



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

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)**

40 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XL No. 85A - 1:30 p.m., MONDAY, JULY 15, 1991



MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fifth Legislature

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

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, July 15, 1991

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of H. M. Johnson, D. L. Girard, Albert Todd and many others requesting withdrawal of funding and the prevention of construction of The Pines project and to prevent projects similar in nature from destroying the community.

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

Mr. Speaker: To the honourable member for Transcona (Mr. Reid), I have reviewed the petition of the honourable member, and it conforms with the privileges and practices of the House and complies with the rules. Is it the will of the House to have the petition read?

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): To the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba

The petition of the undersigned citizens, of the province of Manitoba, humbly sheweth:

THAT the Winnipeg International Airport is vital to the economic health of the city of Winnipeg, and the project known as "The Pines," in its current location, will jeopardize the future of Winnipeg International Airport.

THAT to risk the jobs of the hundreds of people who are employed at the airport is not in the best interests of the community.

THAT "The Pines" project will inhibit riverbank access to the general public.

THAT the strip mall portion of "The Pines" project will give a foothold to commercial development which is incompatible with the residential nature of the neighbourhood.

WHEREFORE your petitioners humbly pray that the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba may be pleased to respect the wishes of the neighbourhood

by requesting the provincial government to withdraw provincial funding of "The Pines" project.

AND as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

* (1335)

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Mr. Jack Reimer (Chairman of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Third Report on the Committee on Law Amendments.

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments presents the following as their Third Report.

Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments presents the following as their Third Report.

Your committee met on Thursday, July 11, 1991, at 8 p.m. in Room 254 of the Legislative Building to consider bills referred.

Your committee heard representation on bills as follows:

Bill 40—the Education Administration Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'administration scolaire

Ms. Judy Bradley - Manitoba Teachers' Society

Bill 41—The Public Schools Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur les écoles publiques

Ms. Judy Bradley - Manitoba Teachers' Society

Bill 42—The Public Schools Finance Board Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur a Commission des finances des écoles publiques

Ms. Judy Bradley - Manitoba Teachers' Society

Bill 49—The Colleges and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi sur les collèges et modifiant diverses dispositions législatives

Mr. Peter Olfert - Manitoba Government Employees Association

Mr. Bruce Buckley - Private Citizen

Mr. Martin J. Stadler - Private Citizen

Ms. Donna Finkleman - Private Citizen

Mr. Larry Hogue - Private Citizen

Mr. Eric Penner - Private Citizen
 Mr. Pat McDonnell - Private Citizen
 Mr. Stephen Kormilo - Private Citizen

Your committee has considered:

Bill 40—The Education Administration Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'administration scolaire

and has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your committee has considered:

Bill 41—The Public Schools Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur les écoles publiques

and has agreed to report the same with the following amendments:

MOTION:

THAT section 16 of Bill 41 be struck out and the following substituted:

Section 171 amended

16 Section 171 is amended

(a) in the definition of "eligible enrolment", by adding "or" at the end of clause (d) and by adding the following after clause (d):

(e) pupils who are not residents of a school division;

and

(b) by striking out the definition of "government support to education program".

MOTION:

THAT section 25 of Bill 41 be struck out and the following substituted:

Subsection 175(1) amended

25 Subsection 175(1) is amended by adding the following after clause (f):

(g) prescribing the percentage of the municipal contribution, in each school division for each fiscal year, that is to be raised by special levy.

MOTION:

THAT proposed section 194 of The Public Schools Act, as set out in section 36 of Bill 41; be amended by striking out "in addition to support that may be provided to assist" and substituting "in addition to support that may be provided, to assist".

Your committee has also considered:

Bill 42—The Public Schools Finance Board Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Commission des finances des écoles publiques

and has agreed to report the same with the following amendment:

MOTION:

THAT proposed new section 19 of The Public Schools Finance Board Act, as set out in section 15 of Bill 42, be amended by striking out "under this Act" and substituting "under this Act and The Public Schools Act".

Your committee has considered:

Bill 49—The Colleges and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi sur les collèges et modifiant diverses dispositions législatives

and has agreed to report the same with the following amendments:

MOTION:

THAT the proposed clause 9(1)(a) be amended by striking out "on terms acceptable to the board and the students' association" and substituting "by the students' association".

MOTION:

THAT the following be added to the Bill after section 40:

Application of Civil Service Superannuation Act 40.1 The employees of a college are employees within the meaning of The Civil Service Superannuation Act.

MOTION:

THAT subsection 43(1) and 43(2) of the Bill be struck out and the following substituted:

Student activity fees

43(1) A students' association may set student activity fees.

Collection of fees

43(2) A board may collect student activity fees and where it does so, it shall require the payment of the fees before registering a student.

MOTION:

THAT Legislative Counsel be authorized to change all section numbers and internal references necessary to carry out the amendments adopted by this committee.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Mr. Reimer: I move, seconded by the honourable member for Fort Garry (Mrs. Vodrey), that the report of the committee be received.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

Mrs. Rosemary Vodrey (Chairman of the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Seventh Report of the Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources.

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): Your Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources presents the following as their Seventh Report.

Your committee met on Friday, July 12, 1991, at 1 p.m. in Room 254 of the Legislative Building to consider bills referred. On July 12, 1991, your committee elected Mrs. Vodrey as Chairperson.

Your committee heard representation on bills as follows:

Bill 48—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (2);
Loi no 2 modifiant le Code de la route

Mr. Robert J. M. Adkins and Mr. William Ratuski
- General Scrap and Car Shredder Ltd.

Your committee has considered:

Bill 46—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act; Loi modifiant le Code de la route

and has agreed to report the same with the following amendments:

MOTION:

THAT the proposed clause 242.1(4.1)(b), as set out in subsection 2(3) of the Bill, be amended by striking out "registered in the name of the owner applying under subsection (4)." and substituting "that was at the time of the seizure and impoundment registered in the name of, or owned by, the owner applying under subsection (4)."

MOTION:

THAT the proposed subsection 242.1(7.1), as set out in subsection 2(4) of the Bill, be struck out and the following substituted:

Two seizures within two years

242.1(7.1) Notwithstanding subsection (7), where a motor vehicle seized and impounded under this section is registered in the name of, or owned by, a person who, within two years before the day of the seizure and impoundment of the motor vehicle, was registered as the owner, or was the owner, of a motor vehicle that was seized and impounded under this section, and the seizure and impoundment was not revoked by a justice under subsection (5) or (6),

the motor vehicle shall be impounded for a period of 60 days from the day it is seized.

MOTION:

THAT the proposed subsection 242.1(7.3), as set out in subsection 2(4) of the Bill, be amended by striking out clause (a) and substituting the following:

(a) while registered in the name of, or owned by, the applicant; and

MOTION:

THAT the proposed subsection 242.1(10.2), as set out in subsection 2(5) of the Bill, be amended

(a) by striking out "subsection (1)" and substituting "subsection (10.1)"; and

(b) by striking out "owing under this section," and substituting "owing to the Minister of Finance in respect of the motor vehicle, as prescribed by regulation,".

Your committee has also considered:

Bill 48—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (2);
Loi no 2 modifiant le Code de la route

and has agreed to report the same with the following amendments:

MOTION:

THAT the French version of the proposed new definition of "scrapper" in subsection 1(1) of The Highway Traffic Act, as set out in section 5 of Bill 48, be amended by striking out "l'activité" and substituting "le commerce".

MOTION:

THAT proposed subsection 21(1) of The Highway Traffic Act, as set out in section 12 of Bill 48, be amended by striking out "by the dealer, scrapper or wrecker," and substituting "by the dealer, scrapper or wrecker, other than a motor vehicle or motor vehicle part or motor vehicle accessories acquired from another dealer or wrecker or from the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation".

MOTION:

THAT the French version of proposed new subsection 21(4.1) of The Highway Traffic Act, as set out in section 15 of Bill 48, be amended

(a) by striking out "ne sont pas responsable de l'endommagement," and substituting "ne peuvent être tenus, en vertu de l'alinéa 171(1)(a), responsables de l'endommagement,"; and

(b) by striking out "contrairement à l'alinéa 171(1)(a).

Your committee has also considered:

Bill 57—The Horse Racing Commission Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Commission hippique

and has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your committee has also considered:

Bill 58—The Development Corporation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Société de développement

and has agreed to report the same without amendment.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable member for Niakwa (Mr. Reimer), that the report of the committee be received.

Motion agreed to.

TABLING OF REPORTS

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I am tabling today the Annual Report for 1988-89 of The Public Trustee and the Annual Report for 1989 of the Law Enforcement Review Agency.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Child and Family Services Volunteer Role

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Many of us attended the meeting of volunteers about three weeks ago or two weeks ago, dealing with the hundreds of people who were working throughout the various agencies in the city of Winnipeg, the Child and Family Services agencies in the city of Winnipeg, many of them working hour after hour on behalf of children and parents in our communities, Mr. Speaker.

Of course, we have raised in this House about the role of volunteers with the new superagency that has been created by the Filmon government, the Conservative government, I mean, with the creation of their new over-the-weekend Child and Family Services agency in the city of Winnipeg.

I would ask the Premier today, Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that they say the volunteer status will

be the same and enhanced under their new superagency, can he inform Manitobans and the people of Winnipeg what is the status of the volunteer programs dealing with very vital programs like child abuse and other programs? What is the status of those volunteer programs in the city of Winnipeg based on his government's initiative for the new superagency in the city of Winnipeg?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice on behalf of the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer).

Mr. Doer: The Minister of Family Services and the Premier spoke about the strong emphasis the new agency would have on the voluntary component in the system, Mr. Speaker. They talked about and welcomed the role of volunteers in the system.

Mr. Speaker, we are advised by the campaign co-ordinator for the just say no to child abuse program that volunteers are now—the numbers have been reduced close to 50 percent on people who are working in that campaign since the government made their announcement to bring in all the agencies into the one superagency.

Surely the government factored in the role of volunteers in their communities in their decision making, but it appears, of course, they did not in their weekend takeover of the Child and Family Services agencies in the city of Winnipeg.

I would ask the Premier, will he investigate the situation with the decreased enrollment of volunteers dealing with just say no to child abuse, and will he re-evaluate totally the assumptions that his government made on the takeover plan, assumptions that are not working in our communities with our parents and children and are not working with our most vulnerable children, as alleged by the government?

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, without accepting as accurate any of the preamble that the member has put on the table, I will take that question as notice and look into the matter.

* (1340)

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, the information comes from the co-ordinator of the child abuse program of the city of Winnipeg, the co-ordinator who is working with the volunteers and the six agencies. In fact, his government, on hearing about some of these declines in volunteers, has tried to move some staff into the central office.

Mr. Cooper has convened an emergent meeting last week, Mr. Speaker, to deal with this situation. I am surprised he has not advised the government and the Premier of this, because it speaks against the total philosophy of the provincial government's takeover of the Child and Family Services agencies.

I would ask the Premier, if his minister and his government are wrong about voluntary community involvement in vital programs like just say no to child abuse, Mr. Speaker, if his government made a mistake on the weekend takeover of the Child and Family Services agencies, will he re-evaluate the assumptions made on their takeover and look at returning the community-based programs and the community volunteers with the improvements that are necessary to that system, but not throw the baby out with the bath water, as the Conservatives have done with this takeover?

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, for someone who has been in government before, I find it rather foolish that the Leader of the Opposition does not know that Mr. Cooper would not report to me. Mr. Cooper, obviously, as an individual, would report to the ranks, to his seniors in the Department of Family Services. There are 18,000 civil servants. It would be chaos if each of them reported directly to the Premier, but that may be the way the NDP organize their government. I know then why they had such trouble.

I will take that question, Mr. Speaker, as notice, as well, and respond to the member.

Bill 70 Public Presentations

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, we are seeing on a daily basis just how far this government is willing to go to implement its right-wing ideological agenda.

We have seen with Bill 70 the dismantling of 50 years worth of principles of labour relations. We have seen a Premier break his word given to Manitobans about the free collective bargaining process. Most recently, we have seen a hearing process whereby more than 400 Manitobans were disenfranchised at four o'clock on a Sunday morning, and many of them today were present in the committee and were denied the opportunity to speak.

My question is to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness). I would like to ask the Minister of

Finance how he can justify this Meech-Lake-type process of sitting until four on Sunday morning, Mr. Speaker, and denying many Manitobans, including Manitobans who were there at the committee this morning, the opportunity to speak on this bill, a new form of closure in this province.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question has been put.

* (1345)

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, here we have the hypocrisy of the New Democratic Party personified by the member for Thompson. This is the most democratic jurisdiction in the world. It is the only one that has mandatory public hearings for every single piece of legislation that is brought in.

Mr. Speaker, for the edification of those new New Democrats who are part of the gang who are trying to hijack democracy, I will tell them exactly what the purposes of this process—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Point of Order

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, the term "gang" is unparliamentary. There is only one group in this House trying to hijack democracy—this government.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member does not have a point of order.

* * *

Mr. Speaker: The honourable First Minister, to finish his response.

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, if he prefers ragtag group, I will replace the "gang" with "ragtag group."

Not only did the committee adopt its rules that allowed for unlimited time for presentations, Mr. Speaker, as compared to even the all-party task force on Meech Lake that put limits on time of presentation. He may recall that all three parties agreed to limiting the time of presentation. The purpose of public hearings is so that the general public can put legitimate concerns on the record with respect to technical amendments, with respect to problems in drafting, with respect to improvements to the legislation, with respect to pointing out unexpected consequences, but never, never was that legitimate public process intended to be able to frustrate, block or filibuster the democratic process—never.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the tyranny of the minority as practised by the MFL and the New Democratic Party. They want to destroy democracy, bringing in organizers from Toronto who do not even know people here, who put names on the list of people who do not even know their name is being put on the list, and they read word-for-word briefs that have been presented and written for them by other people to hijack democracy. I make no apologies for being reasonable, for being reasonable in setting democratic rules to the process, instead of acting like the New Democrats did. -(applause)-

Mr. Ashton: Mr. Speaker, they applauded General Jaruzelski as well in Poland.

Mr. Speaker, the comments of this Premier are an insult to the 106 Manitobans who made presentations, the many more who would have made presentations if they were not cut off by this government.

I want to ask the Premier, since he did not listen directly to their concerns, I want to ask if he will listen to the single parents who came before the committee, making less than \$20,000 a year, and this government is going to be taking \$1,500 out of their pocket.

Will he listen to the many other Manitobans who came before the committee and said, this legislation, Bill 70, is the most Draconian piece of legislation, the most vicious attack on working people in the history of Manitoba?

Mr. Fillmon: Mr. Speaker, my comments are very directly an insult to the antidemocratic party that sits opposite us, and they ought to be taken as such.

I will listen to all Manitobans. I will listen to those Manitobans who are struggling to keep their farms, to keep their houses, to keep their jobs. I will listen to people who are struggling to make ends meet, given some of the most difficult economic circumstances we face. I will listen to Manitobans who are struggling because of the huge debt load put upon them by the New Democratic administration, of which all of that ragtag bunch are supporters and of which many of them were a part. Those are the people who have created the circumstances that have faced us with some very difficult decisions.

Mr. Speaker, ultimately, having listened to all Manitobans, I am prepared to make difficult decisions, unlike New Democrats who speak out of both sides of their mouth.

Mr. Ashton: I think the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) put it in real terms, the real policy of this government, when he said during the committee hearings on Friday, he had to be there but he did not have to listen, Mr. Speaker. This government is not listening and the Premier knows it.

Justification

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): My final question is to the Premier or the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), whoever wishes to respond, and once again is based on the presentations before the committee where many people said this will lead to unprecedented labour unrest in this province. The latest statistics for the first six months of this year show the highest number of days lost to strikes in 10 years.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member for Thompson, kindly put your question, please.

Mr. Ashton: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) talks about bringing out the baseball bat. This government is the one—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Ashton: My question to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) or the Premier is: How can he justify bringing in Bill 70 which will destroy the harmonious labour relations climate, where we have already seen in the first six months of this year the highest strike rate under this Tory government since the last Tory majority government in 1981?

* (1350)

Hon. Gary Fillmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, if we want to talk about fomenting unrest and organizing demonstrations, all we have to do is look at the fact that the Manitoba Federation of Labour and the New Democrats had to bring in organizers from out-of-province to deal with this bill. That is right.

I say this, Mr. Speaker, these are, indeed, very difficult times in which only people who do not want to acknowledge reality can say that there should not be difficult measures brought in to face difficult times. We are the sixth province out of ten that has been faced with these difficult choices to make. We want the province to strengthen, to grow, to become a good place in which to invest and create jobs and opportunities for the future. In the short term, difficult choices have to be made. We have made them to keep faith with the people of this province.

Bill 70 Public Presentations

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I remember the Minister of Justice and Attorney General (Mr. McCrae) flying in a crew from Minnesota so we could meet with them on the drinking and driving legislation. There was a special meeting for that, so let not the Premier condemn those who happen to seek advice from outside the province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier. The hypocrisy of the Premier comes through every time he opens his mouth. The Premier and various members of cabinet, as he has done this morning, have often and repeatedly lauded the fact that Manitoba is unique in Canada in allowing public comment to committee stage before all bills before the House. For that process to be credible and effective, surely it is necessary that it represent an honest attempt to hear all citizens who wish to be heard.

Mr. Speaker, can the Premier explain how arbitrarily disenfranchising hundreds of Manitobans in the middle of the night, at 4 a.m. on Sunday morning, is consistent with any concept or definition of democratic process?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting that in his preamble, the true colours of the member for St. James show as he always tried to block our passage of the toughest drinking and driving legislation in this country, and he continues to be opposed to it by virtue of his criticism of bringing in outside experts to help in the legal aspects of that bill.

My response to the member for St. James is very clearly that the democratic aspect of the process is to allow people to legitimately express concerns to assist in making changes that would strengthen and improve the bill, not to have them come in huge numbers, organized and orchestrated by the NDP, the Liberals and the Manitoba Federation of Labour, including bringing not out-of-province speakers but out-of-province organizers to be able to filibuster, block and stifle the passage of that legislation.

Tyranny of the minority is not part of democracy. That is why we followed a legitimate democratic process that gave the opportunity for more than a hundred people to be heard and gave them the opportunity -(interjection)- Mr. Speaker, everybody

had the opportunity to come and be heard. Some did not choose—

An Honourable Member: At four in the morning?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Filmon: They had opportunities on Tuesday, on Wednesday, on Thursday, on Friday, on Saturday, on Sunday. They had opportunities in the morning, in the afternoon, in the evening. Regardless of what shifts they might have worked, they had the opportunity to be heard, Mr. Speaker.

Premier's Comments

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): I think we have it now, Mr. Speaker. It is not the numbers that the Premier objects to. His party lined up hundreds of people for Autopac. It is the content of what they were saying that offends this Premier. They were not saying the right things. That is the bottom line. They were disenfranchised halfway through the process.

Will the Premier tell the House today, explain his comment that they were not saying the right things, what they were saying was off the base of what the bill was about? They were all talking about the bill, Mr. Speaker. The chairperson raised it many times. He kept it relevant. What does the Premier mean when he says he does not like what they said?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I did not say I did not like what they said. As usual, the member for St. James, in his smarmy way, is misrepresenting what I said. If he does that in court, I can understand why he cannot make a living as a lawyer.

Point of Order

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, everyone in this House is supposed to be considered an honourable member. No one in this House ever attacks the professional qualifications of members of this House, except the Premier of this province. He has attacked the professional qualifications of members of this House consistently, and I demand that he apologize.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable Leader did not have a point of order, but I would remind all honourable members again, due to the fact of our watching public, that we do pick and choose our words very carefully.

* * *

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, I cannot imagine the hypocrisy of the Leader of the Liberal Party who last week maligned all rural Manitobans, saying that they did not have the ability to judge what was a good investment and what was not. All rural Manitobans did not have the ability to do that. That is the kind of hypocrisy that we get.

The reality is—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I will allow the honourable First Minister to finish his response, but I have not recognized the entire front bench.

* (1355)

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, every single person who signed up to be heard was given two opportunities to be heard at different times of the day in each case. Those people chose not to be there for those hearings.

In the past, New Democrats have criticized us for holding public hearings only during the daytime. These public hearings were held during the morning, during the afternoon, during the evening and after midnight. It would not matter what shift people work, they had an opportunity to be there and be heard.

Mr. Edwards: Mr. Speaker, let the record show that some 15 hours were heard after midnight. Some presenters were called both the first and the second time after midnight, some at 2:30 and again at 4 a.m. in the morning on different mornings.

Standing Committees Public Presentations

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): For the Premier (Mr. Filmon), can he give any assurances today, as we head into other bills going to committees in this House, other controversial bills heading to committee, that Manitobans seeking to make their views known to the committee will be heard at a reasonable hour?

I am speaking of all bills presently before the House, including Bill 68, including Bill 59, both of which represent bills no doubt in which large numbers of people will come forward. Will we have to put up with, and will Manitobans have to put up with this kind of arbitrary so-called democracy, whereby people's rights are effectively destroyed at 4 a.m. in the morning?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question has been put.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, let me assure the member for St. James that all members of the public who wish to make presentation on bills, as is our custom, will be allowed to do so, will be provided with an opportunity to do so.

Indeed, if they cannot be in attendance, certainly the government will receive briefs. Indeed, all members of the House will receive briefs, and they will be taken into consideration, as is the normal practice.

Rest assured also that the government will treat every presenter with respect, not as the Leader of the Second Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) has, at least as attributed to her by her member for St. James who said, and I quote, it is part of the record, that in the mind of his Leader, all rural members of this House are not smart, indeed are dumb. That is indeed what the member for St. James said.

Point of Order

Mr. Edwards: Mr. Speaker, I was referring specifically, and I was speaking specifically to the rural member who is sitting across from me, the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Connery).

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The honourable member does not have a point of order.

* (1400)

Bill 70 Public Presentations

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I have a follow-up question to the Premier, because I grow increasingly concerned as I hear this Premier describe why they enforced closure on the public of Manitoba on Bill 70 at four o'clock on Sunday. The Premier accused 106 presenters of filibustering. The Premier accused them of doing other than what has always been the tradition, to allow full and open explanation of their opinions.

Now, I will ask the Premier directly: Is the reason they forced closure at four o'clock in the morning because 106 out of 106 said this government was wrong and that this Premier had lied to them when it came to collective bargaining, Mr. Speaker?

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member for Thompson has put his question, and I am sure he would like to hear the answer.

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, whether I disagree or agree with anyone's comments on anything that I or this government does, I will defend to the death their right to make those comments, believe me. Each and every one of those people has the right, if they still want to be heard, to have a written presentation submitted. -(interjection)- We have Report Stage on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the point of the matter is that out-of-province organizers were brought in and put in names without even checking with people, in some cases, to fill the list of presenters to try and orchestrate a movement on behalf of the New Democratic Party. Despite all of that, they were still given an opportunity to speak not once but twice, and they chose not to be there to speak. They chose not to be there to speak. Under those circumstances, we have done our level best.

Mr. Ashton: Mr. Speaker, how can this Premier say to this House that he will fight to the death to allow people to make their views of concern when there were people in that room this morning who had been told they could come back on Monday, who had come from as far as Thompson, Manitoba, who came before that committee and were denied by the government majority the opportunity to express their views on this bill? How can he make that statement when he knows he forced closure—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, those people were not told by any member of the government or by the Clerk's Office that they could come and present this morning. If they were told false information by the New Democrats or the labour organizers who were brought in from out of province, that is a different story. We do not take any responsibility, and we say shame on the New Democrats.

Mr. Ashton: Mr. Speaker, if he had been there this morning, he would have talked to a number of people, including the woman who attended three times last week, was unable to be there on Saturday because she worked, asked if she could come in and was told there was a hearing Monday. She came in this morning fully expecting to present.

My final question to this Premier is—and it is in regard to some of the presentations. I would like to ask him: Is he saying that the many people who

came before that committee, who spoke from the heart, some of them in tears, including a woman who has just declared personal bankruptcy, Mr. Speaker, who now is going to be forced, as she said, to live off credit if she can get it, if this bill passes, is he saying that they were filibustering this bill? Is he saying that her comments were not relevant? Why did he cut off hundreds of more Manitobans like that woman presenting—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, I have no criticism whatsoever of all those who spoke on the bill. The fact of the matter is that the New Democrats and their farm team, the Manitoba Federation of Labour, are trying to suggest that somehow these other people were disenfranchised. They were given the opportunity Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Sunday, and they were called to be able to speak, and they chose not to be there on those cases.

Point of Order

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, the First Minister obviously did not understand what happened. People were called once between Tuesday and Saturday and called the second time Saturday night. If they—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member for Thompson does not have a point of order. It is a dispute over the facts.

Highway 491 Responsibility

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, this question is to the Minister of Highways and Transportation.

The Trembowla Cross of Freedom site is an historic cultural site north of Dauphin near Valley River. In 1982, the former New Democratic government designated the site as an historic site in recognition of the first Ukrainian service that was held there in 1897. In 1983, the road, some five kilometres, leading to the site was designated a Provincial Road No. 491. Now on the 100th anniversary of the Ukrainian settlement in Canada, this government is throwing away its responsibility for this road and turning it back to the municipality.

In view of the historic significance of this site, will the Minister of Highways announce today that he will not proceed with turning back this road to the

municipality and the turning away of his responsibilities for this road to this historic site, to the Ukrainian community and to all Manitobans?

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation): Mr. Speaker, I explained the process the other day in this House. I can indicate to the member that each municipality has been sent a letter identifying certain roads.

The next step in the process is that Doug Gourlay, who I have appointed to be the mediator, is going to be making contact with municipalities. If they have certain roads that they feel strongly about, they can get in touch with the mediator. He will listen to their concerns. He will come back to me and we will sit down and see whether we can have alternate choices that we can consider.

Mr. Plohman: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this minister and other ministers of his government have received resolutions from the Cross of Freedom Incorporated site, will this minister now change his decision, and will he acknowledge to this House today that he was not even aware of the historical significance of this road and this site when he made the decision to turn that back to the municipality?

Mr. Driedger: Mr. Speaker, I have indicated that they have 13 districts within the province, and the districts were the ones that by and large gave the first suggestion in terms of roads to be turned back.

If there is a matter of major concern with the municipalities that has historic value, I am prepared to have a mediator sit down with them and look at options. If there is a choice that we can make, we will take it and accommodate them.

Mr. Plohman: The mere fact that this government has chosen to take this kind of a decision on the 100th anniversary of Ukrainian settlement in this country is a slap in the face to the Ukrainians, an insult to all Ukrainians and all people in this province.

I want to ask the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Mitchelson): In view of the fact that it was her own department through the Historic Resources Committee which recognized the historic significance of the site, the freedom to worship that the Ukrainian settlers sought so desperately when they came to Canada 100 years ago this year, will this Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship tell her colleague the Minister of Highways and Transportation that she will not

tolerate his offloading, that she will not tolerate this insult and put a stop to this nonsense, of this road change right now?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Hansard appears to be having some difficulty with the honourable minister's mike, so I would ask the House for a little bit of co-operation here so that the interject mikes will pick up the remarks of the honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation.

Mr. Driedger: Mr. Speaker, the member obviously has difficulty hearing. I just explained what the process is that we have in place, and if there is a major significance to this thing, I am prepared to sit down with my mediator after he has met with the council. We will take and consider the position and see whether we have other options.

* (1410)

Civil Service Appointments Independent Inquiry

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, day by day, the scandal surrounding this government's hiring practices continues to grow, and we learn that the Premier has not been straight in his answers as far as the information he has been giving in this House.

He said, for example, that there would not be one, but two, independent inquiries, and they were presently underway, neither of which, we have said from this side of the House, in fact, can look at all of the implications of government hiring. Mr. Speaker, we have now learned that one of those so-called independent inquiries is not independent at all.

My question to the First Minister is: When the First Minister said that the Civil Service inquiry was independent because only a two-thirds majority of this House could fire the commissioners, he was clearly leaving the impression that it was the commissioners who were conducting the investigation. We have now learned that it is not the commissioners. How can he now tell this House that it is indeed an independent inquiry that is being conducted?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): If the member will examine all of the things that I have said about the many questions that have been placed on the issue, what I have said is that the senior staff of the commission are the same senior staff that were there when the New Democrats were in government, No. 1; and No. 2, the commission itself

can only be replaced by a two-thirds vote of this House.

On both those counts, I say that the Civil Service Commission and its operations remain independent of government. I remind her that there are two separate investigations, one being conducted by the RCMP, and if she wants to suggest that the RCMP are not independent, Mr. Speaker, I would invite her to go and make that charge publicly. Secondly, the investigation being done by the senior staff of the Civil Service Commission are the same senior staff that were there under the New Democratic administration which preceded us.

Mrs. Carstairs: Mr. Speaker, it is very clear that they are not independent. They report to a deputy minister; they report to political hirings of this particular administration; they report to the Premier. They do not report to the Civil Service Commission per se.

Point of Order

Mr. Filmon: The Civil Service Commission staff do not report to a deputy minister. They report to Paul Hart, the commissioner of the—

Mr. Speaker: The honourable First Minister does not have a point of order.

* * *

Mrs. Carstairs: Mr. Speaker, can the First Minister tell this House how this is an independent inquiry when according to the Premier himself, they are reporting to a deputy minister?

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, the investigation on all of the allegations that have been made will result in a report from the Civil Service Commission to the Deputy Minister of Family Services, the department in which the alleged inconsistencies and irregularities were to have taken place.

Mr. Speaker, we will have that report given to the deputy minister, and the deputy minister will then make recommendations for whatever action is appropriate under the circumstances.

Amarjeet Warralch Civil Service Act Violation

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, Section 12(4) of The Civil Service Act states: "Except on the recommendation of the commission, . . . no member of the civil service shall receive any remuneration

out of the Consolidated Fund in addition to the amount that he is entitled to receive under the pay plan."

Can the First Minister tell us today why no waiver has been given for Amarjeet Warraich and that he is indeed being paid as a member of the Manitoba Human Rights Commission when this is a violation of The Civil Service Act?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice.

Seech Gajadharsingh Public Inquiry

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, it should come as no surprise to the Premier that the patronage appointments of this government remind me of The Pines scandal, wherein day after day there were new revelations and new pieces of information, and day after day there was nothing but stonewalling and excuses from the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ernst).

The Premier has now admitted that the inquiry into the activities of Seech Gajadharsingh is not being conducted by the board of the Civil Service Commission but by staff members, some of whom approved his appointment to senior positions in Family Services. Manitobans now know that the Premier has been stalling on a true, full and impartial inquiry, because he and his colleagues do not want more details to come out publicly.

My question is for the Premier. How many more revelations will it take before this Premier does the honourable thing and calls for a public inquiry?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, any and all allegations are being examined by both the RCMP and the Civil Service Commission senior staff. I believe, and I think most people believe, that those independent groups—and the staff are very much independent, because they are not even appointed by a particular government. They have been there and they served the New Democratic government that preceded us.

Those are being fully investigated. If he has any other information that he wants to share, I am sure they would be pleased to investigate any allegations that he wants to bring forward.

Amarjeet Warralch Appointment Suspension

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Premier why this government has not acted on news reports, particularly the immigration events and the suspension of Amarjeet Warralch from the Human Rights Commission. Why has he not suspended this appointment?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, primarily because the immigration events are matters that come under federal jurisdiction. They are being acted upon by the federal—the RCMP in their investigation, that is the primary purpose. Those allegations, with respect to influence peddling, with respect to breaches of the Immigration Act are being fully, thoroughly and completely investigated by the RCMP.

Civil Service Positions Competitions

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): What is the justification for this Premier continuing to refuse to reveal whether there are any competitions for Civil Service positions at a time when this government laid off hundreds of long-term employees and budgeted millions for severance pay in the current budget?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, we have revealed in a variety of manners in response to questions where there have been cases in which there was not a competition. We have indicated that, and we have indicated where there has been a competition. We have been very open about it and in the case, for instance, of I believe it was seven allegations made in the Winnipeg Sun, only one of them involved an appointment without competition. That is the way in which this matter has been reviewed, thoroughly and completely and all the information put on the table.

Antiracism Programs Media Campaign

Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radlsson): Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that under this government, racists in the province are having a field day. In our schools, in our universities, hospitals, workplaces, organized racism is on the increase. White supremacists seem to be protected under the law with this government and victims of racism are not.

My question is for the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship. Will the minister act to implement a media campaign that was requested by the Manitoba Intercultural Council and many other groups that will counter racist attitudes, power relationships and educate people as to the systemic discrimination abundant in our society?

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship): Mr. Speaker, I am sure there are many initiatives that could be undertaken and, in fact, will be undertaken besides a second media campaign. There seems to be a fairly effective media campaign that is ongoing right now, and I believe the federal government is participating in that media campaign.

I do want to indicate that one area that the Manitoba Federation of Labour and the government have been able to work very co-operatively in is the area of racism where the Manitoba Federation of Labour realized within their organization and within their labour community that there was racism.

We have participated with them as a provincial government in developing several modules. We seconded a person over to the Federation of Labour for a two-year period to work co-operatively with them to develop eight different modules that will be used within the workplace, within government and throughout the community to ensure that we are working in a co-operative fashion.

I want to commend the Federation of Labour for recognizing the problem within, and also our government in responding to and working co-operatively with them.

Mr. Speaker: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

Nonpolitical Statements

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have leave to make a nonpolitical statement.

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable First Minister have leave to make a nonpolitical statement?

An Honourable Member: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: Leave. It is agreed.

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all members of the House will be saddened and will join us in expressing our condolences to his wife, Kay, and family of Bill Ziprick on his untimely passing this past weekend.

Mr. Ziprick is our former Provincial Auditor and died at the age of 71 on Friday. He was born in Inglis, Manitoba, and served in the Canadian Army and the Royal Canadian Air Force before becoming initially chief accountant for what was then the Manitoba Power Commission, prior to joining the Auditor's staff of the provincial government, ultimately rising to Provincial Auditor status, a status he held for some 12 years from 1971 to 1983. Following his retirement from that position we were very pleased to have him accept the appointment as chair of the Manitoba Health Services Commission, a position that he served the province in with great honour and with great capability for the past three years.

Certainly on behalf of all our colleagues in the Legislature I extend to his wife, Kay, and his family our sincere condolences.

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, may I have leave for a nonpolitical statement?

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable member for Brandon East have leave to make a nonpolitical statement? Leave? It is agreed.

* (1420)

Mr. Leonard Evans: Mr. Speaker, I would join with the Premier in extending from this side of the House our condolences to the family on the passing of Bill Ziprick. We had just learned about it, and we are very shocked by his passing. He was indeed a very fine person. I had the privilege of working with him from time to time on various kinds of projects. He was a man who was always ready to go the extra mile in working on behalf of the public of Manitoba. He was always willing and ready to take on extra duties. I recall him, too, as being a very level-headed person, very friendly person, and one who was ready to laugh even in the middle of a lot of turmoil and difficulties.

So, indeed, the people of Manitoba have been very well served by Bill Ziprick. We are very, very sorry to learn of his passing and certainly would extend our very sincere sympathies to his family. Thank you.

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, do I have leave?

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable member have leave to make a nonpolitical statement? Leave. It is agreed.

Mrs. Carstairs: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Liberal Party, I would like to join in the condolences that will now be extended to the Ziprick family on the loss of Bill Ziprick. Bill Ziprick, as the Provincial Auditor, was one of the more high ranking members of the Civil Service who saw his job very clearly as being totally apolitical in the sense that he was to report on the expenditures and the budgets and the means of the way in which government spends their money under a number of administrations. For that, he has been applauded in the past and will be continued to be respected in the future.

Mr. Ziprick also made himself available to those of us who, as new opposition members, knew very little about the Provincial Auditor's function. I contacted him so that he could explain it to me as a former Provincial Auditor, and he spent the time with me to give me the information and to let me know the breadth and the depth of that particular function. I will always be personally grateful for his time commitment to me at that particular time.

So to his wife and to his family, I extend our sympathy because although 71 seems in our lifetime to be a long span of time, now it is being considered considerably less than the normal life span to which we should all be entitled.

* * *

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to make a nonpolitical statement?

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable minister have leave to make a nonpolitical statement? Leave. It is agreed.

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Speaker, on various occasions, we take the time and opportunity to acknowledge the high calibre of pages we have serving us in this House and, certainly, their strong academic performances and their community involvement. I would like to take a moment today to acknowledge one of our pages, Mr. Hadley Archer, who recently graduated from Westwood Collegiate and was the recipient of the Member of Parliament Award for St. James. He was also the recipient of the St. James-Assiniboia School Board Award for high academic standing. He also received the Robert Kellow Scholarship, and he was acknowledged as outgoing president of Westwood Collegiate.

So I am sure all members of the House join with me in congratulating Hadley and wish him well in his future endeavours. Thank you.

Thank you.

* * *

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if there would be leave to revert to motions for a moment.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave to revert to Introduction of Bills? Is there leave? Is there leave to allow the honourable Minister of Justice to introduce a bill? No, leave has been denied.

Committee Changes

Mr. George Hickey (Point Douglas): Mr. Speaker, our caucus moved some committee substitutions, by leave, to the membership of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations during the weekend meetings. As was agreed during the weekend meetings, these same substitutions will now be moved in the House.

I move, seconded by the member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations be amended as follows: Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway), moved at 1:17 p.m., Saturday July 13; Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak) for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), moved at 1:17 p.m.; Thompson (Mr. Ashton) for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen), moved at 11:36 p.m.; and for July 14, Wellington (Ms. Barrett) for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak), Broadway (Mr. Santos) for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman).

I move, seconded by the member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Agriculture be amended as follows: Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) for Interlake (Mr. Clif Evans), for Tuesday, July 16, 1991 at 10 a.m.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed? Agreed.

Before recognizing the honourable government House leader, the honourable member for Inkster with committee changes.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, with committee change, I move, seconded by the member for Crescentwood (Mr. Carr), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations—if I can start over again. Our caucus moved some committee substitutions, by leave, to the membership of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations during the

weekend meetings. As was agreed during the weekend meetings, these same substitutions will now be moved in the House.

I, therefore, move, seconded by the member for Crescentwood (Mr. Carr), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations be amended as follows: moved at 12:06 a.m., July 14, River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs) for St. James (Mr. Edwards); and moved at 3:43 a.m., July 14, St. James (Mr. Edwards) for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs), for the Saturday, July 13 meeting.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed? Agreed.

Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for St. Vital (Mrs. Render), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Agriculture be amended as follows: Steinbach (Mr. Driedger) for Turtle Mountain (Mr. Rose), and Niakwa (Mr. Reimer) for Emerson (Mr. Penner).

I move, seconded by the member for St. Vital (Mrs. Render), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations be amended as follows: Emerson (Mr. Penner) for Sturgeon Creek (Mr. McAlpine)—this was at 6:35 p.m.; and Sturgeon Creek (Mr. McAlpine) for Emerson (Mr. Penner), at 1:15 p.m. on July 13.

I move, seconded by the member for St. Vital (Mrs. Render), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations be amended as follows: Lakeside (Mr. Enns) for Assiniboia (Mrs. McIntosh), that was moved at 12:53 p.m.; Niakwa (Mr. Reimer) for Riel (Mr. Ducharme) at 2:07 p.m.; La Verendrye (Mr. Sveinson) for Niakwa (Mr. Reimer), at 4:45 p.m.; Assiniboia (Mrs. McIntosh) for River East (Mrs. Mitchelson), at 11:05 p.m.; River East (Mrs. Mitchelson) for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik), at 4:03 a.m.; Riel (Mr. Ducharme) for St. Vital (Mrs. Render), on July 14.

I move, seconded by the member for St. Vital (Mrs. Render), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations be amended as follows: Niakwa (Mr. Reimer) for Lakeside (Mr. Enns), at 10:04 a.m.; and Arthur-Virden (Mr. Downey) for Assiniboia (Mrs. McIntosh).

Mr. Speaker: Agreed? Agreed.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, my intentions today are to

call a small number of bills and then move into Estimates for review.

Firstly, I would ask whether there is a willingness to waive private members' hour?

Mr. Speaker: Is it the will of the House to waive private members' hour?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: No? Leave denied.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, would you call the bills in the following order? Firstly, Report Stage, I would ask that we do the report stage of the bills as listed; secondly, Second Reading, Bill 75; and then the bills in this order: Bill 4, Bill 59, Bill 68. Then, Mr. Speaker, I will move the motion to go into Estimates.

REPORT STAGE

Bill 8—The Vital Statistics Amendment Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): On behalf of the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer), I move, seconded by the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Downey), that Bill 8, The Vital Statistics Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les statistiques de l'état civil, reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 12—The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Amendment Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), I move, seconded by the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), that Bill 12, The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le recouvrement des petites créances à la Cour du Banc de la Reine, as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

* (1430)

Bill 36—The Legal Aid Services Society of Manitoba Amendment Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), I move, seconded by the

Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), that Bill 36, The Legal Aid Services Society of Manitoba Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Société d'aide juridique du Manitoba, reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 52—The Family Maintenance Amendment Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), I move, seconded by the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Downey), that Bill 52, The Family Maintenance Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'obligation alimentaire, as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 60—The Law Society Amendment Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), I move, seconded by the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), that Bill 60, The Law Society Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Société du Barreau, reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READINGS

Bill 75—The Manitoba Employee Ownership Fund Corporation and Consequential Amendments Act

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), that Bill 75, The Manitoba Employee Ownership Fund Corporation and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi constituant en corporation le Fonds de participation des travailleurs du Manitoba et modifiant diverses dispositions législatives), be now read a second time and be referred to a committee of this House.

Motion presented.

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure today to introduce for second reading, Bill 75, The Manitoba Employee Ownership Fund Corporation

and Consequential Amendments Act. The act has as its primary purpose the establishment of the Crocus Investment Fund, a labour-directed investment fund whose express objective is to establish a unique vehicle for broadening employee ownership of Manitoba companies.

The internationalization of business is forcing small, open economies like Canada's to undertake a rapid restructuring of its industrial relationships. This is especially difficult in western Canada whose economies are sensitive to national monetary and fiscal policies motivated primarily by economic conditions in central Canada.

New business venture opportunities in western Canada are a long way from the interest of Bay Street investors. Also in western Canada, export commodities are priced externally by global market factors.

Mr. Speaker, investment decisions are fundamental to any industrial restructuring. One goal this government has undertaken, as an important component of the economic renewal strategy announced during the last provincial election, is the repatriation of critical investment decisions. We want to empower Manitobans with the knowledge that they can draw on their existing capacity as savers and investors of capital, to influence provincial economic growth in a positive way, to create jobs and to sustain our standard of living.

Through a long-term capital retention strategy, we hope to harness the contributions of individuals, organized labour, small business, industry, institutional players, such as pension funds, Crown corporations and other public sector associations, to overcome some of the shortcomings of traditional sources of investment in our economy.

This government views capital retention initiatives such as employee ownership as mechanisms through which Manitoba companies can attract and retain talented, qualified personal, improve workplace relations, raise capital through loyal and patient investors and empower employees to exercise greater local ownership and control of their own economic future.

As an economic policy tool, the employee buy-out mechanism envisioned and enabled by this legislative framework we are introducing today is expected to provide a hopeful alternative to plant closings and layoffs in certain circumstances. For

example, where corporate mergers or consolidations, retiring owners, or the unavailability of necessary expansion capital threaten the continuation of Manitoba businesses, acquisition of the enterprise by its employees may hold the best promise for job retention and creation and for community development.

As an instrument of capital retention, the employee ownership fund complements other economic renewal initiatives directed at local capital market formation, such as the series of HydroBond issues, the creation of the Vision Capital Fund, introduction of the rural community bonds and the establishment of the Manitoba Mineral Exploration Expense.

(Mrs. Louise Dacquay, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair)

Before proceeding to a thumbnail explanation of the bill, Mr. Speaker, I would like to give due credit to and acknowledge the contribution of the Manitoba Federation of Labour. As a government, our relationship with the Manitoba Federation of Labour is severely stressed as you know by Bill 70. However, putting those differences aside for the purposes of the present discussion, I would like to give credit to that organization for focusing substantial resources on an economic renewal initiative which is intended to empower all Manitobans with the capacity to positively influence economic progress in this province. The Manitoba Federation of Labour from 1988 to 1990 participated in a federally funded worker buy-out project, sponsored by the Canadian Co-operative Association.

The detailed design of the tax-advantaged, employee ownership vehicle proposed for use by the Crocus Investment Fund is derived largely from the research undertaken in support of that project. With the keen interest the government of Manitoba has in respect of leading the way toward broader local ownership in the Manitoba economy, a very important convergence in the policy agendas of organized labour and government lies before us. Perhaps this initiative will help us begin dialogue about the challenges that government has in common with organized labour and lead us away from a preoccupation with issues in which we differ, such as wage settlements in the public sector.

The rapid changes and the challenges imposed by the new world economic order must be

addressed. The government of Manitoba is in agreement with the Federation of Labour in acknowledging that employee ownership can play a positive role in the industrial restructuring process. Madam Deputy Speaker, the concept of incenting employees with equity and of sharing profits with employees is not new. In the United States, employee stock ownership plans have been operating for years. While employee stock ownership plans have served as a primary vehicle for manufacturing sector buy-outs in closure situations in the United States, the absence of large labour-directed equity pools in that country limits their applicability.

In Canada, several provinces, Quebec, Saskatchewan, and British Columbia have authorized labour-sponsored investment funds and assisted their capitalization through the provision of investment tax credits such as matched by the federal government. However, these investment funds have not been designed to provide for direct ownership or control by employees of the companies whose stock has been purchased by the fund. The uniqueness of the legislative framework before us today lies in the coupling of a tax-advantaged, labour investment fund with an employee benefit trust vehicle which is the deferred profit sharing plan to which owner's equity can be transferred to employees in a transaction which is itself nontaxable.

In short, Madam Deputy Speaker, Bill 75 and the incorporation thereby of the Crocus Investment Fund is uniquely progressive in its purposes, which are: 1) the direct control of its investments by the employees affected; 2) the leveraging of traditional sources of financing which are normally reluctant to assist employee start-ups or buy-outs; and, 3) the co-operative model of governance, one shareholder, one vote.

* (1440)

As a prototype or model for encouraging broader ownership of Manitoba businesses, Madam Deputy Speaker, we expect that the loyal opposition parties will be supportive of this initiative. I note with interest that the government of Ontario has recently announced its intent to follow Manitoba's lead and to establish a fund based essentially on the same principles as those enabled by Bill 75.

In terms of the mechanics of the bill, Madam Deputy Speaker, I would defer detailed discussion

of Bill 75 to committee, but I would like to very briefly outline the mechanics of employee ownership as envisioned in this act.

The first step in the Manitoba strategy to increase the participation of employees and other individuals in the ownership of Manitoba companies is the creating of a government- and labour-sponsored mutual fund, the Crocus Investment Fund. This fund will be prescribed under federal income tax legislation providing individual Manitoba investors with a matching 20 percent tax credit from the federal and provincial governments to a yearly maximum tax credit of \$1,400 per individual. The legislation before the House details the operating principles and restrictions of the fund and will, I am sure, be reviewed prior to introduction of the act for third reading.

The second step, unique to Manitoba, is the structuring of a tax exempted trust vehicle for passing control of ownership through to employees of participating Manitoba companies and devising a prototype trust structure to act as an acquisition vehicle. The intent has been to avoid immediate taxation of the employees, avoid all taxation of the trust, permit the employees to finance the acquisition on a tax free basis, and to allow for control of the corporation by the employee shareholders on a one-worker, one-vote basis.

Again, the legal research conducted on behalf of the Canadian Co-operative Association has been extremely useful in devising such a trust mechanism. The mechanism for accomplishing the above, Madam Deputy Speaker, is the Canadian equivalent to the United States employee stock ownership plan and the deferred profit sharing plan. As an employee benefit plan, the deferred profit sharing plan is itself nontaxable and will service as a mechanism through which owners' equity will be exchanged for payment financed by the Crocus Investment Fund.

Madam Deputy Speaker, to kick-start the capitalization of the Crocus Investment Fund, the government of Manitoba will purchase \$2 million in share capital of the fund, potentially providing a further \$2 million by way of loan agreement depending upon how successful the fund is at attracting nongovernment investment from Manitoba employees by way of payroll deduction and from individual investors who will be attracted by the provision of the investment tax credits.

So, in summary, Madam Deputy Speaker, the government is very excited to be introducing this employee ownership initiative as a key component of its larger economic renewal strategy. It is hoped that as Manitobans grow in their appreciation of how their own capacities can be channelled in support of positive economic growth that we can together begin to address the myriad of challenges facing us as we attempt to retain a quality of life which is envied in other parts of the world.

Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Madam Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), that debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

Bill 4—The Health Services Insurance Amendment Act

Madam Deputy Speaker: To resume debate on second reading of Bill 4, on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), the Health Services Insurance Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'assurance-maladie, standing in the name of the honourable member for Inkster.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Madam Deputy Speaker, I had adjourned debate in order for our Health critic to be able to debate it today so it can go on to committee.

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (The Maples): Madam Deputy Speaker, I am very pleased to speak on this Bill 4, The Health Insurance Amendment Act. I will be very brief in my comments and in terms of the contents of the bill. As the minister has put forward this bill to correct some of the problems and one of the major problems which was identified last year with the abuse in terms of the taxpayers' money in one of the clinics, I think this bill will be very helpful to correct that problem. In fact, a similar amendment has been brought forward by the member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs).

Madam Deputy Speaker, this bill, as the minister has said, will deal with a number of issues. I will go through a few of the issues which are quite important in terms of the agreement previously signed under this act, as referenced to the Medical Review Committee. The present bill will continue to follow those guidelines, but if there is no agreement, then the Lieutenant-Governor, by Order-in-Council, can

appoint three individuals, three members, to investigate if there are disparities in terms of the practice of a given physician and to recover monies which, if they find those funds, were given to a physician when that individual did not fit the norm for the practice.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I personally have, and from our party, no difficulty with that as long as there is a clarification made who will be those three members, what will be their qualifications, how the selection will be made, what will be their term of reference and how they will operate. Will they operate on a similar formation as the Medical Review Committee, or will they be looking at different aspects? I think that needs to be clarified and, during the committee hearing process, would like to have some clarification.

Also, there is one aspect in this bill which says that the Health Services Commission can investigate, by notification to a given practitioner or a given facility, the pattern of practice, go through the books, and also the other matter relating to the financial aspect. That needs to be clarified in terms of what will be the time frame, how that physician or facility will be notified and how much time will be given, because you do not want everybody to be suspicious all the time. Somebody could walk into somebody's office and say, I want to see your books. That may not be practical, and that may not be possible. I think that needs to be clarified in this act, which I find quite interesting. Certainly the intention is a good one, and we have no difficulty with that.

The other aspect of the bill which we really like is the inclusion of the facilities other than hospitals which provide the necessary care. I think that will be very helpful.

Madam Deputy Speaker, there are a number of other aspects I think need to be heard in detail from the various groups who are interested to make presentations and at the committee stage will have more input without going further and spending time in the second reading. We will be very open, but we do support this bill in principle. There may be one or two areas I have expressed concern in, and I am sure the minister will be able to explain those things so that we can have a good handle on this bill.

As I understand, the passage of this bill is very important, because we have combined both departments, Health Services Commission and

Manitoba Health. To give the legal authority to the Health Services Commission, we must have this bill. I think it should go through the committee stage as soon as possible.

With that, I will end my remarks and will be very open here for the public and make sure that the views are heard and some of the clarifications can be made. Thank you.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The honourable Minister of Health, to close debate.

* (1450)

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Thank you.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The honourable member for Thompson.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Yes, I will just make a few comments. I know the Minister of Health is going to have a few additional comments afterwards, Madam Deputy Speaker.

I want to indicate that in bills such as this, in comparison perhaps to some of the more controversial items this session, I would note that we have been moving such bills to committee probably in a more orderly way than we have in many other sessions. I know there are a number of members who have been here as long as I have and longer.

One of the more unfortunate aspects on a lot of bills, and I do not mean to call them routine bills, because this particular bill might be described as more routine than other bills, but it is still obviously of some substance. Any bill before this Legislature, any bill that has come this far has to have some import, Madam Deputy Speaker. I think it is fortunate in this time that we are able to follow the committee process in a more orderly manner and, in fact, in a few minutes, unless the minister plans on filibustering this bill on second reading—

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern Affairs): Never.

Mr. Ashton: Well, the Minister of Northern Affairs says never. There was an occasion earlier in this session where there was a bill that was ready for passage through to second reading where the minister decided that he just could not restrain himself and had some comments. I do not know, Madam Deputy Speaker, if that will be indeed the case on this particular bill. In fact, I hope in many ways it is not, because there is a time for lengthy

debate. I am the last one to lecture members about speaking extensively, I suppose, after on another bill this session having spoken six or seven days.

I did want to make the point, Madam Deputy Speaker, that I think this is the process that we are following on this bill that should be followed on far more bills than has been done in the past. New members may not be aware of this, but traditionally many bills such as this have been held until the last day of the session and then passed. In fact, in many sittings, I have seen where we end up in the situation that bills are passed through second reading, go to committee, go through the report stage and third reading on the same day. I have seen many occasions where we run into difficulties where there are amendments that are brought in at committee without notice, Madam Deputy Speaker—

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I must draw to the attention of the honourable member for Thompson that indeed the Clerk has drawn to my attention, and in double checking with Hansard, that you indeed are declared to have spoken to this bill. You took the adjournment for the honourable member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylcia-Leis).

Mr. Ashton: I was not aware that would be counting as my speaking, Madam Deputy Speaker. I apologize. I was just indicating, once again, we are willing going to pass this . . .

Madam Deputy Speaker: I thank the honourable member for Thompson for those remarks.

The honourable Minister of Health, to close debate.

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Madam Deputy Speaker, I want to thank my honourable friends for their contribution, to indicate to my honourable friend the member for The Maples (Mr. Cheema), I believe that the concerns he has expressed at debate on second reading have been covered off in terms of the composition of the Medical Review Committee because, in essence, the amendments that are encompassed in Bill 4 have been signed off, if you will, through a negotiating process with the MMA and with the College of Physicians and Surgeons as a second partner in that medical review process and the Manitoba Health Services Commission, so I think they have covered off any of the concerns my honourable friend might have.

In terms of inspection of other facilities, of course, we are following procedures that are in place in at

least a couple of other provinces because we have had circumstances where the system has been improperly billed for services not performed. I think everyone can appreciate and agree that we should be only paying for services that are properly delivered and needed medical services today because the financial constraints we face and every province faces just dictates that kind of logic.

I thank my honourable friends for their comments to the bill. It has been about seven or eight weeks that we have had it, and now we can get it to committee and allow Manitobans to continue with their presentations. Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is second reading of Bill 4. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

Bill 59—The Workers Compensation Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act

Madam Deputy Speaker: To resume debate on second reading of Bill 59, on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik), The Workers Compensation Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les accidents du travail et diverses dispositions législatives), standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton).

Is there leave to have the bill stand? Stand.

Bill 68—The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (2)

Madam Deputy Speaker: To resume debate on second reading of Bill 68, on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst), The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (2) (Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg), standing in the name of the honourable member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen). Stand.

* * *

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Madam Deputy Speaker, would you call one more bill, please, before I call the Estimates motion? That would be Bill 51.

Bill 51—The Pharmaceutical Act

Madam Deputy Speaker: To resume debate on second reading of Bill 51, on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), The Pharmaceutical Act (Loi sur les pharmacies), standing in the name of the honourable member for Inkster.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Madam Deputy Speaker, I, too, would like to see this bill go into committee today, and in fact adjourned debate so our Health critic could have the opportunity speak to it and get it into committee.

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (The Maples): Madam Deputy Speaker, I must apologize that last Friday I was not here because we sat in the committee on Thursday night until 3:30, and it was not humanly possible to be here and speak on this bill, but I will be very brief on this bill also because this bill has really come after five or six years of consultation. I had the opportunity to meet with the Pharmaceutical Association, and they are in fact very pleased with the bill.

I think the bill basically replaces the previous act in almost entire formation and will give, basically, new meaning to the disciplinary process, including streamlining the procedure to allow for the informal resolution of complaints and to subject the corporation to the disciplinary process and also make some sanctions significantly now up to as much as \$25,000 for people who will be in violation of this act.

Other than that, Madam Deputy Speaker, this bill is very much—there are a lot of factors in this bill and we have no difficulty with most of them. There are a couple of questions I have, but I will leave it till the committee stage and make sure that we hear from the Pharmaceutical Association and other individuals who are concerned about this bill. They can come forward and make some recommendations. One aspect which is quite important, we must consider that places where there is only one physician and there is no pharmacy, the provision will be made for that physician to operate a pharmacy and as long as the dispensing is done for his own patients. I think that has been addressed to some extent in this bill, and I think that is a very positive step. There was some criticism that may be ignored, but that could be taken into consideration whenever there is a need, and I think specific application can be made.

As, I am aware of that, there has been consultation with MMA, with the College of Physicians and Surgeons and various consumer groups and most of them are very pleased with the bill. It is almost after 21 years, this bill has come forward in a major formation. Our party will support and, without wasting any further time, will look forward at the committee stage and make sure if there is clarification that has to be made, if there are any minor amendments which the minister is going to bring or the other party or we may have, I will look forward to that stage.

Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker, for letting me speak on this bill.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The honourable Minister of Health, to close debate.

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Madam Deputy Speaker, I simply thank both opposition parties for their comments on this bill and look forward to discussion at committee stage. Thank you.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is second reading of Bill 51 (The Pharmaceutical Act; Loi sur les pharmacies). Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

House Business

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): I would like to announce that the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections will be called Thursday, 10 a.m., in Room 255, to consider motions that may be referred tomorrow or the next day.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Downey), that Madam Deputy Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into committee to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

* (1500)

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into a committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the honourable member for St. Norbert (Mr. Laurendeau) in the Chair for Fitness and Sport; and the honourable member for Seine River (Mrs. Dacquay) in the Chair for Department of Labour.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY—FITNESS AND SPORT

Mr. Deputy Chairman (Marcel Laurendeau): Committee of Supply, please come to order. This afternoon, this section of the Committee of Supply, meeting in Room 255, will resume consideration of the Estimates of Fitness and Sport.

When the committee last sat, it had been considering item 1.(a) Fitness Directorate: (1) Salaries, on page 74 of the Estimates book and on page 84 of the Supplementary Information book. Shall the item pass? The honourable minister, you wanted to introduce another—

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister charged with the administration of The Fitness and Amateur Sport Act): Just for the benefit of the members who are here today, there is Mr. Jim Evanchuk, who is director of our Fitness Directorate, and Janet McMahon is our senior sport consultant with the Sport Directorate.

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): I am interested in the task force that you are establishing. Could you give me some more information on that and when you expect it to report?

Mr. Stefanson: I just wanted to clarify procedurally how we are going to handle. That question, I assume, is referring to the task force with the Manitoba Sports Federation, which I would be prepared to answer at this time, but since we are under the Fitness Directorate, maybe we should work through the Fitness Directorate and then move on to Sport, if that is agreeable. These are two separate directorates.

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (The Maples): Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I have a few policy questions in terms of the major direction this department is going to take. I first must say that this is the minister who has definitely put a first Manitoba policy for Sports, and I think that is a positive step. At least people will know where this government wants to go ahead, but I am a little bit disappointed, as I was during the budget time, how this government has cut almost \$7.96 million of the budget for this department and the funding they were giving to the Manitoba Sports Federation.

Can the minister tell us how he was able to justify, or who made the decision in the cabinet to cut funding at that level of almost \$8 million? I think that really tells a story that maybe the minister is serious,

but his cabinet colleagues may not be serious about the Manitoba Sport Federation's role and how they will play a major role in the future.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. Could I ask the honourable members if they wanted to ask any questions pertinent to the Fitness Directorate? If not, possibly we could pass the Fitness Directorate and then deal with the Sport issues.

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, we can ask questions on all those things. This is basically a policy question. It could fit into any place. I have no difficulty.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: We have been dealing, the honourable member for The Maples, with line by line, and at this time, we are dealing with the Fitness Directorate: (1) Salaries \$117,800. The questions that have been put forward so far by the honourable members have been towards the Sports Directorate. If there are no questions in the Fitness Directorate, possibly we could pass that.

Mr. Cheema: Which page is that?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Page 74. It is on page 84 of your Supplementary.

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, can the minister tell if there are any positions that are still vacant out of this department?

Mr. Stefanson: There are three positions, and they are all filled, the same number of positions as last year.

* (1510)

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, can the minister tell if there are any positions that are still vacant out of this department?

Mr. Stefanson: There are three positions, and they are all filled, the same number of positions as last year.

Mr. Cheema: Can the minister give us the qualifications of these individuals who are part of this directorate?

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I should have said at the outset, when we did start the process at the end of last week, we spent about the first 20 minutes on Fitness, as you will recall. The member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) had several questions. I did go through the three employees at that time. I could certainly repeat it. I went through their qualifications, their background and their academic qualifications and so on. It will be in the record.

Mr. Cheema: I will read Hansard.

Basically my concern is that—I am not questioning the individuals' capabilities. I just wanted myself to be familiar with their qualifications in terms of so their role fits into this Fitness Directorate, and I just wanted to be aware of that. Other than that, I do not have any questions on this section if you want to pass.

Ms. Friesen: Looking specifically at Fitness then, is the focus of the department on the training of leaders only, or where does—what I am looking for really is the way in which the department wants fitness to develop in the schools. One of the broader purposes of the department is to relate to other departments, recreation, education, health, et cetera. Most of your report, as I read it, on fitness talked about leadership development and rather community development in fitness. Could we talk a little bit about connection with the schools?

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Deputy Chairman, the Fitness Directorate at the post-secondary level does support through a funding grant to the Faculty of Physical Education and Recreational Studies at the University of Manitoba. It also does get involved at the elementary level in terms of supporting, again as the honourable member suggested, the qualified fitness leaders to ensure high standards interacting really with the Department of Education in terms of some of the benefits of fitness, increasing the awareness and encouragement in terms of ensuring that fitness and physical education activities are an important part of the educational system.

Ms. Friesen: Is the department then involved—I was not sure how to interpret what you are saying. You said, fitness awareness, elementary schools. Are you actually training teachers? Are you providing extra courses? Are you involved at the level of teacher training at the University of Manitoba for elementary school teachers, or is this post-qualification training?

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Deputy Chairman, we will participate in in-services through the educational system but basically on an as-requested basis. We will also provide resource material on fitness and fitness awareness to the schools and educational facilities. The participation at the actual school division and school level is on an as-requested basis.

Ms. Friesen: How many school divisions have requested that in the past year?

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Deputy Chairman, special area groups, I am informed, convene in the fall, reparticipate in those functions and provide both verbal and resource material.

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Deputy Chairman, special area groups, I am informed, convene in the fall and we participate in those functions and provide both verbal and resource material.

Ms. Friesen: How many school divisions?—is the question.

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is open to all the school divisions and most participate, but we could certainly undertake to actually give a direct quantification to the honourable member.

Ms. Friesen: That is what I am looking for. I am looking particularly for the relationship between the use of this service in the urban areas and in the rural areas. School divisions which claim, for example, that they do not usually have access to specialization or to certain kinds of specialties, I am interested in whether they are using this program and to what extent. So rural and northern ones versus the participation rate of urban schools.

Mr. Stefanson: We will certainly undertake to provide the honourable member with that detailed breakdown.

Well, again, as part of a resource, Mr. Deputy Chairman, the Blueprint for Action for Children and Youth in terms of the benefits in participation and fitness is available, and apparently well utilized by school divisions and schools throughout our province, but in terms of the very specific question the honourable member asked me, we will provide the breakdown of who really has been participating.

Ms. Friesen: Thank you, and does this department have the capacity to operate with French school divisions, or with immersion programs?

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Deputy Chairman, most of the resource material is available in both official languages, but in terms of the language capabilities of the staff, that is not the case. The written material primarily, most of it is available, but in terms of service in the language provided by our staff, that is not the case.

Ms. Friesen: I wonder if the minister would like to reflect on that, particularly in view of the Gallant report, which suggests there might be French school divisions. I wonder if that is something you might want to consider in the future, particularly if

the kind of training that you say you are giving is awareness training; essentially it is workshopping, it is oral presentations.

I guess what I am asking is, do you see a need for this department to develop those capabilities or to have them on contract?

Mr. Stefanson: It apparently has not been a problem to date, and the teachers in those various communities have been co-operative in working with the department in translation and so on, but in terms of the ongoing fulfillment of the program, that is something we will take a look at.

Ms. Friesen: In the second part of your first answer some time ago, you suggested elementary education or at least teacher training in that area, and you have a contract with the University of Manitoba for, what? I wonder if you could expand on that. Is that research or is that also in the area of training?

* (1520)

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is fitness and leadership development at all levels.

Ms. Friesen: That is, you contract out your responsibilities to the University of Manitoba to conduct these in the schools. I do not understand what the University of Manitoba is doing for this contract. How much is the contract, by the way?

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Deputy Chairman, courses are conducted throughout the province not only at the school level but at the community level for anybody who wants to become an accredited fitness leader. The funding for 1991-92 being provided is \$60,000.

Ms. Friesen: Is this an annual contract, or do you have a five-year contract, or is it arranged each year?

Mr. Stefanson: It is annual, and we do it annually.

Ms. Friesen: Could we look at the other areas of school participation? It seems to me that the research I have read on this, and it may certainly be some years out of date, is that it is at the junior high school level that you lose the fitness, that the elementary school children, generally, where you emphasize the department's emphasis was, is less of a problem, although presumably by grades 5 and 6, there are some problems there, particularly with girls, and that over the years that continues. The gap widens in fitness participation and in levels of performance between males and females.

Should there not be an emphasis or at least some focus upon the high school and junior high school levels? I wonder—the department has obviously had long experience and research in this—what your thinking is and what your priorities are in that area.

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Deputy Chairman, the honourable member is certainly correct that the drop-off, I guess, really escalates at the end of the school years. One thing we have been doing is working with community groups, with municipal organizations like the City of Winnipeg. In fact, we are in the process of working with them in terms of the Fit-4-Fun program and making sure that the opportunities do exist at that stage to participate in recreational, fitness and sport activities. That involves working co-operatively with Sport, with Health and with other departments of government, which is being done. In fact, that was part of the Sport policy announcement, was the interaction of all of those departments.

Ms. Frlesen: I recognize that the gap does increase after children leave school, but it seems to me that you have the opportunity while they are in junior high school and high school to educate, to develop participation, develop skill levels, in a variety of areas that you do not necessarily have after school. Also, while they are in school, you have relative equality of access to facilities, which you do not necessarily have after people have left school, and their economic condition becomes perhaps more significant in affecting their rate of participation.

Mr. Stefanson: I probably agree with the honourable member that I think at the young age in the early school years it is an opportunity to help make fitness a way of life, and clearly we are working towards doing that, working with other departments, working with the Department of Education under a student leadership program, a quality daily phys. ed. program, encouraging teachers themselves to become role models and leading healthy, active lifestyles and so on. Certainly we recognize the opportunity and the need that exists there, and are working towards that.

Ms. Frlesen: Could you tell us a little more about both of those programs? I am particularly interested in that one that you call the quality daily fitness activity—was that it?—because in fact students after Grade 5 simply do not have daily physical education in our schools, and by Grade 12 in fact,

in some high schools, they do not have physical education at all.

Mr. Stefanson: The quality physical education is really a committee of teachers from throughout the province representing physical education, and we interact with that group in terms of many of the issues that we have already discussed here this afternoon in terms of involvement, awareness, value of fitness and so on, so they provide a vehicle to enhance the whole program.

Ms. Frlesen: What exactly do you do? Do you call the meetings? Do you write the agendas? Do you provide the research? Do you offer training? Who initiates these? What is the role of the department here?

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Deputy Chairman, we meet, on average, quarterly with them, more often at their initiation. I gather they are a very active and involved group, but we are meeting with them approximately quarterly.

Ms. Frlesen: The other area that you mentioned you were working on was student leadership. What is the role of the department in that?

Mr. Stefanson: Part of that is interacting with groups such as, an example would be the Interlake Municipal Recreation Association, in terms of our department working with them, in terms of the development and involvement of use in fitness, fitness programs, and so on.

Ms. Frlesen: So that is not working in the school system, it is working with municipalities.

Mr. Stefanson: Our primary contact is, in this particular case, with the municipal organization but it does not preclude and ultimately leads to involvement, certainly, with the school divisions and with the school, but the initial contact is the municipal organization.

Ms. Frlesen: You have given me the example of a rural municipality, what about the city of Winnipeg? For example, is this a broad-scale policy or is that just for rural areas?

* (1530)

Mr. Stefanson: It is correct that the one I referred to is a model of rural Manitoba. We do work co-operatively with the City of Winnipeg. I mentioned a while ago about an initiative that we will be announcing and working on this fall, a Fit-4-Fun program with the City of Winnipeg. Certainly, through their Leisure Guides, other publications, we

use their services. They provide a very useful vehicle to get to the community and to interact with the schools and school divisions.

Ms. Frlesen: I started out on this line of questioning by looking at your statement that you interact with the education department and of your activity in fitness in schools. The answer I got was that you contract out the post-secondary to the University of Manitoba and that you had this quality daily program and student leadership program. Student leadership does not seem to involve many schools from the answers that I have heard so far. The quality daily program essentially means meeting with, four times a year, at the initiative of teachers in Manitoba.

It does not seem to me to be attacking the issue of the decline of fitness in the junior and senior high schools, of the declining time that is allotted to fitness, particularly, in senior high schools, and of the gap between male and female fitness levels by the time they leave school.

Mr. Stefanson: I want to assure the honourable member, and I guess I took part of it for granted, unfortunately, that the directorate does work very closely with the Department of Education in terms of encouraging the utilization of our resource material, in terms of encouraging participation of the youth in the various programs and events that we are a part of, whether it is Canada's Fitweek, or whatever events take place, and some of the other things we touched on in terms of interacting with the teachers and so on.

Certainly, I do not want to understate the importance of that, really, the delivery of most of the programs in the school system we have talked about are through the Department of Education. Our department does work closely with them in terms of the whole issue of awareness, involvement, and so on, and recognizes the importance of doing what we have already discussed in terms of making sure that fitness becomes a way of life.

Ms. Frlesen: Physical education and the teaching of physical education is something different than fitness awareness. The department's responsibility is for fitness awareness and the promotion of fitness. I wonder if you could tell me if you are satisfied with what is happening in the Department of Education?

You know, you can liaise all you like and offer them all the materials you have, but the impression

I have, and I do not know if you have any further research on this, is that in fact conditions are deteriorating in the schools, certainly in terms of time allotted. Now I am not necessarily arguing that time allotted translates directly into decline in fitness. It may not, but I do not know. I am looking for some information from you on this and what your response is to the Department of Education.

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I guess, if anything, the awareness and receptivity of schools and school divisions are continuing to improve, grow and increase, I think, as society in general, so there are tremendous opportunities in terms of working with the school divisions and the Department of Education, which in fact we are doing, as we have already touched on in terms of awareness.

The school divisions have a function and a role to play through physical education, participation and awareness, but it goes beyond that into community events and families, so back to what I talked about with the honourable member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) when we first started, really, in our view, it does straddle several departments. Education is unquestionably one of the most important; Health is certainly one of the most important.

As our staff indicated, if anything, there is much more of an awareness and appreciation for fitness and healthy lifestyles. Clearly, we have seen tremendous growth in that area in the last several years, anticipating that that will continue to be the case, so we will continue to work and strive for new ideas and new initiatives with departments like Education, Health and so on.

Ms. Frlesen: Just a last question before I pass it over to the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli). What is the state of research on this? You must keep the numbers from the Canada fitness test, for example, and apply them to Manitoba. Does this department or does the Department of Education do its own testing? What has happened over the last five years in fitness testing for children aged—what?—12 to 18, junior and senior high? What is happening in Manitoba in terms of that gap between male and female participation and fitness levels?

Mr. Stefanson: There certainly are statistics available on the traditional Manitoba school fitness program, but as has been indicated through the directorate, the whole criteria and statistics and development of the assessment is in the process of

being changed. Our directorate has been involved in that. We are anticipating that to occur by this fall and would then work with the schools and school divisions in terms of implementing that.

We can certainly provide the traditional numbers in terms of how the program was conducted before through the Department of Education, and we can undertake to get those for you in terms of showing how the participation and how the level of fitness has been, but as is indicated, much of that has almost turned off some children participants and so on because of the nature of the evaluation and so on—(interjection)—That is right. I mean, in terms of some of the things that—there is a growing awareness that fitness goes beyond many of the traditional types of things that were done in the past. It, like everything else, is changing, and our directorate is involved in helping to change the whole assessment program.

* (1540)

Ms. Friesen: Do you mean you are moving away from the Canada fitness test to something developed in Manitoba, or is this a new type of Canada-wide assessment program?

Mr. Stefanson: It is a Canada-wide program.

Ms. Friesen: It will be in place when?

Mr. Stefanson: The first pilots will be this fall in locations to be determined, Mr. Deputy Chairman.

Ms. Friesen: Does that address students right up to age 18, because Canada fitness tests, we certainly do not see them much beyond about Grade 8.

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Deputy Chairman, there will now be four age categories to more appropriately reflect the needs within those categories, 5-8, 9-11 years, 12-15 years and 16-18 years.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I just have a few questions for the minister regarding the Fitness and Sports. One is in regard to—I know I watch very little television, but I can recall seeing commercials where we see that Participation, and I believe that is the federal government's commercial. Does the province advertise fitness awareness at all through any media outlets?

Mr. Stefanson: There is no generic advertising. Certainly when there are events like Canada's Fitweek and so on, we are directly involved in those. We are also involved in the airing of 13 half-hour

family Fit Parade programs on MTN in conjunction with Manitoba Blue Cross, Manitoba Milk Producers' and Pace Setter Sports.

Mr. Lamoureux: The Fitness Directorate is to reach out to all Manitobans. I can appreciate the effort going in through MTN, but I am curious as to the rest of the public that might not be watching MTN, and how the provincial government tries to reach out to those individuals.

Do they enter into conversations or negotiations, for example, with their federal counterparts to get what they believe is a priority to stress the importance of fitnesses, whether it is walking along The Forks or whatever it might be? Is there anything else that is done to ensure that all Manitobans are receiving that very important message?

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Deputy Chairman, certainly we collaborate with the federal government, meet with them on occasion and so on. In terms of their generic, their general advertising, we really are not directly involved in that. I mean we are at the table in terms of discussing fitness in Canada, but there are several very specific initiatives that affect all Manitobans that we are involved with: Canada's Fitweek, and participating of 600 community groups from throughout the province; the Rural Fitness Leadership Development Program that has 553 fitness leaders involved.

Canada's Fitweek, in 1991, actually had 500 events with 134,000 participants from throughout the province and 202 communities, so certainly it is something that is province-wide.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, you know we heard a lot of discussion in debate about fitness awareness for our younger peoples which is very important, but another major concern is, of course, the adults in the communities.

One of the concerns that I have is trying to get the 25 and older, if you will, participating in more events, whether they are a quick walk, a jog, sports, whatever it might be, like the Chairperson himself quite often does. Has the directorate looked at anything or any new initiatives that would target that 25-and-up age category?

Mr. Stefanson: Yes, we have, Mr. Deputy Chairman, and that is exactly the age group, the 25 to 44. The Fit-4-Fun program is being developed and, I mentioned it earlier, will be announced and

put in place this fall, and it is targeted particularly at that 25-and-up, 25 to 44, age group.

Mr. Lamoureux: That is a positive thing to hear, Mr. Deputy Chairperson. The other question I have is in regard to the community clubs themselves. Is there anything that the directorate does for the local community clubs? You go to any community club and there is always a core group or a core number of volunteers who are so very essential for every community. Is there anything that the directorate does in terms of advising, making presentations, sitting in on some of these community club meetings or at least offering their services to the community clubs currently?

Mr. Stefanson: We interact with community clubs upon request directly. We are not interacting with each and every community club. We do interact with the City of Winnipeg and utilize their Leisure program and their Leisure Guide, and we interact with the various regional organizations representing central Manitoba, Norman and Westman and so on. So there is certainly the vehicle and the opportunity, and those community clubs have access and availability to our resource material, participate in some of the specific events, whether it be Canada's Fitweek or other events the department undertakes, but we do not interact with each and every community club directly.

Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radlsson): Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I—

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order, please. Could you bring your mike forward if you do not mind so—

Ms. Cerilli: When we left off the other day, I was just starting off in addressing the whole issue of fitness programming development in the province, and I was making the comment that a directorate with a staff of two people that has a mandate for the entire province has got a pretty hefty task ahead of it. I know that there are some wonderful programs being offered and there has been a lot of success, but I guess what I was getting at is that there is a lot more to be done and there is a lot more that could be done, particularly from a health perspective as we are trying to, I think, move from a sickness medical model of health towards a wellness model of health which would encourage and emphasize prevention. I see that there is a huge role for fitness and fitness professionals to play in that. I would like to see more of them employed in government, and I think all of the wonderful things that are going on

could be done more and could be expanded particularly in the rural areas.

* (1550)

One of the things I wanted to ask related to that is, how does the Fitness Directorate relate to the Department of Health? What is going on out there? Who is doing it to try to get this emphasis on wellness as opposed to the medical sickness model? So I am referring to any kind of co-operation between fitness professionals and medical services. We heard that there are programs being offered with seniors. I am wondering if there is anything being done with seniors homes. I am not asking just what are the staff with the directorate doing, but I am sure that they would have an understanding of what is going on in the communities throughout the province in this area.

Mr. Stefanson: I am just going back to the honourable member for Radisson's comment about the staff numbers and the concern with that. I think certainly an important part of the department's role is the building of partnerships and the interaction with community groups and community organizations. Clearly, there is a tremendous resource and vehicle there for our department to utilize in terms of awareness of fitness benefits, involvement and so on. I am not suggesting that at some point there might not be a need for additional staff support but clearly, probably one of the best things the department could do is building these partnerships and getting the people who are actually in the communities, in the organizations and so on, directly involved in fitness, fitness awareness, fitness programs, and so on.

In terms of the interaction with the health, we do interact with the regional health co-ordinators and the regional health divisions, again, in terms of specific events, of resource material, of building on fitness encouragement and awareness through those individuals who are right in the field in terms of the delivery of the health programs. So they are a resource for our Directorate to utilize.

Ms. Cerilli: The idea that we have two people who are to liaise and co-operate and to co-ordinate with community clubs, seniors homes, Parks and Recreation, YMCAs, schools—being realistic, there could, I think, be a lot more done. You said in response to the member for Inkster's (Mr. Lamoureux) question, that there is interaction between community clubs and the Fitness

Directorate. Can you be more specific? What kinds of interaction? What other than providing resource material is happening in terms of say one group, community clubs?

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Deputy Chairman, in terms of the community clubs, as I indicated to the honourable member for Inkster, our link is more through the municipal recreation directorate in terms of the leadership training and involvement in terms of the fitness programs and fitness awareness, that they are our link to the actual community clubs. Now in terms of the resource material that is available, that is available to all community clubs and becomes a working tool and guide for them at the community club level. So that is our link to community clubs.

Ms. Cerilli: So back to the point I was raising earlier about who in the communities is addressing the issue of working towards wellness models, working towards integrating fitness as a prescription, rather than drugs, when we are dealing with particularly stress-related illnesses. So we are starting to look at lifestyle, and I think that there is a lot of education that could go on with the medical professionals. I am wondering who in the community is addressing that need.

Mr. Stefanson: I think, as we discussed when we started the Estimates process under the Fitness Directorate, it ultimately comes down to a co-operative effort. It is not any one single department's sole responsibility. Clearly, our Fitness Directorate interacts, and we are quite satisfied to date with the degree of that interaction and so on with the Departments of Health and Education in terms of, as the honourable member suggests, making a healthy lifestyle a way of life.

Ms. Cerilli: I am not asking the question to see whose responsibility it is. I am truly trying to get an idea of what is going on out there. I do not work in this area anymore. I am hoping that the Fitness Directorate would know or be in contact with people in the community who would be trying to address this whole issue. So I am not saying that it is one person's or one agency's or organization's responsibility. I am wondering if you can clear what I am asking.

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am not sure if I am clear on the question, but in terms of the whole issue of wellness, the directorate points out it recently had, for instance, in the Westman region a

wellness conference pulling together the people who should be most directly concerned and responsible from our Fitness Directorate, from Health, from Education and so on in terms of recognizing and promoting the whole value of wellness and healthy lifestyles as were done in similar initiatives in other parts of the province. So I am not sure if that answers the question or not.

* (1600)

Ms. Cerilli: It is not what I am hoping to hear, but maybe that is the extent of what is going on out there that there is not, I guess, a real concerted organized planned-out way of dealing with the problems like prescription drug addiction and the number of people that go to different medical professionals for treatment or to deal with, oftentimes, illnesses that could be taken care of through diet and exercise and lifestyle change. I think that there is, you know, a role for fitness professionals to play as well as other professionals, to work together to figure out how we can get the medical system that we have to start changing its approach and focus.

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I certainly cannot speak for the Minister of Health, but I am led to believe that certainly within Health and within organizations like the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba, in the last while there has been a growing awareness and growing utilization of the kinds of alternatives that the honourable member is suggesting. I am not for a minute suggesting that there is not more that can be done in terms of utilizing fitness as a partial cure to some of the problems facing people, and we will continue to work in that area.

In fact, another initiative that we are currently working on is we are consulting with the Health Promotion Directorate for a Workplace Wellness Network, and part of the mandate there will be to promote healthy lifestyle practices through the workplace. We will utilize such programs as the Corporate Challenge and so on. That is another vehicle to us, I would suggest, in terms of increasing the awareness and the benefits of healthy lifestyles.

I think this is certainly an area where we are reasonably satisfied with the progress and where we are today, but I think it is an area of continued emphasis and need in the years ahead.

Ms. Cerilli: The minister raises another area that I wanted to see if the directorate had any involvement in, and that is the area of promoting healthy

workplaces and promoting programs for corporate or industrial fitness programs. Is the directorate involved in that? What is the involvement? Maybe, as well, who else in the community is addressing that need and potential solution?

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I already touched on that. It is no longer the Workplace Wellness Network. It is the Workplace Health Promotion Network, which I understand is now under the Department of Labour and is utilized for the promotion of healthy lifestyles in the workplace, but there is also a blueprint that had just been completed in conjunction with the federal government and the province as Active Living in the Workplace, which I understand has just recently been completed and will be available to us and will be available for the promotion of active living and lifestyles in the workplace.

We also have programs like the Corporate Challenge that continues to grow. I have the numbers here some place that I can provide the honourable member with in terms of showing the tremendous growth in the Corporate Challenge program and the involvement of employees and organizations in that worthwhile program.

Ms. Cerilli: I do not want to spend too much longer on this area, but I am interested in finding out more about the Corporate Challenge participation. I guess I am more interested in finding out who in the community is addressing this, be it the universities or any other kind of organization, who is trying to develop programs in workplaces, assist workplaces in developing programs or facilities or hiring people, that kind of thing.

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Deputy Chairman, in terms of the specific question about the Corporate Challenge '91, I have some of the information. Rather than read it, I will provide the honourable member with a copy of it. It might be just as simple.

In terms of other organizations involved with programs in terms of workplace fitness and so on, apparently the University of Manitoba through their Physical Education department is involved. The YM-YW has a program toward workplace fitness and wellness. I believe there might be some initiatives through the various divisions and sectors of the Health department.

Ms. Cerilli: Do we have anything happening in this area in the Civil Service? Do we have anything in

this area of workplace fitness programs in the Civil Service in Manitoba?

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Deputy Chairman, the Department of Natural Resources, I believe amongst others, has participated in the Corporate Challenge, but the reason I mention the Natural Resources is that we have a pilot project, a wellness project that we are doing with the Department of Natural Resources addressing many of the issues we have discussed. That pilot project will become resource material and potentially a model for future utilization throughout the entire Civil Service.

* (1610)

Ms. Cerilli: Where is that taking place?

Mr. Stefanson: Department of Natural Resources.

Ms. Cerilli: But where?

Mr. Stefanson: It is meant to be to each and every employee of the department, operating out of their offices on Dublin, but to affect each and every employee in the department.

Ms. Cerilli: Another area I would like to ask about deals with the provincial fitness leadership program. I would like to have the minister explain the government's policy with respect to the certification and training of fitness leaders in the province? What is involved in the certification?

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Deputy Chairman, the accreditation process is endorsed by our directorate, and it is endorsed by the Manitoba Fitness Leadership Development Association. I understand most employers look for accredited fitness leaders, but it is not a requirement that you be accredited.

Ms. Cerilli: Can you give us an estimate of what percentage of agencies, organizations offering fitness classes have certified leaders?

Mr. Stefanson: According to the department, of the approximately 600 fitness leaders in the province, approximately 85 percent would be accredited.

Ms. Cerilli: There had been an issue a while back, or it seemed to be a bit of a trend, where there were a number of fitness institutions—I do not know what else to call them—fitness agencies that went under, went out of business. I am wondering if there is any government policy that would deal with this, if there was any investigation of those companies. Was there any involvement by the Fitness Directorate in that issue?

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Deputy Chairman, we attempt to make information available to the consumer through the Fitness Directorate on an as-requested basis or through the Fit-4-Fun program. In terms of consumer protection, of course, that is something in terms of if anybody suffers a financial loss or whatever as a result, that falls under Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs, protection to the consumer.

We actually quote information from the Consumer department, write in the some of the information, or we provide to the individual, so we are attempting to increase the awareness of consumer protection and so on, but we are not directly involved if something does go wrong. That is legislation provided under Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

Ms. CerlIII: I do not imagine that, when people are looking for a fitness organization to join, they would call the Fitness Directorate. Does that happen?

Mr. Stefanson: Yes.

Ms. CerlIII: If I were to open a fitness company, an organization, what would I have to do in terms of ensuring that I was going to offer a safe program and a well-managed organization?

Mr. Stefanson: Resources and information are available through the department. A meeting could be set up with one of the employees and the whole issue discussed.

(Mr. Bob Rose, Acting Chairman, in the Chair)

Ms. CerlIII: Does that happen?

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Acting Chairman, yes, that does happen. In the last half year, it has happened on a couple of occasions, but more commonly, it flows again through the Manitoba Fitness Development Association and directly through the directorate, but it does happen on occasion directly with the Fitness Directorate.

Ms. CerlIII: In the minister's opening statements, it says that the Fit-4-Fun program will encourage sedentary adults to become involved in regular physical activities of their choice to ease into fitness in a safe and enjoyable way. How does the Fitness Directorate do this or propose to do this?

* (1620)

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Acting Chairman, the directorate has met with most of the recreation directors throughout the province in terms of the Fit-4-Fun program. We have also, I think, as I mentioned earlier, met and are co-operating with the

City of Winnipeg recreation department for a kickoff to this program within the city of Winnipeg this September or October.

Ms. CerlIII: I would like to find out a little bit more detail about the program, like how is the department or the directorate going to be involved in encouraging people to become more active? Tell us a little bit about the program.

Mr. Stefanson: The vehicle will be through the recreation directors in terms of the implementation of the program. We can certainly provide the details of the program. Basically, the recreational directors will have a series of four levels to encourage people to participate.

I think part of it is maybe breaking down, not barriers as such, but sort of often the typical understanding of maybe what fitness is that you have to get out and immediately start doing something at a high pace or active level at where you can begin very generally doing something fairly simplistic initially, and that will get you on the road to a healthier and better lifestyle. So clearly they will be the vehicle in terms of implementing the program.

We can certainly provide the set of material that will be provided to recreation directors, to the honourable member and any other honourable members in terms of how the program itself—and there will be score sheets for each individual who participates and a monitoring process to see that they move on to the next level and so on and in terms of the kinds of warm-up exercises you should do, depending on how active you are going to be. It is all part of a program of increasing awareness and participation.

Ms. CerlIII: I have one final question I would like to ask the minister. I have heard that the minister does have a sincere interest in fitness and sport and has some experience—I cannot remember if you are a hockey player or a baseball player or both.

I am wondering what the minister would like to see happen in the Fitness Directorate. Where would you like to take this thing?

Mr. Stefanson: I better read my script here. Mr. Acting Chairman, I think the most immediate for me, and I have had some discussions with the directorate, is maybe stepping back and looking at our broad objectives and looking at really a policy, an action plan in fitness.

The question was asked earlier about the overall plan. While we have some very worthwhile

programs, we participate in Canada's Fitweek, we participate in Corporate Challenges, we have different initiatives, we interact with Health and Education and so on. To date, in the short time of the Fitness Directorate, it really has not been put to paper in terms of what our plan would be over the next three to five years in terms of continuing to increase the awareness, the participation and so on. I am a firm believer in the value of fitness and wellness and utilizing it for health prevention and the social aspect that goes with it, all of the good things that I think everybody around this table recognizes that can go through participation, not necessarily only in sports but in terms of appreciating what you eat and the care you take of your body.

While I see some very worthwhile programs, while I see some excellent things being done by our department, I think we have to put in place clearly defined objectives and an action plan. In the short term, that is the immediate thing that I would like to do is look beyond just what we are doing today and say what kind of targets we want to set in terms of increasing—I was asked questions on statistics and involvement—that level of involvement and so on. What are reasonable targets that we can set as a government and as a province in terms of working towards increasing the whole aspect of participation?

Ms. Cerilli: I promise this is my last question. Given that, do you agree with what I was saying earlier about trying to integrate fitness and healthy lifestyle programs and initiatives into our current health care system in a more developed way, in a better way, in a more effective way?

Mr. Stefanson: I guess I could not say yes or no to that at this time, Mr. Acting Chairman. I guess, back to the comment I just finished making—doing a concise and clear analysis of the degree of interaction and co-operation that is taking place between Health, Education, Sport, Fitness and so on. That would be part of why I refer—I use the term development plan or an action plan in terms of seeing what we currently are doing in terms of interacting with Health and what the opportunities might be. I think there is more work to be done in that area before I could unequivocally say yes or no to that question.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Acting Chairperson, just before we pass this line, I just wanted to get clarification on the Grants/Transfer Payments which was reduced from \$109,000 to \$75,000. It has in

brackets, of course, (1) and then tries to explain or justify the decrease.

I have a couple of questions specifically. One is, is that part of the Lotteries contribution that was dropped, or is that money that just flows out from general revenues?

Mr. Stefanson: All of the funds allocated to Fitness and Sport are lottery dollars.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Acting Chairperson, can the minister explain for me what these grants usually go to from this particular line?

Mr. Stefanson: The grants go to the Manitoba Fitness Leadership Development Association of \$10,000, the Manitoba Society of Seniors "55-Plus Seniors Games" of \$5,000, and the item we discussed earlier, the University of Manitoba provincial Fitness Leadership Development Program of \$60,000. That should total the \$75,000 figure the honourable member referred to.

Mr. Lamoureux: This particular cut, can we get some type of history of this particular line? Has it been at the \$109,000 for the last number of years and then the cut just this year?

Mr. Stefanson: In terms of the total dollar amounts allocated under that category, to give the honourable member a feel, in 1989-90 it was \$119,600; '90-91, \$109,200; '91-92; it is now \$75,000.

* (1630)

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Acting Chairperson, by just using the previous two years and the current year, we see that the government is putting less and less emphasis on the Fitness Directorate. It demonstrates that when you look at this particular line. Are these organizations that are financed through this line, do they change, do they make application? Who is it that can actually apply for these grants?

Mr. Stefanson: Some of the grants in the earlier years were one-time-only in terms of organizations that have had a grant each year going back to 1989. The Society of Seniors have maintained the same level, the Manitoba Fitness Leadership has stayed at the same level, the University of Manitoba has had a reduction from approximately \$80,000 to \$60,000. I am led to believe it has had virtually no impact on the delivery of the program.

Mr. Lamoureux: So I am to understand that the actual decreases have not been to ongoing

programs with the exception of the University of Manitoba. With the University of Manitoba, why is it that we see this particular decrease to this particular organization over and above the other organizations?

Mr. Stefanson: With the growth in the whole area of fitness leaders, and the availability of them as a resource, that has been of assistance both to our department certainly and, in part, alleviated some of the need for the additional funding—or the funding maintaining at the same level to the University of Manitoba. There are now approximately 600 fitness leaders throughout Manitoba that, they in themselves, represent a resource certainly to our directorate and to the university as well.

Mr. Lamoureux: Does the university have a reserve fund of any sort?

Mr. Stefanson: Not in this particular area. I am not aware of what overall reserve fund they have, but not as it relates to this particular program or this area.

Mr. Lamoureux: The reason I ask that, Mr. Acting Chairperson, is that I know in the Lotteries and in the next couple of lines, we will be coming up with his own decrease from the Manitoba Sports Federation. The argument that has been given, in most part, is that those that are receiving a decrease are because they have accumulated monies from the past.

So I am to take it that these organizations that did not receive a decrease and the University of Manitoba do not have reserve funds.

Mr. Stefanson: Well, you are referring to the Manitoba Sports Federation and others which we will discuss when we get into Sport, but this decision was not made on the basis of a reserve fund in place to fund this particular program. It was based on review by our department of what we saw as the needs to be serviced by the University of Manitoba in terms of providing the programs. We saw that the needs could be addressed with a lesser amount and made that decision.

Mr. Lamoureux: Does the university agree with you on that?

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am told that the supervisor does agree that basically the program can function with a reduced amount.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I appreciate the answer. To follow up from my initial

question, I had mentioned in terms of the priority that this government has on fitness, and if you take a look at the overall budget for the directorate's office, it is, in fact, a decrease. Is that to show that there is, in fact, a lower priority than previous years on fitness overall?

Mr. Stefanson: I would say absolutely not, Mr. Deputy Chairman. The staffing levels have been maintained at their same level. As I have already indicated on your specific question about the University of Manitoba program, we believe that the program can be operated at its same level with the reduction in funding.

Some of the others that were reduced for one time only, those organizations are now either more self-sufficient, potentially have other avenues of funding or have made other internal decisions, but I do not think our support should necessarily be gauged only in the monetary amount. As I had discussion with the honourable member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli), I think this is certainly one area where working with the community, building partnerships, doing some of the initiatives that we have been doing is extremely valuable.

Ultimately fitness, fitness awareness, fitness participation is an individual decision that you make yourself. It is not something that government can force upon you or anybody can force upon you, and I think some of the initiatives that we are a part of, in fact, I think it is very important to work co-operatively with community organizations, corporate organizations and so on, in terms of the whole issue. Therefore we feel that in light of all of the—I will not give you the fiscal situation we were faced with which I think you both know very well—we felt this was an area that, not on the staff side but on the operating side, that there could be some reductions and still meet the needs of the directorate.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I find that to be an interesting answer at the very least, I must say. In terms of the bottom line, there is a net decrease in terms of resources, commitment from this government to the directorate's office.

Now if you look specifically at the grants and transfer payments line, there would have been other projects from last year, from what I understand, that would have been financed, that would not be financed because they were one-time, if you will. Future one-time projects or thoughts or ideas are no

longer eligible for as much money from that particular pot.

Even though I can appreciate the answer regarding the University of Manitoba, and it is encouraging to hear that they, in fact, had concurred, there are other organizations no doubt that, had there been more money allocated, if the government had the same priority as it did last year and gave them—at least it maintained or froze that particular line, but in fact, by decreasing it, and by calculating the cost of living, it is a substantial decrease. That tells me that the priority is not the same as the previous year.

* (1640)

Now if the government were able to say to me, for example, that the decrease to that particular grants and transfer payments is because no one is making application, there is no interest out there for this particular program, then I could understand and appreciate why there might be a need to have that line decreased, but if the government is, in fact, as committed as it was in the previous two years, and I do not know how further back I could actually go because I have only been given those two years to go by, but then we would have at least, at the very minimum, seen a freeze on that particular line.

I am not convinced that the minister has given assurances to the committee that there is no need for that particular line, that the need for it is not as great as it was two years ago.

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Acting Chairman, as far as I am aware we have not had any complaints from organizations about a lack of funding or availability of funding. We have already touched on the fact that some of them were one time only, and I guess there would be nothing precluding an organization from making an application, but we have had no, as I say, complaints lodged as a result of the funding level in the Fitness Directorate. We are attempting to work very closely with some of the organizations in terms of providing support in other areas, in terms of the staff support that we can offer in terms of resource material that we can offer, in terms of doing other things, in terms of encouraging co-operation and involvement of other community organizations and/or other potential sponsors and working with the private sector in terms of encouraging them and having them recognize the benefits of participating in some of the very worthwhile programs that are run throughout our province.

So, you know, I do not think it should always be left up to government that there are many communities within our province that are very interested in the importance of fitness and are prepared to contribute support either through staff or product or dollars. I think it is very encouraging that our department is able to lever those, and we will continue to try and lever, utilizing as much of that as possible so that it is not the responsibility of the taxpayers.

Ms. CerIII: Mr. Acting Chairperson, I would think that the agencies that are no longer receiving grants from this directorate would think that the priority has changed. Could the minister either inform the committee now or provide us with a complete list of the programs and agencies that got a grant under this area last year that are not going to get a grant under this area this year?

Mr. Stefanson: I can certainly provide the details, but in terms of a comparison to last year, as I have already indicated the University of Manitoba Fitness Leadership Development Program was reduced by approximately \$20,000. Manitoba Fitness Leadership Development Association remained the same at \$10,000. Provincial Fitness Leadership Conference Committee had a reduction from \$4,000 to nil. The Regional Wellness/Fitness Development was reduced from \$10,000 to nil, and the Manitoba Society of Seniors "55-Plus Seniors Games" was \$5,000 and remained at \$5,000. If you add those two sets of numbers, it should total \$109,200 in '90-91 and \$75,000 in '91-92.

Ms. CerIII: Were there any new agencies or programs added to the list for this year?

Mr. Stefanson: No, there were not.

Ms. CerIII: How is the decision made as to which organizations remain funded and which were not?

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Acting Chairman, there really were three areas of reduction: the one we have discussed somewhat, the University of Manitoba; the other one, the provincial Fitness Leadership Conference Committee, there is a suggestion that the shortfall of \$4,000, if required, might well be forthcoming from other possible avenues in terms of the private sector or others; and the Regional Wellness/Fitness Development is an initiative that has not been confirmed, I believe, for '91-92, and decisions will have to be made in terms of the future of that initiative.

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Rose): Item 1. Lotteries Funded Programs (a) Fitness Directorate: (1) Salaries \$117,800—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$87,700—pass; (3) Grants \$75,000—pass.

Item (b) Sports Directorate: (1) Salaries \$328,100.

Ms. Cerilli: Mr. Acting Chairperson, we only have 14 minutes, so I will just maybe start off by dealing with the sport policy that the government issued recently. Will the policy have any legislation attached to it?

Mr. Stefanson: That is not planned at this time.

Ms. Cerilli: So it is a policy that will just guide the programming of the Sport Directorate?

Mr. Stefanson: That is correct.

(Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair)

Ms. Cerilli: Okay. One of the things that I have been concerned about in terms of Manitoba's sport development is, we have seen, through a huge increase in Lotteries revenue over the last 10 years, a huge increase in the amount of money that has gone to sport, and we have talked a lot about, you know, there are wonderful benefits from sport.

I guess my concern is that those benefits are spread out equitably amongst the province and amongst different members of the population. I see that there is an historic problem with sport not only in Manitoba but in Canada, that there has been an imbalance, and a lot of the money has gone into the elite competitive sport. I think that is continued, even though there has been this huge increase in monies available to sport in Manitoba.

I am wondering if this sport policy is going to address the imbalance between dollars going to participation and development programs in sport and the elite competitive national team Olympic focus that so many of the sport bodies in the province have.

I am of the opinion that both are important, that there is a relationship between the two, that there is relationship between elite development programs as well as sort of grassroots participatory programs. Can the minister explain if the policy is intended to deal with this imbalance and how it is going to do that?

* (1650)

Mr. Stefanson: I do not disagree with a lot of what the honourable member said. That really is part of

the rationale and purpose behind the establishment of the task force in co-operation with the Manitoba Sports Federation. We certainly, in terms of the funding we provide through the Sport Directorate, attempt to balance that important distribution between participation and high-performance or leap development, but also the Manitoba Sports Federation, as the honourable member knows, is a major funding source of sporting organizations throughout our province.

While the Sport policy provides a certain direction, it will be the task force and action plan that will take it to that next step of doing the detailed analysis that is required to see exactly where our dollars are being spent and whether or not that is meeting the needs of sport as the community and we as political leaders feel is the most appropriate. That is scheduled, while I am on that, to be established in September and to report by March of '92.

Ms. Cerilli: I am looking at page 5 of the sport policy booklet that was issued. There are key policy statements, and there are numbers one to 10. I am wondering if the minister can explain to the committee which of those policy statements will deal with this issue?

Mr. Stefanson: I am not entirely clear on the question, but through the action plan, these are the roles and objectives. We would intend to address each of these in various degrees. Clearly, the whole issue of financial distribution would actually touch on several of the policy statements outlined here, whether it be the athletes, coaches and officials or the accountability or whichever section, but clearly the whole issue of funding and the distribution of that funding touches on some of those policy statements and therefore will definitely be addressed by the task force.

Ms. Cerilli: When I was looking at this whole issue and I got ahold of the last annual report—now this is the grants brochure—and I started taking a look at the point system that is used in allocating Lotteries money to the various sport governing bodies, it struck me that this is exactly the same issue I am dealing with in terms of immigration policy. It is the same kind of a point system that is used to bring new Canadians to this country, and it is the same kind of issue in terms of, it is systemically discriminating against, in this case, groups that have a focus on developmental programming. That happens because there are more points awarded for elite competition and more points allotted for programs

that are going to lead to elite competition or national team kinds of outcomes.

The other thing that this point system does is it awards points for groups that are more, as some people feel, bureaucratized or committee-ized. The more committees you have, the more points you get. There is no attention paid to the outcome through the actual effects that those committee structures or plans have. So those are two issues where we have a system in place that is systematically entrenching a focus on elite competition. It does that at the expense of agencies or sport bodies that are trying to put more than emphasis on developmental and grassroots participation programs.

Can the minister respond to that?

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Deputy Chairman, first I just want to clarify, that is the Manitoba Sports Federation grant support application, from the Sports Federation.

My response is really part and parcel why the honourable member is somewhat familiar with the negotiations that took place in terms of a new agreement with the Sports Federation, a major part of why I supported and want a task force to look at, in part, that very issue in terms of the distribution of funding to sport in general, because as the honourable member has suggested, the amount of dollars allocated to sport has escalated dramatically in the last few years.

There was a system in place, and I think the time has come for us as a government and for the Sports Federation to take a serious look at the allocation of the funds and whether it is best meeting the needs of sport participation and development in our province. So, clearly, from my perspective and I will be nominating three people and a joint chairperson to that committee, I view that as a very important part of the task force is the review of the allocation of funds to sport in Manitoba.

Ms. Cerilli: So that is a group that is going to be appointed by the minister specifically to look at just the point system in terms of allocating money or the point system plus any other kind of process or issue that would deal with distribution of funds.

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Deputy Chairman, it would be all-encompassing not just the point system, but the method of distribution of funds, the current allocation, the needs that it is addressing and so on. So the intent would be that part of what they would do would be to address all of those issues.

Ms. Cerilli: Is that what is referred to, I think, as sort of stage two of the policy development or implementation?

Mr. Stefanson: I do not know if I have used the expression stage two. It probably could appropriately be called stage two, that really the policy provides the rules and objectives. This task force which is to report by next March will take the task force to an actual implementation and action plan and part of that is addressing how our dollars are being allocated and utilized.

Ms. Cerilli: There was also a needs study done that I have a report of as well. I guess maybe to clarify, how does the Sport Directorate, as I understand it, they are the ones that did the study or was that done by the Sports Federation?

Mr. Stefanson: Manitoba Sports Federation.

Mr. Cerilli: When the sport bodies go through their interview to have their needs assessed in terms of their funding that is going to sport, is that done by the Sport Directorate or the Sports Federation?

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Deputy Chairman, there are two separate processes in terms of the allocation from the Sports Federation of the 96 sporting organizations of the approximately \$8 million that they have for distribution. They have their application process that you have already referred to. We have an application process for significantly less dollar amounts, but that relate to a series of different sporting functions whether it be games, whether it be coaching clinics, some to the sporting organizations and so on. So there is a separate application process to the Sport Directorate.

Ms. Cerilli: I understand that. I guess the thing I am trying to get at is I am surprised that the Sports Federation would not look at outcomes. How is this going to be changed so that sports will actually have the programs that they implement evaluated rather than the assessment that is done in the interview?

Mr. Stefanson: That still would have to become ultimately a part of the analysis performed at the time providing funding through the Sports Federation, but it requires a change in focus in terms of measuring the results.

* (1700)

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Item (b)(1) Salaries \$328,100. Shall the item pass?

The hour now being 5 p.m., I am interrupting the proceedings for private members' hour. The Committee of Supply will resume sitting at 8 p.m.

SUPPLY—LABOUR

Madam Chairwoman (Louise Dacquay): Order, please. Would the Committee of Supply please come to order.

This section of the Committee of Supply is dealing with the Estimates for the Department of Labour. The Estimates are on page 121.

Would the minister's staff please enter the Chamber.

Does the honourable Minister of Labour wish to introduce his staff?

Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Labour): Yes, I have done that, I believe, already, Madam Chair, but I shall do that again.

I have Roberta Ellis-Grunfeld, who is the Deputy Minister; Mr. Jim Wood, who is the Director of our Financial Services; Mr. Tom Bleasdale, who is the Assistant Deputy Minister and in charge of our Labour Services Division; Mr. Jim Nykoluk, who is the director of our research and management section.

I believe, Madam Chair, that the Liberal critic, Mr. Edwards, deferred his opening statement and if we could proceed with that and, I believe, Mr. Ashton has just whipped out to get his notes and will be back shortly, so if we could proceed on that basis.

Madam Chairwoman: The honourable member for St. James, to make some introductory remarks.

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Madam Chairperson, let me thank the minister and my colleague the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) for allowing me to hold over my opening comments until this afternoon.

Madam Chairperson, I look forward to these Estimates with the Minister of Labour. Labour is, in fact, in terms of monetary expenditures not one of the larger departments of government. However, I think it has a role and an impact which far outweigh perhaps the numbers that we see listed here as expenditures under this department. For that reason, I think we should with relative thoroughness proceed through those lines.

I intend to ask questions on the labour relations environment in Manitoba generally. I think this department has a role to play in that. We have

recently seen again the Labour Management Review Commission process break down over Bill 70. There was an initial withdrawal of participation from some management representatives back under the former administration. Under this administration we now see, and most recently, some of the union side pulling back as well.

That is indeed regrettable, because I think if we look to jurisdictions around the world that have successfully developed a co-operative approach between labour, management and government, we know that truly that type of consultative, co-operative process is the way to go. We have yet to achieve that in Manitoba. I do not say that we have a labour relations environment that has more strife than others. We have a fairly good labour relations environment in terms of strike days lost. Madam Chairperson, that has largely been in spite of the consistent rhetoric from both sides of the labour relations relationship.

This minister has expressed to me, and I have discussed with him on prior occasions, the new era of labour relations, which hopefully will not be too far off. We have not seen it yet in Manitoba. We see consistent hostility, consistent—as I would phrase it—rhetoric, which does nothing to enhance, in my view: (a) the actual results of the process in the province, but (b) the public's view of it.

I do not think it serves any of us to speak in terms of class warfare, in terms of a we/they attitude. I believe that if we want to enter the 21st Century as a province that will be able to compete on the world stage, we have to develop a system where all of the parties involved—and I think government is one of the parties. Let me say that at the outset. I think we are a participant in the economy very much in this province and nationally as well. We have to develop a system whereby we understand the stake that each has in an effective way of negotiating and deciding our labour difficulties.

Of course, the two parties involved in any particular dispute are best able to settle those disputes. Overall, on the broader sense, the province has a very integral role to play in getting the parties together and in helping all parties to understand that we as a province need to have an effective form of labour dispute resolution which allows us to compete with other jurisdictions which do have that.

* (1510)

Madam Chairperson, it has given me great distress in the last year, as it has in prior years, to see the job losses in this province, many of which have come in the sectors which are traditionally marked by high wage rates and organized labour, jobs that feed families, pay mortgages, put food on the table. Those jobs are increasingly, I believe, being siphoned quite logically to the United States and, if we are forced to enter into an agreement with Mexico, to Mexico.

I have concerns about the future of this province in those areas of high technology, manufacturing, other sectors which have traditionally been marked by relatively high wage rates. We cannot afford to lose those, Madam Chairperson. I think that increasingly we as Manitobans have to look for some new solutions. Perhaps we can lead the country in finding those solutions. We have every reason to, because we have in Manitoba an infrastructure which is there to serve our needs and serve the young people who are coming through our system. We are unable so far, I believe, to persuade them, at least enough of them, to stay in Manitoba, to make their living here and to raise their families here, pay taxes. We are losing those people in increasingly large numbers to other jurisdictions like British Columbia, Alberta and Ontario. We must be prepared to look at all options to stop that, to take some innovative and some novel approaches.

I am going to be asking some questions when it comes to research being done by this department, labour adjustment strategies being looked at and contemplated by this department. I do not think the old solutions are enough. I think we have to look at new solutions to deal with the emerging world economy and the emerging need for co-operation between government, labour and management to solve those problems.

As well, let me indicate that we, of course, are all distressed, at least on this side of the House, by the process which has led to Bill 70, the further division in the community which it has caused. Madam Chairperson, I have been particularly distressed by what the signal of Bill 70 is to the community on the process. It is my view that it reflects badly on all legislators in this province, that the government of the day has given its word and broken its word when it came to dealing with whomever, in this case, civil servants and their unions, their lawful negotiators. It reflects on all of us, and it reflects poorly on the

entire labour relations field and this government's role in it. We heard that again and again and again. People do not feel they can trust the government any more. That will linger with us far beyond this particular year and the immediate impact of this particular bill.

I think it is cause for some sadness amongst those who participate in the labour relations field in this province that we have come to that point. I do not say that this government is unique. I think the New Democratic administration, as well, embarked on that kind of class warfare approach, choosing one side over the other and alienating management entirely. I think they did that, so I do not say that the Conservative Party, which is presently in power, is unique. What I do say is that it is time to move beyond that. What I do say is that perhaps from both sides it is time to realize that we all have a stake in maintaining harmonious relations.

Madam Chairperson, as I say, I have had occasion to speak with the minister on some of the more pressing issues in this department, and I appreciate his forthrightness. He has been ready and willing to discuss issues in his department on a regular basis, and I appreciate that. The same could not be said, in my view, for former ministers, but in his case, I think he has shown a willingness to discuss those items. Obviously, we do not agree on all things, but I must say that I think he has at least approached his job with some integrity and comes to it with a willingness to consult. I have seen that first hand, so I do appreciate that.

Madam Chairperson, with those comments I look forward to going through line by line in the Estimates process and want to indicate to the minister that we will not be contesting, I can say at this point, his salary. I think we can say that up-front, that I think for his part he has consulted in a relatively open manner. I think that he gets into trouble when his other cabinet colleagues start meddling in labour issues, but in any event I do look forward to line by line.

Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

Madam Chairman: Item 1. Labour Executive (b) Executive Support: (1) Salaries \$299,600—

Mr. Edwards: Madam Chairperson, can the minister indicate who the executive support are in this line?

Mr. Praznik: Madam Chairperson, the Executive Support staff are my personal staff, as minister, in

my office as well as the support staff for the deputy minister. I believe the staffing levels and dollars allowed are fairly consistent across government by department, although there are some exceptions to that.

Mr. Edwards: Can the minister indicate the numbers of his own staff? He has indicated his personal staff. Can he give us any details?

Mr. Praznik: Madam Chairperson, I have, as do most ministers, a special assistant, Mrs. Marg Conway. I have an executive assistant, Mr. Scott Ransome, who joined my staff on July 2. I also have two secretarial positions in my office currently. When I became minister, because there were additional responsibilities for my predecessor with the Status of Women, there was a position from the department that was there on a temporary basis on loan to catch up with some of the work and we, with the retirement in the department and a movement of people back, et cetera, have eliminated that position in our office.

Mr. Edwards: Madam Chairperson, in other departments there is a management team of sorts that brings together people heading up various divisions of a department, and I am aware of that, and I speak specifically, I guess, about the Department of Justice. Is there such a management-team approach in the Department of Labour and, if so, who is on that team and how often do they meet?

Mr. Praznik: Yes, at different levels. First of all, as minister I have regular meetings with my senior staff which would consist of the deputy minister and my three senior directors and ADM, Mr. Bleasdale, Mr. Nykoluk and Mr. Farrell representing the three major divisions of my department. We regularly bring in senior directors as part of that depending on the issues, whether they be worker advisor office, whether they be conciliation and mediation, et cetera. So we have a fairly good approach, but my senior three directors, ADMs, and the deputy, we meet very regularly. We also have a management team which consists of all of our directors in the branch for each area, and they meet monthly with an executive group of that meeting weekly.

Mr. Edwards: Madam Chairperson, I notice that administrative support remained at 7, but in fact the number went down by close to \$20,000. Can the minister indicate whether or not certain people left

and others were hired at a lesser level or how that number came to be reduced?

Mr. Praznik: Madam Chairperson, what we are attempting to do in the senior end of the department is shoulder the same type of restraint that has been put on this department across the board as well as across government generally, so it means that we have less money to work with at that particular level. It means we have to work a little smarter, a little harder, and some of the jobs, et cetera, that were done are spread a little differently within the department, given some of the changes we have undertaken in management, et cetera. We are tightening our belts.

Mr. Edwards: Madam Chairperson, I do not want to belabour this, but would the minister indicate some specifics as to how it was reduced? Perhaps I missed it, but can he indicate if some positions and how many of them took a reduction, or whether some people left at a higher salary level and others were hired at a lesser salary level or just generally what happened?

* (1520)

Mr. Praznik: Pardon me, I may have misunderstood the question from the member for St. James. The largest part of that reduction in the department has come with a split in the function of the executive assistant to the deputy minister. A number of the roles that person was performing has expanded to certain special projects within the department, et cetera. Part of that salary is now being picked up within the department, as that role has evolved from being just support staff to the deputy, his executive assistant, to taking on special projects in the department. Part of that allotment is gone, and we do not have, quite frankly—we have not made up the time that was spent on things within the deputy's office.

Again, we have kind of tightened up on some of the things that we do and moved part of that person's role into special projects and operations within the department. It is an expanded role for that person, moving more into the department, and hence a saving at this particular area in the deputy's office with reduced support staff, I might add, support time, in essence, for the deputy.

Mr. Edwards: What are the \$20,000 in other operating expenditures?

Mr. Praznik: Those dollars are the operational dollars for travel when the deputy and myself attend

interprovincial meetings or other meetings. It is for various supplies, et cetera, in the office. We use it for some publications from time to time, so it is an array of things for which that money is directed. I should tell you that we, on a variety of fronts, examine very thoroughly where we spend that money, particularly in the area of travel.

Mr. Edwards: Would the minister be willing to provide what portion of that \$20,000 was directed toward travel and give us some details of how it was spent?

Mr. Praznik: Madam Chairperson, we will be happy to get the details on that expenditure for the member. We do not particularly have it here. I can tell you—it may be of interest to him—that to date, I guess, as minister, I myself have only had one out-of-province trip dealing with Workers Compensation. Our deputy has been involved with the Canadian Association of Administrators of Labour Law and has had a variety of meetings which he has attended. One thing, as I said, we are trying to do in both departments that I administer, Civil Service and here, is a thorough review of travel, et cetera, and trying to reduce that to only that which is necessary.

Mr. Edwards: Madam Chairperson, I will look forward to those further details from the minister.

One of the expected results is to achieve a high degree of public safety in those areas to which the department is responsible. Is there a particular bent amongst the executive on that front? I know that a number of the services offered by the department are public-safety directed. Is that there for any other reason than that it just generally falls under the ambit of the department or is there any kind of subgroup within the executive that meets on safety issues at the executive level?

Mr. Praznik: Yes, Madam Chairperson, I can tell the member for St. James that safety areas are probably one of the most substantive parts, as he is aware, of this department, given the eight public safety acts that we administered during our responsibility in Workplace Safety and Health, et cetera. As my deputy points out to me, the comment that he is referring to talks generally about the mission of the department and the support that goes in that area. Safety is a very large part of the operations of this department because of the acts with which the Legislature has charged us with administration.

Madam Chairman: Item 1.(b) Executive Support: (1) Salaries \$299,600—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$84,000—pass.

Item 2. Labour Programs (a) Management Services: (1) Salaries \$1,195,600.

Mr. Edwards: Madam Chairperson, one of the Expected Results is the collection of data and the publishing and distribution of it through the labour relations information bulletin and the collective agreement database guide. In my experience, the Labour Board, as well, has some kind of research branch that independently—am I correct in that? Is there indeed some research done directly out of the Labour Board, and if so, is there any co-operation between these two? How does that information come to be brought together in a consistent and efficient way?

Mr. Praznik: The Labour Board, per se, does not have a research branch. I understand that we have one analyst there who is responsible for compiling the data of the Board as well as a compendium of decisions of the Board which is a very important reference tool, of course, to everyone in the labour relations community. The Labour Board works very closely with the general research branch of the department but it does not have a research branch, per se, and what it does compile is with a very small staff component.

Mr. Edwards: How does this department co-ordinate legislative and regulatory development? What is the process that this branch has in place to do that?

Mr. Praznik: Madam Chairperson, because we have over 20 statutes for which we are currently responsible, we have two staff in the management area who monitor, deal with, co-ordinate information regarding those statutes. Also, in terms of developing regulatory or statutory changes, we have a rather large system of advisory councils and committees that meet, particularly Workplace Safety and Health area, with respect to various steam fitting acts, boiler acts, et cetera, and offer advice, either initiate it at those committees for change or come from within our own department as areas we should be looking at in keeping pace with developments in those particular areas. So it is sort of a two-way process that we use.

There is a fair bit of work that is put in, in developing any regulatory or statutory changes in terms of consultation. As I am sure the member will

appreciate, since most of our safety legislation is very complex, we rely on a very wide range of expertise in those particular areas of joint labour management committees or committees of experts in those particular areas to give us advice. There are a host of areas currently that we are working on to update regulation and statute, particularly in the public safety area.

Mr. Edwards: The minister speaks about updating and the various statutes he has responsibility for. Is there an ongoing statute renewal objective in this branch, that is to make sure that we keep pace with technological change and make sure that we keep pace with the new regulatory regimes which come up in other jurisdictions? These statutes are not, obviously, ones that many are going to go to the Law Reform Commission. They are regulatory in nature. They are specific. They are technical in detail.

* (1530)

What is the process whereby these are updated so that we stay current? Let me illustrate to the minister an example of what I am talking about. As I recall, there was a list of hazardous materials attached to the Manitoba statute dealing with those matters. I remember this coming up in the context of the fire some couple of years ago in which there was an explosion in St. Boniface and there was a fire there. There was a list of chemicals which we listed. The federal act had a very different list. It was a better list, I thought. It had—and I am not a chemist—but it had certainly some that we did not have and seemed more thorough.

How are we making sure that we are keeping up with what is happening in the outside world as technology progresses rapidly in many of these areas?

Mr. Praznik: Yes, Madam Chairperson, the member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) asks a very good question. We as a department try to work very closely with people involved in those areas, whether they be at the federal level or an industry, to keep our public safety acts as current as possible.

I will just give you one example in the area of radon gas which is a topical area now in our building code area. The federal government developed a series of amendments to the building code with respect to radon gas, and our advisory board here has worked with them to make recommendations for implementation. I understand we are just about to the point where we are ready to go with printing of

the new code to bring those in. There is only one we did not accept, and that had to do with—it did not suit our climate. Primarily, it was not appropriate for the province of Manitoba. In the case of the health hazard regulation and the WHMIS information, my staff hand me a sheet, which I do not think I can read in 30 seconds or 3 seconds to provide you with that information, but we work very closely with the federal government.

One of the great advantages, that I believe, we have within our department is the chief occupational medical officer, Dr. Theodore Redekop who is continually working on checking the particular lists that we have in Manitoba with lists that the federal government have to ensure that we are as expansive as is practicable, and that our health hazard regulation is in tune with what is happening across the nation. We also have on staff in our Workplace Safety and Health area one of our occupational hygienists who is also a doctor of chemistry. So we have some very good expertise in our department that we rely on to ensure and to advise us as to our lists and our regulations and making sure they are current with thinking and regulations across the country.

Mr. Edwards: On this line there is the loss of one Managerial staff person and three Professional/Technical persons. Can the minister indicate what those positions were?

Mr. Praznik: Madam Chairperson, the staff adjustments in the Management Services division were as follows. We had two staff years in the Public Education Development branch. We had .26 staff years in the Human Resources area; one staff year in the financial officer category; one staff year in the internal audit position; one staff year in the director, Legislation and Policy development branch, Workplace Safety and Health Support Services division; for a total of 5.26 staff years in that particular area.

I believe the member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) may be interested in this, that only two of these particular staff years had occupants at the time and they were in the, as I said, Public Education Development branch which had been consolidated now into a central unit of government. Regrettably, we always wish we would have the ability to do more, but they have been consolidated, and I think that is probably a good move for co-ordination, because from time to time we have had incidence where we have been running one particular

campaign and other departments others, et cetera. So now we will have, I think, the benefit of a concerted effort across government in the public safety area in terms of advertising and promotion.

Madam Chairman: 2.(a) Management Services: (1) Salaries \$1,195,600.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): In an introductory way, I discussed the whole issue of labour law review last time, and I want to indicate to the minister I will be pursuing that further. I am quite concerned about the direction this government may be taking, the fact that there is a review underway and what that review might lead to. I have a question also in regards to information in terms of the research-planning element of this section. I raised today in Question Period my concern about the fact that the most recent statistics on days lost, work stoppages, for the first six months has increased significantly over the pattern. In fact, it is the highest since in 1981. I am concerned about the ramifications of Bill 70. I believe that we are headed for an unprecedented period of labour unrest in this province because of the actions of this government.

Madam Chairman, I am asking the minister if he has considered, and whether his department has considered, in the introduction of Bill 70, the fact that it is clearly going to lead to labour unrest. The minister sat through the Legislative committee hearings; there were many people at the committee hearings, for example, from MTS or Hydro, which have never had a strike, certainly not in recent years, who have said that they went the route of final offer selection this time, and in the case of a couple of components, but next time the choice is going to be the contract or strike. We may end up with a significant amount of labour unrest within those particular corporations. There is a lot of concern about what may happen with the Civil Service itself. Traditionally, there has been arbitration instead of strike as the method of resolving disputes that are not settled through bargaining.

I raise that as both a concern and ask if, in any way, shape, or form, this department, this section of the department has considered the implications of the passage of Bill 70 which, while not having taken place yet, certainly seems imminent given the majority of the government and the degree to which it will go to force the bill through. I am basing that on the assumption that Bill 70 will pass, something that we will do everything in our power to stop. Has this at all been considered in analysis of Bill 70,

given the fact there has already been an increase in labour unrest in the province?

Mr. Praznik: Yes, Madam Chairman, I had a chance to analyze those numbers today. Certainly, we have a very large number of person-days lost in the first half of 1991, indeed, 152,938 person-days lost, the highest since 1984, but I think when you analyze those numbers you find that 141,210 of those days lost had to do with the dispute this winter, the strike with the Manitoba Nurses' Union. I raise that because when you eliminate that particular number of days lost you come to approximately 11,728, which is considerably less than the days lost in either 1988 or 1987.

In 1987, with eight labour disputes, we had almost 50,000 days lost, and in 1988 we had 17,000 days lost. There is no magic to this, of course. I would also point out to the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) that the Manitoba nurses' strike, when it did take place, was still under the regime of final offer selection, which was available both before and after. In fact, when I look over a number of the other labour disputes that we had this year, the Manitoba Sugar dispute example, the dispute at Manitoba Sugar, final offer selection was available to the union there prior to the lockout. In fact, the union that represents those workers is one who has made great use of final offer selection, usually invoking it prior to a work stoppage. It did not happen in that case, but it was available there.

The other one, of course, was the operating engineers who could have also applied for it prior to going on strike this winter, chose not to, and stayed on strike for the necessary number of days to apply for final offer selection. Why I raise that is just to put those numbers into perspective.

* (1540)

To answer the member for Thompson's (Mr. Ashton) question about Bill 70, one can see that there is no doubt that labour relations in this province, currently in the public sector, are strained. There is no doubt about that.

I say this to the member for Thompson as a Minister of Labour. One of the great dilemmas that we face, not only as a province, but indeed other provincial governments across the country, are the financial restraints that are being imposed on us all by an expanding debt-servicing cost in government. They have created a very new reality, I think, in government finance, and I am very candid with

them, that I did not fully appreciate until I was asked by the Premier (Mr. Filmon) to come to the cabinet table, and my appreciation has grown over the last number of months as I have had to work with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) and others.

I say that just to tell him—not to engage in a rhetorical or political debate here by any means—but I think I am trying to, as he and I so often do, get into some very good discussions on these issues. I just say that we are in a very new age in public finance, and I do not think either the public or many at the bargaining table on the other side have fully appreciated at this time. I do not say that as a criticism; it is one that we are just starting to come to grips with.

My great regret over Bill 70 is like two great bears, the labour movement and the government are battling it out, and perhaps if, on both sides, we had, over the last number of months, better avenues and channels of communication—and I say those things are always two-way streets. It is very difficult for government to be at the table and developing good relationships when your employees' representatives are advertising against your policies. I do not criticize that at this particular time, I just say it is one of the realities that do not allow the flow of information back and forth that allow both sides to be operating maybe from the same understanding of the issues, and be able to bargain more effectively.

That is my great regret as Labour minister, and I do not point fingers in any one direction. I think we all bear some blame in that particular area, certainly I think on both sides, and my great hope is when this is behind us that we are able to redevelop some of those channels. So I would concur with some of his comments and just put them into that perspective.

Mr. Ashton: Madam Chairperson, the minister makes my point. The figures that he has for the first six months include a public sector strike. It is disingenuous to the extreme for the minister to say, well, let us net that out and the figures are not that bad except for that. The figures are the figures and are largely because of a public sector strike.

For the minister, he mentioned about final offer selection. I will say to the minister, that if final offer selection had not been available in theory, because it was not available de facto thanks to Bill 70, but if it had not been available to the operating engineers they would have continued their strike potentially. If

it had not been available to casino workers they could have been on strike again. In fact, the original strike might have continued unresolved. If it had not been for final offer selection IBEW with Hydro which applied for it and also MTS, there could have been a strike.

The fact is, if it had not been for final offer selection being theoretically in place, those units which employ significant numbers of people—while the casino workers is a small section of MGEA, the IBEW locals with Hydro and MTS employ a significant number of Manitobans, thousands of Manitobans—if it had not been for the supposed word of this government, that FOS would have been in place, we would have found, potentially, and I say this because this was brought forward by the committee from IBEW, Hydro workers who said, if it had not been for FOS, there was a very good likelihood they would have voted for a strike. The fact is we would have had a much higher number of days lost.

So already we are saying two things. One is that final offer selection has clearly reduced the number of days lost to strikes. It has reduced the number of days lost to strikes even when, in actual fact in the final analysis, it was not in place. It was retroactively negated. I can point to these units. The minister was there. He heard. The people came forth. He heard members of the union, members of the negotiating committee and shop floor workers, and they all had the same message—strike was the other option. So FOS has been vindicated in this strange experiment we see of a government saying, it is in place, and then retroactively saying, well, yes, we signed a piece of paper that said that was the case, but that was not the case.

We have seen that. That leads to the further conclusion that we are already seeing one of the highest rates of strikes, that we have the highest rate in more than 10 years. If one looks at the six-month figures, it is a very disturbing amount. It could have been massively higher.

What I am saying to the minister is, it will be massively higher again for the same reason the figures are high this time, public sector strikes. He is forcing public sector workers in the future—since they have no power now under Bill 70 and will have no power to do anything, they cannot bargain, they cannot negotiate anything. That is part of Bill 70 for one year. In future contracts, they will no longer have the option of final offer selection. They will be

faced with the catch-up position from the one-year freeze of this year. They will have one choice, either a negotiated settlement which will be extremely difficult for this government to achieve, given the fact that it is eroding the wages this year by 6 percent, or a strike.

That is why I ask the minister, and I put on the record my concern, Madam Chairperson, that we are going to end up with a significant level of labour unrest in this province that has not been seen for more than 10 years. I do not think it is any coincidence that the last time we had a Conservative majority government, we had an increase of labour unrest. There is a direct cause and effect. In this case, the figures are no accident. We had a Conservative majority government, and the nurses' public sector strike occurred. That was not an accident.

We have seen here other bargaining units that could have been on strike. They were not. They did not go on strike because of final offer selection which had been introduced by the New Democratic Party, being taken out by the Conservatives. So the logic of what the minister and this government is doing is it is leading to the law of the jungle when it comes to labour relations. It is leading people more and more to have to make the tough decision of taking the kind of—I hate to use this word—but the kind of abuse they have taken from this government, certainly in a contractual sense, or else using the only weapon they have available to them, the strike weapon.

I put this on the record as much as anything else—I understand from the minister's answer, he has analyzed the previous figures. I do not know if he has had the opportunity to really look ahead, but I think the minister will acknowledge as well, that is indeed going to be the case, and I say to the minister that I really believe they embarked on a counterproductive course.

It is unfair of this government to attempt to deal with whatever real or imagined fiscal problems that are in place, because I do not accept all of the minister's analysis, but we certainly see that there are tough times. I say, Madam Chairperson, that you do not put people to work by laying off civil servants. You do not improve our economic situation by freezing civil servants' wages. You do not improve the ability to build this province together by selecting one out of ten Manitoba workers and taxing them by as much as \$1,000 or \$2,000 a year,

because that is what this wage freeze is. Let us put it bluntly: it is a tax on the public sector workers, coming right out of their pockets. You do not improve the economy by sowing the seeds of unrest and distrust that this government has done in terms of the public sector.

I state that as much as a prediction to the minister that in future Estimates of the Department of Labour I will be asking, and whoever follows as critic, Madam Chairperson, in other years if we have another critic from our side—we will be putting on the record, and this will be in many ways the prediction today, that we predict that there is going to be unprecedented labour unrest. Certainly the period in which we had relative labour harmony from 1982 on has now ended. It was in place in many ways because of the working relationship established with the public sector by the previous government and even, and I will say this, by the fact we had a minority Conservative government that did not substantially change that. They did not even change final offer selection until it became a majority government. So I will put those comments on the record and hope that the minister will recognize that it is the government's policies, particularly in regard to the public sector, that have already led us to this point and will lead us into further problems in the future.

Madam Chairperson, I want to indicate I am not trying to—I have to talk to somebody outside the Chamber for about two minutes. I am not trying to go out on the minister in terms of the response. I will be back. I think it is courtesy and it is only fair, and if I miss the minister's comments, I will be perusing them in Hansard, but I do have somebody waiting for me outside. So it is not out of offence. The minister can adjourn if he wants. Somehow I do not think he wishes to. I just state this very seriously—

* (1550)

Mr. Praznik: Madam Chairperson, I appreciate from time to time members have to slip out to make a phone call, and I see the member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) is here and the member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), so they will have a chance to carry forward my remarks to the member.

I want to say very clearly on the record that I have been looking forward to this question. I started to get into it a little bit, and if members will grant me the time to respond, we have reached a very different

time in our public finance than we have ever been in in decades, if at all. That has changed substantially the whole means by which government has traditionally viewed its expenditure. Since 1985-86, this province has spent less money on services each year than it has collected in taxes, since 1985-86 when members opposite were in government. Every penny of that surplus, every penny of it, the difference between what we have spent and what we have collected, that surplus, every penny of it, plus hundreds of millions of dollars—I think our lowest year was \$42 million; most years when they were still in power it was over three, four, five hundreds of millions of dollars—every penny of that borrowed money plus their surplus since '85-86 has gone to the payment of interest to service our accumulated debt.

In other words, the people of our public service in this province each year deliver a huge array of services with far less money than the taxpayers of this province provide to them. The difference, of course, again, has gone to service public debt. From 1980-81 when we were starting to come out of that recession, each Manitoban was indirectly asked to pay \$79 a person towards debt servicing. Today we as a Legislature are asking them—not asking them, we have to pay it—almost \$600 a person towards servicing that debt.

The other day, Madam Chairperson, I sat down, I did a little calculation. I know the member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) and I often get into these discussions, and I find him a very interesting person to deal with because he listens, and I listen to him. The other day I sat down with a pen and paper and I did a little calculation. If this Legislature was to spend no more than what we raised each year in total, in other words, eliminate our operating deficit and find within a \$100 million to apply to paying off our principal. In other words, spend what we took in, pay all our interest within what we collected, and found another \$100 million within to start repaying our principal, it would take 40 to 50 years of that to pay off the debt load of this province—a debt load that was substantially created in a decade.

When I look at my two daughters, one three and one almost three months, and I look into their eyes, what am I going to tell them some day about why they have no money left because their tax burden is so high? I do not know what I am going to tell them, because our problem is we are paying off debt that was borrowed over the last number of years.

The member opposite, and people who appeared before committee in the last few days, talked about Keynesian economics. I remember sitting in that loge between a Clayton Manness and a Howard Pawley in the Christmas 1981 session of the Youth Parliament when I was a premier and listening to them debate that same issue. Howard Pawley said: We have to spend in poor times to stimulate growth. Clayton Manness said: Yes, but you have got to collect it in better times to pay it back to replenish your coffers for the next recession. Howard Pawley agreed. The only thing was when times were better in the mid-'80s, when revenues were increasing 10 and 15 percent, not one penny was put aside. In fact, \$400 million to \$500 million was borrowed. All those bills have come home.

Having put it in that context, I want to say to the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) when he spoke about the public sector, no, we did not want this bill. We did not want Bill 70. We knew it was going to cause damage to labour relations in this province. We certainly did not want that, but something has happened and there is a fundamental difference on labour relations between him and I and between, I think, the traditional labour negotiator or the believer in traditional labour relations and those who look for third-party solutions.

Yes, we may have more strikes, but the day when government can afford third-party arbitrations is gone. Our finances will not allow it, and the one thing about free collective bargaining that I have learned since I have become Minister of Labour is the best settlement is one where two sides go head to head at the table, argue and debate it, fight and sometimes revert to work stoppages as part of that, but ultimately come to a conclusion that they both voluntarily—they may not like it—put their signature to.

Why we have always had objection to FOS—and I will not even do it the honour of calling it FOS, because it was a one-sided FOS. It was a tool that was effectively only available to one party. I remember asking the honourable member, should we make it available to both? Oh, I would have war. Certainly I would have war, because it would then become a vehicle that would rob where employees have the right to strike. The reason why we abolished it is that third-party settlement is not true free collective bargaining and work stoppages are part of free collective bargaining.

I would remind members opposite that the Manitoba Nurses' Union had the ability prior to that strike—because there were issues in dispute that they could have had final offer selection but they chose not to. They chose not to because their leadership and their membership were not afraid to bargain. If bargaining meant withdrawing their services, then that was it, that was part of that bargaining. They hammered away, they withdrew their services, they negotiated and they were tough and hard negotiations. There is no doubt about it but ultimately, at the end of the day, both parties put their signature to an agreement. Both parties may not have been happy but they had agreed. It does not take a great deal of skill as a labour leader to go to a third party to get an agreement. That is easy, but negotiations including work stoppages are what proves the mettle of any leadership.

The member says in the next year or two we are going to have more strikes. Yes, we may. They are also symptomatic of a period of recession, because in periods of recession the dollars are not there for increases. Sometimes they are not even there for keeping up at zero. All we have to do is look at some of the recent settlements where we have had layoffs right on the heels of the settlements. There are going to be more work stoppages and those are the result, I think, of tough times, but they force people to bargain.

If you try to keep—and my great fear is if you try to keep labour peace by providing particularly one-sided means of settling disputes by third parties, you may not have the work stoppages but you might not have the jobs at the end of the day, because they will impose settlements in some cases that are not liveable by the employer and the jobs will go and the employees who have lost their jobs will then have to ask their leadership, why did you not bargain? No matter how tough bargaining can be, ultimately it is bargained arrangements that are the best ones.

* (1600)

The great difference that I see coming in this House, on so many issues, is that the modern New Democratic Party finds it much easier to get away from hard bargaining and go to third party, particularly one-sided third party mechanisms where they can call it in if they want it instead of bargaining to get a third party settlement. They are finding the easy route, and I find it just so discouraging and disappointing that a party of

labour would abandon that fundamental principle. Sure it sounds great to have those tools but it ultimately takes away from the bargained agreement. In tough times, the only security of those jobs being there is the bargained agreement, not the imposed third party agreement.

Madam Chairperson, I will admit freely, the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) and I have a great disagreement.

Madam Chairman: Item 2.(a)(1) Salaries \$1,195,600—(pass); (2) Other Expenditures \$149,200—pass.

Item 2.(b) Labour Division Administration: (1) Salaries \$145,100—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$23,700—pass.

Item 2.(c) Mechanical and Engineering.

Mr. Edwards: Madam Chairperson, it has come to my attention through a couple of sources that there is considerable concern about the effectiveness and the up-to-dateness of The Elevator Act. I had brought to my attention some serious concerns by people in the industry about whether or not we were up to speed with other jurisdictions on accreditation requirements, and there was a—it may be a small issue to the general public, but The Elevator Act is of obvious importance to keep up to date, because very tragic consequences could flow from problems with elevators. I wonder if the minister could comment.

I see one of the indications here is that this branch does inspect elevators as required under The Elevator Act. Are there plans for a general overhaul of that act? Is he aware of the same concerns which have been made known to me about the continuing need to update that act?

Mr. Praznik: Madam Chairperson, one of the great privileges of being Minister of Labour is to continually have your family and friends remind you of the fact they have seen your name on these elevator permits.

The comment that the member makes is, yes, it is an area that myself and the department are very well aware of. The change in technology in elevators has been ongoing, obviously. The Norquay Building is an example, when it was built in the '60s, I believe with state-of-the-art elevators, self-levellers and those type of things which now are somewhat obsolete in elevator technology.

What our department is attempting to do is to review our current legislation. It is part of a general review of our public safety statutes, and we hope to really accomplish two things. One is to update the regulatory scheme to suit changes in elevator technology. The second thing, on the broader or more administrative picture, is to see some consolidation of our general public safety legislation into one statute with various segments, et cetera, so it is much easier to deal with for those who have to administer it.

We are trying to address it on two fronts. Obviously, the more important front for public safety is to update our regulatory schemes to suit new technology. Work is ongoing in the department in that area, and we hope to have some changes, I would hope, in the not-too-distant future.

Mr. Edwards: Madam Chairperson, I do encourage the minister to pursue that act as priority simply because—and I am certainly no expert—I have had some very serious representation made by persons who are knowledgeable in the field that this act does need an overhaul in Manitoba.

Madam Chairperson, in the last Estimates process, flowing from an incident in an apartment building here in the city I asked questions about the leakage of certain poisonous gases in residential apartment buildings and other buildings. I believe, and again I am not a chemist, and that is pretty obvious, but it was carbon dioxide, I believe, which was in that particular case.

Has the minister got any further update on what has happened in that area? In particular, I would also be interested to know if there has been any further research into the particular monitors which were available at the time. Technology had advanced to the point where there was a hand-held monitor. I asked at the time if the Department of Labour even owned one, I think the cost was some \$200 per unit, and the answer was no.

Have there been any further developments in that area that the minister could tell us about?

Mr. Praznik: Yes, I very much appreciate the question, because it is an area within the department that we have done, I think, some very innovative process steps over the last while. I am going to take a moment or two just to share that with the member for St. James.

Just by way of background, the problem we face with chimneys in the province today is, years ago

there was a large heat loss from chimneys, so they tended to stay very warm throughout the winter and did not have the contraction and expansion. Now, with very efficient furnaces, Madam Chairperson, chimneys tend to be much colder and have far more contraction-expansion during the course of the year and consequently crack far more than they ever did. The particular incident that arose led to, I think, an examination of how we deal with chimneys.

The department has been in the process of developing a chimney regulation with respect to liners, et cetera. One of the difficulties that we have—and this is where we are trying to address it in a meaningful way—is I believe there are some, what was it, 17,000 chimneys?—14,000 commercial chimneys, I understand, in downtown Winnipeg alone. We do not know where all of them are. We do not know which ages of buildings, et cetera. So one of the great dilemmas we faced in the department was how even bringing in a regulation, how we do our inspection, identification and try to alleviate risk and hit target areas.

The Professional Property Managers Association who, they indicate, represent about half of the commercial properties in Winnipeg, has been working with us in developing a set of regulations and a process of implementation—I think that is the key part—whereby we can target our inspection and we can target our work in a reasonable fashion, that we are going to be covering the oldest and most dangerous chimneys first and then over a period of several years eventually getting every one in an orderly fashion.

So I am very pleased that we are working with them, because they have access to information as to age of buildings, owners of buildings, locations of buildings, types of heating systems, et cetera, that the department does not have. It gives us a bank of information that will allow us to be far more effective. So we are in the process of working out a method of implementation, and they are assisting us particularly with their information.

As to the monitors specifically, our department has done some testing of those monitors and found them—the advice I have been given by my department as minister is they are not as effective as one would have initially thought they would be, and that the best way is going to be an inspection process. My ADM advises that possibly even involve the use of a video camera going down the

chimney, et cetera. You can appreciate the type of involvement that takes.

So we have to have some system of targeting, and over a number of years catching all chimneys. So we are looking at that now and trying to develop the mechanism that we will use to carry those inspections.

Regrettably, the monitors were found not to be reliable instruments for detecting carbon monoxide and gave us far more problems than we anticipated originally. I hope within the next while we will be able to have the whole process in place. There has been a lot of person effort going into this on the part of the department over the winter, and we, as I said, have tapped a source of information through the Professional Property Managers' Association that allows us to, I think, more effectively inspect those chimneys over a period of several years and also allows us—for the number of providers of chimney liners, et cetera, are limited, the number of installers are limited—to get them first to where they are most needed. So I hope we will be able to move on that very shortly as our discussions with the group and within the department, I think, are just about concluded.

Mr. Edwards: Madam Chairperson, how many boilermaker inspectors are there left with the department? I see that there was one position, a vacant position albeit, which was dropped from this year's line.

* (1610)

Mr. Praznik: Yes, we currently have 11 boiler inspectors in the department. We had one individual who retired, which created a vacancy that was eliminated in the recent budget cuts. We have 11 currently, and we had one who retired, leaving us a vacancy. That was the vacant position that was eliminated.

Mr. Edwards: It is indicated in the Estimates book that 29,000 inspections of boilers, pressure vessels, refrigeration plants, electrical applications and gas and all fire equipment took place in the last year. Can the minister indicate how many of those were inspections of boilers? Or maybe I can phrase it this way—I am not sure if boiler inspectors inspect more than boilers—what I would like to know is, how many of those 29,000 inspections were done by the 11 boiler inspectors?

Mr. Praznik: Madam Chairperson, those inspections would have been carried out by the

Mechanical and Engineering staff. I should point out to him that not all inspections are done yearly. There is a rotational system that we use. So, as you can see, we are covering a fairly large bit of ground with the relatively small but, I think, very efficient staff.

Mr. Edwards: Is the minister saying that the boiler inspectors did none of the 29,000 inspections which included inspections of boilers?

Mr. Praznik: Madam Chairperson, I ask the member to forgive me if I did not be more precise, but our staff at Mechanical and Engineering that includes those 11 boiler inspectors conducted all of those inspections, so the relevant inspections to the boilers were done by our 11 boiler inspectors.

Mr. Edwards: What I am trying to find out from the minister, and maybe I should put it more directly, is why the boiler inspector position was dropped. What was the rationale for that? Was there a drop in the number of inspections this year? What was the criteria used to determine that was a position that should be dropped?

Mr. Praznik: Madam Chairperson, to answer specifically the question, our policy within the Department of Labour, as we dealt with the general financial situation of the province in this budget, was to use vacancy management to meet our budgetary goals, and we had a vacancy in that position. I should tell him that my concern, obviously, was safety. When we looked at it, we were able to redistribute the work among our other 11 inspectors, pick up some slack that was there, and generally have carried on the same schedule and rotation. With our ability to manage vacancies, if we do find at some point that we are in need of an additional inspector in that area, other vacancies are created from time to time. We would look at shifting staff dollars over to there to fill that position.

At this time, staff assured me as minister, that the current load could be carried by the 11 remaining boiler inspectors. If it cannot be, if time proves us wrong, that we do need additional staff there, then we will have to look to fill it from, again, using our vacancy management within the department.

Mr. Edwards: Madam Chairperson, let me ask—and I would hope that the fact that there was a vacancy was not the criteria used to determine what position should be deleted. Vacancy may indeed be a very necessary position. Just because it is vacant does not mean that it is less or more

important than any other position. One hopes that there are other criteria used before a position is deleted. The minister says in defence of that the 11 people could take up the other slack. Can the minister indicate, let me ask again, how many of the 29,000 inspections done were done on boilers, and can he also give me that information for the year prior?

Mr. Praznik: Yes, Madam Chairperson, I would refer my colleague, the member for St. James (Mr. Edwards), to the '89-90 Annual Report of the Department of Labour. On boilers, I believe on page 39 we list the types of equipment and inspections and we do just under 7,000, I think 6,815. Again, I would just point out to the member that there is a rotation, so those numbers may not always be exactly the same from year to year. There may be some variation, et cetera. As they come up on rotation as well, the closure of a building, for example, might eliminate it from the roster. Changes in heating systems, et cetera, reduce it from time to time.

Although I recognize the member's point that vacancy should not be the only criteria for eliminating a position, when we looked through our department, given where we are with inspections, given what our remaining staff are able to do; I was assured by my senior staff, by staff in that department, that we could manage with the loss of that particular position, and we could conduct our regular inspection of boilers with the remaining 11 inspectors.

Now if that turns out to be wrong—as I indicated, from time to time we have positions become vacant. We also have within our department areas of policy, for example, in pay equity where we have had a rather large staff to deal with public service and that winds down as that has been implemented. We have additional positions that become available, so we would have the ability to fill that position by moving dollars. I know the member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock) had a briefing from my department on some of the changes that we were making in our administration in the department in terms of flexibility to make some adjustments. That would allow us to do that, and, of course, being responsible to Treasury Board, we monitor it. If it turns out that the advice I was given does not suit the conditions out there, then we will find a way to meet that need.

Madam Chairman: Item 2.(c) Mechanical and Engineering: (1) Salaries \$1,301,700—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$285,900—pass.

2.(d) Fire Prevention: (1) Salaries \$1,482,000.

Mr. Edwards: One of the activities that is identified in this heading is the promotion of public education in fire prevention practices and life safety measures. Can the minister outline what measures were taken in the past year under that heading?

Mr. Praznik: Madam Chairperson, the member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) has asked a question that is near and dear to my heart, being responsible for the fire commission, a very interesting part of the Department of Labour and one that is very active throughout the province.

In the area of public education, we have promoted the development and dissemination of public fire education materials throughout the province, all fire service personnel trained to assist local municipalities in preparing and delivering public education programs in their communities. The Fire Commissioner's office has also produced the Nero and Ashcan matches and lighter safety kit for daycares and kindergarten age children. Last year I had the opportunity to have one of the kits here that we provided to both opposition parties.

Our project in the last year—some time this month we will have printed for wide scale distribution the Nero and Ashcan Home Fire Safety Safari. It is an interesting little book. It is a very useful one. It is a picture book and we are finding it to be very effective because it catches the eye of kids. One area where we have to, I think, increase our awareness areas among young children on escape, on risk of fire, prevention, et cetera, and what to do in case of fire. I would like to actually, if I could have a page, provide this copy to the member for St. James. I know he has young children at home and he can test it out and offer me his opinion, and if he would like the kit we can arrange for that too. I am always interested in these home tests of our products.

Mr. Edwards: I thank the minister for this hot-off-the-press early edition of the home fire safety safari. Generally, the only time the fire alarm goes off at my home is when I am cooking. I keep the batteries in, though. I look forward to using that.

Under this heading, it appears there is a reduction of four positions due to vacant positions that were open and appear to have been deleted. Can he

indicate which of these have been deleted? They fall under the heading Professional/Technical.

Mr. Praznik: Just to put these particular reductions into context, when my predecessor Gerrie Hammond became minister responsible for the fire commission, what we found was a commission that was in need of some organization. I want to set the context because then he will understand, I think, the moves a little bit better.

What we found was we had three functions being performed by the department. One was working with the mutual aid districts and fire prevention organization activity—pardon me, working with the mutual aid districts with their training, et cetera. Two was fire prevention activities, safety promotion. Three was our actual inspection when we had a fire occur, a fire investigation.

* (1620)

What we had was a host of districts, people assigned to one job. It startled me. When I became minister, we were just in the process of making the change. When I was out in Portage la Prairie, our representative in Portage la Prairie could not investigate fires in Portage la Prairie but was the back-up fire investigator for Winnipeg. So if a fire occurred in that community, he could not go to investigate it. The guy from Winnipeg would have to come out. Yet if they needed someone in Winnipeg, our staff from Portage would get in the car and they would pass on the highway. It was just silly.

We have been in the process of reorganizing, by way of district, where the three functions would be performed primarily by the person assigned to that district. So that has given us a little bit of ability to free up some staff.

The positions we eliminated, I understand, all were vacant at the time. One was a fire service training officer in Waterhen. One was a public education specialist in Winnipeg. Another was a clerk III position in Brandon. The fourth was a typist position, also in Brandon.

Given our reorganization and some of our other abilities with the new Fire Commissioner to consolidate some of our services, none of these actually were felt to be needed. Although budget considerations were there, generally speaking I think it would be safe to say that the requirements for eliminating these positions were more the reorganization. I would also add that in my recent

meeting with representatives of the fire chiefs, they commented to us, in fact, with our reorganization is a much better delivery of service.

These were more driven by the restructuring than they were by budgetary considerations. Given the fact that this particular office is funded by the fire fund, they had more to do with the efficient use of those trust monies than they did with the overall budget framework of the province.

Mr. Edwards: Can the minister tell me about the fire fund? I am not familiar with it. Can he give me some details about it?

Mr. Praznik: Madam Chairperson, the fire fund is one of those unique entities in government that makes being the Fire Commissioner's minister a very enjoyable one. The fire fund is a levy on all insurance premiums in the province, currently at 2 percent. It was at one percent some years ago and the previous administration raised it to a 2 percent levy on the basis of funding the expansion of the fire college. When that, in fact, was completed, their intention was to reduce it. We have now, in that process of reducing it, I believe a quarter point a year over three years to get it down to a quarter point above its original levy. It creates a trust fund of dollars which are used to fund fire prevention activities, the Office of the Fire Commissioner and a host of other things that are related to fire. We use those dollars, for example, in support of our mutual aid districts, training in our mutual aid districts and our public education activities, et cetera.

So it is a pool of money held in trust, raised from insurance premiums across the province to support fire prevention activities, fire support activities from a provincial level. Again, it is held in trust under relatively strict criteria and we use it to carry out the operations in the Fire Commissioner's office.

Mr. Edwards: Can the minister indicate how much is in the fund presently?

Mr. Praznik: Madam Chair, currently there is approximately \$10 million in the fund, earning interest, and we will spend this year approximately \$2.5 million in fund for our operations. The fund grew rather quickly over those years. Because of the 2 percent, it generated a fair bit of revenue. We are comfortable with the current levels and plan to go back to the original levy. It has been a very, very effective use of, I think, its contributors' money.

Mr. Edwards: Just the one further question I had asked that was not answered is, how much did the

2 percent bring in, in this last year? What revenue are we looking at each year that the 2 percent brings in?

Mr. Praznik: Yes, the 2 percent raised about \$3.5 million that comes into the fund I think at the end of March, beginning of April each year.

Madam Chairman: Item 2.(d) Fire Prevention.

Mr. Edwards: I am sorry, I had one further question. One of the activities in this department is the conduct of investigations that determine the cause, origin and circumstances of fires.

Can the minister indicate how this department becomes involved in fires? I am not aware of which fires they investigate, how it is determined which fires they investigate. What is the participation with police when police suspect arson? Do the police call in the Fire Commissioner's office to do an investigation? Do they have that ability to request assistance in investigating whether or not arson is the cause?

Mr. Praznik: Yes, Madam Chairperson, whenever we are called in the Fire Commissioner's office where there is a suspicion of arson in a fire, we respond with our fire investigation staff. One of the areas where we have spent a great deal of effort, particularly in the last year, has been increasing the awareness among fire departments, particularly our volunteer fire departments through mutual aid districts, of what to look for, what are the signs of arson, heightening the awareness, because one difficulty in arson cases is the destruction of evidence.

So we spend a great deal of time with our fire fighters so they are aware of things to watch for, to become suspicious of, to preserve evidence, et cetera, until the fire investigator gets there. I think we have had a fairly successful rate at reducing the number of false claims, fraudulent claims, where arson is involved. We are working very closely with the insurance industry to make sure that we heighten our ability to detect and prove arson.

* (1630)

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): In the report produced by the government in the Legislature January 1990 dealing with the Solvit explosion, the Fire Commissioner's report was subsumed into an overall report that was produced by government, an interdepartmental committee. That report outlined three possible causes of the fire explosion. It never determined any one set cause.

Has the minister received from his department any further information about the cause of the fire, and what action are they taking on the one option of possible arson with the explosion?

Mr. Praznik: Madam Chairperson, I have been advised that currently the Fire Commissioner's office has not been able to narrow down those causes or to provide sufficient evidence to determine if arson was, in fact, the cause of that fire. So I have not received a report that has been able to narrow down the causes of that fire or to confirm arson.

Mr. Doer: Would the Fire Commissioner's office be working with the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation investigative unit dealing with possible insurance claims? What is the status of the MPIC report?

Mr. Praznik: I am advised that the fire investigation staff worked very closely not only with the appropriate people at MPIC, but also with the City of Winnipeg Police. I am advised again, as well, that it was the joint feeling of all three involved that there was insufficient evidence to determine a case of arson.

Mr. Doer: Have there been any pursuant to the explosion and the report—as I say, the subsumed report of the Fire Commissioner's office was tabled in this House. Have there been any claims settled by the Public Insurance Corporation, therefore, to date? Were there any liabilities and, therefore, any claims with the Public Insurance Corporation dealing with Solvit?

Mr. Praznik: Yes, Madam Chairperson, I am not able to answer that question. As Minister of Labour responsible for the Fire Commission, we would not know if MPIC has paid out those claims.

Mr. Doer: The government also cleaned up—we raised a number of times with the former minister the cleanup operations, some of it in the water retention ponds, some of it ground into the soil at that point. We have been advised that the taxpayers have paid for that cleanup. Have the company and the partners paid for that cleanup or is it the taxpayers of the province of Manitoba?

Mr. Praznik: Madam Chairperson, again I wish I could provide the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) with that answer. In terms of my department, we were not involved in that cleanup. That would be the Department of Environment that conducted the cleanup and the relationship between that

department and any surviving people within the corporation or the corporation itself to pay for that is not something which I, quite frankly, have knowledge.

Mr. Doer: The government established a committee and the former minister responsible for the Fire Commissioner's office stated, and I quote, in January of 1990 on a CBC Radio interview that she expected the new regulations to be produced six months after this Fire Commissioner's report was tabled in the Legislature, and that regulations would flow pursuant to that.

Of course, the minister will know that I asked the Minister of Environment about this issue on the second anniversary of the Solvit explosion, and I would argue that to no avail was the result of my questioning. We have been told that there is a sort of interdepartmental committee, which is a nice fuzzy way to answer a very major issue like that.

Can the minister tell me whether the people of north St. Boniface and other people can sleep better at night? Are there going to be better regulations, or are we going to just rely on interdepartmental committees?

Mr. Praznik: Yes, Madam Chairperson, there are two issues that arise from the point that the Leader of the Opposition raises. One, of course, has to do with the Workplace Health Hazard Regulations which, as the member knows, were passed in January of 1988 and came into effect in October of 1988. The second part was, as I am sure the member appreciates, when you have a situation as occurred at Solvit, you have a host of departments that have a piece of that particular problem, and how they interact amongst themselves and are able to deal with the issues that come within their scope is a very critical point. Consequently, as my colleague has indicated, an interdepartmental committee was struck to develop a protocol to deal with those situations. That protocol, I am pleased to say, is just about complete, and I hope we will be able to have it in the next number of months out and in operation.

Mr. Doer: So we have got a committee of interdepartmental people; we have lots of departments that are responsible for this; and now we have a protocol. That lady I spoke to in north St. Boniface, I do not think would feel very comfortable if I gave her that answer tonight, just phoned her up and said, oh, we have got a protocol going on in departments.

I ask the minister, who is the lead minister? Usually when you have two or three departments responsible for an issue that crosses across departments, who is responsible for preventing a situation like this happening again? Which minister is the lead minister in government? Who do we hold accountable if this thing falls apart again?

Mr. Praznik: Madam Chairperson, the lead minister is the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) on this issue. My department has some involvement, a variety of roles. I just want to stress again to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) because I have always had trouble following him—and I do not say this as a criticism from his comments on this issue—when I came back to my department, when I became minister and was briefed and became involved in this issue, that there is a difference.

There are two processes often that get combined. The regulatory authority that is needed to control a variety of things is in place. It is there; it came into effect. The co-ordination of various elements—and I will correct myself, not just interdepartmental co-ordination but interjurisdictional co-ordination, that committee met. Their protocol proposals, just to add further for the member's information, went to the Workplace Safety and Health Committee. They made some recommendations. It came back. I am sure he appreciates, there is a lot of expertise that is available that we have drawn upon.

We now have the protocol, and the protocol is for the operation, how we operate among multijurisdictions and departments when you have that type of situation. So the protocol is a very important thing, and although—you know it always sounds better—we have a regulation; we have a law. The protocol is the appropriate means of co-ordinating multijurisdictional response to this type of situation.

Mr. Doer: So the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) is the one that is responsible. That is who we tie the can to if something goes wrong. That is the first question I had. It is not the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik); it is over to the Minister of Environment. I got that straight.

Secondly, the minister mentioned how do we respond? I am not worried about how we respond. The question I was asking was the question I got from the lady in north St. Boniface, who said, how do we prevent this in the future? Does the minister's

protocol include a way to prevent these incidents from taking place in the future?

Mr. Praznik: Madam Chairperson, just to clarify a little further, the lead minister—I mean we all have some responsibility, the Department of Labour has some—is the Minister of Environment, but the protocol deals with issues of licensing, of enforcement and dealing with the situations when they occur. So it is a multifaceted protocol.

* (1640)

Mr. Doer: Given the public interest in this issue, and given the fact that the public received three possible causes of a major explosion in a residential setting some two years ago, will this document be tabled and made public in the Legislature? Can I get a copy of that protocol?

Mr. Praznik: Oh, yes, Madam Chairperson, when we have completed it and are ready to put it in place, I not only believe it should be tabled, but our whole purpose is to get it out there, make it widely known and make it common information to everybody who is involved, so they know how everyone interacts on those important issues. Certainly, I would be more than pleased.

Mr. Doer: The minister said a minute ago, we have a protocol, and now he said, when we have it ready to be public. So I have got two different answers, I think, from the same issue. Maybe I am wrong. Is the protocol completed and can we have a copy of it, please?

Mr. Praznik: Madam Chairperson, we have, and perhaps there is some misunderstanding in what I said to the member. The interjurisdictional committee drafted a protocol; it went to Workplace Safety and Health, to their advisory council. They have provided some commentary. The protocol currently is with the interjurisdictional committee who are dealing with the commentary of the Workplace Safety and Health advisory committee.

Just for the member's information, the intergovernmental committee included the Workplace Safety and Support Services division, Manitoba Labour; Fire Commissioner's office; Department of Environment; Rural Development; City of Winnipeg Fire Department, Labour Canada, Transport Canada, and Manitoba Municipal Administrators. So it is a large group. The member is aware that it is not always easy to bring people together. They need some time to take the work of Workplace Safety and Health Advisory Council,

take their information and put it together. When that is completed—

Mr. Doer: Oh, it is not completed.

Mr. Praznik: I never said it was. I said we have a substantive protocol. We have commentary back from the advisory council. The interjurisdictional committee is now dealing with that commentary. When they have completed their work, and we have agreement on the protocol, then it will become public. I am getting a signal from the gallery from Mr. Tom Farrell, who is in charge of Workplace Safety and Health, that somewhere from four to eight weeks we should have that completed.

Mr. Doer: Thank you.

Mr. Praznik: My pleasure.

Madam Chairman: Item 2.(d) Fire Prevention: (1) Salaries \$1,482,000—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$1,157,100—pass.

2.(e) Engineering Safety Services: (1) Salaries—

Mr. Ashton: Madam Chairperson, I note the reduction in this department of four positions, the Professional/Technical branch, just dealing with the Engineering Safety in general, and I wonder if the minister could explain the reason for the reduction in this area, given its fairly important activities in terms of safety codes, building codes, safety standards, generally.

Mr. Praznik: Yes, Madam Chairperson, what we have done since the budget process is within this particular branch. We had four vacancies which we eliminated. The seven remaining staff—if I may just preface this for a moment. One of the interesting things that comes out of the envelope process of budget making is where deputy ministers, who otherwise may not have the opportunity to review each other's departments, do. We came to some conclusions, as did Rural Development, that the services provided by this particular branch would have a much better delivery mechanism within the Department of Rural Development. So the seven staff years have now been or are in the process of being transferred to the Department of Rural Development which will now administer that particular activity. Just for the member's information, this particular area deals with a certain number of building inspections, but primarily the review of plans and support to municipalities.

The Manitoba Association of Urban Municipalities at their convention a year or two ago passed a

resolution requesting that a greater number of inspection services be assumed by municipalities instead of being provided by this area. I know as minister in spending some time with staff in this particular area, because I made it a habit in some of these very technical areas to talk with my staff and see what their comments are about delivery, their advice to me as well was that their role would be better suited in seeing some of those functions go to the municipalities who have inspectors in place, and they would provide the backup support services. They would be available to be called in when it was something those people could not handle and thus provide, I think, a better delivery mechanism across the province.

We ran into some difficulties, I think, in Winnipeg Beach where there was a confusion about inspection. That led to some not-so-good results, and this is one way I think of correcting it.

Mr. Ashton: Madam Chairperson, I have a number of concerns. It is fine to transfer from one department to another, but generally resources are being reduced by government, and I have that particular concern. I am also concerned about any offloading that might take place in terms of relying on municipalities in this area. I know I get many concerns expressed about building safety matters, and there really is a great deal of confusion, not just at Winnipeg Beach but generally, about who is responsible for what.

Even I do not know in a lot cases, and I have checked into it. I have talked to various people. I know in my own constituency I am extremely concerned about unsafe buildings that, in my opinion, do not meet building safety codes and standards and many of which should be condemned.

I am rather concerned about that because this is, by the way, not the first time that there have been changes in the department affecting safety and inspection. There were reductions in other years previously, and this is one other area, I would say, should be a priority. I realize this at the building level as well, but it also deals with building safety and provides technical support to municipal authorities. I feel, if anything, there needs to be fairly strong direction to the municipalities to ensure that we do not see the types of situations develop.

We do have unsafe buildings. I would invite the minister to inspect some of the buildings I have been

in. They are unsafe, in my opinion. Yet there is sort of a Catch-22. Different jurisdictions, people concerned about the impact of closing a building down, where are the people going to go, there is no alternate accommodation, et cetera—I raised that with the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ernst).

I know in the case of my own constituency there was a point at which there was panic actually amongst some Emergency Measures officials—well, not panic, but there was a great deal of concern that they might end up with unsafe buildings being closed down and having the problem to deal with what do they do in terms of the people. Some of these problems go right back, in my mind, to meeting building codes, safety codes, and I really believe there needs to be greater direction and significant amount of resources put into place in this particular time.

I realize there are other matters as well in terms of fire safety. I did not deal with it under that section, but there are aspects there. I have seen many a building, to my mind, which is unsafe, is a fire trap, a fire hazard, with doors that have been nailed shut, emergency exit doors, with fire extinguishers, et cetera. I realize that is dealt with by other sections of the department, but what I see is too many gaps, people falling through those gaps, people living in circumstances that are unsafe, and I want to express my concern. I am not satisfied with the minister's explanation. We will be monitoring this in upcoming years.

Mr. Praznik: Madam Chairperson, I certainly appreciate the concerns of the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton). He mentions the confusion in dealing with this area, and it is certainly an area that I had lots of questions when I became minister as to how the scheme functions.

The province has jurisdiction, and of course where municipalities have taken that over, in many cases have given it up, and just for his information there are only 28 municipalities in the province where we have responsibility for inspection and issuing the building permits for all buildings. In 147 municipalities we only maintain responsibility for buildings three storeys or greater and 600 square metres in ground floor. So in the vast majority of municipalities they have taken over that responsibility from the province.

The advent of the planning districts back in '76 and their much more elaborate inspection systems

have become far greater in delivering these types of services and we have seen the municipalities take over more and more of these areas. I know municipalities have been asking for more and more of those functions, simply because they have the ability to deliver that service better.

* (1650)

When I spoke with my own staff in the area, it became very clear that building inspectors in municipalities, smaller area, much more aware of what is happening, much better to inspect, issue building permits, do those kinds of things. What they have been asking us to provide is the support information, the review of larger plans, when they run into difficulties having someone available to come out and help them with those difficulties, particularly in the approval of plans for large buildings, et cetera. That is the kind of role that this branch has been moving into over the last couple of decades, and will continue to do in the Department of Rural Development.

As to violations of the fire code, et cetera, once a building permit is issued, the local fire chief has the authority to inspect and enforce the code and, where they are made aware of those situations, do. So we have, in a nutshell, a very effective system of administration in most municipalities now through their building inspector, local fire chief, et cetera, and we hope to be able to provide an enhanced support service to them in carrying out those functions.

Madam Chairman: 2.(e) Engineering Safety Services: (1) Salaries \$408,400—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$40,600—pass.

Item 2.(f) Conciliation and Mediation Services: (1) Salaries \$370,000.

Mr. Edwards: Madam Chairperson, the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger) I am sure will want to learn all that comes out under this particular heading. It is a very important one in the Department of Labour. I know he has probably had this question on the tip of his tongue himself many times. This branch—I think this particular group's importance in the area of labour relations cannot be overstated. I have nothing but good things to say about the people who work in this branch. They do a very, very fine job, and I happen to have personal knowledge of the job they do.

Madam Chairperson, I simply want to -(interjection)- Well, one of the nice things about this group is, by their nature, they do not take sides.

They get involved and do the conciliation and mediation job. We could probably use some of their efforts right here in this Chamber. I do not think they would want to assist us, particularly, but I am sure we could use them.

I want to know whether or not the workload is increasing or decreasing for this group. I hope it is increasing, but I would like to know if the minister knows offhand how many requests they got as compared to former years or, indeed, whether those requests have been from the department itself, the minister himself, or requests from outside parties.

Mr. Praznik: Madam Chairman, there are very few ministers who can claim to, or are often accused of, having the angels in their department, and Conciliation and Mediation is one of those areas whose reputation has grown over the years to the point where we joke about them coming in for Estimates and taking the bow up in the gallery, but I appreciate your commentary.

I am advised that normally—since I have only been minister for less than a year—there is a cycle to the work of Conciliation and Mediation. They are, obviously, in one of the busy ends of the cycle. They advise me as well that they are able to cope with the workload that is there. It is something that I am aware of and I certainly like to monitor as minister, because there is only so much that human beings are able to do. The people and the staff in Conciliation and Mediation do go above and beyond in their service to the people of this province.

I appreciate your comments and I thank you for them on their behalf.

Mr. Edwards: Madam Chairperson, I wonder if the minister might have any information specific to my question, which was whether or not the number of requests is growing? I know on a yearly basis it has cycles, perhaps, but I am talking year to year. Have there been more requests in the last year than in prior years, or is the level of activity being referred to this branch on the decrease?

Mr. Praznik: Their workload has been increasing. I do not have the specific numbers for you. If you would like me to get them maybe on a 10-year, 15-year time frame we certainly will, and I think staff would accommodate you with those numbers. What I am advised for those who follow this is that they tend to be cyclical. We are certainly moving towards the high end of the cycle. Their workload

has been increasing, and they have still managed to do a very admirable job in resolving disputes.

I appreciate your concern. It is something I share with the member and monitor regularly.

Madam Chairman: Item 2.(f) Conciliation and Mediation Services: (1) Salaries \$370,000—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$46,300—pass.

2.(g) Pension Commission: (1) Salaries \$247,900—

Mr. Ashton: Madam Chairman, we are on the Pension Commission, are we? Yes, just to confirm.

I am just wondering in terms of pensions, there have been particular concerns about various discussion papers, et cetera, various proposals in terms of pensions. I would like to ask the minister what the current situation of the government is, both in terms of pensions, generally, and also in terms of Civil Service pensions, in particular, the Civil Service superannuation that we have in place in Manitoba. I ask that in the context that, for example, in Alberta there has been a major controversy involving changes to Civil Service pensions, et cetera. I would like to know what review is ongoing of both the Civil Service and other pensions?

Mr. Praznik: Madam Chairperson, there are three areas in the member for Thompson's (Mr. Ashton) question. The first, with respect to pensions, one of the great dilemmas or great issues that is facing the Pension Commission today in Manitoba is they are looking at dropping the number of private pension plans that exist. That is a great concern to me because we should be encouraging people to put dollars away for their retirement. The vehicle of a pension plan has come to, shall we say, having a declining usage across the province. The vehicle of an RRSP tends to become a favourite vehicle, and it has given us great concern because a pension plan still should be a very, very good vehicle.

We prepared a discussion paper at the Pension Commission, The Promotion of Private Pension Plans in Manitoba. There has been a host of consultations going on. I know as we have groups coming to my office interested, we have been steering them there to make their comments and their recommendations. I am looking for a final report from them with recommendations sometime in the fall, if they are able to put that together.

What I am particularly interested in is why in our province are employers and employees not opting for the vehicle of a private pension, and hopefully

we will have some answers to that and some recommendations to reverse that rather alarming trend.

The second area with respect to the Civil Service pension fund, I want to indicate—I am just checking my numbers—we currently have just in the Superannuation Fund over \$1 billion of unfunded liability, and it gives me great concern. I do not point any fingers. Back in the '60s, the government of the day, Duff Roblin, made the decision to use those dollars and only fund the current liability of our pension fund. Regrettably, that has resulted over numerous governments and numerous decades an unfunded liability of well over a billion dollars.

In other words, our civil servants, the government's contributions to their pension plan are not there quite frankly, and their pension plan is not as secure as one would hope that it would have been. That gives us great concern. I know the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) and myself are exploring ways. We have had some discussions, and will over the next year, as to how we address that problem. It has taken 30 years to get to it. We may have to take a long period of time to get out to it, but it is a great problem.

The third area that I take it the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) has addressed are specific changes in our pension plan. The advisory groups with respect to our own Superannuation Fund have made some recommendations. The employees' side of that fund currently has a surplus from what is needed to meet their liabilities. They are making some recommendations to enhance the fund. Obviously, the government is not in a position to match those, but there is precedent where those dollars have been used. Employees' dollars, employees' contributions have been used to enhance the fund at their expense, using those dollars without the government objecting and not incurring additional liabilities.

So those are presently before us, and we are working towards, hopefully this fall, negotiating with them in that particular area. I still add to the comment that the greatest threat to our employees' pensions is the fact that collectively we have not, as employer of all parties, contributed over the last 30 years to the fund and have left it in a state that in most cases would be severely criticized by the potential recipients of that fund. So it is something that gives us all great concern, particularly when you add it to the other liabilities of our province. You can

see that we are not in good financial shape as a government in this province or as a Legislature in this province.

* (1700)

Madam Chairman: Order, please. The hour being 5 p.m., I am interrupting the proceedings for private members' hour. This committee will reconvene at 8 p.m. this evening.

Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. Speaker: The hour being 5 p.m., time for Private Members' Business.

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

Res. 31—Funding for Arts

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Point Douglas (Mr. Hickes), that

WHEREAS Manitoba has a vibrant and active cultural life shared by a large cross section of the population; and

WHEREAS fostering and developing of the arts in Manitoba is a public good and worthy of increased public support; and

WHEREAS the Manitoba Arts Policy Review Committee Report of May 1990 recommended that the government of Manitoba commit itself to total provincial funding to the arts at a level of 0.7 percent of total estimated government operating expenditures by the year 2000; and

WHEREAS there are serious concerns in the arts community that these funding objectives will not be met.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba urge the government of Manitoba to confirm its commitment to this recommendation of the Arts Policy Review Committee Report; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Assembly urge the government of Manitoba to seriously consider the benefits to the community of providing the increased levels of funding called for in the Arts Policy Review Committee Report of May 1990.

Motion presented.

Ms. Friesen: Mr. Speaker, my purpose in moving this resolution is to draw attention to the DeFehr report or the report of 1990 that the government commissioned and to offer support to the minister in raising this with her colleagues.

This was a long study of many months which involved a wide cross section of the arts community. We have not heard very much of it since. I think during the election there was a genuine interest in the fate of the DeFehr report. A lot of people had taken part in the hearings, had made presentations, some of them very lengthy and very detailed ones. In the arts forum debate, which was held at the Gas Station during the election campaign last year, I think there was a great deal of interest and a very well-attended meeting.

There was general support I think for some of the recommendations of that committee, particularly for arts education, in many areas for the support of an arts act. There was general support I think for the .7 percent goal by the year 2000 that is expressed in the DeFehr report and a sharing I think of anxiety that an increasing amount of arts funding is coming from lottery revenues rather than from regular revenue of the government.

There was some opposition. I would not want to say that there was whole-hearted support of every recommendation in the DeFehr commission. I, myself, had some reservations about the tendency to emphasize private patronage and private funding. This is always part of patronage of the arts, always has been, but it does have a tendency, Mr. Speaker, to support only certain types of, generally speaking, relatively tried-and-true, successful, conservative, with a small "c," types of artistic endeavour. The idea of moving by the year 2000 to .7 percent, I think, is one that had the support of most people in that audience and there certainly have been concerns during the election, since the election and in the many months that the Legislature has been sitting that the government does not appear to be moving on this.

The idea of a special percentage of government expenditures for art is not a new one. It is used by many jurisdictions. It has been used in the government of Manitoba and the Government of Canada when, in days of new buildings that 1 percent of expenditure on a particular building—whether it is a heritage building that is being restored or whether it is a new building—that there be an expenditure of 1 percent for art or for

particular architectural endeavours. It is a way of measuring the pace of expenditures and establishing a constant amount that the community can monitor. I think it is not an unusual conclusion. It is not an unusual type of policy and it is one that has a general support in the community.

I do not know why we have not heard much about it. I think one has to have genuine sympathy with all ministers of culture in times of recession, particularly in North America where the arts are not in many jurisdictions seen as the engine of the economy. They are seen as a frill, or they are seen perhaps at best as entertainment. I think that is one of the things that all ministers of culture, whatever political stripe, whatever government, do have to contend with. I genuinely offer my sympathy to the minister and want to raise this issue in the sense of trying to draw it to the public attention, and if there is a way that it can be of assistance to her, to also ensure that it is seen in that light.

In the context in North America today it is also very difficult to get a hearing for experimental art, for state support of the arts, particularly in the United States where the entertainment industry is seen as a very important lobby. In Canada, I think, we have always held to the idea that state support for the arts is something which is a common good and which we would all support.

It is very disturbing, Mr. Speaker, to see the way in which the United States is pursuing the Mexican free trade deal at the moment, emphasizing that culture, cultural industries, the entertainment industry must be part of the new free trade agreement. So far the Canadian government has said no, that this will not be the case, and I want to lend our support to the minister as she speaks to her federal colleagues to argue in fact that we hope that this will continue, and to support that particular approach that it must not be a part of any bargaining in a larger North American free trade agreement. I think that is an approach which would be shared by Manitobans and Canadians of most political stripes, although I am not sure what the Reform Party—it seems to me to have a different cultural perspective, a different North American perspective on many of its policies than any of the so-called older parties.

* (1710)

State support of the arts as a principle is not what is at issue here. It is not generally challenged in Canada as it may be in other parts of North America.

Since the Second World War particularly, state support of the arts in Canada, in western Europe and in parts of Asia has become a very important role for government funds. It is partly because of the loss of private fortunes. It is partly because of the decline of the great landed estates of western Europe and elsewhere and it is something which the state, for a variety of reasons, perhaps a part of the expansion of the welfare state in some areas, has taken upon itself. It has also been, I think, one of the purposes of the expansion of state participation to expand accessibility, to expand the varieties and the experimental nature of the arts. In all of those areas, I think the state has a role to play that is generally accepted by Canadians.

So the issue, Mr. Speaker, is not whether the state should support the arts. The issue is by how much and in what areas and in what ways should we be supporting it. This government, when it was in a minority position, did commission an arts review. It was not the first that governments have established across Canada. Remember the Massey Commission just after the Second World War. Many others have proceeded at both the provincial and the federal level. Some of them, particularly the Massey Commission, have had important effects upon Canadian cultural life.

The most recent one that the Manitoba government commissioned was the DeFehr commission which, amongst other things, argued that lottery monies should go into general revenues and that arts funding should reach this targeted amount by the year 2000. The government has taken a great deal of time to study this. I know the minister has replied to this in a number of situations, has not ruled out the possibility, has not ruled out that goal as an option, as a choice for the government.

I want to assure her that this stage is certainly something that the official opposition would support, and we would want to see the government move to that position and perhaps demonstrate to us the steps that they are beginning to take in those areas. There are certainly fears within the community. I am sure the minister has heard them as well, people on this side of the House, that the commission is becoming a dead letter and that the government has not yet indicated to the community the steps that it is taking, or will be taking, to reach that goal.

Meanwhile the community does see, and again the minister has heard this a number of times in

Estimates, that arts money is becoming increasingly reliant on lottery monies and that this is something about which people have considerable concerns. It is an unstable form of revenue. We all perhaps know these arguments very well. It is not possible, I do not think—perhaps unfortunately—to say that in a recession lottery revenues will drastically decline, but they do become unstable. They are unpredictable.

So I do not think, and I am sure the minister would agree, that it is not a wise move for any Minister of Culture in the long run. It is not necessarily something that anybody would choose, but certainly a temptation in a recession when the claims on government become very urgent, when the government has to deal with unilateral cuts in its funding from the federal level, that there are certainly difficulties that the government is addressing. I do not want to get into debating the causes of the recession or the way the government has chosen to handle it, because my purpose here is to draw attention to the review, to offer the minister support, and to ask that she at least give us some idea of the kind of steps that the government is considering in moving towards this goal that had, I believe, the community support.

The recommendation of moving to .7 percent of expenditures would, as the arts community has indicated, in many cases double the amount that the government is currently spending on the arts in Manitoba. It would be a greatly appreciated, obviously much needed—however you define need—part of arts funding. We cannot rely on the private sector as the Bovey report and, as to some extent, the DeFehr report also argue. We must increase the amount of money that is coming from the state.

I am interested by an article that was in *The Globe and Mail* some time ago by Michael Valpy which quotes Allan Taylor, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of the Royal Bank of Canada, who described the history of Canadian corporate charity as, quote, not a proud record. The statistics that he offered were that Canadian corporations, relatively speaking, today give less than half of what they gave in the 1950s and 1960s. In 1989, total giving in absolute dollars was less than it was in 1983, although corporate pretax profits in 1989 were \$22 billion more than in 1983.

It is partly because of the recognition of that parsimony of Canadian corporations that the

Imagine campaign has been undertaken. We do not know the total effects of that. We certainly wish it well. We do anticipate that Canadian corporations will and should expand their work in the area of the arts and culture generally, but at the moment we cannot, as the chairman of the Royal Bank indicates, rely upon the generosity of the private sector.

In the last budget we did see cuts to many major institutions in Manitoba, again not something, I am sure, the minister would have chosen. As she has reiterated on many other occasions, cabinet has chosen other priorities. I think it is these kinds of changes and the prospect that they might be intensified over the next few years which has led to many concerns in the community generally.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that funding of the arts is an economic prospect as well as a cultural prospect. The arts generate jobs. Scores of federal and provincial studies have shown the ripple effects of investment in the arts. If we look at Manitoba even in the last year, we know very clearly the amount of jobs and paybacks, the amount of money that has been raised for charity, just in the area of film. I spoke recently in the House on this and pointed out the role of CIDO, particularly the role of the National Film Board, and the way in which our arts and film industry, in particular, is generating a great deal of interest and, certainly, economic impact in Manitoba as well.

If you look at other areas of Manitoba, cultural industries, the Winnipeg Film Group, if you look at dance, if you look at festivals across Manitoba, one of the things that strikes you is, first of all, the wide range of activities in the arts in Manitoba. It is not just film. It is film and dance and writing and literature and publishing, a tremendous range of artistic endeavours.

It is also experimental, and that is why I think it is important to recognize the role of government funding, because whereas the Bovey Commission may want us to move toward private funding, the DeFehr commission may want the same thing, it is possible that the Imagine campaign that is being run federally may improve the situation for corporate funding; but generally speaking, corporate funding tends to go to the safe and the secure. It does not go necessarily to things like the Winnipeg Film Group; it does not go perhaps to performance artists; it does not go to experimental festivals with smaller numbers of participants.

If you look at the things that Manitoba has had over the last few years, whether it has been the mime festival or whether it has been artists like Wanda Koop or Mike Olito or the poems of Valgardson and Dennis Cooley, it is in the experimental, in the new, in the things which perhaps shock and startle us that we have developed very strongly.

If you look at the Manitoba Museum of Man and Nature, a very interesting and experimental program that they ran recently in astronomy in the presentation of a program on Ojibway astronomy, and working with the community. That is unique, I think, in Canadian museums and Canadian artistic policy. We look at the experimental activities of Rachel Browne, for example, in the choreography of the Contemporary Dancers—a wide range of new and innovative activities which have all benefited in the past from government expenditures. So I want to, I think—

An Honourable Member: Conclude.

Ms. Friesen:—conclude—thank you—by emphasizing for the minister our support, to emphasize the support that she would have from the community in adopting these resolutions, that Manitobans in the past have had the talent for ingenuity. They have the talent of the—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member's time has expired.

* (1720)

Committee Change

Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas): May I ask leave to rescind the committee change I made for Tuesday, July 16, 1991, 10 a.m.? It was for Agriculture, the member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) for the member for Interlake (Mr. Clif Evans).

Mr. Speaker: Could the honourable member have leave? Leave. It is agreed. I would like to thank the honourable member for Point Douglas.

* * *

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to stand in the House today and indicate some of the progress that has been made with the arts and in the arts community over the last couple of years. I recognize that we receive some fairly good support from members of the opposition on some of the

recommendations that were made in the DeFehr report.

If I might just go back in history in the province of Manitoba, the last Arts Policy Review that had been done before this one was undertaken was some 10 years ago under another Conservative administration, the administration of Sterling Lyon, and there were some considerable recommendations that were made at that time. A decade had passed, and we had had six and a half years of NDP administration. I believe that probably back in the Sterling Lyon years, the NDP would have supported the recommendations that were made at that time, too, when they were in opposition, but in fact all of the recommendations from that policy review some 10 years before had not been accomplished. We did have six and a half years of NDP administration to accomplish and to follow through with the recommendations that had been made.

So, Mr. Speaker, I know when there are recommendations that come forward, it is extremely easy for the opposition to support and to look to the government to provide all of the solutions and solve all of the problems. It is much easier in opposition to be supportive than it is actually when you are in government to carry through with the recommendations that have been made.

So I do want to indicate that it was a major undertaking. It was a fairly long and extensive process where all members of the community had the opportunity to come forward, express their points of view. The committee compiled that information and came forward with a policy review that would lead future governments over the next decade in funding for the arts.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP critic first mentioned arts education, and that was one area that was examined and was addressed in the report. I am pleased to say that we have started a process whereby both the Deputy Ministers of Education and the Department of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship have established a working group on arts education. I guess the main focus of that working group will be access to education opportunities throughout the province of Manitoba. It is not something that can happen overnight. We at least now have the two departments working together to try to find some solutions to some of the problems that are experienced and some of the real needs that are out there in the area of arts education.

Another point that has been raised, and it has been raised by both opposition parties, is Lotteries funding to the arts in Manitoba and the sense that there is increased dependency on Lotteries funding for the arts. I must say that if it had not been for major increases in Lotteries funding and the arts being funded through Lotteries over the last number of years, you would not have seen the extensive increases in funding to the arts that were experienced because of Lotteries revenues.

I will just explain what had happened in the past when the Arts Council received a certain percentage of the lottery pie for arts funding. In the years when Lotteries funding was increasing by leaps and bounds, I might say up to 18 percent to 20 percent over a period of years, in fact funding for the arts flourished.

Unfortunately, a department of culture within a provincial government would never receive those increases in funding. There are budgetary guidelines that are set down, and while the Arts Council was receiving an 18 percent increase, the Department of Culture would only receive the annual 3 percent increase. So we felt that the Arts Council was able to do much, much more as a result of the increase in Lotteries funding.

Mr. Speaker, if I might comment, I think that Lotteries funding is a much more stable source of funding and there are, even though minimal increases these years, there are still increases in Lotteries funding where there are not increases in government revenues to date. When you look at funding and dependency on Lotteries, I think the arts has benefited as a result of Lotteries funding over the years. I know that they will continue to receive funding through lottery sources in the future. Just as the former New Democratic government did not change the sources of funding to the arts I do not think you would see any governments in the future changing that source.

I just want to talk a little bit about the budget and the comments that I have had from the arts community as a result of our budget. Yes, there were some reductions in some areas, decisions that we as a government made very carefully and not without some pain, I must admit, because we all would like to be all things to all people and be able to continue our funding at all levels and in all departments.

I have said, as I said in Estimates and as I have said in the House many times, government had some very difficult choices to make, and many departments had to accept some reductions because the priorities of our government were health care, social services and education. Those are the three largest departments that require the largest amounts of budget from government. Mr. Speaker, the rest of us have had to share in the responsibility of trying to keep the deficit as low as possible and ensure that we are maintaining those essential services while still attempting to fund, not only the arts, culture and heritage, but other areas of government.

I believe the arts fared very well through this budget process. I have letters from arts organizations that were probably expecting and anticipating there would be further major and very serious reductions, that found they are able to live with the grants that have been given to them this year and have commended government, as a matter of fact, for the decisions that we have made.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is not all doom and gloom. When the economy is better, we do know too that we will have more money to spend in other areas besides health, education and social services, and we will be able to see some increases. I do want to say that we looked internally at the administration in the Department of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship and, administratively, we took a bigger hit than any of the organizations externally.

What we wanted to do was ensure that the arts organizations that we were funding received the programming money as much as possible that they needed, and we internally streamlined the department so that, in fact, we could give as much money as possible to the artists and the organizations that we do fund.

* (1730)

Mr. Speaker, I do want to address for a few moments the recommendation and the policy review that talked about .7 percent of the provincial budget by the year 2000 going to the arts. At the time we released the policy review, I indicated that it was a very laudable goal. I have never completely committed to .7 percent funding for the arts. I have indicated that at the end of a 10-year period, whatever government, the government of the day that is in power will have to look at what they have

accomplished as compared to that recommendation.

I think that we are a government that might state quite clearly that a certain percentage of the budget does not necessarily mean that you are doing good things or bad things or doing the right things. I would prefer to see us funding the arts as the needs arise, not just setting a figure and pulling a figure out of somewhere and saying this is what the funding for arts will be, whether the need is there or the need is not there. I think that we as a government will be and have been and will continue to look at the needs and fund the needs rather than trying to meet a dollar or percentage figure.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP critic also did talk about our film industry and the major accomplishments that we have made. That was one of the areas, of course, where we were able to maintain funding in the arts, because we realize and recognize what a viable industry we have. It certainly does create jobs, and it certainly is an area that has major potential. We have seen the good things that have happened in film over the last number of years. The ERDA agreement was in place for five years. It took a few years to get up and running, and now we are just seeing the fruits of the financial commitment that was put into our film industry. I have indicated in the past, and I will indicate today in the House, that it is an area we will continue as a provincial government to fund, because we see the very positive benefits to the economy and to the cultural life of our province.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other areas in the arts, too, that contribute in a very, very positive way to the well-being of our province of Manitoba.

One area I would like to mention is an area that we have, I believe, since we have been in government, made a major commitment to in funding of the arts, and that is in capital funding. Some over 20 years ago now many of our facilities were built in the centennial year of our province with major capital input, and that was, I think, where some of the first Lotteries dollars were spent. In the last 20 years, those buildings have been sadly neglected, and I must say about 15 out of those 20-some years were NDP governments that put something like \$300,000 per year into capital upgrading of our cultural facilities. As a result of that, those institutions were sadly neglected, and all in need of some very major upgrading and repair.

We have made some major capital commitments of several millions of dollars over the last two years of our administration to upgrade and maintain those facilities. Unless you have good facilities for those artists to perform in our province, we are not going to have a terribly vibrant cultural life.

Mr. Speaker, there is much more I could say, but I think at this point in time, I would like to move, seconded by the member for St. Vital (Mrs. Render),

THAT the resolution be amended by substituting all words after the first paragraph, with the following:

WHEREAS the government of Manitoba had the wisdom to seek solutions to challenges facing artists and the arts community by appointing an Arts Policy Review Committee; and

WHEREAS the government is currently studying the Arts Policy Review Committee Report to review recommendations and set a course for further action; and

WHEREAS the government has maintained the grant funding to the Manitoba Arts Council despite the fiscal challenge our province faces; and

WHEREAS the government has demonstrated leadership by increasing capital allocations to major cultural institutions in Manitoba to correct the sad state of disrepair many have fallen into; and

WHEREAS the government of Manitoba has demonstrated its commitment to the cultural industries of Manitoba.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba congratulate the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship for demonstrating leadership in the field of the Arts; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Assembly congratulate the government of Manitoba for continuing to recognize the important role of the Arts in the culture and heritage of Manitoba.

Thank you.

Motion presented.

Mr. Speaker: The resolution is in order.

Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne): I wonder if I may get a copy of the amendment. The committee did not supply copies.

Mr. Speaker: It is coming right now.

Mr. Alcock: I would like to reserve some of my remarks on this subamendment directly until I see the copy of the specific amendment, but I think one of the THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVEDs was that

the Legislature of Manitoba congratulate the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation for showing leadership in the funding of the arts, in support of the arts. So I would like to do that.

I would really like to congratulate a Minister of Culture in this province for showing leadership in the support of the arts in this province because I think it is time we had some of that. I have been involved with this arts community for some number of years and count among my friends a number of the artists and performers in this province. I was chairman of the board of the Prairie Theatre Exchange for a number of years and had an opportunity to deal with the department and to consider in some depth the funding problem of arts that the arts face in this province.

I want to, in thinking about the amendment that the minister has proposed, see it in the light of the resolution that the member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen) has brought forward. What I believe the member is attempting to do is to say—and asking this Chamber to say—very clearly that the arts and culture are important in this province and important beyond the good wishes or whims of the government, that we have gone past the point that we began at, really, where kings and noble persons hired people to entertain them and that what particular forms of art or entertainment got supported depended on the things that they happened to personally enjoy. We began to recognize that the arts and culture—culture as differentiated from entertainment—is something that is pretty important to us, to the people who live here.

It was interesting, I was reading as I was travelling yesterday, a rather devastating report in *The Economist* about Canada and the nature of this country. What they talk about is how we have a country that is so diverse that a group within it that has a very solid and a well-identified culture is beginning to see itself as being more important than the whole. One of the questions that they raised is, is our policy of multiculturalism simply going to create more of that? Are we simply going to have more small groups that come up and begin to see themselves as more important than the whole?

The problem is that is not an off-setting vision. We know what it is to be a hyphenated Canadian, but we are not certain what it is to be a Canadian, and then sense that is what arts is all about, that is what culture is all about is to talk to us and to reflect

to us about what we are about. I am not certain when we look at some of the objectives that we try to meet with our policy right now, that simply seeing rather less-than-perfect productions of off-Broadway shows does that and that what creates a vision that we can hold up to the rest of the world and say, this is us; this is Canadian; this is our country; this is what we stand for; this is how we are unique and different, is not something that should be produced elsewhere. It should come out of a vibrant, local community. We have that here.

* (1740)

We have that as a result of some expenditure of a great deal of energy on the part of a lot of people, the willingness of our corporate sector to invest very heavily. There are a number of corporations here that give a significant amount of support to culture and a body of government policy. I am going to give credit to a former Minister of Culture and Heritage, and that is Eugene Kostyra, who, when he became minister back in the early '80s was one of the first ministers, in my experience, who actually went out to the arts community, who worked with local artists, who attempted to understand the structural problems that they faced as they attempted to build an industry here.

One of the issues that arises for me, as I think about this, when we are talking about spending, the government's own review says we are spending less than four-tenths of 1 percent of our total budget on the arts in this province. The recommendation the member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen) is referencing is that we should try to raise that a little bit. One of the things that is often put forward by the arts community is that when we spend on arts what we are spending on is employment because we have a large number of people. We are blessed by the fact that they are prepared to work for the sake of their art, because they certainly do not earn what a lot of us would define as a living wage at this. They do it truly for the love of the work itself.

What we are saying is that it is out of that work we get things like "Section 23". "Section 23" was a play that if you took it to Montreal, nobody would be interested in it; if you took it to B.C., nobody would be interested in it. In Manitoba, it is very interesting, and it is very important because it is about us. It is about our history; it is about our background. It talks a little bit about what it is to be a Manitoban in the country of Canada. "A Flush of Tories" was another piece that was commissioned here and came

forward and did the same thing. Good play—a little more national appeal.

The point is, it was not something that told us about life in Tennessee or in Paris. That is important, too, but what we need to start doing is saying to ourselves in this country, that we have something specific to talk about. That is something that a lot of small, independent theatrical groups in this province are trying to do. They are trying to describe what is happening in Brandon, what is important about the immigration of the Mennonites into the eastern part of the province. They are trying to preserve that history and bring it forward and keep it, and keep it alive, so that the people get a sense of our uniqueness as a people.

So what the member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen) is saying, and she is echoing the minister's and the department's own report, is let us structure that. Let us not leave it to the whims of a government. Let us not just say, well, if we have got one group in and they happen to be supportive of the small organizations, they will get some strength. Then we get another group in and they are more supportive of the big organizations, and they will get some strength. They are saying let us recognize culture as something that is so vital and so important to the life of this community that we, by policy, put aside a chunk of support for this, that we are going to see that that community gets to support itself.

Now, I have to tell you, I am a little concerned about the recommendation, because I am not certain that you create works of art through policy. I am not certain that by fiat you can say, well, 1 percent of the budget will produce this much culture and .7 percent will produce this much and 4 percent will produce this, because culture is what we are. I mean we have always had it; it has always flourished; it has always existed, because it is part of the human condition to tell stories about itself and to think hard about the relationships that exist between people and communities.

What this will do, and it was demonstrated by the ERDAs that the minister referenced, is it will build that necessary infrastructure that allows young artists to test their craft. Because you have got to produce a lot of mediocre art in order to produce a masterpiece. You have got to fail a lot as you test and try in order to produce excellence.

That is what we have developed in this province, particularly in this last, I would say, about 15 years.

I would give the Lyon government some credit for it, because they were quite understanding of this and they worked hard to see that arts organizations had some support.

You know, one of the things that always happens, and I have not been before the Arts Council for some time, but certainly when I used to go as the chairman of the board of the Prairie Theatre Exchange, they used to always say there was—well, the cultural pie is only this big, and if we give you a little bit more, we have got to give somebody else a little bit less. I believe that they quite intentionally attempted to set the arts community on each other to get us fighting among ourselves to divert attention from the fact that as a community we need to be saying that this is important.

Why is it that a city the size of Edmonton can support seven professional theatres and a similar sized city in Manitoba can only support three, maybe four? Why is that? Is it that they have a more generous corporate community? I do not believe so. We have got an extremely generous corporate community. I think in part it is because they have been willing to recognize from a very early stage the strategic importance of supporting developing art, and I think that is something that we are doing in this province. I think it is something that we need to do more of.

When the minister asks us to congratulate her for showing leadership in this field, I am a little hesitant to support that resolution because I have not seen it. I have seen the appointing of a committee that has made some recommendations that would provide some leadership, but I do not see a willingness on the part of the government to adopt the recommendations, and that is what the member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen) is asking us to do, is to simply act upon the recommendations.

We have a government—in fact, I was sitting a little earlier with someone in the loges just talking about the government and how it has changed. We have a government that a year ago I might have accepted, I might have believed was willing to provide leadership in an area as sensitive as the arts, a government which believed in openness and communication and negotiation and tolerance, but that is not the kind of government we have. The kind of leadership that this government shows is in shutting down dissent, closing off celebration, not embracing the difference and the diversity that we have in this community. So I do not think that this

minister or this government has done anything to earn the accolades that are contained within this amendment. I am disappointed by that because I think that as a people we suffer very badly when we do not support something as important to this community and to this country.

If I can come back for a minute to this article in *The Economist*, it ends with a paragraph that says—and this is a major piece of work, some dozen pages within *The Economist*, it is a major contribution to the discussion of this country internationally—they say, Canada is a very nice country that is going to become a part of the United States, and it is too bad.

That is certainly *The Economist's* opinion at this point, and I agree, it is too bad. I think one of the ways that we can fight back is to put a little more energy into defining who and what we are, so that that result which the international community is seeing as becoming inevitable does not come about, because I think we all lose, and I frankly think that the world loses.

So I cannot support the subamendment. I would like to support the resolution and would urge the Chamber to defeat the subamendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

* (1750)

Ms. Frlesen: Speaking to the amendment, which has certainly disappointed me, I had offered, I thought, nonpartisan support to the minister. I have tried to sympathize with the position of all cultural ministers in Canada in times of recession. I tried to offer the support of the community as I understood it, and certainly of our support for attempting to move toward those goals of .7 percent.

We are a little further ahead, Mr. Speaker, because I think what the minister has put on the record is that the government has indeed considered this particular aspect of the DeFehr report and that, as the minister said, they preferred to meet the needs as they arise rather than meet a percentage or dollar figure, so there certainly seems to be a clear rejection there of one specific aspect of the report that the minister indeed commissioned and which was, I believe, supported not just by the people in her own party at large but also by the community in general.

These were goals. People were looking for steps by which the government would choose to meet these, and it is interesting to see that the

government is certainly backing off that particular review and the recommendations that it had.

The minister also chose to put on record the achievements, obviously unnaturally of this particular government, and she mentioned the capital amounts that have been supplied to the Centennial foundation. I do not know if she was referencing any other capital expenditures, but certainly there have been major expenditures to the Centennial Corporation for the renovations and for the reconstruction of parts of the buildings, and certainly we would applaud that. We are glad to see that those buildings are being kept up and that they will continue to serve Manitobans for a long period of time.

The minister also made reference to the ERDA Agreement, which they have continued to support, and we certainly confirm that we initiated that particular agreement. It was a \$20-million agreement that Mr. Kostyra, the former Minister of Culture and Heritage, initiated for the people of Manitoba, and as I said in my nonpolitical statement last week, we are glad to see that this particular government has continued to support that.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly cannot support this amendment congratulating the minister for the initiatives and wisdom of their solutions. I certainly do not accept the criticism that was offered of earlier governments. To suggest that nothing was done in culture or the arts over the years of the NDP government is really to considerably stretch the truth. This was the government which provided assistance and development of the Children's Festival, of a new cultural centre in Manitoba, which brought ethnocultural activities and performances into the mainstream of Manitoba life, which assisted very dramatically in the debt reduction of the symphony and of Contemporary Dancers, which created the Manitoba prize, the Prix Manitoba, to recognize individual and collective achievement of all areas of the arts and heritage and which perhaps in many ways the one which is having the most immediate impact on us now, negotiated that ERDA agreement with the federal government, which has made so much difference to the film industry in Manitoba and to individual film makers and to local communities across Manitoba.

If I were to compare this, Mr. Speaker, to the kind of leadership which we are seeing from Conservative governments in culture, I think it is very important to notice that we are all now working

in the context of the federal Tories who are setting out to destroy one of the most major culturalized institutions that we have across this country, and that is the CBC.

If you look at the destruction of the CBC, piece by piece, year by year, by this federal government, you look at the kind of cuts which the government has brought in, in a number of Secretary of State programs, particularly to ethnocultural organizations, if you look at the cuts to the NFB that have been made in the last five or six years, I think you will see that there is a systematic attempt to undercut state support for cultural activities in Canada.

I mentioned the Bovey report before which attempts to push the burden of support onto the private sector. Although we would welcome certainly the private sector living up to its obligations, at least to the amount that it did 20 years ago, Mr. Speaker, we certainly do not support the thrust of both the federal Conservative government and the Bovey recommendations which aim to treat art as a commodity, something which can only be bought and sold in the marketplace and which does not have the broader cultural implications and the broader cultural expression. On this side of the House we look at culture and in fact in our own policies, whether it was in multiculturalism or festivals or in the support for major institutions such as the symphony, that we try to see the arts a part of a much broader cultural framework, as a way in which we speak to each other, a way in which we speak to each other in the face of the onslaught of North American television and the North American entertainment industry.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, we have to look at the .7 percent as an ambitious goal perhaps for Manitoba but certainly one which is achievable and one that we could certainly take steps to meet. I would like to have seen the minister perhaps look at some of the reasons that she is not prepared to do that, if that is indeed the answer that is coming with this particular resolution. Because we have seen cuts in Manitoba—I mentioned some in the earlier part of this hour—but we have seen cuts to the Winnipeg Art Gallery and to the Museum of Man and Nature which seem to compound the kind of large cuts that they are experiencing from the federal government.

The museum's assistance program which provided block grants, quite large block grants to the Winnipeg Art Gallery and to the Museum of Man and

Nature, in fact, which considered them in a sense as national institutions, those are being very quickly withdrawn and at the same time the provincial government has cut those major institutions. It is important, Mr. Speaker, to notice the regional role that these major institutions play. The Museum of Man and Nature is not just one large institution on Main Street, but it is an institution which has an impact right across the province which provides education and assistance and conservation facilities and extension work right across the province which represents Manitoba in a national sense, in a sense—I think one of the ways of looking at it is a national western museum, one which, of course, has won tremendous accolades both within Canada and outside Canada. It has received, as we all know, three stars in the Michelin Guide and is in fact one of the cultural treasures of Manitoba.

Similarly, the Winnipeg Art Gallery. It is a major institution, used to receive large federal grants, has been cut by both the federal and provincial governments, and it performs a function within the province which is not performed by anyone else. It has the focus of the library, of the extension activities and of the research into the history of Manitoba art which cannot be done by the smaller institutions across the province. They are certainly not funded to do that and for many of them that is not their focus either. The Winnipeg Art Gallery has a very specialized role within the province.

So I think the wisdom of this particular government and these particular government policies is not very readily apparent when we look at the major institutions and the way in which they have been treated.

Let us look at these smaller ones, the experimental ones, the ones which do need the state support which are not going to get the private funding. The mime festival, the Franco-Manitoban societies, the Native Communications groups, all of which received cuts through this budget. Some of them received cuts apparently because their audience was too small, perhaps others received cuts because they were too experimental, but, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly where state support for the arts must come in. It must maintain the ability of the arts to shock us, not just to entertain us. The arts have to be able to challenge us, to create dissent and that is the kind of thing that we look to some aspects of state support—not just state support, but certainly some aspects of it, because those are the

kinds of things which are not going to be funded by the private corporations or the small or large business groups in Canada.

Funding for the arts is not just about, as the phrase goes, putting bums in seats. It is about speaking to each other, it is about expanding education, expanding accessibility, of assisting artists to develop their talents, of providing the support for people who are going to make national names for themselves and international names for themselves.

For far too long, Mr. Speaker, what the arts have done, and this is not just in Manitoba, but certainly in Manitoba as well, is that the individual artists have been subsidizing the cultural production, cultural industries of Manitoba, whether they have been visual artists, whether they have been designers, whether they have been dancers, or whether they have been arts administrators, they all are, generally speaking, with one or two exceptions, very lowly paid employees. They tend to be very young.

Many of them in fact cannot support families on the kind of wages and salaries which they are obliged to accept in support of the culture and arts which we all enjoy.

So I am disappointed by this resolution. I had hoped that the minister would accept the support that we were offering her, that she would have taken the support of the community and used it in fact in her discussions with her own cabinet colleagues.

As I suggested, this is a difficult time for all Culture ministers. We were trying to put on the record our own support for this particular recommendation of the DeFehr commission—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. When this matter is again before the House, the honourable member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen) will have four minutes remaining.

The hour being 6 p.m., this House is now recessed. I have the understanding that the House will reconvene at 8 p.m. in Committee of Supply.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, July 15, 1991

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Presenting Petitions

The Pines Project
Martindale 4592

Reading and Receiving Petitions

The Pines Project
Reid 4592

Presenting Reports by

Standing and Special Committees

Law Amendments
Reimer 4592

Public Utilities and Natural Resources
Vodrey 4594

Tabling of Reports

Annual Reports:
Public Trustee, 1988-90
Law Enforcement Review Agency, 1989
McCrae 4595

Oral Questions

Child and Family Services
Doer; Filmon 4595

Bill 70
Ashton; Filmon; Edwards 4596

Standing Committees
Edwards; Manness 4599

Bill 70
Ashton; Filmon 4599

Highway 491
Plohman; Driedger 4600

Civil Service Appointments
Carstairs; Filmon 4601

Amarjeet Warraich
Carstairs; Filmon 4602

Seech Gajadharsingh
Martindale; Filmon 4602

Amarjeet Warraich
Martindale; Filmon 4603

Civil Service Positions
Martindale; Filmon 4603

Antiracism Programs
Cerilli; Mitchelson 4603

Nonpolitical Statements

Death of Bill Ziprick, Provincial Auditor
Filmon 4603

L. Evans 4604

Carstairs 4604

Tribute to Hadley Archer, Assembly Page
Stefanson 4604

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Report Stage

Bill 8, Vital Statistics Amendment Act 4606

Bill 12, Court of Queen's Bench Small
Claims Practices Amendment Act 4606

Bill 36, Legal Aid Services Society
of Manitoba Amendment Act 4606

Bill 52, Family Maintenance
Amendment Act 4606

Bill 60, Law Society Amendment Act 4606

Second Readings

Bill 75, Manitoba Employee
Ownership Fund Corporation and
Consequential Amendments Act
Stefanson 4606

Debate on Second Readings

Bill 4, Health Services Insurance
Amendment Act
Cheema 4609
Ashton 4610
Orchard 4610

Bill 51, Pharmaceutical Act
Cheema 4611
Orchard 4612

Concurrent Committees of Supply

Fitness and Sport	4612
Labour	4627

Private Members' Business

Proposed Resolutions

Res. 31, Funding for Arts	
Friesen	4647
Mitchelson	4650
Alcock	4652