a problem with obstetrical services and also delivery of the disease prevention programs. Could the Minister provide us some background? What are the areas he is going to concentrate on?

Mr. Orchard: Again we want to attempt, with the resources that are available, to provide as high a quality of care as possible to the Native communities of Manitoba. We are open to the suggestions that were made and brought up just recently by the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan), which become part of the analysis as to whether that represents an effective new direction in delivery. There is no other goal than providing as high a quality of care as possible.

I will tell my honourable friend right up front so that his next question or several questions may well be answered. We know that with Native health services in general probably that is one population group that is underserved at present, not only in the Province of Manitoba but across this nation. It has been the subject of concern to various Governments of all political stripes, and we will work in a concerted effort to focus on the problem and attempt to provide a resolution as readily as is possible within Government's ability to serve those individuals.

Mr. Cheema: Could the Minister indicate what his views are, what his ideas are on the role of the nurse practitioner in some of the remote areas in the northern as well as in the Native communities?

Mr. Orchard: Very often, the nursing station staff are the front-line deliverers of medical services in many of our remote communities. Nursing stations are the round-the-clock providers of medical service, and most of the communities in question receive only periodic service by medical professionals, whether they be doctors or dentists. It is the nurses who provide the front-line support.

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Chairperson, under the heading of Health Care Demonstration Projects, could the Minister explain to us what are the projects under way and what is the area of his major concern at either of these being addressed as a part of research or, as he has indicated in that Advisory Network also, there will be certain projects to make people aware of the disease and prevention? Is it the same thing or different?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Chairman, I will give you some of the projects that are demonstration projects that are

under way right now. They are: Shortened Hospital Stay for Low Birth Weight Infants; Early Discharge Surgical Program in Brandon; the Centralized Not For Admission Unit—again in Brandon, that is for NFA surgery; Community-Based Crisis Management Services for Mentally Ill Adults; Psychoeducational Program for Families of Schizophrenics; Review of Diagnostic Services; Urinary Incontinence Program; Provincial Home; Parenteral Nutrition Program; Analysis of the Necessary Sputum Cytological Examinations; Palliative Care Supports in Gimli; the Immigrant-Refugee Health Outreach; Cost Containment in Adult Medical Intensive Care Units; Occupational Therapy Transitional Care; Discharge Planning Model; Admission and Discharge Program; and Analysis of Provincial Hospital Separation Abstracts Using Diagnostic Related Groups.

Those are projects which are hospital-specific and system-specific and have been suggested as specific demonstration projects that may have applicability to the overall goals of cost containment and quality preservation and enhancement.

* (1550)

Ms. Avis Gray (Elice): Mr. Chairperson, under the Activity Identification in Research and Planning, obviously some of the ongoing activities are represented here but a number of the activities are specific projects. I am wondering if the Minister could indicate to us which projects that are listed were initiated by the previous administration.

Mr. Orchard: A number of them, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Gray: To make the answer easier, perhaps the Minister could indicate to us which of the projects listed have been initiated by his administration?

Mr. Orchard: The Manpower Planning Analysis, the Teaching Hospital Review, the Implementation of the Management Information System in Mental Health, and the update of the Walk-in Clinic Study for fiscal year ending March 31, '88.

Ms. Gray: To clarify, in regard to the Walk-in Clinic Study and the Mental Health Management Information System, were those projects not initiated before this particular administration took power on May 9?

Mr. Orchard: There was a study of '87 information on walk-in clinics that was completed by the previous administration. We are completing the 1988 study. That is not to say that had Government not changed, that would not have got on but that is a specific one that I requested.

In terms of the MIS, certainly the background research was done but the decision to implement was made by this administration.

Ms. Gray: Then again to clarify, the Minister is indicating that the Manpower Planning Analysis and the Teaching Hospitals Review were specifically two projects that his Research and Planning Branch under his direction—that those two projects were initiated?

Mr. Orchard: That is correct.

Ms. Gray: That is correct? Okay, thank you.

I am wondering if the Minister could tell us—and I can appreciate the fact that with the Continuing Care Program Review that specific answers to that review would be better answered in another line, but I am sure the Minister will be able to answer some of these questions. I am wondering if, first of all, he could indicate in regard to the Continuing Care Program Review and the review that was conducted by Price Waterhouse, are there other reviews that have been conducted either by Research and Planning or other parts of the Department of Health or even other external groups that will also be used in conjunction with the Price Waterhouse Review as far as deciding what recommendations will be followed through?

Mr. Orchard: I missed the last part.

Ms. Gray: Which last part? The question was, are there other reviews that are being conducted either by other components of the department or even external agencies or by even other departments that impact on Continuing Care? Are there other reviews that have been conducted within the last two or three years, reviews that would be considered to be recent, that will be used in conjunction with the Price Waterhouse Review in regard to determining what recommendations will be followed in regard to Continuing Care?

Mr. Orchard: There was an internal review done by the department approximately two years ago, and then of course the Price Waterhouse Review as an external review.

Ms. Gray: I can appreciate the fact that the Minister was not the Minister of this department two years ago, but I am wondering if he has the information. Could he tell us what the nature and scope of that internal review was and were there any recommendations that resulted from that review and were there any recommendations that were acted upon?

Mr. Orchard: It might be helpful if I simply take that particular question as notice and provide that information when we get to the Continuing Care line.

Ms. Gray: Yes, we would certainly appreciate the information on that study. My understanding is that in fact that study was conducted and very few, if any, of the recommendations were acted upon by the previous administration.

I am wondering if the Minister could tell us, with the Continuing Care Review, the Price Waterhouse Review that has been conducted, could the Minister tell us what process will be followed to determine which, if any, of the recommendations will be followed as indicated by the Price Waterhouse Review?

Mr. Orchard: We have an Implementation Committee chaired by the Deputy Minister. Some of the recommendations, as my honourable friend knows, affect externally funded agencies as well as the

department. The intention is to involve through the Implementation Committee consultation with the external agencies and the affected groups that some of the recommendations may well impact on. There will be, hopefully, quite full discussion with those groups on some of the recommendations for implementation. Some recommendations are rather straightforward and it will be implemented. Others, naturally, take some discussion with affected parties, be they external agencies or otherwise.

Ms. Gray: Could the Member tell us who, other than the Deputy Minister, will be represented on the Implementation Committee?

Mr. Orchard: The membership will be made up of not only departmental staff but representatives from the external agencies as well as the hospitals who are part and parcel of a portion of the Home Care Program.

Ms. Gray: The Minister has indicated external agencies. Does that mean that representatives from or at least a representative from the Victorian Order of Nurses will be part of that Implementation Committee?

Mr. Orchard: I am advised they will not be a member.

Ms. Gray: Could the Minister tell us, with this Implementation Committee, has the committee actually been struck yet? Have they had any meetings? Is there a time frame with which this committee would hope to complete its job?

Mr. Orchard: We have letters going out to strike the implementation committee next week and some of the recommendations. If you follow the Price Waterhouse time frame there is, I guess, from one month to two years' time frame for implementation. I guess starting in the new year, we are going to try to achieve that one month, two-year time frame.

Ms. Gray: Could the Minister tell us, will the process be that all recommendations contained within this report, that all will be reviewed by the implementation committee? Will it be this committee with, of course, a final sanction from the Minister that will decide which recommendations will be followed and which will not?

* (1600)

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Chairman, some of the minor recommendations have already been agreed to. Some have been rejected outright and will not be subject to any discussion. For instance, the suggestion on the client contribution, the user fee, has been rejected by Government and will not be part of any discussion by the Implementation Committee.

Ms. Gray: Would the Minister be able to tell us if any of the other 10 recommendations considered priority by Price Waterhouse have been rejected?

Mr. Orchard: We can discuss those when we hit the Continuing Care line. I guess, being a farmer, I have never enjoyed ploughing the same ground twice.

Ms. Gray: Mr. Chairperson, the executive summary which indicates the 10 priority recommendations, I would think that the Minister would have some knowledge as to whether in fact his Government has made a decision to reject any of those recommendations outright. I am wondering if the Minister could comment on that since these are general overviews and not getting into specific details.

Mr. Orchard: I would be absolutely delighted to do that when we get to Continuing Care, but I do not drag around tons of books to sit here waiting for an anticipated question in Research and Planning that would be more appropriately placed in Continuing Care. I would simply ask my honourable friend for the patience that when we get there we can have this full debate. In the meantime, maybe we ought to consider Research and Planning.

Ms. Gray: Mr. Chairperson, being a farmer's daughter, I do not necessarily have a lot of patience. I would assume that the Minister would have some of the basic information about the 10 priority recommendations as indicated in Price Waterhouse, or at least have some understanding of the direction that he would like to see his department take in regard to the Continuing Care Program. I also have no difficulty in keeping those general questions as we move on to the Continuing Care section.

The Minister had indicated that there was an internal review done by the department a few years ago on the Home Care Program. He has mentioned that he will be able to give us specifics of that review and we appreciate that. Could the Minister tell us, was there also not two internal reviews that were conducted of the Home Orderly Program which of course is a component of the Home Care Program?

Mr. Orchard: I thought there was only one, but my staff tells me there were two.

Ms. Gray: Could the Minister indicate what the status is of those two reports?

Mr. Orchard: One of the two reports is in the process of being implemented in terms of a number of the recommendations.

Ms. Gray: Mr. Chairperson, I would assume that is probably the second report. Could the Minister indicate to us what happened to the first report that was conducted internally? Was there any results of that review or was it put on the shelf?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Chairman, it stimulated the second report.

Ms. Gray: Could the Minister tell us why there would be a need for the second report? Was the first report inadequate or incomplete, or totally disregarded?

Mr. Orchard: The previous administration did that.

Ms. Gray: Mr. Chairperson, I simply want to point out to the present Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) that I

would certainly hope that in his administration that when reports are commissioned internally or by Research and Planning, that they are not done so and left to sit on the shelf as we certainly have seen with the previous administration many, many times.

The Minister had mentioned some demonstration projects and given some examples. The one he had mentioned was low birth weight infants. Could he provide us some more detail as to the nature of that demonstration project?

Mr. Orchard: Which one?

Ms. Gray: The low birth weight infants.

Mr. Orchard: Shortened health stay for low birth weight infants, this project of comprehensive community follow-up care for 100 low birth weight infants and their families will help avoid illness associated with prolonged hospitalization at the Health Sciences Centre. Voluntary participation in the project should result in a reduced hospital readmissions, reduced use of emergency departments and improved infant growth. Contact Dr. A. Bishop, 787-2441 or Dr. O. Casiro, 787-4370, Department of Pediatrics, Health Sciences Centre, funding \$167,484, Family Services and Child Health Directorate, \$55,870, Health Sciences Centre, \$223,354 total project. Evaluation measures, No. 1, infant weight at discharge from hospital; No. 2, number of days in hospital from birth to discharge; No. 3, weight at discharge and length of hospitalization will be compared to matched historical controls; No. 4, frequency and type of visits to emergency room and readmissions to hospitals; No. 5, a group of psychosocial variables that will reflect the benefit derived from a shortened hospital stay, among these, parental satisfaction, infant behaviour and changes in the home environment.

An Honourable Member: Hear, hear!

Ms. Gray: Is the Minister suggesting that we should go ahead and contact those individuals or are they possibly subject to the same orders as indicated in your memo to all staff in regard to giving that information?

Mr. Orchard: You might contact them and find out because they are not departmental staff and never received the memo, and they may even phone you back.

Ms. Gray: I would hope that these individuals, and I certainly knew they were not departmental staff, would feel free to give us that information.

Could the Minister indicate this demonstration project, has it been completed and are results available?

Mr. Orchard: I am informed that what I read to my honourable friend was the status as of May 1988. There are quarterly reports. The project is not completed. None of the projects have been completed.

Ms. Gray: The Minister had also indicated that there was a demonstration project in regard to Community-based Crisis Management Services for the mentally ill.

Now he has indicated that all these projects are ongoing. Could he give us some information as to the scope and nature of that particular project? What prompted this demonstration project?

Mr. Orchard: A need in the system that was identified, Mr. Chairman, is the reason why the project was undertaken. Let me share with my honourable friend the project.

Community-based Crisis Management Services for Mentally Ill Adults, the project will provide community-based, short-term intensive care and treatment for mentally ill persons in psychiatric or social crisis in Winnipeg. The Crisis Stabilization Unit with eight spaces and expanded community mental health services will reduce frequent readmissions and lengthy stays in hospital. The goal of the project is to provide crisis management and intensive care stabilization for high-risk adults instead of hospitalization at the Health Sciences Centre. Contact, Major R. Moulton, Salvation Army, 942-4197, funding \$275,000.00.

Evaluation measures, a complex cohort analysis model is proposed to evaluate the project through (a) development of detailed information on all clients served by the unit; (b) utilization of two cohorts, Target Group and Control Group; and (c) adoption of a convergent validity approach, through comparison of the two groups over a period of time. Goal of this project is to demonstrate that a community-based crisis stabilization program can be a clinically effective alternative to inpatient treatment. For this target group (a) the number of inpatient stays (days) will be significantly reduced; and (b) per diem costs of care for this specific client group will be lower. Initial information that I have received on this program is that it appears to be working quite nicely.

Ms. Gray: Could the Minister tell us if initial reports are that this type of model is working? Are these types of community-based crisis units, is this something that is part of this grand mental health initiative that this Government has talked about?

Mr. Orchard: At the risk of pre-empting any information that might come out of this demonstration project, first blush reaction says this is a good project and a reasonable approach to the crisis stabilization in mental health. We are certainly optimistic that when the demonstration project is completed and the analysis is done that it will provide us with the answers that my honourable friend seeks.

* (1610)

Ms. Gray: Could the Minister tell us what other specific per diem rates that have been attached to individuals who stay in those crisis units that are provided to the facility?

Mr. Orchard: I cannot give you that information. That will only come out of the completion of the project because there have been times when the facility was not fully occupied, pending start up. The per diem cost for a half-full facility are considerably higher than for

a full facility. At the end of the demonstration project, hopefully, we see a basis of full occupancy of the eight beds to give us a more definitive per diem cost. The initial blush was that it is much higher than acute care because of the occupancy rate. That is not fair, that is not a fair conclusion to make.

Ms. Gray: For clarification then, as individuals enter into this unit, they are not paid per day at a specific rate. I am assuming, from the Minister's answer, that there is more of a block funding that is given to this particular unit?

Mr. Orchard: The unit is a demonstration project funded for \$275,000.00. A substantial amount of the cost is staffing costs. Those staff are in place. You spread the staffing cost over eight beds. If only four of them are occupied, that doubles the per diem cost for that particular day. The unit, the staffing is designed for eight. Hopefully, as I am trying to explain to my friend—she is nodding her head she understands—that when we end the demonstration project, we will have a more realistic analysis as to the per diem cost. Hopefully they will compare quite favourably with acute care.

Ms. Gray: The Minister has also told us about a Discharge Planning Model Demonstration Project. Could he tell us, is this discharge planning totally from hospitals? Are we referring to specific clientele who have specific medical needs or what is the nature of that demonstration project?

Mr. Orchard: My honourable friend is asking such detailed questions. I will provide the detailed answer.

The Discharge Planning Model, St. Boniface General Hospital will develop specific strategies in a data collection system to implement improved discharge planning. Specific skills include: (a) development of strategies to enhance the discharge planning skills of health professionals; (b) development of evaluation strategies to determine the effectiveness of the discharge planning process and the discharge planning outcome; (c) development of appropriate data and statistical collection systems; (d) review of discharge planning practices in other hospitals in Canada. Contact, Ms. M. Redekop, R.N., St. Boniface General Hospital, 235-3111, funding \$78,700.00.

Evaluation measures, development of evaluation strategies for use on an outgoing or a periodic basis to determine the effectiveness of the discharge planning process and discharge planning outcomes is one of the major activities proposed by this project. Such strategies would include survey models and use of hospital stay and readmission statistics as well as other methods. Evaluation criterion include how accurately the patient's and family's discharge planning needs were assessed; the extent to which the patient and family participated in the discharge planning process; the patient's and family's perceived level of satisfaction; the effectiveness of patient education; viewpoint from community agencies regarding effectiveness of the discharge planning process; and the impact of discharge planning on length of hospital stay and rate of

Tuesday, November 1, 1988

readmission. Efficacy of data collection methods, is the final criteria.

Ms. Gray: Could the Minister tell us, has Research and Planning been involved with any reviews or studies in regard specifically to discharge planning or early discharge planning for post-partum mothers?

Mr. Orchard: Yes, they are undertaking a further study and the study is based on the St. Boniface experience in terms of how that experience which has been quite well received might be applied throughout the Winnipeg hospital system for those hospitals with obstetric units.

Ms. Gray: Could the Minister tell us, was there not a first study that has already been completed where there are recommendations available?

Mr. Orchard: The study is completed and the results available. The more comprehensive study in terms of the Winnipeg hospital system has not been.

Ms. Gray: Could the Minister tell us briefly what the results of the St. Boniface study were?

Mr. Orchard: It seems to be effective in several ways, but particularly there was no evidence that early discharge had any effect on readmissions or baby health and safety or mother's health and safety, and that it is an effective way to reduce the—I do not know how to put this, but the vernacular in the system is the "hotel cost" of the hospital. In other words, it is simply occupying the bed post-service delivery. The St. Boniface experience has been good enough that it has been reviewed in terms of application throughout the Winnipeg system.

Ms. Gray: Could the Minister indicate with that initial study that has been completed, and he has indicated some of the positive outcomes of that review, were there any recommendations or was there any data that was collected in regard to the ability or inability of the community-based health system? By that, I mean public health nurses to actually provide early intervention once the mothers came home.

Mr. Orchard: No, Mr. Chairman, I am told that there was no identification, but the current unit is at capacity with the St. Boniface program. Of course that is subject to the city-wide review. If we are going to expand the program from St. Boniface, we of course have to expand staffing in the community to back up and resource that program.

Ms. Gray: I have some difficulty with some of the Minister's comments. He can correct me if I am wrong. He has indicated that a study has been done at St. Boniface in regard to early discharge and the applicability of that throughout the various hospitals in Winnipeg. My understanding is that in fact other hospitals, Victoria General Hospital is one that comes immediately to mind, already do discharge their mothers and babies early so that in fact that program already exists throughout the city.

Mr. Orchard: My honourable friend is correct, but I think it is fair to say that all hospitals over the last

number of years have, if you will, early discharged, because mothers and babies are not staying in the hospital environment as long. That has even changed in the time since our family entered the world, but the St. Boniface had quite short criterion put to it and I do not believe that any other hospital emulates their length of stay. They come close to. Of course there we can get into what is early discharge and what is just an enhanced program, but I think my honourable friend would be incorrect if she is indicating that the other community hospitals have a program where the length of stay is comparable to the early discharge program at St. Boniface.

* (1620)

(The Acting Chairman, Mrs. Gwen Charles, in the Chair.)

Ms. Gray: Does the Minister have information as to what is the length of stay, and what is the length of stay for individuals who are labelled as early discharge among some of the hospitals in Winnipeg?

Mr. Orchard: That kind of information is exactly what is currently being developed with Dr. Manning in terms of the Winnipeg system, so that the decision can then be forwarded through the management system for next year's Estimate process, to determine whether we want to resource the city-wide program in next year's Estimates.

Ms. Gray: I am assuming the Minister has more information than I have, since he has said that I would probably be correct if I thought that other hospitals are discharging post-partum mothers at a rate or at a length of stay similar to St. Boniface, so that is why I was asking the question as to what information the Minister had in regard to the length of stay. Now, the Minister has stated that his department, in furthering a study similar to the results of the St. Boniface project, that study would be indicating how we would be resourcing other hospitals. Could the Minister elaborate on what he means by that?

Mr. Orchard: As my honourable friend knows, the St. Boniface early discharge program was resourced in the community through public health nursing, through the regions, through Regional Services. If the St. Boniface program model were to be expanded to other hospitals, we need to provide the community resource that is not in place right now. That is what is meant by the need for additional resources to support expansion of that program to the Health Sciences Centre and to the community hospitals with obstetrics.

Ms. Gray: Could the Minister explain to me—and I have certainly been away from these programs for a number of years—what the difference is between how we resource the project at St. Boniface Hospital and how we would provide resources through the other hospitals or in the community for individuals who leave those other hospitals?

Mr. Orchard: That is exactly what is being discussed with Dr. Manning right now on a Winnipeg-system

approach. That resource dedication will be identified, will be carried through to management level in the Department of Health, will be presented as one of the options for expanded service in the next budget Estimate round. I cannot indicate at this stage of the game to my honourable friend what those resources will be in terms of staffing years or of cost. I simply do not have that information. That information is being developed.

Ms. Gray: Could the Minister tell us, do we have hospital coordinators who are public health staff in the other hospitals in Winnipeg, other than St. Boniface?

Mr. Orchard: Their program has hospital coordinators.

Ms. Gray: For the Minister's information, I am not referring to the hospital home care coordinators. I am referring to hospital coordinators who are public health nursing staff from Winnipeg Region Operations who spend a major portion of their time in assisting in discharge planning in some of the hospitals in regard to post-partum families.

Mr. Orchard: I do not know.

Ms. Gray: Can the Minister indicate if any senior staff know that answer and could provide it for him?

Mr. Orchard: We will provide the answer to that burning question at the earliest possible convenience.

Ms. Gray: The reason for this line of questioning is that what has happened, and again I am going back in history with the previous administration, is that hospitals have decided to go ahead, similar to St. Boniface, and provide early discharges for post-partum families. In some cases, we are not sure of what communication went on between the Department of Health who then had to pick up the service in the community and with the hospitals.

It would appear to me that a number of the hospitals in the city already use early discharge planning for post-partum families. The expectation then is that community public health will follow those cases once they are in the community. If the Minister is indicating to us here today that Research and Planning and his staff are studying the St. Boniface project to determine whether in fact or how they will resource the other hospitals and provide services in the community, what I am suggesting to the Minister is to take a good look at that program and actually first clarify what specific services we are already providing in the City of Winnipeg in regard to hospital coordinators who are regional staff and in regard to the type of early intervention services we are now currently providing in the community.

I think that has to be looked at before there is an assumption made that we are going to study the St. Boniface project to see if we should do that in other hospitals. What we are already doing is actually providing a similar service in some of the other hospitals. That is the reason for my questions in regard to early discharge planning.

Mr. Orchard: Madam Acting Chairman, I want to thank my honourable friend for her insightful advice which will be used to the fullest possible extent by myself as Minister and by my departmental officials, and I thank her for it.

Ms. Gray: Madam Acting Chairperson, one other demonstration project the Minister alluded to—and I am sorry I did not catch the entire name of the project. The one word I picked up was "nutrition program." Could the Minister indicate what the nature of that demonstration project is?

Mr. Orchard: Madam Acting Chairman, the Provincial Home Parenteral Nutrition Program, required intravenous feeding therapy for adults and children will be provided in their home settings instead of in the Health Sciences Centre and the St. Boniface General Hospital. Substantial reduction of hospital stays (3 to 24 months for both surgery hospitals is expected). Contact Dr. Ray Postuma, Health Sciences Centre, 787-4203. Funding is \$156,156 from the Health Sciences Centre, \$94,524 from the St. Boniface General Hospital, for a \$250,680 total project value.

The evaluation majors, there will be a central registry relating to all HPN patients. The registry will be maintained at the Health Sciences Centre. A profile of each patient's physical and chemical status will be maintained. Auditing in this manner will allow continual patient monitoring in the quality care assessment. The program will be evaluated by standards and procedures outlined by the HPN Committee.

Specific evaluation measures include: 1) the number of patients on HPN; 2) the number of patient days on HPN; 3) comparative cost of HPN versus hospitalization; 4) the benefit to the patients.

Ms. Gray: As well in this section, the Minister had said that a psychogeriatric review was being conducted as a result of a request from Seven Oaks General Hospital. Could the Minister tell us why was this request made from Seven Oaks General Hospital for a review? There must have been some rationale or reason behind that request and also rationale or reason why Research and Planning decided to conduct the review?

Mr. Orchard: Madam Acting Chairman, possibly I could refer my honourable friend to last night's Hansard in which this very question was posed by her colleague, the Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema), the Health critic. This was a project chosen by the Seven Oaks Board of Hospitals in which we have compiled and provided the backup for the statistical analysis of the program on their request. You might want to talk over with your honourable colleague from Kildonan and read Hansard.

* (1630)

Ms. Gray: Could the Minister tell us, is part of this review also to do an evaluation of the community component of the psychogeriatric services provided out of Seven Oaks Hospital? Is it?

Mr. Orchard: Yes.

Ms. Gray: Again, as part of that review, will there be the involvement of regional staff who provide that community service?

I ask the question because there have been a number of concerns ongoing in the last three or four years since this program was established in regard to the Psychogeriatric Program out of Seven Oaks Hospital. One of the major concerns was the ability of the community component of the program to provide a service in some of the relationships with the community and the hospital. Could the Minister indicate, is that a major focus of this particular review? Will staff in the regions and supervisors in the regions be part of that review in regard to getting their information and ideas as to what the problems are in the program and what they would see as suggestions for improvement?

Mr. Orchard: How be I read to my honourable friend what I read into the record last night so we can fatten up Hansard and show people how hard we work in this Chamber?

Seven Oaks General Hospital Psychogeriatric Program Evaluation for the second time, the Research and Planning Directorate is examining this program's attainment of objectives, service delivery, cost effectiveness and patient outcome. As with all new programs, there have been numerous changes and adjustments to program operation. Seven Oaks General Hospital Psychogeriatric Program is now developed to a point where the program evaluation can be completed. The hospital administration set the completion of the evaluation as one of its objectives for this fiscal year. To this end, the administration has responded promptly to all requests for information and has facilitated interviews with key program personnel. I would assume that regional staff are part of the key personnel.

Ms. Gray: I am assuming that the Minister did not read into the record, I am assuming that regional staff were part of that evaluation. Could he confirm if in fact regional staff will be part of that evaluation because, if they are not, they should be?

Mr. Orchard: I wish to confirm that for my honourable friend who was not here last night because she was visiting with Robert Bourassa in an attempt to find out the benefits of free trade which, to date, have eluded her.

Ms. Gray: Yes, the Minister is correct in that I was not here last night nor have I had the benefits to read Hansard, since Monday night's Hansard have not been produced yet. I have only had the benefit of reading Hansard from yesterday where I see that the Minister has pointed out or indicated a contradiction in regard to whether in fact he had any information as to whether the Seniors Directorate—if he was aware of the Seniors Directorate in terms of what they were producing in the supplements. On one hand, he has indicated "no" and in another section he has indicated "yes." But I will certainly leave more of those questions until we get to the supplements for the Seniors Directorate, if at some point we do get to those supplements.

Could the Minister indicate, in the area of Research and Planning, has there been any need identified to

specifically look at the need for providing more supports in the community for medically-at-risk children who would need home care supports? I am not referring in general to the Home Care Program but we do see that with medical advancements and technology that more children are able to move out of the institution and to move back into the homes with their parents, although they do require a number of medical supports and social supports as well.

I would say that to this point, the Department of Health has not been a leader or a forerunner in looking ahead to see what kinds of support should be provided. I am wondering if the Minister could indicate to us, is this an area that has been discussed at all in Research and Planning or in other branches in his department? Is it something that his department or the Minister himself would be prepared to look at as far as what long-term strategies and supports this department should be making available for families with children with complex medical needs?

Mr. Orchard: No, yes and yes.

Ms. Gray: I would suggest the Minister be careful on how he gives the no, yes and yes, because that is what fouled him up in Question Period yesterday.

Mr. Cheema: Could the Minister tell us, under the heading of National Database on Physicians, how many times this subcommittee has met, who is the chairman of this committee, and what is the relationship of this committee with the Standing Committee on Medical Manpower?

Mr. Orchard: I am truly honoured to introduce to all Members of the House and Members of the gallery Mr. David Pascoe, who is the national chairman of this committee. Mr. Pascoe informs me that they have met three times and, if he could get away from the House this afternoon, he flies to Ottawa tonight. At midnight, when he arrives, he is going to immediately work on that fourth meeting.

Mr. Cheema: The chairman of the committee is right here. Could the Minister tell us what are the major concerns in the medical manpower and how they are relating with the Standing Committee on Medical Manpower in Manitoba?

Mr. Orchard: This chairman works very closely with SCOMM.

Mr. Cheema: Could the Minister indicate to us, are the billing numbers, or restricting the physicians from one part to another part of the country a part of this committee?

Mr. Orchard: No, Madam Acting Chairman.

Mr. Cheema: Could the Minister tell us, is the policy for the foreign medical graduate a part of this study and more specifically, in the past six months or one year, how many times the Minister has waived the evaluation exams for medical graduates from foreign schools to serve rural Manitoba?

Mr. Orchard: Yes, that is part of the study and I would have to give my honourable friend exact numbers, but I think probably we are up to close to 10 waivers this year.

Mr. Cheema: Could the Minister tell us if this just would be for a specific time or there is going to be an extension considering the shortage of rural physicians in Manitoba?

Mr. Orchard: I am reticent to do that, Madam Acting Chairman.

Mr. Cheema: Madam Acting Chairperson, I could not hear the answer. Could the Minister please repeat, if he does not mind.

Mr. Orchard: I just indicate to my honourable friend that although I have not been asked to do that, to date, I am reticent to do it.

Mr. Cheema: Definitely that will help certain communities in rural Manitoba to overcome the shortage of physicians, and in the past I think that waiver has been used. We are encouraging the Minister that if need be, it should be done.

Could the Minister indicate to us, under this Antibody Prescription Study in personal care homes, what is the objective of this study if this is a new study? What are the personal care homes that are involved, and what are the terms of reference of this study?

* (1640)

Mr. Orchard: It is a project that the federal Government will provide some input into and involves, with the cooperation of the personal care homes an analysis to determine the prescribing protocol for patients in personal care homes.

Mr. Cheema: Has that study been started or not? What is the present status of that study?

Mr. Orchard: It is about halfway started right now.

Mr. Cheema: There is another item under Management, acute elderly admission to hospitals, geriatric versus internal medicine. This is a new study and who are the participants and again which are the hospitals involved? Is it a part of the provincial Government or is it that we are getting funds from the federal Government?

Mr. Orchard: We discussed this one yesterday. I thought we did anyway. Basically, we are trying to, on a random basis, determine who does a better job of caring for the elderly, geriatric physicians or internal medicine physicians, in terms of the admission protocol, the discharge protocol and treatment protocol.

Mr. Cheema: What is the present status of this particular study?

Mr. Orchard: This is another one of these projects that is funded by the federal Government, is ongoing and, hopefully, will be completed within a year.

Mr. Cheema: Could the Minister tell us, what are the hospitals involved in this particular study? For any study to be effective, it has to be a controlled group. Is this any special control group?

Mr. Orchard: It is St. Boniface Hospital. Because they are randomly assigned, that effectively answers my honourable friend's second question.

Mr. Cowan: Madam Acting Chairperson, yesterday I had asked the Minister if he would be prepared to table the review of the hospital beds and the situation with the cuts at the Health Sciences Centre. We got into a prolonged debate about the issue itself and I never did sense that he had answered the specific question as to whether or not he was prepared to table that review. For the record and, hopefully, for an affirmative response, I would ask him if he would be so prepared to do so.

Mr. Orchard: Madam Acting Chairman, my answer has not changed from yesterday.

Mr. Cowan: I have to apologize to the Minister. Perhaps then he should repeat his answer of yesterday.

Mr. Orchard: That I provide that information.

Mr. Cowan: Can he indicate when that might be provided to us?

Mr. Orchard: I think it ought to be available by the time we get to the Manitoba Health Services Commission Estimates dealing with the Hospital line.

Mr. Cowan: I thank the Minister for that indication that it will be available to us. If he can get it to us a bit earlier so that we can review it before we get to that particular line, it might help us speed our way through the discussion in that particular area.

What section of the department would we discuss the matter of research into AIDS and how to deal with it from the Manitoba perspective?

Mr. Orchard: Diseases, Madam Acting Chairman.

Mr. Cowan: I thank the Minister for that advice. That would be where we would discuss the general program, the statistical development, the programs, the communications that are involved with that particular area. Okay.

I would also ask the Minister if the department has done any research with respect to free trade and the impact of free trade on the health care system in Manitoba.

Mr. Orchard: Madam Acting Chairman, in anticipation of the fear campaign of the Liberal-New Democratic Party coalition nationally, we have taken some of the alleged detrimental effects to the system of Medicare in Canada and attempted to determine whether they were part of the Free Trade Agreement. Any analysis that I have seen to date indicates that, as I indicated earlier, the Liberal-NDP coalition nationally

fearmongering on the effects of free trade on Medicare in terms of the wild and rhetorical statements made by Liberals and New Democrats nationally and provincially are unfounded.

Mr. Cowan: The Minister referenced materials and an analysis that he has seen to date. Is he prepared to table those materials and analysis?

Mr. Orchard: There is no reference to our Medicare system in the Free Trade Agreement. The allegations that are being made by the Liberal-New Democratic coalition against free trade and against Canada are simply not part of the Free Trade Agreement.

Mr. Cowan: The Minister indicated that he had seen some analysis. Is he prepared to table that analysis?

(Mr. Chairman in the Chair.)

Mr. Orchard: You cannot table an analysis on an issue that is not part of the Free Trade Agreement. As I indicated to my honourable friend, this is part of the Liberal-NDP national and provincial coalition of fearmongers and fearmongering that they are using to intimidate and to cause fear amongst Manitobans that they are going to lose their Medicare benefits, all of which are totally unfounded in any analysis of the Free Trade Agreement. Nothing could have been proved more definitively in that regard than during the English language debate when Prime Minister Mulroney said to the national Leader of the NDP, Mr. Broadbent, "Show me where it says in the Free Trade Agreement," and Mr. Broadbent's reply was, "Duh!"

Mr. Cowan: I appreciate the Member enunciating his depth of understanding about the Free Trade Agreement, but I would ask him the question again. Is there any analysis which he perceives as having said that there will be no impact on the medical care system in Manitoba as a result of free trade which he would care to share with us, or is he just taking out of the air what it is he has heard from different sources and suggesting that it is backed up by an analysis that obviously does not exist or he is not prepared to table?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend wishes me to table an analysis which denies phantom allegations and false allegations. You cannot analyze falsehoods. You cannot definitively describe that Clause 409(b) of the Free Trade Agreement does not impact on the health care system of Canada, because as was challenged by Prime Minister Mulroney to Mr. Broadbent in the debate, "Tell us what clause of the Free Trade Agreement affects the Medicare system," and Mr. Broadbent could not do that because none exist. So my honourable friend is asking me to analyze a circumstance that does not exist.

I know that would suit my honourable friend's purpose in furthering the Liberal-New Democratic fearmongering coalition and their goals to defeat the Mulroney Government initiative of free trade, but unfortunately you cannot analyze what does not exist. However, I want to simply point out to my honourable friend a couple of basic facts of light in terms of free trade.

* (1650)

What free trade is intended to do in this country, and my honourable friend knows that, may not agree with it, which is perfectly his will and right, because if one analyzes who are the opponents to free trade, there are two primary groups: (1) the Liberal Government of Ontario in direct contrast to the Liberal Government of Quebec; and (2) the labour union movement across Canada.

Now I said earlier there was a Liberal-NDP coalition across Canada and that is correct, and that is where my honourable friend as a Member of the New Democratic Party is soiling his hands in commiserating with the Liberal Party because normally they are staunch enemies. Mr. Chairman, that is their choice in this debate, not ours, because we represent the future interest of Canada on the side of the supporters of free trade.

But I want to tell my honourable friend that I can understand where he comes from in terms of the labour union pressures because, without the labour union movement, the NDP do not exist. They do not have money; they do not have funds. They do not have supporters; they do not have workers. So what Bob White says in Ontario, "All New Democrats across Canada, if they are pure to their religion, must adhere to slavishly," I accept that. I accept that fully and completely that this is a slavish adherence to the union-driven mandate of Bob White, Shirley Carr and those other notable leaders in the union movement, but that is not where other Canadians are coming from because many Canadians, quite frankly, support the Free Trade Agreement.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Liberal-NDP coalition nationally is bent on making this the issue in which they ride their coattails to power. I want to point out a couple of things to my honourable friends because no doubt we will continue on this debate for several days, and I hope we do, because Members on this side of the House want to debate free trade.

What my honourable friends wish to demonstrate to Canadians is that somehow the Free Trade Agreement is the end of Canadian sovereignty, that it is equivalent and tantamount to making Canada the 51st state, that it is tantamount to raising the Stars and Stripes and tearing down the Red Maple Leaf. Let us follow this through to its logical conclusion.

That means 210 Members of Parliament, some Liberal Senators of common sense, the business leaders of this country, the Western Canadian Federation, a number of associated trade-related groups, a number of environmentalists are all saying the agreement is good. But we have, on the other side of the fence, the Liberal-NDP politician coalition who are saying that we are the only ones who can defend Canada and that the 210 MPs, federal Progressive Conservative MPs, are the ones who are going to go down in history as destroying this country. What sheer and utter nonsense!

And for the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) to even applaud once shows his profound ignorance of what drives politicians. Maybe that is what drives the

Tuesday, November 1, 1988

Liberal Party to make those kinds of short-term decisions, but the only Party in Ottawa that has a vision for the future is the Progressive Conservative Party.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make a prediction. Remember those dirty old days of 1979

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Interest rates.

Mr. Orchard: No, no, no, I am sorry. I want to go back to the Stanfield election. What year was that in? Remember the 1974 election where the Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party nationally, Robert Stanfield, suggested that wage and - (Interjection)- We are not right on the year. It is not 1974. What was said is that to bring inflation under control in Canada, we need temporary wage and price controls. Remember that as a platform of the Progressive Conservative Party? Remember what that opportunist dog, Pierre Elliott Trudeau, did? He said, "No way, never will that happen." He persuaded the people of Canada that was wrong. And what did that lying Leader of the Liberal Party do upon achieving Government? He brought in wage and price controls.

I predict to my honourable friends today that should this nation be ever so disgraced to have John Turner as the Prime Minister of this country, he will immediately reverse his standing position on free trade and support it publicly as he does, except that he cannot support it because of the Lloyd Axworthys and the other left-wing quasi-New Democrats who are part of the federal Liberal caucus. They are better known as the "rat pack." John Turner is known as the chief rodent of the rat pack.

That is where we are headed. We are headed to another "big lie" campaign on wage and price controls like they did to Mr. Stanfield, defeated him in the election and six months later brought it in to the detriment of this country. That is where this Liberal Party nationally is coming from, I predict as I am standing here. Should those people so disgracefully be able to win the election, John Turner will change his political stripes on free trade so quickly and endorse that agreement with the United States that it will make your head spin. The Liberal-NDP coalition will have done this country innumerable damage.

(The Acting Chairman, Mr. Helmut Pankratz, in the Chair.)

Before I leave this important topic this afternoon, I want my honourable friends to understand one basic underlying principle. Do you think that this province, this Government and our health care system, can stand on a 75-cent dollar and 20 percent interest rates that would be given to us if the Liberal Party formed Government nationally? Can we afford that? What are we going to do to provide the health services if that happens?

I want to point out to my honourable and gullible Liberal friends on the opposite side of the House, you take a look at the 1981 Estimates of the Province of Manitoba and you will find out that in 1981 this province spent some \$90 million on interest, on debt acquired

through 110 years of provincial Government of all political stripes. Do you know what it is in this year's Estimates? Read the numbers! It is \$545 million. That is \$455 million of additional interest given to us by our grinning friends in the NDP represented by the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan) as a Cabinet Minister.

That is what interest rates do to you. That is what declining dollars do to you. That is what will kill Medicare quicker than any other single event of political importance in this country. If we did not have the exorbitant spending of the previous seven years of NDP Government in this province, we would have \$545 million not going to bankers in Zurich, not going to bankers in Tokyo, not going to bankers in London and Berne and New York, but we would have it staying here in Manitoba to provide needed health care and to support Medicare because \$545 million represents more than one-third of the health care budget of the Province of Manitoba.

These nay sayers in the Liberal-New Democratic coalition want to kill this country and kill the social programs by going out with a "big lie" campaign on free trade. That will be the destruction of this country and its social programs much more quickly than any other single event in the history of this country.

If you think on this side of the House we are not very, very concerned about where this election goes federally and where this Free Trade Agreement goes, you are dead wrong, because already in one day, with a poll out showing that there may be a chance that if the Mulroney Government is not re-elected, this province inherited another \$110 million of debt. That was over one weekend.

* (1700)

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Pankratz): The hour being 5 p.m., time for Private Members' Hour. Committee rise.

Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. Helmut Pankratz (La Verendrye): The Committee of Supply has adopted a certain resolution, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River (Mr. Burrell), that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS PUBLIC BILLS

BILL NO. 2—THE BUSINESS NAMES REGISTRATION AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We will now proceed with Private Members' Hour.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway), Bill No. 2, The Business Names Registration Amendment Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae). (Stand)

Does the Honourable Attorney-General have leave to allow the Bill to stand in his name?

Mr. John Angus (St. Norbert): I do not want to deny that would be the courteous thing to do, but I would like to address the Bill.

An Honourable Member: Go ahead.

Mr. Angus: Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is leave for the Bill to stand in the name of the Honourable Attorney-General? (Agreed)

Mr. Angus: The proposed Business Names Registration Amendment Act is a reasonable David and Goliath-type cause.

While the Member who has introduced it has his heart and his concerns in the right place and while we recognize the importance of a name, I believe that—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please; order, please. If there are other Members who wish to address the principles of this Bill, I would ask that they wait till the Honourable Member for St. Norbert has completed his remarks.

Mr. Angus: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I appreciate the concerns that the Honourable Member has in introducing The Business Names Registration Amendment Act. I appreciate the concerns that the family has with the identification of the name. I appreciate the David and Goliath-like aspect of the big guy-little guy. I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it is important that the Honourable Member has identified some serious concerns in relation to small business and small business survival.

We have seen our honourable friends in the Government make moves to reduce punitive taxes in terms of the payroll tax, and I am sure that they are going to be doing and introducing other programs that will stimulate the small business and will assist them. When we have small businesses, we must move to offer them every form of protection that is available.

While I agree that larger organizations oftentimes are inconsiderate and insensitive to the rights of smaller organizations and while they bow at the shrine of the almighty dollar and profit is the magic word that motivates them, I find that this Bill, this proposed amendment is poorly researched. I find that it is a weak proposal in relation to addressing what is identified as a serious cause. If this particular Bill is fortunate enough or this proposed amendment is fortunate enough to make it to the committee stage, I would hope that there would be some substantial changes to it to give strength and the protection that is deserving of smaller organizations in a business-oriented world.

I find that this particular Bill borders on a repetitive legislation of another jurisdiction, and I wonder if the Legislature would not be better counselled in terms of addressing our concerns to the federal legislation. It appears that there may be a court challenge on this specific issue and that we may be interfering with the court's deliberation. I am not privy to that.

I am privy, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the fact that we have an individual, family who has attempted to build a business, has identified a particular business they want to be in and have identified their family name with that business. Whatever the reasoning, whatever the logic, whatever the responsibility in relation to the advice that they had, if they chose not to or did not or had bad legislation, bad legislative advice from their counsellors, their lawyers in the past, it seems that they are suddenly now in one of those legal situations where they cannot do anything to protect themselves and where they are going to inadvertently be driven out.

While I have difficulty supporting this type of amendment as not being specific enough and identified enough, it nonetheless highlights specific concerns of protection for little companies and protection for people whose only mistake perhaps is not being fully aware. They have put their heart, their soul, their business expertise and their livelihood on the line to try and develop this particular business, and to see it run roughshod over by other organizations who are not intentionally or not purposely trying to hurt or malign any organization, they nonetheless are causing severe hardship and severe concerns at least in this organization.

So, while the Bill might be better stood until such a time as—or perhaps even referred to the Courts of Appeal for some sort of deliberation and/or discussion—while I believe that the Honourable Member could have strengthened the resolve and specifically made the amendments more protective of smaller businesses so that at least it would have got to the committee stage for some legitimate discussion, I do not believe that this particular amendment is going to do anything for the company in question.

* (1710)

The concern actually in relation to the principle, Mr. Deputy Speaker, goes way beyond the names of the particular individuals named in this Bill. Certainly if it is a principle that is going to destroy the rights of a family business in Manitoba by whatever name, then the principle should be applied to all of the businesses. If individuals have established their businesses—the Honourable Member is asking for my amendments and he well knows or at least should know, based on his participation in this organization in this House, that those amendments are only introduced when it gets to the committee stage.—(Interjection)— They are calling my bluff, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Angus: Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the rewording of the existing legislation is not significant enough to warrant the passing of this particular legislation. If there

Tuesday, November 1, 1988

is legislation that can or should be put into—Mr. Deputy Speaker, suffice it to say that corner drug street lawyers and business entrepreneurs from the left-wing element of the Opposition will be pleased to introduce legislation that they believe will protect the rights of the smaller organizations and smaller companies. I do not believe that this legislation is going to offer any protection to the company in question.

If they want to make legislation, if there is legislation that can be introduced, perhaps we should be looking at bringing it in on a national basis. Perhaps we should have the names registration branches go for national searches, etc., etc. There are all sorts of things that can substantially be done to give protection to smaller organizations, but this is not the way to go about it. This particular Bill is not going to see the light of a committee. I am sure, however, if it does that there will be some substantial changes made to it at that time. Thank you.

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): I am pleased to speak to this Bill in support of the Bill. I find the Liberal position, frankly, quite confusing. It just added, to say the least—(Interjection)—that is right. The Member who just spoke added to the confusion. We, frankly, do not really know where they stand anymore. I do not think they know as a Party where they stand. They came out with a couple of speakers initially saying that this Bill was not needed and that we were interfering in a court process with this Bill, that in fact it was not going to do any good. They were quite content to see a small business in this province footing a legal bill of some \$65,000 and getting nowhere fast and just leave them languishing like that, while a big national company comes into this province and uses their trade name.

I find that deplorable. I frankly find it deplorable that the Liberal Party in this province has taken that mixed position on such an important issue dealing with small business in this province, and I think that it underlines the confusion that is felt in their Party generally. They do not know whether they support big business or whether they support small business, or whether they are a Party of the people or whether they are a Party of big business. They are trying to be everything to all people and, therefore, they have to sit on the fence on critical issues such as this, and we saw that with the Member who just spoke here to this issue again.

Frankly, we should be moving this forward as quickly as possible to committee so that it can be passed. If there are amendments to strengthen it—the Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Angus) says that, first of all, he wants to strengthen this Bill and the Bill does not seem to do what it is supposed to do, and then he says he does not know what amendments he would make and others in his caucus have indicated that—

Mr. Angus: On a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please! The Honourable Member for St. Norbert, to a point of order.

Mr. Angus: Mr. Deputy Speaker, not once did I mention any amendments that I was going to make. Not once

did I suggest that I did not have any amendments that I would wish to make.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member does not have a point of order. A dispute of the facts is not a point of order.

Mr. Jay Cowan (Second Opposition House Leader): On the same point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a dispute on the facts is not a point of order and—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please; order, please. I already ruled on the point of order raised by the Honourable Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Angus).

Mr. Plohman: The Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Angus) has indicated here today that this Bill in his opinion was poorly researched. Then he went on to give a number of different positions on the Bill himself, indicating that there was very poor research on the part of the Liberal Party, and at least on the part of the Member for St. Norbert.

The fact is, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the New Democratic caucus and the Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) who has introduced this Bill, and I applaud him for introducing this Bill and standing up for small business in this province when they are being trodden on by a big business in this case, an international company, has got his information and advice from the Legislative Counsel in drawing up this Bill. He has also legal opinions to support it.

The Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Angus) did not mention that the only legal opinion that he has received on this issue, at least that I am aware of and of course he can add to the record and correct it, is from a Liberal candidate, perhaps maybe some Liberal MLAs who are also coincidentally lawyers. But that is where they got their legal opinions, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with no reflection on the Chair, as coincidence would have it, in this particular case.

What we have here is a very strong Bill that at least is attempting, within the jurisdiction that we have in this province, to ensure fairness, that small companies in this province are protected. There are other cases where similar situations could develop. It was mentioned in my colleague's speeches in the past. Advance Electronics was one case where they could be facing the same situation as Brick's Fine Furniture is in this particular case, and others. We should be very concerned about this, but clearly the Conservative agenda in stalling this is that they in fact do not want to support small business. Their true colours are showing up very clearly in stalling this. The Member for Brandon West (Mr. McCrae), in standing this Bill day after day, is showing that he does not want to support small business in this way in this province. He takes the side of big business.

Then we see the Liberals torn on this issue because they are not sure who they represent. They should in fact be taking the side of small business and standing up for Manitobans, not worrying about the constitutionality or the legal issues or jurisdiction in this case at this particular time. They should be talking

about backing up Manitobans who are being treated unfairly and who are being put upon. That is where their stand should be.

That is where we are standing in this particular case, as we do as many times as we can whenever issues arise of this nature for Manitobans. We stand up for Manitobans. That is where the New Democratic Party is. That is what is not happening in this Chamber by the other two Parties.

Similarly, we talk about coalition. The Member for Pembina, the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), was talking a few minutes ago about an NDP-Liberal coalition against Free Trade. We see a P.C.-Liberal coalition against small business in this House, and it was never exemplified in any more clear way than it is through this Bill right here. It shows their true colours.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Plozman: Let us not forget that there is a small company in this province who is facing some \$65,000 in legal bills, and we are content to let that linger on, maybe appeal, let us see what that appeal says. Let us not step on any federal toes.

* (1720)

The fact is federal legislation in this particular area does not impinge on the province's right to legislate local trade practices. That is within the provincial jurisdiction and we should not confuse the trademark legislation with trade names. Clearly, if they are going to come into this province, Brick Warehouse, and use a federal trademark as a trade name in this province, then we have a right to require them to register and to prosecute them if they are not abiding by our laws.

That is the problem with the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae), that the Attorney-General is facing, and he is not standing up for Manitobans and ensuring the protection that is required. Instead of that, he is not standing up for the law in this province which is critical. His job as Attorney-General is that he should stand up for the law, ensure that the law is enforced. He has sat back and allowed them to violate the laws of the Province of Manitoba for months without doing anything about it. How can he say he is Attorney-General of this province when he does not stand up and ensure that the law is enforced in this province?

That is what is happening at the present time. That is shameful and it is shameful that there are any doubts, any second-guessing on behalf of the Official Opposition in this province as well, that they cannot come forward immediately and know where they stand with regard to small business and protecting them against this shameful act by this large company who is impinging on their ability to do business in this province after 25 years of using that family name.

I just cannot understand why these two political Parties here cannot understand clearly the wisdom of what is being proposed here. I implore both Parties to come forward, bring this forward, let us do everything we can to ensure that business is protected and others in a similar situation are protected now and in the future.

I ask the Members here to do everything they can to support this Bill. I would ask that you put it forward through to committee so that we can get on with the discussion.

If Members have logical amendments to strengthen the Bill, all the more power to them. We are very happy to see that. We want to see stronger amendments if that can be done, but let us ensure that small company is protected in this province and the employees there as well. I ask you to look at that. Let us not be impacted on it, let big business interfere with what is right, what is justice, and this is clear in this case. I find it regrettable that black and white is not clear to the P.C. Party and to the Liberals in this House. It is regrettable.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am going to conclude my remarks and indicate clearly that Section 3(1) of the Act is being violated by Brick's Warehouse and I ask the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) to ensure that the law is enforced in this province, that the Opposition supports this Bill, that the Conservative Party will now look to the wisdom of this Bill, the fairness, the justice inherent in this Bill and will support it because it is fair and it is right. They should know that and I appeal to their sense of fairness, even—

An Honourable Member: They do not have a sense of fairness.

Mr. Plozman: I believe that there are some Conservatives who have a sense of fairness. I believe that there are Liberals with a sense of fairness, and I believe that is why many of these people are in public life, because they think what they are doing is fair. I want them to look more closely and search their conscience more closely to ensure that they are on the side of fairness and justice in this situation, and they are not, clearly they are not.

I think we could take this out to any group of Manitobans and put it forward to them and they would wonder, they would not be able to believe how those Parties could take the position that they are on the side of—unless it is because they have some ideology that they are supporting, simply that big business has to be supported just like they are doing in the free trade deal, that somehow big money has got to run the show in this country and this continent and the average person's needs and the rights of people does not matter at all. It is justice for big business, not for the average Manitoban in this case. That is what we have to guard against and that is what we are standing up for here.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: This Bill will remain standing in the name of the Honourable Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae).

BILL NO. 3—THE CORPORATIONS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway), Bill No. 3, The Corporations Amendment Act. (Stand)

**BILL NO. 13—THE MANITOBA
HYDRO AMENDMENT ACT**

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), Bill No. 13, The Manitoba Hydro Amendment Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst).

Mr. Darren Praznik (Lac du Bonnet): I would like to speak, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst) have leave to have the Bill remain standing in his name? (Agreed)

Mr. Praznik: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise in the House this afternoon to continue the debate which took place in this Chamber earlier in the afternoon in committee about free trade.

The piece of legislation which is before the House now, Bill No. 13, The Manitoba Hydro Amendment Act, ranks with this particular publication that went out across the nation a few weeks ago. This publication should be more aptly described as the big lie rather than the big deal, because I believe Bill No. 13 does exactly the same thing. It is designed to spread half truths, innuendo, misconceptions across our province. The Members across the way sit there and shout. The Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) said just a few minutes ago, where are those who are going to stand up for ordinary Manitobans? They are here, not there. They are here.

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon, on a point of order.

Mr. Storie: The Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik) is imputing motives. He has indicated that somehow in his impression because someone has prepared some information which tells the truth about free trade, he believes that it is a distortion, that somehow that compares with the Bill that I have introduced. Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is a breach of the privileges of myself as a Member and imputes motives, which is clearly against the rules. If this Member believes that standing up for the few businesses, the large corporations that are going to benefit from free trade is standing up for Manitobans, he has missed the mark considerably.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The Honourable Government House Leader.

* (1730)

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): The Honourable Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) has the audacity to stand in his place on a point of order and complain about imputation of motives, while at the same time and in the process of raising the point of order, impugns the motives of the Honourable Member

for Lac du Bonnet with the suggestion that he stands up for a small group of people. The Honourable Member should withdraw that alone.

Only moments ago, the Honourable Member for Flin Flon sat and listened to his colleague, the Honourable Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman), over and over by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon's definition of imputation of motives, refer to the Honourable Member for Dauphin telling certain Members they are not standing up for this, that or the other thing. The Honourable Member, in the guise of trying to stifle a debate on free trade in this House, a very important debate, uses a point of order which is nothing more than a matter of debate.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please; order, please.

I would like to thank Members for their advice and remind all Honourable Members that a debate on a point of order should be restricted to that point of order.

With respect to the point of order raised by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon, a dispute over the facts is not a point of order.

Mr. Praznik: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in case the Member for Flin Flon disagrees with me, in case he does not like my assessment of this particular piece of legislation, let me quote, if I may, from an article written by the man who negotiated the Free Trade Agreement, Simon Reisman, because I think it is very timely that this quote be read because the Members across the way keep holding up the Auto Pact as the wonderful agreement, the model, and Mr. Reisman, I would remind them, is the man who negotiated that. They cannot have it both ways.

Let me quote from Mr. Reisman. What does he say? He says: "It will probably not be possible during the election campaign to elevate the debate on free trade to a higher level. It will probably not be possible because of the politics of fear. They will continue to be exploited by certain protectionist interests and others opposed to expanded trade with the United States. These fears are unfounded. There is simply no truth in the charges that the agreement threatens current social programs, health care, culture, fresh water," and for the benefit of the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), "energy resources as well as agriculture."

Mr. Reisman goes on to say, "I am confident that Canadians will see through the distortions and falsehoods and reject those who promote them." With Oscar Wilde, I continue to believe that if you keep telling the truth, sooner or later you will be found out, and today is the time to tell the truth.

What is the truth? The truth is here in today's Free Press, right here in this little box. I look at my colleagues across the way and I wonder how many of their constituents could afford the \$100 that came out of each and every pocket of their constituents yesterday because their Party and the Members of the Liberal Party across the way go round this country opposing probably the most significant and important trading agreement in the world today.

What does this say? It says the Canadian—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please; order, please. I hesitate to interrupt the Honourable Member, but I wish to remind all Honourable Members that we are debating the principle of the Bill No. 13, The Manitoba Hydro Amendment Act. Although the Bill perhaps does touch on the Free Trade Agreement, I would again direct, advise all Honourable Members that we should debate the principle of the Bill.

Mr. Praznik: Just for the edification of Members opposite, the purpose of this Bill, as was clearly stated, is because of the Free Trade Agreement. The piece of legislation refers to the Free Trade Agreement. The principle of this piece of legislation is supposedly to protect our poor little province, as the Members across the way would have us believe, from this evil, terrible deal, and I am challenging that premise on which this piece of legislation is based. I am proud to do that and I know I have the support of my colleagues on this side of the House.

We wanted truth and we wanted fact. Here is the truth and the fact. When our dollar, because of opinion polls that come out that show that there may not be a Conservative majority, there may not be a trade deal, we have not a little decrease in the value of the dollar. We have the largest decrease in the decade.

Oh, what is a penny and a half on the dollar? I do not have the income of many of the Members opposite but I can tell you this, that that is very significant to the Province of Manitoba, some hundred million dollars lost in one day because the Members opposite and our two federal Opposition Parties go around the country and they say to the world we are weak and uncompetitive. We are not prepared to trade; we are afraid; we have nothing to sell; we are bankrupt.

That is what they have said to the world, and the world is listening to this Assembly. They are listening to the comments that are made in this province by Members opposite. The message we are sending out, no matter how much we wrap ourselves in the Canadian flag as John Turner has tried to do, is that we in the 1980s in a world which is trading and developing trading blocs, that we as Canadians are not prepared to trade, we are not prepared to enter into one of the best trade agreements the world has ever seen, that most of the world would be envious of and is envious of.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) talks about big business. He talks about big business. This is not big business, this is everybody's business, this is all business. I ask him, in my constituency, I have a paper mill. It indirectly and directly employs almost a thousand of my constituents. It employs many people from the constituency of the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper). If they do not have access to the United States market, that plant will shut down, that mill shut down. Where will the people there go for their daily bread, for their income? Where will they come?

The Member for Dauphin, does he have employment for them? Does he? No, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Does the

Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) have that? No, Mr. Deputy Speaker. No, they have no options. I will tell you, if this trade deal dies on the 21st of November, will the Honourable Member opposite, the Member for Concordia be able to look in the mirror, with the results? I doubt that.— (Interjection)—

There they go, wrap themselves in the flag. The same guys who burn flags of our best neighbour, our best trading partner, and even the Deputy Premier of the Day, how disgusting and despicable on behalf of Manitobans. But I am not even worried about these Members opposite because their arguments, I expect—they have a Party who has always wanted to be protectionist, who has always wanted to control our economy and run it even though they could not.

But it is the other Members opposite—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I hesitate to interrupt the Honourable Member, but I would ask that all Honourable Members of the Manitoba Legislature allow the Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik) an opportunity to speak to this Bill. Should they wish to engage in their own comments, perhaps they could wait until the completion of the Honourable Member's remarks.

* (1740)

Mr. Praznik: The Members in the New Democratic Party do not concern me, because we know they are going to be in third place on the elections.— (Interjection)— Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, he mentions Jason Schreyer. Last week, it was Vic Schroeder running against me; before it was Clarence Baker. Well, they come up with a new candidate every week. I just keep working, and I know the people of Lac du Bonnet will return me, I am sure of that.

Even Ed Schreyer—the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) raises this by way of a heckle from his bench—even the mighty Ed Schreyer went into my, I understand, riding a day or two before the election, campaigned at a Hutterite colony and I still, from what they tell me, got all the votes there. So, I will take on Jason Schreyer any day.

The Members of the New Democratic Party do not concern me on this issue because we know their arguments are expected. They have always been a protectionist party. They have always wanted to keep our economy within ourselves, even though they know that there would be a sacrifice in prosperity. They have always been prepared to make that sacrifice but it is the Members directly opposite, the Members of the Liberal Party, who disappoint me most on this issue.

Many of my New Democratic colleagues have been raising it with me today that I am sure many of us fully expect, because of the importance of this deal, if the Liberals win a federal election on the 21st of November, I would not doubt if John Turner would be down in Washington within the month, and he will change a few colours and a few words on the agreement and want exactly the same document because they ultimately know we need that agreement and it is the best thing for the country.

If there is any doubt, Mr. Deputy Speaker, one only has to look at the 1974 general election on the issue of wage and price controls. We all know how the Liberal Party changed on that one pretty quick, because it was the best thing for the country.

Mr. Reisman in his article makes a very succinct and important point on energy and he says, and this comes back to this piece of legislation: "The only significant obligation is not to cut off completely, through the instrument of Government export controls, our existing U.S. customers during a period of short supply." It goes on to say that is only fair. It is already standard market practice and acceptable principle of the GATT, the GATT, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that Ed Broadbent and John Turner always refer to. Oh, Mr. Speaker, pardon me, except when the GATT rules against Canada. Then Ed Broadbent, well then he is not in favour of the GATT.

That is the only concern about energy. How many minutes do I have remaining, Mr. Deputy Speaker?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Honourable Member's time has expired.

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe the points of order are not calculated into the Member's time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. With respect to the Honourable Members' comments, I have allowed him a certain amount of time for some of the matters that have been raised during his portion.

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to address this Bill, and I would like to leave it standing in the name of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst).

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I believe the House has allowed leave for the Bill to stand in the name of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism. (Agreed)

Mr. Albert Driedger: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I enjoyed the comments from the Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik) and he is talking about this is business. Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is politics. This is what it is all about. I can tell you, after having been in a campaign involved with—I want to clarify, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Do not let the noise necessarily bother you. I want to explain why there is that kind of noise because, over the years that I have been campaigning, when you are Opposition, when your opponents are in trouble, it gets noisy. And what is happening to the NDP, who have been the noisy characters here today, they are screaming loudly because their ship is going down, their rating is going down.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I noticed you expressed some concern as to whether the free trade issue adhered to this Bill. I want to assure you that I believe that is what it is all about. That is why the Bill was presented to begin with, because the very Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) who brought in this Bill was the one who was out in the States negotiating like crazy, along with his

counterparts, coming into this House every six months announcing a Hydro deal of which nobody knew anything about, and which never transpired. That is the very Member who comes into this House and brings in a Private Members' Bill talking about Hydro.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hypocrisy of it, I have heard it from the time that the Member came to this House, it has never changed. When we get into the real heat of politics and elections, these things happen. When the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) gets up and starts screaming loudly about how they look after the small people, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to indicate to you that in the short five months that I have had the opportunity and privilege to be a Minister in this House that I have seen how they treated the people in Manitoba. I have had, time and time again, delegation after delegation come forward and say, you are listening to us, you are meeting with us.

So, that is when it gets noisy on that side because these Members have ended up being referred to as the Dirty Dozen. They have only 12 people left and it is for a reason, because you can fool the people some of the time, but you cannot fool them all of the time, and they tried it one round too many.

I find it most amazing that this group stands in this House in Estimates hour after hour flogging something that they failed to do. They are wasting time, that is their prerogative. The House makes provision for every Member to have his say in this House but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they will have a long time coming back. I do not know why I should even waste time talking about them.

But this is the group that is trying to say that free trade is a bad thing. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to bring you back a little bit, because there are a lot of new Members in here, to the time when the Member for St. James, Mr. Mackling at that time, stood in this House and got involved in all kinds of antics with the Americans. We had the flag-burning issue where Members from the then Government participated in. If you wonder why they are excited about free trade, they have been the ones who have been jumping on the Americans from Day One. But when it gets down to election time, then you use whatever you have to use, I suppose. Because does anybody recall when the then-Member for St. James indicated that if we did not deal with the Americans in good faith they would send in the Marines and get what they want. How blatant can you get!

But part of the problem is that many of the people out there are not sure exactly what is going on. So then, if you take and heap up all kinds of lies and fictitious stories, it creates confusion. That is what has happened right now. But if you look at all the analysts who look at exactly what is—what is happening with free trade? I think it is a very positive aspect of it. We should be shouting it from the rooftops that we can get this through.

* (1750)

I know where the NDP are coming from, but I do not know where the Liberals are coming from. They

are fighting free trade, but I would expect, God forbid, that this should ever happen, that John Turner should become Prime Minister, but I would expect that if that should ever happen that they would proceed with a free trade deal, make two little amendments and go with it, because they have a better understanding of it than they wish to admit at this stage of the game.

When I talk of the confusion that is created in people's minds by these kinds of discussions, I want to give you some examples. I represent the Emerson constituency which borders the American side there. We have had free trade there for a long, long time and it is working very well. I have said this before and I want to do it again. We have people who have dual citizenship in my end of the country there. We have the Americans providing the medical services in my constituency. We have intermarriages. We have traffic flowing up and down. They have no concern. They look at the debate that is going on with free trade and they wonder where in the world they are. They cannot understand this because all this garbage is floating around.

Reference was made by some Members that every Member is an Honourable Member and should do the best they can for their constituency. I will accept that, and I think most of them do, except when it comes to election time. All of a sudden all principles are thrown out the window. In the four campaigns that I have run, especially with the NDP over those years, every time we ran a campaign they would be out there promoting. They were good campaigners, I will tell you that, because they would run around and scare people, tell them we would close, throw them out of hospitals, we would throw them out of nursing homes—the scare tactics.

I say that very sincerely. They went out and promoted that kind of a campaign. There are people—if it affects you, if you can create a scare, then they would rather not touch it. That is exactly what is being done with this free trade issue. You create a scare, you create a doubt in people's minds and then even if it is fictitious, even if it is lies, people have some doubts about it. I will tell you something. I find it just abhorrible, really abhorrible in terms of what is happening in this debate. I should not say abhorrible.

I will accept by and large what is happening. But I want to tell you one thing, I want to go out to my people and indicate where I stand on free trade, the impact it will have. The Leader of the N.D. Party sits here day after day and yells about the unemployment factor. You know why we have unemployment at this stage of the game? I want to illustrate to you why we have 7,000 people unemployed, because if he had any brains he would go out there and look at what is happening in the agricultural community in terms of drought, the businesses that are laying off people at this stage of the game.—(Interjection)—But aside from that—(Interjection)—No, you might be right. We have just seen the tip of the iceberg on that.

But what we are seeing right now, and I am glad you said that, are the benefits and the results of six-and-a-half years of NDP Government where they took and just totally strangled the economy. I will tell you something. That is why we have unemployment, payroll

tax, the biggest tax grab you ever saw. That is what is creating unemployment here. He is sitting there yelling, it is us. It is us in five years. He says the drought has not really taken effect yet. No, it has not. But that is why we have difficulty.

That is why, when the Prime Minister indicates that it will create jobs, we know that it will create more jobs. That is why we should be supporting free trade. If one could ever get a proper factual sheet out illustrating the facts of what is happening with free trade, and forget about the scare tactics. We had the same thing with this plant, the clothing plant, Wescott, the closing of it. What happens? The first thing the media runs and asks one of the employees, why do you think they are closing? He says it must be because of free trade. When we finally get the facts sorted out, it is not true. It is this kind of tactic that is being developed and it is being developed more and more because we are into an election at this stage of the game but actually, as politicians and representatives of the people, we are not doing them a favour by going through these antics. We are not.

I have always felt, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that on principle I would like to be honest with people. I would like to tell them where it is at. If I cannot do something for people, at least I like to tell them that. I like to be up front. I will try but, if I cannot do it, I cannot do it.

What we are doing with the kind of tactics that are being used right now, we are not being fair to the people of Manitoba. We are not being honest with the people of Manitoba and that is why there is confusion out there because there are blatant lies being spread out there. Really, if we are going to serve our people of Manitoba as elected representatives, we should be able to develop statistical information and information that people could use to make a decision on. Then they could decide. What has happened, there is no more rationale or no more proper statistics. It is all being lost in the cloud of this just like this Bill.

It is a nothing Bill, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It means nothing and it shows the hypocrisy of the individual who brought it forward. When they were in Government, they had all the opportunities. I am finding it interesting. You look at the Order Paper and there are all kinds of Bills in there. Where were these Bills when they were Government? They just got defeated a little while ago. I fully realize that as beaten down as they are into the ground at this stage of the game that they are fighting to try and get back, but I can indicate to you that it will take a long time. It will take a long, long time until they make their recovery.

Right now we have a different Opposition that is trying to find out where they stand on this issue. They are all over the fence. We have the Leader of the Liberals (Mrs. Carstairs) who on one side is with Turner, supposedly the same Government Party as Quebec has. Her and Bourassa cannot see eye to eye. She cannot see eye to eye with John Turner. She has got a terrible time skating around, where am I on free trade, where am I on Meech Lake? She is all over the place. That is the difficulty that the Liberals are going through and that creates more confusion because now we have three Parties that feel they all have a right to say what they want and they do.

Tuesday, November 1, 1988

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I find it interesting that we deal with this kind of legislation here. If it is a free trade debate that is wanted at this stage of the game, and obviously it is, we will accommodate and we will tell people what the facts of the whole free trade issue are. Thank you.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): I would like to speak on the Bill on the understanding, Mr. Deputy Speaker, once again by leave, that it remain standing in the name of the individual who is presently there.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Leave has so been granted.

Mr. Ashton: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I could not resist responding today because it is interesting. What a difference a week makes. For the last two years in Canada, we have had a strategy by the federal Conservative Government which is outlined in the document in regard to free trade which was quite clear. That was the lowball of the issue.- (Interjection)- Yes, I want to talk about it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I would again request that all Honourable Members extend this Honourable Member the courtesy of listening to his comments.

Mr. Ashton: For the last two years, the strategy of the Conservative Government has been to lowball the free trade issue because that document that outlined the strategy said that the more people thought about free trade and the more they found out about the deal, the more they would be opposed to it. For the first year and a half, two years following that strategy, it worked. Then something happened. We hit an election campaign and the truth has started coming out. What has happened to support for free trade? It has plummeted. Along with the support for free trade, support for the Mulroney Conservatives is plummeting and now finally the Conservative Party is out debating free trade. Is it not interesting what a difference a week makes?

What are their arguments? The Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik) says we should support free trade because the money speculators are driving the cost of the Canadian dollar down. I say to the Member for Lac du Bonnet that Canada is more important than following the dictates of the money market in regard to the

Canadian dollar, that Canadians are willing to stand up for this country and oppose the free trade deal.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if there are lies in this debate, it is the lies of the cynical manipulators of the Conservative Party, including John Crosbie who says that he is going to sell this agreement to Canadians and he has not read it. We have the Prime Minister who, in 1983, before the election, said he was against free trade. Where is he now? He is out selling this as the saviour for Canada.

I wonder what has happened to the Conservative Party we knew, the Party of John Diefenbaker, the Party of Sir John A. Macdonald, a Party that stood for Canada and Canadian nationalism. Why are they now selling out Canada? Why are they trying to sell out Canada, I should say, because there is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that on November 21, the Conservative Party will learn the lesson of history. They should have looked at the 1911 election campaign which was fought on free trade. Canadians said in 1911 that they are against free trade because they want to maintain Canada's identity and they are going to say the same thing on November 21.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let not the Conservatives come out now in their dying days in this election, as their support plummets, with this righteous indignation about this deal. They have tried to hide the details. The details are out. People know that this free trade deal is going to have serious consequences for Canada. They know this is an historic election and if we do not make the decision today to stop this deal, that in 5 and 10 years, we and our children and our grandchildren will wonder what happened in 1988. They will wonder why the Conservative Government was asleep at the switch while our sovereignty was stripped from us because of this deal, and let the Prime Minister talk about it being only a commercial deal. How ridiculous! It goes to the heart of what Canada is all about and that is why we are opposed to it.

* (1800)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. When this Bill is next before the House for debate, the Honourable Member will have 11 minutes remaining.

The hour being 6 p.m., this House stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow afternoon (Wednesday).