

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 24 July, 1986.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, M. Dolin: Committee, come to order.

We are on Page 56, Resolution 53, Item 8.(b) Capital Grants, Universities and School Divisions - the Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, we were at the close, located in 8.(b)(2), I believe. If leave of the committee, I would like to suspend that for a moment and move to 6. in the departmental Estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, just for the record, the committee isn't approving this. There has been a request that we make some accommodation for a number of members who have to leave. There is every willingness on my part to accommodate their needs. I wouldn't want this to be as a precedent. We normally do follow a much more rigid routine in committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, so it was my understanding. We will then deal, if all are agreed, with Item 6., is the one you wished to move to?

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to put on the record that we appreciate the cooperation and kindness of the present Minister for allowing us to traipse through the financial Estimates of Education without any prearranged order, and we are indeed thankful for his cooperation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, Item 6. is the one you wish to deal with at this point?

MR. C. BIRT: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, we are on Item 6., Resolution 51, Universities Grants Commission, Page 55 - the Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleague, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, in offering thanks to the Minister for his kindness and the accommodation he's made. We may sound just a little more grateful than we really are at this point, Mr. Chairman, and the Minister may wish he hadn't made the accommodation later on. Anyway, I thank him for that.

Mr. Chairman, in the last little while, the matter of the Brandon University has occupied some of the time of the House. During the course of the discussions we've been having in the question period, there have been some comments made, notably by the Minister but also by the First Minister, which require a little bit of rebuttal. Rebuttal is not really allowed in the question period but this isn't question period, so I'll take this

opportunity to rebut a few of the comments the Minister has been making.

At one point in one of the question periods, I asked the Minister about the discontinuance of a lawsuit against Mr. Errol Black, discontinued by Dr. Perkins. I asked the Minister if the timing of that discontinuance was not somewhat of a coincidence. The Minister responded that it was probably because Dr. Perkins cares more about the institution of Brandon University than I do. Well, I certainly take offense to that comment. For a number of years, I have been very much a supporter of the activities of the Brandon University.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, when I was quite a lot younger, I went to the Brandon University for my music lessons and Mrs. Smart taught me my lessons well, although the fact that I don't play very well today cannot be blamed on Mrs. Smart, because she was a very fine music teacher. After she passed on, she was very generous to the university.

But later on, Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Brandon City Council, when pressure was applied to remove the grant that the Brandon City Council makes annually to the Brandon University, I was a member of that council and was there to oppose such a move. The council of the City of Brandon is one of two or else three in the whole country that grants monies to universities, and I must tell the Minister that I've been supportive of that. If I was still on the council, I would continue to be supportive of that.

Also when it came to an effort on the part of Dr. Tyler, the interim president at Brandon University, and the efforts by Dr. Mallea, the present president of Brandon University, to attempt to get back on stream private fund-raising efforts for Brandon University, Mr. Chairman, I as a member of a committee of Kinsmen in Brandon took an active part in seeing that the Brandon University was the recipient of a \$150,000 grant from the Kinsmen Club of Brandon.

I just point those things out to remind the Minister that I do indeed care about Brandon University very much, and I take offense at statements like that.

The other one was the allegation concerning the lawsuit against Mr. Black, the allegation that the dropping of that lawsuit might have been part of the settlement with Brandon University. The Minister claimed that allegation was a spurious one. I asked him about that yesterday, and he repeated that was a spurious allegation. He says that he gets his information from a member of the Board of Governors. Well, isn't he lucky! Nobody else seems to get information from the members of the Board of Governors on the settlement at Brandon University. So someone is not telling us the entire truth here because, as we read in the Brandon Sun or in the Winnipeg Free Press, Dr. Perkins does claim that it was no coincidence that these matters were all settled at the same time.

The Minister also said that I supported the change in the presidency at Brandon University. That is patently untrue. The fact is, I definitely support Dr. Mallea and any president at Brandon University who works as hard as Dr. Mallea does to repair damage done in our community, damage done by a government-appointed Board of Governors at Brandon University.

The other point is that apparently the Minister would say that, out of the goodness of Dr. Perkins' heart, he discontinued his suit against Mr. Black. I don't understand how someone can claim to be defamed and then, out of the goodness of his heart, drop a lawsuit against that person.

The Minister talks about me and members on my side of the House doing a disservice to Brandon University by asking questions. Later on, I'll be asking the Minister just what his philosophy is when it comes to the expenditure of public funds because, when an opposition party and its members ask about the spending of taxpayers' dollars, I don't think that's a disservice, Mr. Chairman. Really, I wonder why we're here if it's not to find out just how taxpayers' dollars are spent.

The Minister might do well to take a lesson in parliamentary democracy, he might understand that we're here, he's here asking this House, the members of this House, who are representatives of the people, for money to run his department and to run the institutions in this province, and to throw the answer out that we're doing a disservice by asking questions, does a disservice to the parliamentary system.

The other point I want to make is that, at one point, the Minister told the House that the settlement with Dr. Perkins, no matter how generous or not so generous, will have no impact on programs at Brandon University. Well, I would like him to explain that statement and how that can possibly be. Surely, if money is there to pay a wrongful dismissal settlement, that money, if there had not been a wrongful dismissal, would have been available for programs at Brandon University.

So, Mr. Chairman, I might start by asking the Minister just a little bit about the autonomy so-called of the Board of Governors at Brandon University. Repeatedly, he and his leader have told the House that it's an autonomous board and apparently, by extension, need not be responsible for the spending of taxpayers' dollars, and I just wonder, I'll give the Minister an opportunity to tell us just why it is that the Board of Governors, this Minister or his leader, have no responsibility for the spending of taxpayers' dollars at Brandon University.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, I don't suppose there is anything particularly new or insightful in the member for Brandon West's comments. I certainly need no lecture from the Member for Brandon West about the role of the government vis-a-vis the universities, and perhaps the Member for Brandon West has yet to learn some things about the nature of the relationship between governments and universities historically in this province.

MR. J. McCRAE: That's why I asked.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, the member raised a number of issues, I suppose, not specifically for the purposes of review of the Estimates of spending, but raised them as issues of concern. He professes to have a great concern for Brandon University and I accept the fact that he does have a concern for Brandon University as I do. I want to reiterate that some of the comments he's made, with respect to the damage done to Brandon University by government appointees is a

pretty unfortunate - there are other words one could use - kind of remark.

I have pointed out to the member, on a number of occasions, that the Board of Governors is 17 individuals, only 10 of whom are appointed by the government. I have pointed out, and the member should understand something about leadership, particularly of an institution like Brandon University. He cannot say, nor do I believe any member around this table can say, in any definitive way, what the result of not changing the presidency would have been.

I point out to the Member for Brandon West that there was turmoil at Brandon University before the decision was made to replace the president; that the Students Association, that students, faculty, the community was concerned about the relationship between the president and the board, and the president and other groups in the university.

There is no telling at this point what the result of not making a change in leadership would have been. I don't know all of the details or the history of the decision that was made. I do know that there were legitimate concerns expressed; a decision was taken. Obviously, that decision was concurred in by the majority, if not the entire Board of Governors. So I don't think it's fair to say (a) that the government-appointed members created the problem. They were part of what I believe was the solution, and that was a change of leadership. I think there's a certain amount of partisanship creeping into the Member for Brandon West's comments, and that is unfortunate.

I indicate, as well, that the settlement which was negotiated between the Board of Governors and the president, as a result of lawsuits which were initiated by the president, has been resolved. I suppose that Brandon University, and I've indicated so previously, took advice from legal staff that there were some costs to pursuing that to its ultimate conclusion through the courts, the legal costs, which continue to add up, given the protracted nature of the dispute. There were costs in terms of the ability of the university to move ahead with its fund-raising activities, given a rift in the community, a continuing one; and there were costs in terms of the atmosphere surrounding the university and the community of Brandon that needed to be resolved.

The member has raised the question about whether the decision to negotiate a settlement was a wise one. I suppose only the long term, and whether in fact Brandon University gets back onto an even keel, will resolve that issue. There is no simple answer.

However, having made the decision, rightly or wrongly, that a change needed to be made, they had two choices, either to make the change or they suffer the consequences. They felt that the consequences were too great not to act, the consequences of leaving that growing problem in the university to fester.

I'm not trying to impute any blame. Who knows why those kinds of problems develop, but it was quite obvious, I think, to all and sundry, that problems were developing.

A decision was made. The board then had another decision, to pursue through legal means this to its conclusion or, as I believe they did on the advice of legal staff, negotiate a settlement which was satisfactory to both parties. Negotiations, if they are to be successful, ultimately have to be satisfactory to both

parties. The alternative is to pursue the only other option, and that is have the courts resolve the dispute. So they made those decisions.

Now, if the member is telling me in good conscience, that given his breadth of knowledge of the issues, given his unlimited understanding of what the implications of not acting were, this was a horrendous mistake, then let him say that. I don't think the issue was nearly as clear-cut as the Member for Brandon West pretends, nor do I believe that the decisions that were taken were necessarily not in the interests of Brandon University. I don't think the member can, in good conscience, say likewise.

Mr. Chairperson, I find it a little frustrating that the member should refer to the relationship between myself, the Department of Education and the government, in the way that he did. Clearly, there are other autonomous bodies, quasi-judicial bodies in the Province of Manitoba, who get their authority from the Government of Manitoba, who act independently and have acted independently for many, many years. In the Province of Manitoba, it would be unheard of for the Provincial Government to start directing the University Board of Governors on whom to hire, whom to fire, whom to negotiate with, what courses to offer, what courses not to offer.

I ask the Member for Brandon West: if the Member for Brandon West supports this direct intervention of university affairs at this level, then where does the Member for Brandon West stop? The member knows as well as anybody else that the issue was raised with respect to the Engineering Faculty at the University of Manitoba and its funding. Do I interfere? Does the Minister responsible for Education, the Minister responsible for the University Grants Commission interfere at that level?

I can tell the Member for Brandon West that the university presidents, collectively, appreciate the fact that the autonomy of the University Board of Governors has been maintained. The president of the University of Manitoba has indicated that to me personally, because to start pursuing the kind of precedent that the Member for Brandon West has asked for would be, I think, leading us down a new path and perhaps one that, on reflection, we would not want to entertain.

Having said that, I have said in the House; I have said publicly; it was reported in the Brandon Sun, front page, that I believe that the results of the negotiations should be made public. I have maintained that from Day One; I have said it in the House. The First Minister has corroborated that position, and that position has been communicated to Brandon University.

I believe that Brandon University Board of Governors will be making a decision to release that information. I believe that is in the best interests, as perhaps the Member for Brandon West does, of the university community and the university, so that this issue can be put behind us.

But let's be clear about who continued to raise this issue, and for what purpose. The university community, whether this is made public or not - and again, remembering what kind of issue we're talking about, not programming, but personality issues around which there is no clear right or wrong in all likelihood. I suppose that is why the decision to negotiate a solution.

I pointed out, not in defence of the University Board of Governor's decision to attempt to maintain some

privacy with respect to the agreement, I point out that talking about the terms of the settlement begged the question of why it was necessary to initiate the action in the first place. Why was it necessary to change leadership, which gets back into the debate of what was wrong at Brandon University. Who was right and who was wrong? It is a vicious circle, if you will.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, the Minister accuses me of partisanship. You know, this is the place for partisanship, right here, right in this building. Partisanship should not be taking place on the boards of governors of our universities in this province. That is the bottom line here. That's where the partisanship is, Mr. Chairman.

For the Minister to sit here in this committee and pretend that he doesn't know that there's partisanship going on at Brandon University is a shocking admission of his failure to grasp what's going on in his department. I agree, he hasn't been the Minister very long. He has my condolences to have inherited such a mess from his predecessor, a mess that his predecessor and his leader were key in creating in the first place. What we have here is the bail-out Minister of Education, trying his darnedest to bail out the sullied reputations of certain people in this province who have taken active political roles at Brandon University, as well as their political masters here in Winnipeg.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister should know, if he doesn't, full well that the Board of Governors in existence in 1983, at the time of the firing of Dr. Perkins, was put together for a specific purpose. In December of 1983, the comment made at that time was that the Minister at that time, presently the Minister of Business Development and Tourism, made the appointments at Brandon University on the Board of Governors with the knowledge that there was a faction on the university campus anxious to see the president removed and chose the people who were willing to side with this faction against the president.

So we can't just sit here and say it's an autonomous board who made a decision which they thought was in the best interests of the university. We can't say that it's an autonomous board when the people who put those people on the board were very knowledgeable of the situation, very knowledgeable of the partisan feelings going on in the university, and most specifically, the Economics Department of the University.

The Minister, if he doesn't know that, then he really should know that and why he doesn't I don't understand. The Honourable Minister of Employment Services and Economic Security is here. Do these Ministers never talk? Do the Ministers in this government never consult? Surely the Minister of Education knows exactly the scenario behind the firing of Dr. Perkins.

The Minister tells us that it was wise for a settlement. I agree. It was very wise because this matter could have dragged for another couple of years and hurt the reputation of Brandon University even more. It's better that it be over with. But we don't know that it's over with until we see the terms of settlement.

Has the Minister seen the terms of settlement yet?

HON. J. STORIE: Well, Mr. Chairperson, the Member for Brandon West indicates that it's not over until we

see the terms of the settlement. I'm not clear whether the member is saying that changes any decisions that have been made.

MR. J. McCRAE: It doesn't change any decisions, Mr. Chairman.

HON. J. STORIE: That's right, Mr. Chairperson . . .

MR. J. McCRAE: But perhaps it's not too late to correct the situation.

HON. J. STORIE: . . . that is exactly the point. The issue has been negotiated and a settlement has been reached. The only issue that could be raised by discussing the details of a very personal, in one case, and a very difficult issue in both cases, follows that the only dispute would be whether it was adequate or inadequate in that sense.

I point out, as well, and the member has raised the issue, that there was turmoil, that it wasn't simply this government's board appointees who felt that there was a need for a change. That feeling was pervasive in the university community amongst the students, the faculty, and some members of the community at large. It wasn't simply a partisan, political issue as the Member for Brandon West would have us believe.

I know that there were people, staff at Brandon University who were not necessarily sympathetic to the government, who did not support the continued tenure of Dr. Perkins. Now, what those reasons were or whether they were valid, as far as I'm concerned, at this point is immaterial. I appreciate the member's comments about the need for a resolution to that continuing conflict.

The member asked whether I was aware of the terms of the agreement. I indicated to the House, and the situation has not changed to date, that I am aware of some of the terms of the agreement. I have not seen the agreement to date so I cannot say with any certainty that I know all of its details. While I, too, am curious, I believe that I have enough knowledge, and knowledge that I have provided to the members, that I'm satisfied that while the resolution has been completed, and it is an unfortunate event, that for all intents and purposes, Brandon University has indicated to me that the resolution has not been at a sacrifice to their operations or the interests of the students that attend Brandon University.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, the Minister says he is aware of some of the terms of the settlement. How did he become aware of some of the terms of the settlement? If it was through the newspapers, that's what everyone is aware of, but the Minister seems to be in a position to tell us which ones are wrong and which ones are right. How did he become aware? Did someone from the board tell the Minister what those terms were?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, yes, I have indicated on a number of occasions that I spoke to the chairperson of the Brandon University Board of Governors after the negotiations had been concluded. I have confirmed on a number of occasions, essentially

the details that have been reported, but again, I reiterate that I have not seen the agreement. I do not feel that it is my position to make any determination on the merits of the agreement. I have indicated, as well, that I believe the university should be making those public and I indicated, at our first conversation about the potential resolution of this issue, that I felt that disclosure was the best option. The decision not to was the University Board of Governors. I believe that the decision to will be the Board of Governors, and hopefully that decision will be forthcoming.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, on September 26, 1981, there was a meeting at Brandon University, I understand, a meeting attended by certain members of the faculty and students at Brandon University, a meeting with the then Leader of the Opposition, and now the First Minister. I understand the Minister of Employment Services and Economic Security may have been there and the other candidate at that time in Brandon West, Mr. Henry Carroll, and others.

Out of that meeting came certain assurances, according to press reports, that there would be changes to the Board of Governors. Mr. Black, whom we've heard about, said that we have a commitment from him. If the NDP come to power, I hope he quickly implements some kind of change.

Can the Minister, after consulting with the Member for Brandon East and the former Minister of Education, and the Premier, tell us what commitment there was made at that meeting?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, I was not at that meeting, nor was I aware of it for that matter.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, I refer the Minister to a story written by a Mr. Black in the May, 1983 edition of "Canadian Dimension." It was a story about one Patrick Mooney, and how the Board of Governors won its battle with the administration at Brandon University to bring Mr. Mooney in to do lectures at Brandon University. This was, of course, after changes made to the board, the kind that were asked for at the time of the meeting of 1981.

Mr. Black writes in the story, he says: "But the issue that rallied campus people to the NDP was the expectation that election of the NDP Government would lead to a resolution of the problems on the campus. The logic ran something like this. The election of an NDP Government would lead to changes in the Board of Governors and the new board would act to resolve outstanding grievances and introduce constraints on the powers of the president."

We can only assume, Mr. Chairman, what kinds of constraints those faculty people and others in Brandon had in mind.

Then it says: "With the benefit of hindsight, we can see that this was very naive logic but at the time it seemed plausible, especially when the Leader of the NDP and the two NDP candidates in the Brandon riding assured us that there would be quick action to deal with the board. It lured unprecedented numbers of campus people into the campaigns in Brandon East and Brandon West. As it turned out, the NDP won both Brandon seats, Brandon West for the first time . . ." and so forth.

Then shortly after that election, Mr. Chairman, there was a submission made to the government and the first request on that submission was the immediate replacement of all Tory appointments to the board.

The Minister talks about partisanship - immediate replacement of Tory members of the board. Is that partisanship here or is that partisanship on the campus at Brandon University, Mr. Chairman?

HON. J. STORIE: This may come as a shock to the Member for Brandon West, but the replacement of members of boards and commissions who are appointed by O/C at the change of a government is not that unusual.

I point out that the member, in discussing the - now, I do not know Mr. Black; I don't know if I've ever met him . . .

MR. J. McCRAE: He's the former president of Brandon East NDP Association.

HON. J. STORIE: . . . I don't believe I have. However, the member for Brandon West makes . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

HON. J. STORIE: . . . my point. There was turmoil; there was dissatisfaction at Brandon University. It was there before the appointment of any new government appointees to Brandon University Board of Governors. That is the fact of the matter, and the member has not given me any indication as to whether he believes that things would have been as normal had there not been a change of leadership.

I believe that what he has just put on the record indicates that there was a need for a change; and there is only one way for that change to occur - two ways. Either that change occurs on a mutual understanding and a handshake and it's a mutual parting of the ways or the board wrestles with a decision on how to relieve one of his/her responsibilities. I understand that there wasn't that willingness to part company on mutually acceptable terms in the first instance. But the Member for Brandon West makes the point that there were problems and they were deep and they were continuing and they required solutions.

I point out that the reference to change at Brandon University can also indicate a number of other needs for change and that is this government, over the last four or five years, has contributed pretty significantly to Brandon University. Increased operating funds - not only to Brandon, but other universities - after some horrendous years, increased miscellaneous grants, increased major capital projects, so I think it's safe to say that there has been some improvement in the position of Brandon University as a result of the change from government, not only a change with respect to the board, although I grant the member that change occurred.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, Item 4 on the shopping list of the people who put forward this submission was the selection of replacements for the Tory members of the board, from a list of NDP members, compiled by the groups on campus, a list which included trade

unionists, women and progressive farmers. Later, Mr. Chairman, three of the people named on that list were indeed appointed to the Board of Governors, according to Mr. Black, and not too long after that, Dr. Perkins was gone.

Mr. Chairman, I make the point that the politics is not just here and the Minister seems to have agreed with me. He says there was a problem and since the firing of Dr. Perkins, there have been vast improvements.

Let me tell the Minister that within three months of this progressive move of firing Dr. Perkins, one pledge to the Brandon University from a private individual or from the private sector of \$750,000 was stopped, was removed. Another one . . .

HON. J. STORIE: I'm sorry, I didn't catch that reference.

MR. J. McCRAE: According to the media, three months later, after the firing of Dr. Perkins, there were applications for rebates of donations amounting to \$125,000 requested from donors. Two contributions of about \$750,000 and \$500,000 were put on hold because the donors were upset about the Perkins dismissal. The Minister tells us that's an improvement. I fail to understand how people, being so upset about what happened at Brandon University, being so upset as to take back hundreds of thousands of dollars in private donations to the university, I fail to see, Mr. Chairman, how that is an improvement.

But the bottom line to the whole issue, Mr. Chairman, is that never have we heard from the Board of Governors, never from their political masters here in Winnipeg have we heard why Dr. Perkins was fired; there have been no grounds released that would justify the firing of Dr. Perkins.

Dr. Perkins had considerable support in the City of Brandon. Dr. Perkins was brought to Brandon University to reduce deficits and to increase enrolments. The feeling in Brandon, the perception - (Interjection) - It was the Schreyer Government. The Minister of Employment Services and Economic Security makes the point it was the Schreyer Government that was in power when Dr. Perkins came to Brandon and he gives that government all the credit for that.

Just a little while ago, the Minister of Education told us it's the Board of Governors that makes the decisions at Brandon University. Now which Minister is right, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Inkster on a point of order.

MR. D. SCOTT: On a point of order.

The Member for Brandon West is manipulating words coming out of another member's mouth, and I don't appreciate him doing that to myself or to any other person. When a person sitting around this table takes a comment that another person makes, in reference to the government, the stripe of the government that was in office, when that board - and therefore that government would have appointed that board - it would have been, as the Member for Brandon West claims, to be an NDP board, therefore . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the point of order, that is not a point of order. That is a dispute of the facts. The Member

for Inkster has no point of order.- the Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Inkster will go to great lengths to try to defend what appears to be indefensible, which indeed the Board of Governors in Brandon will admit is indefensible, by virtue . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. J. McCRAE: . . . of the fact that a settlement has been made. The Honourable Minister from Brandon East tells me I don't know what I'm talking about, but . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please.

The Member for Brandon West has the floor. Excuse me, I think the Chairman will interpret the rules - the Member for Brandon West. Does the Member for Brandon West still have the floor or . . .

MR. J. McCRAE: Yes, I hope I do, Mr. Chairman. With all these interruptions . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

The Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, has the Universities Grants Commission been consulted during the process of settling with Dr. Perkins in an effort to get authorization for funds to flow to Dr. Perkins for this?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Education.

HON. J. STORIE: I'm sorry, I missed the last part of that question.

MR. J. McCRAE: Has the Universities Grants Commission approved of the expenditure of funds to bring about the settlement with Dr. Perkins?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, the Universities Grants Commission does not approve of the expenditure of monies to any one, any individual, any cause, any program. Those decisions are made by the University Board of Governors and the administration within it.

The Universities Grants Commission is responsible for the global allocation of funding, capital and operating, to the university. They, on their own, make the decisions with respect to where and under what circumstances those funds are spent.

I do want to add to the member's comment about the loss that occurred, or the potential loss, of money flowing to Brandon University as a result of the change in presidency. I hope the member is not suggesting that a number of benefactors, no matter how significant, should determine the policies and the direction of a university. I've indicated that far be it from a few benefactors who were disappointed, disturbed by the happenings, that the University Board of Governors is responsible for university life in its entirety, the well-being of its faculty, its students and its ability to function.

While it is regrettable that some benefactors may have perceived the change as undesirable, I don't think

the member is suggesting that because a number of benefactors were prepared to provide substantial dollars that that should change or rearrange the priorities of the University Board of Governors. Their priority, obviously, has to be the long-term health of Brandon University. The member has tried again to make the point that there was no need for the confrontations.

I point out that what the member read into the record, and certainly from anything that I have heard about the situation in the future or recently, indicates that there were some serious problems and that a number of allegations have been made. It wasn't a select few of Board of Governors' appointees who determined that it was time for a change, that was a feeling that was much broader than that. I raised the question again. The member seems to be indicating that if nothing had been done, if the situation had stayed the same, that Brandon University would have resolved its problem.

I think it was a question of leadership and I believe that the change has been satisfactory in the respect of gaining again the confidence of the staff and students and the community. In that respect this issue is better behind us.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, I obviously disagree with the Minister. There are significant problems at Brandon University which remain to be sorted out and I do not have confidence that the present government-appointed members to the Board of Governors are the ones to sort out those problems.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, if the Member for Brandon West would care to sit down and discuss any of the outstanding issues at Brandon University with me, I would be more than happy to listen and act. The Member for Brandon West has not raised any substantive current issues, future issues. He has raised an issue which began some years ago, has the potential for being resolved and put to rest so that Brandon University can continue.

Some members opposite raised the question of the cost and I point out that not making a decision when it comes to leadership also has a cost and no one can quantify what that might have been. There were problems and those problems were continuing and had continued over a number of years. The Board of Governors made a decision and it's perhaps too late to judge very accurately whether it was a right or a wrong decision.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, in some of our discussions, the Minister said that he hoped that the Province of Manitoba was not spending dollars to settle lawsuits with private individuals. I wonder what the policy is. Is that a matter of government policy that Brandon University Board of Governors should not be paying the legal bills of private individuals?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, I have answered that question before and said that I hoped that was not happening. I indicated at the first opportunity when it was raised, that I had checked with the vice-chair and indicated to him subsequently that was not the case. Subsequent to his raising it again, I inquired further and I had the same assurance.

Thursday, 24 July, 1986

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, might I ask the Minister just what that assurance was from the vice-chairman of the Board of Governors?

HON. J. STORIE: It is the same assurance that I put on the record in the House.

MR. J. McCRAE: That the settlement between Dr. Perkins and Mr. Black formed no part of the settlement between Dr. Perkins and Brandon University?

HON. J. STORIE: I believe the member's question was whether public funds had been expended to resolve that issue. The answer to that, on both occasions when I had checked, was no.

MR. J. McCRAE: In view of those answers, Mr. Chairman, when the Minister does get a copy of the terms of settlement, I hope he won't lose his courage and that he will see that it is tabled in the House.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the policy of the government respecting paying the legal bills of private individuals, I will tell the Minister that on February 28, 1985, the Board of Governors passed the following resolution: "That the board, having heard the particular circumstances, agrees to pay the out-of-pocket legal expenses to date for Mr. Rogosin and Dr. Paton." Now, Mr. Chairman, those legal expenses would have been incurred by Dr. Paton and Mr. Rogosin as a result of a motion they moved in the Senate of the Brandon University, a motion of no-confidence in Dr. Perkins and outlining certain allegations, after which I presume Dr. Perkins had threatened to file a lawsuit against those two individuals. The Board of Governors paid \$1,200, according to this motion - \$1,200 of legal expenses - for matters, I assume, leading up to what might have been a lawsuit, but which never did materialize.

So I wonder if the Minister might look into that and report at some stage as to what he intends to do about that.

HON. J. STORIE: Well, I certainly was not aware of that and I have indicated that I do not approve of those kinds of expenditures. The University Board of Governors, as I've indicated, obviously made that decision. I don't know whether that was followed through or whether it was subsequently changed, or whether in fact the facts the member refers to are accurate. However, I will review that matter.

Mr. Chairperson, let me just clear that up. I'm referring to the activities of a board of governors as a private individual. If the member is acting in his capacity as a board member, then clearly the responsibility is somewhat different.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, for the Minister. Dr. Paton is presently a senate appointment to the Board of Governors, but the actions complained of by Dr. Perkins at the time were actions that were taken in the Senate and not on the Board of Governors. I think the Minister should see the distinction there.

HON. J. STORIE: I will check into that.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to understand a little better the accounting procedure at Brandon

University. I would like to know what contingency is? What fund is contingency? What does that mean?

HON. J. STORIE: Essentially that's a fund that is set aside to respond to emergencies unforeseen. I understand all of the universities have contingency funds, sometimes in more than one area of their department.

MR. J. McCRAE: Can the Minister show me, in the Auditor's Report for the year 1985, where there might be an account called "contingency"? I haven't been able to find it. I did find, in the Provincial Auditor's Report, a Note to the Financial Statements about a contingent liability and I wonder if that's the same kind of account.

HON. J. STORIE: I'm informed that it isn't, Mr. Chairperson.

MR. J. McCRAE: The reason I ask, I guess, is because at that same meeting of February 28, 1985 there was a motion to move \$4,500 from Contingency to the Faculty of Arts for student assistance. I just wondered what contingency was.

HON. J. STORIE: I'm told that it's common practice for the universities to have both; in some cases, identified contingencies for specific purposes, fluctuations in heating, or whatever, and contingency funds available within departments that are unspecified for use to resolve smaller issues.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, getting back to the legal bills of Dr. Paton and Mr. Rogosin, what will the Minister do if he finds that they've used public monies to settle a threatened lawsuit with these two gentlemen?

HON. J. STORIE: Well, before making any final determination of what action I would take, I would want to verify that in fact happened and under what circumstances; and what possibilities there were for action, either on behalf of the Universities Grants Commission, or whether there needs to be some firmer policy developed in that respect.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, if after checking twice now with the vice-chairman of the Board of Governors about the discontinuance of the lawsuit against Mr. Black, if the Minister finds that was part of the settlement between Dr. Perkins and the university, what will be his action at that time, if he finds that what Dr. Stewart has told him turns out not to be the truth.

HON. J. STORIE: I don't expect that to be the case.

MR. J. McCRAE: It's too hypothetical for the Minister. Mr. Chairman, recently the university has been engaging in having consultant studies done. I'd like to ask the Minister, since the firing of Dr. Perkins, how many dollars have been spent on consultant studies and how many during the tenure of Dr. Perkins, in terms of dollars. Is that information not readily available? I take it's not.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, we are here to review the Estimates for the year 1986-87. The

information the member requests would obviously take some review, not only of this year's, but previous years' budgets going back some 10 years, I understand. So if the member would like to issue an Order for Return for that kind of information, I can certainly attempt to provide it.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, I don't think that any purpose would be served by pressing an issue that far, any useful purpose. If it had been available, that would have been an interesting thing to know. But I wonder if the Minister has been made aware of the Marchak Report; a report commissioned for Brandon University by Professor Patricia Marchak, respecting the Arts Faculty.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, I understand that the Marchak review is kind of a quality survey that all universities undertake from time-to-time and that is not out of the ordinary in that sense.

I would indicate to the member's previous question that I'm informed that there have been very few consultant reports at Brandon University over the last number of years.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, I suggest he might be interested in getting his hands on the Marchak Report. It's a pretty interesting report about the Faculty of Arts.

As you may already know, Mr. Chairman, Professor Errol Black has been quite a vocal individual in the Brandon area. You might find his name in the Editorial column of the paper quite often. In fact, he writes also to the Winnipeg Free Press and he wants the whole world to know what his feelings are. He's active, I would say, in the Economics Department at the Brandon University.

Mr. Chairman, just as a matter of interest, when we talk about the politicizing of the Brandon University . . .

HON. J. STORIE: I haven't been talking about that.

MR. J. McCRAE: . . . I have. Dr. Marchak criticized the Economics Department for its lack of cooperation in the study; and for its one-sided Marxist political and economical bias. The whole news report of the Marchak Report is filled with comments about political wrangling and political difficulties at Brandon University. You just have to wonder how these things happen when the board is so non-political, as the Minister would have us believe.

HON. J. STORIE: Well, Mr. Chairperson, the member refers to an individual faculty member. Obviously each faculty member is entitled to their own particular views. I'm not sure that is directly relevant to his overriding concern about the appointments to Brandon University.

MR. J. McCRAE: There may be some truth in what the Minister says, Mr. Chairman, but Mr. Black just happens to be the Senator who moved the motion in the Senate to ask the Board of Governors to pay the legal expenses incurred by Dr. Paton and Mr. Rogosin. After a little while you kind of get the feeling that there

is something going on down there that perhaps the Minister should be aware of. If he hasn't been aware of it, really, why hasn't he been? Does he not consult with the Honourable Member for Brandon East, or does the Honourable Member for Brandon East not think these matters are important? I take it that's a question that the Minister shouldn't have to answer.

HON. J. STORIE: I do take the member's concern seriously. If I can avail myself of a copy of the Marchak Report, I would be most interested to read it. I would also indicate that I hope to be able to set aside considerable time to inform myself of the affairs of all our university campuses and to ensure that my working relationship with the Presidents and the Board of Governors thereof are cordial and fruitful.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, another study commissioned by, I believe, the Board of Governors and the Brandon University . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. It's getting very difficult to hear the member who's trying to pose the question.

MR. J. McCRAE: And the Brandon University Foundation, the Gordon Goldie Report, a firm of consultants from Toronto, was asked to look into why it is that Brandon University is having so much trouble raising funds privately in the Brandon area and everywhere else.

The report made the case, or made the point that the reason money couldn't be raised, or couldn't successfully be raised in this way, was the attitude taken by members of the Board of Governors.

What response would the Minister have if he received a report like that? What would the Minister do if he received a report like that?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, I am not sure that Brandon University, throughout its history, since 1957, has had much success fund-raising. I don't attribute that failing to an individual on the Board of Governors, or the Board of Governors themselves, I think if the member considers it for a moment, he will find that virtually every university in Canada has had trouble raising money from the private sector and arranging donations and contributions in endowments, etc.

I don't necessarily find that surprising and, unless I knew what the word "attitude" meant, perhaps then I could comment. I reflect only on the member's earlier comment that a number of endowments, or contributions which were promised to the university, were not forthcoming as a result of the change of leadership. If the university is concerned, the Board of Governors is concerned about leadership and the direction of the university is the result of that lack, perhaps if that's the attitude that the people are concerned about, that they're more concerned about the students in the university than in individual funder's priorities, then that might make sense. I guess I'd have to know more about what the attitude was that was causing the concern.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, the report was received, I suppose, shortly before May 8, 1985, over

two years after the firing of Dr. Perkins when, as the Minister says, relationships were improving so much in Brandon. The report lays the blame for the problems of raising money squarely on the shoulders of the Board of Governors for alienating potential sponsors following the firing of former president, Harold Perkins.

The Minister wants concrete facts. The report said that there could be more than \$400,000 in untapped donations in the local business community, untapped and not there and not available to the university because, according to the report commissioned by the university, because of this alienation brought about by the actions of the Board of Governors.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, I remind the honourable member that the previous president had been in place and operating for a considerable period of time, some five years, with virtually no particular results, or outstanding results.

I point out again that the member keeps referring to the issue of \$400,000 in potential donations. I raise the question, and one that he has not addressed in any of his comments to me, the issue of what price do you attach to the issue of leadership? How important is a cohesive faculty and student body? How important is it that a university have a sense of direction that everyone feels is adequate and appropriate? What price tag do you put on that? Is the member suggesting for \$400,000 that that isn't important? That's another question that has to be asked.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, according to the Gordon Report, many alumni said they felt humiliated by the controversy at Brandon University and would not support the university until the leadership of the present Board of Governors is changed, or changes in its attitude toward representation by the business community in Brandon.

The Minister must remember that prior to the changes that were made by his government to the Board of Governors - these are the problems that the Gordon Report tells us about, this study commissioned by the Board of Governors - I can't quite understand what the Minister is saying either, I guess, because we seem to have a very clear reason here, as reported to us by the Gordon Report, as to why there are difficulties there. By this time, Dr. Perkins was gone for over two years.

HON. J. STORIE: My point was exactly the one the member raised. Dr. Perkins was there for some five, six, whatever number of years, seven years. There was very little money raised during that period of time. The problem spans many presidents, many Boards of Governors, many universities. It isn't a problem solely related to Brandon University. The reflection the member makes on the attitude of individuals in the Brandon community in 1985, I believe he said, there were other excuses, obviously in 1979, or in 1973. There simply have not been substantial funds coming forward by way of donations.

You raised the issue of the report being done since the changes in presidency. I can only assume that the new president is actively pursuing, once again, given that there is a more cohesive atmosphere surrounding the university, the opportunities that may be available for fund-raising outside the university.

Mr. Chairperson, just before I continue, I should indicate that one of the concerns of the Board of Governors, in reaching a settlement with Dr. Perkins, was the issue in the community of the lingering dispute that, in fact, there were people, not only on the Board of Governors, but alumni who felt that was an outstanding issue that needed to be resolved and I'm sure, at this point, are applauding the fact that's been resolved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Just a brief note. The member should be aware that corporate donations to universities throughout North America have been steadily declining since the end of the Second World War, to the point where many universities, particularly in the States where some of the most prestigious have depended for their existence on such funding, are in serious financial shape.

The Member for River Heights will know that the student fees at Harvard are somewhere close to \$20,000 a year in order to maintain Harvard, because it can no longer depend on the corporate donations, and this in the richest country in the world.

I think that it's perhaps a bit simplistic to suggest that corporate donations go up and down depending on the composition of the board. Indeed, if that suggestion were to be taken seriously, then what is being said is that you can sort of purchase a university and that would be far, far more dangerous, it seems to me, than the loss of income from the corporate sector from time to time.

This is not to say that I'm opposed to corporate donations. In fact, the corporate donations that are best received by universities are those that are given for research in different areas. There they tend to be, because they are for research, free from strings and the dangerous tendency to influence the independence of thought, which should be at least something that is cherished in the university atmosphere.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments made by the Attorney-General, but perhaps he didn't hear earlier when I made the Minister of Education aware that, almost immediately after the firing of Dr. Perkins, one pledge of \$750,000 was cancelled. Another one for \$500,000 was cancelled, and one for, I believe I said — (Interjection) — were held back which

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

The Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: And a third donation was asked to be returned in the amount of \$125,000, I think I said. So that in this situation, I point out for the information of the Attorney-General, we're talking about something just a little different than the ability of all universities to raise money. Here we had money almost in the hand, which we lost because of the dealings of the Board of Governors with the then president of the university.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, I'm still not clear what the member is saying. Is the Member for Brandon West suggesting seriously that, if a change of leadership

was required in the interests of the community and the students of Brandon University, for a sum of pledge of \$750,000, it shouldn't have been made. We should have jeopardized the university; we should have jeopardized the ability of the university to cope; we should have jeopardized the relationship that needs to exist between the university and the community and the university faculty and the students. Is that what the member is saying?

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is assuming that I agree that a change of leadership was required. I thought I straightened that out at the very beginning this evening, when I said the Minister was putting words in my mouth. At no time have I said that a change of leadership was required. This was a decision taken by the Board of Governors, for which it's now paying dearly, for which the people of Manitoba are now paying dearly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I'll be brief, because I'll be putting the same remarks on the record that I put the last time the Education Estimates were up. I had the opportunity to spend most of my summer with Brandon people and I know many people in Brandon through my previous experience in my work, etc.

Until the Minister faces the fact that the alumni and the people of Brandon, the majority of people of Brandon, are not going to donate to the University of Brandon until you change the chairman of the board and the board, you will not get that many donations. So you may as well face the facts. If you're not going to face them, you're not going to get donations. It's the same thing I put on the record last year and, if you're going to ignore it, you're just going to be in trouble.

HON. J. STORIE: Well, Mr. Chairperson, I'm not as . . .

MR. F. JOHNSTON: The Member for Brandon East knows it, too.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, I recognize that certain individuals, perhaps because of their . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Education has the floor, please. Can we have some order? Can we have some order, please?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, I understand that there are certain individuals who, for partisan reasons, would choose not to . . .

MR. J. McCRAE: I'm getting a lot of calls from NDPers these days, I have to tell you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

HON. J. STORIE: . . . would not choose to honour their pledges or wish to donate. I suppose that, in itself,

is regrettable. I don't know whether that is, in fact, the case. I do know that the Member for Brandon West and perhaps members of the opposition do not accept the view that the Brandon University Board of Governors took, that a change was required. I have not heard the Member for Brandon West deny the fact that there was strife at the Brandon University, and it was not simply individuals on the Board of Governors. It was students; it was other faculty members, not necessarily in a partisan way, but concerned about the direction. I think those facts are fairly well recognized.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, in 1985, this is two years after the firing of Dr. Perkins and after the situation at Brandon University, according to the Minister, was stabilized and improving, one member of the Board of Governors decided that he couldn't take it anymore and he quit. He wasn't a government appointment, Mr. Chairman. He was the alumni appointment, and the chairman may know the gentleman, Mr. Gary Miller.

He left the board in frustration and he said: "I feel there is a certain amount of manipulation on the part of the board, particularly with this issue," this issue being The Brandon University Act issue which I'll bring up and raise up in a little while. Mr. Miller said the following: "The very things Mr. Potter and the present executive were criticizing the previous administration and the previous executive for doing, they have multiplied tenfold." Now I can assure this Minister that Mr. Miller is certainly not a member of the Progressive Conservative Party. Neither is he a member of the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Miller said also that what they have at Brandon University was a three-person show with decisions being made unilaterally by Bill Potter, Bill Paton and Bev Peters. Now, Mr. Chairman, it'll be known by some here that Bev Peters is no longer on the board. Bev Peters ran for nomination in Brandon West to seek the NDP nomination to run against me, although she didn't make it. She lost that nomination, and she went on to her reward. I believe she's now making more money than an MLA as an assistant to the Minister of Employment Services and Economic Security. I think she makes \$37,000.00. The Minister tells us that she's a very competent person, but these are the remarks we hear from Mr. Miller, presumably one member of that board who would likely be the least partisan of the two sides involved. We get comments that the criticism of the previous administration has multiplied tenfold with this board.

I'm just wondering, I'm really trying hard, Mr. Chairman, to make a point here, but the Minister doesn't seem to grasp what I've been saying for the last hour and 15 minutes. We're facing a very serious situation at Brandon University. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek tried to tell the Minister what the problem is. The Minister is an alumnus of Brandon University and, as a visitor to Brandon University occasionally, should be able to see what is plain to everyone else, as plain on the nose on anyone's face, what is happening at Brandon University. There's a heck of a lot of politicization going on there, politicizing of the Board of Governors. The responsibility for that rests with this government which has been making all the appointments.

Mr. Chairman, one of the present vice-presidents of Brandon University, according to a Brandon Sun article in March of 1985, one Meir Serfaty made the point that the government was responsible for a university crisis. This time, it had to do with government restraint. That was in 1985. I'm telling you there was no Bill C-96 in 1985, and this government was in power in 1985. Mr. Serfaty was another one touted to run for the nomination in Brandon West for the NDP; he didn't.

I'm just trying to make a few points with the Minister so that he'll understand that everything is not all right at Brandon University. I've been trying to tell him for the last three weeks. He pretends not to hear; he pretends not to listen. He's protecting certain people in Brandon . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would suggest to the member that he is imputing motive. I would suggest that he not use unparliamentary terms. I would also suggest to the member that it is not in order. This is not the House where you're going to yell from the back. The fact is the member has put unparliamentary references on the record. I would ask him to withdraw them. I think the member has enough experience to understand what he has done. Would the member withdraw those remarks and continue.

MR. J. McCRAE: May I ask the Chairman which specific remarks it is and if they were unparliamentary I'll certainly withdraw them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You were suggesting the Minister was pretending which is imputing a motive, as one factor. I would ask you to withdraw that.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, I will do your bidding and withdraw if I have said something that's unparliamentary, but I didn't know that the word "pretending" was in the list in Beauchesne's Citation 320.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You were suggesting that the Minister, who is a member of the Legislature, was pretending, which is imputing a motive to the Minister. I made a ruling.

MR. J. McCRAE: I've accepted your ruling, Mr. Chairman. I am asking . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Brandon West, would you please continue.

MR. J. McCRAE: I've withdrawn any offending comments but I ask in what way is it imputing motives, anything that I've said tonight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pretense is an opprobrious term to say that someone is acting as a matter of pretense which means that they're misrepresenting, that they're being dishonest; that is pretense.

The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: The Member for Springfield, referring to yourself, as you were talking, said oh, you shit.

MR. G. ROCH: I never said that.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, you did and I demand that that be withdrawn.

MR. G. ROCH: I did not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. G. ROCH: A point of order. The Attorney-General has said something accused me of saying something which I did not say, and I want him to withdraw it right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Attorney-General has made a comment accusing the member of something which I did not hear. I will peruse Hansard tomorrow and, if necessary, will refer it to the Speaker as appropriate. I would suggest to the member . . .

MR. G. ROCH: Do you have to peruse Hansard? Mr. Chairman, peruse the remark of the Member for Brandon West, as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have made an order on my interpretation. If you look at Rule 64(3) it says: "Chairman of a Committee in the Whole House shall maintain order and decide all questions of order." I have made a decision on a question of order. The member has accepted it, let us continue with the business of the Estimates.

The Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, just in case I wasn't clear. At no point have, or would, I ever impute improper motives on the Minister of Education. The Minister of Education is stuck with a very bad situation and if I said pretense I should not have said that, but it will serve no good purpose for this government to ignore what is happening in Brandon and what has been happening in Brandon. I'm just trying, in the best way I can, Mr. Chairman, to bring to the attention of the Minister that there is a problem and we cannot say there is no problem because there is a problem, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to refer briefly to The Brandon University Act which has been a matter of discussion in Brandon among people interested in matters at Brandon University. There was a draft act sent to the department. I understand it is now in the hands of the Universities Grants Commission. I understand when it first was sent to the Universities Grants Commission it was returned to the Board of Governors of Brandon University asking for certain clarifications, changes or whatever, and the Chairman of the Board of Governors alleged that the Universities Grants Commission was nitpicking. Well, I'd like to know where we're at with The Brandon University Act now.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairman, it, like the act relating to the University of Winnipeg are being reviewed and, although it was not possible to introduce them for the current Session, upon that review, it is certainly possible that they will be brought forward in the coming year or years.

MR. J. McCRAE: Does the Minister propose any changes to the act before it is presented to the House?

HON. J. STORIE: I have not reviewed the act sufficiently to indicate where there may be need for changes. I would like to make the acts consistent across the universities so that there is an understanding and equal footing on all universities, and that they all are operating on a similar, equivalent basis. Until I've had a chance to review the proposed acts and the current acts governing the College Universitaire de St. Boniface and the University of Manitoba that we will await further clarification.

MR. J. McCRAE: I'm not sure I'm as familiar as I'd like to be with the composition of boards of trustees, boards of regents, boards of governors at other universities. Perhaps the Minister can tell me, on other boards in this province, how many of the appointments are government, as opposed to appointments by other groups in terms of percentage.

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, I can and that is one of the reasons why I indicated in my earlier response that I would like to make them consistent because there is no consistency. Currently the University of Brandon has 17 appointments, 10 of which are from the government. The University of Manitoba has 23, of which 12 are authorized by the government. The University of Winnipeg has 10 out of 32. Again, historically a different configuration because of circumstances when it was created as the University of Winnipeg. The St. Boniface College has no appointments from the government. It creates a set of circumstances where, while you have the same responsibility in many respects to each of those university bodies, you don't have the same input, nor do they reflect necessarily the opinion of the wider community.

MR. J. McCRAE: By the numbers the Minister gave us, if my arithmetic is correct, it appears that on none of the boards, except the Brandon University Board, do we have a majority of government appointments to the boards.

HON. J. STORIE: I believe 23 out of 12 at the University of Manitoba represents the majority.

MR. J. McCRAE: 12 out of 23.

HON. J. STORIE: 12 out of 23, you stand corrected.

MR. J. McCRAE: I told you not to trust my arithmetic, Mr. Chairman. In any case, I think in the case of Brandon University where you have 10 of 17 being government appointments, you have rather more of a majority of government appointments. I've made statements about my feelings about the composition of the Board of Governors, Mr. Chairman, and I think the statements I made, and I believe the Minister who represents Brandon East will back me up on this, that my comments were non-partisan comments.

During the election campaign when I was asked about the make-up of the Board of Governors my response was that if a Progressive Conservative Government had

formed a government, that the Liberals and the New Democrats for Brandon and area needn't feel that they would be left out of important decisions respecting Brandon University. I would only hope that maybe the NDP would adopt the same kind of policy and make non-partisan appointments in consultation with people in the community who know the university best. Here I don't refer to conferring with the present government appointments on the Board of Governors, I refer to business and civic and school trustee-type leaders in the City of Brandon when it comes to making appointments.

I don't know they've been done in the past, I didn't ask the Minister that question, maybe the Minister can tell me how appointments are made. I know that some were made directly as a result of the submission made by those people I mentioned earlier just after the 1981 election, but I really would like to see a less politicized Board of Governors and I would like to hear what the Minister has to say about that.

HON. J. STORIE: Well, I'm not sure whether the Member for Brandon West is enunciating a new policy on the part of the Conservatives. I can assure him that, in 1977, there were changes to the appointments of the Board of Governors.

MR. J. McCRAE: And no doubt there always will be, but that's . . .

HON. J. STORIE: Well now, the member raises the point, no doubt, there always will be. I want to indicate that I have some sympathy for his point of view. That's why I take very seriously the responsibility of changing or introducing acts governing universities, because I think there is some requirement for a careful look at the relationship between the board of governors and the broader community and how it represents the community.

I can indicate that I have communicated that feeling and that concern to the presidents of the universities in a meeting some month-and-a-half ago or two months ago, where the issue of appointments and the need for appointments to reflect differing segments of the community was raised with me. I have some sympathy for that. I hope that, when we do make changes to the acts, perhaps some of the comments from the Member for Brandon West will be reflected in that.

MR. J. McCRAE: I sincerely hope my comments will be reflected in that, and that the Minister will join with me in working towards helping to heal the rift that has developed over the last number of years. Whenever it started, we can argue about all day and all night.

But the point is that the problems have not gone away yet and I believe, when the Minister does see the settlement and when it is made public, there will be very good reasons for the Minister to take a very, very serious look at the composition of the Board of Governors of Brandon University. I plead with the Minister to do that and, as terms expire or before if necessary, changes be made to that Board of Governors so that it accurately reflects the feelings of a broad cross-section of the people in Southwestern Manitoba.

Let's not forget that Brandon University serves a very wide area and it also serves foreign students and

students from all over Canada as well. Let's try to make Brandon University a university that does reflect the concerns and the feelings of the people in the area, instead of one narrow, somewhat left-leaning perspective.

HON. J. STORIE: Well, Mr. Chairperson, I thank the Member for Brandon West for that extremely nonpartisan review of the current situation at Brandon University. I certainly wouldn't want to reflect on his closing remarks in any formal sense, other than to say that I believe the member underrates the interests of the current Board of Governors in Brandon University. There may be differences of opinions. However, Mr. Chairperson, I recognize the member's concern; it has been registered.

I have not said that the current situation at Brandon University has settled satisfactorily. I recognize that there are some continuing concerns, and the member has raised a number of them. I do intend to review that issue, and perhaps become better informed of what people perceive to be the problems and where there are potentials for solution.

MR. J. McCRAE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering if we might move to that portion of the Estimates dealing with small schools.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, if that is agreed, we will move to 4.(h), under Regional Services, Page 52 - the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In the Small Schools Grants that fall underneath Regional Services, what you are indicating to us is that would be where the funds would come from. My question would be regarding the changes that came about regarding the assistance to Hutterite colonies. Can the Minister or the department tell me if there was a serious number of requests from Hutterian brethren regarding rent for their facilities that they provide for schools on their own colonies?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairman, I understand that the previous Minister met with the elders of the Hutterian Brotherhood in Manitoba. That concern that was raised, was raised as an issue in many different areas of the province.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, D. Scott: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: I guess the question then becomes whether it was ever determined if these colonies had, in fact, had any discussions with their local school boards before they made presentations to the Minister. I'm wondering whether or not they should be getting additional rent for their facilities.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, not to my knowledge. There is no circumstance where the

province pays rent. Now, school divisions may in some instances; in some, I guess they don't. But those arrangements are made, I guess, with school divisions directly, I suppose sometimes at the request of the Hutterian Brotherhood.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Perhaps I should take the question back one step then. It seemed to me that this was a situation that perhaps got blown out of proportion, possibly in a haste to make brownie points with the Hutterian brethren, or to direct an answer at a question that maybe was not clearly understood when the question came forward. There are some school divisions that have paid rent over the years to the Hutterian brethren for the schools that are used on the colonies to educate their children. It varies, and I know that there have been no specific ground rules. It's always been a case of negotiation between the divisions and the colonies.

I guess I'm trying to understand why the department chose to put it in such a way where, in a letter to the Hutterian colonies and to the school divisions that had colonies within their borders, to indicate that there should be rent paid or that, rather than to indicate to the brethren at the time they made contact with the department that perhaps their first line of approach would be directly to the divisions involved. It seems to me that - if I could just take it one step further - there were a lot of divisions who weren't even aware that they had a problem. In fact, the elected trustees have always been elected to represent all of the people within their wards and there seems to be a short circuiting of the system and rather special terms were inserted between a legitimate group in the community and the school divisions.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, I have indicated and the member is probably aware that the nature of the communication that took place was not adequate, and that the member is quite correct in that school divisions should have been obviously informed of the changes in policy and direction.

However, the member also is aware that not only the Hutterian Brotherhood comes to raise its concerns with the Minister of Education, the parents' rights or the superintendents have their own agenda which they raise directly with government and the Minister of Education. There are many individual groups who may or may not have got their concerns directly to the school division who see government as an avenue for redress of their concerns. I'm assuming that some of the issues that were addressed in the letter had been raised with one or some of the school divisions, perhaps not all; but given again the structure of the Hutterian community, I suppose it made some sense to them to address them as a group directly to the Minister.

I shouldn't want the member to be left with the feeling that I support the circumvention of the system. I think in many cases we have indicated, as the department has indicated, representatives from the department have indicated, that the normal routine for requests is through the school division in the first instance. That should, as a matter of policy, I think, continue.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: I appreciate the Minister's remarks, because I think that he has perceived what

I'm leading up to, because I think it would be a very dangerous situation if every time a group within the community approached the department and made a request that information came back to that group directly and was not communicated to the divisions, perhaps even indicated to them for further discussion.

I would also point out, as I'm sure the Minister has realized that I've raised the issue when the House first opened, that the letter that went out during the writ period of the election, directly to the Hutterite colonies, was, as far as I was concerned, a direct affront to the school boards of this province and certainly was very likely an affront to the Hutterian Brotherhood, the way it went out indicating changes that should be brought about in their relationship with the school divisions and changes that would be coming forthwith regarding funding, regarding allocation of funds for furnishings and all of those things which the Reverend Kleinsasser had presented, I believe, on behalf of his church.

I don't object to the fact that he made the presentation and that it was heard by the department. In fact, I don't even resent the fact that the department eventually responded and acted. The concern was that the action, if every question that came before the department, were treated with the same reaction, I think we very soon would have almost no responsibility as far as locally autonomous boards are concerned.

HON. J. STORIE: I'm chuckling, Mr. Chairperson, because I think I raised this same issue with the Member for Brandon West only moments ago, the question of autonomy of groups out there who try to run their own affairs.

The member makes my point and I'm going to try and be consistent and agree with him as I indicated with respect to the Board of Governors. I believe, Mr. Chairperson, that the member has a good point. I would also . . .

MR. G. CUMMINGS: You're putting words in my mouth, Jerry, now just a second.

HON. J. STORIE: It certainly wasn't my intention to put words in your mouth. I recognized the words in your mouth. I am trying to put words in my mouth and I do it correctly sometimes. Come on, words.

It seems to me that the member should understand that this response, which I acknowledged did come during an election period, was not simply addressed at that one meeting; that, in fact, this issue had been raised on a number of occasions over a number of meetings and that the meeting at which this issue was finally resolved was, I believe, established long before the calling of the election.

So the timing of our meetings, of course, as Ministers, is scheduled months and months in advance. I ended up in Roblin-Russell the day before the election and I can assure you, a coincidence, a meeting that had been established for some time. It simply happened. So I wouldn't want the member to read into all of these things implications which are not there.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: I guess the concern I have about the local autonomy and the responsibility of the boards: there are very few appointed boards of trustees and

they are locally elected, and they therefore have that responsibility which they take upon themselves on part of the electorate. I guess the reason that I wanted to make sure that I raised my point regarding the direct communication that went out during the writ period was that it wasn't until June that that letter was in fact legitimized by a following letter that went to the school divisions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Education.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, I recognize the member's point about the different structures of school divisions and University Board of Governors.

I do point out that, in terms of the their responsibilities, they are essentially the same, that they are autonomous and that they were provided with sums of public money to allocate as they see fit, in essence. So there are some similarities. However, that is not the point of the debate.

I want to indicate that while the original letter went out in here, I believe, and I think I've said so, without the appropriate notice to school divisions. But the member is incorrect in that school divisions were notified by letter of the error and informed of the decisions by letter of March 17. Subsequently, the full details were provided in June. But there was some correspondence. I wouldn't want to leave the impression that something happened in March and no effort was made to resolve the oversight until June. There was a subsequent letter that went out March 17 indicating that there had been an error.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: I'm quite prepared to let the Minister start with a clean slate, although he appears to have inherited a few thorns along the way here.

Regarding the statement or the policy statement, if you will, that went out, the message is out, not only to the divisions but also to, I suppose the colonies would be part of that information as well, that the funds allocated for small schools should be allocated in a manner so that the parents of those particular schools have some input on how those funds should be allocated.

I have a little trouble with that thinking, Mr. Chairman, and I wonder if the Minister can tell me why we would choose that route. We have certainly no qualms about parents - after all, it's their children who are in the schools - but your elected officials are charged with the responsibility of delegating or delineating where funds should be spent. I really wonder what is the intent behind this type of an idea, whereby there are now particular funds that should have a parental council of some sort - although that's not spelled out - but should have some other method of decision-making applied to their expenditure.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, I can only indicate that obviously the concern was that, given the importance of the school to that community and to all communities, there was a desire to ensure that the projects that, as they were developed and prepared, were seen as priorities, and I believe that school divisions, by and large, do that.

I guess the issue that was raised with the Minister at that time, there was a perception, rightly or wrongly,

on the part of some elders that they and their communities weren't as intimately involved as they would have liked to have been; and what the Minister was indicating was that we would hope that could be addressed in some way.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: I don't question the fact that concern may have been put forward by the colonies, but while the sums of money are not large, I certainly have no knowledge of where school divisions have misapprehended - if there's such a word - small schools funds and used them for purposes in the small schools that were not sound educational reasons.

The reason that I flagged this, Mr. Minister, is because there is an option, as I understand it, in small schools grants whereby those funds could be used for additional staff. If the community is also involved, and certainly the trustees represent that community, then it becomes very difficult for the people charged with the educational responsibility to be able to allocate those funds in areas that they are convinced would have the most educational value in those schools.

I see there could be a considerable amount of difficulty in some of the small schools in coming to agreements which will be easily put into place on the expenditure of these funds because the addition of equipment, as opposed to the addition of perhaps an aide or part-time staff, is a decision that's very difficult to make and parents who have students of greater or lesser capabilities, for example, within the same school, will have very divergent views on how this money should be spent; and the decision has been taken out of the hands of those who were originally charged with the educational responsibility.

HON. J. STORIE: I'm afraid it must be getting late, Mr. Chairperson. I think I missed the member's point. The fact . . .

MR. G. CUMMINGS: I'll put it more simply. My point is that it makes the decision process on how to allocate those funds very complicated. The decision process is being changed in the way it's handled within the divisions. What reason would the department have to have made a decision such as that?

MR. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, I don't think that was the intention. I believe the member remarked earlier that the decisions that are being made are being made in the best educational interests of the students that they serve.

I would point out that the practice in terms of small school grants has not changed, in that the expenditure categories which can form the parameters for application include from microcomputers to industrial arts to special education to human resources, so that there is a range, and it depends on the priorities as seen by the school board.

I think the only emphasis that was placed on it was because this is small schools and small schools tend to be those that are threatened or potentially threatened, that the importance of community involvement, involving the local community, was seen as more of a priority in this area than in some others, although it's recognized that boards seldom, if ever,

act in a unilateral, heavy-handed fashion, that they do in fact . . . The Member for River Heights is smiling. School boards obviously wish to represent the interest of all of their constituent communities.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: In the English as a Second Language aspect of the funding that has been allocated to the Hutterian schools, is this going to be a situation where those funds will all be allocated for expenditure there and, in fact, regardless of any evaluation of the ability of those students to speak English, the funds will be spent there for staffing. Will there be an evaluation of their ability to speak the language?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, the consultants within the department review, I guess, the language capability, if you will, in that the grants are not automatic, that in fact there has to be a perceived need for English as a Second Language grants for that to be approved.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Then how is that different from the - why is it specific now? Is that not virtually the same regulatory system that's always been in place for English as a Second Language?

HON. J. STORIE: The difference, Mr. Chairperson, is that originally the ESL Grant Support Program was only for immigrants and this is an extension into the Hutterian school system.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: One other odd situation that I encountered - and perhaps I stand corrected if this has changed recently - but it seems to me that if a student of French speaking parentage moved into an English community and wished to attend that school, there would not be funding for English as a second language. Is that correct?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, that issue hasn't been raised, but the member raises an interesting point about whether it wouldn't be appropriate. I've indicated that originally the program was designed for immigrant children, that this was extended because of kind of unique circumstances in the Hutterian communities, the member raises another question.

Clearly we would be talking about exceptional circumstances there, probably only applying to one child or two children, and the school division might be in a better position to provide assistance without resorting to an overall change in policy. But he raises an interesting point.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Well, the hiring of an aide, of course, would be an additional cost, but it would be one way of addressing it. I wonder - and it just struck me now in this line of questioning, Mr. Minister - if the department hasn't possibly opened a can of worms here, because there are other communities besides the Hutterian communities who have a sincere desire to teach their ancestral language in the home. What better way to teach it than to speak nothing but the ancestral language at home, and then send the children to school and have English as a second language funding kick into place, so that their children will become fluent very quickly in the English language. My concern here

extends to what could happen down the road because of this rather unique situation than try to be addressed on an ad hoc basis.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, I think the member is perhaps reaching somewhat in that speculation. I think it would be unlikely that a parent would - particularly a parent with a capacity in English to do that - given that the ESL grants are only for two, and possibly three years, and perhaps he's putting considerable more faith in the ability of the ESL Support Program to compensate for the fact that English isn't a first language than is actually the case.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: I guess that's a matter of judgment, but I can think of at least three or four instances in communities of single ethnic background, where this could be a considerable difficulty when the children come to school. I hope it doesn't backfire on the department because I think the possibility lies for that to happen.

The question of the Small Schools Grants, are they going to continue to be an ongoing part of the department's funding? I see they're here, obviously for this year, is that a direction the department is satisfied that it would like to continue to go on?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, I think it's safe to assume that this is likely to continue for some time. I want to say, at this point, that the Small School Grants have been extremely well received. They, I think, fill a very real need in many of our small communities with supporting small schools. I think it's certainly enhanced the likelihood that small schools will remain and that many community small schools will be able to provide a better level of education. I certainly believe that it's been well received. I don't know if the member is suggesting otherwise, but I think it's been well received.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: One last comment, Mr. Chairman. I admit, as being a trustee, that I was a little startled when this program came into place, but I would agree that it provides an opportunity for small schools to obtain aides - that's a person - and the equipment that sometimes might not otherwise be able to be afforded within individual schools.

As long as there aren't too many decisions that are made to add to the program, like the ones that I've been talking about in the last few moments, because I think that could very seriously upset what started off to be a reasonably well-conceived program.

HON. J. STORIE: Just on a point of clarification. I recognize the point that the member was raising with respect to Small School Grants. He mentioned earlier, the ESL grants are not part of those; they're part of an ongoing program separate from that.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: I feel that they're getting linked together in a rather inseparable way, although they're certainly obviously separate in the eyes of the department.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, I don't think that member's concern is warranted. The ESL Support

Program is, by and large, a Winnipeg phenomena. There are other ESL Support Program grants being offered throughout the province, but the vast majority does still relate to the immigrant population which tends to focus and centre in Winnipeg. There are ESL Support Program grants going to those schools with perhaps Native populations, etc., but the vast majority fall into the parameters within the perimeter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To mention the time, it's 10 p.m., does the committee wish to continue?

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Continue, Mr. Chairman, if we can.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you're physically able, we will continue.

The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: I'd like to put one comment on the record. The Minister has been very cooperative in moving around on these topics and I appreciate that.

HON. J. STORIE: You're more than welcome.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'd like to get into the whole area of Small Schools and Regional Services. Would the Minister confirm that there is, in fact, a decrease in staffyears in this particular area for the 1986-87 budget?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, there is a decrease of one staff person. That represents a transfer to Appropriation 4.(j) Inner-City Education Initiative.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Well, I'm delighted to see the Inner City get an additional staff year, however I am somewhat dismayed at the fact that the budget for Regional Services has gone down dramatically, from 1983-84 where the actual was some \$727,000, down to this year, where it will be some \$578,000.00. Can the Minister explain why such a drastic cut, when everything else in the costs of education seem to be increasing?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, there has been a reduction, the member is quite right, there have been a couple of internal transfers subsequent to the Estimates preparation. One was a transfer into Regional Services from Curriculum Branch; the second was an additional responsibility flowing to the department which is cost-shared by the Secretary of State 75-25.

So there are some additional dollars for programming, but the member is right that there has been a reduction and it's reflected in the 1985-86 to 1986-87. Again, the reductions have, I suppose, like all reductions, reflect the highest elimination of the lowest priority and that's a phenomena that's not unusual.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: The small school's concept, particularly as it relates to the elementary grades, is one which I have a great deal of empathy for.

Perhaps the greatest concern about this budget is, not so much the staff year drop, but the Other

Thursday, 24 July, 1986

Expenditures drop. Because I would assume that the money used in Other Expenditures is, for the most part, used to travel consultants to small schools to provide aid and assistance to teachers who were dealing with multi-level classes and small classes.

HON. J. STORIE: I want to be clear with the Member for River Heights that the dollars spent on the Small School Program have not decreased. The dollars spent on the Small School Program have actually increased from 1985-86, so the actual money going to the small schools has increased. What is done is some of the in-department expenditures have been curtailed and there have been some, as I've said, transfer of staff.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: I did assume that the grants were not, in fact, part of this particular grouping, but that does not solve my problem which is that you seem to have cut back on consultant services to small schools.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, while there has been a reduction in the direct consulting services' dollars that we are paying, in fact, what we've been able to do in part has been pay secondment dollars, in effect. So what we pay is a lower rate than what we would normally be able to achieve through the hiring directly of consultants by the department. So we've been able to achieve a little more with a little less. An interesting phenomenon you say.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Incredible, I might say.

I put the Minister on notice right now that one of my grave concerns with regard to our education is what we do with consultants in the Province of Manitoba, and I can honestly say that, in my years of teaching throughout Canada, I've never had a consultant in my classroom - ever. I think that is not untypical. I'd like to believe . . .

HON. J. STORIE: It's a reflection of your good teaching ability.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Well, one would love to think that, however, I know that I could have used consultant services and I didn't have them. I am particularly concerned, therefore, in the small schools where you have teachers who do not have contact with universities for the most part; they don't have contact with their own local consultants, because many of these school boards do not have consultants. I am therefore dismayed that there would be less in the way of direct help from the Department of Education to these particular schools.

HON. J. STORIE: I would want to make clear that the Regional Services Branch does not deliver all services to small schools, that in fact the curriculum consultants, the child care and development - I can't get used to be CDSS, I could handle that, but CCD isn't as easy. The services through CCD are in fact delivered in that way and so consulting services, while there has been a reduction in this area, we are essentially obtaining the services in a different way which makes it less expensive. But there are many other services that are provided.

I think, just to comment on the general question that you raise about the visibility of consultants, that perhaps is a concern amongst teachers, that divisions seem to hire consultants, and the department provides consultants, but you never really see them. That is partly because, in most instances, their jobs are not as directly related to the in-class teaching as to contributing to the materials and to the development of materials that come into use in the classroom. But I certainly believe that the reductions that have taken place in Regional Services aren't going to have the impact on the other areas that the Member for River Heights is referring to.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: I will get into it later in the whole area of Curriculum Development, but I would like to make the point now, because I think it's particularly important for the small school, that unless that curriculum consultant is out there in that classroom on a fairly regular basis and has contact with the specific needs of that small school in the multi-level, multi-grade classroom, that it's going to be very tough to produce curriculum materials in a vacuum.

HON. J. STORIE: To this point, Mr. Chairperson, there has not been a great deal of curriculum work done specifically for small schools, although there are consultants now working on adapting curriculum material and that school divisions have done, and actually some interesting adaptations. Some small schools are offering an array of courses that would astound people when you learn that the scope of the school is 50 to 80 students and they have done that on their own, through local initiative and the initiative of teachers. It simply isn't possible for the department, given the larger concerns, to be everywhere and do everything. But the support that we are providing through consultants and through the various branches, I think the small school grants, etc., have improved the situation. There is a lot more hope out there in some of the small schools than there was four or five years ago.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. L. DERKACH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to say to the Minister that the small schools grants that are being provided are, in fact, a positive aspect for many, especially rural small schools, and it's a concept which I would hope that the Minister will continue. But there is one other area that is of concern in terms of small schools. Might I also say the allowing of small schools to use the small schools grant flexibly has become a positive element there.

The concern that we have in some of the small schools is that, when you have to close a small school because of inadequate numbers, or because in some instances perhaps a segment of the population may pull out - the Minister may know of the Native situation.

We are still required to give two-years notice to that school before we can close it and that has become a problem. I'm wondering whether the Minister will be taking a look at this two-year closure aspect and making it a little more flexible to allow school divisions to perhaps close a school where it isn't feasibly practical to run in less than two years.

HON. J. STORIE: The question of the small schools closure or the school closure guidelines have been raised on a number of occasions, and they have been reviewed. I, in my meetings with MAST and in meetings with school divisions directly, have not heard that the guidelines are a specific concern.

There can be exemptions. There are particular circumstances which occur from time to time that preclude a school division doing that kind of planning. I think the principle behind the guideline - and I think it is a sound one - is that, because of the importance to a community of the school, it behooves the school division to do the kind of planning that would allow for an adjustment period for an acceptance of the inevitable, for the arrangement of alternative plans, all of those things.

I think the small schools closure guidelines have worked to the advantage of many divisions. It's given them something to work with as they plan for the future. Two years, in educational terms, is not a long time. In planning terms, when you're talking about something as important as a school, it isn't a long time. So I don't think they're unrealistic.

I recognize that it has put an additional onus on the school division to deal with it in an open way, making the decision I guess somewhat more painful in that it's extended, that there has to be that process. But I think it's a fair requirement of school divisions, and certainly the feedback we've received from the other side, who have had a chance to question and learn about the rationale for those closures, has actually led to a lessening of tensions and perhaps made it easier, in some respects, to make the decision.

MR. L. DERKACH: I don't want to get into a long debate about this, because basically what the Minister says is correct in terms of the principle of the guidelines, except that there are situations - and I think that has to be recognized - throughout the province where it becomes almost impractical to run a high school, for example, with 14 students. At that point, I think the inevitable has to take place. This again is where the boundary changes come in, because I've gone through several school closures in the time that I sat as a school board member. I've gone through school closures before the guidelines were in place and after the guidelines were in place. Of course, it takes the onus off school boards to some extent when you have guidelines as they were set up by the province. But there are the exceptions that, I think, have to be recognized.

The problems that occur are that you have to have complete consensus by the parents before you can close a school, even if the numbers are as low as 14 to 20 students. I think that there has to be some flexibility built into the guidelines where, when a school becomes impractical, the school board and the parents have some alternatives such as looking at changing the boundaries of the school division where students can go to a high school perhaps which is actually closer, but may in fact be in a different school division. The problem, of course, becomes when school boards have to lose tax revenue dollars from land assessment and all those kinds of things.

I don't think there's any easy solution, but I certainly would hope that the Minister and his department would

take a positive look at perhaps allowing the guidelines to be more flexible in special, extenuating circumstances.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, the remarks I think of the Member for Roblin-Russell are instructive, and I don't disagree with some of what he is saying.

I think he referenced schools where there are 14 or 20 students or whatever. In a high school situation, that is simply untenable. I have a lot of faith in school boards. I have a lot of faith in their ability to come to rational, reasonable, financially responsible decisions. What this does, I think, is allow school boards to present those reasons, saying, we're going to close the school and here are the reasons and people will understand it.

There's always a tendency in politics, whether it's school board or otherwise, to make the decision in a hurry and hope that it will get behind you. As the member knows as a school board chairman, that seldom works. Parents want to know why the decision has been made, and it's an emotional issue.

So what the guidelines do is, in effect, give school boards a process in which those things can happen. I don't think there's very often a situation where there are 14 or 20 students in a high school, when the board hasn't been aware for a considerable period of time that there was declining enrolment. That decision was inevitably going to have to be made. It doesn't seem to me that two years is much of an onus or is too onerous on school boards in terms of planning and preparing the community for the upcoming change.

I'm told that in fact there have been instances in the province where schools have been closed without the two-year - was it in your area? - but by consent. Basically, everybody said, yes, I'm sorry, it makes sense. I think that, in reference to the ability of school boards to provide clearer rationale for what they're doing, that in most cases you're going to be able to do it with the understanding that it's inevitable and it makes sense educationally, and all the rest of it.

MR. L. DERKACH: Just to refresh my memory, what is the figure in terms of students for a school to qualify as a small school?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, a small elementary school is considered less than 15. I would like to correct that statement. The formula that's used to define a small elementary school is number of students enrolled divided by the number of grades taught. If that number is less than 15, then it is a small elementary school.

High school, it's fewer than 200 students from Grades 9 to 12. I don't know why they couldn't have a fancy formula, but they don't.

MR. L. DERKACH: In the rural areas, we run into a bit of a problem with the definition of a small high school, because . . .

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, on a point of order. Would the Member for Roblin-Russell care to talk to himself for a few minutes while I go to the washroom?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's take a five-minute recess. It is now 10:20 p.m.; we'll return at 10:25 p.m. The Member

Thursday, 24 July, 1986

for Roblin-Russell can put his questions and line of questioning in order, a five-minute recess. Take a break, back at 10:25 p.m.

HON. J. STORIE: To withdraw that, there was no intention to be cruel or mischievous in those remarks — (Interjection) — okay, maybe a little.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Roblin-Russell is entitled to a small shot, thrust and parry.
The Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. L. DERKACH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

With respect to high schools in rural Manitoba, I think there's a bit of a problem in that 200 student figure because, as I'm sure the Minister is aware, rural Manitoba is becoming depopulated. I'm wondering whether there is any consideration to have that figure even change to include schools that have more than 200 students?

HON. J. STORIE: That's something that could be considered. I would just point out that, right now, the grants are in the neighbourhood of 1.7 million. That money is distributed now between the 275 small schools in the province, both high school and elementary. Some E.D. 1 are high schools. To the extent that you change the criteria, you probably would reduce the effectiveness or the scope of the projects that could be undertaken. So there is a down side to upping the limit.

Certainly, I recognize that there are many schools that are beyond the criteria by X-number that also would like to be taking part in it.

MR. L. DERKACH: The reason I make that point, Mr. Minister, is that, if you compare the programs that are offered in urban schools in Manitoba . . .

HON. J. STORIE: I'm sorry, I just found out something that was disturbing me, and I corrected it.

MR. L. DERKACH: As I said before, the reason I make this point is that I'm sure the Minister is aware that, in the rural high schools in Manitoba, students are not able to take the kinds of options and the types of programs that are offered in the more populated urban schools. There is no way right now, under the present funding formula, where programs can be enhanced because of the numbers.

Perhaps this is one way in which high schools in rural Manitoba could perhaps even improve the quality of education that is being offered in their schools, by increasing that number from 200 students to include more schools in that small schools category.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, I'm going to circulate a couple of documents that have been prepared by the department. One is called "Small High School Study," and the other one's a "Small High School Study - Descriptive Data," which talks about small high schools in the province, very instructive. I mention this in response to the member's comments which, I acknowledge, he's quite right. There is that potential for providing extra options beyond what is available by additional grants to the high schools through the Small Schools Program.

I was quite taken by the kinds of options that are being developed in rural small high schools. In fact, the number of different options that are being prepared here are quite surprising. I wanted to reference one, in particular, and unfortunately right now I can't find it. It's in the course options, Small High School Study. I'm sorry that I didn't have it marked earlier. However, I wanted just to relate some of the options that are being offered.

In one of these, there is a full set of options that has been prepared by the local school in an area that's called agricultural vocation, Page 19. As an example, in Fisher Branch Collegiate, we have a series of different courses which comprise a vocational agricultural program, and we have: Agriculture, Theory and Practice, 105; Introductory Farm Skills, 105; Farm Machinery Operation and Care, 205, recognizing that there are some interesting options that are being provided at a small school.

So the potential for small schools to do innovative, appropriate kinds of things is there, obviously assisted by the Small Schools Grants Program. It just gives you an interesting overview of what's going on in the area.

I should say and this is, I suppose, an important part of the Estimates process, is recognition to staff in the department from the Curriculum Branch and Regional Services and other parts of the department, where staff have worked very hard with small schools, to make these kinds of things possible and to assist local initiative, if you will. The fact is that we are getting calls from all over North America right now, inquiring about our small schools initiatives and the Small Schools Grants Program, because it is quite innovative and has been well received.

MR. L. DERKACH: I'll just conclude my questions and remarks in this area by indicating that I personally support the small schools concept, the support for small schools. But I know that small high schools especially are finding it more and more difficult, perhaps those that don't fall necessarily into that small schools category are finding it more and more difficult to offer comparable options as schools that are in the urban centre, in the City of Winnipeg.

I'm hopeful that, within the time that you are responsible for this department, you will pay some attention to that area and perhaps, in some way, see to it that these schools in fact do not lose ground in the courses that they are able to offer, and perhaps even offer courses that are perhaps even more practical for students as they are about to enter the work force and higher education.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, I hope likewise, and I appreciate very much the member's comments. I, too, was fortunate enough to receive my high school education in a small school, certainly by this definition a very small high school. The point the member raises about the ability of small high schools to offer the same range of options is a legitimate one.

I think what I would like to say as well is, do not confuse the issue of smallness and options with quality of education necessarily. What we will be working to do is making sure that, where small schools are viable and the community wishes to maintain them, the quality apart from the options is maintained as well.

When I look at the kinds of expenditures through this program, if I could just break them down for the member, it's rather instructive that some of it of course has gone to providing additional options, but also money has gone for - and I suppose this relates to the ability to provide options - microcomputers and accessories, to audiovisual equipment, to libraries, to phys-ed equipment and again human resources to help deliver quality education.

So it's being used in a variety of ways, not just to increase the options, which is desirable. But I believe that, even to the extent that options aren't available, there is still the possibility of good quality education being delivered in small schools.

I had a very interesting conversation with your colleague, the Member for Ste. Rose, the other evening about other benefits that aren't always recognized in small school education.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I have just a couple of questions on small schools. Dr. Nicholls had recommended, evidently, a more comprehensive study of small schools. I'm wondering if one is being undertaken.

HON. J. STORIE: It's interesting that the Member for Kirkfield Park should raise that issue, because I have raised that issue myself just recently with the department.

I hope your colleagues will share some of that information on what is going on in small schools - and have asked for specifically, is the question of how small schools do in terms of the achievement of their students beyond the secondary system, because I think that's an important aspect.

Once we understand how well relatively small school students do then we can speak more directly to the quality of the education, the appropriateness of the education they're receiving. So yes, we are going to be reviewing that issue and trying to come to grips more definitively with the benefits of or a lack thereof of small school education.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I'll ask the question on behalf of St. James-Assiniboia School Board. They had requested the study include an evaluation of additional staff costs and high maintenance costs of underutilized buildings and if those two issues would be included in the study.

HON. J. STORIE: That hadn't been raised, I hadn't raised that issue but certainly there are a number of questions, I think, that will have to be raised or need to be raised with respect to small schools.

I, at first, wanted to come to some better understanding myself of where we were at in terms of what we were providing and, to some extent it's an intuitive feeling, and to some extent it's a result of my own experience in the school system, a small school system that were more successful than we believe. I want to have that confirmed in some objective way by reviewing the results, the post-secondary results, in particular, of our small high school graduates. So once I see whether my assumptions are right, then obviously

we want to explore further what benefits there may be for additional resources.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister. As he well would understand that you still have a building to maintain in a small school. We certainly in St. James have tried to consolidate as many as possible, but even at that you end up with some schools that we still had the same high costs of maintaining the building and with a much smaller complement of students. So that turns into quite a cost factor for a school when you're trying to keep your costs down.

HON. J. STORIE: Just while I'm waxing nostalgic about my own experience, I want to indicate the small school in the rural community - and perhaps my rural colleague will confirm this - I recognize there's a community spirit in urban Manitoba as well, but the small school in rural communities is and northern communities are very much more the focus and the emotions and the involvement, in some respects, is qualitatively different I guess. That's a feeling, anyway, I don't know whether the Member for Roblin-Russell would confirm that, but it's a vital issue to so many small communities that I think it has to be a priority to resolve the outstanding problems if we can that they face.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Just one last comment on that.

I did live in a small area too for a number of years but I don't think the feeling is any less in the community that I live in, which is very much like a small community within a larger one in relation to schools. The schools are just a vital part of our area and as the Minister knows, one of the reasons that actually the policy on small schools on the closure came out was probably because of Columbus School that closed in our area, and the amount of consternation and heartache that went on in our community, even though St. James at that time did have a policy of school closure that wasn't too different from what was brought in. But the parents, certainly I think in any community, it doesn't matter whether it's rural or city, have a very strong feeling to a neighborhood school whether it be high school or elementary.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that we revert back to Section 8.(b)(2).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Like . . .

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, there are, I believe, other services relating to it. We just wish to discuss that small school aspect. We'll take it though that the small school question has been passed and we won't come back to it. I can appreciate staff have to come for that purpose.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Where would you like to proceed?

MR. C. BIRT: Then let's revert back to Page 56, which would be 8.(b)(2), which would be School Divisions and Capital.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. 8.(b)(2) - the Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. L. DERKACH: I would like to come back to the Accelerated Program area. The question here is: is this accelerated program concept one that is going to continue in the following years as well or is this done for this one specific year? Will the Accelerated Program concept be one that is going to be continued in the following years?

HON. J. STORIE: I've answered that question earlier this afternoon. The Accelerated Capital Program has been in effect for two years. The original decision to accelerate was actually made in the Estimates process in '84, final decision in '85; another decision to continue it was made after the election when the current Estimates were being reviewed, and I cannot comment on whether it will be necessary, as I've indicated that we have put in substantial, \$75-80 million, over the last couple of years, and that in fact we should be reaching a point where much of the backlog, the urgent and necessary backlog, of renovations and constructions will be achieved. So it will depend very much on what's left to be done and also the financial constraints of the government generally, whether we want to spend additionally on capital construction at this time, recognizing that one of the rationales that was raised by my colleagues was that to accelerate this was to maintain employment, create employment, while doing something, building assets for the province.

We're into a phase now where unemployment is projected to be low and continuing lower over the next couple of years. There may be opportunities to cut back on some of the capital projects. It may in fact be a necessity as we find it more and more difficult to tender and receive bids that are appropriate. It's a less competitive atmosphere with all of the construction that's going on in Manitoba right now.

MR. L. DERKACH: To those school divisions who have their five-year projected priority list and for those projects which come to the top of the list and have not been acted on; are these the projects that the Public Schools Finance Board would be looking at as projects that would go on the Accelerated Program list, or is there some other way that the department takes a look at the accelerated project qualifications?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, I'm told that it's mainly renovation reconstruction projects that tend to go into the accelerated portion because of the need for planning. As the member knows, planning usually requires a couple of years for totally new construction.

MR. L. DERKACH: As a general rule, are school divisions, school boards notified in advance that their specific project in that particular school division may in fact be considered for an Accelerated Program?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, it is announced once a year, once a decision has been made to proceed with the Accelerated Program. There was an announcement and we were talking earlier this afternoon about a specific project.

I want to indicate that the Major Pratt project which was referenced earlier, which was a replacement of a central school, was approved as part of the Accelerated

Program in March of 1985 and put on the Accelerated Program. At that time, an estimate was given. Subsequent to that a letter was sent to yourself indicating that part of it would be going ahead. That also was some eight months or whatever later. That is the normal procedure that the school division would be notified, that yes we're actually onstream and here we go after the whole program had been approved by Cabinet.

MR. L. DERKACH: Well, is there a specific figure that the department puts on the books for accelerated projects within a given year or is this just sort of done on an ad hoc basis? What is the mechanism by which the department approaches the accelerated projects?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, I can indicate that in '85 some 15 million out of the 37 million was considered part of the Accelerated Capital Program - it's 14 million - and it's basically done on the need of the school divisions for renovated or upgraded projects. So basically you say how many projects are there out there that have some sort of priority and a decision is made as to which projects proceed within that kind of allocation.

MR. L. DERKACH: Well, coming back to specifically the Major Pratt situation, the Minister has indicated that particular project had been put on the Accelerated Program in March, 1985. Can the Minister tell me when the letter went to the school board advising them that this project, in fact, was put on the Accelerated Program and would be addressed in the year 1986?

HON. J. STORIE: I know that the letter went in February of 1986 but again the staff were aware that project had been approved, although they had at that point no timetable as to when the project would proceed. When a decision was made as to when to proceed, notification was sent out. At that time, there was still some work left to be done, I guess.

MR. L. DERKACH: Well, I guess that sort of illustrates the point that if these kinds of projects are going to be announced and then are supposedly going to be acted upon the following year, the school boards in fact should be aware of the fact that their particular project has been put on the list as an accelerated project and will be acted upon in the following year, and they should make plans to prepare for that kind of a project.

Specifically in this instance, I guess the board was notified, as you said, in February, that the project would go ahead and it certainly created some anxiety in the community because of the fact that some land has to be acquired for the project to go ahead and there are some negotiations that have to take place in order for that project to go ahead. It just appears some more planning should be done in terms of notifying the parties that are going to be affected by these projects.

HON. J. STORIE: You know, all I can say is that I believe that officials were aware that plans were afoot and the approval was forthcoming; the letter of approval or whatever.

The second stage of that renovation which is the major portion, I guess, of the overall plan which is about

\$1 million, has not been approved yet. There's a little more planning, I guess, required as well on Stage 2.

MR. L. DERKACH: Again, I guess I used this specific example because that's the one I'm most familiar with. Although the project has been approved, to some \$400,000 here, as I understand it to this point, that is not the complete project as I understand it to date. So when is that particular board going to be notified whether or not they have approval for the complete project or is this going to be done on a piecemeal basis? In fact, what direction are we going at in this particular project?

HON. J. STORIE: Well, obviously at this point, I'm informed that no concrete date can be established, but we're in the planning stages, I guess. I understand within a month or two the indications are that their planning should proceed for second stage. It should be possible.

MR. L. DERKACH: If I could move to the new concept for policy of the department to allow for the building of day care facilities and nursery schools to the school building itself where new facilities are being constructed. In the case of, again, the Russell situation, at the time the announcement was made that the board had to make a decision as to whether or not they would accept this proposal to have day care nursery facility added to the school, there seemed to be a very vague attitude, I guess, or knowledge of the needs of the community for those facilities. I'm wondering which department does the survey to establish what the needs are in terms of day care facilities in a community, not specifically that one, but any community.

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, the member has raised this issue previously and essentially I understand it, there are three conditions that need to be met when this kind of cooperative effort between the Department of Education and the Department of Community Services is contemplated.

The first is that the project must consist of either new or major renovations or additions, I should say, to an existing school and there has to be a need identified. That need is confirmed by Community Services.

Finally the local school division must approve the project and the involvement, if you will, of the Department of Community Services and the day care activities. These conditions, I understand, were met at Major Pratt that Community Services had formed a needs assessment and it was believed by that department that there was sufficient need to establish a viable day care unit, so there was - or will be - approval for sufficient spaces, etc. Lastly, but perhaps most importantly, the school division approved the project.

MR. L. DERKACH: I want the Minister to understand the kind of turmoil an announcement like this puts a community in. In this specific instance, there was a nursery school facility - or is a nursery school facility functioning in the community, and one which has been running quite smoothly. When the announcement was made, it was not only a surprise to the school board, it was a surprise to the community, to the nursery school

board, and it put many question marks in people's minds as to what really was going on and what the school board was trying to do.

I think one of the questions that was asked at the time was whether the town or the area could get facilities that were not necessarily attached to the school itself, because there was some apprehension by some school board members and school board officials as to whether in fact it was best to have a facility like this attached to the school. Is it the policy of the department to have facilities of this nature attached only to the school, or is it possible to have these facilities not attached to the school and perhaps even utilized, a building, in this instance, is not going to be used anymore as a school, perhaps get that kind of a building renovated for a day care facility and a nursery school facility?

HON. J. STORIE: In the latter case, yes, it is possible.

MR. L. DERKACH: So what steps does a community go through or a board go through to perhaps get some feedback from the department as to which direction they should move in? Because I think there are many questions in the board members' minds, in the community's mind, as to what approach they should go on because I think they're a little bit afraid that if they don't accept what the department has laid before them, that they will never be able to have an opportunity to get those kinds of facilities again.

So there's some pressure on the community and on the school board to take this offer, even though in fact they may not know at the present time whether it's in their best interests and in the best interests of the community.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, certainly representatives from the Public Schools Finance Board are available, should school divisions wish to discuss the funding arrangements, the implications, with members of the department. They could certainly talk with staff or invite staff out to discuss issues with them. I'm sure Community Services would feel very much the same.

MR. L. DERKACH: Can I ask the Minister then, what is the specific policy with respect to facilities for day care and nursery schools, when it comes to construction of new facilities in a school division?

HON. J. STORIE: I think the policy is pretty clear. If a school division feels that is something that is desirable, they're aware of the availability of capital support through the Department of Education. If they feel that it's something that's desirable or makes sense for the community, then obviously they should request the assistance, the advice, the cooperation of the Public Schools Finance Board and Community Services, and explore fully whether that's a realistic option or something that's desirable.

I certainly don't want to suggest that there's pressure on any group of school boards to do this. It's an opportunity. We believe it makes sense. I believe there are 12 school divisions who are currently taking advantage of the program, our capital commitment for 1986-87 is completely full. I have had a very good

Thursday, 24 July, 1986

response from many school divisions about the direction that this is going. It does make some sense.

If you appreciate the concerns that are being addressed to me currently with respect to transportation, particularly urban school divisions, something like this even makes more sense.

MR. L. DERKACH: Is it the policy of the department then to have those facilities attached to a school?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, that's certainly the department's - and that's what is stated in the guidelines. That does not include, of course, the establishment of a day care anywhere in the province, in any building. Community Services is continually, I believe, looking for additional groups, community groups to sponsor day care. This is simply one alternative, amongst many, in terms of provision of day care at the community level.

MR. L. DERKACH: Would the department then look favourably at supporting capital funds for renovation of an area that is not physically attached to the existing school building or one that's going to be built?

HON. J. STORIE: No, Mr. Chairperson, however Community Services can make capital grants available for day cares established in other community facilities.

MR. L. DERKACH: Is there a written agreement between Community Services and the Department of Education in terms of who will take care of the maintenance of the facility after it is constructed and in terms of its sharing of costs between the school division and Community Services, once that building is in place?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, obviously the 12 divisions where there will be day care facilities are satisfied that agreements can be worked out which absolve the school division of any additional responsibility for ongoing operating costs or other costs.

Certainly, I think the previous Minister made it clear and I will make it clear that there is no intention through this policy to have school divisions assume any additional responsibility. We're doing this in an effort to cooperate, because in many quarters this kind of cooperation makes sense. But we still believe there is a separation of functions and responsibilities between Community Services and Education. Despite the fact that we now may be sharing a facility, there is no reason to assume that we can't separate the financial responsibility.

MR. L. DERKACH: Does the school board have then complete jurisdiction over the facility?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, I believe that's the case. They have a lease agreement, in essence, with the day care group.

MR. L. DERKACH: The department or who has a lease agreement?

HON. J. STORIE: The board owns the facility, but leases the space.

MR. L. DERKACH: Does the Minister have a copy of the lease form?

HON. J. STORIE: Oh my God! Mr. Chairperson, I do not have a copy of the lease, but my consternation arises because there's a committee working on it.

MR. L. DERKACH: We'll just leave it at that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. DERKACH: No, no!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. The Member for Roblin-Russell. I thought you were giving up.

MR. L. DERKACH: No, I'm not giving up.

HON. J. STORIE: I want to interject, that was just a joke.

MR. L. DERKACH: Now I understand why there are so many questions that are being sort of posed by school boards I guess, whether they're not coming to the Minister himself with respect to the future of facilities that are attached to the schools.

My next question is: is there going to be a special board set up by Community Services for day care and the nursery facility?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we should answer him within the spectrum of this Ministry.

HON. J. STORIE: I want to comment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, you want to comment.
The Minister of Education.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, I just want to indicate that my previous remarks with respect to the very real task that the committee is doing who is reviewing the terms of the agreement that will be in place between the school board and the day care were only in jest. I know that, obviously 12 divisions who have undertaken to cooperate and take part in this program believe that it's possible and practical to develop an agreement which protects the interests of both parties. I'm sure that will happen.

The members' specific question, I'm not clear on how he will have the Department of Education respond. The responsibility for the operation of day cares rests with a board which, in the normal course of events, is elected from parents and interested people. That will continue to be the case. The operation of the day care per se will not be the responsibility of the school or the school board, but will be the responsibility of the day care group themselves who will operate, maintain and fund and so forth.

MR. L. DERKACH: What I'm trying to get at is that there is obviously going to have to be some kind of a body that's going to be in charge of the responsibilities of the day care and nursery facilities, and I would presume that it'll be a board. Does the school board then have opportunity to have a school board member

sit on that board? What about arrangements in terms of times for playground facility, use of space, etc.?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, yes, I presume the school board, the school administration will obviously work out those arrangements with the day care staff and the board of directors of the day care. Given that, in most circumstances that I'm aware of, there are many times during the day when the playground is not in use, those kinds of arrangements should be relatively simple to work out.

Mr. Chairperson, I'm also reminded that there are many, many day cares operating in existing schools for which these kinds of agreements have been worked out without any problem. I wanted to add, the member's comment about maybe I haven't heard from school boards with respect to this policy. I want to assure him that I have, and it has been, by and large if not unanimously, positive.

MR. L. DERKACH: The Minister has indicated that in the case of the one rural school division, Pelly Trail, that's going to be receiving the renovations here that have been allocated, there are some \$400,000 that have already been allocated. Are you saying that there's still \$1 million that will be forthcoming in the next month or two?

HON. J. STORIE: No, I didn't give that assurance.

MR. L. DERKACH: Was that a figure that I heard incorrectly?

HON. J. STORIE: No, I think that is an estimate of the cost, but no approval to date has been given.

MR. L. DERKACH: Mr. Chairman, the figure that was thrown out was \$1 million?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes. That's for the second stage.

MR. L. DERKACH: But that second stage is going to take place very soon, as I understand it.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, that is a question that is yet to be addressed, but we have an estimate and obviously are aware of the needs. As we progress through this year, we will be assessing this along with other priorities as with any other case.

MR. L. DERKACH: Does that include the acquisition of the land, or does that \$1 million or the \$400,000 not include land?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, the land costs are not included in that figure.

MR. L. DERKACH: So whatever the land costs would be in this case, that would be over and above the estimated amount?

HON. J. STORIE: I believe that's correct, Mr. Chairperson.

MR. L. DERKACH: Thank you very much.

MR. C. BIRT: During last year's Estimates, the previous Minister of Education, when I posed the question of including day care facilities in schools, indicated that it was not within the parameters of the Department of Education to do it, nor did she want to do it. I'm just wondering, when did the department change its mind and what caused it to change its mind.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, I believe the full context of that debate was not only with respect to the physical facility, but the overall question of the involvement of school division staff and the other possible relationships between the day care and the school, and then the control over, etc., those questions obviously have been addressed in the current program. I suppose were addressed to the satisfaction of the previous Minister, which subsequently saw an announcement of the current program, which I think does address those problems.

MR. C. BIRT: It's interesting to see some movement, even when the former Minister said there was no movement, and perhaps this is beginning the final evolution, including the two separate functions into the one department.

HON. J. STORIE: Is that a good idea?

MR. C. BIRT: Well, I made the suggestion last year and half of it was accepted; who knows what will happen with the other half?

My question is to the Minister, once these monies have been allocated either for renovation or the addition of new space, is it to be tendered out by the school division? Who looks after who is going to occupy the space? Is that the department, the school division, or Community Services?

HON. J. STORIE: Well, of course, before anybody occupies the space, the planning is done; and within the planning, a decision is made as to what space is going to be made available and where. Once the building is complete, then it's occupied, of course according to its design. — (Interjection) — Did I miss your question?

MR. C. BIRT: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Education, on the question.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, Community Services will make that decision based on, I suppose, the groups that are interested and involved.

MR. C. BIRT: Then as I understand it, all that the Department of Education is doing, either through new construction or through renovation, is going to be making space available for the day care services. As to who occupies it and of the running the day cares and meeting of the standards, and how much rent can be charged and paid for is still within the total jurisdiction of Community Services, is that correct?

HON. J. STORIE: That's correct.

Thursday, 24 July, 1986

MR. C. BIRT: The Minister indicates that 1.2 million is set aside in this year's proposed capital program. Is that included in the 19.5 as we show down here as school divisions?

HON. J. STORIE: No.

MR. C. BIRT: Where is it included?

HON. J. STORIE: That is debenture, as is the \$37 million of funds for the construction of schools.

MR. C. BIRT: Could you elaborate on the debenture, where is it shown?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, the debenture simply means that the cost of the facility is amortized over a long period of time. In the case of the 1.2 million set aside for day care, as with the \$37 million, as with school construction since 1969 when the responsibility for capital construction became a provincial responsibility, it's been debentured, and the cost of the debenture shows up in the 19 million referenced in Item 8.(b)(2).

MR. C. BIRT: So if I understand the financing arrangements, the 19.5 is really the interest and principal on debenture?

HON. J. STORIE: No, Mr. Chairperson, only a portion of it is. There are other items which are minor capital costs, school buses, vocational equipment, life skills facilities, all of which show up in the 19 million as well.

MR. C. BIRT: While 1.2 million has to be repaid and there's interest on that, it's being carried in the department's Estimates, and I take it it's included in this particular . . .

HON. J. STORIE: No, Mr. Chairperson, it isn't yet; it will be in the future.

MR. C. BIRT: Whatever it costs, whether it be \$1 or \$100,000 a year, is it the intention of the Department of Education to recover that particular cost from Community Services, or is it now a permanent cost within the department?

HON. J. STORIE: No, Mr. Chairperson, it is a permanent cost to the Department of Education or Community Services or the government. It wouldn't really matter where that money was provided. If it was provided in a debentured way, it would show up as an expense at some point to the department, to government, as a result of interest.

MR. C. BIRT: In the schools that are identified here, either in (a) the regular program, or (b) in the accelerated program, who tenders out that work? Is it the school division or is it the department itself?

HON. J. STORIE: The school division.

MR. C. BIRT: Whether it be a renovation or a brand new school, in planning with the department, they're

given a certain sum of money or at least allocated, and then it's up to the school division to see if they can get the job done by tender?

HON. J. STORIE: That's essentially correct.

MR. C. BIRT: If the job comes in over tender, what happens then?

HON. J. STORIE: There are a number of options. No. 1, the Public Schools Finance Board, which consults, and obviously is aware of the planning, the drawings, everything else as it goes through the system, if the tenders came in too high, would then look at ways of reducing the cost within the design of the building eliminating whatever is necessary until they can come up with a design which it would be possible to construct at the estimated cost.

If that's not possible, and it's not always - but in the majority of cases it is possible - but if it's not possible, then it's possible for the school division to say, well, the extra we will pick up. There have been occasions when the school divisions have chosen to do that.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, if they decide not to proceed with the project, because you can't reduce it below the contract price or they're not prepared to absorb the extra cost, do they still get the money or is it just lost and then it goes back into the general appropriation?

HON. J. STORIE: There are very few instances where it isn't possible, through one of those means, to bring the project in at a reasonable level.

I should indicate that our experience in this is no different than, say, the Department of Housing, which constructs the public housing projects. There are very often design changes necessary to bring it in on cost.

MR. C. BIRT: On the first page, in (d) Acceleration Program, they show Winnipeg and there's Fort Rouge, Ralph Brown, Hugh John Macdonald, Argyle, Shaughnessy Park, Pinkham schools, and it's got \$8.9 million. Then on the third page, dealing with Winnipeg, there's a gross of \$9 million but it seems to refer to a different number of schools and they start talking about two schools in Rosser, and a new downtown school. Why are they different?

HON. J. STORIE: The total on Appendix A, the first page, is the 1985 projects.

MR. C. BIRT: Those were approved in 1985.

HON. J. STORIE: That's right. Those were approved in 1985. The ones that the member referred to, that's out of the \$37 million. The other ones the member referred to, the other \$9 million total, is for the 1986 construction budget.

MR. C. BIRT: Do I understand it, then, that there was \$37 million approved for 1985 and there's another \$37 million for the 1986 year?

HON. J. STORIE: Pretty impressive, wouldn't you say?

MR. C. BIRT: The question to the Minister is - it will be impressive, if they're all built in the next two years?

HON. J. STORIE: They will be.

MR. C. BIRT: The intriguing thing will be, and we will be working on it from hereon in to, as the Minister has said, a promise made is a promise kept. We'll make sure that they're not all readvertised some two to four years from now. Yes, it will be impressive if they are built. If they're not, you'll hear about it.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, I'm not sure but did I hear a suggestion in there that some of them should be held?

MR. C. BIRT: You're hearing things again.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I wanted to ask a question about the 1986 program for Winnipeg. It mentions that the division has submitted projects totalling \$16 million for 1986 and that a total of \$9 million is allocated.

Why was that put down in that way for Winnipeg 1?

HON. J. STORIE: I'm sorry, I'm asleep at the switch here. I missed the key element of your question and I had to say why is she asking?

The reference there is simply that the priorities of Winnipeg School Division were submitted and they included that total, some \$16 million worth of projects for the fiscal year, in this case 1986. They were allocated only - that's not quite the correct term - they were allocated only \$10 million and, of course, prioritized within that. They originally had said this is what we'd like to do and, obviously, with an allocation of \$10 million, they could only do so many. They came back and said these are our priorities.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Just a question I have, and I think everyone's been trying to get at it, is how the Public Schools Finance Board ends up prioritizing Winnipeg 1 at the amount that it's getting, and I recognize that it's a large division with many schools and has old schools. But I look at this list here and although I don't recognize all the schools, I know that Isaac Brock is an old school, but I know that General Wolfe is not what I would consider an old school. I went to the old General Wolfe and certainly this isn't the same school that was there then.

When I see that, and when I see the number of divisions that have been allocated, I just wonder why Winnipeg would receive the amount of money that it's getting in relation to the amount of money that has been allocated to some of the other divisions. In other words, have none of the other divisions put in for more than they have received? In other words, did they not request more and get less? What I'm asking the Minister, I'd like to know just exactly what was requested from the different divisions and how this prioritization takes place. I have a problem with it when I look at the amount of money.

HON. J. STORIE: The specific reference the member made to General Wolfe, the funding there was to close in the classrooms. The member really answered her

own question when she identified obvious circumstances that Winnipeg 1 faces, and that is a tremendous number of older schools. The majority of that sum of money went to the very real need of upgrading some extremely old schools.

Winnipeg 1 is also expanding. Winnipeg 1 is a strange division in that some of the newer areas, I believe Meadows West, is an area that again is really a community that has developed entirely since 1982 and obviously has a diversity of needs, with new construction and renovations. They would argue that because of their special needs, and the older schools in the inner city have needed this for some time, kind of to catch up. By and large, I think many of the other areas, the suburban areas of Winnipeg, have more modern, relatively newer schools.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I recognize that Winnipeg 1 has older schools. I also wonder what type of encouragement is given to divisions to make a point of keeping their schools well maintained and do a lot of their own upgrading, so that the schools don't get into such disrepair that then they need major construction and major renovation work to them. I look at a division like St. James which has always kept a continual maintenance going of schools. We have some old schools, too. St. James is a pretty old area and yet I see Linwood School in which we were renovating when I was on the board. I think we got new windows two years in a row for Linwood School. But I can't help but feel that there has to be some onus on divisions. I think that it should come from the department that they have to keep up some of this work, and I can't help but look at some of the areas and wonder just exactly what kind of upgrading the divisions are doing themselves and if the department keeps track of the kind of money that is being spent on general maintenance.

HON. J. STORIE: The member makes a valid point. Certainly I think most school boards, recognizing that they are independent autonomous boards, I think nevertheless - and I have a good deal of respect for individuals who serve on school boards, it's a difficult thankless job in many respects - are aware and are concerned about the maintenance of our assets, our schools and by and large are very careful with the maintenance. The province has for many years provided, not only the construction costs, but provided minor capital grants for minor upgrading. Those are available to school divisions.

I think we have a fairly broad distribution of funds across the province. I don't think our experience has been that any particular school division has been negligent in requesting repair money. It's certainly our experience that every school division is endeavouring to maintain its schools and upgrade them as much as possible.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I guess I come back to the area about the encouragement for divisions to do their own maintenance because, here again, we have divisions - and I'm sure that there are other divisions beside St. James - who do a continuous maintenance. Because of that, they are short-changed when it comes to major

renovations. You just have to look at the list and I see that there are other divisions here that are missing, also, that must feel the same.

So I ask the Minister if there is any way of giving help to divisions, or at least recognizing in some way, in the grants, their ability to keep their schools so that they are not continually coming to the Public Schools Finance Board for extra funding. I think it's another instance of schools that are being fiscally responsible, divisions that are being fiscally responsible, being penalized.

HON. J. STORIE: I don't entirely agree with the point, I think, the member is making. As I indicated, we put aside some money for minor capital, that amounts to approximately \$3.3 million.

I'm not sure how we provide incentives - I mean, that's apart from the major money that goes for major renovations - I'm not sure how we provide incentives. I suppose because we pick up 100 percent of major projects, there may be no incentive for the school board to do it until a major project is required. Again, you would then be, of course, asking the school division - again with varying abilities - to pick up the 20 percent or 50 percent of the capital costs of upgrading. So you may be working in a self-defeating kind of way in those divisions who simply aren't wealthy enough to take on those projects and provide 50 percent of the capital.

The second point is that the minor capitals; Schedule V Capital which it is called, the assistance is based on two factors: (1) the size of the school (the square feet); and (2) upon the age. So large older schools would receive more of the minor capital stuff and be an encouragement for divisions to commence and continue repairs than others.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: With that, I've just got another question when it's dealing with some of the really old schools, is there any thought any time looking at a school that has deteriorated so much that it isn't worthwhile to make a major renovation to it. What happens in those cases? Who makes that decision; the division or the Public Schools Finance Board?

HON. J. STORIE: Well, the school division ultimately makes the decision, however, there have been circumstances where the costs of upgrading were such that it simply would not have been a wise decision. In some cases, it's a little closer; it's kind of a judgment call. Obviously in some communities there's some attachment, historical or heritage value or whatever, to a building where, although it may have been financially better to reconstruct, a decision has been made to renovate. But generally the Public Schools Finance Board will support up to 50 percent of replacement costs when it comes to renovations. I'm not sure the member caught that. Generally, Public Schools finance about 50 percent of replacement costs. It's kind of a magic figure and after that it's a benchmark, staff inform me, but after that, it becomes a bit more of a value . . .

MRS. G. HAMMOND: On the two schools that are being built in Rosser, what kind of a study has been done to assure that there are the number of children

in the community, like, are these established communities now that we're building the schools for, or are they expanding? What kind of a study has been done, in other words, so that the school isn't built too large for the community? Because that has happened so often in areas that I think that could be a problem.

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, there have been studies and enrolment projections developed which suggested this is something that's necessary.

The answer to the specific question about who undertakes the enrolment projections, it's of course the school division, the division that requests the construction and the Public Schools Finance Board reviews them and tries to determine their legitimacy, etc. But the other question, I suppose the concern the member raises reminds me of another change somewhat in policy, in direction over the last few years of the Public Schools Finance Board, and that is the development of what is called the core school concept, whereby - and I think the member knows this - that communities change from time to time and their structure, the demographics in the community changes. As the community ages, there are fewer students, so what you have is a cycle where, initially, as new families move into an area, there's a tremendous bulge in the enrolment, a school is needed. Over the next 10 years, 15 years, the school age population is depleted, it becomes an aging community. Those offspring end up forming another community somewhere else and you're left with schools that are empty.

So what the Public Schools Finance Board started doing two years ago, and it's a concept that's so simple it's a wonder someone hasn't thought of it before, but what they're doing is building a core school. They're establishing a minimum number of units and then providing additions that would be portable; so in fact, as the enrolment decreases, those parts of the school which are portable would be transferred and used in other areas as other communities develop, and what would be left would be a core school, perhaps small, and could also be part of a community centre, if you will. So that's one of the responses to the issue, generally, that you're raising.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: The Minister is correct. That makes so much sense and I think of a school in my area, Spring Valley, where the second floor has never been used, but when they did the study the city had projected there would be the families, but then when it was built, it was built in a different manner and so the concern is so real that when you take the study, it may have been designed for one thing and then turns out to be another. So I think it's a great idea on the core schools because I look in my own area and we'll be sitting with two schools empty and others in the division.

HON. J. STORIE: There are 16 schools currently under construction or in the works that would be based on this core concept.

We are also developing quality relocatables to add on to schools that are requesting additional spaces at the current time and they're quality, not looking like the normal portables that you see in school yards,

they're high quality and they blend in with the existing structure. So we're using those as well now, so that when the enrolment changes we'll be in a position to adjust.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, in the list of projects for 1986, dealing with Winnipeg - I presume it's Winnipeg 1 - it says that the projects are to be prioritized by the division. Why are they given this authority and no other division is given that authority?

HON. J. STORIE: No, Mr. Chairperson. The fact is that schools do submit their priorities.

MR. C. BIRT: All school divisions?

HON. J. STORIE: All school divisions.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, they are given, according to this note, the right to move their \$9 million around as they see fit, yet no other school division has that.

You could take some of the rural areas that have just as old a school structure as, say, the Winnipeg 1 and if they were to be given a million or a million-and-a-half, surely they could be given the same privilege of being able to spend it where they felt it would be better.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, I'm informed that they do. The difference with Winnipeg - and it's referenced that way - is because obviously they're a huge school division and they have so many new construction projects going on simultaneously and major renovations that it's simply presented in that way. But I am perfectly aware of coming from a school division, that the school division sets its priorities.

The Public Schools Finance Board, in this case, allocates money globally, rather than by project, but the school divisions, nevertheless, set their priorities.

MR. C. BIRT: Could the Minister give us a breakdown of items and amounts under the school divisions? You made reference to minor capital, but I think there were two or three other items as well. Could you just break that down for us?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, the minor capital is approximately \$4 million currently; and I'm reminded to explain here that these totals represent only about 65 percent of the actual allocations because this represents only the portion of funds that come from general revenue. The remaining 35 percent comes from the Education Support Levy which is essentially a transfer from Municipal Affairs back to the school division, so that \$4 million in minor capital actually represents about \$6 million.

The debt services that the member referred to represents about \$10 million . . .

MR. C. BIRT: Likewise, would it be increased?

HON. J. STORIE: Likewise, it would be \$15 million. The school buses are about 4, representing 6, and the vocational . . .

MR. L. DERKACH: Can you explain these school buses?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes.

MR. L. DERKACH: Capital purchase of school buses?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, and vocational equipment about 1, representing 1.5.

MR. L. DERKACH: A clarification on that vocational. Does that also include Industrial Arts equipment in schools or is that under different . . . ?

HON. J. STORIE: No, it would include Industrial Arts.

MR. L. DERKACH: How much is that?

HON. J. STORIE: \$1.5 million, in total. Basically I'm giving you two sets of figures because the 19 will total the 65 percent.

MR. L. DERKACH: With minor capital, it seems that in many school divisions the minor capital is not a sufficient amount of money to look after the general repairs that fall into this particular category.

Has the department received any feedback from school divisions with respect to the amount of monies allocated or the formula that is in place for minor capital?

HON. J. STORIE: I don't think it's been an overriding concern. There have been individual instances where concerns were expressed. I don't think that's unusual. Any category of expenditure is transferred to the school divisions, whether it's small school grants or compensatory grants or capital grants, there's always a concern that it isn't enough; but I don't think there's been any - I've certainly not received any feedback that it's perceived as an exceptional problem.

MR. L. DERKACH: When the formula was changed, when the category was established, there were some school divisions, as I understand it, whose schools were perhaps in greater need of repair than the amount of funds that are being received would satisfy. Has there been any kind of monitoring to see whether in fact the amount of monies allocated to minor repair are sufficient?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes.

MR. L. DERKACH: Is the Minister saying then that the amount of monies allocated to this area is sufficient and there won't be any changes made in the foreseeable future?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, the amount that's allocated is reviewed every year, but again a decision is made on how much is allocated to minor versus construction, basically made every year.

MR. L. DERKACH: All school divisions are using the minor capital, but how many of these school divisions are utilizing their own funds, besides what they receive from minor capital for the purpose of maintaining their buildings?

Thursday, 24 July, 1986

HON. J. STORIE: Just two points. Firstly, the increase this year has been approximately \$300,000.00. The second point is you should perhaps talk to your colleague, who has raised the question about if we fund 100 percent as minor, is there any incentive for doing it - if we funded 100 percent of minor and major? The third point I guess - I know there's a third point there somewhere. Yes, the question about whether divisions fund, some or all divisions. I understand that practically all divisions fund minor capital projects on their own, that this was never intended to be 100 percent of the minor capital projects.

MR. L. DERKACH: So if that was never the intention, what percentage of the minor capital requirements for school divisions was this intended to cover? Was it half or 60 percent?

HON. J. STORIE: The staff indicate that about 75 percent, give or take a percentage, would be covered by the minor capital allocations, but historically there has been a minor capital allocation funded or distributed in this way and it represents the historical average, I guess, and some increase for inflation. I'm not sure I can say categorically that this is the best way to do it or that it isn't arbitrary in some sense.

MR. L. DERKACH: The percentage of increase in minor capital from year to year has to be based on something. What is the increase based on?

HON. J. STORIE: Basically, Mr. Chairperson, the increase is based on I suppose an understanding. Increases are necessary from time to time because of increased costs, relatively the same amount of money proportionally has been set aside year by year for minor capital. So it's based on historical levels and some recognition that costs increase. There is no set formula for the increase.

MR. L. DERKACH: Is there any consideration given to the increase in costs of supplies?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes.

MR. L. DERKACH: Okay, if that's the case, can a school division, if for example they have some major projects in the minor capital area that have to have some attention and they can't be funded out of minor capital for one specific year, can the monies be held over for another year and combined with the grant for a subsequent year to be able to carry out the project?

HON. J. STORIE: I understand that's been done.

MR. L. DERKACH: Are you saying that is sort of a policy of the department that can be done from year to year now?

HON. J. STORIE: I understand that it has been a practice. I don't know whether I'd say it's a policy, it's been a practice for some time.

MR. L. DERKACH: Outside of minor capital then and the debentures, is there any other area that is included in the Item 8.(b)(2)?

HON. J. STORIE: The answer is no, not for this year.

MR. L. DERKACH: Did you say that debentures were 10 million and minor capital was 4 million, are school bus purchases the rest of it?

HON. J. STORIE: 4 and 1 for vocational equipment.

MR. L. DERKACH: One for vocational equipment?

HON. J. STORIE: That's 19.

MR. L. DERKACH: How often are school buses replaced by the province?

HON. J. STORIE: Quite often.

MR. L. DERKACH: That's a silly answer.

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, it is but then, of course, it's a silly time. Roughly, on average, I understand, to be specific to the member's question, about once every eight years. Well it's actually only replaced once, to be more specific, but that replacement generally occurs after about eight years.

MR. L. DERKACH: I think I better quit there, Mr. Chairman.

HON. J. STORIE: I can tell you it deteriorates quickly from here.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, just before I would move that the committee rise, I would like to get some information from the Minister and his staff so that we can facilitate next week's debate in going over the Estimates.

On the first day of Estimates, I asked for three pieces of information and I'd appreciate being able to get that for Monday so that we can start processing it, because we're going to be into the area next week and if you look at the Estimates, at the end of my remarks, I asked for information in three areas and I didn't have them written out right now so I can't tell you what they are, but you said, yes, you'd get them. I left the list downstairs.

HON. J. STORIE: Okay, no problem.

MR. C. BIRT: I've got a handwritten list here also but we're going into - I think we're reverting back to some sort of normal procedure of going through Estimates on Monday . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We should be going into Item 3.

MR. C. BIRT: Item 3, in particular there is 3.(a). If the Minister could give us the breakdown of the school division grants, of the name and number on the GSE formula; the name and number - when I say number, the amount - on the revised formula; the name and amount on the new formula; the grants to independent schools; the formula for grants and determining the grants to independent schools; the small school grants; the divisions and the amount; and the names and the

amount of the Hutterite colonies - I understand this is to take effect in September of this year, at least that's what the letter indicated.

Secondly, in the PACE section of the Estimates, it's the breakdown of the grants by amounts and recipients, and I'll just give you the areas where grants are indicated: 5.(j)(3), 5.(k)(3), 5.(m)(3) and 5.(n)(3). Then, under the Universities Grants Commission, the breakdown of the grants to the universities and the amount as set out in 6.(c), and I'll give you this handwritten note, so if we could get that information. But the important one would be the breakdown, as I've indicated, under 3.(a), because we'll be going into that area on Monday. I can appreciate also that it may have to come to us during the day.

HON. J. STORIE: Do you want this tomorrow?

MR. C. BIRT: No, we're going into it on Monday morning, if we can get it sometime Monday morning. If it's such that we have to get it in pieces during the day, then we'll just have to adjust it.

HON. J. STORIE: We'll do our best to accommodate this.

MR. C. BIRT: Thank you.

Once again, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of myself and my colleagues, I would like to thank the Minister and his staff, in particular, for allowing us to take a rather irregular route through the Estimates this evening. I appreciate your cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, I would move that we pass all the items in 8 and then Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 8.(b)(1)—pass; 8.(b)(2)—pass.

Resolution 53: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$25,729,900 for Education, Expenditures Related to Capital, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1987—pass.

Committee rise.

SUPPLY - HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: The committee will please come to order. We have been considering the Estimates of the Department of Health.

We are now on Item No. 5.(a)(1) Sport - Executive: Salaries; and 5.(a)(2) Other Expenditures - the Honourable Minister.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a short statement. Over the past 10 years or so, amateur sports in this province has made some tremendous strides in growth and development. It wasn't that long ago that the total budget for the province to assist sport was less than \$20,000 annually. Today, the province provides, through appropriations and lottery funds, some \$3 million to assist 74 provincial and six regional sports associations in the development of their sport. This amount is complemented by some \$5 million provided to sports through the Manitoba Sports Federation through lottery funds.

Because of the high level of cooperation between the Sport Directorate and the Manitoba Sports

Federation, and the army of volunteers involved, opportunities for young and old alike who participate in the variety of sports is limitless.

Recently the Manitoba Games hosted in Flin Flon offered opportunities for young and old, in open or mixed classification, a variety of experiences that would last a lifetime.

For the first time in the province's history, the Games hosted events for Seniors and Special Olympic athletes. We feel strongly that all Manitobans be given an opportunity to participate. Many of these athletes will be vying for positions on the Manitoba team for the 1987 Canada Winter Games and 1987 Western Canada Games.

In 1985, Manitoba won the Centennial Cup as the most improved province at the Summer Canada Games in New Brunswick. Manitoba is planning to do the same in the Canada Winter Games in Nova Scotia in February of 1987.

In 1988, Manitoba hosts the first Provincial Summer Games in 12 years. The last one was held in 1976 in Neepawa, Manitoba.

Programs, like the Games, provide opportunities for people in all walks of life, in all age classifications, an opportunity to participate in sport at their desired skill level. The results of programs like this place a large demand on improved coaching, officiating and especially facilities.

Now that we have more leisure time and our parents are spending more time and dollars participating in sports, improvements are required.

Manitoba now boasts in excess of 225,000 registered athletes in the province, let alone those who participate in sport for the fun of the game and do not belong to a provincial sport association. In the last 10 years, the number of high performance athletes who rank 1 to 8 in Canada in their event and classification has risen from less than 50 to 450 athletes.

The National Coaching Certification Program, complemented by the technical coaching certification for each sport has provided both athletes and coaches an opportunity to learn more about coaching and a particular skill in the sport.

Unfortunately the development of sport facilities has not kept pace with the development of human resources. We now face a tremendous challenge to meet the need presented to us by our athletes to develop sports facilities in several sports.

Hopefully, the province, the city, Manitoba Sports Federation, the Federal Government, and our corporate friends will be able to work together toward this end.

The Province of Manitoba wants to keep its citizens physically active. The province would like to reduce the cost of health care in favour of preventative medicine, through the prevention and care of injuries and illness.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I thank the Minister for his opening statement and the information that it contained. There's no question that sport has benefited, particularly the past few short

years, beginning about 1979, and in the last few years with a tremendous influx of money.

I support one of the major questions to be considered by this committee is how well is that money being spent? What are the plans for future expenditures of this continuing growth in money that's being made available to sports in Manitoba, recreation in Manitoba? How can we best plan for the use of that money. How can we best plan expanded and new facilities that are required and can be developed with this money? Those are, in particular, Mr. Chairman, the areas that I would like to examine.

I would begin by asking the Minister, with respect to his press release of July 18 of this year, wherein he announced that an additional \$2.1 million was going to be approved, I take it to be expended through the Sports Directorate. I would ask him if he could answer that question. Is that \$2.1 million additional Lotteries money to be expended by the Sports Directorate in this fiscal year and, if so, is that the total amount of extra money to be expended by the Sports Directorate and what is the breakdown as to how that money is to be expended in this fiscal year?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I guess we'll have to have a lot of flexibility in this; it's very difficult to follow. If you take this at this time, because I'll have to answer on that, this is the money that we requested through the usual procedure. What we see here, that is the Executive and then the Sports Directorate, which is part of the Department of Health. The Directorate, reporting directly to me and using the administration help of the department and so on, reporting directly to me, and working directly with the Sports. We could do this before and then do the rest. It doesn't matter.

My honourable friend is right. We brought in a short history, so he'll understand, of the Lotteries. When we started the Lotteries here, there was a certain amount of money, of course - well, the first time the Lotteries were brought in it was for one year only, and it was for facilities during the Centennial, if you remember, and it was self-destructing. We had to bring in other legislation to keep on with the Lotteries.

At the time, the province decided that, unlike other provinces, this money, the revenues from the Lotteries, would not go directly for the Consolidated Fund. During the Lotteries, or later on - at least we can cover the part of Sports, not the details but the history of it, or the reason why the Sports Federation receive a certain amount of money.

There's a certain amount of money that goes to the government, a percentage of that, it was always like that. At one time, in the Schreyer years, I was the Minister responsible for Culture, Fitness and Recreation, so it was all one department. Then there was a division, it was divided with Culture, and Sports stayed with Health, and Fitness stayed, and then there's Recreation.

So there's a formula that a certain percentage for Fitness, for Sports and the rest for Culture and Recreation. So that, of course, has been followed with the division of the departments and the larger share of the government's share is now with Culture, who is responsible for Culture and Recreation. The Department of Health has a small amount for Fitness and then there's a certain amount of dollars in there for Sports,

and that my honourable friend; the amount of money, this 21, that my honourable friend is that amount of money that's for that. This is the way that will be spent.

You know, as I announced earlier, this is the amount we received; the revenue from Lotteries we spend on Sports that the department decides, and the rest, the 5 million or so, well that's the umbrella group, the Sports Federation, who has the responsibility to divide that with the members.

I can give you the list of it, what we have for this year: it's \$2,117,500.00. That's the correct amount.

For the base grant, the Sports Development Grant is \$150,000.00. That goes to the different associations. The Manitoba High School Athletic Association gets \$30,000; the Sports Special Projects - I'll give you a copy of this, don't write it down, if you want . . . - the base branch, Sports Development Branch, \$150,000 - that's for the different sports associations; The Manitoba High School Athletic Association, \$30,000; the Sports Special Project gets 150,000 - that is also with the association of different sports.

The Provincial Sports Development Program, Regional Provincial Competition, \$100,000; Regional Sports Training Camp, 80,000; Provincial Championship, 170; Provincial Teams, 170; Provincial Chapter was 100; Man-Plan Athlete Development, 200,000; and Man-Plan National, 50,000; National Regional Training Camp is under 65,000.00

Now, the Inter-Provincial Games Development, that's the 1987 Canada Games team training and so on, that is 150,000; the Hosting National Championship Hospitality, 35,000; Special Agencies for Competition, 50,000; the Grants to Regional Sports Association - the region now, not by sports association but by region - rural 280,000; City of Winnipeg, \$20,000; Grant to Provincial Sports Agencies, Athletic Therapy, 25,000; Sports Medicine Council, 15,000; University Athletic Scholarship, 100,000. That has to be matched by the different universities, that's the third . . . Brandon is involved in that. — (Interjection) — Yes, Brandon - three I mean

The Manitoba Society of Seniors, 10,000 - that's to help in competition in the Games; Non-certificate - the Directorate Services re grants, the Non-certificate Coaching Official Developing Programs, 90,000; National Coaching - the official certification - 50,000; Officiating Coaches Evaluation, 8,000; Hosting Special Events, 7,500.

Then finally the Directorate Service Program, the National Coaching Official Certification, 60,000; the Ministers' Planning Conference, 7,000; Sports Awards 10,000; Regional Development Administration, 35; and Games Administration, Manitoba Games, Canada Games, 70,000 - for a total of 2,117,500.00. I'll ask for a copy of this and I'll send it.

MR. G. MERCIER: Could the Minister indicate what figure that \$2.1 million compares to last year.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes. It was 2044 and now it's 2.1-something.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Charleswood.

MR. J. ERNST: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Further to the Minister's answer then, perhaps he could tell the members of the committee why his department spent 3.99 million in Lotteries funds last year.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'm sorry, could you repeat that again?

MR. J. ERNST: According to the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation Report, Mr. Chairman, there was \$3.99 million spent in Lotteries funds out of that department last year, Department of Sport, '85-86.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: There is also - I don't know I'd have to see that report. There is also what is involved in here. It is 121.8 million through the executive and 540 for Sports Directorate. But the amount, the comparable to this last year was \$2,044,000.00.

MR. J. ERNST: Well, Mr. Chairman, in direct comparison between those programs and the money spent on those programs or similar programs last year may be the same, but the Estimates don't show any expenditures of those nature at all. It doesn't show \$2 million; it doesn't show the amount on the O/C. It doesn't show the \$3.99 million that shows up in the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation Report either that is directed to the Department of Sport.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I haven't the reports for the Lotteries Commission at this time. I don't know, maybe we're comparing apples and oranges. This is the portion that comes to the government, not necessarily all the money that comes, it's the money that is authorized to be spent because we usually keep money ahead. If not, you can't, certain things you can't finance - we'd have the same problems as the Research Foundation did, but last year on this which was authorized from the Lotteries through Sports, not counting Fitness, through Sports is the amount that I give 2,044,000 and this year is \$2,117. I'm not saying there's not more revenue that eventually might come back and be authorized later on. There is no doubt we've been talking about construction for facilities and so on, and we will have some money for that.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister can answer then in terms of - and again being new here it's a little bit difficult for me. But it would seem to me that if we were dealing with Estimates of a particular department and those Estimates according to the book that's provided by the government are for this department, Sport Directorate - well, in terms of the whole department even - \$661,000.00. Yet there are \$4 million of expenditure, Mr. Chairman, somewhere that don't appear in the Estimates. They come from somewhere. They come out of the air or whatever. But the fact of it is, there are \$4 million of additional funds funnelled into this department that don't appear in the Estimates, and I think we should ask for an explanation from the Minister.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We're looking today at the Estimates of the Department of Health in the Sport Directorate, and we have this also and one other was

authorized by capital, not necessarily anything - well, it's money from the Lotteries, but it doesn't mean it's going to jive with. What you're going to see is when you look at the Lotteries, then we will have to say what portion is gone. You will find out what portion is gone to each department of the government's portion and what has gone to the different umbrella groups. The revenue will have to jive, of course, but at no time am I saying that the revenues are all spent cent for cent at this time and all accounted for here. But I don't know what my honourable friend is talking about when he's talking about another \$4 million that was spent last year by the department. Well, you know, I don't know what that is at all, because we didn't spend no \$4 million - from the Lotteries? You're not talking about what the Sports Federation had at all; you're talking about money spent by this department in Sport, beside the 2.4, we had another \$4 million? Well, then I'll have to find it. I've never heard of that and I don't know where it is.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, if a totally uninitiated person were to come into this building and look at the Estimates of the government, they would determine by this book that the Department of Sport would spend \$661,800 in fiscal 1986-87. That's the amount that appears in the book for the Department of Sport.

Mr. Chairman, in the year 1985-86, that department received revenues from the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation of \$3.99 million. The Department of Culture, Heritage and Recreation received, Mr. Chairman, \$10.9 million. Neither of those sums appear in this book and I want to know why, or similar sums for the expenditures of those monies, not necessarily the same funds, but obviously that department is getting continuing revenues from the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation. If they are, and they are spending those funds, then it's deceitful, quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, to produce a book like this that shows expenditures of \$661,800 when in fact that department is receiving revenues and presumably expending well in excess of that amount by five and six times.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I can assure you I'm not trying to deceive nor am I deceiving this committee at all with the money that was spent on Sport by this department. We must get to the bottom of it; there must be some explanation. Could you tell me what page you're looking on - the 1984-85 Annual Report, what page?

MR. J. ERNST: I don't have it with me, but I'll find it.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, we'll get to the bottom of that. Anyway that should be discussed during the review of the Lotteries, because I'm discussing the money that has to be spent here. If there's a mistake somewhere, we'll explain it and bring it to your attention. Are you sure you're not talking about the recreation funds or anything like that? Well, we'll have to reconcile that. I haven't seen that I can.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, one last point, the Minister indicated that they're talking about the funds spent under Sport. The Minister has already indicated to the Member for St. Norbert earlier this evening that

the department is spending \$2.1 million, I believe, that doesn't appear in the Estimates. So if we're talking about \$2.1 million that doesn't appear in the Estimates, Mr. Chairman, I want to know where the other money that doesn't appear in the Estimates comes from?

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Charleswood raises a legitimate point. I would point out to the Minister that, in Mr. Miller's review of Lotteries, on Page 55, he says that, in the year 1984-85, as well as the \$750,000 which was contained in the Sports Directorate appropriation, there was \$3.4 million from the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I said that. I mentioned that the two would not necessarily jibe. I said there's a certain amount of money that is coming in. We never know, it fluctuates. That comes from Sports and that should be indicated in there, a certain amount of money that is allocated to government. I have to go to the Treasury Board for that. It doesn't come to the department, we write a cheque, and that's it. We have to go to the Treasury Board on that, and that is what I'm reporting on today. This is what I'm talking about.

That money will be spent plus the money that we have here. It could be that it'll be another - because we don't account as we do in this House for any of that Lotteries money. We don't have to come here. We report it the following year, but we don't have to have permission from this House. You don't see a line where we're saying, vote this money. We don't have to do that at all.

A MEMBER: You should.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, we shouldn't.

MR. G. MERCIER: I don't want to get into that.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, but there are two, there's another one that doesn't understand what it is. Here you're looking at what comes from the Consolidated Fund. Now there could be money directly. We don't have the money that goes to revenue, that goes to the different umbrella groups. It doesn't come in this House.

It comes in this House when you report on the Lotteries. I think that this was started gradually. Now the Lotteries - eventually it'll be treated until next year with questions of the general manager and so on, the same as you see the others. Some of the money is kept back. That's a possibility.

The revenue that comes from Lotteries is put in a special trust fund - right? I know there's money in that trust fund. Then we have to come in and ask the Treasury Board and Cabinet to approve, with an Order-in-Council - that's a copy of an Order-in-Council that I sent you, the page that accompanied the Order-in-Council. That is what is approved.

Technically, the department hasn't got this money until we get the okay from Treasury. So this is why, when we started the Lotteries with this certain amount of money, technically - I guess you should never do that when you're government. But we certainly didn't have to come here, you would report it when you talk about the Lotteries.

This is strictly from Consolidated Funds. I have permission to spend, from that Fund, the amount of money that I can. We will have to tell you, when we look at the Lotteries, to tell you where the money is and how much we received and what is the balance in the special trust fund. I think that's the answer.

MR. G. MERCIER: I thank the Minister for the answer. I think it's an issue that has to be dealt with with the Minister responsible for Lotteries. We should get on with simply discussing Sport in this committee, Mr. Chairman.

I would ask the Minister, in view of the large amount of money that goes to the Sports Federation, which is now about \$5 million he indicates, what role does this Minister or the Sports Directorate play in the expenditure of that money by the Sports Federation, and what coordination is there between the Sports Federation and the Sports Directorate to ensure that there is no duplication? What coordination is there between the two bodies?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: There is a signed agreement between the Sports Federation and the Sports Directorate. There's also - talking about the financing of it, that is the disposition of the Lotteries revenue - another agreement between the Sports Federation, acting as the umbrella group for sports, and the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation.

We have a Sports Liaison Committee that we sit on between the two groups. We're in discussion, also, before we start any programs, they know the programs that we have. Some of them, we might participate in with them; others, we run our own and they run theirs. I think we said before that our priorities are not necessarily theirs, and vice versa. I think that works well.

If you remember, the Sports Federation is made up of the sports associations, and I don't think that they would be too interested in the Manitoba Games, for instance, because they would want more money to go to the association to better the athletes and get better coaching, and so on and develop better players.

We think that's important but we don't think that's everything. We feel that we, as a government, have another responsibility that is not theirs, but we think it's balanced together. That responsibility is mass participation and offering every single Manitoban, if possible, the chance to play at some sport, no matter if it's the Special Olympics, or the Seniors, or whatever. This is an example of what is being done.

I think that a lot of people don't really understand what's happening in the Lotteries and why, including the person that prepared this report on the umbrella group. I don't think that we learned too much new with this report.

The situation was that we had to look at realities. The government had to look at what existed and it was completely out of control. For instance, the commercial bingo, it wasn't actually - in fact, a licence was given by the government - but the commercial bingo halls would say we've got a date, or we haven't got a date, and they pretty well had to have a date. We would not licence them; we had nothing to do with them.

MR. G. MERCIER: Forget about Lotteries.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: If you're asking me about the responsibilities, I think that's important.

I'm saying that we inherited all these groups and many individual clubs were getting so much money to travel, or whatever, and there were clubs of people that probably drank beer most of the time, but played a couple of games and then they could go on a trip somewhere. They put in, and they got a licence, and that's the way it was.

What we did, we had the Sports Federation, we put all the money in, and the percentage of that was spent on sports, and the Sports Federation became an umbrella group. They are trying their darnedest to to work with these sports associations, but they inherited these different clubs that are all yelling for more. There's more expectancy and more people want that. I'm just saying that in defence of the Sports Federation. It's a tough job they're doing, they're trying to do the right thing. A lot of people are saying, well, why do you spend on this; why do you spend on that? They inherited that and they would have to convince their people in there to go in a different direction, and they're moving in that direction. So that is the situation.

We have not the responsibility, as such, to say, well, you can't do this, you can't do that. They're the umbrella group but we, through the government and through the Minister responsible for Lotteries, if we want, as a government, to change policy, eventually we will look at that. We said we would review that. These changes are just going to be for one year or two, but as far as the programs themselves, there is, as I say, no duplication. There might be areas where we both work together on a certain program, like Man-Plan, and some of those programs. There's less than there were in the past.

Under the former government, if you remember, you transferred . . . money in here for the Sports Administration Centre, and you gave them money from the Lotteries. They came in as a partner, before that, it was left for Sports because there were some problems. They wanted to run their own and still have a share of it and that left for sports. But you said, you take the responsibility of the Administration Centre. That is getting more expensive all the time. It's one of the best in Canada, I guess, and it serves a real purpose. That is paid from the Sports Federation as the umbrella group, and then they work with the different associations in the different programs.

I think they'll change that but the beauty of this is that government is not giving the dollars and there is nothing better for a government than to be able to do what? Buy votes and so on. You know, what the Federal Government wanted to do, the Liberals, when they wanted to come back, and we said no, we're going to get the government out of there, the sports group, you decide. Now we don't say where the money is going to go except on the umbrella group. We have a responsibility to make sure that it's spent wisely and I think in the short time that they've been there, taking into consideration what had been allowed before. You don't change it, because you've got a lot of people out there that say why not the ordinary club, but a sports writer might say, well, what's that doing for sports, it's just a few people playing games? That's his way of looking at it and other people will say, fine, we want this, we want to be able to see the kids travel, and so on.

It's a difficult thing and I think the Sports Federation is doing a really good job. We're working with them on that. Right now, some of the money, I'm sure you'll find is still in a special account hoping that we will have a program of facilities construction with other partners.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I was not being critical of the Sports Federation. My question was to the Minister, could he assure us that there was coordination between the Sports Directorate and the Sports Federation, and no duplication or inefficiency as a result of the two perhaps acting independently. I think he's given that assurance to us.

The agreement between the Manitoba Sports Federation and the Sports Directorate refers, on Page 2, to the fact that the Directorate will provide consultative and financial assistance, to encourage annual planning and program implementation for amateur sport in Manitoba. Two more pages over, in item No. 4, it indicates the MSF and Directorate shall set up ongoing communication system for the exchange of current and long-range program plans.

I wonder if the Minister could table those planning documents for the committee.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It's just reviewing the terms of reference and different programs with that. I don't think that the department would have anything specific to table. It's a continuing dialogue with the Sports Federation. I don't think there's any planning going on in a regular sense, or preparing a planning document or something. It's done regularly; they're meeting continually and there's an exchange in communication between the two. But that would enable it, if somebody was to start that, there's a lot of flexibility. You're talking about the agreement between us?

MR. G. MERCIER: Yes. What I'm talking about, Mr. Chairman, are the long-range plans that exist in Manitoba, if any, for sport, recreation and fitness.

The Minister is indicating that his department have none. Is that correct?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'm saying that there's nothing specific, like when they prepared Man-Plan, when they prepared the first document that I remember years ago, when I first accepted this responsibility, that brought in the creation of the Sports Federation and so on. A lot of those things have been done already. They're working at it and building it. Now there has been different things.

For instance, an example is the facilities which are needed. On that, we're working with the Sports Federation and we've asked the committee - that's the committee I was talking about - but we tried to bring the City in on that because they wanted in because of the baseball. In fact, they approached us first and then we tried to get the Federal Government involved in some capacity anyway to do exactly that, but the terms of reference, all these facilities would be built and also the participation of the association. We've asked for a plan but that just died because of what I said, that all of a sudden the city seemed to have said - and I only saw that in the news media - that we might as well each go our way - but then once in awhile I'm

getting a query like I did today, or through the media, are you ready to participate?

We have a standing invitation to say, yes, we should get together. The Sports Federation has invited both of us to see if we can get back together. So we lost baseball. It could be maybe that baseball will be built, but not the level it was before, a baseball park, but with facilities that could be expanded if, later on, we ever have a chance, it could be a lot of things. It could be that the first priority might be, look at what we have now, maybe we should put artificial turf in the stadium. Right now, the Bombers play about 10 games; they don't even practice there, so they don't damage the field. They practice at the Velodrome, which could be used by the amateur sports; those are the things we want to look at. So that's one of the facilities we want to discuss. Right now it's the first priority.

The programs, as I say, have enough money to run their own, which they never had before. Before, a few years ago, they had hardly enough money to run the Administration Centre. That's all they could do; now they have more. Of course, they act as an umbrella group.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister raises facilities, and that's why I raise planning, because I don't know how you can say you're going to build X and X facility without having, first and foremost, a proper degree of planning. The Minister talks about a baseball stadium for professional baseball, and there'd be nothing more that I would personally like to see, frankly, in the city than professional baseball, but that's only a personal view.

But, at the same time, when we see a decision announced - I take it, last night by the City of Winnipeg Council - they're going to spend a couple of million dollars on a baseball stadium. Let me say, in that one particular area, Mr. Chairman, if you travel around the City of Winnipeg watching baseball games, you will find that the facilities for amateur baseball are totally lacking.

MRS. C. OLESON: They are in the country, too.

MRS. G. MERCIER: The Member for Gladstone says they're lacking in the country, too. Mr. Chairman, perhaps we can use that as an example for something I'm going to suggest here. As an example, in baseball, you have the field built in the southwestern part of the city for Bison and Junior baseball at Charleswood Park, which is right out by the end of Wilkes Avenue, a road that people who have any sense of value for their car do not want to drive on. It's all the way out to the perimeter highway, and this is supposed to be a place for kids to play baseball and people to go watch them play, and it's the most inaccessible field one could imagine being constructed in the City of Winnipeg.

Once you get there it's a good facility and the people in that baseball organization are doing a terrific job of developing it and it's all to their credit, but I have to wonder why. Who was involved in the planning of that facility to build it in such a God-forsaken location as where it is? It's absolutely ridiculous. What I'm trying to get at, Mr. Chairman, is there has to be proper planning for the development of sport. Some short-term facilities are needed, medium-term facilities are

needed, some long-term facilities are needed; and maybe what the Minister needs to have in the development of that - he alleges a lack of cooperation with the City of Winnipeg, and I haven't been a part of that so I don't know. But perhaps what the Minister should be looking at, because a lot of money is obviously going to be made available through the growth in lottery funds, and certainly part of it should be set aside for the development of sports facilities.

Perhaps the Minister should be thinking of a form of advisory committee composed certainly, most importantly, of people from the Sports Federation who were involved in all of the various sports; people from the universities where, at the University of Winnipeg they teach recreation; where at the University of Manitoba they have a phys. ed. course and experts in that field; people from the fitness area, we have the Reh-Fit Centre; we have a lot of people in this province concerned and involved professionally with sports, the public school system and many other groups.

Maybe what concerns me is there's money available, there are definite needs, but I hate to see this money being spent in an ad hoc way, because sport doesn't get all that much money. What it gets has to be spent to meet the most important needs. Maybe what the Minister should be considering doing is establishing that form of an advisory committee - and I say, including the City Parks and Recreation Department because they're certainly very involved.

Perhaps he should be considering forming that kind of an advisory committee to develop some long-range planning for fitness, sport and recreation in the province, and an assessment of the real needs; planning for future events like the various games in Manitoba, the role of the Manitoba Games and what, if any, facilities are needed for that. The Western Canada Games - what facilities are needed for that. The Canada Games - what facilities are needed for that. What planning is there for improving - and the Minister acknowledged that the achievement rate of the athletes in the last games had improved significantly; what planning is going into the development of athletes for those games; what planning is going on in order to attract games like the Pan Am Games or the Commonwealth Games to Manitoba.

I believe we should be seeking some of those games, but all of this requires some planning, I take it, from the Sports Director, because you can't build the facilities without proper planning and consultation from everyone involved, and that shouldn't be just with the politicians. I think the last thing that Manitobans need is the Minister, whoever the Minister is, and I'm not being critical of this Minister, but the Minister and the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg deciding what sports facilities are needed, because I think there are people out there, in the Sports Federation, in the universities and all of the various fields who can provide the kind of advice that's required on the kind of facilities that these monies that are now available for sports should be spent on. We should be looking at what plans do we have for the development of these games and what is the province's assessment. Who should be participating in these various games? Should some of these games be confined for the development of younger athletes, others for mass participation, those who are going on to Olympic events, the senior athletes?

All of these things, Mr. Chairman, I think require more planning than we have seen. I'm not saying that has been wrong in the past. I think everybody is certainly doing their best, but looking to the future with more money available, with more concern I think among the public, more participation amongst the public in sports and recreation activities, perhaps a little more planning should be done. If we're doing that, we have a lot of people in Manitoba who would be more than pleased to serve on an advisory committee to assist the Minister.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Sometimes you get up in a debate like this and you say we're pretty well on the same wavelength. We're exactly on the same wavelength and if I didn't know the member that well, I would say that he, like the Member for Pembina, has got spies in my department, because we've done that and I apologize for not explaining it. I said if I didn't know you, well I apologize for not explaining better and I'll try to do a better job.

The first time that we ever talked about facilities, I wrote the Mayor and I wrote the Sports Federation, the initiative came from us. I said could we set up a committee that will look at the facilities, look at the need. I saw what they did last summer in St. John, New Brunswick and we haven't got the facilities in Winnipeg that they even have in St. John, New Brunswick.

Of course that was brought in by the Canada Games but, nevertheless, they're there. Then when we look at cities our size, like Calgary and Edmonton, well the Calgary Olympics will be so far ahead of us. I think that it is important. I wrote them and said, would you agree to name people from the city to sit with us; I did the same thing with the Sports Federation and they did.

It took awhile before we got the letter and the committee is already formed and operating. There is Swail and Gregg from the Parks Board, like you mention; there is Don McKenzie, the President; and Courchene of the Sports Federation; and Don Sloan the Director of Sports; and also Bill Crook, who is in charge of the staff and develops the games. That committee is there. That was done independently, try to forget anything else, but they hadn't started working, there were named, they were going to start working.

I also said exactly what my honourable friend is saying, we will have the games. I have committed Manitoba for the Western Canada Games in 1991. If we try and involve the feds, if they can't give us any money, if at least our MP's from here could try to get us the games as soon as possible, the Canada Games would be in 1993, or help us with Commonwealth Games or any games like that. We're going to look at that.

They have had, from the top of the Lotteries, over \$3 million every year from Manitoba. At the time when they made this deal Otto Jelinek had made a commitment to me that he will see that Manitoba gets part of that back. I suggest that this was the most important thing in Sports and could they participate. That committee is there; that committee also asked the expertise available of other people because they're got all the different associations and so on. I think they're the real experts because they know what their associations want. Now you can forget that for the time being.

I get this call on a Friday that the Mayor wants to see me, it's so important that he wants to meet to talk about the professional baseball. We didn't go and see them, the city asked us to participate, to see if we'd do anything to bring baseball here, to build a stadium. Their idea was - well I'm not going to say their idea was - the Mayor, only he hadn't gone to council, the Mayor and a few of them, this main thing is let's build that baseball park that you're talking about, the big one, and then we'll talk about the others. We said, no, that's the condition probably he's talking about. We said exactly what you said tonight. This might be great. We're no enemy of baseball and if, by helping amateur sports, we can help professional baseball, that's it, that's a plus. But right now we'll look at the needs and we'll look at the priority and we'll also look at contributions from this group.

For example, the people that are most successful - and I'll give you the best example, is the Rugby Club - who got property from the city; they are building their own; they're spending money. They plugged in and applied for the Community Asset Program. They got \$40,000 from there and they're building a facility in the old Taylor Park near the Perimeter at the end of St. Mary's. It's fantastic; that's the best example. These people are cooperating, raising money and everything. So we want to get them involved.

So my deal with the city, I said exactly what you're saying, for the same reason. We said, all right, we're ready to help but amateur sports has got to profit by that, so that was the situation - I don't like to use this word - but it was reluctantly because the Mayor was interested in one thing, bring Triple A baseball here - I'm not saying he's not interested in amateur sports but that obviously was his main interest - and we said, no, and the Cabinet said, no, that's it. They hesitated to put that money for professional sports, but because of the system where it was and helping amateur sports in general, and baseball had no stadium at all, we said fine.

In other words, but you're going to participate and we could justify that, if that was their first priority. You can divide that the way you want, but with their money they would at least helping build that professional sport, but they were also helping with the others. So that was the situation. And when we heard that baseball was not going to come here, that was the end. I haven't heard officially from them yet, I have written a letter and I said, let's get back to this advisory committee and let's get together and see what is needed.

I reminded him that he had accepted to have the Western Canada Games in Winnipeg and that we may need facilities, and if there's any other games they will need facilities, that we wanted to do that. This committee had been working on a plan. They have started, they're working - I don't know if they're meeting now because everything is up in the air - but they were to do exactly that, look first of all at the facilities that are there - and we could deal with the rural, but I'm talking about the city now - with the facilities that are there to see if they could be improved and then what would be needed for games, and so on, and then we would plug in everywhere, get money from the Federal Government if they brought the Canada Games here.

You see with the Western Canada Games, there's been some misunderstanding. There is no money other

than the province and the city for Western Canada Games, there's no other levels of government. The Federal Government doesn't participate in that at all, so that is something we have to decide.

So we're exactly on the same wavelength on everything that my honourable friend mentioned, and I'm glad that he understands it and that is our position now. It's not that we're not going to participate, but then they decide they are going to build that. They don't say, are you interested in going back and working on facilities to see what's needed, as my honourable friend said, they say, we're going to build this; we commit \$3 million, do you want to come in? My answer is, I want to talk to you, to look back and see what is needed and then we'll see what we're going to do and we can be as partners. So that is exactly that.

Now as far as the games and all that, we're always participating. There's always communication with the Sports Federation. As I say, the games are the responsibility of the Directorate that works with the association. Of course, the association is responsible for bringing their teams, and so on, but in organizing the games for Manitoba, even when it's away, like next winter it will be in Nova Scotia, Cape Breton, around Sydney and so on, the Winter Games, and that is being organized the same as two years ago, in 1985 in St. John, New Brunswick, were the Summer Games. So what was described by the honourable member is exactly what we are doing.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I believe the Minister indicated the people from the Sports Federation, the Parks and Recreation Department, and the Sports Directorate are on this planning committee. I would ask him to consider whether or not the planning of that committee might be enhanced or improved. I'm not being critical of the people who are on it in any way, but sometimes if you can involve more people from other backgrounds or interests . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: They have power, too, but there are the three representatives, people that have paid the shot.

MR. G. MERCIER: I'm asking the Minister if he would perhaps consider involving some of the Fitness people or people from the universities also on that committee who have significant facilities and they are involved very much in that area.

At the same time, could the Minister indicate whether there is a fund set aside for the construction of facilities in the city and Manitoba, and if so, how much is that fund and what are the plans for developing such a fund in the future.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No. I'll tell you exactly what the agreement was. We were talking about baseball. The Cabinet had committed - where it was coming from was something else - committed in principle because we were talking about five years, a total of at least \$7.5 million. That's the agreement we made when the professional baseball was coming. The city was doing the same thing, and then that committee was going to develop a recommendation for us and the Sports Federation, who was also keeping some funds, and the

different sports associations a formula to work on that, but that is out now, that didn't go through.

Now, in principle, the government and the Cabinet is always committed to some help. What amount that can vary, I don't know.

I think that we have the problem that the Member for Charleswood was talking about. This is a certain amount of money that's in a special account. That money is there until Cabinet decides what to do with it. That money came in, there was an awful lot more than last year, this year. Usually it's spent - our department, anyway - Sports has always spent the money the year later, getting interest on that so they can plan and know what they're doing. Now, I haven't automatically got the authority to spend all that money that comes from Lotteries. Some of that money is kept in a special account, but I will have to go to Cabinet and it depends on that. We've accepted in principle; we were ready to go with this amount of money in that other thing, but now it's a brand new ball game. But we're committed to facilities.

Now, in this other thing about . . .

A MEMBER: They're in the Estimates.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: In what Estimates? You don't put it in the Estimates.

A MEMBER: Sure.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, you explain it to him because he doesn't understand. Anyway, we're not stealing anything at all.

The situation, as far as the committee, we certainly have no objection to that, of having other people on it. I really don't see the necessity of people in Fitness on that. All the people in our department were all associated with Fitness at the time. Anything that they want, it's there.

The people in Fitness are also not with the Directive for Sports but they are available as needed. But I don't think they can make any contribution to this in general. I think we've got the people that really count, but that's not saying that I'm not interested in that.

These people know that they can get any advice from anywhere they want at the university. Or, let's say we're talking about games, they can bring a guy like Daly in and things like this to discuss; they know that. But that is the committee that has a responsibility because these are the three partners that will put in the dollars also, and they're the experts of this department. It's not the Mayor and it's not the Minister, it is the people in the Sports Directorate that are working with that all the time, that are responsible for the Games, the people in the Parks Board that manage and administer Sports and Fitness and whatever for the city, and also the Sports Federation that represents the association. But we have no objection to having any advice wherever they want.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I'd like the Minister to confirm. I believe he said that he wasn't sure if the committee was even meeting now. I wonder if he could confirm, or at least encourage the planning of the construction of these facilities and could he indicate

whether the Sports Federation is setting aside any, particularly the increased monies they're receiving, for the construction of facilities, or whether the Minister himself would actively pursue the setting aside of some of these monies in a fund for the construction of facilities. We all know the financial circumstances we're in and money is short, and here we have a bonanza of lottery monies becoming available. It seems to me we're very wise - particularly when we view the state of some of the sports and recreation facilities - some of this money be set aside for the construction of a planned orderly program of facilities.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That is true, but let me be very candid and I'm getting a bit nervous. The times are not easy and it could be that there's an awful lot more pressure. Why isn't that money in there; why aren't you using that money, there seems to be all that money for sports and culture and all that. There's been some criticism and there's a concern in Cabinet, to be very frank. We accept, in principle, what has to be done, but I have no guarantee that money will always be there and the same amount will always be there. I want it to go on the record as saying that. That is one of the reasons why I can't tell you, we haven't got that much money put in there. We've got some money, we know that in principle we could have gone with the 7.5, but that is not committed. It was committed for that particular project. We'd have to start again.

Now, the committee started the work and they started by developing a plan to work with, first of all, as I say, to see what is needed - to keep in mind exactly what was said before, the Games that are coming - what we will need for the 91 games to start with, the Western Canada Games facilities. We were going quite well and they were meaning to start that and to start looking at priorities, start looking at the existing facilities that could be improved to be able to answer the service, to do this work or to permit amateur sports to use it, and that was done. But then when the baseball was out, everything was in the air. As I said, I wrote immediately to the Mayor, reminding him of this committee and reminding him that if he wants the Games that we'll have to talk about it because, you know, you can't just say we want the Games. We're not going to fall flat on our face, we'll be responsible. So, therefore, they'll have to go along with some conditions if they're interested.

Brandon, as you know, is very anxious to get it. And if there's not movement pretty soon by the City of Winnipeg, it will go to Brandon, because we're not going to fall flat on our face. Either that, or we'll have to cancel and we don't intend to cancel.

Now, the situation is that the Sports Federation has also invited the city and the province to sit together to do exactly what we're saying, to go back to work and develop this program. Right now, as I say, they haven't met for awhile because they are waiting to see what's going to happen.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the Canada Games, is it the province - and the Minister referred to the level of achievement, I think, in the last Canada Games - does the province, the Sports Directorate, undertake responsibility for the level of

achievement of athletes in the Canada Games through its programming?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: You mean the age or the . . .

MR. G. MERCIER: How well Manitoba stacks up against other provinces, is that a provincial responsibility?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, it is, but certainly not alone, cooperation of course with the teams and the different sports associations.

Let me give you an example. The last time the chef de mission was Bill Crook, who is sitting in front of me. I mean he was in charge of the Team Manitoba and the staff and so on. So they work to get the uniforms, to start with. Before they plan that, money for training, money for participation with different clubs. Then, of course, all the provinces get together and decide well, hockey will be the 18 year olds. You know, that changed.

We have to conform with the Games Council, and we're represented on the Games Council. The Games Council decides this is what you're going to have. You're going to have, first of all, the sport - and there's always a fight because they can't go with all the sports, like, they dropped a few for the summer and the next ones are going to be in the Maritimes and they weren't too happy - the water sports and all that. But that's the games, that's the Canada Games.

When that is decided, the chef de mission will work with the volunteers. He's got people assigned to each sport that will be the contact with each sport. Then, of course, they work with the Sports Association, they give the information to the Sports Association and this is the chief of a Canada team. But, of course, each discipline has their own coach and manager and so on and the liaison from, not necessarily all people from the staff, we haven't got that many, but volunteers, that are meeting a year ahead of time or two years ahead of time to plan all that. So the responsibility and I think a lot of the credit would go, in this instance, to Mr. Crook who has been working very very hard with the Sports and he's doing a very good job.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, what is the criteria for participation in the Western Canada Games? Is that for young developing athletes or is that for senior athletes?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, my friend is right. There are different games and, of course, I'm not going to go into the Olympics and those classes in the Commonwealth, my friend knows about that. The Canada Games was brought in for participation just for pretty well the best, but not world's record. In other words, if you've been in the Olympics, you don't come back in the Canada Games unless it's in another sport or something, there is a possibility. It is mostly for excellence, to prepare for class athletes. Most of our athletes, Canadian athletes, will graduate from Canada Games to better things, to world class, either world championship or so on. Many of them do, and then to the Olympics, or whatever.

The choice of the cities also is very important, like the Games Council, not Manitoba, I'm talking about

Canada and the Federal Government and so on. When they started the Games, the first ones were held in Quebec City in 1967. They had said, at the time, and that was changed and there were exceptions, but they said, we will not bring this to large cities for more than one race because they leave the legacy, one important thing is the money they give for the facilities, and those are left as a legacy and so on. They felt they probably left that in a much larger city and they can compete for the Pan Am Games, the Olympics and those kind of things. So it was supposed to be smaller cities, not necessarily the smallest one in every province, like St. John, New Brunswick, is the biggest one in New Brunswick, but they are small cities. So that would disqualify Winnipeg and those things, although they played Games at one time at Burnaby, B.C. Well, as far as I'm concerned, that's like saying Charleswood or something, it's Winnipeg.

Another reason for that, it's always successful. You've got to have something big, something that attracts the attention in the centre. One of the most fantastic results that I have ever seen in any Games was in Flin Flon. They had 800 volunteers. What would the Manitoba Games mean to Winnipeg? No one would know it existed here, but it was a fantastic thing. They had all these volunteers; they had participation from people in all regions and it was a huge success.

We're talking about sports; we're talking about athletes, but one of the greatest things is the volunteers, the officials and the coaches, the managers that you're forming. I talked about the first Summer Manitoba Games in Neepawa. Those people came out of nowhere and became the members of the local committee on the Games, the host committee, and so on. You know, you discovered people who were fantastic and they have stayed and remained leaders. People who have been helping the youngsters in sports are in other facilities because of the chance they had to participate in something like that.

So the Canada Games, as far as the games we're talking about, are the No. 1. The Manitoba Games is for mass participation and then it's communities working together. We asked the seniors, who had very successful Senior Games, would they have one sport there? They accepted and that was terrific. Then we asked the Special Olympics, handicapped kids, and that was tough, that was tricky. But then, not only what it does for sports, but in the community. People see, here it's not only the perfect specimen who are here, we all belong in the community. There are older people, there are handicapped people, and it was fantastic. We hope to keep on the same way.

Now, you might have a baseball team, a guy your age or my age in certain sports in the Manitoba Games, but you won't find that, except in sports, maybe shooting and things like that. You'll find the best amongst the best, the second-best class, not the world class, but just below that at the Canada Games.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate whether the province will be pursuing the Commonwealth Games or the Pan Am Games and, if so, how will that decision be taken? As I understand it, the Federal Sports Minister has announced a substantial amount of money would be available

provided that the other parties, I take it, can put up equivalent amounts of money. But say Manitoba, what process would the Minister follow in leading up to making a decision as to whether or not Manitoba would pursue the Commonwealth or the Pan Am Games?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, first of all, there was a request to Canada from a city - it's the city, not the province - a few years ago and they asked us to participate. We wrote a letter without making any financial commitment, but a letter of support. Fine, yes, we would back the city for those Games, No. 1; No. 2 - in principle, we would support it if it's viable. You know, it's tough, you have the Games, and \$50 million right away.

I suspect, is he just trying to chase us out before we start? That was never done like that in other Games. They talked about it, you don't announce it. In other words, if you haven't got the \$50 million, don't bother to apply. That makes me laugh. When we've asked them for a few million dollars of some of the money that we got to participate in this facility and no answer from them at all and, all of a sudden, 50 million. I doubt very much. In principle, yes, but if that's it, that you come show us the colour of your money before we even talk to you, \$50 million, I doubt it very much. I doubt that I would recommend that, not with everything that goes on in Health and everything else. \$50 million, I think that's an awful lot of money.

I can wave the flag and say: Oh, yes, we're going to go and I might be proven wrong. I doubt very much if Winnipeg will be considered with the facilities that we have at this time. How much is Winnipeg willing to put in also? I don't know. In principle, yes, but \$50 million will scare the hell out of me.

MR. G. MERCIER: That's for the Pan Am Games.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, that's for the Games that they're holding in Edinburgh right now.

We would like to have them, and we think we should have those kind of Games.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I call on the member for St. Norbert, there are levels of conversation around, please be considerate.

The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: The Minister is saying that it's up to the city, first of all, to apply for either the Commonwealth or Pan Am Games and then the province would make a decision as to what, if any, support, or whether they would support the application, or is the Minister prepared to make any steps to encourage the city to apply for one or other?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It's the city that applies, but there is no city I think that could do it, not certainly in a province like this, without the province. That's understood.

Now, we're already on record as asking to be considered, supporting Winnipeg's application and, in principle, we support them. What I said, and I want to make sure that is understood, not misquoted, I'm saying that the first time that I hear that they'll say: okay,

we'll go to bat for these people, but providing then right away, saying the province will have to pay \$50 million. I practically feel that he doesn't want it here or something, because he's going to scare a lot of people.

If we say, let's look at it, let's see if they want to negotiate or talk like they do for all of the Games including - I did the negotiating for the province in the Canada Games in Brandon. Although they were held after there was a change of government in 1979, but all the negotiating, the amount of money and all that; and, at the time, we had put in more money than any other province, up to that time. I don't remember how many million dollars that went for facilities. So we're ready. We favour it, we support them but, as I say, don't talk to us unless you bring in your \$50 million; I doubt very much. We want to discuss it and negotiate before

MRS. C. OLESON: Just going back for a few minutes to the umbrella group of the Sports Federation. I wonder, could the Minister tell me if the Sports Federation can give out grants for capital projects. Just take, for example, in my constituency there are several golf courses. If they applied through the golf association, say to building a clubhouse, would there be grants available for that type of thing?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: There's no reason why they couldn't, but that is up to the sports group. We felt that for sports, we took all the money that had been spent, took the same percentage and said let's get an umbrella group where the government is not dictating, and the temptation of using that for political results. I can tell you that in Quebec, when they brought in lotteries that everybody that had a licence had a kickback to the Liberal Party of \$5,000, every single one at that time. We felt that we didn't want that, we felt that it would be more to the public themselves, that community, in other words, the sports community to decide how they wanted the money spent. But as I said earlier they inherited certain things, like clubs that had this and it was completely out of control, nobody cared where the money went. There were even people that were building buildings, corporations that didn't exist. I'm not going to dig out the past but there were a lot of things. We didn't make these changes for nothing.

Now, the Sports Federation, I can tell you this, you haven't enough money to go to every single little club. So they figured they can help through the Sports Federation, the Sports Administration Centre helps all the - talking about organized sports, because I'll come back to recreation on something else - so they can do that. Then they work through the different associations, and the association then would love to stay at that level, and then even the association then decides - like the golf association, or the curling decides what they're going to do with the money, and they're getting a lot of help. But there's so much expectancy, and you see some criticism, not because the Lotteries is not working well, it's working better than ever, but everytime there's something people want and they want more. But I believe, I don't want to speak for the Sports Federation, that they are trying to set up something like that and

they would like to keep funds for facilities and I think they are now, with the approval and the fact that we are ready to go along and put some more money, and if the city is well then that'll encourage that kind of stuff.

I want to say this though. I forgot to talk about the rural. We started a program awhile back, that the city got very little out of that. We started a program, it was community recreation - you weren't in the House but you might remember - they had to go through the municipality to make sure that it wasn't a white elephant; then they'd say you build it, now you operate it, because we were not giving any money for operating costs. Then we would match it, it wasn't that much but it helped, it added up to \$15,000.00. Then two communities can get together, they'd get the 30; they'd have to match it. We spent many millions of dollars, that was mostly in the rural areas, and there are still programs like that and help they get through recreation, and that could still be sports, but it's not organized sports. Community clubs and that would come under recreation, so I don't want anybody to think that all the money is going to the city because that hasn't been the case. If anything there has been more going in the rural areas. I think that's what the Sports Federation will do, looking at the needs and so on, and then we'll have it over our chart to know where all the facilities are in the province, how many golf clubs, artificial ice and all these things, and they will look at needs also.

MR. G. MERCIER: One last comment on facilities is, and the Minister himself referred to I think it was a rugby group developing their own facility. Again, as you look at the decreasing amounts of money to be made available for either the construction of sports facilities or their continued operation, other than through lottery money, it seems to me that more and more attention focus should be placed on the construction of the facilities, perhaps turning them over to community groups or sports associations to actually operate it. I know, for example, the Minister cited that example with respect to hockey rinks. The wise idea, I think, would be to look at building more because we have a sufficient number of larger rinks that accommodate larger numbers of people for those few games that they're required. So we should be looking more and more at new community hockey facilities that could be operated by the local community club and volunteers. Because, it's not just the construction that's a problem, it's the continuing maintenance and operating costs, and unless we can encourage the community groups and sports associations to operate these facilities, and we're building a larger financial cost than we can probably afford to bear. I wonder if the committee is looking at some of these facilities from that point of view.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: There's one thing definite. The province doesn't want to own any or operate any of those. That's understood. Now, in the City of Winnipeg, well it could vary, certain things like a hockey rink lends itself to more community clubs for the kind of rink we're talking about. We've got the arena and facilities like that, although somebody said maybe there should be another smaller one. But then in the rural areas, you have some in larger places, pretty good rinks that

can accommodate the fans from that area also. So it is mostly community clubs. In the city many of the facilities, either the land is given, in this case the rugby club, they own that property - well they have a lease on it for 99 years or whatever - in other areas it would be run by the Parks Board. Maintaining that has to be taken into consideration too because that's the City of Winnipeg with those groups that would do that, so that committee would be looking at that also.

So, yes it could be done in a number of ways. Then there's the public clubs like in curling and golfing, there's different ways; but the last thing, and I don't think anybody would want the province to want it and we don't intend to own any of those at all. So there's flexibility, but then some people, a group might come forward, like the right to a club, and say that's what they want, like you have in the rural area. I talked about this 50,000, but that was far from everything. In the days back when that started you had the Winter Works Program if you remember. I remember Neepawa had fantastic facilities; remember there was Winter Works, Jobs Fund and all kinds of help plugged in if they qualified, and we encouraged that and in many areas there was the same thing. That's what the rugby thing did, we had a program, Community Assets; they applied and it was creating jobs and they had it. When we're talking about the funds of the province, we're talking about . . . That's why I say we haven't got any special fund now. We have agreed to go to \$7.5 million minimum and that could be taken from different programs, but money from the province.

MR. G. MERCIER: I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether he or the Directorate, or perhaps the Sports Federation have been dealing with the problem of insurance coverage, particularly third party liability and participants coverage. There was a media story in the spring about the Manitoba High School Track and Field Championships, - they were thinking of cancelling them because they couldn't get the third party liability and participants coverage. Certainly this is a problem throughout all of society, I appreciate, and virtually every segment of society is affected by this huge increase in premiums for insurance coverage, or the lack of insurers that are prepared to offer coverage in that field. My understanding is that some coverage has been placed with Sport B.C., they have some type of an arrangement and some groups are getting coverage through there. But have there been any discussions perhaps with the Federal Minister of Sport about that and what, if anything, is being looked at in that regard.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That's an extremely important subject. It is on the agenda, one of the first things on the agenda of the Ministers of Sports next meeting, meeting in P.E.I. in October, if we're out of here by then — (Interjection) — no hope?

This is a program where we had seed money at one time through the Sports Federation to look at that, and the Sports Federation has that program, working with the different sports. Some of the associations, I think, when they register them automatically as part of the fees or whatever, it includes insurance coverage. I know that is a hot topic at this time, and that everybody

realizes how important it is. But that is mostly the Sports Federation's program, with the associations.

MR. G. MERCIER: You haven't talked to the Federal Minister about it?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, I said it's on the agenda.

MR. G. MERCIER: I wonder if, in that connection, the Minister has considered a program or a group that I understand exists in the Province of Quebec, the Quebec Sport Safety Council. It apparently deals with various safety aspects of sport, which probably would be - although I think we've been fairly fortunate in Manitoba with the limited number of serious accidents that have taken place. But as I understand it, they look at all aspects of safety in sport in the Province of Quebec, and have made a number of recommendations that have been accepted. Certainly, if an insurer is looking at the risk of covering certain sports or certain events, to know that perhaps a safety council has reviewed any problems that may have existed may help them with the insurance problems.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The equivalent, I guess to that - I'm not too sure about Quebec - that we had here a few years ago, I remember, was the Sports Medicine Council, I think they called it. There was a very well-known doctor from Winnipeg, known nationally, who was very active. There was Dr. De Pape, who was active in the swimming, and the cardiologist for children, Cumming, but I'm talking about the other doctor before that. There's a name that was very interesting. I've forgotten.

They still have that on the Canadian scene. It hasn't been active in Manitoba for some reason or other. But the Sports Federation at one time, if you remember at the Pan Am Pool, had sports medicine. It was their program. They ran into trouble. We bailed them out, and ran the program for awhile. Now that program is no longer. Dr. Hildahl has asked for a meeting with me to discuss sports medicine, and I intend to meet him after the Session.

MR. G. MERCIER: I'm encouraged by that, Mr. Chairman. Dr. Hildahl is certainly extremely well regarded by everybody involved in sport.

One question about the university scholarships that are in the program of the Minister out of the lottery funds, I had encouraged the then Minister of Sports, Mr. Banman, to embark upon that program. I wonder if there's been any assessment of that program. Has that program succeeded in retaining athletes to go to university in Manitoba who would otherwise have gone to United States' colleges? Certainly, that was one factor in the development of that program, as well as to just generally help athletes who attend university. It certainly shouldn't be used only to keep somebody here from an American college, but to help athletes in Canada. I wonder if, in any assessment of the program, that information's come up.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: In fact, that program was brought in by Mr. Banman. We had talked about it before, but it was brought in by Mr. Banman. Initially,

it was supposed to be for a period of a couple of years, and there was so much pressure and encouragement and so on to keep the program - it was very successful - by the universities and so on that we kept it on. Now I think it's probably even greater. We're not looking at dropping it. That was one of the first ones that we were going to drop, because initially it was supposed to be for a few years.

If I go by the letters from the athletes themselves, who are kind enough to write and thank the province and take the trouble to tell us that it's kept them here to be able to play sports and all that, and the universities are all very, very keen on it.

Of course, we can't compete for those who get those crazy, wild scholarships in the States and so on, but it helps. It has kept some players, as I say, by themselves saying that this has permitted them to get an education and continue with their sports. Some of them graduate later on to go to other schools that may be out of - but it keeps our athletes and our students in Manitoba, in a modest way. There's not that much money.

MR. G. MERCIER: During the last consideration of the Estimates of this department, there was some discussion between the Minister and I on violence in hockey and rules. I wonder, the Minister at that time indicated something might be happening, and I wonder if he could indicate if he has done anything or there is anything that has developed in that regard.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: There's been some progress. It's been very difficult, and you certainly can't blame the Hockey Association for that. They've done everything they could. We've helped them with the training. We met with them, and we told them that there could be more money to help them on that but, if it kept on like that, then we couldn't dictate to them but we certainly could withdraw any funds. I don't want to give you the impression that we had to threaten them, because they were very interested and they worked hard on that.

They, first of all, instructed the referees. It was a lot tougher this year, and I know my friend follows hockey quite a bit. They clamped down on high-sticking and that a lot earlier, maybe not enough. In fact, we insisted that, for the Manitoba Games, we play recreation hockey, you know the rules, no high-sticking - we wouldn't allow that - and it was very successful in Flin Flon. So there is an improvement.

It's very, very hard, when you've got a professional team here, when they televise the game and they're acting so stupid, you know, with their sticks, and there are so many people injured in professional hockey, losing an eye or being injured. There have been so many lately.

We're satisfied with the - I'm not saying that we're satisfied and we want to stop there - degree of improvement, and also with the willingness of the people in amateur hockey about that. We'll keep on them.

That reminds me. You're not even asking this question but on the same - well, compare it to that, because I saw something that the Federal Minister said, Otto Jelinek. I've had complaints about weightlifters using drugs and all that before this happened, and I've contacted them and did pretty well the same thing. I

said that there wouldn't be any funds at all, the help that was given to their association, and we haven't heard from them. I don't know if it's exaggerated, but apparently there has been some accusation of some of the Manitoba athletes doing the same thing.

That was by an individual and so on, and I certainly don't want to start any rumours. But we asked that before, hoping that it's not true and hoping that it won't develop. We had asked them to investigate that, and the Sports Federation also to look into that.

MR. J. ERNST: It seems to me that several months ago, I saw the Minister, along with Mayor Norrie of Winnipeg, appear on television, each wearing a baseball cap and probably announcing that a Triple A baseball franchise was going to deposit itself in Winnipeg and that, in order to attain that, there was going to be a baseball stadium constructed in the City of Winnipeg.

Could I take from that press conference, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, that was an announcement that the province was going to fund, in part at least, a professional baseball stadium in Winnipeg?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: When that announcement was made, it was exactly that. It was an agreement between the two levels of government and the Sports Federation in their name and the name of the different sports associations, that we would have a five year program. That was announced. That was the big news, as far as we were concerned, and that phase 1 would be to move soccer out, have a soccer field, reasonable, because at least the asset the soccer people had proved plus two other pitches, so there would be more because soccer is a very popular sport, and yes, it would have been where the soccer field is, a baseball stadium that had to be used.

That was another condition we put in. There had to be an agreement that minor baseball would use it also, but that would accommodate a Triple A baseball team and that we had nothing to do with the negotiating with the team that was done by the city. We're sure the only thing in preventing that was the lack of a stadium, but then my friend knows what happened later and that all fell apart.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for the answer.

Perhaps he then could explain to members of the committee why 30 minutes ago, he just indicated to this committee the government was not prepared to fund a professional baseball stadium?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I don't know what is wrong with my honourable friend tonight. He doesn't hear too well or he doesn't pay too much attention. I said we would be ready to look at the total plan. All right, professional baseball is no longer coming here. I think we said we had to look at the facilities, look at the games that are coming. I also said probably one of the first priorities would be baseball but not necessarily the same kind of ball stadium you needed for Triple A ball. That's what I said.

But I said we would not — (Interjection) — Oh yes, read Hansard. I said we would not have them make

announcements; they were going to spend \$3 million on that and the next thing they say, do you want to get in, or you better get in. We said we want to start negotiating to see what is needed, what is first. I don't want to say yes or no to a baseball and soccer stadium. I have very little doubt it would be one of the first priorities, but nevertheless, there's not this urgency anymore, that it was supposed to be by a certain day to enable professional baseball to be here. That is no longer urgent, so that is why we had said, okay, that'll be phase 1. Now we still want the same principles of a five-year program but there's no phase 1 yet.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to hear, both earlier on this evening, when I was paying attention, and just now again, the Minister indicated there was going to be - or he would anticipate at least - a five-year program for sports facilities in the City of Winnipeg. Certainly we know they're badly needed, that any number of them would be most welcome.

My concern is, firstly, Mr. Chairman, how much money in overall terms had the Minister contemplated putting into such a program of facilities over the five years he mentioned?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Now I know you weren't listening, because I said originally the agreement approved by Cabinet with the conditions was for a five-year program including the part for our share, and the city was committed to the same amount of money was 7.5 million each, minimum in five years, with the understanding if things got worse, it could be stretched maybe to six years at the same amount of money, if the facilities weren't ready.

Now I'm saying that was all one deal, one agreement ready with professional baseball. That is no longer there. The approval in principle for facilities from the government still stands, but to what degree - you know we're not committed more than the city is committed. We're saying let's get together and resume that and say, okay professional baseball is not here - but as far as the province has always considered the main thing is still amateur sports and that's still there.

We have the facilities and we'd love to talk with them but there's no money set aside on that. There's certain money. I think we've got the problem you and the member were talking about earlier, that money is there; it's not earmarked for anything yet and some of that would be for Sports, depending what arrangement we could make with the others.

I'd have to go back to Cabinet on that; I don't know. I don't know if Cabinet might decide to lower the amount of it, because there's no professional baseball or to extend - maybe make it in six years or seven years, I don't know that. But the principle of the province being committed to work with the others and put money in for amateur sports is certainly still there.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, I distinctly heard the Minister earlier, but he said it was before it was .5 million, that's not now and that's not what an agreement would be considered if negotiations were tomorrow on those facilities again; although presumably, if Cabinet once wanted to consider 7.5 million, it would do so again, given all other circumstances are similar.

My concern was there was some amount of money over a five or six-year term, or whatever, that would be available for those kinds of facilities and before any further negotiations got under way, at least there would be some parameters for the city to be aiming at in terms of its own budget, in terms of the way they could consider planning their five year recreation program as well. I thank the Minister for that information.

It seems strange to me, first of all, Mr. Chairman, we would see an offer of a substantial sum of money made, albeit attached to a particular event taking place, that is Triple A baseball coming to Winnipeg; yet having the Triple A baseball franchised and then vanish in thin air for whatever reason, to have all of a sudden no one really very interested in terms of pursuing the cooperative expenditures of further sums of money for amateur sports facilities. That's very strange to me, Mr. Chairman, having spent a number of years in a position where I would have loved to have got my hands on that kind of money, as a municipal member. But it seems — (Interjection) — The Member for Concordia says "We got the money from the Jets at the bank." The concern was that money wasn't taken up and obviously, from what the Minister has indicated, wasn't even very vociferously pursued.

Could the Minister indicate a) were there conditions or restrictions placed on the potential expenditure of money that would have caused the City of Winnipeg Council to abandon its efforts to pursue a joint venture with that money?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I find it very strange also. I don't want to be unfair with the City of Winnipeg. It's not as easy to negotiate and it's not the same method here. There's a party, a government and party, and then you speak with some authority and you meet behind closed doors. You haven't got the media there all the time and that isn't done. Somebody will go and see the Mayor. The Mayor has no authority at all.

The Mayor - and I'm not knocking him when I say that - will take the message but it depends how he does, and I hope that my friend, the Minister of Urban Affairs is listening when we talk about the future powers of the Mayor, it seems to me that a thing like this, a request, should go the same as it does here or any other organization should go to either the policy committee or whatever they call it, who would deal with it and decide, at least, in principle.

But now the Mayor in this case approached me to negotiate with no authority, not knowing if these people would support him at all. I think I got him by surprise by delivering too damn fast, because he never thought we would do it so fast, and then he was stuck and we went to Cabinet, to caucus and, of course, the media knew what he was doing because he had no way of meeting - well I guess he could meet in his office - but officially with the council and some councillors were saying no.

In fact, I remember a statement, the first statement, I remember was by my honourable friend when he was a councillor and I agree with that statement. When it first came up, when I read the newspaper like he did, I had no other knowledge except what was said, there'd be this kind of money and I remember taking my cue from the honourable member, because he knew a little

more or I guess they reported to him what they did. They wanted somebody to bill them - I'm talking about the people that would hold the franchise - to bill levels of government, to bill the stadium and give it to them. They wanted to get practically free rental and they want to keep the concession. My honourable friend said that's not quite right. I went to that meeting on the Sunday with the Mayor, feeling exactly the same. What changed my mind then is that I could see - and I told the Mayor, what's the use of meeting? I'm interested in amateur sports. If there's nothing for amateur sports, forget it. But then, the plan that they had changed things a bit because - do you remember the original plan? They were going to develop the velodrome for amateur sports, and they were going to do this and that. That changed it a bit, and we made this offer.

Again, I might be very unfair. If you ask me why it's bizarre or why it's odd I, more than ever now, feel that the Mayor was interested - I'm not saying that he was not interested in amateur sport - but his main interest was professional baseball. I don't know if he wanted to say, I brought in professional baseball here, period. I see my honourable friend agrees with me, and that's the way I feel. I might be very unfair, and it's very easy for the Mayor and the city to disprove that by saying, okay, let's meet.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding what has gone on up to this point in terms of that money and that five-year plan and the \$7 million or so of provincial funding commitment, notwithstanding any of that that's gone on up to this point, are there any specific conditions now that would inhibit that capital flowing toward amateur sport facilities?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, one big one, that I get an official request from the City of Winnipeg, not from one individual or a sub-committee that they formed themselves. I'm not going to go through that merry-go-round again but, if the city approves in principle, No. 1 and No. 2, that we, as my honourable friend, the Member for St. Norbert has mentioned, get together to plan. They could look at that, and we're ready to try to accommodate them, because I still think that what they're suggesting happens to be pretty well at the top, not necessarily at the same degree, necessarily 3 million; I don't know that.

But if they want to meet again and approve in principle and discuss and give us somebody with authority to represent the city by a motion of the city and that we negotiate, work together, there's nothing the province would love more than that. We feel that we need the facilities. We don't want to fight with the city but, most of all, we don't want to punish amateur sports. That's a standing offer, and we've repeated that. My letter hasn't been answered; the letter of the Sports Federation hasn't been answered.

I'd love to. I told Councillor Savoie who came to see me, the only official thing plus a telephone call from Mitchelson one time, just a call, and I'm surprised to see the statement that he's made today in the paper. But Savoie came, and we explained. I told him exactly what I told you today. He was going to get back to me. I see where his former colleagues are not surprised. It's a good thing Bonnie's not here, but anyway.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, then through you to the Minister, can I then assume that there are not necessarily preconceived ideas in terms of priorities, in terms of specific facilities that the province would want to see, one over another, but that simply they want to see a proper plan take place in conjunction with the Manitoba Sports Federation who are the principle sporting governing body in Manitoba? Is that correct?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Absolutely.

MR. J. ERNST: To take another tack for a minute, Municipal Governments, Federal Government, Provincial Government, over many years, have spent considerable sums of money in terms of those kinds of sports facilities that we were referring to just recently. We've spent millions and millions and millions of dollars on sports facilities, on programs, on specific training programs for athletes, any number of things for those people who are participating in a variety of sport.

Mr. Chairman, two areas that have contributed significantly to certainly participatory sport in Manitoba that relate, not just to premier athletes, not just to athletes in the category of, say, 12 to 20 years old, not just to Olympic-class athletes or those kinds of people, but a mass participation of athletes right across the spectrum of age from childhood through to senior citizens, those two areas are curling and golf.

Principally now dealing with curling, not only does — (interjection) — I'm talking about a substantial number of people, but in terms of curling, Mr. Chairman, I don't know how many curling clubs there are in the Province of Manitoba, but there are about 20 or 22 in the City of Winnipeg alone. I'm sure there are two or three or four times that throughout the rest of the province.

Those curling clubs, by and large, are put up by the funds of the curlers themselves. The province does not generally speaking contribute, nor do municipalities. Mr. Chairman, in addition to that, not only are there few if any funds put into those facilities by any order of government, those facilities, in addition to that, have to pay for the privilege of providing those sporting facilities and programs for the people of Manitoba. They have to pay taxes. They pay real property tax and, in some cases, even school tax. Those taxes are becoming significant. They're becoming so significant to a point that those curling clubs are going to have difficulty in the future in trying to continue to operate and to continue to provide programs for thousands of Manitobans on a regular basis.

I might as well throw in the golf courses at the same time. You can answer the same question. Golf courses, at the same time, also provide the same kinds of facilities. They're land-intensive now, and require large amounts of land which are also, in many cases, taxed so significantly that we're talking now, in the case of one particular golf course in my neighbourhood, that's paying in excess of \$100,000 a year in real property taxes, the St. Charles Country Club.

I can see the hairs on the backs of several of the members opposite rise when they hear that name. It doesn't matter. The Southwood golf course, you name any golf course in the City of Winnipeg, the Canoe

Club, a good example. Mr. Chairman, there are a number of those areas that provide recreation for Manitobans, and we're not saying one class of Manitoban over another class of Manitoban. The fact of the matter is they're providing facilities. They're providing recreational opportunities, not only at no cost to the taxpayer, but they're contributing to the tax base on top of that. Whereas we have other facilities, they're a drain on the purse of government - government in broad terms. On top of that, we're providing great volumes of money in order to see their programs continue.

So my question really, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister is this: has the Department of Sport considered a program to deal with this very serious question of taxation on those kinds of recreational facilities, sporting facilities? Have they considered that? Are they going to: (a) provide a grant; (b) provide some form of tax relief through legislation or some other activity that would cause some relief to come to these sports facilities that are providing opportunities for thousands and thousands and thousands of Manitobans?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Before the answer, I'd like to ask a question of my own. Has my honourable friend any youngsters, any boys?

MR. J. ERNST: Yes.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Do they play hockey?

MR. J. ERNST: No.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I want to divide that into two different sections. To say that the golf and the curling clubs don't get any money is not quite right. There's been an awful lot of money. Probably more of those have received help from the Community Assets Program and the Jobs Fund than any other facility. I might be wrong. Maybe the Minister of Finance, I know was involved in that, he might be able to add something or shake his head or something to that account. I didn't say rattle, I said shake. — (Interjection) — Why I ask this question, I wasn't trying to be funny. But my honourable friend says that there is a cost to these people. Ask my honourable friend from St. Norbert how much it costs for a family who has one or two kids playing hockey, youngsters, and you will see they are spending as much money as you would take to belong to an ordinary - not St. Charles and those clubs.

Then there are the facilities. You have to also differentiate between a private club and a public club. You know, people decided, because a public club is more, it's recreation. I'm not knocking it - the private club, I should say, but it is also part of the social club. I belonged to the Granite at one time; it is a private club. It could be the Manitoba Club or the Carlton Club; it is part of that. You know, if you have different facilities and some of that, it is not just organized sports, it is recreation the same as you might have somebody who has recreation with a boat or something in the Red River. There is a limit to what you can do and there are certain sports that maybe some of the people cannot afford. So I sympathize with my honourable friend, but I wanted to make those two differences.

Now, I don't think it is really the department, unless we would provide grants. We haven't got the money to make grants, especially when there is so much money from the Lotteries and so on. That could be decided by the sport fraternities, sport groups. The money that they have there, we're not going to start taxing the people for more money. When that is increasing, where we have more difficulty to get money for the hospital beds or for roads or for anything else.

Now, as I say, I have some, but this is a question of a policy that it be made a tax. Some people feel that you should tax churches and some people feel you don't. So I think that belongs more in the — (Interjection) — no, no, I say some people do think that you should. I say that this is something that — (Interjection) — has to be . . .

I'll give you an idea. The hospitals wanted us to pay - the city is charging tax on the hospitals and so on - in the other areas they wanted us to pay - the Department of Health, to pay the taxes. That'll be the frosty Friday when they come and beg us to have a personal care home. The Chamber of Commerce, I'm not only talking about the health people, and then we're going to pay. It might happen, but I don't think that we should. I think it is sure to take care of people in the surrounding areas, but it is mostly for that town. They profit by it by jobs and that. Anyway, I'm way off.

But this business, they do get money. There is a difference between the private and public club, and as far as taxing, well, that has to be taken in another context when we're discussing tax, when we're looking at revenue by all the members at large. It's not a decision of the Department of Sports.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for his answer, but I appreciate that it costs - I know the Member for St. Norbert has children involved in the hockey program and it's an expensive proposition. But it's expensive for the taxpayer as well, because the taxpayer is providing \$1.5 or \$2 million building and at rates of rental that are subsidized at a minimum of 50 percent.

So it's not just a question of how much it costs the Member for St. Norbert or any other person to pay for his child in a hockey program. I admit it's expensive, but that's the choice they make. But the taxpayers are also subsidizing them and they are not paying, in addition to that, any taxation for the privilege of providing that service. That's not the case with respect to curling clubs and that is not the case with respect to some - not all - golf courses, where in fact not only did it cost the taxpayer nothing to provide those recreational opportunities, those sporting opportunities for Manitobans, it costs the taxpayer nothing, but they also contribute toward the tax base over and above.

We look at the growth in provincial lottery revenues, for instance, and the amount of money that comes in, and there are recommendations in the Miller Report that say some funds should be skimmed off the top of the Manitoba Sports Federation and a couple of other umbrella groups and to put into more local recreational and cultural programs.

In addition to that, there are millions, quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, of dollars in slush funds within the Lotteries Foundation itself and/or the government that

are being held there for: one is called the Special Fund, another is called an Equalization Fund. There are a number of organizations that are being grandfathered out of the whole lottery process, who are currently taking up X dollars within that fund. All of these monies are coming in. In addition to that, there is a tremendous growth in the whole lottery revenue business. All of those monies are coming forward and none of that money is being shifted, as I understand it, to the Consolidated Fund. That money is either held in the Lotteries Foundation, distributed through the umbrella groups or is put aside through some of these slush funds or funnelled either into the Department of Sport or Department of Culture.

Mr. Chairman, couldn't some of those kinds of funds recognize the unique problem that these organizations are facing? It's going to be too late, Mr. Chairman, if we don't do something pretty soon, particularly the curling clubs, because those organizations are going to falter. Some have faltered already. Some have declined and said, no, we're giving up, we're not going to continue anymore. I think that would be a shame.

Manitoba is the curling capital of Canada and likely the curling capital of the world. We have coming up in 1988 the 100th Anniversary of the Manitoba Curling Association. It's going to have the largest single sporting event in terms of curling that has ever been held anywhere, and we have curling clubs that are finding it extremely difficult to continue.

Mr. Chairman, I think it's time that the Department of Sport looked at some of these things and said perhaps there is some way of the Department of Sport, through either lottery funds or some other method, up to and including legislation, that can deal with the major operating problems, not the capital problem. It's fine for the Jobs Fund to provide \$20,000 or \$30,000 for them to fix the roof, or put in a new heater or a new ice plant or whatever. It's not so much the capital funding that is a drain on those curling clubs, it's the ongoing annual operating costs. One of the significant features in those operating costs is the fact that they are paying municipal taxes.

Those municipal taxes, particularly in the City of Winnipeg are becoming very, very expensive; and I think it's time that the Department of Sport took a look at that before it's too late.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I think we're ready to wind it up, so I don't want to prolong this. I just want to say, as I said, I have a certain amount of sympathy with what my honourable friend is saying, and I want to make the difference. First of all, in his first question, my honourable friend was talking about taxing. I'm saying that I haven't got a mandate to change that at all. This would have to be looked at by the Department of Finance and looking at revenue and the taxing . . .

MR. J. ERNST: But will you take it up with them?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: . . . when they talk about the taxation deal. But I want to say this: when I talked about the amount of money, I was answering a question that he said that these people were paying a lot more. I'm saying, no, the actual money out of their pocket that people have one or two kids and they are not the

same class of people, usually. I'm not trying to say that only the millionaires curl and so on, that's not what I'm saying. But all the kids play hockey and there are an awful lot of poor families. I don't know how they do it. It costs a fortune to keep each kid. If you've got two or three kids, it's quite costly.

Then don't forget, again, I want to emphasize that a private club, you're choosing to belong to a private club, and it is more than just playing golf. It is a social club. You can go for a steam there; you can use the dining room, and you're paying for that. I'm not saying that what you're saying is not correct, but those are things that make a difference and there is no reason in the world why they can't qualify to get money from the Lotteries. They can apply. No one says that they can't apply. If you're talking about operating or anything, all these clubs - I don't know how they decide, but anyone can apply. As I say, they've had money from the Provincial Government Jobs Fund and so on, and the Curling Association is one of the associations that gets the highest grant from the Sports Federation from us - the Curling Association. But we don't go to individual clubs like that at this time. We haven't done that.

MR. J. ERNST: I don't want to prolong the question, Mr. Chairman, but I think the Minister may have not understood my question or whatever. The fact of the matter is there are no public curling clubs; they're all private.

Unless you want government of any order to go out and start building curling clubs to go into competition with the private ones, then you aren't going to have any curling, period. So the question is: will the Minister now look at some ways of helping these clubs, of looking at some kind of tax relief? I appreciate he doesn't control the municipal taxes, but he does control the legislation through the Cabinet and through the government, and they have that opportunity to deal with that. He also controls, through that Lotteries Fund, an opportunity for grants to offset those huge amounts.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The Lotteries funds that would go to rent like this, darn it, they've got \$5 million, the Sports group. That's up to them to get it. I'm not going to ask more money for those kinds of things. We're not working at that level with our department. We work with the associations and Games and travelling for the championships and that kind of stuff. That's all I'm saying.

When I was talking about private and public, I was talking about golfing. But curling, my honourable friend was with the enterprise who controls one of the nicest and biggest curling public clubs, but it didn't go because the people were choosing to go to the private clubs. It is their choice.

MR. J. ERNST: That's 12 out of 250. Surely . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: All right, but there could be public clubs if they could make money on them, the same as golfing, and people would go.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(a)(1) - the Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, we're prepared to pass the whole resolution. One item . . .

Thursday, 24 July, 1986

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let me call (b).

MR. G. MERCIER: Just a minute; let me speak for a minute. I would just ask the Minister, with respect to the funding for External Agencies in the amount of 330,000, if he would undertake to provide me with a breakdown of where that money is going. Then I would indicate to him . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It's all to provincial sports associations.

MR. G. MERCIER: Okay, if you'd give me the list, I'd appreciate it. I would thank him for the answers he's given here tonight. This is my first opportunity to participate as a critic in this area.

I think the matters that were raised, particularly with respect to planning in the long-term and medium-term

and the need for additional facilities, are very important. I hope, by the time the next set of Estimates roll around that the Minister will be able to produce perhaps a bit more information with respect to planning for sport in Manitoba, and with respect to the improvement and additions to existing sports facilities in the province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(a)(1) Sports, Executive: Salaries—pass; 5.(a)(2) Other Expenditures—pass.

5.(b)(1) Sports Directorate: Salaries—pass; 5.(b)(2) Other Expenditures—pass; 5.(b)(3) External Agencies—pass.

Resolution No. 86: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$661,800 for Health, Sport, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1987—pass.

Committee rise.