

ISSN 0542-5492



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

29 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Harry E. Graham
Speaker*



VOL. XXVIII No. 70B - 8:00 p.m., MONDAY, 2 JUNE, 1980

Printed by W.T. Matwichyna, Queens Printer, Province of Manitoba

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty - First Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, A. R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANDERSON, Bob	Springfield	PC
BANMAN, Hon. Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BARROW, Tom	Flin Flon	NDP
BLAKE, David	Minnedosa	PC
BOSTROM, Harvey	Rupertsland	NDP
BOYCE, J. R. (Bud)	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
CHERNIACK, Q.C., Saul	St. Johns	NDP
CORRIN, Brian	Wellington	NDP
COSENS, Hon. Keith A.	Gimli	PC
COWAN, Jay	Churchill	NDP
CRAIK, Hon. Donald W.	Riel	PC
DESJARDINS, Laurent L.	St. Boniface	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	NDP
DOMINO, Len	St. Matthews	PC
DOWNEY, Hon. Jim	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	PC
EINARSON, Henry J.	Rock Lake	PC
ENNS, Hon. Harry J.	Lakeside	PC
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
FERGUSON, James R.	Gladstone	PC
FILMON, Gary	River Heights	PC
FOX, Peter	Kildonan	NDP
GALBRAITH, Jim	Dauphin	PC
GOURLAY, Hon. Doug	Swan River	PC
GRAHAM, Hon. Harry E.	Birtle-Russell	PC
GREEN, Q.C., Sidney	Inkster	Ind
HANUSCHAK, Ben	Burrows	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd G.	Portage la Prairie	PC
JENKINS, William	Logan	NDP
JOHNSTON, Hon. J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
JORGENSON, Hon. Warner H.	Morris	PC
KOVNATS, Abe	Radisson	PC
LYON, Hon. Sterling R.	Charleswood	PC
MacMASTER, Hon. Ken	Thompson	PC
MALINOWSKI, Donald	Point Douglas	NDP
McBRYDE, Ronald	The Pas	NDP
McGILL, Hon. Edward	Brandon West	PC
McGREGOR, Morris	Viriden	PC
MCKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., Hon. Gerald W. J.	Osborne	PC
MILLER, Saul A.	Seven Oaks	NDP
MINAKER, Hon. George	St. James	PC
ORCHARD, Hon. Donald	Pembina	PC
PARASIUK, Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PAWLEY, Q.C., Howard	Selkirk	NDP
PRICE, Hon. Norma	Assiniboia	PC
RANSOM, Hon. Brian	Souris-Killarney	PC
SCHROEDER, Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SHERMAN, Hon. L. R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
STEEN, Warren	Crescentwood	PC
URUSKI, Billie	St. George	NDP
USKIW, Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, D. James	St. Vital	NDP
WESTBURY, June	Fort Rouge	Lib
WILSON, Robert G.	Wolseley	PC

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 2 June, 1980

Time — 8:00 p.m.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY — NORTHERN AFFAIRS

MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor (Virden): Call the committee to order. We're on Northern Affairs, Resolution 113, 1.(b) — the Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Well, before the break for Private Members' Hour, we were discussing in general terms some of the difficulties that are facing this government in regard to northern Manitoba. I'd like to continue on that vein very briefly, if I can, because I know the Minister and other members of this committee are anxious to get into the line by line in the detail of these estimates. But I think it's important to paint the overview before we proceed in that fashion.

Mr. Chairperson, it's a situation that confronts the Minister that is one of not of his own making. I think we have to make that very clear right from the beginning that there is a historical reason that the conditions that his government faces, that the people of northern Manitoba face, are there. It's historical and it's not a situation that can be assessed to any particular government. But the fact is that finding that situation as it exists, there is, at least in my opinion and in the opinion of my party and my government when it was in government, that severe and strong action must be taken immediately to order to deal with some longstanding problems. It's not a matter of going in and saying, well, we can accomplish this in time; we can proceed on the same basis on which we proceed in other jurisdictions or in other areas of the province, that we can go step by step. There is a necessity for some very major changes to be made immediately.

The reason for that basically is not so much that the conditions themselves are so onerous but that the result of those conditions are very devastating in human terms and in economic terms. The north is quite literally a third-world country when compared to southern Manitoba. It is an area where the life expectancy is far less than it is in southern Manitoba; where a child who is born has less of a chance of making it to age one than does his or her counterpart in southern Manitoba or in rural Manitoba; where a person has less opportunity of completing their education; where a person born to the north has less opportunity of finding gainful employment, of developing skills that will enable them to continue with that gainful employment. It is a situation whereby all standards that we use to determine the quality of life, we shall find the northern people are on the lesser end of the scale in regard to the situations that confront them.

The situations that confront them are very basic, indeed. The Minister mentioned one of them, water supply. Well, if you don't have adequate water supply, and by that I mean safe water supply, you are going to find yourself with the sorts of conditions

that we presently find in the north. You are going to find that you have an increased infant mortality, because small children are unable many times to cope as well as adults are with the problems that are manifested as a result of poor water conditions. You will find unhealthy children because of that. You will find unhealthy mothers because of that and that has to have an impact on the child. So that is an area of grave concern and it's an area in which the Minister has been doing some work, has been directing some other effort but when we come to a situation like Cross Lake, that initiative and that commitment on the part of the government seems to fall apart. There does not, in my opinion, seem to have been the type of immediate action that was necessitated by the very severe complaints that have been coming out of the community of Cross Lake in regard to their water supply. We know the quality of that water supply, at least, is deteriorating. We know also that the water levels are lessening or are lower this year than they were in previous years. That's a very serious problem that confronts the Minister, again not one of his making, but one that he must act on and act on relatively quickly and act on in a decisive manner.

We also know that if a child is fortunate to make it through those early formative years — and in the north, especially in the remote communities, it is a matter of being fortunate enough — but if that does happen, that they are going to face conditions from then on which are peculiar to northern Manitoba and which will again put them at a disadvantage to persons in other jurisdictions, in other areas of the province.

Number one, there is a lower level of income; average income per family is much lower in northern Manitoba, yet the costs are much higher for food, for shelter, for gasoline. For almost any consumer item that you would wish to direct your attention to, the prices much higher, primarily due to the transportation costs, the extra costs of getting foodstuffs and other consumer goods to northern Manitoba, but also due to the fact that in certain communities there is not a wide range of stores from which to shop and from which to choose. There is a certain amount of that situation being taken advantage of by persons, and that's something the government has to direct its attention to. So that, too, is extremely important.

That is another disadvantage. You know, a youngster needs not only love, which they get, but they also need a stable diet, a good diet, a nutritious diet, a healthy diet, and far too often because of economic situations that exist again in the more communities primarily, but they're not exclusive to those communities, we find that diet is not accessible to the youngster. So in the formative years they are going to suffer nutritionally and that is going to have an impact on the rest of their lives. We are then going to find that when they do hit schooling, that the level of schooling is not to the same degree that it is in the southern parts of the province.

I'm not certain if there would be, especially in industrial communities, that much of a difference in

Monday, 2 June, 1980

the rural schools because I think the systems are much the same and that's something that we have to look to also. But in the more remote communities, I can tell you, especially the reservations, that there is an extreme difference and that is something that the government has to look to. Which brings us to another problem and that, of course, is the jurisdictional disputes that are constantly taking place in northern Manitoba and working, in almost all instances, to the detriment of the citizens of northern Manitoba. They are constantly being played off one government against the other. We find that this government has, a number of years ago, said that, to give but one example, the Critical Home Repair Program would not be available to persons of treaty status living on reserve communities because there were supposed to be federal programs that would supplement or take the place of that program. Yet, in fact, those people in those communities did want that program. That program did service their community, did serve a need and they were unable to get it even though they made representation to the government; even though I made representation to the government on their behalf and my colleagues did; and even though they went before the Human Rights Commission, they were unable to force the government to reimpose that program that was in place before. That is one small example of the changes that we have seen in northern Manitoba that have resulted in a decreased standard of living in regard to housing, in regard to food, in regard to the quality of life.

So a student gets into the educational system, if that system is not providing that student with the same benefits that other educational systems are then we will find that student will slip farther and farther behind. It seems as if the whole deck is stacked against that person right from the very start; it's as if someone had stamped victim across their forehead just because they were born in the remote part of northern Manitoba or even, in many instances, in close proximity or in an industrial community. When they do complete their schooling, if they do complete their schooling — because the fact is that there is a much higher drop-out rate in northern Manitoba than there is in southern Manitoba — you will find that they then have to face another frustration and that frustration is finding gainful employment, especially for persons again living in the more isolated communities — the Metis communities and the Reserve communities. There is just not the type of work available to them; there is not the opportunity available to them. So that they are never able to use a job, to use the same sort of work practices that we have been able to use building a job upon job upon job to develop the type of skills that will see them through the rest of their lives. There's many problems here and I was a bit taken aback when just the other day we were in one of the committees and someone — not a politician but someone from the bureaucracy — mentioned that one of the problems was that those people — and we were talking in that instance about persons in northern Manitoba — those people don't want to work. That is not the case at all.

There is a cultural influence at work which causes some great difficulty for people in transferring from one culture to another and that is where the

government can play a very prominent role in support services such as the Tawow Program, such as the programs to provide support mechanisms to persons coming from remote communities and wishing to work in the mining industry, as well as by their own enlightened hiring practices, encourage and develop that transference process from culture to culture. But the fact is that those programs are too far and few between; the fact is that those programs have not been expanded significantly and in fact have probably decreased somewhat under the Minister's government; and that we are moving backwards rather than forwards at a time when moving forwards is so absolutely necessary. So I'm certain we will discuss that in some detail as we go through these estimates.

Then of course we find widespread social problems due as a result of the frustration; due as a result of the lack of opportunity; due as a result of that sort of pressure that builds from seeing your future as bleak and black. There's many ways you can deal with the situation that confronts the Minister. You can try to, through enlightened programs and through progressive programs, try to overcome many of those difficulties; or you can do as I believe the Minister has done and the Minister before him has done and that's cut back on the programs and try to shift the programs and try to sink back into the colonial mentality that has been prevalent for so many hundreds of years and is the primary reason why we face the problems that we do today. I think that is tragic; I think that this government's reaction to the problems in northern Manitoba have been tragic. I recall the Minister's contribution to the Budget Debate when he read through a list of horror stories about housing that was built, horror stories about arenas and complexes that were built. In fact, he was absolutely correct in certain respects in the fact that there were many problems that came about as a result of our policies in regard to trying to encourage northern people to take some control over their own destiny. But they were problems that would have worked themselves out in time; they were problems that would have, over a period of time, become less and less and less as we were able to develop, in people who had presently not had opportunity to develop skills, those types of skills that were necessary to taking some control over their destiny, to escaping from that colonial attitude that not only is foisted upon them from outside, but after a certain period of time, becomes ingrown and becomes a part of their own thinking process. So the problems in fact were short term, but let's look at what's happened and, again, I'll give you one instance and we can draw parallels from it, since the Minister has had this portfolio as well as the Minister before him, because I realize the Minister has only had this portfolio for a short time. I went into South Indian Lake last summer for a while and they were building a laundromat in the community. I'd like to give you some background on what happened with that laundromat, as presented to me by the councillors and by some of the residents of that community. The laundromat had been housed in the school, or adjacent to the school as part of the school building but on the front of it. At that time the school decided that they needed a library so they decided to buy the

Monday, 2 June, 1980

laundromat from the community and put in its place a library. They did do that and they gave the community the money. Northern Affairs said that money did not belong to the community because of certain technicalities; the way the agreement was written up it belonged to Northern Affairs. The community in fact wanted to build a laundromat next to their shoreline. Northern Affairs came in and said that they couldn't build a laundromat there and so they spent several months doing soil samples and testing of the ground structures in the area to find out where they were going to build the laundromat. All this time there is no laundromat in the community because the original laundromat has been taken down and replaced by a library by the school. The people of the community also wanted to build that laundromat themselves; they wanted to take the money that they had received from the old laundromat and use it to build a laundromat, provide local employment and provide also a training ground for local persons to develop skills in not only construction but also in management, and also in being able to learn how to develop their own work crews, supervise their own work crews. Northern Affairs told them that they couldn't do that. Northern Affairs came in and started to build a laundromat for them and in fact after some fairly humorous shenanigans, if you were sitting and looking from the outside, but some fairly serious situations if you were indeed one who did not have a laundromat for that period of time, ended up building in exactly the same spot that the community had wanted to in the first place. They built the laundromat and then they took it down because it wasn't built properly. And when I was in there in the early fall, or actually in the middle fall, they were still building that laundromat.

That is the type of situation that we find now in northern Manitoba, where the control over one's destiny has been wrested from the northerners and placed in a bureaucracy, whether it works out of Thompson and whether it works out of Winnipeg is insignificant in comparison to what it does to the people of those communities, they feel as if they no longer have any control over their destiny. And that's why you've had, under this government, whole community councils threatening to step down and, in fact, a number of resignations. That's why you've had the sort of articles in the paper that you've had. This government is building up the levels of frustration in northern Manitoba to the extent where they are going to result in some very serious difficulties for the government.

So if, by these estimates, we can convince the Minister to take a second look at his policies and to take a look at what we were trying to do with all its imperfections and go back to trying to develop local skills in trying to develop local control over the activities of the community and the economic development in the community, I think in the long run we'll be far better off. We, of course, will suffer through the horror stories of the badly built arenas; we will suffer through the horror stories of the sometimes, misuse is too strong a word, but not most appropriate use of funding. Those are bound to happen, they happen anywhere in the province, they will happen moreso the farther you get away from the centres of control. So the solution to that is to

build in small centres of control in the different communities so that cannot happen.

That's something the Minister is going to have to look at. That's something the Minister is going to have to give a fair degree of attention to if he hopes ever — and I'm not certain that he does — but if he hopes ever to develop a north that reflects truly and accurately the interests of northerners. Because in order to do that, the reason I say I'm not certain that he hopes he does, in order to do that we're talking about a very significant change in our societal structure in northern Manitoba. We're talking about new concepts, new ideas, some of which I am certain are strange as well as frightening to those persons who don't share the desire for change such as that.

So we have a situation now that is not getting better; it is getting worse. It is a historical situation. We can't blame the government or the Minister or any one government or Minister for the fact that it exists, but I certainly do blame this government for what they have done and how they have exasperated the problems in their short term. I can tell him that, in my conversations with northerners, they indeed are upset; that they have very negative feelings towards this government; that they can't wait to be able to exercise their responsibility to vote so that they can show exactly how they feel about the government; and that they are eagerly awaiting a new government because they have no faith in this government's abilities to properly manage the north. They are awaiting the election of a new government when they can get back to again progressive change and positive change and change that, while sometimes difficult, will result in the long run in a much better northern Manitoba shaped in the interests and shaped for the interests of northerners. We will discuss that in some detail as we go through the estimates but I wanted to put those general statements on the record before proceeding, Mr. Chairperson.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. DOUG GOURLAY (Swan River): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This afternoon it was indicated that the members opposite would like me to table the Third Year Review and I was somewhat confused by this request because I was of the opinion that it had been tabled last year. However, further discussion indicated that maybe it hadn't but this information, if my consensus is correct, it was tabled a year ago but I have some extra copies here for the members. The Third Year Review was part of the agreement to deal with surface transportation which originally was only funded for the first three years where the rest of the sectors were for a five-year period. This was the reason for this Third Year Review. We'll be discussing it further when we come to the appropriate part of the estimates.

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

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding 339,500 for Northern Affairs—pass.

(3)(a)(1)—pass; (3)(a)(2)—pass — the Member for Churchill.

Monday, 2 June, 1980

MR. COWAN: Mr. Chairperson, on (3)(a)(1) . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, yes, that's right. (3)(a)(1)(a)—pass.

MR. COWAN: Could we have a breakdown on that from the Minister?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GOURLAY: This section provides training to the councils and council clerks, community election officials, monitors community accounts and records, progress reports, actively involves community in planning and any physical and political developments, and also monitors the election process in the various communities.

MR. COWAN: Would this be the appropriate area then to discuss the Minister's statement, during his opening remarks, that there would be in 1980 five more communities under local control as compared to 21 before, that it would now be 26?

MR. GOURLAY: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister could elaborate a bit further on that statement he made in his opening remarks, that is, the community's advancement towards self-administration. What exactly is he definind as self-administration? Could he provide us with a list of those communities that are now self-administered and those that are predicted to be self-administered over this fiscal year under consideration?

MR. GOURLAY: Basically, when they become self-administrating, they are in a position to issue their own cheques and set their own budgets and collections and so forth.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, in The Northern Affairs Act, there is a provision for communities to move towards incorporated status and I would like the Minister to elaborate on that, if during this period of self-administration are any of these communities indicating a desire to move towards a fully incorporated status and what measures are the department taking to try to move the communities towards this status?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GOURLAY: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. To date we've had no requests from any of the communities to become incorporated. However, we are looking at this whole situation with respect to incorporation and hopefully there will be some desire on the part of communities to become incorporated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: The Minister in his opening remarks indicated, as I said before, that there were 21 self-administering communities and they would hope to add to that number five communities this year. I'd ask the Minister if he can indicate how many self-

administering communities there were in 1977, 1978 and 1979.

MR. GOURLAY: In 1977 there were 23; in 1978 down to 21; in 1979 there were 21 and 1980, 26.

MR. COWAN: Does that mean that there are 26 now or that they would hope to have 26 by the end of the year?

MR. GOURLAY: By the end of the current year.

MR. COWAN: Can the Minister indicate, perhaps, why there was a drop of two from '77 and '78? What were the circumstances behind that reduction in the number of self-administered communities?

MR. GOURLAY: I should indicate that at the present time there are actually 23, with the indication this will increase to 26 by the end of 1980.

Now with respect to why the number dropped from 23 in 1977 to 21 the following year, there were financial problems in a couple of the communities.

MR. COWAN: Can the Minister provide us with more detail than that as to exactly what kind of problems they were and what procedures were followed in regard to dropping those communities from a self-administering status to an otherwise status?

MR. GOURLAY: As was mentioned earlier, there were some problems with finances and this was made a joint responsibility until such time as the financial situation improved. This has since corrected itself in those two communities and they are again self-administering.

MR. COWAN: So if I understand the Minister correctly, Mr. Chairperson, all we have now is the same number that we had in 1977, a no-growth situation, and the Minister would hope to, by the end of the year, add three communities to the number of self-administering communities; is that correct?

MR. GOURLAY: That's right.

MR. COWAN: Then I'd ask the Minister why there was a no-growth situation for the last two-and-a-half years? Why it was that there was no addition to the number of self-administering communities by his government? And the question that immediately falls upon that is, why is there going to be this year if there hasn't been for the past two-and-a-half years? Can he explain what circumstances are different now that were not in place a couple of years ago?

MR. GOURLAY: The communities that get into the self-administration, of course, have to show some expertise in money management and so forth, and this situation remained fairly static for the last three or four years.

MR. COWAN: I'd ask the Minister why it remained fairly static. Was there a reduction in activity of his department in this regard or did they hit some problem areas that they felt were more difficult to overcome than problem areas that had been hit in previous years? Or was there a lack of commitment

Monday, 2 June, 1980

from his government in regard to proceeding along this path of self-administration?

MR. GOURLAY: In order to become self-administering communities, the request has to come from the communities themselves, and requests were not forthcoming until this year. There has been an indication that there'll be 23 now and there'll be another three before the end of the year.

MR. COWAN: So in three years now, since 1977, the Minister is indicating that there have been only three requests for status as a self-administering community from all the communities that fall under his jurisdiction.

MR. GOURLAY: There will be an increase of five this year, from 21 to 26. We're currently at 23.

MR. COWAN: Yes, but from 1977 there were in fact 23. Two of those five were communities that were self-administering and three of them appear to be additional communities that have not been self-administering in the past. I'd ask the Minister is those three were the only three new requests that his department has received since 1977, or have there been requests that have been turned down?

MR. GOURLAY: No, those are the only ones. In a great many communities there appears to be no interest, at this point.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. To what does a Minister attribute this lack of interest in becoming a self-administered community? It would seem to me that there are certain advantages to that status of being a self-administered community. It would seem to me that the communities would wish to work towards it unless, of course, they didn't believe that the support services were in place in order to enable them to become self-administering on a practical basis, or unless they didn't know that that option was in fact an option that was open to them, that there had been no sort of encouragement on the part of his department to, No. 1, explain to them the process by which they became self-administering and, No. 2, provide to them the sorts of support that they would need in order to make the request. Because that request, in itself, is a fairly significant step for a community to take and it's not going to take it on its own. So I'd ask the Minister what sort of support services and what sort of educational services they've had in place.

MR. GOURLAY: There are a number of communities that wished and were in a position to become self-administering and looking back, 1976-77, it remained constant. I would say, in the short time that I've been in the portfolio there has been shown to me a desire on the part of staff to encourage the communities to become self-administering and I think there appears that another three will be reaching this status before the end of the year. It looks like, at this point, there could be another three or four next year and it seems to go in that type of cycle, where there's a number of years, or three years, where there was basically no change and now we're running into a situation where there's

a number of communities will become self-administering.

MR. COWAN: Well seeing as how the Minister has decided to go back past beyond 1977 and refer to 1976 here, I would ask the Minister to drop back a couple of years from that and bring us up-to-date from perhaps 1970 so that we can see the full growth pattern, in order to determine if, in fact, there is a cyclical process at work here.

MR. GOURLAY: I don't have the figures before me before 1976 but there is some indication that they were considerably less prior to 1976, however, we can try and get this information for you.

MR. COWAN: I'd appreciate that, just to satisfy my own curiosity, if nothing more. I notice the members on the opposite side of the table are wondering why I wanted to go back quite so far. Well, No. 1 is to see the type of development that has been ongoing in that; and No. 2, is to see if, in fact as the Minister suggests, there is a cyclical process because I can see how there could be, in the respect that one community becomes self-administering and if it happens to be in an area, in close proximity by other communities, it would be an encouragement on the part of the other communities to become self-administering. That could happen but I would have to see it in actual numerical terms before I would accept it as having happened and then one, of course, would have to try to analyse why, in fact, it does work that way. Because I believe it is a significant step in the development of a community for them to take on the responsibility of becoming self-administering and I believe that the government should be encouraging it and should be providing the type of support mechanisms that are necessary for the communities to make that, what might appear at the time, difficult move. I would hope that by the information that I have requested we will be able to judge in fact this government's record against the previous government's record and I think that's a logical area to look into, in order to determine what has changed since this government has come into power.

So having asked those questions, I would ask the Minister presently how many staff he has working in this particular area and what services they are performing and what jobs they are performing?

MR. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. At the present time, we have 26 SMYs, an increase of two this past year.

MR. COWAN: Could I ask the Minister then what those two increased persons will be doing, what their job function is?

MR. GOURLAY: These are two additional co-ordinators in the communities.

MR. COWAN: Well, just to make certain that I've understood the Minister correctly, last year there were 24 SMYs in this particular area, this year there are 26 and the two new ones are working directly with the communities as co-ordinators or are they working with other staff as co-ordinators?

Monday, 2 June, 1980

MR. GOURLAY: Yes, that's true. They will be working with the communities as co-ordinators.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)(1)(a)—pass; (1)(b)—pass; (1)(c)—pass — the Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: On 3.(a)(1)(b) there is a significant decrease in the dollar value of the Other Expenditures. Can the Minister account for that decrease?

MR. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, most of this was over-budgeted in the year 1979-80.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)(b)—pass — the Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Yes, the Minister indicates that it was over-budgeted for the previous year, can the Minister indicate how much money was actually spent then in the previous year?

MR. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, there was actually 127,000 spent.

MR. COWAN: Perhaps the Minister then can indicate what areas weren't spent in regard to the appropriation of last year which was 219,600.00. In general terms, I don't ask for specifics but just what areas were over-budgeted for?

MR. GOURLAY: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. The reduction was primarily in the travel reduction.

MR. COWAN: Does that mean that the staff in fact were doing less travelling than they were in the previous year or that they were doing less travelling than was anticipated for them in the budget?

MR. GOURLAY: No, they weren't doing less travelling but they were using more of the scheduled airflights rather than charter service.

MR. COWAN: So the Minister is saying then in fact there was no decreased travel into the communities but that in fact they were relying on different modes of transportation.

MR. GOURLAY: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)(b)—pass; (1)(c)—pass; (1)(d)—pass — the Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: On the — I should keep my hand in the air maybe and then I could avoid some going back and forth — there is a significant increase here in the Fire Program, I'd ask the Minister if he could detail that for us briefly.

MR. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There was a considerably increased training program initiated for this year and training outside of the communities, Brandon College, Fire College, is one instance and of course there is other regional training in Thompson and Gimli.

MR. COWAN: I'm going to depart from my usual here and commend the government on this action. I believe I did so also during the Minister of Labour's

Estimates when, I don't know whether it was a similar program or a supplementary program or perhaps even the same program that we were talking about but I do believe that the government has recognized a very serious concern, a very serious problem and has acted in a responsible manner in regard to providing fire training to individuals in northern Manitoba who, in fact, have needed that training and will put that training to good use I'm certain. I know that in the past we have lost far too many persons because of tragic fires. I think the last one was in my own constituency in Ilford where we had a multiple loss and I shared some of the grief of my constituents in that regard, as I know everyone did in this House. That sort of tragedy need not have existed and it was, in large part, due to the fact that the people in that community who wanted to act, who desperately tried to act to put out the fire, did not have the proper training, had never had access to the proper training. It's no comment on them, other than to say that the will was there, it was just the training that was not given to them and that was in fact why we had a tragedy that perhaps, and perhaps because one has to second-guess in this regard, and perhaps that tragedy need not have happened. And so we commend all the efforts on the part of the government to increase the training of fire personnel; to increase the purchase of protective devices for homes, because that too is a very important part of the fire control program in northern Manitoba, to have an extinguisher in the house, to understand how to use that extinguisher, to make certain that the extinguisher is checked on a regular basis; to have in the community equipment that is available for larger fires, to make certain that people know how to use that equipment and also to make certain that equipment is in good repair at all times.

So I would just like to, as I feel it is important as an opposition member, to support the Minister in efforts that I believe to be significant and that I believe to be positive and this is exactly one of those areas. For whatever my commending the Minister is worth, I imagine it's probably worth as much as my criticizing the Minister, but for whatever it is worth, I do commend the Minister and the government on this particular issue and hope to see them expand this program in the future because it is indeed a very necessary program, a very important program and it's the type of program that is going to pay off in very positive results, both economic and both humanitarian results in the near future. So if I can be of any assistance to the Minister in this regard, either by support or by promoting his efforts in the communities, I assure him that I will do so in this specific regard. I don't want to get too general in my compliments because it always me feel bad afterwards, but I do think that this is a good program, worthy of the government's attention and I think the government has made some major innovative changes in this regard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GOURLAY: I'd like to take this opportunity to thank the Member for Churchill for those comments. They are appreciated. As a matter of interest, in 1978-79, there was only one fire department in northern communities and this year we have some

Monday, 2 June, 1980

25 fire departments in various communities. A big increase and so, the training costs account for the large increase or a large part of the increase. Just to briefly outline some of the training programs, there are two regional schools per area with 20 candidates per school. These regional schools were at Thompson, The Pas, Dauphin and Selkirk. Four N school firefighting courses with 15 candidates each; there were 3 fire prevention courses with 15 candidates each; 2 fire service instructors courses with 10 candidates in each one of those; 2 fire chiefs courses, 15 candidates each; 1 rescue course involving 15; Manitoba Fire College courses with 15 candidates and there was 150 local training schools involving 6 candidates each or involving a total of 900 people.

MR. COWAN: Just one question from that and that is the 150 schools that the Minister mentioned lastly. Are those schools that are held right in the community itself in regard to training local residents for fire protection?

MR. GOURLAY: Yes, they are held right in the local communities.

MR. COWAN: Again, I just want to suggest that I think that is a very positive way to go about it, to hold those schools in the community. It seems to, in the long term, have more impact. It seems also to increase the awareness of persons not attending the school but just living in the community while the school is ongoing and it has an educational purpose for the whole community, as well as an educational purpose for the individuals who are learning how to better protect their lives and their property. So I encourage the Minister in that regard specifically.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)(c)—pass; (1)(d)—pass; 3(a)(2)(a)—pass; (2)(b) — the Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Perhaps we can just have a breakdown on this from the Minister again as to staff person years and changes, if any.

MR. GOURLAY: On this section we have 12 SMYs and no increase for the current year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2)(a)—pass — the Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister would be more specific in what exactly this section of his department is responsible for.

MR. GOURLAY: This really involves the managers of the co-ordinators and secretaries and support.

MR. BOSTROM: It's the managers of the co-ordinators. Which section handles the salaries and wages for the co-ordinators?

MR. GOURLAY: The previous one was sharable with the Northlands and this one is not sharable.

MR. BOSTROM: I see. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think it would be appropriate to point out here to the Minister that the problems that appear to be coming

forth, to the opposition at least, from the communities indicate that the system, as we were discussing before the break for supper, is not working as well as we would hope it would work. That is, as I was mentioning earlier, that the co-ordinators appear to be not available to assist the communities at all times when they are required to assist the communities. Now, that may be a management problem, it may be a lack of staff. The other problem, as I indicated earlier, is that the co-ordinating system is not working out as well as a direct delivery system and that is where the department is delivering the programs directly through the department. I don't suppose that this message is getting through to the government because it appears they are not proposing to change their delivery program. However, where there are co-ordinators who are attempting to co-ordinate the delivery of programs through various departments, it appears that this is where the major problem arises as far as the communities are concerned. They feel that they are getting the buck passed by the co-ordinators who are not able to exercise the kind of authority they need to exercise in order to get the performance out of the other government departments. I wonder if the Minister can indicate if he has any idea of the problems in this area and if he has any suggestions for solutions to those problems.

MR. GOURLAY: Thanks, Mr. Chairman, in dealing with the item with respect to the co-ordinators, I'd like to indicate that the co-ordinators, on the average, visit the communities twice a month. However, there has been in one instance, in one community, where the co-ordinator was in seven times in one month and some of the communities feel that the co-ordinator comes in too often and doesn't let them get on with their own work. Also, the question with respect to co-ordinating the various departments, as I understand it, the previous government changed this so that there would be more co-ordination with the various departments. As Minister of Northern Affairs, I find that this has worked well from where I can see it. It avoids a duplication of services in the province and for the most part the co-ordinated effort has worked out reasonably well.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, it has achieved just the opposite in my opinion because rather than having a co-ordinator from Northern Affairs or a line delivery person handling departmental services to a community you now have several different departments having to deal with that community. If there is a road to be built in a community, for example, that, as I understand it, is handled not directly by the Department of Northern Affairs but there is a co-ordinator from Northern Affairs who is attempting to co-ordinate the efforts of the Department of Highways. The same applies for airstrip maintenance, airstrip construction, I think winter road construction. Where there communities relating to a co-ordinator for those things, they also have to relate to line departments of government, so that you have not one civil servant travelling to a community and dealing with all of the problems that arise in that community but you have several

Monday, 2 June, 1980

different departments. If you have a water system problem it's no longer Northern Affairs that handle it, it's another department. If you have a problem with respect to Public Works, as I understand it from your description earlier, you're depending on the Department of Government Services for these things, so that there is no longer that capability within one department to deliver those services to the community.

I'm not an advocate of all services being delivered by one department because I think that is not the way to go either; but as far as all of the local and municipal kinds of services that are delivered to a community, I think that these can be more efficiently delivered under the auspices of one department rather than having several different departments. Not only is it an advantage in terms of efficiency, in terms of having only one agent from the department travelling into the community, but it's also an advantage in terms of the performance of the department. Because when the Department of Northern Affairs had the responsibility of delivering services to communities, those were high priority items for them. That was their budget to deliver. Now you have the tail end. The Department of Highways may have a section in there to do roads in northern communities, and they end up doing those things the last item on their list of priorities, so to speak, so that many of these things, they never really got the job done in many cases.

I know of several communities that have complained to me about their roads not having been gravelled or roads not having been constructed when the budget was there. They should have been done over the summer, and no action was taken. Now it wasn't for lack of trying on the part of the coordinators. I'm not faulting them in this process, but I think that they did not have the authority or the clout to go to the Department of Highways and say, hey, this is a high priority; get on with the job and have this job completed during the construction season. Unfortunately, because that was only a minor item in terms of the agenda or the budget for the Department of Highways, they put it on a back burner and the end of the summer comes, the end of the construction season, and nothing is done. This has happened in more than one case and I think this is where the complaints are coming out from the communities, that they don't see the same kind of efficiency in performance from the Department of Northern Affairs that they saw in the past.

You can argue in other cases that there were problems in the administration in Northern Affairs before and I admit there probably were, but there were growing pains as a new department. But the fact that you have a budget for a department and they have a program to deliver, it's going to be delivered much more effectively through one line department than having several departments attempting to deliver several tiny packages, in relative terms. When one thinks of a small community and there may be half a mile or a mile of road to hook up to a new subdivision in a community, there may be a piece of water line to put in, there may be a pump house to build, that sort of thing, and you may have several different departments involved in those activities; whereas before the Department of Northern Affairs would

handle all of those things as a matter of their program budget. I think that's where you are having problems. That's where the communities are complaining.

Now you may choose to ignore those things and go merrily on your way and not attempt to find any solution to them, but I'm simply pointing out to you that I do not believe the system of having coordinators in the field, with several different departments responsible for delivering several different little pieces of the action, will ever work in practice.

MR. GOURLAY: I would say at the outset that I'd be the first to admit that . . . There are problems, no doubt, but the co-ordinator of the community is involved in all the projects, involved with the various departments that might be doing the work for the community. The major projects might be delivered by other departments or the smaller ones could be done by the community itself. This, I would say, is definitely on the increase. There is more and more work being done by the local communities in the north. The larger projects are done by other departments. For instance, in 1979, there were 115 projects, of which 105 were completed; plus there were 43 other projects that weren't originally planned for that were completed, as well. I think, sure there were problems, but I think the record speaks for itself that a lot was accomplished. For sure, you're not always going to make everybody happy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2)(a)—pass; (2)(b)—pass; (2)(c)—pass — the Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, on (2)(c), could the Minister indicate what he is planning to do with the funds?

MR. GOURLAY: In this section, this is the money that goes to the communities for their operation and maintenance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2)(c)—pass; (2)—pass; (3)(b)(1)—pass — the Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, rather than interrupt each time when we come to a section like this, I would ask in advance that the Minister put on the record what the appropriation is for, what staff man years are in each section, etc.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In this section there are 21 SMYs. There was an increase of 4 during the current year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (3)(b)(1)—pass — the Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate more specifically what this section is for, Community Works; what are the funds appropriated for?

MR. GOURLAY: This area covers the community infrastructure plans in conjunction with the community's local government services staff and

Monday, 2 June, 1980

other government departments for the delivery of the infrastructure requirements such as airports, water and sewer, or garbage facilities, subdivisions, or roads, and so forth. It also ensures that all water systems are operational, and safe drinking water. It trains local water system operators so that they can keep this thing functioning without having to call someone from a distance to work on it. It coordinates the regular inspection reports and submits water samples to the Department of Health, that sort of thing. It provides liaison with other departments and agencies.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(b)(1)—pass; 3.(b)(2)—pass; 3.(b)(3)—pass; 3.(c)(1)(a)—pass — the Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, my standing request is on the record.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister on (c).

MR. GOURLAY: On the 7 staff man years in this section, there is no change in the present year. The list of activities is staff training related to the development of local self government, develop training resources materials which directly support the development of local government units and maintains community profiles for some 50 northern and remote communities. It directs the taking and compilation of communities censuses in the Northern Affairs communities every three years. It carries out the functions of the principal electoral officer and maintains the departmental library.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)(1)(a)—pass; (1)(b)—pass; (1)(c)—pass — the Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, before we pass this section here, 3. Local Government Development, could the Minister elaborate on this section and indicate what changes, if any, he has made since he has become Minister in the delivery of services to local government, and what changes, if any, he is proposing for this year in terms of the delivery of those services; and the kinds of needs the department must meet in terms of local government development and in terms of developing councils to be better management units, in terms of the department assisting the communities in better planning, in terms of assisting the communities to become more self-reliant in the municipal status point of view? As I see this thing unfolding so far, I mean, there is very little change, if any, from when the NDP were in government, in terms of the section under consideration.

I would like to know if the Minister is looking at this from the point of view of changing the delivery system. The comments I made earlier related to items that were not so much the items that are in the budget but those that are not in the budget. This department is a failure, not by what it has in the budget but by what it does not have in the budget, and our criticism of the department is that they are concentrating too much on only that one side of the Northern Affairs mandate, original mandate, and that is of developing a municipal government. There is another mandate that we feel should be in the works

of Northern Affairs and that is to develop the total community, the community development, economic development particularly, where we assist the community councils to be more than simply municipal authorities. Because in many cases the people on the municipal councils in northern communities are the natural leaders in the community and people look to them to provide leadership, not only from a municipal point of view to look after the roads and airstrips and water systems but also to assist them in terms of dealing with government in a general way and helping them to develop their community from an economic point of view.

Now the government here appears to be doing a satisfactory job of carrying on those programs that were in place under the NDP government and that is of assisting the municipal side of the councils, but what are they doing further than that? I mean, are there any items in this budget to work with the communities in assisting them to be more than simply managers of the municipals services? That's a very small part of the community. Most communities in northern Manitoba are small units and have very few services. They're not like the rural municipalities you have in the south or the villages and municipal councils you have here, which naturally have a wider tax base and much more services to administer, and really look after things mainly from the municipal point of view and don't get involved in the economic side of affairs.

But in the local communities, my experience with the councils in the north are that they would like to be more than simply municipal councils. They would like to have a wider mandate and one of assisting their community from a point of view of total development, of looking at the economic side to see what resources can be developed, what programs can be established in the community to assist the community to develop job opportunities and resource development opportunities, for individuals and groups. And in fact where there is initiative lacking on the part of individuals and groups, the council in some cases takes on that leadership role in the community and attempts to get something going, a logging operation or a fishing operation or a wild rice harvesting operating, or whatever. I'm wondering if the department is looking at that or if they simply, as I suspect, are looking at the council simply as municipal units and doing a credible job of looking after that side of their mandate but not doing very much of the other that I'm discussing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (3)(b) . . .

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate a response from the Minister.

MR. GOURLAY: Without making a specific reference to Economic Development in this particular section here, the question as to what are we doing with the councils. It was indicated earlier the extensive program in fire protection. We're also in the process of revamping the election process and training for elected council members. We're planning to have the elections held over a one-month period rather than scattered throughout the year. We've had the concurrence from the communities to go this

Monday, 2 June, 1980

route. Also, as was indicated, although it was slow for a couple of years, it now appears that there's going to be an increased number of communities that are going to become self-administering. So those are some of the areas that we're working on.

The Economic Development, I think, we'll be dealing with that probably a little further on in the estimates, 4 (c).

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(d)—pass — the Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: The Minister indicates he'll probably be dealing with it further on in the estimates . . .

MR. GOURLAY: Under 4.(c).

MR. BOSTROM: . . . coming out in reality is that this department is not dealing with that aspect I'm discussing and that is the economic side of development in the communities has been completely left out of the Northern Affairs mandate. The previous Minister and this Minister have worked towards and achieved their goal of removing from Northern Affairs any mandate to work with the communities in northern Manitoba from an Economic Development and total community development point of view. They appear to be concentrating primarily on those things which are important. I'm not discounting them at all, but primarily they're working on things like the development of the councils as municipal units and that's a very important mandate for Northern Affairs and it's one which I commend them for doing. I don't criticize them for carrying that out. It's something which must be done and should be done vigorously, enthusiastically. But the other part of the mandate is equally important and it requires, I think, more initiative and more imagination and more ambition on the part of government than simply working with the councils from a municipal point of view. It's very easy to carry out that aspect of development in a community, where you turn someone, a local leader, into an effective administrator of the municipal services, that's essentially what you're doing in local government development. You're assisting them to develop into what southern Manitoba has enjoyed for many years, competent administrators of local services looking after the roads and the ditches and the drainage and the water services and all of the things that must be done. I mean, to me that's a very necessary part of local government. I find it personally very boring. If I was a municipal councillor I would be much more interested in the other aspect of it and I suppose that's why I'm interested in that and would like to see the Department of Northern Affairs pursuing that aspect of it and that is the development of the total community, not only the municipal side. But what will be the future economic base for that community? What's the point of putting in infrastructure? What's the point of putting in roads and water systems and subdivisions and arenas or recreational facilities, all these nice things that are important to have for services to the community, but what's the point of having those things if that community is going to dry up and die because there is no economic base? The economic base is equally as important as putting in municipal services and infrastructure and training

people to be effective managers of that infrastructure. It's equally important for Northern Affairs to work with those communities to ensure that they have a future and an economic base on which that community will be able to rely in the future, and be able to hopefully gather revenues from to be able to pay for some of these municipal services.

Right now the Department of Northern Affairs — I'm sure the Minister is painfully aware of that — is the department that pays for many of the services to northern communities. The economic base is not there for the communities to be able to pay through their local taxes for the infrastructure like many of the communities in southern Manitoba do. However, the mandate in Northern Affairs, the objective of Northern Affairs, should be to assist those communities to develop that economic base so they don't have to rely on a department like Northern Affairs forever; that some day they're going to be on their own, an incorporated council; they're going to have an economic base that they can rely on. Maybe in some communities it's an impossible dream but in some communities it's not. Some have a resource base that they could develop and build on and hopefully achieve a certain economic base, at least to provide a livelihood for a certain base of population over a long period of time and that's the kind of thing that the Northern Affairs Department should be doing. It should be relating the resources in the area to the community and being very honest with the community as well with respect to those resources and saying: These are your resources, this, as we can best estimate it, is the future potential for your community, these are the kind of job opportunities that these resources could hopefully provide for your community through proper development. There should be an opportunity there, a technical assistance and financial management and managerial assistance provided through a department like Northern Affairs to those communities so that they may develop that side of their community. That is a much more challenging task and a much more long-range useful task, than the one which this department appears to be simply carrying out now and that is of putting in municipal services and training councils to look after them.

MR. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I indicated what we were doing in this Municipal Support Services, training councillors and changing the election procedure and what not. Many of these things the people are asking for. When I mentioned that we'll be discussing the Economic Development later on in the estimates, I didn't mean to say that we weren't doing anything about it or we're not interested, we certainly are. However, at this particular section we're dealing with the municipal aspect of it and certainly I'd want to address the question of economic development further on in the estimates, which I have indicated come under 4.(c), I understand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(d)—pass; 4.(a) — sorry.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, I don't recall moving off (c) but I had a question on (d).

Monday, 2 June, 1980

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right, 3.(d) then. I'd passed 3.(c), I thought, but maybe we're . . . 3.(d) — the Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, this section contains the funding for various agencies which the department provides grant funding to. I wonder if the Minister could outline the agencies that fall under this section and how much, if any, grants are payable to them this year.

MR. GOURLAY: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. The Northern Association of Community Councils come under this section; Native Communications Incorporated; the Supplement to Tax Sharing.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that's an all-inclusive list. I wonder, has the Minister just paused or if he has more to add.

MR. GOURLAY: Yes. There's also the MMF Corps funding which is in this allocation.

MR. BOSTROM: Could the Minister indicate how much of a grant is payable to each of those associations?

MR. GOURLAY: Yes. The NACC this year is 167.6 thousand and the NCI is 95,000; the MMF Corps funding is 130.8 thousand and the Supplement to Tax Sharing is 15,000.00.

MR. BOSTROM: Does the Minister have a line on this budget where he pays money out to the councils as corps funding, as a payment per capita grant?

MR. GOURLAY: Yes, that's built into the payout directly to the community councils this year. That's built in as a payment to the councils rather than a . . .

MR. BOSTROM: Yes, Mr. Chairman. On that aspect of it I assume we have passed that somewhere or are we coming to that item in your budget, the payout to councils?

MR. GOURLAY: Yes, 3.(2)(c), Community Operations. That money is included in that budget there.

MR. BOSTROM: Can the Minister indicate on that if there has been any increase in the per capita grant to the councils? Is it the same amount as previous?

MR. GOURLAY: It's the same amount that's been paid in the past but it's added to the ongoing budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(d)—pass — the Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, the grant funding which the Minister indicated, there are four agencies, there are four items that he's indicated make up the 408,000 in the budget, can he indicate if these funds have been paid out to these organizations at this time?

MR. GOURLAY: The MMF has not been allocated and the NACC and the Native Communications are

quarterly payments and the first quarter has gone out to the NACC and the Native Communications.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, on that, I wonder if the Minister can indicate if he has made up his mind yet with respect to the Manitoba Metis Federation corps funding.

MR. GOURLAY: With respect to the MMF corps funding, as I announced a few days ago, an advisory committee has been established to look into all aspects of the funding to Metis organizations and delivery of programs to the Metis people. This committee has been requested to report back to me on or before the end of September and, until such time, no moneys will be paid out re the corps funding allocation.

MR. BOSTROM: Can the Minister indicate who makes up this committee which is investigating this matter and has the mandate to make recommendations to him?

MR. GOURLAY: I have contacted the MMF and the Manitoba Metis Confederacy as well as the Northern Community Councils and the Metis Women's Association and the Manitoba Association of Friendship Centres.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister saying that he has not yet set up the committee, that he has contacted these people or these organizations to make recommendations to him?

MR. GOURLAY: I'm in the process of getting names from these organizations to participate in this advisory committee. They've all been contacted and half of those that have been contacted have responded and I believe, there's still two organizations to hear from yet.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate who all will make up the committee? Will this simply be the members of these organizations that he has named or will there be additional representatives on the committee and if so, who will they be?

MR. GOURLAY: Thank you. There'll be an official from the Department of Northern Affairs. Mr. Hank Light will be chairing the Advisory Committee.

MR. BOSTROM: Can the Minister be more specific as to the effective mandate of this committee? Will the recommendations made to him be binding on him in terms of his decision with respect to this funding?

MR. GOURLAY: These will be recommendations that will come to myself as Minister. We hope that this exercise will clearly identify the role of the Metis organizations in the province and we also hope that it will enable the various Metis groups to participate in a review of provincial programming available for improving the situation of Metis people in the province of Manitoba and also to review the funding requirements of the Metis organizations.

Monday, 2 June, 1980

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to indicate, if he can, why he has seen fit to take this step, this year, with respect to the corps funding for the Manitoba Metis Federation. This is an ongoing grant which I believe the Metis Federation has been receiving for several years and I believe it's something which they use to assist them in the corps administration of their organization.

The Minister may have his opinions as to the Manitoba Metis Federation and whether or not they represent all of the Metis people in Manitoba but why has he taken this decision this year and held back this money, perhaps jeopardizing the effective organization of this group? Holding this decision off until September certainly puts them in limbo. It would effectively, I would say, destroy this organization if in fact this were the only source of funding for this organization. Luckily, they probably have other sources of funding but if this were the only source of funding how would he expect them to operate for that period of time, from the beginning of the fiscal year until September, when and if he makes up his mind with respect to the future of the corps funding which is presently allocated in the budget for this purpose?

MR. GOURLAY: Well, Mr. Chairman, first of all, the provincial corps funding only made up a very small part of the total corps funding requirements of the MMF. I felt that this was an opportune time to review the corps funding situation with respect to the many concerns that had been brought to my attention, not only by Metis people in general but by a good percentage of Metis people that belong to the MMF that expressed concerns they had with respect to the way the organization had been operating in recent years and they felt that some changes were necessary.

As you are aware, I only took over responsibility for this part as of April 1 this year and because of the concerns primarily that were being expressed to me by, as I mentioned earlier, a large percentage of the MMF people themselves, as well as other Metis people that didn't belong to any organization in particular, and there was some indication that some of the programs that were being administered by the MMF were only available to those people that belonged to the organization and wasn't made available to Metis people that might not belong to the MMF. I found that very difficult to understand, why we would continue to promote, as a provincial government, this sort of thing, denying people that chose not to belong to an organization for their own good reasons. Unfortunately, I would have hoped that we could have expected this advisory group to bring in recommendations sooner but I think, in fairness to them, even September 30th might be pushing it with respect to getting a meaningful survey or study of the things that have been requested of them. I might say that a lot of the organizations that I've contacted look at this very positively. They feel they welcome this opportunity and so this is basically the reason that I've requested this study.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I guess the Committee will have to rise temporarily, I suppose, and go into the House for . . .

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that Committee rise.

(PROCEEDINGS INTERRUPTED for Department of Education vote in the House.)

SUPPLY — NORTHERN AFFAIRS (Cont'd)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I call the committee to order. We're on Resolution 115, 3.(d).
The Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: The Minister was speaking when we left, and he did not conclude his comments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, that's right, the Member for Rupertsland; maybe I'll give the Minister a chance to complete what he was addressing.
The Honourable Minister.

MR. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was more or less just concluding my remarks with respect to the reason why I had established an advisory group to review the corps funding and I think pretty well I'd covered what I intended to say.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, regardless of what I may think of the Manitoba Metis Federation, whether or not they're administering their affairs the way in which their membership would like to see them administer their affairs, or whether or not they are representing the interests of their membership in the way in which their membership and/or Metis people who are not members of the organization would like to see them represent the interests of Metis people in the province of Manitoba, I do not believe it is really the Minister's mandate to interfere in the democratic operation of the federation as an association representing Metis people. I find his attempt at the solution by naming a committee of other associations, none of which have had their funding cut back or held back, while they are sitting for six months or four months, or whatever the case may be, on a committee deciding on the future of the corps funding of the Manitoba Metis Federation, I don't find this to be an effective solution.

All associations and groups of people that are banding together for a common purpose, from time to time have problems in their organizations. Not so many years ago the Northern Association of Community Councils went through a similar period and they managed to work this out through their own democratic structure, having the matter eventually resolved through numerous meetings and a conference representing all of the northern communities involved. Some of the communities refused to join the association for a period of time because they were upset with the way in which the Northern Association of Community Councils was administering their affairs.

I don't recall the government at the time saying, if you don't straighten things out, we're going to cut off your funding. I'm sure encouragement was given to them to straighten out their affairs but they managed to do that and the initiative for that change and that straightening out of their affairs came from within the organization as a democratic group. They had their meetings. They straightened out their problems. They had their fights. They made the necessary changes in

Monday, 2 June, 1980

the organization that they felt were necessary to make it more effective, in terms of its representation and also in terms of its administration.

I believe that would be the natural result of the Minister leaving this situation alone and allowing the Metis people in Manitoba to resolve their own problems. I don't believe that the Minister should be interfering in the process in this way. In fact I have to suspect that the Minister has other motives for holding back the funding for the Manitoba Metis Federation. I have to suspect that the government is not very happy with the Manitoba Metis Federation as a group, because they happen to be one which has been vocal in their support of demonstrations against both the federal government and the provincial government. Most notably, perhaps, was the statements that came out by the Manitoba Metis Federation during the sit-in by the Norway House Community Metis group in the summer of 1979 and in other cases the Manitoba Metis Federation, I believe, has been involved in various forms of lobby with the government, various forms of critique of the government, through the MMM Committee, to name one, where they pointed out that there's a high degree of unemployment in northern Manitoba and made proposals to the government to attempt to resolve that problem.

Now the fact remains that the Manitoba Metis Federation has that as one of its objectives, to represent the interest of Metis people, and if they were not critical of government from time to time I would think that they would not be performing their job effectively. They were critical of government when we were in government. The President of the Manitoba Metis Federation, when we were in government was a Conservative; the President of the Manitoba Metis Federation when the Conservatives are in government happens to be probably someone who is not a Conservative. Now that should not affect the way in which the government deals with an association. I mean I don't believe the government should be punishing an association because the leader of the association or members of the association happen to differ in their political views from the government of the day. In fact it's probably most effective as a critique or a lobby group, if they're not the friends of the government.

When I was first elected to the Legislature I had been just formerly an employee of the Northern Association of Community Councils. My first recommendation to them, as a new MLA, was to not become politically aligned in terms of an association because, as I recommended to them, they should attempt to keep as politically neutral as possible, be as effective as they can be in their criticism of the government but they have to be able to maintain some neutrality in terms of their criticism because they're going to have to work with different governments. It may be a New Democratic government they have to work with and the next government may be Conservative. In each case, they have to be able to represent the interests of the group that they are representing and in doing that they can't be in a position to be either punished in one case or maybe rewarded in the other. They have to represent the interests of the group the most effective way they can.

I believe that advice is applicable in the case of the government and their handling of the Manitoba Metis Federation. They shouldn't look at the Manitoba Metis Federation as a natural enemy to be stamped out simply because the Metis Federation happens to be disagreeing with them. I mean, that's the nature of the association. The more they are disagreeing with the government, probably the more effective they are operating as an entity, as a group representing their people. In the case of the Metis in Manitoba, certainly they are a disadvantaged group. They are a disadvantaged group geographically because many of them live in remote communities; they are a disadvantaged group even in the urban area because they have difficult problems adjusting to the urban environment and are often coming into the urban environment ill-prepared for the challenges of an urban type of life. I think that the Manitoba Metis Federation should attempt to work out its problems, if they have problems, within their own organization. The Minister, I would think, would be more effective in giving the Manitoba Metis Federation six months to work out their problems than to set up a committee to be an investigative committee into their organization. Most of the committee of whom represent other organizations that are perhaps competitive in their interests, may not have as their interest the continuation of the Manitoba Metis Federation. It may have, in their interests, objectives of obtaining that funding for themselves, rather than having the Metis Federation have that corps funding. I would recommend to the Minister that he not set up such a committee but, in fact, allow the Manitoba Metis Federation to have their first four-month instalment of their corps funding on condition that they have a full conference of their membership. In fact, if the Minister were to show good faith in this he would in fact assist the Metis Federation in having such a conference, in terms of assisting them in paying the expenses of such a conference, so that the Metis people of Manitoba could come together and discuss their grievances, if they have them, in a democratic way and have those grievances aired and have them resolved in a democratic way.

The Minister's handling of the situation is similar to his handling of the LGD affair in the LGD of Alexander which I think was demonstrated to be poorly handled. The Minister and his staff showed poor judgement in the handling of that, as I think they are showing poor judgement in the handling of the Manitoba Metis Federation. I don't believe it's the Minister's or departmental staff, their mandate to get involved in the internal operations of an association or internal operations of a LGD, like the LGD of Alexander. It was demonstrated by members of the Legislature that in the case of the LGD, a departmental employee got involved in the politics of the municipal council in seeking the resignations of one or more councillors. I believe that is . . .

MR. GOURLAY: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister on a point of order.

MR. GOURLAY: Are we talking about Municipal Affairs or Northern Affairs?

Monday, 2 June, 1980

MR. BOSTROM: Well, we're getting into the same kind of situation, Mr. Chairman. I'm only referring to the LGD of Alexander by way of comparison and the comparison I think is legitimate in that, in the case of the LGD of Alexander, the Minister interfered in the operations, the Minister's department interfered in the operations of the LGD to the extent of causing problems there and did not allow the democratic process to work out as freely as it should. In the case of Manitoba Metis Federation, the Minister is now getting involved in the internal operations of the Manitoba Metis Federation by establishing an investigative committee, so to speak, to look at the operations of the Manitoba Metis Federation and pass judgement on them. I think that would be more appropriately done by the Metis people of Manitoba collectively, and as widely-based and as grass-roots a representation as possible.

The most effective means for that kind of representation would probably be a conference of Metis people held in a geographic area that would be most accessible and as soon as possible so that the Metis people of Manitoba could come together and discuss their problems and to decide on a course of action. I think that the Minister interfering in this way is uncalled for; I think it's bad judgement on his part. I deplore this kind of handling of this situation. It simply smacks of — what will we call it — political punishment of a group that has taken unpopular stands in terms of this government, has taken stands against this government in terms of its northern policies, in terms of its employment policies, in terms of its lack of action for unemployment for the Metis people of Manitoba and have been very vocal in that regard. I simply think that this government is attempting to not provide corps funding to the Manitoba Metis Federation as a means of punishment of them and they are simply setting up this committee to delay that process.

My recommendation to these groups would be that they not participate in such a sham and I think it is a sham, because the Minister is not saying that their judgement, their recommendations to him will be accepted. He may take their recommendations under advisement, wait another six months before making a decision and there goes your complete fiscal year and the Manitoba Metis Federation will be simply out their corps funding for the fiscal year, 1980-81. It appears that is the objective of the government and they are attempting to use the other Metis organizations in Manitoba to assist them in this sham. I think it's unfortunate that the Minister is following this tactic.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(d)—pass — the Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. On this item, the Minister indicated earlier in the House that the Manitoba Metis Federation had undergone a series of audits in regard to their corps funding. I'd ask the Minister if he can elaborate on why those audits were called and specifically what the results of those audits were?

MR. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It was a review of the audits, as I indicated, the government has attached no strings to the corps funding.

However, the recommendation from the Auditor was that there appeared to be an excessive amount of spending in travel and meetings. However, as far as the government was concerned, they had attached no strings to how the money was to be spent. As I understand it, the money that was provided by the province went into a fund, together with other funding that had been given to the MMF, and so it was difficult to criticize the MMF for the way they had spent the money because we really hadn't established any areas in which they were to spend the money specifically. The Provincial Auditor only received the other audit; he didn't conduct one himself, he just reviewed the audits that had been done.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. So, in fact, there were no irregularities in regard to the audits. There may have been some, what the Minister or the government or even the Auditor thought, inappropriate uses of money but nothing that was irregular or nothing that would indicate that the funding should be withdrawn from the MMF as a result of those audits. They, in fact, showed that their accounting practices were acceptable and that their spending, in fact, was acceptable, given the conditions under which the money was provided them. Is that true?

MR. GOURLAY: Yes, that's basically true.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3. — the Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Well under this same item, we see a grant to the NACC and a grant to Native Communications. Has the Minister over the past year conducted any audits of those organizations?

MR. GOURLAY: No, there has been no audit on NCI?

MR. COWAN: Or the NACC, is that correct, also?

MR. GOURLAY: We received the Auditor's reports from the NACC and the NCI.

MR. COWAN: I'm sorry, I apologize to the Minister. There have been no special audits, other than the normal Auditor reports that would come at the financial year-end, is that correct?

MR. GOURLAY: No special audits, that's right.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. In fact the Manitoba Metis Federation was the only group, under this particular section, that was singled out to be audited, is that correct?

MR. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Actually there was no audit done, as such, it was just a review of audits that had been provided by the MMF.

MR. COWAN: Well, on that technicality, Mr. Chairperson, then, I'd ask the Minister if these were special considerations given to the Manitoba Metis Federation, the review of the audits that had been conducted and that were not given to the other organizations. In other words, the Manitoba Metis

Monday, 2 June, 1980

Federation was in fact singled out for this sort of a process, is that not correct?

MR. GOURLAY: Yes, this is correct, mainly because of allegations that were directed at the MMF.

MR. COWAN: I'd ask the Minister then if there had been any allegations brought to his attention directed at other organizations receiving grants under this particular section?

MR. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. No, not to my knowledge.

MR. COWAN: I would ask the Minister if there has not been, from time to time, discontent perhaps expressed, in regard to some of the activities of these organizations or the way in which these organizations are structured, to the Minister, or even the Minister, having been in his portfolio only a short time, I should ask him if he anticipates that in the future there may be such complaints brought to his office as has been the practice in the past.

MR. GOURLAY: I think in all fairness to the other organizations there were more strings attached in specific areas in which the money was to be used.

MR. COWAN: My question to the Minister is more general than that, Mr. Chairperson. My question is perhaps too philosophical to ask in specific terms as I have been attempting so I'll put it in generalities. Organizations are made up of people; people differ. That's part of the joy as well as part of the problems of living in a society that tries to structure its activities via organizations, via structures. I can relate it to my own experience which is the union experience and I know some very good unions who have been positive and progressive for the most part have, from time to time, had discontents within their movement who have expressed concern over the way in which the union was handling its activities, have expressed some complaints in regard to where the money goes and how the money goes. I'd ask the Minister if he would not anticipate that might happen from time to time in any organization that is comprised of a large number of people and is responsible for providing services for those people and also as high profile in the provision of such services. Is that not a generality that we can accept as members of this committee that will from time to time occur?

MR. GOURLAY: Well, I would find it very difficult to forecast just what problems might arise with any given organization in any given year. I wouldn't want to say that this could be a problem or may not be a problem.

MR. COWAN: Will the Minister accept the philosophical tenet then that when you have an organization of a large number of people that come from different geographies, from different occupations, from different areas, from different backgrounds, that you will from time to time have conflict within that organization in regard to how people perceive the function of that organization and

how people perceive the operation of that organization? It's not an extremely difficult question, I think it's one that is fairly self-evident, if the Minister is willing to admit that such is the case. I think if he looks back upon his own experience he may find examples upon which to draw which he can extrapolate into future and say that it may not be this organization or that organization in a specific sense, but that generally those problems do from time to time occur. Is that an unusual statement in the Minister's opinion or is that a statement that does hold some validity?

MR. GOURLAY: I think that's a reasonable statement and I think it's also important that we know, as government, where public money is being spent and how it's been spent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the Member for Churchill, the Leader of the Opposition has been trying to get in for some time now. All right, the Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Out of deference to my leader, Mr. Chairperson, I'll be as short as I can. I would just like to pursue the questioning a bit if I can and then I'm certain that my leader will take ample opportunity to put his questions in, with his permission, of course. I'd ask the Minister then if one is to expect these types of situations to arise from time to time, is it not unusual that in the middle of a financial period that the Minister acting upon the advice of a number of complaints, would for that financial period, after the fact, refuse to live up to a financial commitment made previously by the previous Minister and by his own government. Is that not an unusual way to react to what would appear to be some fairly normal and commonplace occurrences?

MR. GOURLAY: I think that would be dependent on the receiver of the grant.

MR. COWAN: What the Minister is telling me then is that he is willing to make a value judgement as to the appropriateness of that organization receiving the grant. Is that an accurate assessment of what he has just told the committee?

MR. GOURLAY: I think perhaps one of the unfortunate situations, with respect to the MMF, is that, as I see it, that there weren't more strings attached to the funding to the organization.

MR. COWAN: Was there not a commitment made by the previous Minister for the corps funding that is now being withheld from the Manitoba Metis Federation?

MR. GOURLAY: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, my apologies to the Member for Churchill. I didn't catch that question.

MR. COWAN: I'm sorry, perhaps I rattled it off too quickly. Can the Minister confirm that in fact there was a commitment by the previous Minister of Northern Affairs, the one who preceded this Minister directly, in regard to the amount of 131,800 corps funding that is now being withheld from the Manitoba Metis Federation, did the Minister not

Monday, 2 June, 1980

commit that money in writing to the Manitoba Metis Federation for this financial year?

MR. GOURLAY: Not to my knowledge.

MR. COWAN: Has the Minister checked with the previous Minister to see if that is not the case?

MR. GOURLAY: I haven't specifically asked him that question but I am sure that had he done such a thing he would have responded to me on it. But I can certainly check with him.

MR. COWAN: You mean to tell me, Mr. Chairperson, that the Minister has withheld funding to the amount of 131,800 without checking with the previous Minister to see if there was a commitment made for that funding? Would the Minister now take the opportunity to check with his staff to see if perhaps they know of such a commitment?

MR. GOURLAY: Certainly there was no commitment made by staff and these items are discussed in Cabinet and certainly there was no indication given to me in Cabinet that there had been written indication from the previous Minister.

MR. COWAN: Was there any indication that there had been a commitment made at all by the previous Minister that would have arisen during those conversations?

MR. GOURLAY: To my knowledge there was no commitment given at all by the previous Minister.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Chairperson, it's not like we're springing this upon the Minister, it's been a subject of public debate and a subject of debate within the Legislature. Is the Minister telling us that he has never taken the opportunity to discuss this matter with the previous Minister as to determine whether or not the previous Minister had, in fact, explicitly or in an implied manner, committed the Minister's government to this corps funding?

MR. GOURLAY: I would like to put on record that I've had a number of discussions with the previous Minister. We've discussed this issue at length with respect to the program for the current year and I can only say that to my knowledge no commitment was made by the previous Minister with respect to the current year's funding.

MR. COWAN: Would the Minister then take the opportunity between now and tomorrow to perhaps discuss with the Minister as to whether or not there was an implied or explicit commitment in regard to this funding and report back to us by tomorrow because I imagine we'll be fairly well through these estimates at that time and would like to discuss this matter further on the basis of the best available evidence and that includes all the information. Would the Minister undertake that commitment at this time?

MR. GOURLAY: Yes, I would be prepared to discuss this and ask the previous Minister and report back.

MR. COWAN: In regard to this funding under this grant section, the Minister indicated there will be a task force, so to speak, set up to determine whether the funding is now being proceeded with in an appropriate manner or whether there should be changes made in funding. I would understand that the NACC of course would be a part of that task force, that the Metis Women's Association would be a part, that the MFF would be a part. I understand that some approach has been made to the Manitoba Association of Friendship Centres. I attended their annual convention this weekend in Lynn Lake and I know they were discussing whether or not they should opt into that program or not. Can the Minister indicate if any of those other organizations have had their funding withheld until the determination of the committee has been made.

MR. GOURLAY: No, there has been no fundings withheld from those organizations.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Has the Minister invited the representatives of the Metis Confederacy to sit on that committee also?

MR. GOURLAY: Yes.

MR. COWAN: The Minister indicates that he has indeed invited members of that Confederacy to sit on the committee. Does the Confederacy in fact have any official recognition from the government?

MR. GOURLAY: No.

MR. COWAN: Does the Confederacy in fact have any official recognition from the Metis community in Manitoba?

MR. GOURLAY: I'm not sure whether they have. I doubt that they have perhaps.

MR. COWAN: What does the Minister think of the Manitoba Metis Federation?

MR. GOURLAY: I would say that the organization, over the years, I think has provided worthwhile effort to the Metis community. I can honestly say that I haven't worked closely with them in the community. I know some of the people personally who belong to the organization and I have a lot of respect for those people as individuals, and I have no really serious hangup as far as the MMF is concerned and I know that it's been indicated that I am punishing the MMF for the fact that they held sit-ins here last year. I can honestly say that is not the case at all. I look at this with a fairly open mind and in the case of announcing an advisory group to look at the Metis organization and its people, I must admit, contrary to what the Member for Rupertsland has indicated, that these people look at it very positively. They feel that this could be a very useful exercise.

MR. COWAN: I would ask the Minister, which people look at it very positively?

MR. GOURLAY: The people from the various organizations that I have talked to that have been listed earlier tonight in discussions.

Monday, 2 June, 1980

MR. COWAN: Would that include the Manitoba Metis Federation?

MR. GOURLAY: Yes.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I would ask the Minister if he has heard any complaints from Manitobans in regard to the Metis Confederacy in its operation.

MR. GOURLAY: I haven't heard very much about the Confederacy to any extent. I had some visits from a few of the people who I understand belong to the Confederacy. I don't know much about their organization and that's really about all I can mention on it.

MR. COWAN: But the question was, has the Minister received any complaints in regard to the Confederacy?

MR. GOURLAY: No, I have received no specific complaints. As a matter of fact, as I mentioned, I talked to only a few people who indicated to me that they belonged to the Confederacy. Most of the people I talked to indicated to me that they were members of the MMF, in some cases they were members of both organizations. As I indicated earlier, the people who I talked to, you know, indicated they had some serious concerns about the way the MMF had been operating and they felt positively that the study could be a useful type of exercise.

MR. COWAN: Would the Minister care to put a number, an approximate number also, to the number of persons who have been coming to him with complaints, as to the MMF? Are we talking about 5, 10, 100, 1,000?

MR. GOURLAY: I would say it would be in the tens. Just to add further to the previous question, if I received any complaints about the Confederacy and I don't know that I heard that many or any specific complaints, but there were some concerns expressed by the MMF executive with respect to the Confederacy.

MR. COWAN: I would imagine that there have been some complaints expressed about the MMF from the Metis Confederacy executive also. Would that not be the case?

MR. GOURLAY: That's right.

MR. COWAN: I would imagine that would happen when you have discontent. You usually have people complaining about each other. Nothing unusual about that. The Minister has indicated that he believes over the years that the Manitoba Metis Federation has provided worthwhile effort to the Metis community. Is that organization still providing a worthwhile service to the community right now?

MR. GOURLAY: Yes, I think in a lot of cases they have been providing good service to their membership. From the information I gather, they don't go beyond helping their own membership primarily.

MR. COWAN: I would suggest to the Minister that a lot of their lobbying work, a lot of their projects are in fact designed to help the entire community in which they are implemented and that would go beyond the membership. I would also suggest that when a group such as the Manitoba Metis Federation does provide benefits to its membership, as well as to a group within society, that the whole society benefits in many ways as a result of that. So that while they may direct a number of their programs to the membership, they are also playing a viable and valuable role in their communities and also in Manitoba as a whole. I would hope that the Minister would agree with me in that regard.

I asked the Minister the question because I would like to ask him now if he believes the withholding of the corps funding in any way will act to the detriment of the activities of the Manitoba Metis Federation? In other words, will it stop them in any way from providing the valuable service which he has seen them providing in the years past and which he still considers them to be providing in many aspects?

MR. GOURLAY: No, I don't anticipate that the corps funding that we are withholding at this time will seriously affect the operation of the MMF. As was indicated earlier, the bulk of their funding comes from other sources.

MR. COWAN: I would ask the minister then what this funding has been used for in the past?

MR. GOURLAY: You're referring to the MMF corps funding? That's for the operation of their central office.

MR. COWAN: So in fact that the withdrawal of this money, the withholding of this money will affect their central office operations to a significant degree?

MR. GOURLAY: It may or may not.

MR. COWAN: But there is a possibility that it may.

MR. GOURLAY: I would think that the chances are very slight because, as I indicated, we provide only a very small percentage of the corps funding.

MR. COWAN: Does the Minister know how many people are employed by the Manitoba Metis Federation in their central office?

MR. GOURLAY: Possibly upwards of five.

MR. COWAN: Has the Minister advised himself as to how the withdrawal of this money will affect those five positions?

MR. GOURLAY: I really can tell you that it can affect them to any large extent because there's only a small percentage of the funding being withheld.

MR. COWAN: It's only a small percentage of the total funding of the Manitoba Metis Federation, agreed, but it is a sizeable percentage of the office funding, the area in which it is specifically directed for the Manitoba Metis Federation, and I would suggest to the Minister if he investigates the situation thoroughly we'll find that it is going to have a

negative impact. If it were not to have a negative impact then why provide them with the funding in the first place? Because if the Minister says taking the funding away is not going to have a negative impact, then the converse is true and providing the funding would not have a positive impact, yet we know that it has in the past. So I would suggest to the Minister that it is indeed going to have a negative impact and I think anything he says to the contrary can be challenged and will be challenged, not only by members on this side but also by members who are involved day to day in the office.

Without placing any value judgement as to the appropriateness of the Manitoba Metis Federation versus the Metis Confederation of Manitoba, without trying to attempt to determine which is the more representative group, which is the group that should in fact receive funding and to what extent should that group receive funding from the provincial government, I would like to make a couple of general statements on this. No. 1, from all the questioning that has been going on this evening, as well as that question which is going to follow, we have seen that the Manitoba Metis Federation has in fact been singled out in regard to having special reviews of their funding, in regard to having their funding withheld, while the other organizations that are receiving funding and sitting on the task force are in fact receiving their full funding. So there is the undeniable fact that the Minister has singled out the Manitoba Metis Federation for some reason. Now we don't know what reason. The Minister tells it's on the basis of complaints and yet when we press him as to the number of those complaints, he tells us it's in the tens and he tells us that some of it is coming from the executive of the Confederacy and that makes ultimate sense that the Confederacy would complain from time to time.

By the way, as an aside, in Lynn Lake this weekend I had the opportunity to meet with the President of the Confederacy and found him to be a very capable and able person. I listened with great interest to his speech that he gave to the Friendship Centres Association and as a matter of fact, on certain points, found myself agreeing with him, just as I would have agreed on certain points with the Manitoba Metis Federation, and believe that he is very sincere in his efforts and very honest in his efforts, as I do believe the President of the Manitoba Metis Federation is sincere and honest in his efforts.

I can see why there might be discontent from time to time within the organizations and I can understand the Minister even wanting to do a more thorough review of the funding of organizations but, for the life of me, I cannot understand why the Minister feels it is necessary to renege on a commitment that this government has made. It's a commitment that is right here in this Estimates Book before us. It's very plain; 131,800 was committed to the Manitoba Metis Federation for this fiscal year. Why he would want to renege on that for the period during which that task force is sitting, when it is going to have a detrimental impact on the operations of the Manitoba Metis Federation and, by that, will have a detrimental impact on all Metis people in the province. Because the Minister isn't turning that money over to another organization to work with, the Minister is holding that money back. That means staff are held back; that

means expenses are held back; that means that activities can't be ongoing and that means that you are going to, in the long term, create problems within the Metis community by your very actions here.

I would hope that you would want to avoid that. As a matter of fact, I am certain that you would want to avoid that. I believe your decision to withhold the money has been ill-advised; I believe it is ill-considered; and I believe in the long run you will find that it will have far more impact than you perceive it as having now; and that will not be positive impact, that will be negative impact. That will be to the detriment of the Metis people; that will be to the detriment of their organization and it will take a very long time to correct the injustice which the Minister is perpetrating at this moment. I would only hope that he would, on the strength of our argument somewhat and on the strength of the argument which does not have to be voiced, which is a natural argument, which is the logical, that he would immediately reconsider his decision to hold back that money. And even if he only does it to the extent that he says, okay, we will provide them with interim money until September, at which point we're going to make a decision, or we will provide them with interim money until at which point we do make a decision, whether it be October, September or August or next year, that the Metis people in the long run are not the innocent victims of what seems to be a somewhat unreasonable squabble and what seems to be a somewhat ill-advised and ill-considered action on the part of the government. So I would hope the Minister would take that advice into consideration. I know that if he does do great harm to the Metis community he will in fact also be doing great harm to the Metis Confederacy as well as the MMF. So he will, in the long run, be creating situations which I'm certain he does not want to create.

I know that my leader will be far more persuasive in his arguments than I am, having been in this venue longer than I have been and being more accomplished at it and coming in from the advantage point of being a lawyer, who knows how to ask questions and knows how to receive and solicit the proper answers. So I would leave it to him to follow up on what I consider to be some very rudimentary base work in regard to this and I would hope, at the end of that and the presentation by the Member for Rupertsland and the presentations that I know the Minister is going to get from outside of these rooms, that he will in fact reconsider his decision and seek the compromise solution which is for the interim, to live up to a commitment which his government had made, and then when the report comes in they can make a final decision as to how to allocate that money.

MR. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to respond briefly with respect to some of the comments from the Member for Churchill with respect to withholding funds from the other organizations that will participate in this advisory study.

Two of the five organizations get no provincial funding whatsoever from the province. I'd like to indicate, too, that the Confederacy has received recognition by the Native Council of Canada at their

Monday, 2 June, 1980

last annual meeting so that there has been some dissatisfaction, not only from the people that I've talked to but from other sources, apparently, with respect to the MMF.

MR. COWAN: Just to answer those two comments from the Minister. No. 1 is, I'd ask him my question very explicitly and for good reason was, has the Confederacy been recognized as a Manitoba organization by any Manitobans as an organization? I'm fully aware that it was recognized by the Federal Council and I also know the history that goes along with that and the Manitoba Metis Federation's participation and withdrawal from that. So it's not as simplistic as the Minister would have us believe by his brief statement.

The other point, what I did ask him was, did the organizations that have received funding under this particular section been stripped of their funding until that task force reports. And I think he has to agree that although there are two organizations that do not receive funding the others that do have not in fact been singled out, as has the Manitoba Metis Federation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister advise when he received these alleged ten-some complaints involving the MMF?

MR. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I've had ongoing discussions with a number of people dating back, I guess, about the beginning of the new year, January.

MR. PAWLEY: So the complaints that the Minister received were on or about the first week in January of 1980; is that correct?

MR. GOURLAY: Yes. It possibly would start soon after I became involved in the portfolio, which would be the first part of December of 1979.

MR. PAWLEY: The first part of December is when you . . . ? So that the Minister received complaints in December, as early as December, 1979, is that correct?

MR. GOURLAY: I can't be specific on the actual date, but thereabouts.

MR. PAWLEY: Can the Minister advise when a decision was taken, on his part, to hold back funding from the MMF?

MR. GOURLAY: Are you asking me a specific date?

MR. PAWLEY: Yes, on or about.

MR. GOURLAY: I can't be sure of the . . . I would say it would be perhaps the latter part of April, or thereabouts.

MR. PAWLEY: So the Minister is indicating that complaints first flowed into him in December or early January; a decision was made on his part toward the end of April to hold back funding. Can the Minister

indicate what took place between the early part of January and the near end of April to cause him to arrive at a determination to hold back funding to the MMF?

MR. GOURLAY: You must remember that I did not take responsibility for this area until April 1st, although I had ongoing discussions with some Metis people regarding the corps funding, but it was administered under a different department until March 31, of 1980.

MR. PAWLEY: But you were a Minister of the Crown during the period December and early January in which you received these alleged complaints involving MMF; you were present during the Treasury Board decisions when decision was made to include within the printed estimates a sum of money for the Manitoba Metis Federation, is that correct?

MR. GOURLAY: That's right.

MR. PAWLEY: That is correct. Now, the Minister indicates that around the end of April a decision was undertaken on his part to hold back funding from the MMF. Did the Minister undertake to find out from the MMF the extent of impact that such a holdback would cause upon the MMF?

MR. GOURLAY: I had discussions with members of the executive from the MMF on two or three occasions. Naturally they were interested in knowing what the decision would be. They did not indicate that there would be any serious difficulties. They indicated that they would be receiving federal funding and I'm not sure whether they indicated they received funding from other sources or not.

MR. PAWLEY: When was the decision made by the Minister to hold back funding from the MMF? When was that decision related on to the MMF itself?

MR. GOURLAY: Well, of course I would expect you to appreciate the fact that in order to make such a grant of corps funding that I require Cabinet approval for this.

MR. PAWLEY: But my question really relates to when was the decision related to the Manitoba Metis Federation that the corps funding would not be provided?

MR. GOURLAY: I think I indicated that it was somewhere around the end of April but I can't be sure of the exact date.

MR. PAWLEY: The corps funding for the previous year would terminate as of the 1st of April?

MR. GOURLAY: The 31st of March.

MR. PAWLEY: I ask the Minister whether, as a reasonable individual, that he feels that a notice of zero days, or in fact after April the 1st without any notice whatsoever, is a reasonable notice period to provide to an organization such as this that their funding will not be provided in the traditional manner as it has been for a number of years. How many

Monday, 2 June, 1980

years has the Manitoba Metis Federation received corps funding from the province of Manitoba?

MR. GOURLAY: I think it dates back to the year 1972.

MR. PAWLEY: The Minister is indicating that the corps funding was discontinued this year without any advance notice given to the MMF, without any advance notice being given to the MMF ahead of the period to which that corps funding would have been applied for the year in question?

MR. GOURLAY: In discussions I had with the executive of the MMF, there was good reason to believe from the discussions that corps funding was not an automatic thing.

MR. PAWLEY: When did those discussions take place?

MR. GOURLAY: Dating back, again I can't be specific to the exact date when I had my first meeting with the Executive of the MMF but I would say that it was probably in the month of February.

MR. PAWLEY: Is the Minister now indicating that he gave reasonable indication of notice to the MMF some time in February of 1980 that their funding would not be provided for in this oncoming year; that the MMF had reason to believe from you that you would be cutting off their funding for this year, in February of this year?

MR. GOURLAY: No, all I indicated was that the corps funding moneys was not an automatic thing that was going to happen, but they were fully aware that there may be some delay or discontinuing of corps funding.

MR. PAWLEY: But when did the Minister actually give them notice, outside of 'mights' and 'possiblys', when did the Minister actually give notice to the MMF that the funding would not be provided?

MR. GOURLAY: I'm just trying to recall the exact day . . .

MR. PAWLEY: Isn't it true that it was some time in the month of April?

MR. GOURLAY: I'm not sure whether it was April or the first part of May but it was, you know, a few weeks back.

MR. PAWLEY: At that particular time, did the Minister make any enquiries from the MMF as to the impact that this termination of funding would impose upon the organization?

MR. GOURLAY: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Leader of the Opposition to repeat that question.

MR. PAWLEY: At this time, in other words, around the end of April, 1st May, the Minister indicated that the funding would not be forthcoming, did the Minister at that time meet with the representatives of MMF and advise himself as to the impact that such

termination of financing would impose upon their organization?

MR. GOURLAY: No.

MR. PAWLEY: I was interested in a comment made by the Minister earlier when being questioned and I want to raise this further with the Minister, words to the effect that may or may not affect the central office, then proceeding on to say chances are slight that will affect the central office. Does the Minister concur with me that, in fact, that he has undertaken no enquiries to ensure with a certainty, as to the impact of the cutting of the corps funding might have on the MMF? Again I repeat the Minister's words have been may or may not affect, then further on chances are slight, admission on the Minister's part that he has not consulted directly with the MMF at the time of the termination of the funds. I suggest to the Minister, and I await his comment, that in fact there was no notice, no consultation, no checking as to the impact of the termination of the funds in question, and to this day, the Minister isn't really sure, the extent to which his actions may have hurt that organization which has been the traditional recipient of corps funding from the provincial government. The Minister can not, I gather, at this point, tell us with a certainty that the termination of funding will not have an impact upon the MMF.

MR. GOURLAY: Well, I would suspect that no doubt the cutting back of funding to the organization would have some affect, again I refer back to the comments that I see as one of the problems that the government has never placed any strings on the corps funding money and it's very difficult to assess just how much difficulty it may create on the MMF, the fact that the corps funding might be, or is currently withdrawn. There is some indication on the way the money has been spent, a considerable amount of money was spent on travel and meetings, and I would suspect that perhaps our percentage of the corps funding may not necessarily affect the current operation. Over the long haul it no doubt will have some implications but there is no indication at this time, you know, just how long or whether there might be a whole different approach to corps funding to the Metis people.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, what I think concerns member on this side and we would simply ask that the Minister re-examine, in light of the facts, would it not have been reasonable, I think the Minister would want to have been reasonable, to have provided some reasonable notice to the MMF so that they could undertake those adjustments that they might have to undertake for a period of months, to avoid a complication insofar as their internal arrangements. Would it not have been reasonable, on the part of the Minister, if his intentions were to terminate the funding and it appears that there was some thought along those lines as early as December, early January, to have given reasonable notice so that appropriate adjustments could have been undertaken, on the part of the MMF, so that their operations would not be affected? The Minister's admitted that he cannot be certain, or his words implied to us this evening, that he cannot be certain

Monday, 2 June, 1980

as to the impact of the holding back of these funds upon the organization in question. He's used words such as may or may not, chances are slight, doesn't suspect but unable to speak with any certainty to us this evening. Surely the Minister, as a reasonable individual, undertaking what would be expected as the responsibility of a Minister of the Crown, would surely have wanted to have provided reasonable notice. Can the Minister indicate to us why he would not have provided that type of reasonable notice to the MMF, there has apparently been no irregularities of an untoward nature, the organization is recognized by the Secretary of State, we know there has been some difficulties within Metis people as to respective organizations, which they'll have to sort out, it's not up to government to sort out, it's up to the Metis people to sort out. Why would the Minister not have provided the organization with reasonable notice so they could have made the appropriate adjustments to avoid complications that any organization would encounter under these circumstances?

MR. GOURLAY: Well, first of all, I would say that I gave no assurance to the MMF Executive that the corps funding was an automatic situation that would happen come the 1st April and I appreciate the comments that you are making with respect to the affect it can have on the operation of the central office and I'm prepared to look at the recommendations of the advisory group and certainly would reconsider the corps funding to the MMF. However, as I indicated to earlier questioning, the response to the announcement that a committee would look at the Metis funding and organizations and so forth, met with a very positive reaction from most of the people.

MR. PAWLEY: Now I want to make it clear to the Minister that his actions in establishing a committee to review the funding to Metis organizations is probably a good decision, probably a review should have been undertaken since there's been no review, I gather, since 1972, so the Minister should be commended in that respect. But I want to ask the Minister when he anticipates that he will receive the results of this review.

MR. GOURLAY: In addition to looking at Metis funding, I don't believe the Leader of the Opposition was in attendance when I indicated that the exercise is also to clearly identify the role of Metis organizations in the province and also to enable the various Metis groups to participate in a review of provincial programming available for improving the situation of Metis people. There are many many dollars directed at the improvement of the Metis people, granted it doesn't specifically go entirely to Metis people, it goes to people of Treaty status as well but basically it's targeted to the Metis people.

MR. PAWLEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe neither the Member for Rupertsland or the Member for Churchill or myself have been questioning the formation of the committee, that's the Minister's prerogative, he's exercised that prerogative and we'll be looking forward to the report but it's at this point important that the Minister not be demonstrating a partiality or a prejudice. Would the Minister agree

that he doesn't want to undertake any action at this point that would demonstrate any prejudice or any partiality on his part as a Minister of the Crown, prior to his receipt of this report?

MR. GOURLAY: Well, I can indicate to the Honourable Leader that we're directing almost 800,000 of provincial funding to the Metis organization in various programs, so it's not that we've, you know, abandoned the Metis people, far be it from that.

MR. PAWLEY: But back to the central issue before us, the Minister has refused to provide the usual corps funding until the review is completed. He is not certain as to the ramifications that the holding back of that corps funding might have upon the MMF. The report apparently won't be available till toward the end of September 1980. The Minister will have to review that report which may take some time after the end of 1980, is that correct? It may take some additional months?

MR. GOURLAY: Yes, I've requested the committee hopefully could have the recommendations in by the end of September, sooner if possible. But to comment further, you are making some indication that by cutting back on the corps funding that it's going to hamper the administration of a lot of other programs that we still participate in with the Metis people and as I understand it, this will not affect the delivery of these programs.

MR. PAWLEY: But it may or may not affect, according to the Minister's words earlier, the ability of the organization to conduct their operations from their central office. Correct?

MR. GOURLAY: The effect would be, as I see it, affecting the central office only and not the other many programs that are delivered.

MR. PAWLEY: Now the Minister earlier, if we could just go on to the next stage, the Minister earlier had said that he has no serious hangup involving the MMF; secondly, he is not punishing the MMF for demonstration of this past summer, the reference is to the Norway House demonstration at the Legislature; and the Minister also indicates that he has an open mind. Is that correct, is that a correct reporting of the Minister's opinions that were expressed earlier pertaining to the MMF?

MR. GOURLAY: Yes, I would say that's accurate.

MR. PAWLEY: Now, what concerns me and I'm sure it must concern the Minister upon reflection then, if that is the case and he's asked the committee to complete its report by the end of September but we know how things often happen, the end of September may drag out to the end of October, the end of November. The Minister indicated that he hoped to have the report by the end of September, then he has to review that report. Is it not correct that prior to the Minister having made a determination in respect to this matter that much of the present fiscal year will have expired?

Monday, 2 June, 1980

MR. GOURLAY: Yes, I suppose that it will be getting well into it. That's right.

MR. PAWLEY: Then, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister has an open mind, no serious hangups, is not punishing the MMF, admits that there may be some impact upon the central office, not sure, hasn't apparently consulted with the executive and I would urge the Minister to do that. Would the Minister be prepared, in acting in a reasonable manner, if he finds that his holding back of these corps funds might have some impact upon the central office, is the Minister at least prepared to provide interim funding to this organization in order to ensure that by his actions he has not demonstrated any prejudice or partiality? Because what the Minister has done, and I think the Minister would be quick to acknowledge this, it's like an accused, he's charged with an offense and rather than a status quo being maintained until a decision is arrived at, the Minister — and maybe through advice that he has received, maybe unfortunate advice, maybe not the Minister's own actions — has decided to hold back the funding pending some review which is going to take place. Now would the Minister in order to ensure to an organization that he has no hangup toward, is not punishing, has an open mind toward, that he admits may be the beneficiaries of some detrimental impact at the central office, an organization which apparently, by his own admission, wouldn't receive the funds until toward the end of the fiscal year. The Minister wants to be reasonable. Would the Minister not provide some interim funding, if indeed there is going to be a detrimental effect, so that he does not appear to be partial or prejudiced in his approach and attitude towards the MMF?

MR. GOURLAY: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I could safely say that I would be more than pleased to discuss the situation with the MMF executive if they could demonstrate to me that there was some serious effect in the delivery of programs to Metis people as a result of the cutback in corps funding. At this point, I have not had any indication from the MMF with respect to the consideration of interim funding. However, I would be, I think, remiss if I didn't want to entertain some concerns that the MMF can express to me with respect to problems that this cutback in funding is demonstrating.

MR. PAWLEY: And the Minister, making that response, would include the operations of the central office?

MR. GOURLAY: I'd be prepared to meet with the executive to review the problems that they might be able to identify to me.

MR. PAWLEY: Okay, the Member for Rock Lake made some comment about it appearing to be like a courtroom, but I think the Minister hasn't shared that sort of attitude that was expressed by the Member for Rock Lake. From my point, I'll await some report from the Minister as to his discussions with the MMF and with the probability, if in fact there's been a detrimental impact, that the Minister will provide some interim funds. That's all I have to say, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(d)—pass. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding 3,123,600 for Northern Affairs—pass.

The Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman. I move that committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise.

SUPPLY — EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): This committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members' attention to page 39 of the Main Estimates, Department of Education, Resolution No. 50, Clause 1, item (d) Field Services, (1) Salaries—pass — the Honourable Minister.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, the Member for Rossmere had requested a sheet of qualifications for people acting in the position of field representative with our government and also the qualifications and duties required under the previous government for people acting in a similar position. I have that information for the honourable member, Mr. Chairman, and he will be interested to find that it is exactly the same sheet of paper that covers both. The date at the bottom of the particular sheet I'll be sending him is May, 1977, and this is exactly the same outline of duties and qualifications that were used on June 15th, 1979, in the hiring of two additional members to this particular unit. So I would send this information to the Member for Rossmere.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. VIC SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the Minister for that information. I was reading some of the old estimates. I believe in 1978 the Minister indicated that education was heading toward a cliff in Manitoba when this particular government took over and that somehow some action taken by this government was averting us heading over that cliff. It would seem to me that if he is using the qualifications under the old government to justify what he is currently doing to add to it, that is, under the old government we had four people left in that department, I believe that there would have been a much larger number of inspectors at the beginning of the NDP term. We dropped it down to four and now we're back up to 17, although the definition of their job is still the same. I don't see very much progress in light of that fact.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just as a matter of interest, I asked that I be given the opportunity to take that sheet to the Member for Rossmere so I could look at it on the way. I see nothing whatsoever under the section Duties and I skimmed it very quickly. You notice, Mr. Chairman, I just took it to him. I saw nothing there that gives the field field representative the authorities of an inspector, and yet the Minister said he had the

authority of the inspector. He said it's another name; he's playing with names.

Mr. Chairman, that's the whole point I was trying to make last Thursday, again today, and my understanding apparently is correct, that the previous government did not want to continue the role of inspector and, Mr. Chairman, I do know that when the Member for Burrows comes, he will give us information more specific in relation to the attitude of a Conservative government in relation to field representatives. I seem to have a block on that word representatives, Mr. Chairman, because apparently it was called field officers, but the point is that the Minister mislead himself — let me put it to him as kindly as I could — that when he told us that they had the rights of inspector to suspend a teacher — he's nodding his head — and yet I don't see anywhere that they had that right, neither in the list of duties that I scanned quickly as I took them over to the Member for Rossmere, nor — and he admits — that there is no legislative recognition of the role of a field representative, and he admits that nowhere are they called inspectors. Mr. Chairman, can we ask the Minister to clarify? Do they today, or do they not today, have the power to suspend the teacher?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I'll repeat, I would imagine for the last time for the honourable member, they do have that power as they have had that power for the last 12 years possibly, perhaps longer. Whether they have been called inspectors or a descriptive term such as field officers under the previous administration or, as I find out now, under the previous administration they were also called education administration consultants, and this is the term that we used until just lately. I feel that field representatives is a more apt descriptive term. They do have that particular power as they have had for many years. I think it's essential that they have that particular power to cover emergency situations.

Mr. Chairman, I think the Member for St. Johns is well aware that under Section 6(1) of The Education Administration Department Act, that the Minister has a right to assign duties; under The Education Department Act, I would repeat, that this is one of the responsibilities that these particular people have. I have mentioned before that it is one that they have not exercised for sometime but, as I also mentioned before, there very well could be at an emergency situation where it would be necessary for them to exercise that particular power. —(Interjection)—
One.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I don't know why this Minister is so insistent on saying what he is saying. Mr. Chairman, this Minister — of course he just said it for the last time which means he's giving up — but, Mr. Chairman, he said when I was questioning him last Thursday, he said, and I quote: When I'm dealing with the Member for St. Johns on legal matters I'd like to double-check. Mr. Chairman, I think he's just giving us wrong information. Section 6(1) reads: (a) — that's what he said — The Minister may (a) prescribe the qualifications and duties of the Chief Inspector of Schools and inspectors of public and secondary schools.

Mr. Chairman, yes, I will, I'll say that I believe that the Minister of Education of Manitoba can read English and I think he knows what words mean. I think he must know when it says inspectors, it means inspectors. Mr. Chairman, he doesn't have to go to 6(1); he can go to 8(2) of the same Act which reads: An inspector of schools may suspend the certificate of any teacher under his jurisdiction for incompetency, misconduct or violation of this Act or The Public Schools Act or of any regulation made under either of these Acts, and the Minister is misleading himself, or attempting to mislead us when he waid in extreme cases, a case of emergency, he has that power.

Mr. Chairman, I made the point last Thursday, under the Act the inspector has the power to do it arbitrarily for any reason whatsoever. Maybe the Minister would fire him if he finds that he used it in that casual way, but last Thursday I said the Minister himself had the abysmal record of having fired a person of senior status without giving a reason or without giving him a letter of acknowledgement to the effect that the man had ever served in his department. So let's not talk about extreme cases because we know from reading the Act and from this Minister's past behaviour that you don't need to have a good reason to do what you have the power to do.

The point I'm making, Mr. Chairman, again, and I'll make it again if necessary, I do not see how this Minister has the right to say that a field representative is an inspector. A field representative, giving him that title, could be a person who is a secretary in the Department of Education, could be a person who is a caretaker of the Department of Education, could be a person who establishes curricula within the Department of Education. He need not be anything other than what he is called, which is field representative. He is not an inspector.

I'd like to ask the Minister the direct question, where does the authority stem for a field representative to have the power to suspend a teacher? I ask him that, because when he answered me the last time, he referred to 6.(1)(a), but he had to read what he was referring to. There it says, he can prescribe the qualifications of an inspector. Mr. Chairman, is the Minister being fooled by others or is he fooling us, or just himself? Because he's not fooling us, Mr. Chairman. I ask him again, where does the authority derive to give the field representative the power to suspend a teacher? Where is the authority? Well, now, you see, Mr. Chairman, he points at himself and I don't know where he has the authority to give the field representative the power to suspend. Mr. Chairman, we have legislation. The Minister may be not aware of the fact that there are limits to his power. He is not all powerful, although he might like to be. He has to have authority to do something.

The Member for Crescentwood says he's a wonderful Minister. I think he's a pretty cute Minister, Mr. Chairman, because I think that it takes awhile for us to get him to face up to answering questions that are put to him directly. It took quite a while to get to the stage where he has now admitted the field representative is not an inspector, nor does it indicate that he has a right to be inspector. That took awhile to get out of him. When asked for the

Monday, 2 June, 1980

authority, he dealt with 6.(1)(a) and said that's where the authority stems. Well, I think he knows very well now, as I read it to him, that he can only prescribe the duties of the inspector, and 8.(1) gives the responsibility or authority to an inspector.

Mr. Chairman, I reiterate that the previous government, in changing the name from inspector to something else, intended clearly and loudly to change the role, otherwise why change the name? They changed the role and the Minister says that what he brought to produce to the Member for Rossmere is the document used in 1979 and used in 1977. Both documents, which are apparently identical, do not give any indication that the duty or responsibility of a field representative is that of an inspector. So it's not good enough, I think, Mr. Chairman, for this Minister to point to his own chest and say, I gave him the authority, because he has not yet got the power to dictate the legislation which has not yet been passed.

Mr. Chairman, don't we know that he's bringing in a bill which is intended to give field representatives the power to suspend? We know that. He must know that. He introduced second reading. He must be doing that because he knows that he doesn't have the authority. So why don't we start from scratch? Why doesn't the Minister get up and say they do not have the authority of the inspector; I intend them to have the authority of the inspector, that's why I'm bringing in, in part, new legislation. And when and if that passes, then they will have the authority. If he would say that, I would say yes, that's correct, it sounds right, it sounds like a correct response and I, for one, would have to drop it. But at this stage the Minister keeps insisting. What does the Member for Roblin want to contribute?

MR. McKENZIE: I was just practising my French.

MR. CHERNIACK: Oh, that was very useful, Mr. Chairman, to have him interrupt with his efforts at French.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister keeps on trying to attribute to this field representative powers that I don't think he has and I don't know why, except that he would lose face when he would have to admit that he was wrong. I'd rather he admitted he was wrong and I would have more respect for that than to keep insisting without any citation where he gets the basis of his statements. So I again challenge him, show us where the authority is derived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass — the Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I merely say again to the Member for St. Johns, and I won't convince him because he has a definite opinion and I know that he's not going to be swayed from his opinion, in spite of the fact this is the first time I guess that this has occurred to him although this certainly has held true for eight years under his particular administration and three years under ours that the terms, whether it be field officer, educational administration consultant under both their administration and ours, and field representative, are synonymous as far as the legal aspect is concerned in the Act, synonymous with the title of inspector. I

am not going to convince the member of this, Mr. Chairman, I realize this at this time; so as far as I am concerned I have said everything that I can on this particular topic.

MR. CHERNIACK: I thought that I had said all I could on this topic but, Mr. Chairman, I just can't get away from the fact that the Minister is making law. He is saying, this man is saying that a field representative is synonymous with inspector. Where he gets that, I don't know. If he could show me a dictionary which says it, I'd have to accept the fact that it's synonymous. If he brings in a thesaurus, I would have to accept that he has some basis. But the fact that he says it or anybody else says it, doesn't make it so, Mr. Chairman. How could he pretend that by saying it, it makes it so?

Mr. Chairman, I practiced law for forty years. I have yet to learn that a Minister can determine, pass an ordinance in his mind, that black means white, that field representative means inspector. Where does it say that? Not even in his own documentation, if he said that. Field representative, also known as inspector in The Education Department Act, is available for jobs and we are appointing so and so as field representative, also known as inspector. It's not there so, really, it just means that the Minister, having been caught in making a statement last Thursday — not that anybody caught him, but he made it — and is now apparently bound by what he said in his own mind, which shows tremendous limitations in the Minister's makeup, not to be prepared to say, okay, he didn't have that authority or we abused the authority. The fact is that his saying so doesn't make it so and it's a shame that a Minister of the Crown, this Minister, is not prepared to back up with some basis the statement that he makes. It's not a question of convincing me; let him go and convince anybody else he knows that the word, field representative, equals inspector. When asked, where is the basis of your statement, I made it up, which is in effect what he's telling us. It is his opinion, that's what he says. Well, that's nonsense, Mr. Chairman. He keeps looking up at the sky as if he's going to get help there. I don't see how he can get help anywhere but from the written word in the legislation.

When he was appointed Minister, there was a whole series of Acts that were put under his charge and those are the Acts under which he operates and he has no powers other than those. I guess it's time he learned it; it's only close to three years since he's had this role. It's time he learned that even his power is limited by legislation. I challenge him once again, eventually — I don't know when he can do it — to show us something in current legislation, not what he wants to bring in but in current legislation, that he's right. Mr. Chairman, it's a joke and I'm sorry we wasted 20 minutes of time just to show that the Minister really has no basis for what he said and doesn't know what he is talking about in that respect.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, if we have to spend 20 hours on this particular point, I don't

think it's a waste of time and I think that the Member for St. Johns has made the case well, but we have to look at this appropriation in somewhat of a perspective. When the Minister says that there were educational administrative consultants, nobody quarrels with the deployment of people throughout the province to act in the capacity of consultants. With the bill, which I believe in the last session I called horrendous, was that they wanted to give police powers to these people by Order-in-Council. But it should be abundantly clear from the points dragged out by the Member for St. Johns that it is the policy of the Conservative government to once again downgrade the teaching profession in the province of Manitoba.

Now, I say this and I said earlier that the inspectorial system was put in place because there were many people in the province of Manitoba who weren't qualified teachers and these people were placed as a resource, more than an inspectorial or enforcement system, albeit from time to time they deemed it necessary to suspend some teaching certificates and some teaching permits. But, Mr. Chairman, I don't know what other profession in the province would stand still if a Department of Health deployed inspectors into operating rooms and hospitals. I don't know how the lawyers would react if the Attorney-General's department deployed inspectors in the courtroom. But in 1980, Mr. Chairman, we have gone through a professionalization in the teaching profession which was initiated by the former Progressive Conservative government. We have seen nearly three years of regressive Conservative government and especially in the field of education. Intersessionally, Mr. Chairman, as a result of the opposition to two bills which were presented to this House last session, the government saw that they couldn't get away with some of the cute stuff that they were trying to put in these bills; such as: police powers to education, administrative consultants appointed by Order-in-Council, the bill speaks for itself, or spoke for itself, because that part of it died, I think. But nevertheless we have the same kind of system, albeit a little watered down. I don't believe that they intend to appoint these field representatives — a different name, they're still inspectors — the Minister has made that abundantly clear in his response to the Member for St. Johns, that this is how he sees these people functioning — and I'm not going to get into the debate of whether he has or hasn't got the authority to do so. I would concur with the Member for St. Johns and as far as the limitations of ministerial prerogative are concerned, I would draw the Minister's attention to the McCrerar Inquiry into civil rights in the province of Ontario in 1968, which is a good basis for lay people who take on roles of Minister to see what they can and can't do as far as the ministerial prerogative is concerned. Even after having read that and understood it somewhat, Mr. Chairman, I was party to an Order-in-Council which the Supreme Court of Canada overturned in a particular case, so the ministerial prerogative is limited. If the Minister called these people in their appointments, in the papers appointing them inspectors, and there's no question from this side of the House that he has the authority to do so under existing legislation, I don't know just how long we

can prolong the debate. We prolonged the debate in Health Care, Mr. Chairman, for three years before it got out into the press that the present administration was taking two heels of bread and taking slices out between and throwing them out and squeezing the heels closer together, pretending they were providing health services of comparable quality to that which was provided prior to their assuming office in 1977, it's taken three years for the people in the province to finally wake up to the fact that the health service in Manitoba is not being maintained. The same thing is true in the educational system because it is the attitude of this government that they wish the Opposition would go away, that they're not responsible to anybody. They have a preconceived idea of how education should be delivered in the province of Manitoba and they are bound and determined they're going to implement it. If they have to call school inspectors educational administrative consultants or field representatives or something else they're going to impose that system once again. I just hope they don't build little boxes and paint them red, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. JAMES WALDING: Mr. Chairman, the Minister had agreed this afternoon that he would give us a job description for these field representatives. I wonder if he has actually done so or still will do so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the Minister for what he did provide me, which is a piece of paper entitled Education Administrative Consultant, dated May 19, 1977. There's some qualifications. I'd like to ask the Minister, is that the identical set of qualifications which now exist for field representatives?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm sure members of the committee will recall on Thursday, and later, the Minister telling us that these field representatives are not there for the purpose of teacher evaluation; they're not a judge and jury, etc., etc. One of the specific knowledges, abilities and skills required by these individuals is the ability to evaluate the progress of students and the efficiency of teachers. Now it would seem to me that if there's anything that we have heard time and again, it is that that is not the purpose of these individuals. Now, if it's not the purpose of the field representative to assess the progress of students and the efficiency of teachers, why is that a part of the qualifications for these individuals in 1980? The bulk of these people have been hired since 1977.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I believe in my introductory remarks this afternoon, I answered that particular question. I pointed out to members that in certain situations in Manitoba there are no school

Monday, 2 June, 1980

superintendents and it then becomes incumbent on the field representative to fulfill that particular role as far as the permanent certification of teachers is required. They also recommend for teachers in the Department of Indian Affairs in northern development schools, private independent schools, and these cases still exist and in order for them to act in that capacity, they, I would suggest, require that particular type of expertise.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Could I ask the Minister to provide us with a list of those school divisions which do not have superintendents?

MR. COSENS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I can get the Honourable Member for Rossmere the list of those school districts and those particular federal schools and other schools where that would apply. I don't have them readily at hand but I can get them for him. I'd just mention, Mr. Chairman, they are not a large number of schools in this province at this time.

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

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I'd raised with the Minister, I believe it was last Thursday, the amount of increase in the Salaries portion that we're now on. The amount was 520,000 in the estimates last year and now it is 593,300, a difference of some 73,000 for one staff man year. I asked the Minister if he could give us an explanation of this last week and he said that he would attempt to do so.

MR. COSENS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I thought that I'd done that this afternoon as well. There is one new SMY that I mentioned this afternoon that amounts for some 30,800.00. Of that particular 61,900, the remainder of the 61,900 is accounted for by increments and reclassifications and cost adjustments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Can the Minister just tell the committee whether that new position is a director's position or is it one of the field representative positions?

MR. COSENS: No, it is a field representative position and it's a person at the maximum.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I would just make as a passing comment, that this individual must have been pretty good to start at the top of the range. I have a couple of other questions I wanted to ask the Minister, arising from the answers that he gave this afternoon, and one of them had to do with the amount of lapsing of some 2.6 million that the Minister said lapsed in '79-'80. I'm not sure from that reply, whether it lapsed sometime during the '79-'80 fiscal year. In other words, that it applied to the '78-'79 year or whether that amount lapsed at the end of

the '79-'80 year. In other words, did that amount lapse on March 31st, 1980 or 1979?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, at the end of the fiscal year, '79-'80.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2.6 million is a lot of money and I wonder if the Minister can break it down further for us so that we can get an indication of where this amount was not spent. Further to that, I would ask him whether it's in the area of the construction and acquisition of physical assets or whether it is other appropriations throughout the department.

MR. COSENS: It represents bits and pieces throughout the whole department, Mr. Chairman, with the exception perhaps of some areas where there would be no lapsing at all but there are amounts here and there throughout the whole department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, to the Honourable Minister, would there be anything concerning field services in that last discussion?

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I wonder if you are attempting to enter into the debate when you address questions to the Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I'm not . . .

MR. WALDING: I personally have no objection to doing so if you wish to take your seat but I don't want you to be out of order anymore than I want us to be out of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the only other alternative I have is to rule you out of order if I don't follow the reasoning, and I thought that we could expedite matters just by one question being asked.
The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I suppose we can stretch a point because there was some lapsing in this particular section, some 678.64.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, the question arose as a result of the answer to an earlier question that was asked under General Administration. Had the reply been given at that time, I would have continued to ask the same question again, which I am now asking and that is, can the Minister provide us with a breakdown of the different appropriations or lines in the department where there is a lapsing of approved expenditures from last year? And along the same lines, I had also asked him for an accounting of any special warrants that were issued during the year, and perhaps he could give us that information too.

MR. COSENS: I would just like to clarify one point, Mr. Chairman. I thought the honourable members reference to special warrants was in this fiscal year, and my answer to that particular question was that there had been none in this particular fiscal year. Is he now referring to fiscal year '79-'80?

Monday, 2 June, 1980

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I'm not surprised that there have been no Special Warrants in this fiscal year since we're only approximately two months into the fiscal year and according to Interim Supply we had voted the government some 30 or 35 percent of the funds that it needed. If it has already used those funds up and is looking at Special Warrants I would be very much surprised. Naturally, Mr. Chairman, I am referring to the 1979-80 year. I want to know whether the department had any Special Warrants for the 1979-80 fiscal year?

MR. COSENS: Yes, 1979-80, Mr. Chairman, Special Warrants amounted to 1,755,500 and the honourable member was interested in the lapsing as it applied to each particular section of the department. If he wishes that in detail I'm quite prepared to give it to him at this time. In some cases the amounts are quite small but, taken over the whole department, they do add up to the 2,633,837.00. I can go through them item by item if that's what the honourable member so desires.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, if it will save time perhaps the Minister could send over that information to me. I am certainly interested in getting it on a line by line basis especially when I hear that nearly 2 million worth of Special Warrants were issued in the same year. It would appear on the one hand that the government has underspent by 2 million and on the other hand it has overspent by 2 million. What I guess has happened is that the department needed extra funds under some appropriations and in other appropriations there was a shortfall. I'm interested to know which of those appropriations they were short in and which they were over in, so that we can compare the requests for this year and perhaps to find out the reasons for an underexpenditure or an overexpenditure in the last year.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I'd be quite prepared to assemble that particular information for the honourable member and I will get it to him. I don't have it in a form at this time that I can give it to him right now but I certainly will put it together and have it forwarded to him tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, this afternoon the Honourable Minister had indicated to us that he presently has a staff of, I believe, 17 field officers and I believe he also mentioned that their two prime functions are: (1) to recommend teachers for permanent certification in those school districts and divisions which do not have school superintendents who normally perform that function. The other is to assist the school buildings' projects committee in advising it in making its decisions and recommendations to the Minister.

Now it seems rather strange, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister would need that large a number of field officers to assist so few, or such a small portion of our education system, because really, I don't know if there are too many, if any, school divisions which do not have a school superintendent. Thinking back

three years ago, I can't think of one school division which did not have a superintendent. Now, there may have been a short period of time, an interval of time between resignations of one superintendent and the hiring of another that they may have been without a school superintendent, but those were only short intervals of time. One such school division that I could think of was Boundary which was without a school superintendent for some period of time. I really can't think of any other. But by and large, I think that practically every school division did have a school superintendent.

Therefore, by the Minister's own words, there was no assessment or evaluation or recommendation of teachers with interim certificates for permanent certification that had to be done in those divisions. In fact, some of the school districts have school superintendents. Mystery Lake has a school superintendent, which is a large one. The only school districts which do not have superintendents are the smaller ones. Of the larger ones of the school districts, Leaf Rapids, Snow Lake, I suppose, Lynn Lake, Churchill, I believe, does not have a superintendent. Then of course there are other much smaller ones employing only five or six teachers or as little as two or three such as Sprague and Gypsumville, which employs three or four, if that; Carpathy which employs two teachers, so of course they wouldn't have a superintendent, and a few others like that.

Then the Minister said there are the Department of Indian Affairs schools where the field officers involved in inspecting the teaching of teachers with interim certification, with a view to recommending them for permanent. But even of those, there are two large school systems which do have their own superintendent, namely, Fort Alexander, which I believe has a superintendent and Chief — I believe it's called Peguis School District, which is on the Peguis Reserve just north of Hodgson, which now has a superintendent.

Really, it makes one wonder, Mr. Chairman, what the 17 field officers have to do performing those two functions and serving no more than perhaps a total of 300 or 400 teachers, 500 at the very most, at the very most, that is of school districts which do not have superintendents, and wherein field officers will have to perform that particular function which in others normally is performed by superintendents.

So I would like the Minister to offer us a justification for employing that large a complement of field officers for that few a number of pupils, schools, and teachers.

Then I believe the Minister had made some reference to the fact that we were the ones who abolished the position of school inspector. Mr. Chairman, I think that matter ought to be placed in its proper perspective. It is true that with the — and this was a gradual change which had commenced before we became the government back in the days of the Roblin administration with the formation of the unitary school divisions, the consolidation of, in fact, thousands of small school districts into 48, 49, 50 larger units, 48 school divisions and a couple of school districts. And then, in turn, those school divisions hiring their own senior administrative staff who were able to perform many of the functions which previously, of necessity, had to be performed

by a staffperson of the Department of Education. So with the formation of the larger divisions, it became apparent to us that the traditional role and function of a school inspector which we had inherited and which had, sort of, continued over the years practically since Day One became redundant and unnecessary and that those people at that time employed in that capacity as school inspector, their time and talents could be better utilized in other ways. Hence, the position of field officer was created and the individuals formerly performing the traditional function of school inspector were assigned to work in a consultant and an advisory capacity to the various school divisions within the area of their particular expertise.

I would just like to draw to your attention, Mr. Chairman, that previously, and this goes back many years, the school inspector within his bailiwick inspected the teaching of teachers in all grades, all subjects, from Grades 1 to 12. But we are all aware of the fact that the people who were assigned to those positions came with perhaps a narrower, a more limited expertise; one limited either to a teaching of elementary grades or junior high school grades or senior high school in some particular subject area, be it the sciences, mathematics, English, foreign languages or whatever. So we said, well, rather than have the inspector spread himself thinly over the entire educational spectrum, let him act in a consultant-advisory capacity within the area of his expertise and, thus, came the position of field officer into being.

I want to draw to your attention or to remind you, Mr. Chairman, that in creating that position, it was this party that moved a motion while we were government, the effect of which, had it passed, would have been to fire the former school inspectors and leave the Minister without any funds to pay them because the record shows that during the debate of the estimates on this very item, after we had spent several days attempting to explain to the then opposition what the role and function of the field officer will be, and the Honourable Minister, presently the Minister without Portfolio, moved a motion that this particular appropriation be deleted. Had that passed, I, as Minister, would have been left in a position with no funds to pay those 30 or 35, whatever number of staff that I had. Because in effect, what the Honourable Member for Brandon West, the Minister without Portfolio, what he said was this in his motion, he said either we have the traditional school inspector in the system or we don't have them at all. So, therefore, I vote against the appropriation of that particular item in the estimate. I don't want them at all in any other capacity.

So it was a Conservative Party that voted for the removal of the school inspector. The Conservative Party said that if there is no room for the school inspector in the traditional role which we had inherited 100 years ago that we don't want them. I think, Mr. Chairman, that point ought to be made and the Minister ought to be reminded of it, of what had transpired in this House before he was elected.

But getting back to the question which I put to him, it really is beyond my powers of comprehension why the Minister would require 17 — what does he call them now, field officers? Field representatives — why he needs 17 field representatives to serve the

number of school districts that I could count on the fingers of my hands, because there are very few more than that. Well, I wouldn't even need all of my toes — the Honourable Member for Rossmere is attempting to help me — I wouldn't even need all of them because of the larger school districts which does not have superintendents. I've mentioned it to the Honourable Minister and he knows which ones they are: Churchill, Lynn Lake, Leaf Rapids, Snow Lake, and we've run out of the larger ones because Frontier School Division has a superintendent. There are a number of Indian Affairs' schools and those, by and large, are the smaller ones because on the larger reserves they have established their own board and have hired their own superintendent; namely, Fort Alexander and Peguis. Oh, yes, the other one remaining is the military one at Shilo and then, of course, there was the one at Pinawa. But I think I saw an ad in the paper not too long ago — no, I came across an article in one of the newspapers where the superintendent from one of the school divisions of Manitoba is taking on the job of superintendent and secretary-treasurer of the Pinawa School District. So, therefore, that one is out.

So apart from the few school districts in the north, there is a handful of those in the south; namely, Gypsumville, Carpathy, Sprague and possibly one or two others, and that is about all which represent, when I say 500 teachers, I think that I'm overestimating, I'm grossly overestimating; it's probably closer to 300 or 400. Here, the Minister has 17 high-priced field officers serving that handful of school districts. Really, Mr. Chairman, I'm at a loss to know what those 17 men and women are going to be doing to justify their existence, their being on a payroll. How many teachers are there that are teaching with an interim certificate who are in the process of applying for permanent certification and would require their recommendation? How much building is there going on from year to year that would require the advice or the type of advice that these people consider themselves competent of offering?

I would like the Minister to explain how he justifies having 17 professional people. Well, I would suspect that on his payroll on the Civil Service pay scale, there are likely, at least professional officer, no less than 6 or 7, possibly 8 or 9 — 1 or 2 of them, I would suspect, are likely senior officers — the average pay being in the order of 30,000 a year. The lowest, I would suspect, would be no less than 25 or 26 because, after all, even the newly hired ones, I would presume that there are people coming into the system with 5, 6 or 7 years of teaching experience with one or two degrees; hence, likely in class 5 or 6 in the public school system which would put them at a salary of something in the order of 25,000 or 26,000 a year. So they must be earning at least that or more, and to have 17 high-priced educators in his system to serve just a handful of school districts, just a few hundred teachers, is really beyond my powers of comprehension.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, responding to the Member for Burrows, who I think has probably missed a bit of this debate and may not have heard some of the things that have been said a little bit earlier, I did not say at any time in this House or

anywhere else that the prime function, and I repeat his words, the prime function, and I repeat his words, the prime function of the field representatives was the certification of teachers. I did say in those particular situations in the province, where there is no superintendent, they still retain that function which at one time was a prime function of the old school inspector's position. But if the Member for Burrows is trying to imply that I see this as the prime function, then I certainly would like to correct his thinking in that regard, not at all. Perhaps I could review some of the functions for him at this time because he has some problem understanding why we would utilize 17 people throughout the province and I have to emphasize, first of all, that one of the chief roles of these people is one of liaison. I have said this before, I say it again, that I think any department of government runs the danger of becoming isolated, or if we wish to use the word insulated, from the people it is serving and has no way of really being in contact with them or being able to really assess what is happening out there as a result of that particular government departments' actions. And it is this liaison function that I see as particularly important, it's the interpretation of government policy to school boards, to administrators, to school staffs and also to parents, throughout the province and that happens both at a regional, divisional and school levels. Of course, there is another value that I prize and that is the provision of feedback by these people, to myself and to members of my department, as it pertains to how well our educational delivery system is working at the school division level and even at the individual school level, Mr. Chairman. And, of course another function, and I mention these only because the Member for Burrows seemed to imply that there was only one or two functions for these people and he couldn't understand how we could employ 17 of them in a province as large as this. Another function of course is the appraising of the implementation of government policies as they relate to the educational services we provide; they appraise the general climate of education in all the regions and divisions of this province; they appraise the administrative procedures at the various levels; they appraise the implementation of the various programs at the school level; they appraise the departmental support services that we provide to school divisions; they provide that feedback on how well these are working, how well they should be working. It gives us some valuable indication of how effective we are being in helping these people, Mr. Chairman. They appraise the assessment procedures that are used in the schools and at the division and regional levels and of course they also analyse the the appropriateness of the grant structures, relative to the programs that are being offered; they appraise the space requirements submitted by school divisions; they conduct reviews, particularly at the division's request, of schools and division systems; they can do special analysis and evaluation tasks from time to time, as assigned by myself or by the Deputy Minister. I might say, Mr. Chairman, that at this time the demands for that type of service far outstrip the personnel we have to handle them. So the implication by the Member for Burrows that this is a large staff with nothing to do, that there is no

demand for their service, certainly does not hold true in the light of the type of demands that we are receiving out there for their very services. And, of course, they assist school personnel in problem solving and in various support activities which may be required from time to time and they also assist parents who may encounter some difficulties of communication with the school system.

Those are only a few of the things they do, Mr. Chairman, and I would suggest to the Member for Burrows that he oversimplifies the function drastically when he tries to imply that it's only the certification of teachers. I agree with him that there are very few teachers in this province that don't fall under school divisions or districts that have a school superintendent who would handle that permanent certification of teachers. He's quite right and as a result I do not see it as a prime function, a chief function, a major function; I would suggest it is a very minor function of these people but, however, necessary as long as we do have people in the province in school districts or divisions that don't have someone who can provide that service to teachers.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, if one of the other main or significant functions of the field officers is one of appraisal and evaluation or whatever the Minister wishes to call it, then perhaps the Minister could explain to us where does he draw the line between the role and function of the field officer, within the area of appraisal, evaluation and the role and function of his program development and support services staff which also is involved in evaluation. Because I would suspect, Mr. Chairman, that within every branch of his department there's a mechanism built in for assessment, appraisal and evaluation. And it would seem, Mr. Chairman, there must be a certain amount of staff tripping over each other, as it were, because there are individuals in other branches doing appraisal and evaluation. Then the Minister tells us that there are field officers going around the countryside also doing various types of appraisal and evaluation. So perhaps the Minister could explain, you know, how does he draw the line between the two to avoid any duplication of services, or maybe there is duplication of services, perhaps the Minister could explain to us?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, very simply, in answering the Honourable Member for Burrows, I suppose if we were to place it in the simplest context that the field representatives are doing systems assessment and appraising and consultation, whereas the consultants from the curriculum branch, program branch are dealing with more specific subject areas and particular areas of expertise that they may have. We have people who are experts in the area of English and they would deal with problems in that particular area that might be encountered in a particular school division or provide assistance on request from the school division, perhaps in the implementation of new curriculum, in English. Or it may be mathematics or any other particular area. The field representative is dealing with a systems approach rather than in a more subject-centred approach, Mr. Chairman.

Monday, 2 June, 1980

MR. HANUSCHAK: The Minister had also mentioned that one other function of the field officers is one of liaison between the community — by community I would include the school board, the teaching staff, the pupils, all the ratepayers — and the Department of Education. But I would think, Mr. Chairman, not unless there's been a drastic change over the last 2-1/2 years, but I would think that in the vast majority of cases, whatever liaison there is between the Department of Education and the school divisions, the lines of communication are one of two or three, either directly to the appropriate branch within the department to which a matter may be related to, curriculum, curriculum services, native education, whatever else it may be, vocational education, and the liaison will be directly to the director of that particular branch; or if the school board or its superintendent does not receive satisfaction from his dealing with that particular branch, then he pursues another channel of communication, that is the Deputy Minister or directly to the Minister.

I really have grave doubts whether the field officer would do much by way of liaison in those particular areas, because it's much simpler to go directly to the branch head, and if one does not get a satisfactory answer, to go to the Deputy Minister or to the Minister, than to go through the field officer, because the field officer probably will not be able to resolve the problem anyway, or will not be able to give the school division the satisfactory answer. All that the field officer will be able to do within this type of structure is say, well, thank you very much for receiving the information. I will pass it on to the appropriate branch or to the Deputy Minister or to the Minister, and in due course you will hear from him. So if the field officer is functioning as a liaison officer, then I would suggest to the Minister that it's merely another sort of a hurdle to overcome, another stumbling block in the bureaucratic process about which people complain and which makes it all the more difficult to resolve problems which could be simplified if the lines of communication were directly from the school division to the appropriate branch heads or to the Deputy Minister or to the Minister.

I really doubt, Mr. Chairman, whether the field officers are performing that much of a liaison function, and hence again, I sincerely question the need for 17 people acting in this capacity, because I would think that a very efficient communication and liaison mechanism can be established without the 17 field officers by direct lines of communication from the 48 school divisions and the school districts of Manitoba, to the appropriate branch heads and to the Deputies and to the Minister's office, without the need of having to go through the field officer every time. So, therefore, I would ask the Minister just how rigid is this liaison system that he has set up? Is it absolutely imperative that if a school board chairman or a superintendent wishes to talk to the Department of Education, is the Minister saying to them that in talking to the Department of Education he must talk to a field officer; that the Minister will not listen to him; that the Deputy Minister will not listen to him; that no branch head will listen to him unless he goes through the field officer? Because if that's a system that the Minister has set up, then I would suggest to

him that it's a very time consuming and a cumbersome one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass — the Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I can assure the Honourable Member for Burrows, that that is not what happened, that school boards have the alternative to approach any particular section of the department. However, practice and experience over the last couple of years has shown that they do utilize the services of the field representatives to a very large extent. In many cases they are able to get questions answered and information that they require without attempting to get in touch with someone in Winnipeg, and this is particularly applicable to those who live some great distance from this city and who appreciate that type of service. And as well, those who service the urban area seem to appreciate that type of service. I can tell the honourable member that I have had nothing but positive feedback from school boards and the superintendents of this province on the particular functioning of this unit.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Perhaps the Minister could clarify one more point for me. He made reference to appraisal, and I would like to know just precisely what it is that the field officer is appraising. Is he appraising the performance of the teachers? Is he appraising the performance of the pupils? If he is appraising the performance of the teachers, is he merit-rating them? Because I'm sure that that's tied in with appraisal. The Minister is laughing, Mr. Chairman. But I'm sure that this is a matter of concern to the teachers. So I would like the Minister to explain to us, in some detail or with more clarity, just what it is that the Minister means that the field officers are doing when they're going about appraising, and what it is that they're appraising, I'm not quite sure. Perhaps the Minister could explain.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I'd be pleased to go into that particular area, because I think it's a valuable function, as well as the liaison function. I said before that one of their particular duties was appraising the implementation of government policies as they relate to educational services; seeing how well, in fact, they are working out in the school divisions; whether, in fact, the people who work in the schools are having difficulty with those policies. We have all found out that what may appear very fine in theory, once it's put into practice can create a certain number of difficulties for those having to put it into practice. We have people who can talk to those who are putting these particular policies into practice and find out what the difficulties of implementation are. So I would suggest, that's one type of appraising.

The suggestion — and I did laugh, Mr. Chairman, — that we were merit-rating teachers is absolutely ridiculous, and the Member for Burrows smiles because I think he knows that he was being a bit facetious when he said that. We certainly are appraising the implementation of particular programs, as curriculum is revised and as it is put into place in the schools of this province, and the field representatives have an opportunity to observe

Monday, 2 June, 1980

and talk to the people who are putting it into place, to find out what problems may be associated with that particular interpretation.

The field representatives also, Mr. Chairman, have the opportunity to appraise how well some of our support services are working out in the school divisions by talking to the people who use those services, and the Member for Burrows seems to have some difficulty understanding how that would happen. I suggest to him this is an opportunity for feedback for people to have some input into the department directly, by talking to the people who represent the department in all of the regions. Of course, they also have the opportunity to appraise the particular assessment procedures that are being used in the school — and I'm talking here about the provincial assessment procedures — and find out how schools view these, how they utilize them, what their suggestions are for improvement or modification, and then feed those particular suggestions back into the department. I could go on and on in some detail, Mr. Chairman, but I think that's a sampling of the type of appraising that these people carry out.

MR. HANUSCHAK: One more question with respect to appraisal. In Manitoba, over the last eleven years, and I would suspect that certainly in the western hemisphere, over the last 15 or 20 years, and that is in the North American continent, there was a move toward a greater measure of autonomy given to the local school authorities to design education programs that they feel would best meet the needs of their particular clientele, and it was felt that those locally in charge, the board, the superintendent, the principals, the teachers, were in closest touch with the pupils with whom they work, were in the best position to sense their particular needs and then in turn to develop meaningful and relevant programs for them. And being in that position, they of course would be in the best position to appraise and assess and evaluate the effectiveness of the programs that they have designed and which they are delivering. Hence over the years we have found slight variations of the basic education program occurring from one school division to another, from one school to another school. Basically, I suppose it's the same because arithmetic is arithmetic and grammar is grammar and there is two plus two equals four, by our calculation anyway. Some may arrive at a different total, but — (Interjection)— that's true, depends what you use as a base.

Now the Honourable Member for Roblin is anxiously waiting to make his contribution. He will have his opportunity too, Mr. Chairman, nobody will deny him that.

Anyway, the point is that there was the general move toward developing an education program designed to meet the needs of the particular community that the education program was designed to serve. Now, I wonder, and I have grave doubts, Mr. Chairman, about the ability of some one being parachuted in, as it were, because the individual may not be from that school division at all, may be unfamiliar with the makeup of the community, with its particular needs and so forth, how that type of individual could come in and offer a valid

assessment and appraisal of a particular education program that was designed to meet the particular needs of that area, be it the core city of Winnipeg, be it something in the area of native education or something tied into ethnically cultural education, and we find bits and pieces of that in various school divisions and various schools, or be it something in the area of technical education — by technical, I am including agriculture, whatever else that some school division in some area might feel is of particular need and usefulness to its particular pupils — and to have some one assigned by the Minister of Education, whoever assigns the field officers to the various divisions, and this, too, perhaps the Minister could explain, on what basis does he assign the 17 field officers to the various divisions. If they are just chosen at random or if they are people who are unfamiliar with the environment, the cultural background, all the other relevant factors that should be taken into account insofar as the delivery of an education program is concerned, I really do wonder whether that type of individual could offer a meaningful, relevant, and a helpful appraisal to a school division and offer it advice as to what changes, modifications, that it should bring about in order to improve its education program. Because really I think that that type of assessment and appraisal can be done most effectively by the local people; the board, the administrative staff and the teaching staff which it employs. I think it could do that much more effectively than some one sent into the division by the Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, it's rather interesting to hear the Honourable Member for Burrows hold forth with his particular philosophy in this regard because experience doesn't bear out what he's maintaining at all. We are finding that school divisions welcome an outside objective viewpoint from people who have expertise, who have experienced a number of different types of situations and his suggestion that appraisal can always be done locally by the unit itself is not borne out in practice at all. In fact, the very opposite is true, that in all cases people seem to appreciate the opinions of those who are outside the system, who don't have the problems that are sometimes associated with those within the system itself. We have heard the term used, Mr. Chairman, that sometimes we are so close to the forest that we can't see the trees; perhaps that applies in this particular case. I will say that experience over the last couple of years seems to bear out that people do welcome the outside opinion.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister one further question. In the process of acting as a consultant and the process of appraising education programs, who has the last word as to whether or not a particular program is going to continue or not? Is it the local authority, namely the board, the superintendent, and others working with him, or is it the field officer? In other words, is the field officer merely acting as a consultant who offers his advise, his suggestions, which may or may not be accepted or acted upon by the school division, by the Minister, or does the field officer have the last word? In other words, if a field officer goes into a

Monday, 2 June, 1980

particular school division and raises his eyebrows, as it were, at a particular program, then does that spell the kiss of death to that particular program, because the field officer gave it a negative report? Is it the field officer then that has the last word? So, who is it, the field officer or the local authority?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the local authorities will make any final decisions as to programming, staffing, all of those things that fall under their jurisdiction.

MR. HANUSCHAK: And if a local authority has the last word then does it follow that whatever financial assistance they would be entitled to from the government of the province of Manitoba, they would receive it, regardless of the report of the field officer?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure that that has very much to do with the topic under discussion. The financial assistance received by school divisions in this province is not determined by the field representatives at all, it's determined by formulas and different grant structures that have been set in place that apply either to pupil counts or to programs that are being conducted in a particular school division.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is succeeding in making me more nervous than I was initially. In response to one of the earlier questions, he said that the role of these people was to check on the implementation of government policy. I'm going to have to reread that in Hansard in its context, I don't want to take something out of context, but it prompts me to say, Mr. Chairman, it is not that I, as one member, am in the least nervous about the individuals who may be deployed. Because as a teacher I appreciated the inspectors, because I drew on their knowledge and familiarity with the system, because they were much more experienced than I was as a new teacher when I first started. It's the government that we question, Mr. Chairman, and in response to the Member for Burrows, when he says that these people are going to evaluate programs, we can only go on what we have experienced over the past two-and-a-half years vis-a-vis the government.

I look at two programs that the government locked the books up, they didn't burn them. One particular program, I think they sold it to Saskatchewan for 28,000 and it cost us about a millions dollars to produce. Interestingly enough, that particular program was purchased from Saskatchewan, in some province, Alberta — I think it was on Co-op Development. Mr. Chairman, this is not a court of law and it is up to courts of law to see whether the Minister is doing that which he can under the law. But I think it is incumbent upon members, regardless of what side of the House that they are on, when the Minister exceeds his prerogative or in one particular case when the chairman of a board exceeds his prerogative — I think there was a cartoon in the paper of me giving the chairman of the Liquor Control Commission a hot-foot because I didn't think

that he had the authority to do something in a particular way and strangely enough in law I was correct. But there was a case, at least in my opinion, that they proceeded by a writ of certiorari. Perhaps somebody can spell that for the staff on Hansard because I can't even spell it, and I can't say either.

But nevertheless, it exists in law, a redress for Ministers or officers of the Crown or corporations exceeding their prerogative and that is the whole thrust of the argument from this side of the House, Mr. Chairman. The Minister can put as much sugar around that pill as he wants. The record shows that the Minister deems these people to be in fact school inspectors and there's no argument from this side of the House that the Minister has that authorization so to do. But it must drawn home forcefully so that not just your superintendents and not just your school boards who the Minister said were pleased with this system — he didn't mention the teachers in the system; he didn't mention the parents in the system; he didn't mention the students in the system. So therefore, Mr. Chairman, I for one cannot support this appropriation. Therefore, I move that Resolution No. 50, Clause (d) be reduced by 688,299.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the honourable member, do you have a copy of the motion?

The motion before the House is that Clause 1., Item (d), Resolution No. 50 be reduced by 688,299.00.

MOTION presented and defeated.

MR. BOYCE: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeas and Nays, call in the members.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

MR. CLERK, Jack Reeves: Yeas, 16; Nays, 23.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the Motion defeated.

Item (d)—pass; Item —(Interjection)— page by page? —(Interjection)— Item (e) Teacher Certification, Records, General Education, Educational Development and Education Data Services: (1) Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. JUNE WESTBURY: Mr. Chairperson, I just wanted to ask a question. At what point can I ask the Minister about Affirmative Action Programs. Would it be under this section or would it come under 3? I know it wouldn't come under 2., under 3.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, that properly would fall under the program section, Curriculum, etc.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would give us a breakdown of this item, please.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the Teacher Certification, Records Branch is composed of three

Monday, 2 June, 1980

sections. The Teacher Certification is one, the High School Records and General Education Development testing is another, and the third area is the Education Data Services. The Teacher Certification takes care of such functions as evaluation of teacher credentials for certification, assessment of teacher and school condition qualifications for placement on the teacher salary grant scale. Another function is the maintenance teacher record system, the issuance of statements of teachers' professional qualification and the provision of statistics on teacher qualifications and teacher supply as required for policy decisions by the Department of Education, teacher training institutions and school boards. Another function, of course is the liaison with education authorities in matters dealing with teacher education and certification.

It's interesting that the teacher certification office maintains approximately 40,000 active files on teachers, Mr. Chairman, and this number includes the 12,400 teachers in the public school system plus those employed by private schools, the Department of Indian Affairs, and those moving in and out of the profession. I mentioned the issuance of certificates as an important function, statements of standing, permits, letters of authority and an interesting fact is, Mr. Chairman, that this particular section of this branch during 1979 received 15,300 pieces of mail and sent out more than 22,250 pieces of mail.

The High School Records Section, the General Educational Development Testing Program are included together. The major functions here are the collection and maintenance of all student academic records at the senior high level in the province. The search and preparation of student academic transcripts, the appraisal of out-of-province credentials from persons seeking employment in Manitoba, the provision of assistance to schools and other external institutions such as Canada Manpower, schools of nursing, community colleges, universities, etc. on matters dealing with the appraisal of out-of-province credentials from students wishing to pursue further their studies within the province. It also looks after queries by telephone, correspondence related to the high school program, credits, equivalencies, student-initiated projects, school-initiated courses, music options, special language credits and so on. It looks after the administration of GED tests, the General Education Development Testing Program; it looks after the maintenance of permanent records of that program, the preparation and issuance of statements of standing and diplomas of high school equivalency based upon results obtained in the GED tests. It also, of course, looks after the maintenance of information related to teacher placement for use by school boards in search of teachers.

There are some 160 high schools, Mr. Chairman, in the province that report student academic achievements at least once annually and that is approximately 50,000 individual student files that each comprise about 6 to 7 separate subjects per year, and some 800 transcripts are issued annually by this particular section of the department. This is provided on personal request only as high schools are generally responsible for providing transcripts to their students. There are approximately 175 appraisals of out-of-province credentials that were

completed during the past academic year, and in addition to that, in excess of 400 calls annually are related to assisting high schools, employers, post-secondary institutions evaluate credentials. In excess of 200 candidates were awarded General Educational Development equivalency diplomas at either the Grade 10, 11 or 12 level during the past academic year.

The third section of this particular branch is the Education Data Services, Mr. Chairman. Its major functions cover the responsibility for the development and co-ordination of the computer-based systems, the development and maintenance of the teacher information system, the development and maintenance of the student academic record system, maintenance of the General Educational Development test system, provision of client services through the random selection sub-system and the address label system, the development and maintenance of the Manitoba text book inventory system, and the development and maintenance of the school bus scheduling system. Those are the main functions of this particular branch of the department, Mr. Chairman. As I have stated, it's composed of three sections.

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

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, the Minister's list of staff for this year indicates that there are some 23 staff man years under this heading. I wonder if the Minister could give me a breakdown under the three headings, Certification, GED and Education Data Services, of how many in each, please.

MR. COSENS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, a total of 23 — seven people in teacher cert., nine in teacher records and student records, one person in the GED portion and six people in the education data services, for a total of 23.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister then if there is no change in the number of people employed, can he explain why the salaries portion shows a reduction of some 7,400 this year.

MR. COSENS: It's accounted for, Mr. Chairman, just in replying to the Member for St. Vital by staff turnover.

MR. WALDING: Is the Minister then expecting some resignations or retirements in the coming year? Is this the reason for it?

MR. COSENS: I'm informed, Mr. Chairman, that this sort of thing happens where you have people of long service retiring, resigning and their positions being taken over by those starting at a lower stage on the salary scale.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I understand the principle involved; I am asking the Minister whether he expects this to happen in the coming year.

MR. COSENS: I can't anticipate that, Mr. Chairman, we have to come up with these figures on the basis of the staff experience that we have at this time.

Monday, 2 June, 1980

MR. WALDING: I'm not sure that I understand what the Minister is telling me, Mr. Chairman. Is he saying on the one hand that he doesn't expect any of his senior staff to resign or become deceased or otherwise leave the department in the year and yet somehow there is a formula that tells the Minister this? He explained to us on the previous one, when we were questioning an increase of some 70,000 of increases in salary costs, that this is accounted for by people becoming more senior in the department. It is a natural type of thing. Now if there is some rule of thumb that indicates that senior people will leave in this department, why did that not apply in the previous department?

MR. COSENS: I think, Mr. Chairman, that I explained this earlier in answering the honourable member, when I stated that there had been people leave this particular section and their positions had been taken by those with less experience, who are placed lower on the salary scale. We know those people are in place and will be in place for the coming year.

MR. WALDING: I believe I understand now what the Minister is getting at, that he is telling me that some senior people in the past year had left and were replaced, and that the forecast for the coming year is based on last year's experience. If that is the case, perhaps the Minister can so indicate.

MR. COSENS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to then ask the Minister about the number of teachers in private schools in the province; if he could give me a breakdown of the number of certified teachers and uncertified teachers for the latest time available. And if he keeps those figures separately for those schools that have shared services' agreement, I would appreciate the figures too for both certified and uncertified teachers at the latest available date.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the honourable member has other questions that he would like to ask at this time while my staff are putting those figures together?

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I expect to have other questions that would arise out of the answers that the Minister gives me under this one, but I believe that one of my colleagues has some questions as well. I'll come back to it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister advise as to what kind of records of teachers are kept by the department? That is, the Minister has indicated that there is 40,000 teachers on record — what kind of things are recorded with respect to these people?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Apropos to the question asked by my colleague, the Honourable Member for Rossmere, I would like to ask him again — I believe I asked a similar question either last year or the previous year, or I'd made the suggestion to him, that there should come a point in time when records of teachers should be declared to become obsolete and hence be destroyed. I think this is quite the common practice in many government departments. I can recall there used to be a committee made up of representatives from various departments who would deal with issues of that kind and make recommendations to their Minister as to what records be destroyed. And it would seem to me that anything going back beyond, with some exceptions I suppose — I think that the transcript of the academic records from the school from which the teacher may have graduated and that type of thing, that has some permanent value and significance to what should be retained, but I would think that there are many other documents which may find their way into the teacher's record file that after a period of time should be destroyed.

The reason why I mention this is because — and at this point I would say that perhaps I was somewhat to blame, maybe I should have taken the initiative — but I can recall a case, it was a question of whether the teacher's certificate should be cancelled or not, and the committee, in reviewing the case had looked at the teacher's teaching records going back to the 1930s, and of what significance or relevance they are today, I really do wonder. I asked for the documentation, of course, Mr. Chairman, it's the Minister that has the final word on the cancellation of the teacher's certificate, so prior to acting upon the recommendation from the committee, I asked for a transmittal of the documentation from the teacher's certification office, and there I was presented with school inspector's appraisal reports of a teacher's performance back in 1935 and 1936 and that sort of thing.

In 1935 or whatever year it was, the inspector rated the teacher's personal appearance as B, the following year as D — why, God only knows, but I would hope, and in fact I would like to think that the committee reviewing the status of a teacher attached very little importance to records of this kind. Nevertheless, there it was, cluttering up the file, which I would think, you know, may have had a bearing on the thinking of some member or members of the committee. So, I would suggest that records of some types beyond a certain age, be destroyed, No. 1.

No. 2, I would also like to re-emphasize the question put by my colleague the Honourable Member for Rossmere. I too would like to know just what type of information is contained within the files. I have the impression, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister has files on many more individuals than who are actually engaged in teaching today, because there are only what? — about 12,000 teachers employed in the province of Manitoba, but the Minister said he has 40,000 files, so that's 26,000 more than are employed, or 28,000 more. So perhaps the Minister could explain what the guidelines are for the retention of teachers' records, of teachers who are not employed, how long are they kept and for what purpose.

My other question to the Minister is, who has access to such records? Can anyone walk in off the street and ask to see a file on a particular teacher? Or is it just the teacher, or is it the teacher and some other individuals — superintendents, the trustees of the school division employing the teacher, the school inspectors, or as my colleague says, perhaps anyone who smokes a stinky cigar perhaps might have some special privileges — I don't know if there that many people who smoke stinky cigars, not only the one who is presently speaking. So, if the Minister would indicate who has access to the records on teachers contained within this branch?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, first of all, in responding to the Member for St. Vital, there are a total of 639 teachers in private or independent schools in Manitoba. The actual breakdown as to certified and uncertified teachers within that 639, I don't have at my fingertips; I'll have to bring that information in for him tomorrow.

The Member for Rossmere asked what type of information is kept in the teacher records. The following items are recorded: the academic qualifications of the teacher, years of teaching experience, the division and district where the teacher has taught, the salary grant ratings, school inspectors' reports, correspondence with director or office, superintendent or field representatives' recommendation toward permanent certification, these are the particular items that are recorded in those files. I'm informed that the records are destroyed at the time the particular teacher becomes deceased, and only the names are retained for historical purposes. The access to these files is rather strictly governed by rules that have been laid down in the department. I understand they've been in place since 1977; only the teachers themselves have access to those particular files, and field representatives.

I might also mention, Mr. Chairman, while I'm on my feet, the Member for Burrows questions why we would have 40,000 — I believe he used that figure — when we don't have that many people actively involved at this particular time, and have never had that many — there are people who move in and out of the profession, as well, of course, as those whose records are maintained after they retire, until such time as they are deceased.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister indicated that one of the items on file would be a field officer's recommendation for permanent certification. I'm just wondering, what are the qualifications for permanent certification, if there are any. Is there a specific number of years of teaching? And if you have completed those years of teaching, once you have your permanent certificate, does that mean that it is kept by a teacher forever? Even if they're out of the field for 20 years, would they still be entitled to come back in and teach in the system without any kind of upgrading, without any kind of updating, without anything other than having some school division say you're hired?

MR. COSENS: The Member for Rossmere, Mr. Chairman, is asking about the certification of teachers that they receive after two years of successful teaching in a particular school division and after receiving a recommendation based either on the school superintendent for that area, or if there's no superintendent, on the recommendation of the field representative. Of course, further to what the Member for Rossmere asks, under Manitoba Regulation 154(76), they retain that permanent certificate, I suppose one could say, for the rest of their life. It would be possible that someone could return to the educational system with that certificate after a long absence. That would be a matter to be judged by the employing school division as to the desirability of employing someone who had been away from the active participation in the profession for a large number of years and who had not taken courses or taken some particular action to upgrade themselves or to keep themselves more or less informed of what new developments had taken place in the teaching profession. I think that in itself controls that particular aspect rather effectively.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There's an item for Education Data Services — and I'm sure the Minister must have explained something but I missed it, and I'm just wondering whether he could explain again what that item refers to.

MR. COSENS: The Education Data Services, Mr. Chairman, replying to the Member for Rossmere, are responsible for the development co-ordination of the computer-based aspect of the record-keeping in this particular section. They look after the development and maintenance of the teacher information system, of the student academic record system, the general educational development test system, the provision of client services through the random selection sub-system and the address label system, the development and maintenance of the Manitoba Textbook inventory system, and the development and maintenance of the school bus scheduling system.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I believe it's on this item that we had raised the matter on previous occasions, and I would like to raise it again, the question of Canadian citizenship as a prerequisite for permanent certification. My colleague, the Honourable Member for St. Vital, has just reminded me that's his speech and I will not elaborate on it at any great length. He does a far better job in dealing with this topic than I do.

I would like to urge him once again to reconsider the provision within the regulations that makes Canadian citizenship being mandatory as a prerequisite for permanent certification, because I do believe that there are many teachers who have perfectly valid reasons for not becoming Canadian citizens but yet wishing to live in this country and wishing to be employed herein and practise their profession.

Last year I gave one example and I will repeat it again to refresh the Minister's memory. This is the

Monday, 2 June, 1980

case of an American who married a Canadian boy. She came up to Canada to live here. She was a teacher and was employed in one of the suburban school divisions on a — what is it, interim teacher's certificate, the one preceding the permanent — which is open for renewal once, twice, I believe, which will give you a period of six years within which to teach. Well, during that period of time her husband passed away and some time thereafter she found herself on the horns of a dilemma as to whether she should remain in Canada or return to the United States because there were some changes back home, as it were, and there was the possibility that it might be to her advantage to return to the United States to run the family business. If she were to do that she wanted to keep her options open and have her American citizenship. On the other hand, she did enjoy working in Canada and did prefer to stay here, but she was told that there would come a point in time at which she would have to make a decision that she would have to take out a Canadian citizenship in order to continue teaching.

Well, as it happened, she is not teaching today because she chose to take over her late husband's business so she is involved in that. But nevertheless, that doesn't clear away or remove the problem. The problem is still there because at some time, there's no saying what she may wish to do at some time in the future. She may wish to return to teaching. And as long as this regulations is there that barrier will remain and there'll come a point when she'll have to make that decision as to whether she wants to become a Canadian citizen or not. This is about the only profession with the exception of one other, law I believe, that one must be a Canadian citizen in order to practise his or her profession.

I suppose a case could be made — and I'm not attempting to make it — but perhaps a case could be made in support of the need for a lawyer, for a barrister or solicitor to be a Canadian citizen because at law he is regarded as an officer of the court. But a teacher, an engineer, an architect, a dentist, a doctor, I really see no need for Canadian citizenship to practise any of those professions. In fact, there is no need to practise any of those professions with the exception of teaching, for some reason or another.

I would like the Minister to reconsider that and indicate whether he has had any change of mind on this particular point and I mention that particularly in view of the fact that over the years we in Canada have always had our doors open to people who were victims of a political system or some political upheaval in the other part of the world and they chose to take refuge in Canada. Over the last 25 years or so we've had Czeks come here, we've had the Hungarians come here, the Chileans, more recently the Vietnamese, and I would ask the Minister in the event that there are school teachers amongst the Vietnamese who have settled in Manitoba and who may, after having settled here, may have got to like living in Manitoba and they wish to make this their home for many years but for reasons of their own may not wish to become Canadian citizens, and amongst them there might be school teachers. Is the Minister telling them that despite the fact that their colleagues who came with them, bringing with them whatever skills they had,

whatever profession they had, that they would be at liberty to practise their trade, practise their profession, but those who are teachers and who would wish to take up the practice of teaching in Manitoba, would have to become Canadian citizens; whereas their friends, if they wish to become Canadian citizens, well, they'll do that of their own free choice, but it will not be mandatory for them to do so in order to practise their particular calling, their particular occupation. But in the case of teachers, one has to become a Canadian citizen.

So is the Minister telling the Vietnamese — those who are teachers — that despite the fact that the red carpet as it were was rolled out for them a year ago and they were welcomed with open arms in Canada, in our province of Manitoba, in the city of Winnipeg, very graciously and warmly received, but that those among them who are teachers will not enjoy the same privileges, the same benefits as others if they should choose to remain for a period exceeding five or six years? Their friends, it will be up to them whether they wish to take out Canadian citizenship or not? But for those who may wish to teach they will, of necessity by law, have to become Canadian citizens?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I have listened with some interest to the remarks of the Member for Burrows. I just happen to have an old education bulletin here from the year 1972. It's entitled, Citizenship Requirement for Certification and it says, if I may read it: The Minister of Education, the Honourable Ben Hanuschak, has accepted the following recommendations from the Board of Teacher ED and Certification that the interim certificates of non-citizen teachers be renewable upon application of two-year intervals to a maximum of three intervals, and this policy will apply to all non-Canadian citizen teachers commencing September 1, 1972. Those non-citizen teachers in the Manitoba Public School System with five or more years of teaching experience will be allowed to complete a further two years of teaching until September 1, 1974, to gain Canadian citizenship. If citizenship is not gained by September 1, 1974, interim certificates will not be renewed. All other teachers will be required to become citizens within a six-year period after initial employment in Manitoba. Certificates will be renewed for two-year intervals after initial employment, upon the recommendation of either a school inspector or a school superintendent. It goes on to say that, If a further clarification is needed, please contact the director of Teacher Certification and Records.

The Member for Burrows, Mr. Chairman, has taken, I know, a favourite concern of the Member for St. Vital and voiced it here this evening. Certainly this is an item that I can tell members of this House that we have under very active consideration at this time and I'm quite optimistic that I will have a policy announcement on this very soon. Taking into consideration some of the aspects of the problem that the Honourable Member for Burrows has mentioned. I of course, like all other Manitobans, feel that I have an obligation to Manitobans first at a time when we have some Manitobans who find difficulty finding employment in the teaching profession. It is difficult to look at a policy that would

Monday, 2 June, 1980

allow those who are not citizens to become certified. However, we have to take into consideration the extenuating circumstances of this particular situation, where we have people who are citizens of other countries who have been invited to come here. In fact, school divisions in the past have almost gone and pleaded with them to come and fill positions that they were not able to fill with Manitoba graduates. I think they're of certain specialist areas such as music or art, where in the past we have had shortages in this particular area and in particular, citizens of the United States have come up to Canada and have done an outstanding job in teaching in these particular areas.

So I say to the member, Mr. Chairman, that we do have this matter under active consideration, that I found it of rather considerable interest that the Manitoba Teachers Society at their annual convention this year passed a resolution to the extent that they favoured the certification of citizens of other countries who had come to Canada and not taken up citizenship here but who had taught in this particular province for a number of years and were not prepared to take out citizenship but were prepared to continue teaching, here and where school boards were inclined to recommend that these people be employed and that they receive permanent certification that such action should be taken. This was the recommendation of a resolution arising from the convention of the teachers of Manitoba this year. There are many aspects to the problem and I can assure members that we have these under consideration. Hopefully, I will be able to make an announcement in that regard in a very few weeks.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for those remarks that he has made. They're the most encouraging that I've heard from him since becoming the Minister. He is quite correct when he quotes my colleague from Burrows, who was the Minister at the time when that particular regulation was published.

Members have mentioned that this is a particular concern of mine and I make the same speech every year. I've made the same speech to this Minister on a couple of occasions and to his predecessor and his predecessor before him, all with the same lack of success, Mr. Chairman. I stood up, or intended today to more or less repeat the same sentiments again with not too much hope that anything would come of it. I should say that although the former Minister, the present Member for Burrows, had issued that particular resolution, I believe that in speaking to him afterwards he realized the position and intended, at least gave me the impression that he intended to have that regulation revoked. He had not done so by the time that another member was appointed as the Minister.

I don't intend to repeat all of the arguments. I believe that has been done very well. I happen to agree with the Minister when he says that he agrees that Manitobans should be given first priority as far as employment is concerned. But to be a Manitoban doesn't necessarily imply citizenship in the country. I could understand the argument being made, Mr. Chairman, that someone coming to this country should not be allowed to take up his particular line of

work for a certain length of time because he came from a different coach or a different system, different method of doing things.

I believe we have the same qualification for people voting. The people who come to Manitoba are required to live here for a year before they are allowed to vote in a provincial election. People coming into the country, I believe, are required to be in the country for, I think it's again a year, before they are allowed to vote in a federal election, so an argument can be made on those grounds for delaying a person's right to carry on his particular skill and expertise for a certain period of time. What we have with this regulation is exactly the opposite. A person can come here from a totally different society, maybe a society that does things quite differently, that has different terms and expressions, a different form of expression, and providing he gets an interim certificate which is granted solely on his academic qualifications, is allowed to teach immediately.

So any danger that he might be to Manitoba children would surely occur in the first few years that he were here and not after six years. But the regulation states that he can teach for the first six years and only after that time, when he's lived in this province and become accustomed to the ways and the customs of the province and the geography, the history of the province, its institutions and its politics. But then after six years, the Minister will not allow him to teach any more, no matter how good he might be, no matter how well thought of by his employers or how well liked by his students, the Minister says no.

It's irrational, Mr. Chairman, it doesn't make any sense, and it flies in the face of The Human Rights Act. I have mentioned this to the Minister before and both previous Ministers to that and they always pointed out to me, well, it's not the province that is the employer. Employers are prohibited from discriminating on the basis of a number of things, including nationality. But it's the school board who does the employing. Now they don't discriminate on those grounds. They discriminate only as to whether the teacher has a certificate or not. No certificate, no employment. But it is the province that is the issuer of the certificate. So this is the way that the province gets around that particular requirement.

The Member for Burrows is quite right in saying that there is only one other area to his knowledge where citizenship is a requirement for employment and that is the law. Now we heard one of the government backbenchers, I am not sure which it was from, introduce an Act this year to amend The Law Society Act, including that very section dealing with citizenship, which eased the requirement to some extent. I don't really quarrel with the necessity for citizenship when it comes to being an officer of the court. There is a certain governmental function involved in that case which does not appear when it comes to the teaching of children. I happen to agree with the Manitoba Teachers Society that says academic or professional qualifications — and I'm not sure if that's the correct term — should be the only criterion for certification in this province.

The Minister is not correct when he implies that resolution was first adopted at the annual general meeting of the Teachers Society this year. It was at

Monday, 2 June, 1980

least in effect from last year from the AGM of the Teachers' Society and possibly for the year before although I am not certain about that. The reason I am aware of that, Mr. Chairman, is that I brought a resolution, a Private Members' resolution into the House last year, stating that the Legislature should vote on that particular regulation that the Minister has quoted and in the text of that Private Members' resolution was notice of the fact that sentiment had been approved by the Manitoba Teachers' Society, and as I say, I believe it was from last year at least, if not from the year before.

So in closing I am very encouraged by the Minister's remarks. I hope that he will take it under even more active consideration and I hope that he will come to the realization that to discriminate on the grounds of nationality is morally wrong.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, one of the other functions of this branch is the General Educational Development Program, commonly known as GED and this is a program in which we on this side are particularly interested in. This is one that was instituted in our system during our years of government and one of which we were very proud because it gave adults who had to drop out of school, for whatever reason, at the end of Grade 8, 9, or 10, but over the years in the school of hard knocks, they felt that they had acquired the volume of knowledge that would put them on par with the high school graduate except that they didn't have that piece of paper to show that they had graduated from high school. This gave them an opportunity to write an examination or test or a series of tests and if satisfactorily completed, get them a certificate indicating their particular equivalent grade level standing.

So my question to the Minister is, could the Minister give us just some comparative data or statistics on this particular program, and its popularity, its appeal? Is the demand still there? I know he did indicate the number who had obtained, I think it was the equivalent of Grade 12 standing during the past year, but I suppose if I were to check back in Hansard or check through the annual reports of the Department of Education, I could get this information for myself, but I think it is of sufficient importance to go on the record in the proceedings of this committee. So I would appreciate hearing from the Minister, just a brief rundown on the success of this program and the popularity and appeal of it, whether it's increasing, declining, etc.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I could refer the honourable member to page 66 of the Annual Report where all of that data is broken down and the statistics are available from 1979, March, June, September, December, and the totals. We're seeing just a slight decrease in the number of people who are applying to write the GED tests and I think, Mr. Chairman, that is no reflection on the tests. I would hope that as more and more people come through our educational system and we've retained more people in the system for a greater length of time, that eventually we will see the necessity for the GED tests disappear. We're seeing just a slight diminution

in the number of people who are applying to write the tests at this time. It's nothing of a major nature at all. The number has hovered around the 2,000 mark over the years. I believe 1976 it reached a high of 2,584. In 1978 there were 2,001 who wrote the tests. In 1979 it has dropped to some 1,749. The people in my department expect that in 1980 it will probably increase slightly again. So we're not seeing any rapid drop in the number who are applying, Mr. Chairman. Again, as I say, I would hope that we will eventually retain such a high percentage of people in the school system through grades K to 12 that the necessity for the GED test will practically disappear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Back on teachers' certification, I believe the Minister indicated that one of the items on teachers' records were inspectors'0000orts. Now we've gone through inspectors and their successors for some period of time. I assume that these reports are no longer coming in on teachers. There must have been a cutoff at some time or other. Is that so, and if so, are people who were in the system prior to that particular cutoff date then being treated somewhat differently from those who have entered the system after that, in that those who have entered after that particular cutoff point don't have these types of comments on their records?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Rossmere is quite correct in that because there are no reports now recorded in the department by field representatives. That type of material does not exist in the files of teachers who have begun teaching in the last few years. It does exist for those who were teaching up until the time that school inspectors gave over that particular function to school superintendents. Today, superintendents' reports exist on teachers and these are kept, as far as I am informed, in school board offices.

MR. SCHROEDER: The superintendents' reports, then, are not made available to the Department of Education. Is that correct? The old inspectors' reports, to whom would they be available?

MR. COSENS: To the teacher, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Just one further comment in this area in terms of permanent certification. I admit to not having given this a great deal of thought because I wasn't aware of it before this evening, but it seems to me that there should be some consideration of a requirement of some kind of upgrading or refresher course for anyone leaving the field and coming back in some years later. You can have people going into real estate, or goodness knows what other kinds of professions or callings, and coming back years later, and without any refreshing, without any upgrading, just walking right into the system, and that doesn't seem to me to be a logical way to proceed. I know, for instance, with

Monday, 2 June, 1980

nurses, that isn't allowed. There is a certain amount of time required to be spent, and if that time isn't spent, their certification is lifted. I was wondering whether the Minister would care to comment on that.

MR. COSENS: There is no requirement, Mr. Chairman, just in answer to the Member for Rossmere, in that regard. To this date, the professional responsibility of teachers seems to have taken care of that particular aspect as well as, I suppose, a certain discipline that is imposed by the system itself, where the employers would be rather loathe to employ someone who had been absent from active classroom work for a large number of years and, on applying for a job, was not able to show any evidence that they had done anything in the recent year or so to upgrade themselves or bring themselves in line with current teaching practices and so on.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I understand that some school divisions, possibly many of them, have teacher induction programming, and I am just wondering whether the Minister would care to comment on those programs and who funds them.

MR. COSENS: These would be funded by the local school division, to my knowledge, Mr. Chairman. The particular induction programs that the member refers to vary widely across the province. In some cases, they may really comprise a one-day workshop, and others it may be a much more comprehensive and something that's spread over a number of weeks or a number of months in fact. Some school divisions have become very sophisticated in their induction of new teachers to the job, so that they in fact spend their first year in internship situation where experienced teachers work very closely with them.

MR. SCHROEDER: Does the department have any standards for this type of program which it recommends that school divisions follow? Does the department have any specific standards on induction programs that it feels should be followed?

MR. COSENS: This is left to the decision of the employing school division, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SCHROEDER: Could the Minister advise as to how many school divisions or districts operate suitable or any teacher induction programs?

MR. COSENS: I don't have that particular information readily available, Mr. Chairman. From my experience I would suggest that a majority do at this time, but I can't be more specific than that at this point.

MR. SCHROEDER: Does the Minister believe that the induction programs in general are adequate, and if not, does he see any solutions in terms of provincial funding of these induction programs, and does he feel any provincial responsibility in view of the fact that it is the Minister who finally provides the certificate qualifying an individual to teach?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, teachers who are now going into our schools have received four years

of training. They have spent a considerable amount of time in practice teaching out in the classrooms of the province, and as a result, the requirement by the department for a structured funded type of induction program, I feel, is not as necessary now as it might have been ten years ago, when people were moving into classrooms after one year of training with perhaps a week or two at the most of practical experience in classrooms. The young people that we have moving into classrooms today have received a considerable amount of practical experience, actual classroom experience, before they begin teaching.

MR. SCHROEDER: Is the Minister then indicating that those school divisions which are providing up to a one-year internship as indicated by the Minister, are providing a service which is unnecessary and costly?

MR. COSENS: I don't judge those particular programs, Mr. Chairman, as unnecessarily costly. They may require some extra time and effort by fellow professionals that mightn't have to be expended if they decided not to follow that particular program, but I think this is certainly within the judgement of a particular school division if they wish to follow that type of program; if they feel that it results in more effective teaching in their school division, a happier personnel; that it cuts down on the number of problems that the beginning teacher has in their particular school division. That's certainly well within their judgement, and again, I don't view these as particular expensive programs, because it doesn't require the hiring of additional personnel. But it does require experienced personnel on staff to expend a certain amount of extra time perhaps, and extra energy to consult with beginning teachers and to work with them on occasion.

MR. SCHROEDER: Would the Minister then confirm, that all other things being equal, the teacher who has been through an intensive induction program, will be a better teacher than the individual who has either been through one of those one-day sessions the Minister was indicating, or a very short period?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, if the Honourable Member for Rossmere can tell me how you can measure the effect of that, I'd be very interested, because if I knew how we could measure the effectiveness of those programs in an absolute way, perhaps I could give him a little more specific answer.

MR. SCHROEDER: It seems to me that of course is one of the problems of the education system. It's not turning out oranges and apples, it's providing knowledge to people, and here in specific, a number of school divisions are providing training above and beyond the training provided in the school system. It would seem to me that it would be logical to assume that that type of program will provide for a more highly qualified teaching staff, and if a teaching staff is more highly qualified, then all other things being equal, that staff surely has to be a better teaching staff than one which is less highly qualified. Therefore, I would suggest to the Minister that it is

Monday, 2 June, 1980

time to consider the provincial government encouraging these kinds of programs in those divisions which do not have them by providing grants for them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, further to the figure that the Minister gave me earlier about the number of teachers in private schools being 639, I assume from what he says that is the grand total of those certified and uncertified, and schools with shared services agreements plus those without agreements. Perhaps he can confirm that. The reason I'm in some doubt about it is, from figures that the Minister gave in the estimates last year when the same question was asked, where the Minister said on page 2755, there are some 498 teachers in private schools as follows: 383 hold Manitoba teacher certificates, 115 are uncertified, for a total of 498, those figures for February 15th, 1979. He then went on to say, For those private schools where there are agreements with the local school division for shared services funding, these schools had 359 certified teachers, some 53 teachers did not have certificates. Now I'm a little unsure from reading those figures, whether those are in two different categories, that is, to get a grand total the figure of 498 should be added to approximately 400 in schools with shared cost agreements, or whether the second total is contained within the almost 500 teachers given in the first instance. If the same figures would apply this year, it would either indicate a reduction in the first instance of some 300 teachers, or an increase of 100 teachers from 500 to some 600, which is quite a dramatic increase in just one year. I wonder if the Minister could just clarify that point for me. I'm willing to wait until tomorrow for the actual breakdown in certified and uncertified teachers.

MR. COSENS: Yes, I can provide that information tomorrow, Mr. Chairman. The reason for the confusion, if that does exist in the honourable member's mind, maybe because we're talking about total number of teachers in private schools as opposed to the figures of teachers in those schools that are under shared service agreements or teachers in private schools who are receiving funding from the provincial government, we have two or three different categories there, as well as teachers in private schools, as I mentioned earlier, under the direct shared service type of agreement. So I would be quite prepared to have that breakdown prepared for the member and have it available for him tomorrow.

MR. WALDING: Can the Minister then confirm that the figure of 498 teachers in private schools is the total in whatever categories he breaks them down into and that that corresponds with the latest figure that he has given of 639? Are those the two figures that we can compare?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I am informed that those two figures are correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass; (2)—pass; (e)—pass; (f) Interprovincial Training Agreements—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I don't see this item taking too long, but could the Minister list for us what the training agreements are, with which provinces?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, we have two training agreements under which we pay the cost of Manitoba students taking training in other provinces, the training which is not available in Manitoba. One of the agreements is with Saskatchewan, with the School of Veterinary Medicine at Saskatoon, and the other one is with Ontario for students taking Optometry. On the other side of the coin, Mr. Chairman, we have at Red River Community College, programs in nuclear medicine technology and programs for the hearing impaired, where other provinces send their students to utilize our programs.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister can give us a breakdown between these two programs, how much is going to veterinary medicine and how much to optometry. Can the Minister confirm that there is no amount in here for a dental nurses' course in Saskatchewan and that this very worthwhile program has finally been sabotaged and laid to rest by this government?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the breakdown in funding is as follows: for veterinary medicine, 1980-81, 392,900; and for optometry, 26,400. The dental nursing agreement terminated with the 1978-79 academic year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (f)—pass — the Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the Veterinary Science Program, could the Minister indicate the number of seats that will be available for first-year enrollees in the fall of 1980, because that's what this appropriation will take care of. Number two, the total number of Manitoba students presently enrolled in Saskatoon and the number of students enrolled in the optometric course in Ontario. And the third question, could the Minister bring us up to date on plans, if any, I know that there were some plans on track a number of years ago for the establishment of a school of optometry, I believe, it was in Calgary, Alberta, I'm not sure whether Alberta had decided on which campus it was going to have the school located at, and I'm wondering whether those plans are continuing or in fact if the school is already established and if there are any plans to utilize that facility as opposed to the one in Ontario, which is, I believe, in Waterloo, I'm not sure. And a fourth question, the Minister will recall a year ago the Minister of Economic Development was very very excited about the development of his Bird Care Program and I'm wondering whether the Veterinary Science Program makes provision for the training of personnel to deliver the Bird Care Program of the Minister of Economic Development. No it wasn't birdseed, this was a program to deal with ailing birds and not with feeding them.

Monday, 2 June, 1980

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, in response to the Honourable Member for Burrows, the allocation to Manitoba historically of veterinary students has been 10 students per year. We have discussions under way at this time and there is a good possibility that will be expanded to 12 in the coming year.

Currently we have some 38 Manitoba students enrolled at Saskatoon in the Veterinary Medicine Program; and in optometry at Waterloo, a total of seven students. I can inform the Member for Burrows that discussions are still under way on a western school of optometry. And yes, Mr. Chairman, vets do take care of birds.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, with respect to that Children's Dental Health Program, are there remnants of that program still operating in the school divisions? That is, as a result of previous programming, do we have dental health nurses operating in our school divisions in the province?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, that question would be better posed to the Minister of Health as to the personnel that are operating in the particular Children's Dental Health Programs across the province. Yes, the program is operating in a considerable number of school divisions and yes, I believe some of the graduates of that particular program are working in that program.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Isn't there a specific program operating in the Turtle Mountain School Division which the Minister would be getting reports on and if so, what kind of reports is the Minister getting — are they favourable or is the jury not yet in?

MR. COSENS: Once again, Mr. Chairman, I would have to refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Health. Those reports do not go to the Department of Education. I have received no particular report at any time on the Department of Health programs that are being offered in particular schools.

MR. SCHROEDER: The Minister is then saying that although these programs are being delivered by the education system or through the school system, or at least at school, the reports are being made to the Department of Health.

MR. COSENS: Actually, Mr. Chairman, what happens is that the educational system, in some cases, provides the facility. The program is funded by the Department of Health and the personnel are employed either by the Department of Health, or in the cases where private dentists are operating the plan, then the personnel will be reimbursed by the private dentists. Any reports in that regard then would go to my colleague, the Minister of Health.

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

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister told us that there were 10 students in the

veterinary program last year and that there are negotiations to increase that two, to 12 for this year. I would like to ask the Minister whether that is the reason for the large increase in that appropriation this year, 392,000 as against 303,000 last year, or is there an increase in fees as well and if so what is the breakdown?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, answering the Honourable Member for St. Vital, the increase really represents an increase in cost. The per-student cost in veterinary medicine in 1978-79 it was some 8,542 per student; in 1979-80 it is estimated that the cost per student will be 9,242, a considerable increase, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WALDING: Is the increase of some 90,000 totally taken up by that increase in fees, or is this taking into account the possibility of an additional two students as well?

MR. COSENS: The actual cost, Mr. Chairman, in 1979-80 totalled 394,471, not 345,900.00. There was an additional billing that was received on that particular year, as we receive an additional billing each year. We have no way of being able to predict accurately what that particular sum will be.

MR. WALDING: Can I ask the Minister if he can give us the corresponding figures for optometry? He's asking for 26,00 this year and he asked for 32,000 last year — that's a drop. Could he give us an explanation of that please?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I'm informed that the actual costs from Ontario in regard to the optometry program last year were less than what we had anticipated. We had anticipated some 32,300 in costs and the actual expended was 24,241.00.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, the Minister mentioned a number of seven for the number of Manitobans taking the optometry course. Now does that indicate seven each year or does that mean a total of seven who are at the different stages, different years of the course, and can he further indicate how many will be going this year?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the total is seven, and of course that is made up of people at different levels in the four-year course. We anticipate this year that three students will be entering the first year of the optometry program from Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (f)—pass; we will move on to Clause 2., Research, because we cannot pass the Minister's Compensation in that item. Resolution No. 51, Clause 2., Research (a) Salaries—pass; — the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, this is an item that could well take a bit of time. I wonder if it would be an appropriate time for the committee to rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise.