

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, January 25, 1990.

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

* (1335)

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Speaker: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct Honourable Members' attention to the gallery where we have from the Assiniboine Community College, 40 Business Admin students, and they are under the direction of Laurie Murray. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans).

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Economic Growth Government Strategy

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, three studies were released yesterday, and they all contained bad news about this province's economy.

One study reveals that the City of Winnipeg's economy is in a downward slide and is at a critical stage. Another tells us there will not be any federal aid to Portage la Prairie to replace the base. Then another study places Manitoba at the top of the list in terms of the highest increase in business bankruptcies for all of Canada in 1989, increases of over 90 percent in the last four years.

Mr. Speaker, this represents bad news for Winnipeg, bad news for rural Manitoba, bad news for business, bad news for consumers and bad news for labour.

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Deputy Premier (Mr. Cummings). In light of all of this information, can we now expect to see any action from this Government to deal with the sad state of Manitoba's economy?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Deputy Premier): Mr. Speaker, there are a number of things that the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) puts on the record that do not necessarily coincide with what is actually happening in this province.

Mr. Speaker, the report on the City of Winnipeg, the Province of Manitoba participated in the development of that report, and it is a building block upon which we can start to reconstruct the economy of this province after the disarray that it was left in by the previous Government.

Mr. Speaker, you do not build a house on sand; you build it on a strong foundation.

Some Honourable Members: Right on, right on!

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order, please. The Honourable Deputy Premier.

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, we have all the nattering nabobs of negativism on the other side who do not want to look at the direction that this province is moving. It is building on a strong foundation that we outlined yesterday, that we are leaving more money in the hands of the taxpayers of this province, and there are literally dozens of initiatives that are going to start producing growth and jobs in this province, and they simply do not want to recognize that.

CFB Portage la Prairie Compensation

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the federal study has told the people of Portage la Prairie that there will be no help from the federal Government to help them over the lost jobs and revenues that they have been experiencing. They have been told by this study to deal with it by themselves.

Mr. Speaker, can the Deputy Premier (Mr. Cummings) tell the House today why it is that Prince Edward Island is able to get financial support and new industry from the federal Government, and Manitoba is unable to get any of it, and our people are told to wait 15 years?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Deputy Premier): Mr. Speaker, the truth of what the Opposition Leader is trying to say is simply not borne out by the facts. There is an investment of some \$75 million by, I believe it is, Cavendish Farms in P.E.I., with very little federal economic involvement. They are involved in the environmental side.

You look at Portage la Prairie, we are not in any way conceding that base is going to disappear. We are prepared to do everything we can to keep it there. We have already got \$8 million worth of additional economic activity coming into Portage, and that is only the beginning.

Government Strategy

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, this Government becomes more ostrich-like by the day. This is a federally commissioned study, which says not only is the base not going to stay open, but there is not going to be any help. What is this provincial Government doing about it with their federal cousins?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Deputy Premier): Mr. Speaker, as I said a moment ago, we are only at the beginning stages of what we can do for the City of Portage la

Prairie. The development in that area will not go unintended by this Government. We have made our case very strongly with Ottawa. We continue to make that case, and it is our intention to make sure that jobs, opportunity and investment are secure in the City of Portage la Prairie.

CFB Portage la Prairie Government Position

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, this study makes reference to the fact that they consulted with Governments. We can only assume that the Governments they consulted with were the Governments at the federal level, the Government at the provincial level, and the municipal Government of Portage la Prairie. Apparently they got the same refrain, that we do not think there should be any federal aid. Will the Minister tell the House what kind of advice he gave to these consultants?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be back in Manitoba and I see some things have not changed. I see the Liberals are taking great pride and satisfaction with any news that tends to be a little bit negative with respect to the Province of Manitoba. Let me assure the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs), from the best of our knowledge, that being the Deputy Premier and myself, that there was no input given to this study by way of the Industry, Trade and Tourism Department that would in any way lead to believe that there was not a bright future for Portage.

* (1340)

As a matter of fact, again I would reiterate something that the Deputy Premier (Mr. Cummings) just said, that some of the announcements that have been made with respect to a growing economic development plan with respect to that community are just the beginning. There are many more in the works. In time they will be announced in full detail.

What I find curious with respect to the line of questioning from the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs) is that she chooses not to dwell in great detail with respect to the report put out called Winnipeg 2000. I know I did not hear all of it yesterday, but nevertheless there is a very candid, concise recommendation and laying out as to exactly what has happened in the Province of Manitoba and the City of Winnipeg over the last seven or eight years.

Economic Growth Federal/Provincial Discussions

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): To the Deputy Premier. Can the Deputy Premier tell the House why his First Minister (Mr. Filmon) is in Ottawa tonight and tomorrow and is not meeting with the Prime Minister to dialogue specifically about the economic chaos in the Province of Manitoba and what they are prepared to do as they are prepared to do for P.E.I.?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Leader of the Liberal Party

would be happy to know that the Premier and I were last night in Toronto where we had occasion to meet a number of businesspeople from that city at that time. I would like Members, not only of the Opposition, but all Manitobans to know that Manitoba is being looked at in a much different light in the investment centres within North America. For once, and it is referred to most definitely, some of the problem that may exist in this province today is laid out very well in this document. What is becoming evident to people who are watching Manitoba is that there is finally a Government in control, one who realizes that there has to be put into place a better economic climate, one that realizes that there has to be tax reductions and one that realizes it has to control Government increases and expenditure.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. In view of the watching public here today, I think decorum is of great importance. Time is extremely scarce.

Mrs. Carstairs: This Government can no longer put the problems of this economy solely on the disastrous years of the New Democratic Party. They have to accept the fact that they have been the Government since April of 1988 and the economy is going down, down, down. It is in a tailspin. Will the Deputy Premier (Mr. Cummings) tell this House why, if the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and the Prime Minister have time to go to the ballet together, they do not have time to talk about the economy of Manitoba?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker -(interjection)-

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Manness: I find it passing strange that the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs) would recognize that we have attempted, in bringing down two budgets, to deal with the losing confidence in the Manitoba economy that we inherited. Our economic model has been one that has tried to provide greater disposable income to Manitobans. We have done that through major tax reductions, recognized everywhere I have been the last three days.

Mr. Speaker, I have challenged the Liberal Party over and over again to lay before this House, if not the people of Manitoba, as to what their economic development plan would be. What we have found out to date is that what the Members opposite have asked are two things: first of all, there should not be a reduction in taxes; and secondly, there should be an increased level of expenditure. That only leads to greater and greater deficits, and it causes Ministers of Finance to have to borrow and borrow more money.

Mr. Speaker, what is their solution? To date only one Member, the Member for Transcona (Mr. Kozak), has risen to his feet and indicated that he has a solution. Yet to this point in time he has not provided it to the people of Manitoba. Shame.

Thursday, January 25, 1990

Economic Growth Job Creation Strategy

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): My question is to the same Minister. It rises out of the latest numbers out again today, the bottom-line numbers, not the rhetoric in this Chamber but the bottom-line numbers. The bankruptcy numbers yesterday, Mr. Speaker, Manitoba was the last in Canada, 10th in consumer bankruptcies and in business bankruptcies. Today, Manitoba's numbers on retail sales are the lowest, No. 10, 10th place in terms of increased sales in Canada. Every month we get more full-time jobs lost in this province. Every month we see no increase in our population under Tory administration—bottom-line numbers.

My question to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) is: did he and the Premier (Mr. Filmon) meet with the president of Ogilvie last night to get oats reprocessed back in Manitoba? Did he meet with Molson to get those jobs back in Manitoba? Did he meet with Campbell Soup to get jobs back in Manitoba? What is this Government going to do to get jobs back in this province and opportunity for Manitoba families?

* (1345)

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): I should indicate to the Leader of the third Party that part of my answer to his litany of questions would be, yes, we did meet with, as a matter of fact, some of these people.

I could not help also noticing in today's paper that one Rubin Bellan, a former professor of economics of mine at the University of Manitoba, who certainly is no friend to this Party, indicated as his response to some of the information released yesterday with respect to Winnipeg 2000 that some of his reasoning for some of the fall-off in sales had something to do with population migration.

If one goes back to this, it says between 1983 and 1988—and we were sworn in, by the way, May 9, 1988—more than 124,000 people left Winnipeg and Manitoba, 43 percent of those between the ages of 20 and 34, consuming public, people who consume disposables, who consume goods and items. Indeed, the Member opposite knows the answer to his question.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. I am sure Honourable Members would like to proceed. I am sure they would. The Honourable Member for Concordia.

Job Creation Strategy

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I did not expect the report commissioned by the Liberal-Conservative coalition gang of 18 to tell the real facts of the matter, which is what Ruben Bellan was talking about. In 1982, the population of Manitoba was 1,027,000. In 1988, it was 1,082,800. It was 9,000 persons increased per year in the population of Manitoba under the former Government, something that

is not happening under of the Conservative Government.

My question to the Minister of Finance: given the dismal 10th place statistics every week that we are getting under his administration, under his Government in the last 12 months, what economic strategy will he develop to reverse the absolute zero growth in population in this province as opposed to 9,000 or 10,000 per year and start providing jobs and opportunities for Manitoba families rather than just rhetoric in this Chamber?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I find it again strange that the Member wants to talk about real facts. The real facts are, we still have the second highest taxation regime in the country. The real facts are I came back from New York having borrowed a quarter billion dollars this week, refinancing loans taken out by this Member and his people in 1982 and '83. The cost of this refinancing works out to \$30 million a year, heaped upon the taxpayers in this province. The NDP economic plan for development in this province has been rejected, totally rejected, as an abysmal failure by the people of this province.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) knows that Manitoba has gone from the second lowest unemployment rate to the fifth or fourth every month now. The Minister of Finance knows that the City of Winnipeg under his administration has gone from second place to seventh or eighth or ninth or sixth per month, always on the downward slide. It is time the Minister of Finance and the Government started admitting it.

My question to the Minister of Finance is, while the Premier (Mr. Filmon) of the province is participating in the ballet with the Prime Minister of the country, will the Premier of our province bring back a number of—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member for Concordia.

* (1350)

Economic Growth Cultural Development Agreements

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I know what has been bothering the Member for Pembina (Mr. Orchard). I think we should all nominate the Member for Pembina for next year for that same dubious honour. It is okay, Donnie. I know he is wearing pink shoes now. I do not know where the cowboy boots have gone, but maybe he wants to appeal to Chatelaine for next year.

My question, and it is a serious one, Mr. Speaker, the cultural development grants of the Province of Manitoba, which have spun off into a large number of jobs in the cultural industries, are one of many federal-provincial agreements that have not been re-signed between the existing provincial Government and the

federal provincial Government. My question to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) is, will that new agreement be signed? Will some of those cultural industries which have spun off to numbers of jobs and cultural opportunities in this province, will they be re-signed on behalf of the people of Manitoba?

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation): Mr. Speaker, Happy New Year, I am pleased that I am able to answer a question in this new year of ours—or have been asked a question.

Mr. Speaker, just before answering that question, I find it very strange that both the Liberals and the NDP today have criticized our Premier (Mr. Filmon) for attending the Royal Winnipeg Ballet performance in Toronto. The Royal Winnipeg Ballet is of national significance and something that we in this province should all be proud of. The Premier of Manitoba, as being the ambassador for Manitoba and supporting our Royal Winnipeg Ballet, something that the Opposition does not want to give credit to our province for producing—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order, please. The Honourable Minister.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Speaker, on the cost-shared agreement, the cultural ERDA that is about to run out, we have indicated quite clearly as a province that our money is on the table. We support cultural industries in this province and we realize the economic benefits and the spin-offs that have resulted. We are actively negotiating with the federal Government to continue that agreement.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, now I know why the Minister took a cheap shot about the ballet, because we are all proud of the ballet, but she has not got a signed signature on the federal-provincial agreement.—(interjection)—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Economic Growth Development Agreement

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): My question is very simple. To the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), my question is, last year we were told that you were negotiating the federal-provincial agreements. Last fall we were told you were negotiating the federal-provincial agreements. Again today we were told you are negotiating the federal-provincial agreements. Where is the beef? Do you have an agreement on the cultural development grants? Do you have a specific agreement to deal with Portage la Prairie? Where is the success? What are you bringing back to Manitoba—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question has been put. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I am not the lead negotiator on behalf of the

Province of Manitoba with respect to development agreements with the federal Government. I can indicate to the Leader of the third Party as we are moving into our budgeting sequence that we, too, are trying to ascertain with greater clarity and certainty where it is the federal Government is going to be on a lot of these development agreements that of course have run their course. I can indicate that not only are we concerned, but we are disappointed that in many cases the federal Government has not seen fit to give us a clear understanding of their attitude towards renewed funding into the next fiscal year.

Margaret Scott School Structural Damage

Mrs. Iva Yeo (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, on May 26, on June 12, 13, and 14, I asked questions regarding the Public Schools Finance Board and in particular the decrepit state of Margaret Scott School. A series of studies have been done since 1985, most indicating the need to rebuild the school on that present site. We know that in 1985 another Government was in place; we know that things were not good then; we know that things are not good now. They were leaving then. They are leaving now. Maybe it is time for a change, Mr. Speaker.

Why does the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) wait until walls are ready to tumble down? A building filled with children is deemed so unsafe that the school has to be closed in one day. Why is this Minister always the Minister for reaction? Why does he not act immediately?—(interjection)—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Education and Training.

* (1355)

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the Education Critic from the Liberal Party and indeed the entire Liberal Caucus did not listen to the answers when they were given to the questions that were posed with regard to the Public Schools Finance Board and its responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, may I say in the beginning that I support the Winnipeg School Division in moving the students out of that school immediately, because the engineers did find that there were very serious structural problems with the school.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. I am sure Honourable Members would want to give the courtesy to the Minister to respond to the question. The Honourable Minister.

Mr. Derkach: When Winnipeg School Division No. 1 applied to rebuild Isaac Newton School the Public Schools Finance Board did consider it. They used the same criteria they use for every school in this province.

Thursday, January 25, 1990

They looked at the available space in the neighbouring area. In December of 1988 Isaac Newton School was rejected for rebuilding because there was adequate space in neighbouring schools to accommodate each and every student in that school.

Mr. Speaker, Winnipeg School Division were notified of that—pardon me, Margaret Scott, I am sorry.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please.

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Speaker, I apologize for that.—(interjection)—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

POINT OF ORDER

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Government House Leader, on a point of order.

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Speaker, it is not only difficult for me and others in this Chamber or for the Minister of Education and Training (Mr. Derkach) to answer questions put to him, we expect that those questions are put forward seriously and the Members would like to hear the answer. We have had quite a lot of trouble today with the Liberals in this House with their lack of decorum.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order. The Honourable Opposition House Leader, on the same point of order.

Mr. Reg Alcock (Opposition House Leader): If I could speak on this point of order, although I do expect that the Government House Leader is simply giving his Minister time to figure out which school he is trying to answer the question—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. This is not a time for debate. I have recognized the Honourable Opposition House Leader on the same point of order that has been raised. Would the Honourable Member like to deal with that point of order? The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Alcock: Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to support the Government House Leader (Mr. McCrae) to this extent, I think it is true that things have been getting a little more boisterous than perhaps allows for effective debate in this House. I would ask that he call his Members to order, and I can assure him that we will give him the same respect. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to thank both Honourable House Leaders. For our watching public here today,

we do have some contentious issues that do arise from time to time. I understand there are strong political views on both sides of the Chamber, but I must stress that decorum is of great importance.

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, yes, I did make an error in the name of the school. The name of the school is Margaret Scott School. It so happens that Sir Isaac Newton School is very close to the Margaret Scott School and can accommodate the students.

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious issue. Let it not be misunderstood that the Public Schools Finance Board did act accordingly and the Department of Education nor the Public Schools Finance should bear any responsibility for this immediate closure, because last May and last June the Public Schools Finance Board advised Winnipeg School Division No. 1 that in fact they should close Margaret Scott School and move the students out of that school into the neighbouring schools where they could be accommodated. Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a decision that has to be made by the Winnipeg School Division No. 1 and it is their entire responsibility.

* (1400)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Public Schools Finance Board Objectives

Mrs. Iva Yeo (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, the report of the Provincial Auditor just recently received declares concerns with the need to clarify the mandate and review the organizational structures of Public Schools Finance Board and Education Manitoba. Will the Minister immediately sit down with the chairperson of the Public Schools Finance Board and his staff and clarify the objectives and practices of the Public Schools Finance Board?

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, I am just a little bit disappointed that the Critic for Education on the Liberal Caucus has not read further where the Provincial Auditor indicates that steps have already been taken by this administration, by the Department of Education in addressing those areas. As a matter of fact, he commends the Department of Education for the action they have taken. This issue has nothing to do with the organization. This is an issue where the Public Schools Finance Board is indeed correct in the decision that they have made.

Mrs. Yeo: Mr. Speaker, when will the Minister of Education and his Government, in light of the fact that the only Member on that side of the House who has even a portion of his constituency in the Winnipeg No. 1 School Division is the Premier (Mr. Filmon), when will they stop the rhetoric and demonstrate serious consideration and action for all the core area schools that are either crumbling or overcrowded?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Speaker, what is the Liberal Party saying? Are they saying that the school boards should not have the mandate to decide which buildings should be replaced? Winnipeg School Division No. 1 was advised that because Margaret Scott did not fit the criteria for rebuilding that school that they would indeed have an alternative school that they could name for replacement. To date that school has not been named. It is up to the divisions to name their replacement schools and we will honour the agreement that we have with any school division.

Churchill River Dam Meeting Cancellation

Mr. Harold Taylor (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, the new dam on the Churchill proposed at Island Falls by Saskatchewan Power will impact three Indian bands, two of those in Manitoba. Last week, very suddenly the Saskatchewan Environment Minister, Grant Hodgins, cancelled the meeting, a public consultation meeting he had planned for the people of Pukatawagan. The cancellation was however by the local band chief, because this Government over here will not stand up for Brochet and Pukatawagan in that very meeting.-(interjection)-

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, the record of using the right words but total ineffectiveness on Rafferty-Alameda has gained national notoriety for that Government. Will the Environment Minister of Manitoba (Mr. Cummings) tell us when he will start looking out for the environment of Manitoba and the rights of its citizens, including those about to be impacted at northern bands?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately we have now seen a demonstration of why the information that is brought to this Chamber by the Opposition is considered in very, very poor light most times because they do not get it straight. Working on behalf of the bands and the communities in that area who are affected by the dam site on the Saskatchewan side of the boundary, I agreed that I would work on their behalf to have a meeting with them and the Saskatchewan Minister of Environment so that he could hear their concerns directly and so that they could hear from him what his thoughts and intentions were regarding this potential change of a dam site.

Mr. Speaker, it is a very lengthy answer I understand, but the problem is that they then decided that they would not meet with Mr. Hodgins, and therefore he cancelled the meeting.

Environmental Impact Study

Mr. Harold Taylor (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, the Environment Ministers across the way have never been able to show us up as having the facts wrong. They just have not done any of their research and they have not provided any direction or leadership.

The question, Mr. Speaker, is why has the Minister not intervened on behalf of both Brochet and

Pukatawagan with Environment Canada, who are at the moment reviewing that very licence, and make sure that the impacts are properly studied by an environmental review panel so there can be mitigation against the likely impacts?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared to table the communication that I had with the affected people in the area and with the Minister of the Environment in Saskatchewan. Unfortunately, the representatives of the bands and the communities that were affected decided that they were not going to meet after a meeting had been set up. The concerns of any change or any development on that river that would affect us on the downstream side will be very carefully taken into consideration, and until some action is either applied for or shown, the simple fact is that the federal Government cannot react to something that is not happening.

Licensing

Mr. Harold Taylor (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, Manitoba Water Regulation licence for the existing dam lapsed in 1982. The then NDP Government allowed an opportunity to positively effect a resolution for those two bands to slip through their obviously incapable hands.

Mr. Speaker, can the Minister explain why neither he nor the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) has insisted that Saskatchewan come under the controls available to the Province of Manitoba? It would appear that the lip-service environmentalists are just as bad as the hindsight environmentalists that preceded them.

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, I guess I will have to take back what I said a minute ago. The Member got the first part of the preamble right anyway. We have met with the people of Brochet, Pukatawagan and the communities in that area, met with the representatives. We attempted to convene a meeting so that Saskatchewan could clearly meet face to face, along with the representatives from the Province of Manitoba, to deal with this issue, to start to put in place the kind of processes that would be needed in changes that could occur to that dam, or that Saskatchewan might be planning to make to that dam. At this stage, it is my understanding that Saskatchewan has withdrawn any intentions to do anything to that dam.

* (1410)

Winnipeg School Division Reconstruction Policy

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, I was glad to hear the Minister suggest that the decision by the Winnipeg School Board to vacate Margaret Scott School was the appropriate decision. The Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) wrote in a letter to the board chairperson back in May of 1989 that the decision of the Public Schools Finance Board was a decision that was based on the proper control of public expenditure.

Thursday, January 25, 1990

Given the fact that the Liberals and the Tories are prepared to provide \$30 million to private schools, given the fact that Liberals and Tory councillors are prepared to see Winnipeg sprawl all over the province creating the need for new schools, given the fact that the Public Schools Finance Board has funded new—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. Given that I have given the floor to the Honourable Member for Flin Flon, would you kindly put your question now, please?

Mr. Storie: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Education meet with the school board today to examine the rationale for creating the need and building schools in urban areas of this city, while denying rebuilding and regeneration of schools in the inner city of Winnipeg?

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): The preamble of the Member for Flin Flon is completely incorrect. First of all, there was an agreement struck between the Public Schools Finance Board, the Province of Manitoba and Winnipeg School Division where we would allow for the reconstruction of one new school in Winnipeg School Division No. 1 because of the aged buildings within that division. We are honouring that commitment. Margaret Scott School was designated for replacement by the school division.

Upon doing the study, Public Schools Finance Board found that there are several schools within half a mile of Margaret Scott that can accommodate every student who is in Margaret Scott today. As a matter of fact, Isaac Newton School has an availability to house 275 students. There are only 163 students in Margaret Scott. Even the chairman of the board has indicated publicly there will be no problem in accommodating these students in other schools.

Margaret Scott School Upgrading

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) has received a letter from the Winnipeg School Division showing some examples of where community schools have been built in the southern part of Winnipeg, wherein the same kind of school, community school, is being denied in the inner city.

Given the discrepancy between the practices of the Public School Board, apparently by geography, given the apparent discrimination against the parents in the inner city of Winnipeg, will the Minister now overturn the decision of the Public Schools Board? Will he allow the upgrading of Margaret Scott School so that the—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The question has been put. The Honourable Minister of Education and Training.

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, the Public Schools Finance Board follows the same criteria for establishing whether a school will be built in a particular area or not. I have to indicate to the Members of this House that Isaac

Newton School is one-half block away from Margaret Scott. Now I ask the people of this province whether it would be sensible to build a school when in fact a school that is half a block away can accommodate very comfortably every single student who is now housed in Margaret Scott?

Mr. Storie: Mr. Speaker, the same can be said for schools that were built in urban Winnipeg.

Parents Meetings

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister. If he believes his argument is so valid, will he attend the meeting this evening at 7 p.m. at Isaac Newton to explain to the parents why they cannot have a public school in their community while in the community of St. Vital or Fort Garry they can?

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): I wish the Member for Flin Flon would listen to the answers because in fact there are four schools within half a mile of Margaret Scott, four schools that have available space to accommodate students within their particular space. The decision has been made. The decision was made that Margaret Scott School will not be rebuilt. That is a firm decision made by the Public Schools Finance Board, and I support it totally.

Place Promenade Construction Costs

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, my question is to—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

Mr. Carr: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Housing and the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme), and he can wear whichever hat makes him more comfortable today.

The great confusion now surrounds the costs of constructing Place Promenade. We see that building permits show the total cost to be \$17.8 million, but the Manitoba Housing Renewal Corporation says that a sworn statement from the developer has it at more like \$29.1 million.

Would the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, which advanced an \$18.5 million mortgage to the developer, and the Minister of Urban Affairs, who is a one-third partner in the North Portage Development Corporation, tell the House exactly what the costs were?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I hope the Member from across the way is not using building permit costs as an accepted appraisal practice in Canada.

First of all, you do not use building permit costs as your appraised value.- (interjection)-

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Ducharme: Mr. Speaker, the Members from across the way, I would like them to listen to the answers.

First of all, he says, whatever I am comfortable with. First of all, I am up here every other day answering questions on an agreement that was signed by the previous Government, and I am going through the process of coming up with the answers that he is asking for.

First of all, the project value of that project in 1986 was arrived at by CMHC employing the standard cost appraisal that they use for mortgage insurance purposes, that form basis of the MHRC loan of \$18.5 million, which is fully insured, and we will protect our investment.

Mr. Carr: He did not tell us what the building costs were, Mr. Speaker, and that was the question. Has the Minister been informed—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. I would like to remind the Honourable Member that it is out of order to make reference to the answers that one has just received, whether you received one, or whether you did not. It is out of order.

Non-Profit Management

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, with a supplementary question to the same Minister. Has the Minister been informed of any expression of interest to take over management of Place Promenade by any seniors' housing agencies in the City of Winnipeg?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, first of all, the question by the Member, in regard to not getting the right answer, when a Member uses building permit costs to determine values in the city, I say that he is being irresponsible.

The answer to his last question is no.

Mr. Carr: It has come to our attention that the Lions Manor has expressed an interest to CMHC to take over management of Place Promenade. Given the fact that the Minister has no knowledge of this, would he immediately pursue the possibility of a non-profit housing agency taking over management of this troubled facility and report back to the House as soon as he has found that out?

Mr. Ducharme: Mr. Speaker, again the Member is being very irresponsible. CMHC and the North of Portage will do the negotiations. I, as MHRC, as director and chairman of the board, cannot get involved. We are in the court process right now. I cannot get involved in negotiations between North of Portage and CMHC.

Mr. Speaker: Time for Oral Questions has expired.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order.

* (1420)

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order, please. I am sure all Honourable Members would like to hear this announcement. The Honourable Government House Leader.

Mr. McCrae: It is my understanding that the Estimates of the Department of Labour will be examined today in Room 255, and that the Estimates of the Department of Education and Training will be examined in the Chamber.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger), 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 Labour, and the Honourable Member for St. Boniface (Mr. Gaudry) in the Chair for the Department of Education and Training.

* (1430)

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY—LABOUR

Mr. Chairman (Harold Gilleshammer): Order, please. I call this section of the Committee of Supply to order. Today the Committee of Supply shall resume consideration of the Estimates of the Department of Labour. When we last met to consider these Estimates the committee had been considering item 2.(j) Grants \$6,500—the Member for St. James.

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe I had mentioned this at the end the last time we were meeting in the Labour Estimates. I simply wanted to get a commitment from the Minister. As she had mentioned there was an appointment to some kind of advisory board with respect to CCOSH, I believe it is called. What does the province envisage in terms of any financial commitment to CCOSH, or has any financial commitment been made? Does the province envisage that they may have to contribute something to the ongoing funding of this centre, given that the federal Tories have withdrawn completely from funding this very, very useful and important institute in Hamilton?

Hon. Gerrie Hammond (Minister of Labour): Mr. Chair, the federal Minister has given funding to the end of

Thursday, January 25, 1990

this fiscal year. We are still hoping that they would come up with the funding and had been pushing for that. In the meantime, the governors have had a working group that are putting together a business plan, and as soon as we know what is happening there, there is I think a commitment from both, yes, from Mr. Corbeil to this year at least that we would be working to make sure that CCOSH would still be there because we feel it is very necessary.

Mr. Edwards: Finally, for the Minister, and again this touches on another issue I had raised before that, that is funding for unemployed help centres in the province. It is certainly our position that these centres provided an invaluable service in a very complicated, often very intimidating forum, that is, dealing with the Unemployment Insurance Commission.

In fact, it was interesting, Mr. Chairman. I have heard from people who work with the Unemployment Insurance Commission as adjusters that they found these centres very helpful because they helped individuals clarify their position in their case, and they very much missed that assistance on behalf of workers, because they simply do not have the time to go through the claims with the same detail to see if there has been some oversight, whether or not somebody should be on funding.

So I ask the Minister if there is any intention on the part of our Government to assist people in dealing with the Unemployment Insurance Commission in lieu of the fact that these centres have been withdrawn from, in light of the fact that the federal Government is now changing the Unemployment Insurance system completely and has shown through its actions that it has very little regard for the needs of workers when it comes to maximizing what they can get from the Unemployment Insurance Commission.

Mrs. Hammond: Yes, I think the Member makes the case for the reason that we are not funding it, that we feel that the federal Government should be funding it and that we are working with the labour adjustment units. We think that we can work with people very well there, and that is where we are going to put our efforts into labour adjustment, into education and training.

Mr. Edwards: Of course, labour adjustment does not get involved with really the vast majority of laid-off workers in this province. Secondly, it is very much in the provincial Government's interest, I would submit, to fund this type of centre, to ensure that whatever Manitobans can be gaining funds from the Unemployment Insurance Commission do get those funds. The fact is the federal Government is pulling back from the area. They are attempting to pull back from funding workers in this country, and I think that that extent provincial funds are threatened.

That is not the most important reason. The most important reason is that we want Manitoba workers who are laid off to have access to these funds, but a side effect of that is the province will end up having the financial burden for laid off people placed on the federal Government wherever that is possible. As the

Minister has said she feels this is a federal issue, it is also very much a provincial issue.

I simply make that statement and that case, which I think is patently obvious, and would ask the Minister to indicate whether or not her Government, in the event that the federal Government has no intention of placing funds in this area, which I very much doubt they do, if the provincial Government has any commitment to the unemployed workers in this province in their attempts to deal with the Unemployment Insurance Commission and again maximize the benefits that they may be entitled to?

Mrs. Hammond: We are very interested in helping people who are unemployed but there is not money for everything. This is a federal program, we are choosing to put it into education and training and into the labour adjustment unit, unlike the Liberals who seem to have a blank cheque. There are some things we feel that we can and should be doing and still be able to help people who are unemployed. That is our interest as well. Certainly that was a good service but there are a lot of good services that are out there but it is not up to the provincial Government to perform all of them.

Mr. Edwards: I agree there is not money to give everybody everything they want. It does make sense, however, if there is a financial benefit to spending money in appropriate places. It is my experience in talking to people who would have used this service, speaking to people who were on the other end of this service as officers of the Unemployment Insurance Commission itself, that this may well have saved the province at least as much as they might put into fund these centres.

Has the Minister had any economic or financial analysis done for her by the Research and Planning Branch which might show her case, that it would not be in the best interests of the province to fund this? I think on the surface it is quite clear that there is a financial benefit to the province. Can the Minister point to any statistics to show that it would somehow be a loss to the province if they invested some funds in assisting people to deal with the Unemployment Insurance Commission?

Mrs. Hammond: I think we are going to have to agree to disagree on this particular issue. As a Government we are not planning to fund that, we believe our funds are better able to help unemployed workers in other areas.

Mr. Edwards: Finally, and I realize that this question may have had a little more to do with the Research and Planning Branch, given the changes that are coming into effect clearly down the road shortly from the federal Government with respect to unemployment insurance, has the Department of Labour analyzed the effect those changes will have in the Province of Manitoba with respect to unemployed workers presently and projections for unemployed workers in the future, what effect that will have generally in terms of dollars lost to unemployed Manitoba workers and indeed dollars lost by the provincial Government through welfare

Thursday, January 25, 1990

payments and other payments which will have to pick up the slack?

Mrs. Hammond: I think if I understand the Member correctly, and probably I do, the fact is we wish to put our funds toward putting people to work. We want to get them into job retraining and that is where we are choosing to spend our funds. This is the way the Government is going to deal with unemployed workers. We want to make sure that they get jobs.

Mr. Edwards: The Minister says she wants to put money into Labour Adjustment. True, we are not at Labour Adjustment yet but she has raised it. I looked two pages down and the total increase in expenditures is \$61,000.00. That is roughly 10 cents per Manitoba worker. This is absolute lip-service, and that is no excuse for this Minister to rely on repeatedly. The fact is the Labour Adjustment Branch does not get involved with the vast majority of Manitoba workers laid off.

* (1440)

The fact is the federal Government is dramatically changing the unemployment insurance regime in this country to the detriment of Manitoba and Manitoba workers in particular. Has this Minister analyzed the effect of those changes in the Province of Manitoba, because I would submit that analysis will show that assisting people in maximizing what they can get from the Unemployment Insurance Commission would be a wise investment. Has the Minister done, or is the Minister presently doing it even, any analysis which would show what the dollar loss to Manitoba will be through these changes in the unemployment insurance regime?

Mrs. Hammond: Yes, the Member has often quoted de Granpre in terms of specific measures to adapt to ongoing change. The report stated the council would not want to see Canadian workers, unions and management attempting to prove that a particular problem of adjustment arises out of free trade nor do they want them to see a large bureaucracy trying to determine whether such circumstances arise out of other developments. So I think where we want to put our resources to and are putting our resources is strengthening services to respond effectively to the needs of laid-off workers with the consolidation of the labour adjustment program in our department.

We are giving—there is pro-active assistance to Manitoba industry by IT&T to take advantage of free trade and other opportunities for growth and development and establishment in the Department of Agriculture of a task force on supply management re: the agri-food industries. We are ensuring, we are doing things to get people work. That is the goal of this Government, both to bring jobs to Manitoba and when there are jobs losses to make sure these people are retrained or they are able to find other jobs.

Mr. Edwards: I do not want to belabour this point and I am cognizant of our limited time but I do want an answer. If the answer is no, so be it. There has been no signal from this Minister and I have asked this

question twice already. Is this Government doing any analysis of the effect of the changes to the unemployment insurance regime on Manitobans?

Mrs. Hammond: This is a policy decision that we have made to spend the dollars elsewhere.

Mr. Edwards: Maybe the Minister does not understand. I am saying in the Department of Labour, I am not saying, this question is not about monies going into the unemployed help centres, I have already asked those questions. This question is about analyzing the effect of the unemployment insurance regime changes on Manitobans. Is anybody studying that and looking at our present situation, looking at the future regime, which is proposed, which is coming through, and seeing what that is going to mean in terms of dollars lost in a Manitoba economy?

Mrs. Hammond: Until we know what effect the new funds the federal Government is redirecting from unemployment insurance into retraining and labour adjustment programs have, we cannot predict the effect that these changes will have on Manitoba workers.

Mr. Edwards: What discussions has the Minister had with her federal counterpart as to monies being redirected into those programs in Manitoba. Have there been any commitments made that there will indeed be funds redirected to this province? If so, what dollar amounts are we talking about?

Mrs. Hammond: Mr. Chairman, this is an issue that comes under the Minister of Education and Training (Mr. Derkach).

Mr. Edwards: If the Minister wants to pass it to the Minister of Education, that is fine, but unemployment insurance and unemployed people is a Labour problem. Maybe I can just direct the Minister back to the question, and I gather the answer is no, there is no analysis being done in her department of the effect of the changes in the unemployment insurance regime on Manitobans.

Mrs. Hammond: Mr. Chair, we recognize the issues, but we can hardly do research until we have all the facts. Until we know what funds are going to be redirected from unemployment insurance into retraining and labour adjustment programs, there is not a lot that we can do in that area. What we are doing is what we can with the information that we have.

Mr. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the Government has put out a definite plan as to what they intend to do with the unemployment insurance payments across the country. They have set up various little districts around the country. They have indicated their specific plans with respect to what the payment levels will be based on in terms of percentages, in terms of how many people are employed, what the unemployment rate is in that particular district.

On the issue of what monies will be replacing that, which the Minister is referencing, I accept that is not a decision which has been made, but the Minister and

surely the Government sees the wisdom in analyzing what we know is going to happen and finding out how much money is not going to come into the province through direct payments to unemployed people, so that we will have a figure to go to the federal Government with and say, look, this is the money that we are losing, we need that replacement money in education and training.

Is the department finding out how much money, given the existing plan? There have been committee discussions, there are now more discussions going on, but the committee has toured this country and representations have been made. A plan has been put forward by the federal Government.

Has the Minister determined what the dollar amount loss will be to Manitoba workers under the proposed federal regime, just so that she can make her argument better when she is asking for replacement funds in education and training?

Mrs. Hammond: The Honourable Minister, Mrs. McDougall, has given the Canadian Labour Market Productivity Centre the task of making a report on these issues. Some of the things that the Member says have been done have not been done, because they have not reported to the Minister yet.

Mr. Edwards: Do I take it then that the Minister is content in terms of the impact on Manitoba to leave it to her federal counterpart to determine that?

Mrs. Hammond: No, Mr. Chairman, I would not be, but we do have to work in co-operation with the federal Government on this issue. We are actively working with education and training so that we know what is happening as far as funds directed to Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the item pass—pass; item 2.(k)(1) Pay Equity, Salaries \$223,600—the Member for St. James.

Mr. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, with respect to pay equity generally in the province, can the Minister give us an update as to the numbers of Manitoba workers that have thus far been affected by pay equity brought up to par under the pay equity system and what numbers are anticipated in this coming year? What work is being done to ensure that pay equity standards are met for all workplaces affected by the Act?

Mrs. Hammond: The report is a public document and it has all the figures in it. We can give that to him if you like. I do not know if we have it here, but we can—there were 55,000 workers that were in the sectors covered by the Pay Equity Agreement.

* (1450)

Mr. Edwards: What discussions if any has this Minister had, in her tenure as Minister, with representatives from the private sector on the issue of pay equity with a view to ensuring as much compliance as possible in the future with the goals of pay equity?

Mrs. Hammond: Consultations were held with the former Minister. I have not held any consultation with

the private sector. I have with the City of Winnipeg and the school—not the school divisions, but the umbrella organizations.

Mr. Edwards: Does the Minister intend in this coming year to embark upon that process and seek the co-operation of the private sector in putting into place pay equity programs that would obviously reflect the desire of this Government insofar as it has applied to Crown corporations and its own departments? Does the Minister have any intention to go forward and reach out to the private sector on the issue of pay equity in the coming year?

Mrs. Hammond: Mr. Chair, the department and the former Minister, or the department, did a consultation with them and I have no plans in the near future. We have indicated through that consultation that any information or help that they would want in implementing pay equity that we would be happy to be a resource.

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns): Mr. Chairperson, I have a number of general questions on this whole area of pay equity. The first has to do with the general state of affairs in the health care sector, obviously referring to the fact that the 23, I believe, institutions—

Mr. Edwards: On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: On a point of privilege, the—

Mr. Edwards: Yes, point of order. Point of order, I am sorry.

Mr. Chairman: On a point of order, the Member for St. James.

Mr. Edwards: I see that the Member for St. Johns, and I think even the Member for Ellice (Ms. Gray), intend to ask questions with respect to perhaps the recent decision as it affected health care professionals in this province.

I must declare a conflict of interest based on my employment as a lawyer with the law firm I am employed with, which is recorded of course with the Clerk. I will not be taking part in any discussion, and in fact I will remove myself at this time until this item passes.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you. Just a minute. The Member for St. Johns.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: My question, Mr. Chairperson, to the Minister has to deal with the unresolved matter of pay equity in the health care sector, a matter which was scheduled to have been resolved along with the universities by the end of September of 1988. It is clear an impasse has been arrived at. The tradition of consultation, conciliation, bargaining and reaching a compromise has ended, that period in our history has ended. We are now into a period of confrontation with the health care unions being forced to take this matter to the Labour Board.

We are all aware of the decision by the Labour Board with respect to the presentation of the health care

unions at that level. We have all been disappointed with developments around this area. We are disappointed with the inability of the Government itself to resolve this matter, to live up to the spirit of the pay equity legislation. We are disappointed with the way in which this matter was handled before the Labour Board.

My question to the Minister is: what is she planning to deal with this impasse? How will it be handled? What role is she playing to ensure that full pay equity is achieved for all members of our health care sector?

Mrs. Hammond: In the legislation there was a dispute mechanism that was built into it. There was also the 1 percent cap for four years. I understand the union has asked for a review. Although it may not have worked out to be what the unions had hoped for, the Labour Board came down with a decision, the unions have asked for a review and I will certainly await that decision.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: Mr. Chairperson, the Government proposal going into this whole dispute in effect, by all accounts and all analysis, calls for a settlement of pay equity that closes the gap only 70 percent of the way, and that was hinted at in the Labour Board report. It in fact concluded its report by suggesting there is nothing to come in the way of voluntary efforts to further close the gap. In our view of course, that is totally unacceptable and inappropriate. The whole concept in our view of pay equity means closing the gap fully. I am wondering how the Government could justify going into this whole process with a proposal that only closed the gap 70 percent of the way.

Mrs. Hammond: The area is still open for the gap to be closed through the collective bargaining process.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: Is the Minister saying she was not prepared with her colleagues to follow the full spirit of pay equity and abide by the spirit of the legislation and the intent of the legislation to close the gap through pay equity process 100 percent of the way?

Mrs. Hammond: Mr. Chairman, I imagine if the spirit of The Pay Equity Act had been to close the gap completely, there would never have been a cap put on by the former Government.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: I have no intention of getting into a debate on this matter. I think the Minister, if she reviews the history of this issue, will come to the realization the legislation in Manitoba is based on legislation in other jurisdictions with the understanding that it worked well and effectively, and that it was not meant to undercut the determination and the efforts to arrive at pay equity.

My question to the Minister is this: if that is the stumbling block, if that is the barrier, if the Minister is prepared to interpret the legislation so literally and so narrowly and not in fact follow through with the spirit of the legislation, is she then prepared to bring forward an amendment which removes the cap of 1 percent and calls simply, as more recent legislation in other jurisdictions is doing, for a general time period by which full pay equity must be achieved?

Mrs. Hammond: Yes, I think the Member is under misapprehension, that is not the word—

An Honourable Member: She is wrong.

Mrs. Hammond: She is wrong, right. I do not interpret the legislation, the Labour Board does, and the matter is under review right now.

* (1500)

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: Yes, I am not arguing right now around the Labour Board report, I am arguing with the approach of this Government on this matter. Since it is this Government and this Minister and her colleague the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) who have consistently fallen back on that notion of the 1 percent and used that as the basis for refusing to close the gap completely, my question to the Minister is this: since she is the one that has raised this, both in the House and now in Estimates, is she prepared to come forward with an amendment to the pay equity legislation that removes the 1 percent cap in the legislation?

Mrs. Hammond: The gap can still be closed through bargaining. We certainly support the pay equity act and did at the time, but I think that until we see what happens to the review process I would not want to comment on it any further.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: Mr. Chairperson, at issue is not what can be done in future bargaining around this issue. At issue is the adherence to pay equity in the public health sector according to the legislation and the spirit of that legislation. What we have is a dispute between the parties with a proposal from the Government, notwithstanding and long before the Labour Board process, that proposed addressing this wage gap only partially and using as a crutch a section in the Act that specifies 1 percent per year over four years versus a proposal from the health care unions which has made specific recommendations and very sensible approaches around the issue in terms of delayed implementation to allow the Government to achieve the objectives of the legislation within the same period of time without costing taxpayers more.

My question to the Minister is, given that is the essence of the debate, the issue at hand, the reason for going to the Labour Board to begin with, and given the fact that the Minister has consistently tried to deflect attention from this issue by referring to the legislation and suggesting that the problem rests with the former administration for having incorporated that into the legislation, I would ask her clearly, and I would ask for an answer at this point, is she prepared to accept, to propose herself an amendment to the legislation which removes that cap or prepared to accept an amendment proposed by another party?

Mrs. Hammond: Mr. Chair, throughout this process I think the Government has lived up to its legal obligation. We recognize when there comes to be a dispute that one side or the other is going to, I suppose, be looked on as the winner. In this case the dispute mechanism

which was in place was used and it was all according to the legislation and to the bargaining.

So because of the 1 percent, they went to the Labour Board. The Labour Board ruled in favour of the management position. I believe that it is under review now, and I do not think anything further really can be said on the matter.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: Well, a lot more can be said, Mr. Chairperson, I am not going to dwell on it, but it is very much a disappointment, as the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan) says beside me.

The fact of the matter is that the Government had the ability to resolve this issue to achieve full pay equity in the health care sector in the four-year stipulated time period if it had the will to do so, and it was prepared to put its money where its mouth is when it comes to equality between women and men.

The Government has chosen to use technical arguments and literal interpretations of legislation in order to not achieve full pay equity and to avoid dealing with this issue in the best interests of the health care workers who are predominantly female as the Minister knows.

I would ask one more time, since it is the Minister who stood up in the House and who, at the outset of this discussion, said it here as well, that the problem is the 1 percent. Is she prepared to bring forward an amendment to the legislation, or accept an amendment to the legislation, removing the 1 percent cap?

Mrs. Hammond: This matter is under review by the Labour Board, and I will certainly not be planning anything while that is happening.

Ms. Avis Gray (Ellice): Mr. Chairperson, can the Minister tell us, in regard to this issue, why, given that the issue right now is under review by the Labour Board, as she indicates, although they have already ruled, what is precluding her and her Government from being proactive and addressing this issue so that in fact full pay equity can be achieved within the time frame, and so that full pay equity can be achieved for those very many health workers, many of whom are women?

Mrs. Hammond: Mr. Chair, the Government has lived up to the requirements under the legislation, and while it is under review, certainly we will not be doing anything further. The Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) has indicated that the money has been there ready and waiting for the parties to have, and they can still close the gap through negotiations.

Ms. Gray: I am wondering if the Minister is prepared to answer the question that I just asked. Is there a reason, and there may be but I do not know what it is, why her Government cannot go ahead and look at the legislation, or look at what alternatives they have so that in fact full pay equity could be achieved even though this issue is now under review.

Mrs. Hammond: We are always looking at legislation, and certainly when an issue like this comes up it will

be reviewed and we would be taking a look at it. Whether we decide to make a change, I cannot say at the time.

Ms. Gray: Now I am confused, because before the Minister said they were not looking at the legislation, and now I thought I heard her say they are looking at the legislation.

Mrs. Hammond: I think the Member is mistaken. I do not think I ever said I was not looking at legislation. At times we are checking legislation and when something like this happens then it always is discussed. It is not that we would rule out doing something, but right now we will not be doing something.

Ms. Gray: It sounds like an answer from the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson), which I am sure the Minister of Labour will take as a compliment anyway.

I would ask the Minister: is she saying that her Government is now actively looking at this pay equity legislation, given the recent Labour Board ruling?

Mrs. Hammond: Mr. Chair, we are following the law. As long as this is under review, we are not planning to do anything at this time.

* (1510)

I would like to make mention of the remark that the Member said about the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson). I do not think it helps any of us to have that type of remark made about another Member.

An Honourable Member: Oh, think back a few years.

Mrs. Hammond: Oh, think back, what do you mean think back a few years?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Order.

Mrs. Hammond: I do not think that is helpful.

Ms. Gray: I think the Minister is obviously interpreting my remark as negative, which could have been positive.

An Honourable Member: A little sarcasm.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member for Ellice.

Ms. Gray: Mr. Chairperson, does the Minister believe, given the escalating health care costs and given the restraints which hospitals in particular seem to indicate that they are under, that there is much possibility of the wage gap being closed through the next collective bargaining process?

Mrs. Hammond: Mr. Chair, that is speculative at best, and I could not possibly answer that question.

Ms. Gray: The Minister has said that certainly the wage gap can be closed through collective bargaining. Does she feel that is quite a reasonable, possible solution?

Mrs. Hammond: In collective bargaining there are a number of factors that are taken into place. If that particular area was a priority, that is a possibility they could. I am not saying that they will, but there is always a possibility that they could.

Ms. Gray: Mr. Chairperson, it would sound from the Minister's answer—and maybe I am reading into her answer—that she is saying that there is that possibility. I guess the question is: what is the probability if this Government has decided they are going to leave it up to collective bargaining to close that wage gap? Does the Minister feel that is a wise thing to do on the part of her Government?

Mrs. Hammond: I guess as Minister of Labour I should not predict what the unions will bring to the table. I could not possibly predict that. What I am saying is that it is open for negotiation.

Ms. Gray: The Opposition Parties both had indicated their disappointment at the Labour Board ruling. What was the Minister of Labour's response to that initial ruling?

Mrs. Hammond: As Labour Minister, I respect the Labour Board's ruling. It is not up to me to decide whether it was right or whether it was wrong.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: Perhaps the Minister cannot do that. Perhaps she could indicate to us what reasons account for the fact that the written decision by the Labour Board did not make any reference to the detailed proposals by the health care workers and the health care unions.

Mrs. Hammond: The Labour Board considered all the matters that were put before it, and I believe that was one of the reasons the union has asked for a review. I cannot comment any further.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: It is I think apparent the health care unions have asked for a review for a number of reasons, one being that it is clear, from the written decision of the Labour Board, that very little consideration was given to their very detailed proposals for a delayed implementation proposal that would have helped the Government resolve its dilemma around this issue.

I would ask one final question in this area before we ask the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) to come back in, pending any other questions on this matter. I think it is curious on the part of many Members in the Chamber that this Government and this Minister is prepared to go to the wall when it wants to change legislation, when it wants to repeal legislation, as we have seen in the case of final offer selection. Yet, when it comes to a matter such as achieving full pay equity for workers who have been undervalued and underpaid for decades and decades, this Government is prepared to say its hands are tied from full implementation of pay equity and give no assurances that it will go to the wall to change legislation to deal with that concern.

I would ask the Minister, how does she justify on the one hand going to the wall to repeal legislation, to

change legislation, on a matter like final offer selection, but when in a case of pay equity for health care workers, predominately women, she is not prepared to at least deal with her own concern, the thing that prevents her and her Government from acting, and give us a fuller answer and more assurances about changing legislation on pay equity, if that is her major barrier and major concern.

Mrs. Hammond: I guess hindsight is a wonderful thing. When we are looking at bringing in the FOS legislation that is something that we said we would do. When the NDP brought in their pay equity legislation they set it out in a certain way. It did not work out to the satisfaction obviously of the Member. We certainly will never know what they might have ended up doing. I imagine, knowing how they have operated in the past, that they probably would have kept to the letter of the law as we have.

I certainly do not want to see any of the women in our economy treated unjustly. I do believe when we look over this legislation and when we review all the things that have happened once it is all completed there may well be changes in the future, but I cannot say that right now at this time.

I just feel we have lived up to the letter of the law and we have left it with the mechanism that was put in place by the former Government to deal with situations like this. I believe now that it is under review with the Labour Board that is about all that I can comment on.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: One final comment on this. It is clear, only history can indicate how individuals and Parties have performed on these matters in the past. We will never know how the NDP would have dealt with this issue if it had been faced with it, except I think it is clear, and I do not think the Minister can dispute this, that when it is choosing between the interests of women and the interests of business, the former NDP administration always chose on behalf of the interests of women as evidenced by the introduction of final offer selection, something that benefits women and is currently supported by women, and moved on an issue like pay equity legislation, supported by women and clearly benefiting women.

The record of the Conservative Government, and this Minister, to date on both matters indicates that she is more prepared to listen to the interests of business than she is prepared to listen to the interests of women.

I think we can call in the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards).

Mrs. Hammond: I want to remind the Member that when this legislation was passed, it was passed unanimously in the House.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the item pass—the Member for St. Johns.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: We have more questions on pay equity. We would just like to call in the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards). While he is doing that I will be prepared to carry on.

Carrying on into another difficult area and controversial area in the whole pay equity area, there is a great deal of uncertainty, confusion and skepticism about this Government's commitment on pay equity, and particularly as it relates to the extension of pay equity to other sectors of the economy, particularly school boards and municipalities.

In the last Speech from the Throne of this Government, May 18, 1989, the Government indicated that consultations will continue with school boards and municipalities to establish a timetable for extending pay equity in these sectors.

Could the Minister tell us what exactly are her plans with respect to extension of pay equity to school boards and municipalities?

* (1520)

Mrs. Hammond: We met with the City of Winnipeg and we have formed a working group with the Pay Equity Bureau and the City of Winnipeg to get started to get all the numbers in place. They are working actively. We have also met with the MAST and the umbrella groups in the school divisions and are planning to meet—in fact we were hoping to have the meetings going into Estimates with the school divisions. We were going to meet with representatives of the school divisions so that they could start working out a formula for pay equity.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: What does that mean exactly? Is this groundwork that the Minister is undertaking as a forerunner to legislation? Is the Minister legislating pay equity when it comes to school boards and municipalities or not?

Mrs. Hammond: We are working with the City of Winnipeg at present, which represents about 85 percent of all the municipal workers. We are also going to meet with the school boards. We are trying to set some time lines, and we need to see just what is different in those sectors. We would like to have them start bringing in pay equity.

Some of the school divisions in the city, I think two or three—Assiniboine South has started. We are wanting to work with the divisions that have embarked on this so that they end up not all over the place but working on the same playing field, you might say.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: Am I to interpret the Minister's remarks to mean that her efforts extend to helping co-ordinate voluntary efforts in this regard, but she has no intention of extending pay equity legislation to school boards and municipalities?

Mrs. Hammond: We are trying to give them a time frame to work voluntarily on this. We may be bringing in legislation on it, but we want to wait and see how it is working and how we will bring the legislation in.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: Women have to wait and see again, after decades and decades of waiting and seeing and not getting any closer to equality or true pay equity.

On what basis is the Minister making a decision to not extend legislation to school boards and municipalities and instead pursue the age-old voluntary approach that has failed women dismally for a long period of our history?

Mrs. Hammond: Most of the sectors have unions, and the legislation was based on collective bargaining. What we have indicated to the people that we have met with is that if they can do it through the collective bargaining process and that is the process they are starting with then that would be fine, it could be done. If not then we would be looking at legislation.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: —which is a nice round about way of saying this Government is not prepared to extend legislation to school boards and municipalities. It is contrary to the advice, at least the previous advice, of her department which recommended against the voluntary approach because: a) it did not work; and b) it leads to a scattergun approach, a hodgepodge of pay equity plans that do not all end up meaning the same thing and are not all easily co-ordinated.

After a year of negotiations, or should I say consultations, which I believe began in December '88, where she met with all the relevant unions and all the relevant organizations and all the interested individuals—there are pages and pages of them which ended and led up to the statement in the Speech from the Throne in May of '89—can the Minister explain how she did not make any conclusions and deductions based on that consultation process and now has embarked upon a further one in order to determine what direction to take with respect to pay equity in the school board and municipal sectors of our province?

Mrs. Hammond: We are going to be giving the conclusions of that report to all the Parties. What we are doing with the municipality, with the City of Winnipeg and with the school division is working out a framework that they can all work from.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: —working on a voluntary framework that does not compel them to do anything and has no enforcement mechanism whatsoever.

Mr. Chairperson, I think what we are hearing from the Minister today is absolutely appalling. She has, in the past, refused to answer these questions directly. What we are hearing today is a clear statement from the Minister that she has decided to halt the progress in this province full stop in terms of pay equity for women and is prepared to turn back the clock and go back to approaches that have been tried and rejected.

The reason a legislative program was begun in this province was because the people themselves, and particularly women themselves, in this province have indicated that the voluntary approach does not work. Their situation is not improving as a result of that kind of approach. Action is long overdue for bringing in place, putting in place pay equity to ensure that women are paid on the basis of equal value for work performed.

Mr. Chairman, what we are hearing from the Minister today is that she is not at all prepared to carry on in

that direction and continue on with a framework that achieves greater equality for women and does achieve pay equity inasmuch as it is possible within a pro-active legislative framework. What consultations and what research has been done, what new research and new consultations have been done to indicate that there has been a change in thinking and a required change in approach to take us back in time, to stop us dead in our tracks in this province in terms of legislative pay equity?

* (1530)

Mrs. Hammond: I am advised that the consultations show there are some problems especially with the school divisions. The record is clear, we are working to make sure that pay equity does come about and whether it is legislated right now, we are hoping to do it through the collective bargaining process. We are hoping to get a strategy that all the divisions can work toward.

We are going to give a time frame to bring it about, and whether we end up legislating or whether it is done through the collective bargaining system as Newfoundland has done in these areas—because of some of the problems with the school divisions we do not want to make an error in legislation that is going to create problems. We want to make sure that we are working with the divisions. Certainly the City of Winnipeg has started working right now.

I think that although the Member sees it only as being done one way, we do believe we can achieve the same goals through the direction that we are taking.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: The Minister references her consultation process and uses that as a way to back up what she is doing. I would ask her to table the results of that consultation process and the presentations made by all individuals and organizations, something we have been asking the Minister to provide for a considerably long period of time. I remind the Minister and all Members of her Government that we have been dealing with nothing but a wait and see, dragged-out review process that is producing no sign of action. It appears to be leading us nowhere, where there is no plan of action.

We went from the election of this Government in April of '88 to December '88 where they did nothing. Well, I should not say nothing, they did cut back the Pay Equity Bureau, reduced staff in terms of funds that were planned in order to carry on a meaningful program of pay equity. We went from that to December of '88 where they announced a consultation process, to hearing nothing about the results of that process, being able to get no access to information, getting a letter in response to our request for such information on July 27, 1989, where the Minister is still saying she cannot possibly provide that information because a summary report is not yet ready.

Today we find out—we are still not getting indication of where the summary report is and what is in it except through big references to the fact that consultations have directed this Minister and led her in the direction

of continuing on a scattergun, voluntary approach that we all know is not in the interests of women. It may be in the interests of school boards, it may be in the interest of the mayor of the City of Winnipeg, who obviously are going to be concerned about not spending a penny if they do not have to in terms of achieving pay equity, yet the Minister is not prepared to address those concerns, table the information, and come clean on this issue. I would ask her to table every single piece of presentation that was made during that process and the summary report today, if possible.

Mrs. Hammond: Yes, the summary report is not available today, but I understand it is a large undertaking, the analysis of the consultations. I know that the Member would like to go in a certain direction. We are going by consultation with the school divisions, and we are doing it through the umbrella organizations.

In fact one school division has gone ahead and done the process themselves. So we will have a guide to go by. Some of the smaller divisions will have a more difficult time. We want to make sure that we are going in the right direction with this, but pay equity will come in with the school divisions and with the City of Winnipeg.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: My final comment and question then, Mr. Chairperson. Women have been told that for centuries. They have been told to wait. Wait for your fair share of recognition and remuneration while the powers that be, and those who pay and those who use you as a cheap source of labour, have the time to figure out how they are going to do it. I do not think this is anything but another example on the part of this Minister and this Government to totally ignore the interests of women in favour of the interests of business, corporate individuals and organizations in our society. There is no excuse and no argument for delaying one more moment.

My final question to the Minister would be, although it is perhaps a rhetorical question or a question for which I already have the answer, is the Minister prepared at all to look seriously at the private sector?

I would assume, if she is not prepared to do anything but a voluntary approach in the school board and municipality sector of this province, then she is not prepared at all to give any kind of direction and any kind of pro-active stance to business in this province. I would ask, in the interests of women in this province, in the interests of equality, if she has any interests, inclination and intention of advancing equality in the private sector, and pay equity in the private sector, on a legislative, pro-active, mandated basis?

Mrs. Hammond: Mr. Chair, we have indicated that we would not be bringing in pay equity in the private sector, but we are working. We have met with the private sector, and are willing and able to give them any help or any resource.

As far as not being interested in women, it is fine for this Member to talk about something that she sees as high profile, but when it came to battered women, this was the Minister that sat while children got a per

diem of \$6.90 in the shelters and \$13.90, starved them to death, when we increased it to \$45.00.

So I do not think we had better get into an argument about interest to women, because I know personally what we have done, but I also know that in spite of the fact that, as Members of other Parties, we may disagree on issues, I know that as women we all have the interests of women of Manitoba at heart and how we go about it are different stories. I do not think we will get into an argument about interests of women.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the item pass—pass; 2.(k)(2) Other Expenditures, \$101,500—pass.

Item 2.(m) Labour Adjustment; 2.(m)(1) Salaries, \$177,200—the Member for St. James.

Mr. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, by way of opening comment in this area—

* (1540)

Mr. Chairman: We are going to terminate the committee at this time.

SUPPLY—EDUCATION AND TRAINING

* (1440)

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Neil Gaudry): Would the Committee of Supply come to order, please. This section of the Committee of Supply has been dealing with the Estimates of the Department of Education. We are on item 1.(b)(2) Other Expenditures, \$67,100—the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

Mrs. Iva Yeo (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Acting Chairperson, Tuesday we were just getting our questioning moving, and I had asked the Minister a question on small schools.

The discussion paper, or the guidelines for school closure which were submitted in 1982 are still in action. I had asked if there was any move to modify or change these. The Minister indicated I believe that, no, they were still in place and would continue to be in place. I was under the impression that, in fact, there was some work that was under way with the intent of sometime this year revising those guidelines. I would submit that as a question to the Minister.

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Acting Chairman, from time to time we do review guidelines with regard to closure of schools, small schools especially. I would have to say, yes, Public Schools Finance Board staff and Public Schools Finance Board are reviewing guidelines to ensure whether or not we have to change them or leave them as they were. As you know, our rural areas are becoming more sparsely populated and there is always a need to re-examine the guidelines as they exist today.

Mrs. Yeo: I would like to know if the Minister is planning to develop any sort of comprehensive type of a plan that would co-ordinate the maintenance and the

building of schools in the next say 10 to 15 years with the changing demographics in mind and with the possibility of taking into consideration some of the things that will be implemented by the High School Review?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Acting Chairman, I think that is a situation that is continuous, because when we take a look at not only our rural population but even our urban population we find that there are shifts and concentrations of students, that indeed there is a need to take a look at not only the question of small schools, the criteria, the maintenance, the rebuilding, there is a need to take a look at our geographic boundaries, if you like, and see whether in fact they meet the needs of the populations in the communities.

For that reason my department has taken the steps to meet with community leaders, groups, education leaders and education groups to see what their views are with regard to boundaries, with regard to services. It is more than just a question of buildings and closures of schools. It is a question of services being provided and programs being provided. You couple that all with the boundaries as they exist today and perhaps what should happen as we get into the '90s and into the 21st century.

Indeed the High School Review is a very important document and, I know we have talked about it a great deal, Opposition Members have wondered when the final review is going to be done or when the final announcement is going to be done. Indeed this is an extremely important document for us in the 1990s and into the 21st century, because we cannot spend hundreds of thousands of dollars reviewing a curriculum every two years. We know that whatever we set down today is going to impact on students that are going through our high schools over the next 10 years at least.

Therefore, we have to be very careful, and I know it is taking some time, it is a very laborious exercise, but indeed when we do approach it we hope we will have covered most of the angles that are out there and most of the concerns that are out there. It is not an easy challenge, and I will admit, I will be the first to admit it, but we are progressing very slowly but very positively toward a solution.

Mrs. Yeo: I am sorry the Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik) has just left. I cannot see him.

I want to just put on the record that I certainly am not opposed to the aspect of a K to eight. He has suggested a K to nine school by the questions that were asked today during Question Period. I really do not know how that assumption came forward, because depending on what the recommendations are from the High School Review Committee, if they believe and in fact the Minister and his department believes that nine to 12 should be the high school, then certainly it may well be more cost effective to build in the future, any future schools as K to eight schools.

I think that is part of the reason why we are so desperate in Manitoba to hear what the direction is

going to be, because school divisions, educators, parents, communities are looking for direction, looking for leadership. Certainly the K to eight concept or the K to nine, if the High School Review people and the Minister's department feel that high schools should remain basically as 10 to 12, I have no difficulty with that whatsoever. I felt compelled to put that on the record.

The Minister did indicate that he and his department have been in contact with numbers of people from the community. Can he tell me whether he has received proposals from any school divisions to study the need for schools in the future in their particular area, and if so, how many does he expect to be funding, any of these reviews, or what kind of assistance would he give to school divisions or districts in doing studies like this? Does he have any—there are three questions there I guess—plan to co-ordinate any reviews?

* (1450)

Mr. Derkach: I do not want to mislead the Member. I guess I was not quite clear on the last question. With regard to the High School Review, it is not a High School Review Committee to review the review, it is the Policy Advisory Committee which is going to be making recommendations to me in a report at the end of the month.

With regard to studies by school divisions, I am not familiar with any specific study that is underway at the present time with regard to curriculum by individual school divisions, but that does not necessarily always come to our attention. Indeed some school divisions may be carrying out surveys or studies of their own for their own particular area and we would only learn of it by them reporting it to us. The autonomous nature of school boards is that they do have that flexibility to make and enter into studies where they feel those are necessary.

I would ask the Member maybe to clarify the last question.

Mrs. Yeo: I find it somewhat amusing to hear the Minister talk about the autonomous nature of school divisions and school boards, when in fact Winnipeg No. 1 School Division several times has asked the Public Schools Finance Board for replacement of Margaret Scott School. The question that I asked was, have you received any proposals from school divisions to study, to help them study the need in the future potential for new schools to be built, and if you had received proposals or had dialogue with some of the school divisions, could they anticipate some cost-sharing or some personnel from the department that would assist them in doing these studies?

Mr. Derkach: I would like to address the autonomy of school boards, first of all, Mr. Acting Chairman. Let it be very clear that, yes, school boards have autonomy, and they have responsibility. If a school board wants to replace a particular school, they would make application to the Public Schools Finance Board.

Public Schools Finance Board has the responsibility to ensure that in fact we are not duplicating facilities

that in fact there is a genuine need. The Public Schools Finance Board will conduct their own need survey, their own assessment of an entire area, because we are talking about taxpayer dollars. It is public money belonging to the taxpayers of this province.

This Government, and any Government, has responsibility to ensure that we spend those dollars very wisely, and that we in fact are not duplicating facilities where others are available. We have seen that happen in the past. We see some brand new schools, some very new schools, as a matter of fact, across this province that are closed. Perhaps that was a result of poor planning. Perhaps that was a result of many things. I am sure the Member understands what I am talking about. It is sad to see buildings that cost millions of dollars closed because we do not have a student population there.

I think we have to avoid that kind of a situation at all costs. For that reason the Public Schools Finance Board does an analysis, a very thorough analysis, of whether or not there is another way to accommodate students within an existing area. We have demands from school divisions coming constantly, but nevertheless we have to screen them, we have to ensure that there is responsibility on our part in the way we approach any of these projects.

Yes, there is autonomy in school boards, but that autonomy is limited because of the responsibility we as Legislatures, we as Governments, have within this province.

With regard to the projects, I know of one project and that is Evergreen School Division where they have undergone a study of their educational facilities. As a matter of fact, they have made recommendation to the Public Schools Finance Board on what they would like to see as their future kind of use and amalgamation, if you like, of educational facilities.

That proposal has come forth. Indeed Public Schools Finance Board will be looking at it as they do all other projects. If you ask if there is any kind of specific monetary contribution toward that kind of a study, I would have to say that we do not get involved in funding a study in any particular school division for the purpose of rationalizing their educational space.

Mrs. Yeo: I asked about monetary funding and also about assistance in the way of personnel in documentation, et cetera, from the department.

Can the Minister tell us what impact the anticipated changes in the various curricula might have on the need for physical space in the future? Have there been any studies done on proposed changes in curriculum of any kind that would change the need for physical space?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Acting Chairman, if we were to look at the High School Review, one of the recommendations in that is we should move the Grade 9 students into the high school area.

In some schools this can be accommodated very easily and that is a change in curriculum, of course. It

Thursday, January 25, 1990

is a change in the way we approach education in Grade 9. It also means a significant change in physical institutions around the province.

Now if we were to move ahead with a recommendation like that, before we could even suggest that we should move in that direction, we would have to analyze several things. One, first of all, the impact on curriculum; and secondly, the impact on the dollars that would be required to make the shift because there are many schools that are K to 9 schools today where you would have to move the Grade 9s out and that would mean expanding other facilities.

So that study would have to be made, but that study cannot be made until such time that I see the final recommendation from the advisory committee, and that will come at the end of this month. Once we see that, and if there is indeed a will by Government and by the department to move in that direction, then those studies will be undertaken. At this present time we do not have the specific studies on how curriculum would affect space.

Mrs. Yeo: I think that is exactly why there is some urgency and some anxiety, and the anxiety continues because everytime we are sort of told that it is coming, its coming, something else happens to delay and delay. I think there are, I know there are, people out there across Manitoba who are saying, please tell us, what are the directives going to be, we cannot make a move without this kind of direction.

The people in the rural communities are suffering I think because there is some concern that with the declining enrollment there may be a move toward some, what could be hasty and ill-advised, school closures and amalgamations in the rural communities.

Can the Minister give the assurance that this in fact is not the thrust of this particular Government?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Acting Chairman, one of the things we have to understand is that this province does not have a bottomless pit of money and so, therefore, we have throughout this province an education system that is working. We are not anticipating implementing changes whereby we are going to see massive school closures, or massive requirements for new structures.

We did move on several issues. We took the moratorium off the vocational and industrial arts area and that has cost us some money, but indeed there was a need for that kind of initiative. We have seen some schools now construct industrial arts and vocational ed facilities where they needed them, but I am not anticipating any kind of a move by this Government to vastly change the education system where it is going to impact in a very substantial and in a very harsh way on the kinds of facilities we have throughout our province.

* (1500)

Mrs. Yeo: So what the Minister is saying that there is a continuing role for educational facilities of all levels from K to 12 in the rural communities and towns?

I think I will turn it over to the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), unless there is a response.

Mr. Derkach: I would just like to respond to that comment, Mr. Acting Chairman, because I think we have to couple that with the demographics of an area, and if in fact a decision is made by the school board to close a school because of the population drop, they have to follow the guidelines. So we cannot say that what is out there now will be there forever, we have to understand that as our province grows, changes and evolves, certainly there will be changes that will have to be addressed by school boards and by us.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Gaudry): Shall the item pass—pass; 1.(b)(2) Other Expenditures, \$67,100—pass.

1.(c) Research and Planning; 1.(c)(1) Salaries, \$412,300—the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

Mrs. Yeo: When I think about a signboard in our own school division in which I reside and is very beloved to me, I think it was last year when the signboard said something about the kindergarten classes that are entering the schools today will be the graduates of the year 2000. That sort of puts upon us in the education fields across the province a rather onerous position.

I looked at a report that stated how concerned many of the individuals are throughout North America with the level of reading that some of our graduates have. Some of the statistics in fact that we looked at yesterday in the Winnipeg 2000 Report that came out talked about Manitoba having the fewest number I believe it was of people with Grade 12 education. That concerns me.

I am wondering what research this particular Government has done? What planning mechanisms are in place to address the concerns that many parents and in fact students have today? Certainly there must be changes for the graduates of the year 2000 to assist them with their level of reading, to improve their level of reading skills.

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Acting Chairman, one of the tools that we have for assessing how students are doing, are faring in a variety of courses is through the assessment program that has been running in the department for many years. What we did a year ago or a year and one-half ago was to try and speed up the process of getting the assessment results back to the schools. In that way schools and school divisions across the province could react much more quickly to the kinds of adjustments that they need to make to their curriculum.

In addition our Planning and Research Branch is constantly vigilant of the kinds of new programs that need to be put into the curriculum. They are constantly reviewing the new programs that are coming on stream. Indeed the time has come now I think to take a very serious look at the entire program area from kindergarten through Grade 8 or Grade 9. I think we are at that stage today because it has been some time since that whole area was reviewed.

Thursday, January 25, 1990

Before we do that I think we have to establish some criteria. Before we launch into a study like that I think it is important that we finally put to bed the High School Review, because we are going to have ongoing reviews all the time.

Staff in the department at the present time are putting together criteria that might be used to do a review of the early years of education and the middle years of education. In doing that we have to keep in mind what the community is telling us, what parents are telling us, what the business community is telling us and what academics are telling us. I think that all of these things are being taken into serious consideration when we are developing the criteria for establishing the review, if you like, of middle and early years education.

I believe that yes, the education system across this country has been under some criticism, because we find a dropout rate that is unacceptable. We find that we have illiterate people who are coming out of our high schools. Through our task force on literacy we found that indeed there are areas that need to be addressed.

I think we are moving in the right direction. Given the resources that we have, I think we are spending them effectively. Hopefully over the next year or the next two years we will see some important strides in addressing some of the deficiencies, because by and large I think our basic education system is fine. It is in good health, but I think it can be improved. That is what we need to be striving for continually.

Mrs. Yeo: I would hope that our basic education is in good health. I think there might be a number of people out in the communities that would argue that there is a great deal of improvement that could take place. By the year 2000 the graduates are going to need a tremendous education merely to obtain a decent job. I believe the statistic that was located in the report that a lot of us have just glanced through said that Winnipeg, not Manitoba, Winnipeg has the highest, is the city with the highest number of non-high school graduates. I think the statistic was 45 percent, which to me appears to be tremendously high.

One of the things that this article suggested, and I am not saying whether I agree or not, I am just wondering whether there has been any research into perhaps doing as Japan has done, which now has 240 eight-hour days in a school year.

I know that my own daughter spent a year attending a school in northern France. She went to school Monday to Saturday, albeit Saturday was only eight until noon. When she came back to Winnipeg and back into the family we had a long discussion about that. She in fact said in many ways this was a tremendous benefit.

I am just wondering if there is any move on the part or thoughts on the part of the Research and Planning people in the Department of Education or the Minister himself to perhaps look at modifying or some changes that would increase the length of the school day?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Acting Chairman, if we continue to place greater and greater demands upon educators to

cram more material into the school day now, we will eventually have to take a very careful look at the school day and the school year. I am not prepared at this moment or during our mandate now to alter significantly the school day.

If we take a look around us we find that there are jurisdictions that have even shorter school years and shorter school hours. I think we have to look at what we do within the school day that is there today. I think we have to look carefully at the in-service days that we take from the instructional day as well. Those are areas that we I think need to look at very carefully before we go into expanding the school year or expanding the school day.

Because of the make-up of our province, we have today children who are getting on the school bus as early as 25 after seven in the morning and returning home at five or later. For those youngsters I think the school day is plenty long enough now, but I think we will have to look down the road at innovative ways in which we can address some of the way we use our time in the school day.

Mrs. Yeo: Under Activity Identification, it states that the department conducts surveys, program evaluations, et cetera, and I wonder if it would be possible, not today, but at some time to obtain perhaps a computer printout that would indicate some of these surveys and evaluations that are done.

* (1510)

Mr. Derkach: Yes, certainly, Mr. Acting Chairman, I would be pleased to table this information for the Member now.

Mrs. Yeo: Evaluation of programs, I believe, is one of the important things, and because of the pandemic of AIDS and the tremendous amount of research and information that is coming, almost on a daily basis, new information, new facts, new statistics, new ways of prevention, I would hope that the education of this topic, the way of delivering education, is evaluated very, very frequently.

I would ask if that in fact is being done and ask what ongoing attempts are made to obtain resource materials for our teachers who are having to make this very sensitive topic—communicate it very effectively to our young people and hope that there are resource materials available for them?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Acting Chairman, yes, in fact the reason we made changes to the current AIDS program was because we had evaluated what was in our school system before and had determined that indeed we were not spending enough hours on the education program in the high school and that there was a need to expand the program even into the lower grade levels.

We have an excellent person on staff in Mrs. Joyce MacMartin who has been monitoring the program very, very carefully. We have the Manitoba Education Council on AIDS who have had input into not only the evaluation but into the new program. This is an ongoing process.

Thursday, January 25, 1990

During the next year, we will be evaluating the program that started in January, we will be evaluating the program as it has been reorganized in the high school, and if we have to make alterations we will do that on an annual basis if that is necessary.

Mrs. Yeo: The Minister referred to MECA or the Manitoba Education Council on AIDS. Is that council still active, and if so, how many times has the Minister, the Minister's department, met in 1989 with this particular group of individuals who have been working very hard?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Acting Chairman, yes, the committee is still functioning. I cannot tell you exactly how many times they have met over the last year, but I can certainly get that information. They meet occasionally to do an analysis of the program when staff feel that they need the input. Secondly, during the writing and the evaluation and the recommendation of the current program, there were meetings with staff. I have met with the committee once in the last year. The committee is really designed to meet with staff and to give direction in that way.

Mrs. Yeo: One last question on this particular appropriation, the universities, the community colleges, have stated their concerns, some of the people who teach within those facilities, about in fact the level of mainly English sentence structure ability of a student to even know what an essay is, let alone put one together, how to do research, how to use libraries. There are all kinds of concerns that are raised by some of the professors in the universities. Is there co-ordination with the universities? Are there people from the facilities representative on the committees that are doing the studies and doing the research and doing the planning for the future?

Mr. Derkach: Yes, Mr. Acting Chairman, we try to involve as many people as we possibly can on such committees from the post-secondary areas. I think that is an important aspect. I think there has to be better articulation between the high schools and the post-secondary institutions, whether they are the community colleges or the universities.

The universities have signaled to us—since I have been in Government anyway—that there is a need to address the quality of English, if you like, or language arts and the quality of mathematics and science at the high school level. They have indicated that there is a variation of quality, if you like, from various parts of the province of students who come in and attempt to take a first year of university programming.

So for that reason we have insisted that one of the focal points of the whole High School Review has to be quality and standards. This is a response to what the universities have been telling us. When we have our committees meet we try to incorporate as many people as we can from those areas to give us advice so that we, as an education community, move together.

Mrs. Yeo: I should never say one last question, because answers bring to mind other questions. I think this will be the last.

The Minister talked about the different levels from high school to high school and the different standards, et cetera. On Tuesday when I presented opening remarks I was concerned about the term, equal access to education, which appears in the front of the Estimates book and whether in fact there was equity in education. Do you have statistics, do you have anything you can share with us in writing, any documentation, that would indicate which high schools were performing perhaps not up to snuff or the differences seen from school to school or district to district?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Acting Chairman, that is kind of a dangerous thing to get into, with school divisions especially because once we start identifying that a particular school division or a particular school is deficient in some of the basic skills that are required for a high school education then we are evaluating that particular school and perhaps even that particular teacher, about which there has been a lot of controversy over the last few years. The only mechanisms we have in place right now are the assessment mechanisms, the assessment tests that are conducted on an annual basis in various subject areas and the CTBS tests that are written.

Indeed, if we had an evaluation program—which would not necessarily evaluate the teacher's performance or the child's performance—of some kind throughout the province we would indeed be able to identify where those deficiencies were and where perhaps we need to put more resources and perhaps where we have to put more professional development and training.

Yes, that is something that we all in this Legislature would agree needs to be done. That is an area that the advisory committee on High School Review is considering very, very seriously.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Gaudry): Shall the item pass—the Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Acting Chairman, I just have a couple of questions. The Minister tabled a paper outlining some of the activities, I gather, of research and planning. Is that where this list comes from? It says 1988-89 and it is a list of projects dealing with review of south-central regional elementary science project, Manitoba Student Aid defaults by institution type. Did you receive it?

Mr. Acting Chairperson, there are a number of very interesting questions on there, particularly for myself the one on school smoking policy. It says, planning in process. I am wondering if the Minister can indicate whether there has been any approach to the Department of Education from school boards with respect to a provincial policy on smoking in school.

Mr. Derkach: No, I am not aware of any particular school division coming to the department and asking for provincial policy. That is a matter that really is within the jurisdiction of a school division. I think a community elects representatives to a school board who have the responsibility to do the will of their taxpayers and the

Thursday, January 25, 1990

people who put them in office. I think that is one of those areas where there needs to be a decision made by the school board. However, in a broader sense there is nothing wrong with the department looking at the broad area of smoking and then perhaps provide advice, provide assistance, provide some suggestion to school boards. I would be very reluctant at going in and saying, your school shall now be smoke-free, and that is mandated by the department.

* (1520)

Mr. Storie: Mr. Acting Chairperson, I am a little reluctant at the Minister's timidity when it comes to this area. Clearly his federal counterparts have shown a great deal of leadership when it comes to the issue of protecting people's health from those who choose to smoke, particularly in public places. I think the Minister is perfectly aware that there are a number of school divisions who have shown leadership and banned smoking in their schools. There are a number of individual schools who will have taken that initiative for themselves. I do not think there needs to be any more evidence presented to the public that smoking is a dangerous practice and it is not right to have people exposed to it, never mind the question of whether having people in our schools is a good example for the youth of our province. The simple question of whether it is dangerous to their health has to be addressed, and I am very disappointed that the Minister is so timid on this question.

Mr. Acting Chairperson—(interjection)—oh, it is Alex. That makes sense. The list here does not include any of the activities for the coming year. I am wondering if, for example, the department, or the Planning and Research Department, is considering doing a more thorough examination of where our high school students are going, what percentage to work, what percentage to university, to community college? Do we have any up-to-date statistics that would be of use, for example, to those planning in the faculty of education or in our community colleges or universities?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Acting Chairman, the Education Ministers across this country, I think, have had some concern about getting to know exactly the answers to the question that the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) poses with regard to where our students and what is happening with our graduates. Indeed, in the last year the council struck a committee and struck a direction in determining what in fact does happen to these students. It is the National Indicators Project that the Member for Flin Flon may be somewhat familiar with and that is now in progress. Hopefully within the next year we will have some idea as to what is happening to high school students not just in Manitoba but indeed across the country.

I would like to go back to the question and the comments made about smoking, Mr. Acting Chairman. Smoking is just not a new phenomenon in this province. Indeed when the Member was the Minister of Education, I am sure there were probably more smokers in this province than there are today. If he feels so strongly that a Minister should move unilaterally to impose a

non-smoking policy in our schools then I suggest he should have done it when he was Minister. Perhaps today we would not have the problem before us.

Mr. Storie: I am glad the Minister provided me with this platform. Mr. Acting Chairperson, as a matter of fact I did discuss my intention with school boards and Manitoba Teachers Society and the Minister has now been in his portfolio twice as long as I was, and he has not accomplished anything. Mr. Acting Chairperson, I can assure the Minister that it was my intention to do that and I believe it is important to do.

Let us move on. I am disappointed that the Minister is not active. I am anxious to know, given the Minister's inclination not to do anything, what the purpose of the school smoking policy survey is? Are we wasting money on this, given the Minister's statement?

Mr. Derkach: Well, Mr. Acting Chairman, I think that if you take a look at the topic, that is Health and Welfare Canada's initiative. Certainly we are pleased to participate in any way that we can and provide advice, information and perhaps provide guidance to school boards who may require it with regard to implementing a smoking policy, with regard to questions on how to best implement a smoking policy and all those matters. I think that in showing leadership in that way we indeed are setting a pace.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Gaudry): Shall the item pass? Item 1.(c)(1) Salaries \$412,300—pass.

Item 1.(c)(2) Other Expenditures \$88,900, shall the item pass—the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

Mrs. Yeo: I wrote a number of things down here and one of them was—it is not here. I wanted to ask about the average pupil-teacher ratio in the province, if you have statistics that you can share with us there.

Mr. Derkach: I think it is about 14.7.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Gaudry): Shall the item pass—the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

Mrs. Yeo: One other question, I am not sure whether this is where to ask about provincial bargaining, and I am wondering where the Minister stands with his—what is his philosophy opinion about provincial bargaining? It is a thrust that is coming forward from some corners of the education scene.

Mr. Derkach: Well, Mr. Acting Chairman, provincial bargaining is an issue that has been before us for 20 years I would say. At one time the association of school trustees wanted provincial bargaining and the teachers did not.

Today we see the MTS wanting provincial bargaining and MAST being opposed to it. I think we have a system in this province that is working quite adequately for the local school divisions. I respect the timing of the school divisions to handle such matters, and although we say we waste a lot of time at it and there are a lot

of resources that are put into negotiations, I feel it has worked to the benefit of both school divisions and the teachers.

We have a salary for teachers in this province that compares fairly well with anywhere else in the country. There are some that are higher, some that are lower, but indeed as a province with the resources we have I believe that local autonomy, local bargaining has served both teachers and trustees well in this province. I guess when teachers and trustees come forth with a consolidated approach where they both agree in one direction then we would have to consider it in a different light.

Mrs. Yeo: I had a document in my hands not too long ago that talked about affirmative action. There was a position I believe in the Department of Education, an affirmative action consultant, co-ordinator, whatever. I do have an article from the paper that says that the Minister focuses jobs at women, and yet I look across in front of me here and I see only one woman and four men from the department. I am wondering if in fact there is an affirmative action consultant, co-ordinator, and how is the Minister's department doing as far as hiring women?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Acting Chairman, this gives me the opportunity to brag a little bit because I think this department has done some magnificent work in this regard. As a matter of fact, I was very pleased to have an Assistant Deputy Minister of Finance who is a very capable person and is a woman and is doing an extremely fine job.

If you take a look at the key positions filled by affirmative action target group members I would just like to read them. Again in the Assistant Deputy Ministers we have two positions there out of four; college presidents and branch directors, we have one Native, we have one female as executive director; I should say we have one Native as college president, and that is at KCC; we have one female as executive director of Distance Education and Technology Branch; we have four females as directors of Student Aid, Regional Services, Financial Branch and Communication; we have a female acting director of Finance and Administration, PACE Division; in terms of college vice-presidents, we have one female who is the vice-president of Red River Community College; directors and managers of college programs, we have a variety; we have two visible minority directors, a director of Extension Services at Red River Community College; a director of Distance Education at Red River Community College; we have five females, a director of Co-operative Education, Assiniboine Community College, a director of Northern Nursing Programs, ACCESS North, the Thompson Region, Keewatin Community College, director of Staff Development at RRCC, director of Contract Training, Market Training Centre at Red River Community College, and director of Resource Centre for Handicapped Students at Red River Community College; we have one disabled female who is the director of Registrations and Admissions at Red River Community College. The list goes on and on, Mr. Acting Chairman, and I guess I could stand here for hours to read.

* (1530)

I would like to indicate that our department by and large has put a concerted effort to ensure that affirmative action is an important aspect of our hiring practices and that we indeed do give full opportunity for full participation in the work force by not only minorities but females and anybody else who is under the umbrella of the affirmative action policy. I do not pretend to stand here and say that we have done everything that is supposed to be done, but indeed we have moved a long way.

In some areas of our department, Mr. Acting Chairman, 70 percent of the employees are females and affirmative action candidates. I think this department has done very, very well.

Mrs. Yeo: I wonder, because we only have such a few number of hours for Education Estimates, if we have lists such as that, if we could just receive them instead of going through them. I realize then it does not get on the official record, and perhaps there is some benefit to that.

I gather from the responses of the Minister that the Department of Education or Manitoba Education does not have any specific individual targeted as the affirmative action co-ordinator or whatever.

Mr. Derkach: Yes, Mr. Acting Chairman, I would be pleased to table the entire list. I would just like to indicate that I will table this the next time we meet, because I would certainly like to go over this list again. We do have a director of affirmative action, and that is Louise Ulrich. It has been in place for some time.

We have to indicate, Mr. Acting Chairman, that there are those individuals who do not necessarily wish to declare that they are candidates of affirmative action groups. Therefore, beyond the list that I will give, I can guarantee you that there are others who do not wish to declare that they are members of affirmative action target groups.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Gaudry): Shall the item pass—pass; item 1.(c)(2) Other Expenditures \$88,900—pass; 1.(d) Personnel Services: (1) Salaries \$279,600—pass. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

Mr. Storie: Yes, Mr. Acting Chairman, I am just wondering whether the Minister can tell us whether there is any activity in the CAMEO Program? I cannot remember exactly what the acronym stands for, but it was a program for moving administrative personnel up into more responsible administrative positions within the department. The director was a person by the name of—worked under Mr. Claydon—name of Ms. Fort I believe.

I am wondering if the CAMEO Program is still operating. Is there still a policy within the department of bringing people up from within the bureaucracy into administrative positions?

Mr. Derkach: Yes, Mr. Acting Chairman, I can advise that, yes, it is operating, and Margaret Buchanan is

Thursday, January 25, 1990

heading a subcommittee of that group, of affirmative action.

Mr. Acting Chairman, I might indicate that we have had several positions in the department where there indeed have been promotions of affirmative action candidates. I could indicate that my secretary has moved up, Pat Lavoie. I could indicate Margaret Buchanan has recently moved up, and I am sure there are others that I could find lists for who have indeed moved up to more senior positions and have advanced within the department.

Staff in the department are constantly encouraged to take professional development programs that could enhance their ability to move up into more senior positions. As a matter of fact, up until last year, it is my understanding that secretarial staff within our office had never been given that opportunity to attend in-service sessions or had not been encouraged in any specific way to attend professional development sessions. That has changed. We indeed are encouraging staff, throughout the entire department, to take as much professional development training as is possible.

If I could just revert for a second, Mr. Acting Chairman, to the question I was asked about how many times MECA has met. The information I have is that MECA has met 10 times since last January. This is just information that I thought I would pass along, and part of that has resulted in the new AIDs program.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Gaudry): Shall the items pass—pass. Item 1.(d) Personnel Services: (1) Salary \$279,600—pass; item 1.(d)(2) Other Expenditures \$25,700—pass.

Item 1.(e) Financial Services: (1) Salary \$1,579,400—the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

Mrs. Yeo: I looked through this section and wondered if this was the area where I could ask about funding to the independent schools.

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Acting Chairman, the area, if the Member wishes to wait, is budgeted in (XVI)3, and we can deal with it then.

Mrs. Yeo: All right, if not budgeted, how about the aspect of accountability of independent schools, the same thing?

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Gaudry): Shall the item pass—the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

Mrs. Yeo: Public Schools Finance Board—separate, a different section.

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Acting Chairman, that section is under a different appropriation, so we could deal with it when we get to it.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Gaudry): Shall the—the Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

Mr. Storie: Mr. Acting Chairman, just one question. The community colleges had expressed an interest a

long time ago in obtaining some freedom from the normal Treasury Board process with respect to the purchase and sale of goods for the cafeteria; that the purchase of additional material they might sell, even at a profit.

I am wondering if the Minister can indicate whether the community colleges are still operating under fixed budgets, or whether they have been given additional flexibility to deal with the sale of materials, goods and services that make the schools a profit.

Mr. Derkach: Yes, the community colleges have expressed concern since I have been in office and probably some time before that. One of the issues that we said we would do something about was to address the whole area of the ability of colleges to perhaps be more flexible, be able to respond to the training needs, to the education needs that are out in the communities.

We have seen that concern expressed by the Manufacturers' Association, by Chambers of Commerce of this province, by the Chamber of Commerce of Winnipeg, by business groups, by educators, by parents, by communities, and this whole area of greater flexibility, greater accountability, greater autonomy, is being addressed by the committee that has been struck to look at the entire area of college governance.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Gaudry): Shall the item pass? Item 1.(e) Financial Services: (1) Salaries \$1,579,400—pass; 1.(e)(2) Other Expenditures \$83,500—pass; 1.(f) Communications: (1) Salaries \$223,500—pass; 1.(f)(2) Other Expenditures \$105,300—pass.

Item 1.(g) Administration and Professional Certification: (1) Salaries \$1,116,900—the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

Mrs. Yeo: "Calculates and disburses all grants to all public and private schools funded under the various support to education programs." I would like to know from the Minister how the calculations are actually made. Could I receive a formula that is used for calculating expenditures? Is it on a per pupil basis, a block grant basis, a categorical grant basis? How much are per pupil grants to public school students and independent school students, and how are they calculated?

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Gaudry): Order. We are recessing right now.

RECESS
IN SESSION

* (1540)

Mr. Speaker: The Committee of Supply, having been suspended for the balance of this sitting earlier today, and the hour being 6 p.m., this House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow (Friday).