



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

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)**

42 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XLII No. 86A - 1:30 p.m., MONDAY, JUNE 21, 1993

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fifth Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, June 21, 1993

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill 47—The Residential Tenancies Amendment Act (2)

Hon. Linda McIntosh (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer), that Bill 47, The Residential Tenancies Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur la location à usage d'habitation, be introduced and that the same be now received and read a first time.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been advised of the contents of this bill, recommends it to the House. I would like to table the message.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 48—The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1993

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Downey), that Bill 48, The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1993 (Loi de 1993 modifiant diverses dispositions législatives en matière de fiscalité), be introduced and that the same be now received and read a first time.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been advised of the contents of the bill, recommends it to the House. I would like to table the message.

I would like to make a few remarks, Mr. Speaker, on first reading.

Motion presented.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1993, which contains amendments from the 1993 budget and technical amendments.

Also contained in this bill is a provision under The Tobacco Tax Act for the imposition of a tax on raw-leaf tobacco at the reduced rate of four cents per gram, effective midnight tonight.

This bill also contains an exemption from aviation fuel tax for aircraft configured solely for hauling freight which are arriving from or departing to points outside of North America.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 49—The Summary Convictions Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), I move, seconded by the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger), that Bill 49, The Summary Convictions Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les poursuites sommaires et apportant des modifications corrélatives à une autre loi), be introduced and that the same be now received and read a first time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 50—The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1993

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I move, on behalf of the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), seconded by the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Ducharme), that Bill 50, The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1993 (Loi de 1993 modifiant diverses dispositions législatives), be introduced and the same be now received and read a first time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 51—The Municipal Amendment Act (2)

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach), I move, seconded by the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst), that Bill 51, The Municipal Amendment Act (2) (Loi no 2

modifiant la Loi sur les municipalités), be introduced and the same be now received and read a first time.

Motion agreed to.

* (1335)

Introduction of Guests

Mr. Speaker: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery, where we have with us this afternoon from the Sherwood School twenty-eight Grade 5 students under the direction of Ms. Sandra Copp. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer).

On behalf of all honourable members, I would like to welcome you here this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Cortelco Canada Inc. Manitoba Plant Closure

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Deputy Premier (Mr. Downey).

Today we learned, unfortunately, that 40 jobs have been lost in the Cortelco plant in the city of Winnipeg. Forty people were working there a year ago on St. James Avenue, and there now have been 20 people recalled, and then the plant was announced as being closed today. At the same time, the company has indicated publicly that they will be maintaining the plant in Regina, in fact servicing the Manitoba region from Regina, and they will be maintaining their plant in Guelph, Ontario.

I would like to know from the Deputy Premier: Why did they choose to close the plant here in Manitoba?

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, the short answer is because of lack of orders and work right here in the province of Manitoba in terms of a reduction in the supply of telephone set piece parts and some telephones and also the repair and refurbishing of limited phone sets that are no longer required by Manitoba Telephone System.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, the minister did not answer the question of why they are closing one of three plants in the province of Manitoba.

I would like to ask the minister: What action did they take to try to prevent this closure of this plant, to try to prevent the loss of another 40 good jobs in the province of Manitoba, 40 jobs that are essential for the families of this province?

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Speaker, I outlined for the Leader of the Opposition the reasons given as to why this particular plant was closing. He refers to 40 employees. The provision was to recall 20 employees, and it is the 20 employees who are receiving the notice.

Having said that, we are always concerned about any job losses in Manitoba, so we did follow up in terms of what the reasons were. I have outlined them for this House, but as part of an additional follow-up, there will be a meeting taking place this week with officials from Cortelco, Manitoba Telephones and the government, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, the operation is now going to service the Manitoba Telephone System and other telephone systems from their Regina plant.

I would like to know from the minister, Mr. Speaker: Why did the company choose to close the Manitoba plant? Why did we not have the Manitoba plant stay open and maintain the jobs in this province? What reasons led to the decision of the company to make a decision to close one plant in three? Why was that the Manitoba plant that was chosen?

It is very important. We have lost a thousand telecommunication jobs in March of this year over March of last year. Why is this happening here in the province of Manitoba?

Mr. Stefanson: Again, Mr. Speaker, my understanding is because of the level of work and the loss of some work here in the province of Manitoba that I believe has not happened in the province of Saskatchewan. So, from an economic and business perspective, the company would retain their plant where they have a higher volume of work and they have more work available. That is not the case in Manitoba. So that is the reason, I am led to believe, from information I have been provided, for their decision.

We are always concerned about consolidations taking place, and that is why I remind the honourable member. I am sure he is interested in seeing that when other amalgamations and changes have occurred, they benefit Manitoba, whether it is Unitel putting one of their call centres

in Manitoba, whether it is Canadian Pacific putting one of their call centres in Manitoba, whether it is Canada Post putting one of their three in Manitoba.

There is a series of initiatives that go in our direction, and I would suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that we are certainly winning more than we are losing when it comes to companies making the decision where best to locate because of the cost of doing business, the quality of labour, and Manitoba is clearly one of the best provinces in all of Canada to do that, Mr. Speaker.

* (1340)

Gretchen Family Romanian Adoption

Mr. Dave Chomlak (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, no Manitobans can help but be moved by the situation respecting the Gretchen family, and one can only conclude that the province has made a mistake in trying to force the family to post a \$300,000 line of credit in order to have their adopted daughter reunite with her sister here in Canada.

Can the minister advise this House today that he has looked into the matter and he will resolve it so that this young child can be reunited with her family immediately or as soon as possible?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat familiar with the individual circumstance, and the policy that has been used in this case with the adoptive family sponsoring this youngster from Romania has been consistently used for a number of years. All of our hearts go out to that young child, and I think clearly all of us would want to see the family reunited.

It is with that intention in mind that we have made those financial arrangements with the sponsoring family because of the medical circumstances around this individual's condition in Romania.

Mr. Chomlak: Mr. Speaker, I phrased my question very carefully, because I am convinced the mistake was made by the province. This little girl was adopted prior to the province even sending the letter to the Gretchen family saying they would have to pay this \$300,000.

Will the minister advise this House—I spoke with the mother this morning. Will he meet with the family immediately and try to resolve this problem? They should not have to put up money for this little girl. We are not even certain if she is HIV positive.

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to discuss the medical condition of this young child, and I think it may well be rather inappropriate that my honourable friend would do so. The information I have is that the youngster was examined by a Viennese doctor when the medical circumstances were identified and were communicated to Immigration Canada, who deemed the youngster to be medically inadmissible. In circumstances such as that, there is no exception made to the immigration of such an individual to Canada, regardless of age and regardless of status.

I think my honourable friend can understand some of the circumstances that led to those conclusions by Immigration Canada. In this circumstance, it was suggested that should the province be able to accommodate this youngster, Immigration Canada would waive their normal prohibition on medical admissibility.

It is under that circumstance, and with that full knowledge, that we have indicated that a letter of credit to the extent as indicated to the Gretchen family would be required, based on the knowledge that we have of the medical condition of this youngster and, Sir, that process has been communicated, as you well see, to the sponsoring family.

Mr. Chomlak: Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary to the minister: We have a universal health care system. This girl is an adopted member of a Canadian family, regardless of the medical condition of this child. Will the minister not admit that an error has been made, and, even if an error has not been made, that the policy will be changed to admit this girl immediately to Canada so that she can be reunited with her family?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my honourable friend's approach to this issue, but let me reiterate to my honourable friend so that he understands the nature of his request.

For approximately 20 years, it has been the policy of governments of Manitoba to require such letters of comfort for medically inadmissible individuals to come to Canada to access the universal health care system, which is paid for by the taxation collected on Canadians and through borrowed funds that we go to the financial markets to secure.

Mr. Speaker, that policy was put in place in 1975, formally, and administered through the Manitoba Health Services Commission. Prior to that, it was a policy that was administered by another physician giving advice to the Province of Manitoba. Since that time, there have been 75 individuals admitted to the province of Manitoba under similar letters of credit by the sponsoring family.

This, Sir, is yet another one, and the process is very clear with Immigration Canada. They screen the applicants for immigration to Canada regardless of circumstances, and where there are circumstances which disqualify an individual from immigration to Canada, they are deemed medically inadmissible. That is the circumstance with this individual. On compassionate grounds, we agreed to the immigration with the similar letter of comfort provided by 75 other families in Manitoba over the last 20 years.

* (1345)

Repap Manitoba Inc. The Pas Project

Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, when I asked the Minister of Finance about the upcoming annual meeting of Repap, he indicated that not only had he been invited, but that he would be trying to push more quickly the project at The Pas.

Well, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, he should have attended, because at that meeting on Friday, Mr. Petty indicated a number of very good things about the company, that they were moving into a cash positive position, that they are going to be paying a, quote, record share profit in the coming year, but that the project at The Pas had been shelved, and they would not be proceeding with it.

I would like to ask the Minister of Finance what action he is going to take, finally, to hold this company accountable to the deal he made with them.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, there is no new news in the remarks that the member provides, by way of question.

In essence, almost a year ago, the government indicated that the project had been shelved. I mean, that was the essence of the statement made in the House in 1992 by myself.

Of course, what we are trying to do is, over the next year and a half to two years, upward to the end

of 1994, is either do a reconfiguration and/or go and find a joint partner, either with Repap's blessing or ultimately without Repap's blessing, to make a commitment to the major northern project. There is no news in the revelation of the member as he brings it forward today in Question Period.

Mr. Alcock: Mr. Speaker, as recently as Thursday, the minister said they would be proceeding with the project, that he was going to be pushing hard to see that this project goes ahead. On Friday, we find out that the company is both cash positive and posting record profits.

Mr. Speaker, the question is really simple. When are we going to see some action at The Pas, or is the minister simply going to sit here and tell us this is not an issue?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what interpretation the member took out of my remarks last week. Again, I say to him that we are in negotiation with Repap toward a reconfigured project.

I would apologize to the House if indeed they felt that the \$1-billion project that had been announced in 1989 was proceeding, because it clearly is not. When I made mention of a project, I am talking about a reconfigured project that we continue to work on. Certainly, there are various options. Repap has presented them to me over the course of the last 10 months, and we continue to dialogue around them.

Now, when the member talks about record profits, certainly Repap may be experiencing some positive cash flow, but after they have lost upward of \$400 million in the last two fiscal years, I can tell you nothing is record as compared to those types of losses.

Mr. Alcock: Of course, Mr. Speaker, in order to post a record profit, one has to pay off the carried-forward losses from the previous years.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps then the minister can just explain to us his comment in the House on Thursday that says: We will be trying to push more quickly the larger developed project at The Pas in keeping with the commitment made by Repap contractually to the province.

Those are the minister's words on Thursday. Does he have the partner? Is the project going ahead? What is the status of that project, particularly in light of the statements from Mr. Petty

that they are doing quite well, thank you very much?

* (1350)

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

Mr. Manness: Again, the member refers to Mr. Petty's remarks that they are doing quite well. They are doing quite well, Madam Deputy Speaker, in the sense of the first quarter in the last 10 that they have turned a profit, so I would have to think that in relative terms, they are doing quite well.

Are they anywhere able to secure financing and put toward Manitoba a billion-dollar project? The answer quite clearly is no. Is the province still trying to negotiate a reconfiguration of taking into account either the existing mill and/or building beyond that, even working toward a paper machine?

The answer quite clearly is yes, but all of that is dependent upon the ability of Repap, either directly through financial circles and/or in partnership with a joint partner to be able to secure the financing that is needed.

Cadham Provincial Laboratory Essential Service Designation

Ms. Marianne Cerlill (Radlsson): Madam Deputy Speaker, the Cadham lab does testing for water contamination, sexually transmitted diseases, food poisoning and blood work for a variety of other serious illnesses and diseases. Bill 22 will mean that these services are only provided four days of the week.

I would ask the Minister of Health, given that some of these samples will expire in that additional day over a weekend, why has the government not deemed these lab services as essential services and exempted them from the layoffs of Bill 22?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Madam Deputy Speaker, I would accept my honourable friend's premise only in part, because from time to time, we have three-day weekends as a course of long weekends in the normal course of operation of the lab.

We often have circumstances at Easter or Christmas where there were four days in a row in which those circumstances are applicable. The operations of Cadham lab will comply with the financial requirements of Bill 22, and in that regard,

we expect to be able to maintain the level of testing that is required to maintain the health of the public at large.

Ms. Cerlill: I have a supplementary question, Madam Deputy Speaker. With summer being the busiest time of year for water samples, why is this government effectively obstructing Manitobans from this essential service, and will the government not reconsider its decision and declare that these services are essential services and exempt them from Bill 22?

Mr. Orchard: Madam Deputy Speaker, I guess we could have considered that had Peter Offert at all agreed to a voluntary agreement, but they chose to force us either to layoffs or the 10-day leave without pay. We chose the 10-day leave without pay.

In terms of water sampling, I suspect we will be able to maintain the workload in this busy season, as my honourable friend alleges, and will be able to provide the services that Manitobans are so interested in receiving.

Ms. Cerlill: How can this government justify classifying gambling outlets and liquor sales as essential services, but not classifying diagnostic lab services for health and environmental care as essential services?

Mr. Orchard: It is because we have been able to integrate into each of those respective areas of service delivery the flexibility required to achieve the financial savings and provide the service.

Now, Madam Deputy Speaker, I know that kind of management is not understandable by members opposite because in one contract they settled with the MGEA, they gave everybody an extra week of holidays. Where was the service concern then?

Repap Manitoba Inc. The Pas Project

Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River): This government has told us time and time again they are renegotiating the Repap deal. The minister tells us their options. However, last week, Mr. George Petty said there are no options and that Repap has no plans to proceed with the pulp mill project.

Can the minister responsible tell us whether this was a unilateral decision by Repap, whether it is part of the decision, and whether he agrees with the decision to not proceed with the pulp mill in The Pas?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Well, I am intrigued with this newfound interest by the opposition parties. It is almost as if they really did want Repap, Madam Deputy Speaker, and particularly the member for Swan River. I do not quite understand her. Today, there are 50 or 60 in the chipping industry in the Swan River area, only because Repap is, of course, active within our province.

But, Madam Deputy Speaker, the project— [interjection] Well, all I know is, when the members call it a bad deal, we have not lost a dollar, as the taxpayers of this province, in the last five years, and the NDP lost \$200 million plus when they were running it as a government organization. I dare say we have done a remarkable job, but Repap has done the better job.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I look forward to the supplementary question from the member for Swan River.

* (1355)

Cutting Area Negotiations

Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River): The minister says he is intrigued by us, but we—

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Question.

Ms. Wowchuk: Since there is no expansion and the pulp mill has been shelved, can the minister tell us where they are on the renegotiations of the cut area?

Is there any plan to renegotiate the cut area? Is any of the hardwood going to be freed up? Is there going to be any opportunity for jobs in the Swan River and The Pas area, or has he given up on all those jobs?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Madam Deputy Speaker, there are 50 to 70 jobs today in Swan River purely as a result of the feedstock required for The Pas.

The member opposite, of course, harkens back to a time when there was a desire to use the hardwoods. This government would love to see the hardwoods used, but not when the government has to put in basically all of the financing for risky ventures. It will not do that. It is not our business acumen to be involved in that type of approach.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I am aware there are other interests in the hardwoods. We certainly take them seriously. We will continue to dialogue with

Repap, and we will free up those resources certainly if we need to, indeed, if there is a viable alternative that can be used, particularly if Mr. Petty and Repap are not going to move within the foreseeable future with respect to the larger facility.

Employment Creation Strategy

Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River): Madam Deputy Speaker, again, I say we have always been interested in the jobs for the area.

I want to ask this government: What are they going to do? Are they going to insist that Repap proceed with the jobs? Are they going to insist that they hold up their end of the bargain?

We want to know whether there are going to be jobs in The Pas, and we want to know where this government is on the 250 jobs they promised to Swan River in the last election campaign.

Mr. Manness: Madam Deputy Speaker, I remind the member, who is now sort of a convert, she now wants the Repap large expansion to proceed.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the promise was made by Repap on the basis of \$800-a-tonne pulp. It is now \$450- to \$475-a-tonne pulp. Furthermore, I point out that that industry has undergone \$2 billion worth of losses in the last two years. I further point out the consolidation that has taken place within the pulp industry particularly and the closing of a significant number of those types of plants throughout Canada.

The member must be aware of this. There has not been one new one built over the course of the last three years. So let us try and see this industry become healthy, and during that time, I put my faith in Repap. The member may not. She may want them to be run out of the province, but this government puts their faith in Repap, and once the proper time comes about, I know there will be economic activity in the Swan River Valley.

* (1400)

Substance Abuse Northern Treatment Centre

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (River Heights): Madam Deputy Speaker, another young person died this weekend in the northern part of this province from solvent abuse. There is an estimate of 2,200 people in northern Alberta suffering from solvent abuse, many of them under the age of 18.

Can the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) or the Minister of Health tell the House today what recent negotiations have been going on with their federal counterparts in order to establish a northern abuse centre for solvent abuse in the province of Manitoba?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Madam Deputy Speaker, that issue is very much one that the federal government, as I understand it, has under study nationally.

My honourable friend inadvertently mentioned northern Alberta, and part of the study includes northern Alberta, northern Saskatchewan, other parts of the country of Canada wherein the federal government is undertaking an investigation.

It is my understanding that committee is expected to report within the next several months, if my memory serves me correctly, and should provide to the federal government some guidance as to how they would approach the issue of substance abuse and sniff in some of our northern aboriginal communities.

I think it would be appropriate guidance for the federal government, because as issues are approached one by one, not always is there a co-ordinated focus. Witness the recent decision in the northern Labrador community where sufficient focus was put on the issue that the federal government reacted in some fashion.

I would hope that the federal government, in collaboration with the native communities of northern and remote Canada, might come to an equitable solution around this issue of importance to those communities.

Substance Abuse Legislation Amendments

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (River Heights): Madam Deputy Speaker, it is clear neither the Minister of Health nor the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) is prepared to take a hands-on approach to this particular problem.

Will the Minister of Health commit today to an amendment to his own antisniff bill, which will put the onus clearly not on the abuser, but on the seller of the type of product which creates the abuse problem that we have here in the province of Manitoba?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Madam Deputy Speaker, I will listen with a great

deal of attention to my honourable friend's persuasion around such an amendment that she might propose. That can appropriately be done at committee, should and if and when opposition parties pass that bill to committee, as we on this side of the government are very anxious to see done.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I want to indicate to my honourable friend that it would seem as if the Liberal Party's position in second opposition is now that the province should assume yet another federal responsibility for service provision, because that seems to be where my honourable friend has come from.

That is why a federal committee is studying the issue of substance abuse in northern and aboriginal communities, so that they can work through details where Health and Welfare Canada in conjunction with Indian Affairs can structure a program which might help to resolve the problem in co-operation with those very same aboriginal communities.

Fatality Inquiries Act Inquest—Substance Abuse Death

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (River Heights): Madam Deputy Speaker, the Liberal Party only wants to make sure this government takes a hands-on approach to solving some of the problems affecting vulnerable youth in the province of Manitoba.

Will the minister replacing the Premier (Mr. Filmon) today, the Deputy Premier (Mr. Downey), tell the House if this government will order, under The Fatality Inquiries Act, an inquest into this young person's tragic loss of life in the hope that finally both the federal and provincial governments can understand the level of solvent abuse in this province and across this nation?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Madam Deputy Speaker, I will take that proposal as notice on behalf of the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) for the province of Manitoba.

Madam Deputy Speaker, let me indicate to my honourable friend the member for River Heights, in making statements of caring for children in this province, my honourable friend might reflect on the fact that since we have come into government, there is available to youthful adolescent women a treatment program and facility because of funding from this government at St. Norbert Foundation in

reinforced and enhanced programs, and programs available through the Alcoholism Foundation, soon to become the Addictions Foundation of Manitoba, which brings together partnerships of community sponsor groups and individuals to focus on problems of substance abuse throughout the length and breadth of Manitoba.

Madam Deputy Speaker, that may not be enough for my honourable friend, but to leave the impression that only she cares about children is totally inaccurate and very naive at the best.

Workforce 2000 Elmwood Motors

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): Madam Deputy Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education and Training.

Last week, the Minister of Education talked about how she monitors each and every firm that was given a grant under the Workforce 2000 program. She said, quote, the program is monitored and that there are also checks of the program as it goes along.

Now given this, I wonder if the Minister of Education could tell the House why Elmwood Motors was given a training grant last year and what the grant was for.

Hon. Rosemary Vodrey (Minister of Education and Training): Madam Deputy Speaker, in the area of Workforce 2000, as I explained last week, there is criterion for acceptance into the program. There is a process to monitor.

If the member has a specific question, he might like to raise it when we reach that line in the Estimates of the Department of Education and Training.

Mr. Maloway: Madam Deputy Speaker, given that the firm was given a grant on June 4, 1992, some four months after being charged with tampering with odometers—I believe eight charges—what series of criteria and what process of monitoring did she use for this grant?

Mrs. Vodrey: Madam Deputy Speaker, as I said, the details of any of the Workforce 2000 programs I will be happy to discuss when the details are in front of me during the Estimates portion of the Department of Education and Training.

Mr. Maloway: My final supplementary to the same minister, Madam Deputy Speaker: Since Elmwood

Motors was convicted and fined for odometer tampering one week after the grant expired and since Elmwood Motors is no longer operating, could the minister please release the terms of the contract with the firm so that Manitobans can see what this grant accomplished?

Mrs. Vodrey: Madam Deputy Speaker, as I said, if the member would like to attend the Estimates of the Department of Education and Training, then we will certainly have a look at that particular contract.

Apotex Inc. Manitoba Plant Status

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Madam Deputy Speaker, not too long ago, one of the local news media in a paper had a headline called False hopes: Tories' job deals do not materialize.

Today, we talked about Repap. As well in this House, we have raised questions about the government's involvement with Apotex and the government's much ballyhooed announcement of a \$50-million investment in hundreds of jobs coming to Manitoba.

My question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism is: Given the difficulties that Apotex is now having with an ongoing investigation with respect to the sale of generic drugs in the United States, can the minister indicate what the status of the Apotex proposed plant in Manitoba currently is and whether we will actually see any investment during the short life of this government?

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Madam Deputy Speaker, without accepting, obviously, very much of the preamble of the member for Flin Flon, very little has changed in terms of the dealings with Apotex. He knows full well the concerns expressed by Apotex about the changes in the patent legislation by the federal government. The project has not been cancelled. It is on hold pending a final decision and review of that legislation and their overall development plans.

I hope he is not suggesting for a moment that the allegations and improprieties that are being referred to through the media are reason for us to be taking any action at this particular point in time. The company itself has corresponded with individuals within the industry, and it has stated over and over, Madam Deputy Speaker, that it has not committed any unlawful act, and let us wait and see what the outcome of that review is.

* (1410)

Rh Institute Employment Statistics

Mr. Jerry Storle (Flin Flon): Well, Madam Deputy Speaker, my concern is not so much with the ongoing investigation by the FBI; my concern was with this government's ability to construct a deal that actually works to create jobs in Manitoba.

I would like to ask the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism to tell this House, after facilitating the sale of the Rh Institute to ABI and the transfer after ABI was sent into receivership to Apotex, how many jobs in a very important industry, in the health care industry, have been lost to Manitoba as a result of this government's bungling of this set of negotiations, in the Rh Institute and ABI as well as Apotex?

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Madam Deputy Speaker, there have been no jobs lost. The jobs that were in place at the Rh Institute were in fact retained in place through the transfer that occurred.

The Apotex full production facility was to create incremental jobs in our province. As I have already indicated to this House, it remains to be seen what the final conclusion of that is.

The company has not come to Western Diversification or us in terms of wanting any changes to the agreement. They have not said that the production facility is cancelled. It is on hold, and we will continue to work with the company.

Mr. Storle: Madam Deputy Speaker, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism is wrong. Jobs have been lost at the Rh Institute, and I can provide him with names.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I want to know how many jobs have been jeopardized as the government tries to offload its responsibility for the Rh Institute and for the negotiations at Apotex. How many jobs have been lost, compared to what were in place prior to 1989, prior to this government's involvement with Apotex?

Mr. Stefanson: Madam Deputy Speaker, as I indicated to the member for Flin Flon, the majority if not all of the jobs were in fact retained. I look forward to dealing with this issue in some detail when we finally get to Estimates with Industry, Trade and Tourism.

This particular project that he questioned today was to create incremental jobs. That possibility still exists, Madam Deputy Speaker. There are many issues to be dealt with, and time will tell what happens with Apotex.

It is interesting, Madam Deputy Speaker. Again, he comes at a project where he thinks he finds an opportunity for some criticism in terms of not creating as many jobs as one might like or expect, rarely to be good questions about the positive announcements, Northwest's announcement a few weeks ago of 165 jobs, Unitel, Canadian Pacific, Monsanto.

I could go on and on for the benefit of the member for Flin Flon, because I think that is information he should take the time to pay some attention to, the many positive things that are happening in the province of Manitoba and will continue to happen under this government, unlike the kinds of situations we saw with the short-term, make-work projects from the previous government and leading to nothing but higher taxes and higher deficits in our province.

Civil Service Negotiations

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Madam Deputy Speaker, this past Saturday hundreds of concerned citizens, men, women and children, gathered in Beausejour to protest this government's devastating economic policies and cuts to services and children. Speaker after speaker denounced the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik) for supporting government policies that attack public workers, eliminate the Children's Dental Program, undermine the public school system and eliminate bursaries to students going to university.

I ask this Minister of Labour: Will he tell this House whether he has gained an appreciation for the issues as a result of the rally that took place? Will he now campaign with his colleagues and advocate that they reverse their insane policies that are destroying the economy of this province?

Point of Order

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Madam Deputy Speaker, certainly the question is very much out of order. The purpose of Question Period is to seek specific answers on

specific questions, seek information. Asking for an opinion as to whether or not one of the ministers of the Treasury bench has formed an opinion on one issue or another is certainly out of order.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Would the honourable member for Dauphin please rephrase his question. It indeed was asking for an opinion.

* * *

Mr. Plohman: Madam Deputy Speaker, I thought that jobs would be within the purview of this minister. Many people who lost their jobs and had their jobs cut, their pay cut, were there at the gathering.

I want to ask the minister, in light of the fact that attacking workers in the public sector does nothing to solve the economic problems facing Manitoba—and I would think this is within the purview of this minister—now, if he will reverse his policy of non-negotiation and start to negotiate in the public service so that these jobs and these salaries can be protected in the province of Manitoba.

Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Labour): Madam Deputy Speaker, I find it very interesting, the question from the member for Dauphin. What were hundreds of people in his mind was probably about 125 people.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the group that we both had the opportunity to address consisted of a variety of people, some of whom had some very legitimate interests. What the member for Dauphin missed, of course, was a group of people from one particular school who have a question about quality in the classroom, who have been meeting with me. There were some members of the MGEU who were there obviously, and had concerns, and one does not want to belittle those. Those are certainly legitimate concerns.

There was also a fair sprinkling of people from the New Democratic Party, activists in the organization there, who were to cheer on the member for Dauphin. There were also a fair number of people who are quite interested in the issue, that I had a chance to speak with later about the variety of the issues that were concerned, and the reality was somewhat different from the way the member for Dauphin puts it across.

But, beside the point, I would say to the member for Dauphin, that we have in fact negotiated agreements with many in the public sector, who will

not be calling upon the use of Bill 22 to bring about these wage reductions. I would remind the honourable member, the question that I put to the rally: If there was not a need for restraint in the public sector, then why would Bob Rae be forced to do what he is in fact doing in Ontario?

Economic Policies Employment Creation Strategy

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Madam Deputy Speaker, this minister could not run a Kool-Aid stand.

Madam Deputy Speaker, in light of the fact all the Minister of Labour could offer the people who were expressing their concerns in a legitimate way to this government, through this minister, was doughnuts and Kool-Aid, I want to ask this minister, will he now reverse his policies and start making job creation the primary objective of this government?

Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Labour): Madam Deputy Speaker, the member for Dauphin missed something very critical at that particular rally. Yes, we did provide some refreshment, particularly for the young children who were there who took advantage, and many, many people ate the doughnuts and drank the lemonade provided by myself.

What the member for Dauphin missed was that some of the people serving those public servants were farmers and people with their own businesses who pay all of our salaries, and their incomes have declined significantly over the last number of years.

I found it very interesting that the member for Dauphin, who draws his salary from the public purse, as we all do here, that the public servants who were there picketing, that the teachers who were there picketing, forgot that the people who pay all of our salaries have had a very difficult time and, quite frankly, have had the reductions in their income, and are now asking for them to share part of the burden.

It is very regrettable that the member for Dauphin missed that little but very important fact.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The time for Question Period has expired.

Nonpolitical Statements

Madam Deputy Speaker: Does the honourable member for La Verendrye have leave for a nonpolitical statement? [agreed]

Mr. Ben Sveinson (La Verendrye): Madam Deputy Speaker, last Saturday night, June 19, the Ste. Anne Curling Rink caught fire. It was an enormous fire with flames shooting in excess of 50 feet in the air.

Ken Dayment, the Ste. Anne fire chief, alerted Southeast Mutual Aid co-ordinators in Steinbach, and along with his firefighters from Ste. Anne, was able to successfully co-ordinate the fighting of the fire. The mutual aid co-ordinators in Steinbach, upon being contacted, had fire trucks and volunteers from Steinbach, La Broquerie, Lorette, St. Malo, St. Pierre, Grunthal and Giroux attend the fire.

The firefighters were successful in stopping the fire from spreading to the attached Ste. Anne arena and to the cultural centre. Madam Deputy Speaker, this was all done while ensuring the safety of people living in the mutual aid district. It is reassuring to know that the co-operation that exists in the operation of the Southeast Mutual Aid district indeed reassures rural communities in Manitoba of their safety. All co-ordinating members are to be commended on their prompt responsiveness and dedication in performing their duties. Their actions kept the damage to a minimum, that being the curling rink itself.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I would like to call upon all members of the Manitoba Legislature to join with me in congratulating the Southeast Mutual Aid district, co-ordinators, Ken Dayment the fire chief in Ste. Anne and all firefighters from the mutual aid area on a job well done.

* (1420)

Madam Deputy Speaker: Does the honourable Leader of the official opposition have leave to make a nonpolitical statement? [agreed]

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Deputy Speaker, I would like to join with the member in congratulating the volunteers and the professional staff in dealing with this situation over the weekend. I think Manitoba has been well served by the volunteers and professional staff working in our crisis situations.

I had the opportunity when I was younger to play some hockey in some of those arenas and some of those facilities in the community that is mentioned, and I know that the dedication—[interjection] I do not want to make any comment about that. I know that the hardworking volunteers of the communities

mentioned by the member are to be congratulated, and we want to join today with the member in congratulating them for handling a very, very difficult situation over the weekend.

Thank you very much.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Madam Deputy Speaker, I wonder whether or not there is a willingness of the House to waive private members' hour.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is there leave to waive private members' hour? No.

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

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

* (1430)

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY (Concurrent Sections)

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Mr. Deputy Chairperson (Marcel Laurendeau): Order, please. Will the Committee of Supply please come to order. This afternoon, this section of the Committee of Supply meeting in Room 255 will resume consideration of the Estimates of Education and Training.

When the committee last sat, it had been considering item 4.(g)(1) on page 39 of the Estimates book.

Hon. Rosemary Vodrey (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Deputy Chairperson, when we were together last week, there was a question about statistics regarding audited awards for the years 1990-91, '91-92, '92-93. I would like to table that information today.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson: Shall the item pass?

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Mr. Deputy Chairperson, my colleague the member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen) will be asking some questions on New Careers. As the Chairperson knows, that also comes under this particular line.

Last time we sat, we did have a vote on the Human Resources Opportunity Centre. We gave the government an option for restoring it, and they chose not to support that motion. We regret that was the case. The minister had that opportunity where she could have changed an ill-conceived and wrong decision that was made by the government. Unfortunately, they chose not to do that.

We hope in the other areas as we proceed through the Estimates here this afternoon that the minister is more flexible and readily available to consider alternatives to what has been done in the interests of children and students in Manitoba.

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I want to ask some questions about the New Careers Program.

As the minister knows, we have asked in Estimates about the reductions in this area, which I believe are over a million dollars. At that time, she was not able to give us any of her plans for the future on how this reduction was to be implemented in program terms. I wonder if she would perhaps begin today by telling us how that \$1 million is going to be absorbed by this program.

Mrs. Vodrey: I would like to start, because I know the member for Wolseley would not want to put incorrect information on the record and I believe she has, so let me clarify that reductions in New Careers were in the amount of \$831,000, not \$1,000,000, and that the additional funding reduction was from the Manitoba Technical Training Centre which has now become a private vocational school.

In terms of how the program, New Careers, will continue to conduct its training with some reduction in resources, the program, first of all, has increasingly sought and identified levered funds from the federal government. These funds have been utilized to augment provincial funding and support to project activities. This trend is expected to continue in '93-94, which will enable the program to serve a number of clients.

In addition, the program has negotiated secondment arrangements whereby staff in the

employ of another agency or program are seconded to New Careers for the duration of the training project. These individuals deliver training alongside of the program staff. The program is currently negotiating secondments for projects under development now, and these secondment arrangements increase the program's complement of staff and increase the program's ability then to conduct activity.

Thirdly, the program has begun to negotiate training projects which have a very little or a minimal cost attached. For example, the program is currently negotiating a training project in Thompson directed towards upgrading the skills of women employed as managers for a variety of private and public sector enterprises. Due to their geographic location, these women have been barred from alternate forms of education and could become unemployed without further training. So the costs for this project will be minimal as employers would continue to pay the participants' salaries while they are training. As well, there would be no travel costs associated with the projects, and the costs would then only be in staff salary and training aids.

Other projects of this nature are also developing in the North. These projects enable the program to continue to provide service according to its mandate but in a very cost-effective manner.

Then, the newly amalgamated Employability Enhancement branch will provide a broader range of services than did any of the programs prior to the reorganization. The strategic linking of the programs will reduce the duplication of services and will, we believe, ensure a better utilization of resources, enabling the programs to provide a high level of services to clients.

* (1440)

Ms. Friesen: Will the number of clients, as the minister calls them, or students be reduced, compared to last year or compared to the last two or three years?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chair, yes, there will be a slight reduction in clients. There will be approximately 26 fewer clients projected or estimated for the coming year.

Ms. Friesen: In the past, clients or students of this program have been paid a wage for up to two years. Could the minister indicate how that wage

has changed? What was it last year? What will it be this coming year?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chair, in the past, that was in '92-93, clients received a wage of 70 percent of entry-level salary paid by the government of Manitoba through the program. In 1993-94 there have been some changes which, I think, further speak to the issue of partnership. In the coming year, there have been a number of negotiations where the employer will pay the wage at the entry level. In addition in some cases, Employment and Immigration Canada will pay the wage. Where the government of Manitoba continues to pay the wage, we will be paying minimum wage.

Ms. Frlesen: I just want to try and understand how this works when the employer pays the wage. Has that happened in the past because this is an up to a two-year program? As I understand it, the length of the program differs slightly, depending upon the kind of work experiences and training that people have.

Has the employer paid the wage before, and what proportion of employers are going to be paying the wage this time? Are we looking at 10 percent or 20 percent or 50 percent of employers?

Mrs. Vodrey: I am informed that this is not a great change because in the past several years on select projects employers have, in fact, paid the wage. I am not able to provide the exact number of employers who will be paying the wage because that is still in the negotiation process. It is being done on a case-by-case basis. I would also remind the member that EIC also provides wages for some sponsored programs and also bands provide some funding as well.

Ms. Frlesen: Mr. Deputy Chair, in the past, when employers have paid wages, have they paid the entry-level wage?

Mrs. Vodrey: Yes, they paid the entry-level wage.

Ms. Frlesen: The program that the minister mentioned in Thompson is, as I understand it—and let me run through what I think I heard her say—that women who are already employed, but who may be in danger of losing their job without further training are being trained and paid by the employer—or trained by the provincial government, paid by the employer. Is that what is happening in Thompson now?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chair, yes, in Thompson, the women who are involved in this program would and could benefit from additional skills, particularly in the managerial area. So the Department of Education and Training will be providing the training, and the employers will be providing the salary.

Ms. Frlesen: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, but these are women who are already employed by that employer. Is that the case?

Mrs. Vodrey: For these women in the North, the additional training that they require is not available in the North, so they approached New Careers to provide the training. That is the agreement that has been worked out.

Ms. Frlesen: But these women were not on social assistance at the time they approached the government.

Mrs. Vodrey: No, these women were not on social assistance.

* (1450)

Ms. Frlesen: How does that then fit with the guidelines of this program as indicated in the Estimates book, that is: "To assist social assistance recipients in securing training and stable employment opportunities . . ."? I can see that the issue of location and barrier to training is there; but, as I understood it, we are clustering these under Community-Based Employability Projects to social assistance recipients.

Mrs. Vodrey: Under the Employability Enhancement Programs, where New Careers is noted, the objective speaks about "community-based education and training to unskilled, unemployed or underemployed adults" leading them into meaningful employment. The women who are participating in the Thompson project are considered to have been educationally barriered, and through this program we are looking to provide the training for them.

Ms. Frlesen: Mr. Deputy Chair, I am still not sure why it fits in this area since this is for social assistance recipients, and these women were not on social assistance.

Mrs. Vodrey: In the area under Employability Enhancement Programs that says New Careers, I do not see the words in that particular line that the member is referring to. She may be looking down at Section II, Special Employment Programs. In

the New Careers Program, I can tell her that last year approximately 39 percent of the participants were employed, approximately 25 percent were on UIC, approximately 13 percent had no income, approximately 20 percent were on social assistance, and there was approximately 3 percent of other Manitobans involved in the programs.

Ms. Frlesen: Mr. Deputy Chair, how is it determined that the employer was not able to provide the training which New Careers provided?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chair, I understand the employer made an approach to New Careers because they did not believe they had the skills to provide that training.

Ms. Frlesen: Mr. Deputy Chair, who is the employer?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chair, we usually do not release, specifically, the names of employers, but I can tell the member that it is a variety of both public sector and private sector employers.

Ms. Frlesen: Mr. Deputy Chair, I asked the minister before how she determined that the employers could not provide the training, and, essentially, as I understood her answer, she said she took their word for it. Was there no other check on this? How did the minister evaluate that response?

(Mr. Jack Reimer, Acting Deputy Chairperson, in the Chair)

Mrs. Vodrey: There is a process which does carry on. We do have a person associated with New Careers in the Thompson area. That person is in close contact, certainly, with the employment situations in that area. That individual meets with employers.

There is a needs assessment done. Then there is an opportunity to look and see if that training is available elsewhere. Then a decision is made regarding the offering of that training by New Careers.

Ms. Frlesen: Again, I am asking the minister for the names of the employers. I am wondering why private and public institutions which have received public money she is not prepared to list here.

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Acting Deputy Chair, no money has flowed to this point. I understand some of the negotiations are still being finalized in this area.

Ms. Frlesen: Mr. Acting Deputy Chair, so what we have been speaking of in the Thompson case, of

people who are employed in public and private sector, women looking for additional training, is something which has not yet been negotiated.

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Acting Deputy Chair, the start date in the proposal would be August. Therefore, there is a process of the negotiation to go through the proposal and also to finalize any details.

Ms. Frlesen: What consideration is given to providing the training through the community colleges?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Acting Deputy Chair, certainly the staff of New Careers meet regularly with Keewatin Community College, for instance, to look at capacities and to look at capabilities and expertise; but, with the reorganization of the department, the New Careers Program has recently signed an affiliation agreement with Assiniboine Community College and is in the midst of developing a parallel agreement with Keewatin Community College.

This affiliation will lead to the issuing of joint community college and New Careers diplomas to program graduates. That will have the effect of increasing the program's profile and also the participants' mobility and the ability to access some lifelong learning opportunities.

In addition, the program has begun to identify areas for joint programming with Manitoba's community colleges.

* (1500)

Ms. Frlesen: Does the department or the minister have a policy of giving priority to those agreements with community colleges?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Acting Deputy Chair, with the colleges having moved to governance, we are looking at moving in a direction where we do work much more closely with the community colleges.

As things stand at the moment, as a project proposal is developed, we want to be very careful that there is not a duplication, and we look to be able to work in a co-operative and a complementary sense with our community colleges in Manitoba.

Ms. Frlesen: Mr. Acting Deputy Chair, I asked specifically, was there a priority given to delivering training through community colleges?

The reason I ask this is that the thrust of the government seems to be the other way, that is, towards private training; and I am concerned about

the future of the public institutions in this province. So I am asking, does government, when it looks at the training of people in these particular programs, give priority to using the facilities and the staff and the expertise of the public institutions of Manitoba?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Acting Deputy Chair, as I said in my last answer, we have a number of resources. We certainly are looking to co-operate and to be very complementary with the community colleges. We believe that the colleges, having moved to governance, will allow this complementarity to be more effective.

But, within the department, and particularly within the AEST branch as we have been speaking about, there is a spectrum of programming provided. We have our own staff as well who provide training. So we look for the most appropriate partner in all cases.

Ms. Frlesen: The minister mentioned the New Careers' own staff. Could she tell us how many staff are left in New Careers as compared to last year, and how many of those are actually training staff as opposed to management?

Mrs. Vodrey: There are two managerial staff, 24 professional/technical staff, 9.26 clerical staff. Of those employed, seven of those are people of aboriginal background.

Ms. Frlesen: Could the minister tell us how that differs from last year?

(Mr. Deputy Chairperson in the Chair)

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chair, the change from last year has been a reduction in four clerical individuals, four people who worked as trainers, and one person who actually worked for the Manitoba Technical Training Centre.

Ms. Frlesen: So this program is now down by eight or nine people and is serving 26 fewer clients. There seems to me to be a large cut of staff for a smaller reduction, proportionately, in the number of people served. My concern is the implications of this for staff and for the working situation.

Mrs. Vodrey: Just to correct the member again, it is eight individuals in the area of New Careers. I believe I made it clear that one of the other individuals worked with the Manitoba Technical Training Centre.

In terms of how we will accomplish the work, I have been speaking this afternoon about efficiencies, and now all new projects will have, as

a condition, a secondment. In addition, in the clerical area, we have redistributed the clerical work. We have clerical staff now who are computer literate, and, therefore, we have been able to look at efficiencies in that area.

Ms. Frlesen: Could the minister tell us how this change in staffing has been distributed through the regional offices? There are offices, I understand, in Brandon, Winnipeg, Thompson and—is there one in Portage?

Mrs. Vodrey: In terms of the reduction in positions, there was one reduction in the central office. There were two reductions in the Winnipeg region. There were two reductions in the Brandon office, and there were three reductions in the Thompson office, to a total of eight.

Ms. Frlesen: The minister spoke of all new projects being done by secondment. Could she explain a little further what this means? This means secondment from within other government agencies, I assume.

Could she give us an indication of where people are being seconded from, and what kind of financial arrangements are being made with those departments?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, just to clarify for the member, in terms of the new projects, we are looking at most of those new projects to have the secondment. Primarily, we will be looking at the secondment. However, there may be some in which there is not a secondment.

The secondments will come from participating employers. That may be government. It also may be the private sector. It also may be publicly funded agencies or funded through Employment and Immigration Canada.

* (1510)

In looking at that secondment, we are looking for a training background or an area or expertise within the area of being trained, and then the individual who has acted in that seconded position may, in fact, go back as a resource to their own agency.

Ms. Frlesen: Could the minister explain how those secondment people are financed? Who is paying their wages while they are training on behalf of New Careers?

Mrs. Vodrey: The wages of that individual would be paid then by Employment and Immigration Canada or by another government department or

by the private industry or by the publicly funded agency themselves.

Ms. Frlesen: So in that case, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, what is happening is the individuals are being selected by New Careers—that is, the trainees—their wages are going to be paid at a much reduced level in many cases, and their training will be done by someone from another agency and paid by another agency.

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, let me clarify again some information because we would not want incorrect information put on the record by the member. First of all, the wages as I spoke about previously were 70 percent of an entry level. So the wages are not necessarily reduced, and I think we should clear that up.

Secondly, in the area of the selection process, the participants are jointly selected by New Careers and also by the employer or by the other participating agency. In terms of skills, the person who is seconded would be partnered with a trainer from the area of New Careers. There is the work of designing the curriculum as well.

This is not an entirely new way of doing business. In fact, we have done this in the past. It does work very well and I would point the member to the program delivered for mental health workers and also family daycare workers. The benefit of being able to do this is that it does build skills within the community as well. This is a community-based kind of programming, and this continues to build skills within the community.

Ms. Frlesen: I am sure we would not want information that is misleading put on record by anybody. All I am trying to do is to repeat back to the minister what she says to me to make sure I have it correct.

The minister said that secondments come from other agencies, a variety of other agencies, and that the minister looks for people with a training background. Then they work with somebody within New Careers to design curriculum.

Is it possible that the nature of programs that are going to be developed under New Careers in this way are going to be limited by the numbers of individuals in those public and private agencies who have training backgrounds? I mean, it seems to me that chances are that there are going to be some areas that you will want to pursue where there are not people with training backgrounds.

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chair, I think the member missed what I said as an answer several questions ago. I spoke about a training background or a background in that particular area of expertise which is to be delivered. Also, the employer who would be doing the secondment, I understand, also may advertise for the position to be seconded so that they are not limited, themselves, in any way by whom they may second.

Ms. Frlesen: Mr. Deputy Chair, the minister, when she began this, talked about the federal funds which were levered for this program. Could she tell us how much federal funds were levered last year, and how much will be levered this year?

Mrs. Vodrey: Last year, we levered \$923,000. For the year '93-94, we have confirmed \$661,500. We have an estimated or projected amount for the year '93-94 of \$1,250,700.

Ms. Frlesen: The last sum that the minister mentioned is a projected federal leveraging, or is it the projected total of both federal and provincial funds to be applied to New Careers in 1993-94?

Mrs. Vodrey: It is a projected federal cost-sharing.

Ms. Frlesen: Mr. Deputy Chair, why is there a difference between the projected and the confirmed?

Mrs. Vodrey: The \$661,500 is confirmed, already negotiated, but we are not finished the year '93-94. Mr. Deputy Chair, \$661,500 would be within the total projected of \$1,250,700. But, as the member knows, we are not yet at March 1994.

Ms. Frlesen: Mr. Deputy Chair, is this a matching grants program? Is there supposed to be an equal partnership of federal funds?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chair, no, it is not a matching grant.

Ms. Frlesen: Could the minister indicate the nature of the partnership agreement between the federal government and the provincial government for this program?

Ms. Frlesen: Could the minister indicate the nature of the partnership agreement between the federal government and the provincial government for this program?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chair, there is not a specific protocol that is followed in each one of the projects. Instead, the projects are negotiated with the federal government project by project. We

negotiate under a variety of categories with the EIC, work-based category or skills development category.

Ms. Frlesen: What has been the impact on the federal funding of the reduction in the Manitoba funds? When you have reduced by over \$800,000, what has been the impact of that on the amount that the federal government will put in?

* (1520)

Mrs. Vodrey: I am informed that any reduction in provincial funding will not have an impact on the federal dollars levered.

Ms. Frlesen: On the total federal dollars levered or on the proportionate federal dollars levered?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chair, I am again informed that there is no impact. The actual dollar amount has increased, as I would point out to the member, and proportionate share would have increased.

Ms. Frlesen: Mr. Deputy Chair, as I understand it, the confirmed amount has not increased. Last year it was \$923,000; this year the minister said so far she has confirmed \$661,000. I understand that "not yet" would perhaps be a better way of describing the federal input.

Mrs. Vodrey: Again, the proposals have to be reviewed, but the federal government has certainly indicated its willingness and desire to move ahead in the areas that are projected. I am saying to the member, in wanting in all fairness for information put on the record, to just categorize by confirmed and projected, but certainly with the projected dollars I understand that there is significant interest by the federal government, which would be an increase in the actual dollars and also an increase in the proportionate dollars.

Ms. Frlesen: Last year the minister said that 20 percent of people in New Careers were on social assistance, and I understand that there are many rules in the federal government's transferral to educational programs for people on social assistance.

Could the minister explain to us if there are any rules like that around the federal money in Manitoba in this program?

Mrs. Vodrey: In the New Careers Program there is no impact on social assistance recipients.

Ms. Frlesen: Mr. Deputy Chair, that was not the question I asked. I asked the minister if she could

outline for us what the rules were in the federal government's distribution of monies, application of monies, to social assistance recipients in education programs under a Minister of Education.

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the federal rules are actually dealt with on a contract-by-contract basis. Some contracts are funded under the Canada Employment rules. Others might be funded under the severely employment disadvantaged. Others might be funded under the rules of job entry and re-entry.

Ms. Frlesen: Could the minister indicate how each of those has been applied to this area? I am looking, for example, why this is different than Student Social Allowances.

* (1530)

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, in terms of the social assistance recipients, a subcommittee has been struck to address a number of the issues relating to training programs for social assistance recipients.

I can tell the member that New Careers has in fact always been a program of the Department of Education and Training. There is really not an effect on the New Careers Program.

Ms. Frlesen: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, when the minister says a subcommittee has been struck, is this a subcommittee of the provincial government, of her department, or is it a joint one with the federal government?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, it is a subcommittee of the joint management committee, which we spoke about as overseeing the operations of the Canada-Manitoba Labour Force Development Agreement.

Ms. Frlesen: So at the moment, this is entirely composed of officials of the federal government and the provincial government.

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chair, that is correct.

Ms. Frlesen: What is the task of this subcommittee?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chair, this subcommittee is expected to improve the co-ordination of programs with the Regional Office of Employment and Immigration Canada and to work towards implementing the most effective means of meeting our common objectives.

Ms. Frlesen: Mr. Deputy Chair, we were discussing this subcommittee in the context of the

policy on social assistance recipients and education, something which the minister knows goes beyond this program, but I am interested that a subcommittee has been struck.

I understood from the context that social assistance recipients was on its agenda. I wonder if the minister could perhaps tell us more specifically what the committee is intending to do in looking at social assistance issues.

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chair, this is a recent subcommittee, and, as I said to the member, it is looking to improve the co-ordination of programs. We are looking at common objectives. We are looking to avoid duplication. We are looking at co-operation. We are also looking at integration.

The purpose is also to ensure that the social assistance recipients programs are relevant to the needs of Manitoba. Also, we are looking, as I said, to co-ordinate the federal and the provincial programs that are related to the agreement and to examine new initiatives for social assistance recipients.

Ms. Frlesen: Mr. Deputy Chair, how long is that subcommittee expected to work, and when is its report going to be due?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, this is an ongoing committee. It has been struck to work with the agreement. We expect that it will continue its work through to 1996. There will be no specific report because the work of the committee is ongoing. We will examine the information that has been brought forward from the committee as it is brought forward.

Ms. Frlesen: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, in this program, we are looking at a reduction of eight people and \$831,000 for clerical and for trainers, making an estimate of an average of \$30,000 a year. It seems to me that leaves a gap of \$660,000 in the amount which formerly would have been paid to trainees.

I am wondering if my arithmetic is similar in proportion to the minister's, or are there other factors which should be taken into account there?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, in terms of the amount of money for salary, I can tell the member it is \$752,000 for salary. However, that is nine staff. That number includes the one individual who worked for the Manitoba Technical Training Centre.

Approximately \$267,000 is accounted for in participant salary. As I was saying to the member, in the next year we are looking for employers or EIC to participate in supplementing and supplying that salary line to a great extent.

Ms. Frlesen: The decision then to reduce this program is going to change its nature somewhat in that only people eligible for CEIC or who are already employed will in fact be added to the program.

What proportion of people does the minister expect will come from the ranks of social assistance and those who are not eligible for CEIC monies?

* (1540)

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chair, we do not expect the balance or the proportions to change. As I said, where there is money or wage supplement not provided by the employer or provided by CEIC or provided by bands or other sources, then we will be paying at minimum wage level. As I said to the member as well when I gave her the proportionate participation for this year, we do not really expect that will change in the following year.

Ms. Frlesen: I look forward to asking that question next year, and I accept the minister's undertaking that you do not expect those proportions to change.

I wanted to ask about the difference between the minimum wage level and the 70 percent of entrance level and the way in which this will have an impact upon families.

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chair, if the money provided by minimum wage is less than what individuals received on social assistance, then those individuals would be eligible for subsidies.

Ms. Frlesen: On what basis would those subsidies be available?

Mrs. Vodrey: The subsidies are based on need. Need would include characteristics such as the size of the family.

Ms. Frlesen: Would it also include matters like daycare, transport, those kinds of things?

Mrs. Vodrey: I can tell the member that while the training portion through New Careers is ongoing, then we pay the transportation and the daycare costs; but, when individuals go on to the working portion, then that would be an issue to be discussed specifically with the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer).

Ms. Frlesen: As I understand it, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, there are portions of this program where it is not simply training and then work experience, but that they go back and forth. Does that mean, then, that in that back-and-forth session they are transferred to the responsibility of the Minister for Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer) for those kinds of expenses? Does each person have to negotiate that?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chair, again, when individuals come in for the classroom training portion, we do pay for the travel. We also pay for the overnight child care expenses, because people are away from home, but when they are in their home communities, then they are expected to look at working out and managing through Family Services or through the allowances that they receive in that place.

Ms. Frlesen: Mr. Deputy Chair, has that provided a barrier to some families?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chair, I am informed that has not been the experience of the people working in New Careers.

Ms. Frlesen: How are these changes in the New Careers Program, particularly to the funding of the recipients, being communicated to Manitobans?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chair, it is important for the member to know that anyone currently within a program is in under the previous rules. As we negotiate new training projects, we certainly inform the employers, or the partners, that we will be undertaking these changes, and we try and make sure they are aware of what these changes are so that we can maximize the participation.

(Mrs. Shirley Render, Acting Deputy Chairperson, in the Chair)

Ms. Frlesen: There is nowhere that people can turn to find a brochure, a leaflet, an explanation of New Careers programs under these new kinds of conditions.

Many people in fact, it seems to me, do not get to the stage of asking. If they do not think they are eligible, they do not go and look for another door to be closed in their face. So it is a sense of openness, of knowing what to expect, knowing whether you are going to be even within the bounds of eligibility that would be important to people.

Since the rules have changed, there is, I think, a fair amount of confusion out there about who will be

eligible, for how long they will be eligible and under what conditions they can apply.

Mrs. Vodrey: Madam Acting Deputy Chairperson, first of all, individuals do not approach New Careers directly. It is the employers who approach with proposals and, as I have said, the employers are informed about the changes. Where there is an area where we do a recruitment, then we will certainly make sure that through the process of that recruitment, the eligibility is well known to those individuals.

We have in the past put out a brochure on New Careers. The one I have with me is an old brochure. We will be putting out a new brochure when we have finalized the changes and the reorganization in the Advanced Education and Skills Training area.

* (1550)

Ms. Frlesen: Madam Acting Deputy Chairperson, I am a little puzzled by the minister's last statement, that it is the employers who approach. Again, I go back to the mandate in the public Estimates here which is:

"To provide community-based education and training to unskilled, unemployed or under-employed adults leading directly to meaningful employment.

"To increase the job skills and employability of adults

"To increase the number of trained individuals from a particular geographic area"

It seems to me that the issue, the focus of this program is on the training and education of people who are in the greatest need. Of course, that is obviously one of the reasons that we have been so very concerned about what seems to us a very large cut to this program. So again, I am concerned by the minister's interpretation of this program, that the employers approach.

Could she perhaps add to that?

Mrs. Vodrey: Madam Acting Deputy Chairperson, let me clarify the member's misunderstanding in this area. First of all, the employers provide the vehicle for the training, and it is the employers, where there is an agreement and a discussion around what the employer's role will be and what the employers will be assisting with in a financial way.

When employers come forward then, there is sometimes a recruitment for individuals who would then be trained in this area. So the target group of individuals does include a wide range of individuals, and there could be then a process of recruitment if in fact there was not a group of individuals who had already or previously been identified as people potentially to take this particular kind of training. That is why I said it was important that the employers understood the responsibility in this partnership.

As I said also, where there is a recruitment when employers have approached regarding having identified a training need and then we look for a recruitment of individuals to be selected for the process, a joint selection, then those individuals through the process of recruitment would certainly be given full information about what they would be provided with and also what was available to them.

Ms. Frleson: Madam Acting Deputy Chairperson, well, certainly for me, this turns this program on its head. What I understand the minister to be saying is that she is driven by the requirements of the employer, that she is not driven from the beginning, as every statement in this book says, by the need to assist social assistance recipients to be educated and trained. That seems to me a complete reversal of the focus of the programming. Yes, the means to that may be the employer; the means to it may be privately and publicly identified partnerships; but surely the focus of it is the need of the people who have no training and no education. Every statement in the book leads to that—not even leads to that conclusion, but, in fact, begins with that statement.

So the minister has certainly clarified her views on this, but I am extremely surprised by them.

Mrs. Vodrey: Madam Acting Deputy Chair, the member seems to be surprised that people would be trained to actually do some work, and the role of the employer is to say that there is an area in which they require people to have training, and then we look to recruit those individuals.

The member knows—I thought that she knew; perhaps she does not know—that this program does provide training for a number of different types of individuals, not only social assistance recipients. I did read to her what the percentage of participants was within this particular program. Now the member probably would like to simply provide

training for individuals and then simply turn them out, and there would be no one to hire those individuals.

So our proposal and the way that we work in this program is a much closer partnership with potential employers, so that when individuals are recruited and are chosen to be part of this program, and also employers recognize where they have a need, then people have a much better hopefulness that this will actually lead to employment. The member seems to have not considered that part, or even to think that is important.

Ms. Frleson: Madam Acting Deputy Chair, that is really one of the minister's sillier statements. I do not know why she insists on putting words into my mouth. I did say that employers were the means to it. It was, I believe, our party which developed this. The issue of providing work, of course, is important and for the minister to say—oh, I really, I actually refuse to get into it because it is just too silly for words.

What my concern was, Madam Acting Deputy Chair, was that the minister is waiting for employers to come forward. That was what I understood her to say and asked her to clarify, that it is employer driven, that the requirement is for the employer to come forward. That was not what I understood from the written part of the book, and it was not the way in which I understood the drive and the thrust of both the federal and the provincial governments was on this particular program.

Mrs. Vodrey: There has been no change in the way this program operates since the member's party was in government.

Ms. Frleson: The change is that we are now paying people at minimum wage, and that we have 26 fewer clients at a time when, in the parts of the community where this program has been identified, unemployment rates are rising.

I want to ask the minister one last question in this area, and that is the duration of training. Is that to be changed? There have been a variety of, I understand, programs in this area. Some of them have been as long as two years. Some of them have been somewhat less, but for the most part it has been a two-year program because it is felt that the starting point and the finishing point of these people and these families require those two years of training. So I want to ask the minister: What does she foresee in this coming year under the new

arrangements of what will be the average or the potential length of training for the people in this program?

Mrs. Vodrey: Madam Acting Deputy Chair, the decision to deliver projects of one year in length was taken as an interim measure while this branch reviews the manner in which all the programs will work in an integrated fashion. When we have completed the review of these programs, then we will look at the length of training programs and we will determine if there are to be adjustments in the length of the training program.

Ms. Frlesen: As a matter of policy and planning, why would the minister reduce it to one year in advance of doing the review or in advance of having received the reviews? I understand—I have not read them, but I have spoken to one of the people who did do one of the reviews of this program and who presented publicly some of his findings to a federal parliamentary committee—I understand that his report, in any case, was quite glowing. Given that, and I have no reason to assume that any of the other reports and evaluations of this program are any different, why would the minister change in advance of having done that review and having assembled all those reports and considered them?

Mrs. Vodrey: Madam Acting Deputy Chair, as the member knows, not all of the programs were two years in length. There were certainly programs that were shorter than two years: Family Day Care was a 10-month program; the Transport Drivers program was an 11-week program.

As I have said, we are now looking at the integration. New Careers is now a part and is very strategically placed in the newly amalgamated Employability Enhancement branch. So we would like to have the opportunity not to necessarily commit individuals to a two-year program, because, in fact, they may find that there is another program or another area where a program more suitable to those individuals may be delivered.

*(1600)

Ms. Frlesen: Does the minister consider the impact on the economic viability and the employability and the—I will leave it at that—of the people who are now going to be turned away from New Careers who are only going to have one year of training, who are essentially in limbo? What is

the impact on the regions and the populations from which they come?

We have had a very high percentage of people in this program who have sought employment—sorry, who have been successful in finding employment. It has been one of the hallmarks of this program. I wonder how that is going to have an impact as a result of the reduction of training by 12 months. Does that mean, for example, that we will see a 30 or 40 percent reduction in the number of people who will be employed? Will we see a reduction in their earning potential? One of the things that was, again, a hallmark of the New Careers Program was that people were employed at essentially professional rates and that they were bringing with them into those jobs and into that income level and into that education level an entire family.

Frequently, in parts of the community, both regionally and in terms of aboriginal people especially, people who would not normally have had that opportunity were, I think, for a relatively small-scale program, able to make quite an impact. The reduction by 26 people, the reduction in the number of staff, the reduction in the wages which are to be paid and the reduction in the length of time that people are to be trained—all of them seem to me to be for those communities to confirm the lack of hope, the lack of confidence in this government for their future.

Again, I ask the minister, what has been the impact of the reduction, or what will be the impact of the reduction by 12 months of the training period? Has she considered that?

Mrs. Vodrey: Madam Acting Deputy Chair, I am certainly informed that employers are still keeping their commitments to graduates. Also, I mentioned affiliation with the colleges, and we believe that affiliation with the colleges will promote, perhaps, an even stronger accreditation. I would remind the member that, yes, there has been a reduction of 26 individuals, but that the New Careers Program still maintains clients or people within those programs at 250. There is still a large number. The change is from 276 to 250 individuals.

I will remind her again also that not all programs were two-year programs and that this is a temporary adjustment. I have spoken about it as a temporary change while we are looking at the integration of New Careers in this new part of the department. We are also then going to be

reviewing and looking to adjust the length if necessary.

Ms. Friesen: What will be the difference in entrance earnings of those people who have been trained for one year as opposed to those who had been trained for the longer period of time under the old program?

Mrs. Vodrey: Madam Acting Deputy Chair, the employer determines the starting level. The employer always has, and we have not been informed of any changes in terms of the entry level.

Ms. Friesen: Has the minister made any inquiries about what the salary level, the earning power for a family—and I am looking for the impact of that upon the communities as well—of people who have received only one year's training as opposed to those who have received longer periods of training in the past.

Mrs. Vodrey: Madam Acting Deputy Chairperson, I am informed that we have had no indication from the employers whom we work with that they will be reducing the starting salary. I have been told that some employers are pleased with a shorter term of training program so that they are able to bring the people into work with their business, or their industry, or their agency within a shorter time period.

Ms. Friesen: Does the minister accept a general principle that the longer the training, the higher the entry level of salary; for example, the difference between Grade 12 and those who have had first year university or college?

Mrs. Vodrey: Madam Acting Deputy Chairperson, I know the member would perhaps like to look at a university model more specifically or contrast a community college versus university, but I am informed that within the New Careers Program, this is not a big impact because the employers have been involved from the very beginning of the training, and that is different than other types of education models which the member might like to refer to.

Ms. Friesen: That was not the question at all. I asked the minister, did she accept that there was a general principle whereby the longer the education and training, the higher the salaries. She did not know specifically, and she did not appear to have inquired of these employers.

I asked her, was there a general principle, and the example I gave was, for example, the difference

between those people who have a Grade 12 and those who might have a university or college first year. There was in no way any attempt, and I am sure the minister understood this, to look at different models of education.

I am looking for a general principle of the longer you train somebody, the longer lifetime earnings you have, the higher entrance requirements and higher salaries that you have at the beginning.

Again, I am looking at this from the community perspective of essentially creating a trained body of people who have incomes and work that are satisfying and will benefit that entire community. That is what I feel is being lost in this change in New Careers.

I am asking the minister, has she considered this? What kinds of investigations has she made as to the impact upon those communities of the reduction of the one year in training?

Mrs. Vodrey: I know the member would not want to put words in my mouth, so I will overlook some of the words she has intended to put in my mouth.

She asked about a principle, and I have explained to her that the principle, the very general principle which she speaks about—and I believe she would like to apply it broadly to perhaps community college graduation versus a university graduation, a bachelor's level versus a master's level and so on.

What I have explained to her in addressing that principle in my last answer is to say that it does not appear to have any application in the area of New Careers, and I even gave her the reason for that. I explained to her that the employers are involved from the very beginning from day one; that is unlike the kind of education or training models which the member has used.

In her specific example, she speaks of Grade 12 education versus the first-year university education, and in that there is not a specific employer involved. I have distinguished the New Careers program by saying that there is an employer involved.

* (1610)

The member also tried to suggest that there was not contact with employers. As I have said, there is certainly contact through the proposal, through the selection where there is a recruitment. The information that we have had is that there is not

expected to be an impact. We have not had employers tell us that it will have an impact.

Ms. Frlesen: What the minister is saying, then, is that as far as she knows from the perspective of the employers there is no difference to them between an employee who has been trained for one year and one who has been trained for two years and that they would simply pay the same salary.

(Mr. Deputy Chairperson in the Chair)

Mrs. Vodrey: Again, as I have said to the member, the employer identifies the type of skills that they would like the individual to have at the end of the training. With those skills identified, the employer again is a part of the process from the very beginning. As the member also knows, all of the New Careers programs were not two-year programs. We remind her again that some of the New Careers programs were 11 weeks in the case of the transport driver or 10 months in the case of the family daycare provider.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): I have a number of questions that I was wanting to ask the minister to continue on where we left off on Thursday. It was interesting in the motion that was moved from the member for Dauphin that there were a number of government ministers that took the opportunity to say a few words.

The Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer) really interested me when he was talking about the Gateway Program. He had talked about the importance of that program and how successful that program was of getting individuals off social assistance and into the workforce. In fact, he has at least implied—now I have not read Hansard since he made that statement—but he definitely implied that it was in all likelihood one of the most successful programs that government has had.

The question that I would have is: Can the minister give me the actual number of individuals that have benefited from the program for the fiscal years '91-92 and '92-93?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chair, in 1991-92, the number of participants was 113, and this is for the Gateway Program. The estimated '92-93 participants is 130, and the estimated in '93-94 participants is 140.

Mr. Lamoureux: Can the minister indicate—I know for '93-94 it is obviously 1.6 and the previous year was 1.9—what it was in '91-92?

Mrs. Vodrey: I just wonder if the member for Inkster has been referring to the correct line in the Estimates book. The expenditures '92-93 for the Gateway Program were 1.6, and then for '93-94 would be 1.595.

Mr. Lamoureux: I guess I was reading off Single Parent Access. Can the minister indicate to us what it was for '91-92?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the Estimates in '91-92 were displayed in the Estimates of the Department of Family Services. They were displayed differently. The number, as we have checked back, did not include salaries. The numbers were also rolled together with Single Parent Job Access.

The most accurate information that I can provide the member with is for the year previous to '93-94. That is the '92-93 number that I gave him.

Mr. Lamoureux: I understand in terms of it coming from Family Services. Can the minister not give us any sort of indication at all in terms of the approximate cost? Is it safe to assume, then, that it would have been in excess of \$1.6 million?

* (1620)

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I can give the actual expenditures for '91-92. I would like the record to show that they will be compared with a printed vote, adjusted vote, that in fact they are not entirely comparable.

The actual 1991-92 is \$1,625,500 or \$1.6 million.

Mr. Lamoureux: My question to the minister, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, would be with respect to the number of individuals that have benefited from this particular program and the budgeted amounts of money that are given to the program. If we are seeing a gradual decrease in resources going towards the program, yet we are seeing more individuals going through the program, I am wondering if the minister can explain why that is. What has been changing in the program itself?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chair, I am informed that this is industry-based training. It is somewhat shorter than in the past. It is not quite in the same level of depth, and it is training which is done on site. With that in mind, the shorter duration, we are then looking at some additional individuals participating.

Mr. Lamoureux: Can the minister indicate to the committee if in fact the department, and in

particular this program, is meeting the demands that are being requested of it from individuals on social assistance?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chair, the number of applications and number of referrals has varied between 500 and 700. It appears that in the cycle of '91-92, it was the highest number of referrals, slightly over 700, but in '92-93, the number of referrals was slightly over 500.

I am informed that the variation appears to be the availability of other kinds of programs also available for those people who would be participants.

Mr. Lamoureux: For '93-94, then it would be safe to assume that we have approximately 600 referrals going to it. I am wondering if the minister can comment in terms of the difference of the program itself, because it is industry based, we find that most of it is in subsidy of wages. Is that where most of the money goes out, or a breakdown in terms of how many of those dollars are actually going towards subsidy of wages?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, in the industry based, the largest amount of money does go to the wage assistance and support. That is as compared to the skills training area in which funding also goes for instruction costs as well as for training wage assistance.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, what I am going to attempt to try to establish anyway is to find out how it is that if we cut back on the financial resources to a program of this nature, how, not only in the long term, but in the short term, do government tax dollars, how are they saved when in fact we could be getting additional individuals into the workforce?

If you have the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer) saying that this is in fact a very successful program in getting people into the workforce, and if you are saying that the 140 individuals are entering into the workforce, let us say this year, and there are 500 or 600 referrals going, and if you had the original resources from a few years back, I would hazard it should be safe to assume that the 140 could quite easily increase. In fact, not only as I say in the long term, but in the short term we would in fact be saving dollars. Is that not correct?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the explanation comes, as I said to the member, between the skills training programs and the

industry-based training. In the past, there has been a great deal of skills training and not as much industry-based training. As we have moved into the years '92-93 and what we estimate in '93-94, we have an increased component of the industry-based training. The industry-based training, there is then a sharing and a partnership with the industry that is involved.

So we have maintained, over the past two years using estimated figures for this coming year, that the number of the skills training participants will remain roughly the same. However, there is an increase in the number of participants in the industry-based training.

Mr. Lamoureux: Can the minister explain to me what industry-based training is?

* (1630)

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the skills training will be up to 40 weeks of specific skills training followed by a 12-week work placement. The industry-based training accommodates those individuals who do not require lengthy skills training or retraining or where formalized training is not available.

Mr. Lamoureux: Is the minister then saying that the skills training demand has dropped significantly and this is the reason why we are moving more towards industry-based training?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, in the numbers that I have from '92-93 and our estimated numbers for '93-94, I have the participants in skills training as remaining the same, but an increase in the participants in the industry-based training, which accounts for the increased numbers in the Gateway Program totally.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I am interested in knowing, in terms of the breakdown of the skills training and the industry-based training, and again, I would ask the minister, is there no longer a demand?

For example, there are approximately 600 applicants. Are we getting fewer individuals who are being referred over for skills training, or is this government just having less priority for skills training and is favouring industry-based training?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, as I said, the numbers of participants in the skills training we expect to be the same, or we project to be the same for '93-94 as was in '92-93. Where we project the

increase is in the area of the industry-based training. But I would ask the member to understand that the industry-based training still does provide skills training, and that it has been a partnership which we have entered into, which does suit the employers for the kind of work that the individuals could expect to be doing at the end of a training program. The difference is that the industry-based training is on the job, and the skills training is more in the classroom, but both do provide skills training.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I just want to say that the industry-based training is a new approach which seems to have been met with some success.

Mr. Lamoureux: Yes, and I guess this is why I have some concern when the minister says that it is a new approach. I recall the former—well, when the New Democrats were in government, and they came up with a program such as the Jobs Fund and, in particular, the Deputy Premier and the comments that he had to say about what in fact the Jobs Fund really was all about.

When I look at it, and I see skills training, when you are given classroom training, it tells me that it is more than just being on-the-job training. I would be interested in knowing from the minister the types of jobs that come out of skills training versus industry-based training.

Yes, you might be able to create more work in the short term for individuals, but in terms of enhancing the skills so that work that is acquired from someone on social assistance is more career oriented or long term, I think might be in our best interest, and would she not agree?

Mrs. Vodrey: I just would like to say that in the industry-based training, the industry-based training does share the cost between the public and the private source to allow for training, and that certainly has been one of the issues that has been discussed by labour market ministers and by the federal government, that the governments alone cannot provide all the money required for training. Where there is an opportunity to do the sharing, then that can be extremely helpful and beneficial. As I have said, it does lead to skills training in both routes.

The area of classroom training, or skills training specifically, is a position such as automated office, autobody repair, building operations, power engineering, commercial foods, diesel mechanics,

industrial control and automation and robotics, industrial electricity, industrial electronics, industrial mechanics, clerical accounting, media production, and retail sales.

The training in the industry-based training is in the area of service writer, sales representative, bindery worker, auto mechanic, machine operator, receptionist, sales-service technician, shipper-receiver, legal secretary, receptionist-secretary, assistant foreman, and areas of office assistants, sign maker, print operator. So there is a variety of training offered in both skills training and industry-based training.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, in listening through the list, if it is industry-based training one could become a mechanic and maybe change oil and so forth, and the training program would be very important for doing that. If you have classroom or you are being subsidized to go to Red River College maybe to become a journeyman, to get papers or whatever it might be, I am saying that the classroom is very important in terms of furthering one's education.

Equally as important, of course, is the on-job training also. That is one of the aspects in terms of the skills training that it did have that the industry-based training did not have.

I guess maybe I would ask the minister, can she actually give a breakdown for how much money for '93-94 went towards industry-based training, and '92-93, compared to the skills training? Which area has in fact been cut?

* (1640)

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the member, from his questions, certainly seems to favour the skills training area over the industry-based training area. I would say to him that in looking even across Canada at this area, the goals across Canada have been to strike a balance between skills training which is offered within the classroom and skills training which is industry based. There has been an effort to look at which kind of training is the most suitable to assist people to become employed. It would also encourage people to enter into training. Some people may perhaps be more interested in the industry-based training and are looking for its availability.

In terms of the industry-based training, the participants do receive all of their training on the job. There is a difference. The training ranges

from 12 to 30 weeks and is very much determined by the participants' skill level in relation to the position and the training to be provided. For a number of the industry-based training, the member spoke about how people may progress into various kinds of skilled work. The industry-based training, a number of the people who participate in that particular area have a number of skills and their skills need an enhancement as opposed to people who are beginning at the very beginning who might benefit from the skills training. A number of the people in the industry base already have some of those skills and need an enhancement.

In terms of the industry-based training as well, we sometimes have employers coming to us to say, this is what we need and could you recruit for participants? We also have in the industry-based training individuals who say this is what they would like to do, and they ask us to look at how they can be accommodated within an industry to enhance the skills that they already have.

The numbers that we have, we have them for '92-93, and I would say to the member that these are estimated numbers, that we have been attempting to work them out since the member asked the question. The numbers that I have for '92-93, the industry-based funding is approximately \$130,000, and the skills training funding is approximately \$900,000.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the industry-based training, I believe, is something that is very important to have, a very important component. But if we take a look at the overall decrease that the Gateway Program has suffered, and if the minister is saying that the industry-based training in those new positions from the 130 to the 140 are primarily coming from industry-based training, that then indicates that there has got to be a more significant cut in the skills training area. If in fact there is a cut in the skills training area, and the minister is saying no that there is not, maybe the minister can tell me then in further breakdown of the money where is that money, where is the difference, from 1.67 to 1.59 and some \$80,000 coming from, the decrease?

Mr. Deputy Chairperson, while they are looking at the numbers, maybe what I can suggest then is to indicate to me how many individuals from the skills training area are there for those years versus the industry-based training. Obviously the industry

-based training has gone up. Has the same thing happened with the skills-based training?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chair, the reduction in the Gateway Program is approximately \$79,000, and within that, the salary cost adjustment actually increased in that area. However, then, with the workweek reduction, there was a 4 percent reduction. There was also a systems cost reduction, and then there was a reduction of approximately \$73,000 accounting for the largest part of it, which is an operating reduction. It was an operating reduction relating to the internal operations of the Gateway Program. It was an expenditure management reduction. It was not a reduction that would affect the individuals or the number of individuals within the program.

Mr. Lamoureux: Then, quite simply, to the Minister of Education, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, has there been a decrease in the number of individuals going through the skills training area?

Mrs. Vodrey: As I said to the member, we are expecting it to be the same. In '92-93, the number of participants was 90 in the skills training area, and we are anticipating that in '93-94 the number of participants in the skills training area will be 90. The increase is coming in the industry-based area, where in '92-93 the participants were 40, and in '93-94, we are estimating the participation to increase to 50.

Mr. Lamoureux: In looking at the Estimates, I do not necessarily get that same picture, but it will be interesting to actually go over I guess it next year.

I wanted to move on then. Again, just before we had the vote, last Thursday, I believe it was, we were talking a bit about literacy and the Single Parent Job Access, and I was going to ask the minister, under that particular program where we have seen a decrease in the number of individuals going into the program, if the minister could indicate why that is.

* (1650)

Mr. Lamoureux: I am not looking for the actual numbers, because I was given them. It was 754 in '91-92; then it went to 730 in '92-93; and now 701 in '93-94. Again, the question quite simply is: Why have we seen a decrease in that particular program?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chair, the federal contributions towards the Single Parent Job Access programming in Westman and Brandon

region have decreased significantly over the past three years from \$31 0,000 in '90-91 to \$180,000 in the fiscal year '92-93. So in order to ensure a continued capability to provide programming to single parent social assistance recipients in all regions of the province, it has been necessary to bring the provincial contribution levels for the Westman region into line with its federal funding partner.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I will go over that at another opportunity, but I wanted to get on in terms of literacy, because I am not going to be here this evening.

Was the minister looking at bringing in any form of a literacy program in this area? I know when we were talking about the motion, the member for La Verendrye or whoever it was was asking about an idea, and one of the ideas that we have been promoting is to in fact talk about literacy and see if the government is doing anything in this sector.

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chair, the Literacy line where we were discussing all the literacy projects was the line 4.(f). It is a line that we have already passed in the Estimates and it has been difficult to go back to areas that have already been passed in terms of trying to provide all of the answers to the member.

In the literacy area, if the member is asking, are we looking at a variety of community-based programs or programs that would assist Manitobans, we are. We are looking to keep those programs going. In fact, on that particular line, in the actual literacy programming, because the line in fact is Literacy and another area, there actually was an increase in the funding of \$63,000, so we have maintained the commitment to literacy.

We have also increased the commitment to literacy, because we have recognized that those literacy skills are some of the most basic skills that individuals need to take part in any part of the training program.

That is why, as I have spoken about the Advanced Education and Skills Training Division, I have spoken about it as a spectrum or a range of skills, recognizing that at one point, at a beginning point, the literacy program is important and is necessary.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the reason why I bring it up at this particular line is I have had opportunities, I am sure the minister has,

in terms of visiting with a number of individuals that are in fact looking to upgrade their skills. In many cases you are talking about the single parent.

I would have anticipated, under the Single Parent Job Access Program, that in fact there would be a need for some form of literacy training and how literacy is provided or programming is provided to individuals of this nature that want to get back into the workforce through a program of this nature—how is that co-ordinated between or within the department?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I can tell the member that we have viewed literacy as an important component, and that literacy may become a component of our COPE program or Career Opportunities in Preparation for Employment. Staff, as needed, will be trained in that area in the upcoming year.

I think that addresses the issue of literacy in terms of the career preparation that the member has been specifically focusing on.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson: 4.(g) Employability Enhancement Programs (1) Salaries \$3,936,500—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$3,719,700—pass; (3) Human Resources Opportunity Centres \$3,451,700—pass; (4) Grants \$685,800—pass.

4.(h) Workforce 2000 and Youth Programs (1) Workforce 2000 (a) Salaries \$980,700. Shall the item pass?

Ms. Friesen: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, we only have a few minutes, but I am prepared to begin if the minister's appropriate staff are here. I leave it to the will of the committee.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson: Carry on.

Ms. Friesen: I want to begin by looking at one section of the Workforce 2000 program. That is the \$3-million allocation to the private training incentives. This is not the sectoral one and not the one that looks at the payroll deduction tax but the one that looks at training of small-scale employers. I wonder if the minister could give us a breakdown of the types of industries, the types of employers, the types of companies which have received this money.

I should put on the record, first of all, that I did receive from the minister a list of groups which had received this money. I believe that list went up to November of '92. So perhaps, first of all, I should

ask the minister if there is an updated list to May of '93.

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, in terms of the numbers of contracts with small and medium businesses, to March 31, 1993, there have been 1,704 contracts with small and medium businesses. Some of those have included the introduction of new technologies with computer training, trades training, technology training, health and scientific training.

Is the member asking in terms of the specific range or types of industries?

Ms. Frlesen: There were actually two questions. The first one dealt with the composite list. I believe the list the minister sent me around Christmastime went up to November '92. Is that the case? Is there an additional list, or is there a new composite list that is available?

Mr. Deputy Chairperson: The time is now 5 p.m. and time for private members' hour. I am interrupting the proceedings of the committee. The Committee of Supply will resume consideration at 8 p.m.

HEALTH

Madam Chairperson (Louise Dacquay): Order, please. Will the Committee of Supply please come to order. This section of the Committee of Supply is dealing with the Estimates for the Department of Health. We are on item 3. Continuing Care Programs (a) Administration, page 79 of the Estimates manual.

Would the minister's staff please enter the Chamber.

3.(a) Administration (1) Salaries \$344,800.

Ms. Avis Gray (Crescentwood): Before I ask a few questions about the philosophy of the program, I was just noting that under the Salaries section, when one looks at the Administrative Support in relation to the number of Professional and Managerial staff that it seems to be a very high ratio, three staff to four professionals. When you look through other sections of the department, the ratio does not seem to be quite that high. Can the minister perhaps explain why the high ratio?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Madam Chairperson, I am informed that one of the Administrative Support positions, one of the three, is there as a result of reorganization and will, at

next year's print of the Estimates, be found in 3.(b) for the Administrative Support under the Home Care Program line.

* (1440)

Ms. Gray: Moving on to the philosophy of the program and when we were last in Estimates, I think if I understood the minister, he had suggested that there really had not been any change in the delivery of the Home Care Program with the health care reform, that there did not seem to be a necessity for a change in the delivery of the Home Care Program. I would just perhaps like the minister to clarify or confirm if in fact that is what he said.

Mr. Orchard: Madam Chairperson, that is what I indicated, that over the number of years the guiding principles, if you will, have not changed. My honourable friend might recall the vocal and vehement debates when the "dirty dozen" of the second opposition party, when my honourable friend was official opposition, used to accuse government of having changed the policy of the Continuing Care Programs, and it was to that sense that I indicated the policy had been consistent over the period of time since the inception of the Continuing Care Programs.

Ms. Gray: Madam Chairperson, so with the advent of the health care reform, particularly with the beginnings of the reform when hospitals were aware that major changes were going to occur and that there would be a shift from hospital- to community-based service, is the minister suggesting or saying that there was not any change in the Home Care piece of the program in the community in terms of what the community had to deal with in regard to home care, i.e., any increases in cases, or any differences in the complexity of cases, or any differences in the number of days that clients were discharged from hospital and then were put onto the Home Care Program?

Mr. Orchard: Madam Chairperson, my honourable friend has asked a whole series of questions around the Continuing Care Programs. It would almost stimulate me to give my honourable friend a prolonged answer, but I will not.

The assessment criteria for need remain consistent. The accusation by the NDP from time to time is that we have changed the criteria to access the program. That is not accurate. Having consistent criteria under which assessments are

made to access the program, that underpinning principle still remains.

How are the Continuing Care Programs being utilized today? My honourable friend, if she analyzes the statistics over the last number of years, probably seven, or eight, or nine, she will find a fairly consistent caseload. It has not varied a whole lot, but our budget has been constantly going up, because in answer to one of her questions, yes, the complexity of care undertaken in many circumstances in the Continuing Care Programs has been going up, requiring the dedication of more resources. That has been within the umbrella of assessing needs to consistent criteria.

The policy has not changed, but the program of delivery, yes, it has changed and will continue to change and evolve as we move through reform and other dynamics that impact upon the type of service that the Continuing Care Programs currently deliver and may well be able to add to and enhance the delivery capability.

I do not think my honourable friend would find it any secret that since its inception, for instance, in some circumstances Continuing Care Program personnel deliver the home IV program. That is a new initiative over the last number of years, because it has been found to be manageable in the community and a cost-effective program addition to the Continuing Care Programs.

I want my honourable friend to be very careful in trying to understand the separation I am making. The assessment criteria, the consistency of the programs availability across the length and breadth of Manitoba has remained consistent and, I would suspect, will remain consistent. The method by which and the program by which certain care and deliveries are undertaken in the Continuing Care Programs have been and will continue to change as the program evolves and grows to meet changing needs in community-based care.

Ms. Gray: Madam Chairperson, the minister mentions consistency of the program and the fact that it has not changed. He also mentioned in the last time we were sitting here in the spending Estimates that the community-based home help services that are now available in various parts of the province, that the Home Care Program in terms of assessment that should someone need only maintenance or homemaking services or cleaning services in their home, that in fact those people are

no longer eligible for home care and they are referred to an outside community-based service, some type of home help service. Is that correct?

Mr. Orchard: I do not believe it was in this section, but it was certainly earlier in the Estimates where I indicated that indeed that was the fact. I went back and explained that in 1985, the government of the day, through professional advice they had received, instituted the support services for seniors program which allowed the establishment and the modest funding of support services for senior groups in the community, for community resource councils to be formed supported by modest sustaining grant funding which in essence paid the salary of the volunteer co-ordinator in each of those communities.

Now the mandate of the support services for seniors was a broader mandate than the Continuing Care Program as one can expect. There is a variety of program undertaking community by community, but there is some consistency in a lot of the support services for seniors programs and the community resource council programs. Some of that consistency revolves around meal preparation. Some of that consistency revolves around light housekeeping duties and accompanying with that household maintenance, window washing, yard maintenance, et cetera.

Now the objective in 1985 of the support services for seniors was to establish those community-based resources by volunteers and, where appropriate, to offer a range of services not provided by government in most cases, and in some cases, namely light housekeeping and meal preparation, provided by the Continuing Care Program to establish those on a cost-recovered basis through the efforts of volunteer co-ordinators in the community.

* (1450)

It was that program which in 1985, I think, was quite progressive, that led to very quickly in central western Manitoba regions the establishment of many community-based support services for seniors resources. As a result, in a very major portion of that province, any new in-care program does not offer light housekeeping and meal preparation. That is undertaken by the support services for seniors program. People normally receiving that from the Continuing Care Programs

were taken from the Continuing Care Programs and placed over to the volunteer cost-recovered service of support services for seniors.

That program we supported in opposition, and we continued our support in government. It has grown and it is much more widely available across the province. Where available, as per the rules of introduction in 1985, that where the services of house cleaning or meal preparation were available by a not-for-profit support services for seniors community-based organization, Continuing Care would not provide that service in that the client would purchase that service from these organizations.

That led to an inconsistency. That inconsistency has been subject to many questions in this House, where you have heard the accusation that an individual has had their home care cut back. The cutback is the referral of that client to a service available through support services for seniors, as was envisioned in the program.

Now, what we have in terms of this budget is the inequity, if you will, across the province, where areas that have support services for seniors, those seniors needing light housekeeping and meals preparation in those catchment areas served by support services for seniors, do not receive it through the Continuing Care Programs, access it at a cost-recovery basis, consumer-contribution basis from the programs in the community.

The decision was made to make that a policy right across the entire Home Care Program, regardless of whether there were support services for seniors organizations available, because there has been a growing maturity of economical light housekeeping and meals preparation services available. We are, in the next number of months, going to be referring all of our housekeeping and meals preparation Continuing Care clients to cost-recovered supplied services. That means the program will be consistent, so there are not some paying for the service in Manitoba and some receiving it as part of the taxpayer-supported Continuing Care Programs.

Ms. Gray: So at this point in time, there are still people who are receiving homemaking services through the Home Care Program because those switches have not been made yet—and the minister is nodding in the affirmative.

I am familiar with the nonprofit service for seniors in the north part of the city, but I am not familiar with what kind of services are available in the Fort Rouge-Crescentwood area or in the south part of the city. Can the minister tell this committee what services will be available for individuals there?

Mr. Orchard: Madam Chairperson, I would attempt to provide the south Winnipeg, in particular that region of south Winnipeg, support services for seniors or community resource council presence there, if any, and provide that information.

Ms. Gray: I am sorry, I did not quite understand the minister's answer. Is he saying that there is a support services for seniors council established there, or what services are in place?

Mr. Orchard: I believe my honourable friend's first question was: What services are available? I said I would attempt to provide my honourable friend with that listing in south Winnipeg, and particularly the area she referred to, through support services for seniors or community resource councils, if and where they exist.

Ms. Gray: Then is the minister saying that the staff who are here are not familiar with what services are available in the south part of Winnipeg?

I am asking the question because, being the MLA for Crescentwood and the Crescentwood-Fort Rouge area, as I say, I am familiar with what is available in the northern part of the city, but not with what is available in that part of the city.

Mr. Orchard: Madam Chair, I am informed that there are meals programs, but there are no resource councils providing the other related services in south Winnipeg. There are not community groups that have chosen to make application to the support services for seniors funding access.

Ms. Gray: Can the minister tell us, will the Home Care Program still be providing homemaking and house cleaning services in that part of the city, or will the minister be attempting to ensure that perhaps nonprofit community groups might be prepared to provide those kinds of services?

Mr. Orchard: The latter is the preferred route and we are attempting to encourage that, as has been the case for a number of budget cycles, but to answer the first part of the question: No, the Continuing Care Programs will not be providing the homemaking and the meals preparation as a result of this budget cycle.

Ms. Gray: Madam Chair, can the minister suggest to myself or other members of this House, then, what resources can we be offering individuals who will no longer be able to receive those homemaking services through Home Care? What suggestions do we have for those individuals?

Mr. Orchard: I am advised that the lists of service providers are being put together now and will be made available in the near future so that those individuals who have been accessing the Continuing Care Programs for those services will have some alternatives to consider.

Ms. Gray: Can the minister guarantee me that, in fact, there will be services available to these individuals who will at some point no longer be eligible or will not be receiving homemaking services through Home Care?

Mr. Orchard: Madam Chair, I am not sure whether I understand my honourable friend. To guarantee the service is up to the individual to retain one from a number of hopeful service providers that will be available to serve the individual's needs in south Winnipeg. I am certainly not aware, as I speak, of any lack of services and service providers in the private sector that are providing any number of services to individuals on a cost-recovery basis.

In terms of guaranteeing that an individual will access one of those services, I find it difficult for me to be able to do that. That is going to be an individual's choice of provider, but the one thing that we have decided in this budget cycle is to bring consistency so that there is not the disparity of some receiving services and some not because of the existence of community resource councils and support services for seniors group.

Ms. Gray: Madam Chair, I was asking the minister to guarantee service availability, not necessarily whether an individual would choose to access a particular service.

The minister has indicated he is not aware of any lack of services that would be available to individuals. Can the minister then tell us, so basically we can indicate to people who live in our constituency, what services, which groups, which organizations—or are these private companies?—should we be referring individuals to, should they no longer be eligible for homemaking services through Home Care?

* (1500)

Mr. Orchard: As I indicated approximately three or four answers ago, that is exactly the information that is being developed to be provided to individuals currently receiving the service.

Ms. Gray: Madam Chairperson, what does the minister mean by being developed? Is he saying that there is a list of services, he just does not happen to have that here today? I mean, I am questioning. There seems to be a bit of hesitancy. Is the department, is the minister aware, is the minister convinced and feels reassured that, in fact, there are those services out there that individuals will be able to access throughout the city of Winnipeg and in other areas of Manitoba?

Mr. Orchard: Yes.

Ms. Gray: I am glad the minister is assured. I look forward to seeing that list of services when he does have that available.

Can the minister tell us—I know we are not on this section, but it is related—in regard to the support services to seniors, has there been an expansion of the types of assistance that the support services to seniors have been able to give community groups throughout the city to start developing more of these types of services?

Mr. Orchard: I want to make sure I understand my honourable friend's question. My honourable friend asked, have there been increases to individual existing support services to seniors programs and new ones? Are those my honourable friend's questions? Yes and yes.

Ms. Gray: Can the minister tell us what some of those expansions in programs have been?

Mr. Orchard: If my honourable friend had some specific group that she was interested in pursuing I would provide the range of services as best I can that they provide. But, as my honourable friend knows having some experience with the program, it varies from community to community, from north end of Winnipeg to south end of Winnipeg. It ranges from meals to friendly visiting to light housekeeping and a whole range of initiatives. I will try my best to provide my honourable friend with specifics if I can.

Ms. Gray: Madam Chairperson, will the minister, or can the minister table at some point in this Estimates a list of activities that the support services to seniors staff within the department have been involved in, in this particular year what some of their goals are as far as looking at support

services to seniors? Is he able to table a list of those activities?

Mr. Orchard: I will attempt to provide my honourable friend with a list of activities undertaken by support services for seniors programs and community resource programs in general. Is my honourable friend asking me to provide the specifics for each funded group and what they do, because we can attempt to do that as well.

My honourable friend the member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak) wishes for that detailed information, and we will certainly be pleased to try to provide that to both my honourable friends.

Ms. Gray: Madam Chairperson, the minister talked about consistency of caseloads within home care—over the last number of years that he saw consistency and patterns. Can the minister tell us, within the city of Winnipeg, not a provincial statistic but just a city statistic, what is the average caseload for a home care case co-ordinator?

Mr. Orchard: I will provide that figure rather than an estimate.

Ms. Gray: Can the minister tell us, when the Health Reform initiative began, did the Home Care Program within the communities not see an increase in, not necessarily the number of individuals being discharged from hospital, but the type of case of individual that was discharged from hospital, i.e., that individuals were being discharged earlier with less of a length of stay and that in fact their care needs were more complex?

Mr. Orchard: Madam Chairperson, that circumstance was experienced. It has not been in isolation to the reform initiative launched in the last 14 months, because I think if my honourable friend tracks the Continuing Care Programs, there has been an increase in the complexity of care provided for some time.

Ms. Gray: With the minister and the department seeing those differences, were there any changes that were necessary to make within the Home Care Program in terms of its delivery or methods of doing operation because of these differences or these seen changes with the type of people that were being discharged from hospital? Was there any necessity to make any changes in the home care delivery?

Mr. Orchard: Lest my honourable friend read into my answer, and I am reading into her preamble of a significant change in the approach, et cetera, et

cetera, of the Continuing Care Programs, I do not want my honourable friend to fall into that.

The program has been evolving and meeting differing, and in some cases, more complex needs in the community for a number of years. The Health Reform initiative will call upon the Continuing Care Programs to undertake service provision in, perchance, an ever increasing fashion. That is certainly speculated upon and has been the case, although the number of cases has been relatively consistent over the past number of years.

More importantly, I think, as we move through a number of initiatives in the acute care sector, and let us focus on that for a minute, I think there is clearly an opportunity to provide more effective co-ordination of services. Certainly that is part of an ongoing investigation that the ministry has been engaged in for a number of years that will hopefully lead to more effective use of our current resources. There is a role internal to the hospitals in terms of a more effective co-ordination of identifying in advance services required for early discharge. That is not always a perfect process because there are a number of players internal to the hospital that must be at the table providing advice as to what needs they anticipate and when.

There is a series of work or investigation or meetings or discussions going on to constantly find better ways to manage the system. Let me indicate to my honourable friend that the change to not-for-admission surgery and shorter lengths of stay does not always equate to the need for community and increased Continuing Care services. In some cases they may, and where that is the case, we are working with the hospitals to assure that we can undertake those.

There are other management processes within the hospitals wherein they—for instance, at St. Boniface most recently had in essence same-day admissions so that they were able to significantly reduce, for surgeries requiring admission, the length of stay by the admission process irrespective of the management of the individual post-surgery and any co-ordination with Continuing Care, and Continuing Care supported services post-discharge.

Ms. Gray: Madam Chairperson, so I am assuming that the minister is saying that there was not a

necessity for a lot of changes within the delivery of Home Care as a result of these earlier discharges.

Can the minister tell us, with the VON services that the department contracts with, has there been any significant changes in the type of contract that we have negotiated with VON? Are they still providing similar types of services to what they have been over the last number of years?

* (1510)

Mr. Orchard: Madam Chairperson, the same basic premises are involved in the contract with VON as have been in the past. The substantive change, I guess, would be in the cost per service. That went up.

Ms. Gray: Have there been any substantial changes in the nature of the services with the home orderly service that we provide?

Mr. Orchard: I am sorry, I missed my honourable friend's question.

Ms. Gray: I was wondering if there had been any major changes in the nature of the home orderly service, any major changes in terms of philosophy or criteria for delivering service.

Mr. Orchard: I am advised not, Madam Chairperson, but lest I give away some negotiating positions, my last answer regarding VON was on the basis of the last contract with VON where there was an increase in the cost of service. We are currently negotiating contract arrangements with VON for this current fiscal year, April 1, 1993. Those negotiations have not been completed.

Ms. Gray: In regard to the home orderly service, I know that years ago when this service was a private service and there was a decision made by the former government about whether to take over this service, that the internal report suggested government should not take it over, but the government of the day did at that time.

I am wondering, just out of interest, has that particular service been looked at recently? I mean, is it cost-efficient for us to continue to deliver that service within government?

Mr. Orchard: Madam Chairperson, it has been a long while since I revisited the history around the home orderly service. That is almost stretching my memory and my longevity here, because I believe that was circa 1978 or so when that—no, it was prior to 1978, because we were government then and we would not have ignored a recommendation

of a committee as those other rascals apparently did. I trust my honourable friend is correct in her statement there. A little jest there, a little levity.

Since that time, the Home Care Attendant category of caregiver has been undertaking the home orderly service or what was known as home orderly service and has been providing those services on an assessed need to clients for approximately a decade now I guess.

Ms. Gray: I am sorry, I missed part of the last part of that response, if the minister would not remind repeating it?

Mr. Orchard: I am advised that the home orderly service or the staff description of an orderly is now encompassed in the duties of a Home Care Attendant, the HCA category, and that those functions are provided as part of that caregiver's service provision.

Ms. Gray: In regard to the entire Continuing Care Programs, decisions were made regarding this budget year for changes within pieces of the program, and I am referring now specifically to the home care equipment pool. Can the minister tell us, there is a depot or there was a depot somewhere out in Transcona or North Kildonan, will that depot continue to operate or will that be effectively shut down?

Mr. Orchard: No to the last question, yes to the first question.

Ms. Gray: If the minister could clarify, if the depot is to be shut down, what type of service provision will continue?

Mr. Orchard: Madam Chairperson, the last question was will the depot be shut down, to which I responded in the negative. At any rate, my honourable friend and I got our questions and answers crossed.

The depot will operate but at a reduced size because of reduced volume of goods to be provided. It will be from the depot that we intend to, for instance, maintain the ostomy service provision.

Ms. Gray: Madam Chairperson, for individuals then who will no longer be eligible to receive some supplies through the Home Care equipment program, will they then be required to purchase supplies basically from any type of private companies or will those supplies be offered through the department?

Mr. Orchard: Madam Chairperson, there is a range of answer to that. In some cases the individual may well access those supplies through a pharmacy which they traditionally deal with or one of the medical specialty supply firms that have a presence in Winnipeg, and in some cases, depending on the type of equipment, may well access that equipment at the hospital through the hospital auxiliaries is my understanding of how a portion of the equipment supplies will be then handled, with the hospital auxiliaries making available some pieces of equipment under \$50. However, the depot itself will maintain the supply and distribution of any equipment over \$50, for instance, wheelchairs and other sophisticated independent living aids.

Ms. Gray: Madam Chairperson, does the home care equipment depot buy its supplies from medical supply firms? Is that where the government purchases its supplies?

Mr. Orchard: Supplies that are provided through the Home Care equipment division in Transcona, purchase their supplies by tender. It is the lowest tender that is accepted that meets the specifications of the ministry, and in most cases I think it is fair to say we have multiple suppliers bidding on the supply of those goods. It is rare in that area of sourcing that we are down to single source suppliers.

* (1520)

Ms. Gray: Would not then the cost to a consumer having to now purchase his or her equipment be more than what it obviously would have cost the government because government probably purchases in bulk and purchases by tender as opposed to the individual consumer going out and buying supplies?

Mr. Orchard: Madam Chairperson, in some cases there is no question that is probably the case. In, for instance, the purchase of medical equipment under \$50, these are often one-time purchases of a variety of independent living aids and yes, under the program as it existed, there was absolutely no cost to the individual but, of course, cost to the taxpayer. There will be additional cost to the consumer in two ways, i.e., they now purchase and they will purchase at a higher price than we purchased at because they are individual rather than bulk purchasers. However, factored into the operation of the depot, of course, were staffing

costs which we did not charge back through but was part of the process of supply.

That is why, in terms of the ostomy program, we maintained the presence of central purchasing in Transcona because we considered a number of options based on what other provinces have their programs. If my honourable friend wishes, I can share that with her now, or if you want to get into the ostomy program at a later date in this line that would be fine as well. But we maintained the central purchase function of ostomy supplies, to do exactly as my honourable friend indicates, to keep the consumer price down basis the leveraged, or the volume or the large buying power of the province. For smaller items under \$50, it was not as if it was in most cases an ongoing supply requirement; it was often a one-time purchase. We made the decision to have those one-time purchases sourced in the manner that I indicated.

In some cases if they are purchased in tandem with discharge from hospital, hospital auxiliaries have the opportunity, or pharmacies, or medical supply firms in the province of Manitoba.

Ms. Gray: Madam Chairperson, the minister used the example of some of the one-time purchases, such as the independent living aids. Can the minister tell us what would be the approximate percentage markup that consumers would be paying for some of these supplies?

Mr. Orchard: I cannot give my honourable friend a sense there. I think it can vary. One might make the case that now, with an increased volume of purchase, that, indeed, the cost may come down. So I do not have a sense for that, but it will be, I would expect, more cost than, for instance, our acquisition price, although we never factored into our acquisition price the business costs of supplying them such as inventory, warehousing, staffing, personnel, et cetera.

Ms. Gray: Madam Chairperson, perhaps the minister could tell us when the decision was made to make changes in the policies surrounding home care equipment and who was eligible for it, et cetera. What factors went into the analysis of this decision?

Mr. Orchard: First of all, Madam Chair, let me indicate to my honourable friend that we were facing very difficult financial circumstances this year in preparing the budget.

As my honourable friend knows, last year the federal government estimate of transfer payments reduced, in year, \$120 million. That carried over into the base-line funding provided by the federal government for this year, \$120 million down, and the population adjustment on transfer, I think, removed another \$50 million or \$70 million. I forget the number. We came into this year very severely constrained, in terms of projected support of funding from the federal government. Our revenues that we were projecting, Manitoba source revenues, remained pretty much on target last year, and we expect them to do the same thing this year.

The difficulty that we have in planning a budget is the fact that—and I do not say this politically, this is a reality—the Ontario economy has certainly not been performing up to par. They have gone through a very significant downturn and realignment of their industrial base. In terms of federal transfer payments, as Ontario goes so goes the transfer payments. Of course, that was the reason why we had unexpected revenues back in 1988-89 because of the reconciliation several years after of federal government transfer payments, and those increases were based on a very buoyant mid-'80s economy in Ontario.

(Mr. Ben Sveinson, Acting Chairperson, in the Chair)

As you can gain in that reconciliation a year or two after financial year end, so you can lose if certain economies and provincial economies in Canada have not performed as projected, and that was the case that happened to us last year with Ontario not performing well and Alberta not performing well. They have had a downturn because of energy prices.

So, No. 1, we had to make some difficult decisions. In making those difficult decisions and in trying to come to some consistency of approach across the provinces, we took a look at what other provinces had done. Several other provinces have implemented a user contribution, a consumer contribution for equipment in terms of their home care and independent living programs. Generally, those provinces that had introduced charges did so at approximately the \$50 threshold.

We emulated those policies and brought in the policy to Manitoba where we would ask for the individual to purchase those independent living

aids on their own, rather than have them automatically supplied free of charge as they had been for a number of years, not only in Manitoba, but I think in other provinces. It was a financial drive that initiated this investigation and, secondly, a comparison of other provinces to get us with a program that has some consistency with the approach taken in other provinces.

I think that we might be criticized for introducing a charge for these supplies to individuals needing them or using the services that were formerly provided free of charge, but on the other hand, we did not remove those dollars from the budget. The cost savings we left in the program only with an ability to invest them into more care activities. So on the one hand we can be critical of making the decision, but on the other hand it was in an effort to expand the resource pool that was available in very difficult financial times to provide continuing care services to Manitobans who may well need those services.

* (1530)

I recognize that there are those individuals who do not agree with the policy decision, but we were deliberate in making it at \$50 or less because the tendency is, in general, that those items which cost \$50 or less are items that are quite readily available. In other words, they are fairly common items.

They are, as the definition of the change indicates, lower-cost items, and from that standpoint, if one wanted to take an assessment of retail pricing margins, I think with a greater number of suppliers of those products, you tend to see the marketplace make the ability to generate large margins not there so that we have some assurance that on the lower-cost items the marketplace competition keeps margins fairly close.

It was for that reason, as well, in terms of cost to the individual, but also availability of supply, that we maintained in house the supply of equipment items that are over \$50. We think that in difficult times, we have probably made a series of decisions that are probably the best that can be made in terms of facing difficult financial challenges, but yet maintaining the integrity of the Continuing Care Programs to serve more needs in the community.

Ms. Gray: Mr. Acting Chairperson, in asking the minister about how were decisions made in regards to the budget of the department, he has basically

indicated the government faced very many tough choices, No. 1; and secondly, that in this particular example, the Home Care Equipment, they looked at what some of the other provinces were doing and decided to emulate that.

Can the minister tell us, did his department, did they do an analysis on any of these budget lines in terms of what the impacts would be of any changes to the programs? Was there any analysis done?

Mr. Orchard: Yes, there was analysis done in terms of what the best estimate of budgetary cost would be and that sort of initiative. There was some analysis done as to how other provinces dealt with the issue. If my honourable friend has further questions, she will pose them.

Ms. Gray: Can the minister tell us how many dollars have been saved as a result of this change to the Home Care Equipment program, and where in the budget has that amount of dollars, where have they been put into, another section, as the minister indicated?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Acting Chairperson, we are anticipating some million dollars of reduced expenditures by changing the program in this fashion. As I indicated earlier, in terms of the global budget within the Continuing Care Programs as my honourable friend can see from appropriation 3, in terms of the Home Care Assistance budget, you will find that last year's expenditure of \$62 million had a million dollars of equipment at \$50-and-less costs incorporated in it. That has been removed, and we have in essence, if you wanted to be technical, a \$61-million base line going in and we have added some \$2 million.

In other words, what I am saying to my honourable friend is that we have not taken that million dollars and reduced it from the budget of Continuing Care. We have left it in there to enable us to provide more purchase of assistance, if you will, rather than purchase of medical equipment, et cetera.

Ms. Gray: The amount the minister referred to under Home Care Assistance, \$62.081 million, was that the budgeted amount for Home Care Assistance for '92-93? [interjection]

Do you want me to speak louder? Can we turn off the air conditioning for a while? I am having trouble hearing. [interjection] Thank you, Mr. Acting Chairperson.

I had asked the minister, he referred to the '92-93 expenditure amount of \$62.081 million under the Home Care Assistance and indicated that in this year's budget, that is where the million dollars had gone. Can the minister clarify for me, that \$62.081 million, is that the amount that was budgeted last year for Home Care Assistance or is it the number of dollars that was actually spent?

Mr. Orchard: I am advised that we budgeted \$62 million last year.

Ms. Gray: Can the minister tell us what we actually spent under Home Care Assistance?

Mr. Orchard: \$62.081 million.

Ms. Gray: So other than the—well, less than a \$100,000, the Home Care Assistance budget was not overspent last year?

Mr. Orchard: That is my understanding, Mr. Acting Chairperson.

Ms. Gray: Mr. Acting Chairperson, one other question before I turn it over to the member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak), in regard to the Home Care Equipment and the changes, have individuals or clients been notified about this change in policy, or will they be?

Mr. Orchard: As of July 1, both the ostomy, and I understand there has been communication around the ostomy program, and as of July 1, appreciate the policy will change on the equipment under \$50 and as assessed needs for individuals needing equipment come in they will be informed of the new policy.

Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan): An Order-in-Council has recently been passed appointing an interim director of the Home Care Branch, Marilyn Robinson. Can the minister indicate who Marilyn Robinson is replacing and why?

Mr. Orchard: That is an interim placement for, I believe, six weeks as stated in the Order-in-Council. That individual is filling the current director's position, when the current director is working with the APM group in terms of the Home Care portion of the APM consulting contract.

Mr. Chomiak: Could the minister indicate whether that project's agreement, specifically the Home Care one, has been signed yet between the Home Care and the government and/or Connie Curran?

Mr. Orchard: No.

* (1540)

Mr. Chomlak: The minister has indicated that they have taken the million dollars in savings from the Home Care Equipment program and that money has been channelled back into Home Care or Continuing Care. We also have, presumably, savings as a result of the elimination of the homemakers service and, presumably, that has been channelled back into Continuing Care and Home Care. The minister has indicated \$1 million will be "saved" from the Home Care Equipment program. How much is "saved" from the result of the elimination of the homemakers program?

Mr. Acting Chairperson, at this point I simply want to see where the realized savings from the removal of these two programs are going in terms of delivery of Home Care and/or Continuing Care services.

Mr. Orchard: Page 55 in the Supplementary, subappropriation 21.3(b) Home Care Assistance, where it goes to \$63,187,500, you have to appreciate last year's figures included \$62,081,000. We have made the adjustments in terms of ostomy and in terms of the housekeeping and meals preparation were the sole service and in terms of the Home Care Equipment under \$50.

Those are reduced from the last year's budget which, if we were to just maintain even-steven program year over year, the \$62 million would be less by those three areas. Instead we have an expected increase in Home Care Assistance to \$63,187,500, and all of the program reductions, because we are asking for the individual to make at least partial contribution to the program or, in some instances, entire contribution, then in those dollars which we spent last year that are now going to be picked up by the individual accessing the program have not been removed from the Home Care budget. They have been left in and they will be used to purchase additional units of service, often, as has been the trend in the last several years of the program, at a greater level of intensity in some cases as we move through earlier discharge and other initiatives.

As I indicated earlier on in a response to my honourable friend the member for Crescentwood (Ms. Gray), just two or three or so years ago we did not undertake, for instance, home I.V. through Continuing Care. We do now, and that is a more costly program undertaking than, for instance, Home Care Assistance service provision.

Mr. Chomlak: Mr. Acting Chairperson, the minister initially indicated, or in a response to a question from the member for Crescentwood, that there was approximately \$1 million saving in terms of the Home Care Equipment program. Do I have that correct? It was a million dollars. So that being the case, on a straight arithmetic calculation, if last year's expenditure was \$62,081,000, then the elimination of a million-dollar program would have taken last year's expenditures down to \$61,081,000.

What I am trying to find out is what the number is for the savings for the other two programs, that is the \$50 user fee that is now being charged and the elimination of the homemaker services that are now being picked up by support services to seniors at the cost of the person who receives the service.

Mr. Orchard: My honourable friend, I do not know whether I am making this complex or whether it really is complex. I do not think it is. We made some budgetary decisions. The combined effect of those budgetary decisions is going to have just about a \$4-million, or thereabouts, impact on the program between housekeeping and meal preparation and the equipment side.

The equipment side is not a consistent, all we do is best estimates. But we have some sense that the household maintenance aspect and the meal preparation, where it is a sole service, is a \$3.5-million projected cost to the program in a comparable figure to last year, so that between \$3 million to \$3.5 million, between the two, we anticipate that between those two decisions there is roughly a \$4-million reduction. If we took and did not have those in last year's, our expenditures would have approached \$58 million.

So if we are comparing last year with this year in terms of even-steven, now, there is going to be some slip because appreciate that those figures I gave my honourable friend are on an annualized basis and we are into the year, what, three months, so we are going to achieve three-quarters of that. If we could just forget about the fact that it is partway into the year that some of these are coming in, the difference year over year is approximately \$4 million.

Instead of removing those \$4 million from the program because the consumer is paying for them, we maintained the budgetary commitment and increased it.

So my honourable friend, this is where, when we got into the earlier discussions around the budget, I indicated that we reinvested those dollars back into the program. We are going to purchase now, on behalf of Manitobans assessed for needs, when you add the increase of \$1.1 million and some of the budgetary adjustments of \$4 million, approximately \$5 million more services this year, year over year, in services.

Mr. Chomlak: Mr. Acting Chairperson, well, let us look at that then. The minister said that they are going to purchase about \$5 million more in services this year. That implies an expanded or an increased or a more comprehensive kind of programming. Can the minister outline for me, and I am just going to add a little preamble to that, where that \$5 million is?

* (1550)

I want the minister to know that I appreciate the process. They went into budgetary. They went into the budget and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) approached the minister and said, look, the federal government, et cetera—I have heard it many, many times from the minister—we need these cuts. Treasury Board submissions went in and said we are going to cut and eliminate this program and save X amount of dollars and the money is going to go to blank.

I am trying to fill in where that money is going to, where those blanks that saved dollars are going to, where is the increase? Is it increased resource co-ordinators? Is it increased Home Care co-ordinators? Is it an increase in the IV program, is the volume of people under the IV program going to be increased? Are we taking in a wider range assessment of Home Care recipients now that there has been a shift from institutional-based to Home Care services?

Where is that extra \$4 million to \$5 million units of service? Where is that service going to be, or is there an expanding demographic population upon which it is based? Where are those four to five extra millions of dollars that are going into the system going to show up?

Mr. Orchard: In terms of services provided to clients with assessed needs.

Mr. Chomlak: Mr. Acting Chairperson, the minister has said that, but I would like the minister to outline for us statistically or on some kind of databases where that extra service is going to

appear. The minister appears quite certain, and if the minister wants to come back later tonight with that data, I am prepared to accept that. Is the minister prepared to do that, to come back and say yes to me and the member for Crescentwood (Ms. Gray), this is where that extra service is going to appear?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Acting Chairperson, I almost hate to say, in response to my honourable friend's question, but probably a combination of all of the above in his preamble to his second last question. I mean, that is where the system is going.

It will be some additional services quite possibly purchased because of earlier discharge from hospital. It could quite possibly be additional services purchased to maintain someone living independently for a longer period of time in their home. That is what has been happening in the program and will continue to happen.

If we have an opportunity to advance new concepts in terms of service provision through the increased hours of co-ordination at the hospitals that will be part of the equation of increased purchase of services.

As simply as I can put it to my honourable friend, we made some difficult budgetary decisions. No one is arguing that, I think right across the length and breadth of Canada, difficult budgetary decisions were made.

I know my honourable friend sort of says he has heard it a hundred times from me and from the Finance minister (Mr. Manness), et cetera. Well, he would hear it in Ontario. That is why they are bringing in a \$2 billion wage reduction bill in the Legislature of the province of Ontario. That is why they are hearing it in Saskatchewan. That is why they are going to hear it in Alberta with the budget that comes down this fall. They have heard it in New Brunswick, just right across Canada.

Under ordinary circumstances, and when we get to the hospital line my honourable friend will see that we are reducing the commitment of budget to hospitals. That hospital budget line is down. It is a straight reduction in the budgets of hospitals.

In this line we have made a series of decisions which we have explained. They have the reduction effect annualized equivalent, \$4 million, okay? This year, if we achieve three-quarters of that basis nine months experience then that means the actual reduction will be \$3 million cash flow this year.

That would mean that the budget ought to read \$59 million this year, but it does not because we left those dollars in the program.

In other words, the cost recovery goes over to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness). The Minister of Finance then puts the money back into the Continuing Care Programs, so that we have an increase in the budget this year which is in part an absolute increase over last year and a reinvestment of divested program costs that the individual consumer of the program or client of the program is now picking up and either writing a cheque to the Minister of Finance, as the case may be, or purchasing the service direct, so there is no revenue to government but rather just no cost to government, and we are replacing that cost with budgetary commitment to increase the purchase of Continuing Care services.

I cannot make it any more generally simplified than that, but surely my honourable friend would have to admit that if we were to take the three-quarter annualization of the budgetary reductions, the budget ought to print \$59 million. It has not. It has printed \$63 million. That is why I am saying to my honourable friend we have a significant commitment and increase to this program this year.

Mr. Chomlak: We have \$4 million that are now being paid by the citizens of Manitoba in user fees to the Minister of Finance as a result of program reductions and decreased services from the Department of Health. The minister has said this \$4 million has gone back into the system.

If I look through this appropriation, Mr. Acting Chairperson, we all know in the health care field the vast majority of expenses, for example, are personnel. Let us just quickly canvass the staff years. In Administration the staff years are from seven to seven. In Home Care the staff years are down, from 35 to 33. In Home Care Assistance, it is interesting, direct service workers are down from 46,661.4 to 46,598.5. In Long Term Care the service workers are the same, and Gerontology the staff years are the same. So the years are down, so where are those savings now?

As I peruse the budget and I look through Home Care Assistance details, I note that Expenditures on Supplies and Services, for example, are up close to \$900,000. There is a \$900,000 increase in expenses on supplies and services. There, I found an increase. Is that one example, and can the

minister give me others? Can he explain to me what that increase is, and is that part of the increase he is talking about, because I have just found it in the Estimates?

Mr. Orchard: I think my honourable friend is partially catching on, and I want to tell my honourable friend that the numbers that I think he is talking about are individuals but not hours of service. It is units of service that are going up, and that is what I am telling my honourable friend is the nature of the reinvestment of resource into more service.

Mr. Chomlak: Can the minister give me the breakdown from last budgetary year for the hours of service versus the breakdown of hours of service this year, where he is anticipating the hours in service to increase this year to demonstrate where those increases are, and could he also answer my question about the increase in supplies and services under Home Care Assistance detail of about \$900,000?

* (1600)

Mr. Orchard: My honourable friend hops along like a frog on a hot tin roof.

I am just wanting to make sure that I see where he is getting some of these quoted figures from. I do not want to give my honourable friend any information, but you know, we got into this debate last year when my honourable friend said there were only going to be 20,000 Manitobans receiving home care services when he was right except he was wrong except that he forgot to read the line two above whereas 24,000 Manitobans will receive home care services. The 20,000 was home care equipment. We corrected that.

What I will try to do for my honourable friend is give my honourable friend a concept of the number of hours that we expect to purchase year over year. Number of hours is units of service. I will caution my honourable friend—and here is where I do not have maybe all the answers my honourable friend wants to receive.

I just want my honourable friend to think about the Home Care Program. There are a number of staffing people who are of varying training classifications, I guess would be the way to put it. They are hired on a casual part-time and some full-time basis.

If you take the hours of service that one individual—and let us say it is a home care

assistant who worked for eight hours last year per week. That is one person delivering service. If that person then is a good worker, et cetera, and her supervisors have placed more service delivery with that individual and her hours go up to 24 hours per week, that is one person delivering 24 hours, and maybe she is now taking some of the hours provided by individuals who have left the program, so there could be one person delivering the services of three people last year. That is why my honourable friend cannot go on his people numbers. Units of service is reflected by hours.

I will try to give that to my honourable friend so he has some greater sense.

Mr. Chomlak: Mr. Acting Chairperson, the minister, as usual, did not answer the questions.

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): Oh, yes, he did. I heard him.

Mr. Chomlak: Well, the member for Lakeside said that he heard it. Through the minister dancing around, it certainly was not clear what the answer was to me.

On page 57 of the Estimates, under Schedule 8, it says Direct Service Workers, Estimates of Expenditure 1993-94 \$46,598,500 down from the year previous of \$46,661,400, that is down, Direct Service Workers. That is not staff years. That is dollars paid, presumably, regardless of hours worked, which would then connote that direct service workers are being paid less this year under the Home Care budget than last year. So we now know that part of that \$4 million in increased expenditures to the Home Care, Continuing Care section are not going to direct service workers.

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Acting Chairperson, my honourable friend cannot leap to that conclusion, as much as he would like to, because some of the changes in the program, as it has been in other years, is where a lesser-hourly-wage-paid individual can undertake the work, that is the individual that is put in. Sometimes you see a substitution of, for instance, R.N. nursing with LPN nursing at a lower cost, or LPN nursing replaced with health care aides or home care attendants. Where that is the case, the service is still being provided as required by the individual but at a lower salaried cost, but the individual is still receiving the needed care.

Mr. Chomlak: Mr. Acting Chairperson, the minister is saying that it is possible, though not

necessarily the case, that there will be more service provided to individuals under that appropriation item because it might be provided by lesser-paid individuals. I will accept that for the purpose of the minister's argument.

Let us accept that for the purpose of the minister's argument, and let us say there are more and more lesser-paid individuals in the Home Care system who are providing the service and therefore service is expanding. Let us accept that for the sake of the argument. The minister cannot say that part of that \$4-million saving therefore is going toward direct service workers since it is down from last year, not up. It is down in actual numbers.

I go back to my original question. Where is the \$4 million in increased service?

Mr. Orchard: I missed my honourable friend's latter part of his statements and questions.

Mr. Chomlak: If one accepts the minister's argument, for the sake of an argument, that in fact lesser-paid individuals are providing the same amount or an increased volume of home care service for less money, which is clearly the case in overall expenditure, where is the \$4 million being spent in increased service that the minister has indicated is happening?

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Acting Chairperson, that is exactly what will happen throughout the year with the program, and as we move and reinvest in the system, we expect to provide services of units that are growing in terms of number.

Mr. Chomlak: It is clear the minister is not going to answer the question, but I will even help the minister out. I will give the minister a hand here. Under Supplies and Services there appears to be an increased expenditure of over \$900,000. Is this one of the examples of the increased service—this is helping the minister to make his argument—and what is it?

Mr. Orchard: We will provide that information to my honourable friend as quickly as we can dig it out for him, so he knows where the Supplies and Services line will be going.

Let me give my honourable friend a couple of statistics, and one of them is going to be a preliminary estimate for the year-end March 31, 1993, so my honourable friend gets a sense of the units of service tracking and expenditures. In 1985-86 we provided 2,858,400 units of service, and I have to expect that is a rounded figure. In

each of these years there was an accompanying increase in the program cost and Home Care expenditures. I will just give my honourable friend the units. It was 3,574,200 in '86-87. In '87-88 it was 3,678,400. In '88-89 it went down to 3,398,800; and then back up. I indicate to my honourable friend, we have debated these Estimates in previous years, that was a time when there was a significant wave of new support services for seniors come in, so there were a lot of individuals throughout the province whose housecleaning, house maintenance and meals services were removed as units of services provided directly by the Continuing Care Programs and moved over to support services for seniors.

(Madam Chairperson in the Chair)

In '89-90, the number of service units went up again to 3,501,200; in 1990-91, it increased to 3,833,600; in '91-92, it is 3,989,200; and the estimate that we have for this year, we were at 3,681,600 to January 31, 1993, and we are estimating some 600,000 to 650,000 units of service in the last two months of fiscal '92-93.

So somewhere around 4.3 or, say, 4,250,000 units of service were delivered last year. If my honourable friend wants to get an estimate in terms what units of services we expect to provide next year, I will provide that information.

Mr. Chomlak: You will provide that information at some future date, or does the minister have that information?

Mr. Orchard: We are putting that together, because you have to appreciate that part of the units of service from last year include house-keeping and meals preparation as units of service.

* (1610)

I would suspect that we are going to purchase fewer units of service because of the budgetary decision to have all housekeeping and meals preparation at the client's expense rather than partially provided. You will see a drop similar to the drop that I explained between '87-88 and '88-89, in terms of service provision in terms of units. But, at the same time, the program costs are expected to increase as I have indicated to my honourable friend, so we will provide that.

The Supplies and Services line that my honourable friend questioned earlier, the increase is largely the Victorian Order of Nurse and hospital co-ordination, in terms of supplies.

Mr. Chomlak: This process, together with the air conditioning, is sometimes confusing. Did the minister indicate it was 4.250 million units of service estimated for '92-93?

The minister is nodding in the affirmative, and the minister has stated that he anticipates there will be a decrease commensurate with other decreases as a result of the shift from the home support services.

The minister indicated about a \$900,000 increase in expenditure for VON and supply services. Can the minister give me a breakdown as to where he anticipates those increases and why?

Mr. Orchard: Yes.

Mr. Chomlak: Will the minister provide those figures to us?

Mr. Orchard: I believe I already said yes.

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairperson, with respect to the home equipment supply program the minister indicated a cutoff of \$50. What happens to an individual who requires say a \$35 item and a \$25 item, do they have to purchase each of those items individually, or does the total of \$50 exempt them from having to pay anything beyond the initial \$50? In other words, what happens when it is two items at below \$50? The minister I think knows the flow of the question.

Mr. Orchard: No to the last part of the question, and yes to the first part of the question. It is individual item less than \$50.

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairperson, so I can conclude from the minister's response that if an individual came home from the hospital and required four items all under \$50, the individual would have to pay for all of those four items under \$50.

Mr. Orchard: Madam Chair, I am at a loss to be able to answer that for my honourable friend unless he could specify four items that this hypothetical person might be requiring upon discharge from hospital. I am at a loss to provide my honourable friend with a clear and definitive answer to his hypothetical question.

Mr. Chomlak: It is not a hypothetical question. What is the government policy with respect to the \$50 user fee that you are now charging on home care equipment and supplies with respect to a number of items that might exceed the level of \$50?

Mr. Orchard: We are not charging anything for items under \$50. We are no longer supplying them. For items over \$50, we are supplying them free of charge, and that policy is for items under \$50.

Mr. Chomlak: So it is clear from the minister's response that if an individual required three or four items all valued under \$50, that individual would be required to pay for all of those items. Is that correct?

Mr. Orchard: Madam Chair, if those items were valued at less than \$50 that would be the circumstance, but before my honourable friend starts creating hypothetical circumstances, my honourable friend ought to investigate what those circumstances might be. One could go so far as to say if a person needed 100 items all valued at less than \$50 to live independently, would they have to pay for each of those 100 items? The answer would be yes, but the point is that the supply of equipment less than \$50 is no longer going to be undertaken as part of the Continuing Care Programs. Items above \$50, your high-cost, single-ticket items, will continue to be provided within this current budget.

Mr. Chomlak: Can the minister table a list of inventory items that are presently offered by the Home Care Equipment and Supplies program together with their values so that we can determine which items are now going to be supplied as in the past, what items individuals will now have to pay this fee on?

Mr. Orchard: Yes, Madam Chair.

Mr. Chomlak: The minister indicated that Home Care and Continuing Care are evolving to meet the more complex cases that are developing within the community. Can the minister statistically provide us with information and details to show how the program has evolved and where he anticipates the program evolving?

Now let me give you an example. Does the minister have statistics and data, for example, that indicates we will be having to accommodate X amount of individuals in the community who have certain complex kinds of medical needs that were not required in the past because they were maintained within a hospital, or data along those lines? Are X amount of individuals that require IV services that were not required in the past, because

we are now discharging patients earlier and they can have the home IV service, that kind of data?

Clearly, the minister must have it because of his statements and because of his indications where the program is going. I must assume that he has this data and can provide us with this information so we could ascertain as to where Home Care Program has evolved from and where it is evolving to.

* (1620)

Mr. Orchard: If my honourable friend is wanting to have exact numbers as to what we expect in each category, I remind my honourable friend that what we are debating right now is Estimates. I think the term "Estimates" ought to be considered by definition. These are the best expectations of expenditure to meet needs that we currently have.

Some of it may well be an increase where the individual is deemed to be an appropriate candidate for home IV. That may well be part of the increased service demand. It may be an increased service demand for home oxygen therapy because that program has been one of expanding scope in the last number of years.

But, as with all other areas of the ministry, we do not have a good sense as to how predictable these increases may well be, but as a general statement of where the Continuing Care Programs has been going, clearly, it would be one that says we have been dealing with increasingly complex needs in the Continuing Care Programs since its inception in '74.

We expect that with changes in technology like the miniaturization of home oxygen concentrators and more consumer friendly, if that is the appropriate phraseology—Madam Chair, it is not a precise science to give my honourable friend specifics that will give him comfort and ease, but I do not think my honourable friend in any way can say that the Continuing Care Programs is not and has not been and will not continue to provide services in the community of greater complexity as the process of evolution in health care continues.

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairperson, can the minister give me then a region-by-region breakdown of the recipients of home care by region last year and this year projected?

Mr. Orchard: Madam Chairperson, I think that is what we discussed earlier, and I agreed we would try to provide.

Mr. Chomlak: Can the minister give me the total of staff years allocated to case co-ordinators in home care for this fiscal year?

Mr. Orchard: Does my honourable friend want Winnipeg or do you want the entire program?

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairperson, if possible, I would like it broken down by region if it is at all possible; if not by region then by Winnipeg and outside of Winnipeg; and if that is not possible, certainly the province.

Mr. Orchard: Okay.

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairperson, can the minister also provide the breakdown of resource co-ordinators as well as providing the breakdown of the Home Care Attendants?

Madam Chairperson: The honourable member for Kildonan, would you please repeat your question?

Mr. Chomlak: In fact, I will not only repeat my question, I will expand it. Can the minister provide the same data for resource co-ordinators, for Home Care Attendants, for LPNs and for VONs?

Mr. Orchard: I think I can do that.

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairperson, can the minister indicate how long the response time is in Continuing Care to place service from the hospital to the program?

Mr. Orchard: Madam Chairperson, that can vary depending on circumstances, particularly individual circumstances within the respective hospitals. Generally, I think service placement is accomplished in quite short order, but if there is not within the hospital a mechanism for advanced planning with the physician and others who, as one can understand, need to have some input into the care plan for the individual upon discharge, if there is not that input well enough in advance—we can get, for instance, a request for service at ten o'clock to be in place by noon, and we are unable to do that—but where we have some reasonable advance time, our ability to provide those services is reasonable.

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairperson, can the minister give me a range as to what those time frames are and perhaps a breakdown by region as to what the differences are in terms of the range across the province and the range in terms of the usual to where the extreme might be with respect to placement?

Mr. Orchard: We will try to give my honourable friend that indication.

My honourable friend asked, now, I do not have the breakdown by region but I will give my honourable friend the global breakdown in terms of Continuing Care, seven regional co-ordinators, 11 program supervisors and 128.15 case co-ordinators. That is for the ministry.

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairperson—[interjection] That is the entire province. I understand that from the minister.

My assumption is that figure in fact corresponds to similar figures in the past five or six years, so there has not been any expansion in terms of any of those positions. The minister is indicating that is the correct assumption.

The minister, therefore, will also be providing us with figures on the VONs, the LPNs, as well as the response time for Continuing Care, so I will then, on that assumption, go on to another question.

Mr. Orchard: Madam Chairperson, my honourable friend wanted to have the—now this is not exactly what he wants, but this tells him what he wants. If it is not what he wants, well—

An Honourable Member: You are making an assumption . . .

Mr. Orchard: You are right. I should not make that kind of an assumption.

The first statistic is the homemaking, and it is the average monthly number of persons receiving services. For '92-93, the last fiscal year, the projection was 5,576. We do not have any reason to believe that would vary, but for '93-94, we are expecting that to go down to 3,635 as a result of the decision to remove homemaking as sole service.

Now, let us do the next one with homemaking so that we have homemaking all at once. The next figure I am going to give my honourable friend is the hours provided by month on average for homemaking, projected '92-93 to be 93,683, projected for '93-94 with the budgetary decision to be 61,066. That is homemaking.

Let us go to the Home Care Attendants, the HCAs next. The projected number of persons receiving those services last year was 6,508. It is projected to go up to be providing services to 7,236 individuals on average per month this year. In terms of hours of service provision, that goes from a projection for last year of 202,975 to increase in

hours of services on average per month to 225,756. So the number of people receiving Home Care Attendants will increase as well as the number of hours of home service provision.

* (1630)

We have another category which is overnight or daily, in other words the prolonged presence in the individual's home or apartment. In terms of numbers of individuals receiving that care on average per month, that was 211 last year. We are projecting it to be 189 this year. In terms of hours of service, last year's projection on average per month was 23,748. We are projecting it to be 21,326 this year.

Now let me move to the next category in terms of registered nursing. Registered nursing is projected to serve an average number of persons monthly in the past fiscal year of 849. We expect this year that the projection will be 930 individuals on average per month receiving registered nursing services. That will lead to a projected increase from average monthly units, which is generally an hour of service. Last year it projected at 7,812 increasing this year to 8,561.

The next category is LPN, where last year's projection in terms of numbers of persons on average per month receiving the service was 702. This year we are projecting 689. In terms of hours of service, a slight decrease from an estimate of 4,492 last year to 4,410 this year.

The next group of care providers I want to give my honourable friend is the therapies, where last year the projected number of clients on average per month receiving services was 530. We are projecting a modest increase to 538 individuals per month with an accompanying modest increase in hours of the therapies per month increasing from 1,272 last year to 1,290 projected for this year.

The last category which my honourable friend has asked about is the Victorian Order of Nurses. In that area we are expecting a modest increase from last year where we projected the utilization to be 3,222 people being served on average per month to increase to 3,339. We expect the hours of service in this area of care provision to increase on average per month from 21,586 last year to 22,371 this year. [interjection]

I will give Home Care Attendant both in terms of number of people served, okay. I will repeat the Home Care Attendant ones. Home Care

Attendants, the projection for last year—because bear in mind we have got the projection around 4,250,000 to 4,300,000 service units all up—we are projecting that on average per month, 6,506, I think it is, number of persons will be served per month. That will increase, and that is the largest area of increase. We are projecting an increase to 7,236 individuals receiving Home Care Attendant services. That will increase the projected number of hours for Home Care Attendants from a projected utilization in terms of units of service on average per month this year of 225,756. That is an increase of approximately 23,000 hours per month of increased utilization.

Mr. Chomlak: I thank the minister for these statistics because they, therefore, provide us with a tangible basis to see where the department is projecting the potential need for increased service in the Home Care field. Quite clearly, there are two areas that jump out at me. I know that the member for Crescentwood (Ms. Gray), as well, will want to spend some time on these statistics.

The first is the fact that the minister is projecting on a monthly basis that the amount of people receiving attendant services will be increasing by at least 700—person on average per month, which is relatively significant. I will get to the other issue in a second, but I am wondering on what basis roughly the minister is making those projections.

Mr. Orchard: It is in terms of what we expect to be the assessed needs. We are not changing the methodology of assessment. We expect that will be the assessed needs that we expect to have to provide in this current fiscal year.

Mr. Chomlak: The other interesting statistic is the overnights which appear to be going down. I am wondering, just by definition, I would think as a layperson, that those perhaps might have a requirement to go up, not down. I am wondering if the minister might just sort of outline for me the details of that.

Mr. Orchard: First of all, let me give my honourable friend a bit of history so he does not, maybe, conclude that this thing is trending. The '91-92 actual figures on overnight were 160 for instance, and then our projection was it would increase to 211 and soften back down to 189 is what we are estimating this year.

We are projecting, in that area, some increases for the next year, like '94-95. We have initiatives in

terms of respite, where there will be additional opportunity for respite care, which we think will take pressure off this area and some additional capacity in general in the Long Term Care area of service provision.

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairperson, where does the minister see the increase for respite care? Where will we see that increase?

Mr. Orchard: In some of the personal care home programs, there is an opportunity for increased respite, and we can provide that information to my honourable friend when we get to that area of the program if he wishes.

Mr. Chomlak: Just changing track slightly, can the minister indicate whether or not the regulations with respect to the increase in personal care home fees have been released and, if not, when the minister is anticipating their release?

Mr. Orchard: I do not know how all of a sudden we slipped from Home Care to personal care homes, but—oh, the honourable member indicates he has to go. Well, that is okay.

* (1640)

They will be coming out shortly. They have not been finalized. We expect to have them finalized in the near future, and from thence we will communicate with the personal care home administrators for their co-operation in implementing the new program.

I cannot say how much information has been given by individual personal care home administrations, but there has been some indication, at least in a number of the long-term care facilities, that a new series of charges, means-tested, will be implemented this summer as sort of an advance warning of program and policy change that is coming to residents.

Mr. Chomlak: Madam Chairperson, yes, as I indicated to the minister, I have another meeting. With 20 minutes left in the Estimates' hour I am turning over questioning to the member for Crescentwood to allow her to have some questions. We have been dividing it up on that basis because of a meeting that I am forced to attend in about two minutes.

Perhaps the minister can advise me as to what methodology and what approach will be utilized by those nursing home administrators to determine

how people will be means-tested in order to determine the fee increase.

Mr. Orchard: Yes, I will.

Ms. Gray: Madam Chairperson, the minister gave us an example of the overnight and daily and why the number of persons receiving that service might decrease from last year to this year. Certainly, the explanation of increased respite beds made sense.

I am wondering if the minister could tell us—I suppose we could assume some answers—but with the R.N.s, the projected number of hours in R.N. service appears to be projected that it will see an increase as well. Can the minister indicate to us the reason for that projection increase?

Mr. Orchard: Madam Chairperson, I am simply advised that it is the best estimate the division can put together, reflective of anticipation of greater levels of care requirement for those who are receiving care under the program. It is their best guess, and I think a similar answer would follow from the projected and anticipated increase in VON as well.

Ms. Gray: Could the minister tell us why there is a projected decrease in hours and in number of persons who will be served by LPNs?

Mr. Orchard: It is the best estimate we have in terms of care needs in the program that are normally managed by the LPN. I indicate to my honourable friend that that is a very slight decrease for this year, I think a total of 250 hours per month, if I have my numbers correct. Just to give my honourable friend some sense of our projections beyond this current fiscal year, we are expecting to have a fairly significant increase from 8,500 to 9,500 in the next fiscal year. So it is our best estimate in terms of what hours of what type of care that we anticipate within the given year. They are projections to the best of our ability or as we created the Estimates.

Ms. Gray: Madam Chairperson, does the minister happen to know how many—or is this the information we are receiving this evening because I am not sure—staff years are utilized by individuals who are licensed practical nurses?

Mr. Orchard: In terms of within the Continuing Care staffing complement, not the delivery component—[interjection] Oh, direct service, oh, okay, you read ahead then.

In the Continuing Care staffing breakdown there are 13.5 SYs, LPN. That is consistent year over year. That is in the staffing complement total of 778 that—I better not lose that. In terms of the LPN, the average monthly number of persons anticipated to be receiving services projected last year, 702; projected for this current fiscal year, 689; hours of service projected last year, 4,492; projected this year, 4,410; a decrease of 82 hours on average per month.

Ms. Gray: Madam Chairperson, of that 13.5 SYs utilized for LPNs, does the minister happen to have the figure as to how many individuals are employed, and I know they are not necessarily employed full time, but the 13.5 SYs, how many individuals would that be?

Mr. Orchard: We will have to provide that information. I am advised that we are pretty well staffed to full complement there.

Ms. Gray: Can the minister tell us if those number of SYs, if that is an increase or decrease from last year, or is that constant?

Mr. Orchard: I indicated in my answer previous that it was consistent with last year, same SY complement.

Ms. Gray: Can the minister tell us if there are, with some potential changes possibly to Home Care which we are not aware of, or if there are any, if there will be other opportunities, other than within this type of service, for LPNs to find employment? Other than any type of vacancies that might come up within the 13.5 SYs allocated, would there be other opportunities for LPNs in the community?

Mr. Orchard: My honourable friend, we have been discussing in the last little while, like our best projection in terms of accessing—let us deal with hours of service by LPNs. We are projecting a modest decrease for this year, based on the best projection we can make in terms of acuity of service delivery and the appropriate match of staff with that client need. That is an 82-hour projected reduction per month on an average basis, with that to increase fairly significantly in anticipation of next year's care needs.

This year it would appear, if our projections are accurate, that there is a relatively stable requirement for LPNs in terms of Continuing Care direct-service delivery. There is no anticipated change internal to the department in terms of the 13.5 SYs.

Ms. Gray: Madam Chairperson, perhaps the minister could clarify for me then, where there will be opportunities for LPNs to seek employment, particularly those who may have been laid off, or might be laid off, from places such as St. Boniface Hospital.

Mr. Orchard: Well, bear in mind that within the Continuing Care Programs, we are anticipating a level requirement, but let us go beyond the Continuing Care Programs. Let us talk institutional services and let us talk in particular the long-term care division.

Now, the ministry does not mandate the retention of any particular trained personnel to deliver care. We require staffing to standards of care delivery based on hours and need, et cetera. If I can project my honourable friend's speculation—now I forget what the name of the personal care home was, but just about, what, six, eight weeks ago, there was a great concern that was raised by members, not my honourable friend but members of her party and others in opposition, about the loss of employment by a number of registered nurses at a given personal care home.

* (1650)

If I recall the circumstances there, the personal care home management were restructuring their staffing patterns and were replacing, if my memory serves me correct, some registered nursing staffing with licensed practical nursing staff. So that represented an opportunity.

Again, that is variable. I mean, we do not say that you must employ any given type of trained professional, so the management of each facility makes those kinds of trained staffing or staff training or whether it is an LPN, an R.N. or a B.N. or a nurse's aide, et cetera. They make those decisions internally but must meet our requirements for standards of care.

I want to indicate to my honourable friend that later this year, possibly as soon as November, December, we will have staffed up some of the personal care home beds in the northeast quadrant of the city. There are 240 under construction right now, and although I cannot give my honourable friend numbers, I would speculate that there will be job opportunities in those personal care homes for a number of staff who are either graduating or laid off or seeking change of career. I would speculate—and please do not ask me to quantify,

because I simply cannot—that those facilities will probably be retaining as part of their staff and complement LPNs, so I think there are opportunities there.

The organization has gone through some very difficult times in the last number of months, particularly on the acute hospital side where there appears to be an emerging trend of staff restructuring which would bring in R.N.s and nurses' aides as the staffing mix. That certainly, I think, was most recently evidenced in the St. Boniface restructuring announcement that was made about a week ago today.

Ms. Gray: Madam Chairperson, the reason I asked that question—and I do not have the Hansard in front of me—but I had thought that the minister had indicated the other day in Question Period that there would be opportunities for LPNs in the Continuing Care Programs. Perhaps I was mistaken in terms of his response in the House.

Mr. Orchard: Yes, there may well be, because we are maintaining our level of service commitment in the LPN within a few hours, down very, very slightly. That is not necessarily a fixed identified individual or group of individuals providing that care. Those service opportunities are there, and with staff turnover they represent potential opportunities.

In addition to that, clearly I think there is opportunity for the LPN in the long-term care division with the expansions that are under construction right now in terms of the northeast quadrant of the city of Winnipeg. I wish I could recall the name of the personal care home six, eight weeks ago that made the staffing changes. Central Park Lodge, I believe it was, I think. I am not able to speculate as to whether there will be other facilities that make similar decisions to the one made by Central Park Lodge. We make the assurance in terms of any of these staffing pattern changes, that they comply with the staffing and service provision guidelines that the ministry has had for provision of service in the institution.

Ms. Gray: Madam Chairperson, just on that line of LPNs, I know the minister had talked about a committee that was looking at retraining opportunities. Is it possible for the minister to be specific about what that committee has accomplished and what type of retraining or other job opportunities might be available? I am

particularly interested in the retraining opportunities.

Mr. Orchard: Madam Chair, I am going to have to go back, although this is not the appropriate staff to revisit that issue, but I will attempt, for instance, to provide my honourable friend with some of the access by LPNs subject to layoff of retraining, refresher and entry into the R.N. course at, for instance, St. Boniface to give my honourable friend some sense.

Ms. Gray: Just to clarify, in some of the discussions that we have had earlier today, the minister had indicated that under Home Care Assistance, the base line, the department has managed to keep that base line, and with the changes to programs such as home care equipment, decreases in the homemaking services that we are providing to some clients, that there has been a \$4 million saving in the department in those areas which are going to be used in the Home Care Assistance. Now, am I correct in that statement?

Mr. Orchard: Madam Chair, that is where I was trying to indicate to my honourable friend the member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak) that had we simply taken and removed from the budget those approximate \$4 million of cost reductions, because we are charging for medical supplies under \$50 and we are not providing single service housekeeping, homemaking or meal preparation, then the program would have reflected a lower level of activity, period. That is not the case, and that is where I think my honourable friend can see that there are some significant increases in terms of this anticipated service provision that we are anticipating being part of next year's program.

All of them are refocused on a more costly and more intensive level of service to reflect a shift away to meeting needs of increasing acuity in the Continuing Care Programs. That was the nature of the presentation around average number of persons receiving services monthly and the anticipated hours of service on average provided monthly this year compared to last year.

Ms. Gray: The minister has kindly provided the average number of hours of service per month as well as number of persons receiving that service, particularly for the projected figures for '93-94. Can the minister, for the eight o'clock sitting, provide the accompanying dollars that would be spent that would accompany those average hours per month

for each category, R.N., LPN, et cetera, not, of course, for last year, but for '93-94?

Madam Chairperson: Order, please. The hour being 5 p.m., time for private members' hour.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

* (1700)

IN SESSION

Committee Changes

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member for Point Douglas with his committee changes.

Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas): I move, seconded by the honourable member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Economic Development be amended as follows: the member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) for the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli); the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) for the member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen); the member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar) for the member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman).

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Prior to private members' hour, I believe the honourable government House leader has some information for the House.

House Business

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): House Business, Mr. Speaker, I move, with leave of the House, that both Bills 11 and 13—Bill 11 being The Regional Waste Management Authorities, The Municipal Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act; and Bill 13 being The Manitoba Employee Ownership Fund Corporation Amendment Act be withdrawn from the Standing Committee on Economic Development and transferred to the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable government House leader have leave to transfer Bills 11, 13 as he has indicated? [agreed]

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to move that Bill 18 come out of the Standing Committee on Economic Development, and it, too, be referred to the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable government House leader have leave to withdraw Bill 13 and Bill 18 from the Standing Committee on Economic

Development and transfer them to the Standing Committee on Law Amendments? Also, leave would be required to transfer Bill 11 from the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs to the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, just before we grant leave, could you tell the House what Bill 18 is? It is not on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: Bill 18 is The Corporations Amendment Act. Is there leave? [agreed]. It has been granted.

Mr. Manness: Then I would like to call Law Amendments committee to deal with these three bills, and it will sit on Thursday at 7 p.m. in Room 255.

Also, possibly tomorrow I may give an announcement to the House that Bill 14, the Minister of Justice's (Mr. McCrae) bill dealing with securities, may also join that committee on Thursday night, but at this point it is not.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to announce that the Standing Committee on Economic Development will consider Bill 22 tomorrow morning between the hours of 9 a.m. and 12:30 p.m. in Room 255. Similarly, that same committee will sit Thursday evening from 7 p.m. till 12 a.m. to consider Bill 22.

Similarly, that committee will sit on Friday afternoon between the hours of 1 p.m. and 5 p.m., also to consider Bill 22. All of that is to occur in Room 255.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to thank the honourable government House leader for that information.

Mr. Manness: The final change is, then, that Law Amendments on Thursday evening will then have to come into Room 254.

Committee Changes

Mr. Speaker: Now the honourable member for Gimli with your committee changes.

Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable member for Niakwa (Mr. Reimer), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections be amended as follows: the member for Riel (Mr. Ducharme) for the member for Gimli (Mr. Helwer); the member for St. Norbert (Mr. Laurendeau) for the member for Turtle Mountain (Mr. Rose).

I move, seconded by the member for Niakwa (Mr. Reimer), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Economic Development be amended as follows: the member for Emerson (Mr. Penner) for the member for Charleswood (Mr. Ernst); the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Pallister) for the member for Arthur-Virden (Mr. Downey).

Motions agreed to.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

Resolution 35—Gloria Ulip and Leonora Panis

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): I move, seconded by the member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs), that

WHEREAS approximately 5,000 immigrants each year participate in the federal Department of Employment and Immigration program known as the Live-in Care Program, formerly known as the Foreign Domestic Program; and

WHEREAS the Live-in Care Program requires the domestic worker to reside in the employer's residence; and

WHEREAS by two separate letters dated May 30, 1992, the Department of Employment and Immigration instructed Gloria Ulip and Leonora Panis to leave Canada because they were in violation of the "live-in" clause with their respective employers; and

WHEREAS Ms. Panis's employer consented to her living outside of her residence while she was receiving cancer treatment; and

WHEREAS Ms. Ulip entered into an agreement with her employer upon arriving in Canada that it would be desirable for her to live outside the employer's residence due to space restrictions within that residence; and

WHEREAS at one time the Live-in Care Program did allow domestic workers to reside outside the employer's residence if there was mutual consent between the employer and employee; and

WHEREAS Ms. Ulip and Ms. Panis will be subject to deportation by December 15, 1992, unless the Minister of Employment and Immigration intervenes on their behalf.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba strongly urge the Minister of Employment and Immigration to reconsider his decision not to intervene on these two cases or alternatively allow Ms. Ulip and Ms. Panis to remain in Canada until the Federal Court of Canada has made a decision on the two cases; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Minister of Employment and Immigration and the Prime Minister of Canada; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Assembly urge the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship to report back to this House with a progress report.

Motion presented.

* (1710)

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, it would probably be most appropriate to comment in terms of the timing of this particular resolution. Given the rules that we have to follow as legislators, when we have an issue and because it works on a draw system, unfortunately we were unable to debate this resolution when, in fact, if it had passed, we might have been able to do something in particular for Ms. Ulip, but it is still not too late in terms of Ms. Panis.

I wanted to go over the two cases, and I feel that the Chamber does have some responsibility in the sense that if you take a look at immigration and the ways in which governments have been negotiating to try to get more controls or more influence in immigration matters and so forth, whether it was through the Charlottetown agreement or bilateral agreements between province and the Government of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, these two particular individuals, I believe, have attempted the best way they could to try to be able to rectify a problem that they had gotten themselves into by talking to immigration officers. I wanted to review their cases.

First I want to talk about Ms. Ulip who had come to Canada a number of years ago. Upon arriving in Canada, she had come under the Foreign Domestic Program, and that program basically allows any individual that lives in Canada the opportunity to hire a live-in domestic. At one point in time, it was not required that the domestic worker

would have to in fact live in the employer's residence.

She had come to Canada a few years back. Upon arriving in Canada, her employer who is, from what I understand, a doctor had entered into a conversation and an agreement with the domestic worker basically saying that there was not enough room in their home, in the residence, in order to allow the domestic worker a comfortable living standard. So there was a mutual agreement that the domestic worker would, in fact, live outside of the home.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is also important to point out, in fact, that this particular domestic worker was given a warning and it was suggested that she should move back into the employer's home. Again, this is something in which the employer and the employee had discussed in terms of, well, we have been given a warning, or she had been given a warning, and what does he think, and yes, he was willing and quite prepared to make some room but felt that it would be most uncomfortable for all those involved. Ms. Ulip decided that for the sake of the family and herself, there would be nothing wrong with her to continue working for the employer, but residing outside of the home.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the rules are somewhat clear here. In my review of the case, the only thing that I could really find was that the old regulation used to say that if there was an agreement between the employer and the employee, that in fact the worker would be allowed to live outside the residence. This is something in which I understand Ms. Ulip's lawyer had brought up with the Immigration Department, but felt that there was nothing really that could be done.

Now the reason why I believe it is important that this issue be dealt with inside the Chamber is because it does not just affect one or two individuals. There are a number of foreign domestic workers that do in fact live in the province of Manitoba. A vast majority—I would hazard a guess that 95 percent of them do live with their employer. There is, and I could not tell you specific names, this is more so from hearsay, some individuals that do not necessarily live with their employer, but will in fact have another residence in which they can go to in order to have an opportunity to have that peace and quiet and so forth.

When I look at it, Mr. Speaker, I find that it is somewhat unfortunate that you have, at one point in time, the opportunity, because I do a lot of constituency work with immigrants, and I can understand and I can appreciate the burdens. In many cases they are very easily intimidated. If in fact they feel that it is in the family's best interest not to live there, they will in fact, if persuaded or suggested, live outside of the home. Where there is an employer and an employee agreement, there is a case to be made with respect to allowing the domestic to live outside of the home.

In Ms. Ulip's case, she never missed work in over two and a half years with this one same employer, was there from morning till night and so forth. You know Immigration was fully within their regulations to in fact deport her, but I want to talk about the broader issue on this particular case. The broader issue, of course, is why is it we feel that a domestic worker has to be forced to live in the home when in fact the employer and the employee both feel that there would be mutual benefit for the domestic worker to live outside of the home?

The other case is a case in which I believe the individual has been done an injustice, Mr. Speaker, and that is, of course, Ms. Paris. Ms. Paris is an entirely different case. She is a live-in domestic worker, had received breast cancer. Once she was receiving treatment for the breast cancer, she was feeling very sick and going through chemotherapy, the employer and her decided that it would be in the best interest for her to live outside of the home until, at the very least, the chemotherapy treatment is over and other potential treatments that might be required. It was estimated that she would have to live outside the home for six months.

Well, when Immigration found out that she was living outside of the home, the department took a very hard line and had written her a letter saying that she was being ordered to leave Canada. We were able to demonstrate very clearly that even the department of Immigration and its staff people were wrong on this. Not only did they not give her her entitled warning, and every domestic worker in this particular case is entitled to written warning saying that you have to get back into your employer's residence or we could end up sending you out of Canada, or you have to be prepared to live with the consequences. Mr. Speaker, Ms. Paris was never given that written warning.

Even if in fact, Mr. Speaker, a domestic worker and any other domestic worker that is currently here was in the same circumstances, the Immigration department does allow for compassionate reasons for a domestic worker to live outside of the employer's residence. Of course, one would have to ask if this is not, in the case of Ms. Panis, a legitimate compassionate reason as to why she should not be allowed to live out of the employer's home, I do not know what would be.

Now, Immigration and I have had a number of different conversations. I know in fact the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Mitchelson) is aware of these two individuals. We have had the opportunity to be able to speak.

* (1720)

Again, Mr. Speaker, one could say this is a federal issue and maybe the Member of Parliament, or the concern should be brought up in Ottawa or the department of Immigration. As someone who not only wants to represent the constituents who elected me to this Chamber, I believe that there are a number of individuals who need to have people standing up representing their interests.

You will find that this is an area, in terms of the domestic workers, where I feel that there is very much so a number of individuals who are in that particular program who do need to have strong representation and would encourage the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship to look at this particular program and to evaluate what has been going on in this particular industry, because it is an area in which there still is demand in the province for domestic workers.

I believe that there is a responsibility of this minister to be able to represent and to defend those individuals who are being impacted by decisions that are being made or at least make representation on their behalf in Ottawa, in particular to the Minister of Immigration. The Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship does have opportunity to sit down and correspond with the Minister of Immigration.

With respect to Ms. Panis, I believe that the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship, if the will was there to act on Ms. Panis's behalf, that in fact this is an individual who would not go back to the Philippines where she happens to come from.

If we take a look at both of these individuals, Ms. Ulip and Ms. Panis, both of these individuals have contributed to Manitoba's society for a number of years and really have not done anything wrong and have been very productive, like many other immigrants who come to Canada, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, do deserve at least the attention of the minister, if for no other reason the fact that the problem is still there. We are talking about the impact on hundreds of Manitobans who are in Manitoba under that particular program.

I have had many different opportunities to speak to different organizations and they talk in terms of barriers, and I know the member for Niakwa (Mr. Reimer) has too. There are barriers that are put down or put in place, and these are areas which I believe that the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship should look at. It is a significant barrier that is there for domestic workers and it is a significant number of people.

I believe that, if the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Mitchelson) did take a firm stand on it, Mr. Speaker, we would in fact see some sort of results. I know back in December, when I was trying to get this resolution bumped so that we would actually get it discussed in time before Ms. Ulip in particular was being asked to leave, there was will inside the Chamber in the discussions that I had with the member for Rossmere and the Minister of Culture, Heritage, and Citizenship, we were, at least it looked like, two hours away from getting the leave that was necessary, at least from the three of us, to allow this resolution to come to the top of the Order Paper, to allow it to be debated before they both, Ms. Ulip and Ms. Panis, had to leave.

Now, the Minister of Culture, Heritage, and Citizenship had indicated to me that she had in fact been able to get something done for Ms. Panis. That allowed Ms. Panis to stay at least until the end of January at which time she would review it. I do appreciate the work that the Minister of Culture, Heritage, and Citizenship did there.

Because I know that the resolution is outdated, what I would rather like to see is a commitment from all parties inside the Chamber to look at this particular program, and to do what we can—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member's time has expired.

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Lels (St. Johns): I am pleased with the opportunity to join in the debate on this resolution proposed by the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) regarding the particular situation facing Gloria Ulip and Leonora Panis, and to comment on what I consider to be a serious issue with broad policy consequences.

I want to begin by commending the member for Inkster for his work on behalf of these two individuals, and for bringing this resolution before this Chamber for discussion. It matters little, in our estimation, that the resolution may be somewhat out of date, because in fact the fundamental issue behind this particular incident remains and must be addressed in this Chamber. It would seem to me that this area of immigration and settlement is of great significance for the provincial government, for members of the Conservatives, and calls for action and comment on the part of members opposite.

It is not, in my view, something that can be dismissed solely in terms of being federal jurisdiction and not dealt with seriously by this Chamber, because it is an area that affects very much this province. It affects the livelihood of many individuals. It has serious ramifications for what our society will look like in the future and what degree of tolerance, understanding and respect will be present in the years to come.

I find it interesting that we have had to deal with—and the member for Inkster particularly has had to deal with specifically—the case of two individuals who, in my estimation, have been caught in a trap of regulations and red tape and bureaucracy for little purpose, except perhaps to make it that much more difficult for people from other countries to come to this country and contribute to the economy and make a living and consider Canada as a future homeland.

(Mr. Marcel Laurendeau, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

Interesting that we deal with that kind of situation, and that kind of bureaucracy around individuals who are committed to working here, who are doing their jobs, who are not doing a disservice to this country, who have arrived at reasonable agreements with their employers in terms of their working arrangements. Interesting that they find that kind of problem, that we see these kinds of obstacles in this situation when, in fact, this government, our federal government and with clear

support from the provincial Conservatives, is prepared to embark upon a very questionable area, a very questionable route of handing out entry into this country on the basis of dollars. I speak specifically of the Immigrant Investor Fund. Interesting, and consider the scandal that has rocked this city and this province over the last number of months around the Immigrant Investor Fund.

Is it not interesting that we have governments prepared to endorse a program that says if you have \$250,000 to invest in this country, you are guaranteed landed immigrant status, no matter whether or not that money actually produced jobs, went into real investment projects, was up-front and of total integrity and honesty every step of the way. Interesting, Mr. Acting Speaker, that the priorities of the government here and the government in Ottawa that is prepared to allow people to buy their way into this country, but put up all kinds of needless barriers to people who want to genuinely contribute to this country, use their talents and help people here in this country.

Let us look at the specific examples and juxtapose them once more. In the case of the two individuals brought to our attention by the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), two people from the Philippines, they came here under the Live-in Care Program, a program that recognized the need for sponsoring individuals involved in domestic care, recognized the demand on the part of some Canadians for that kind of service and recognized the interest on the part of individuals from other countries wanting to provide that service and make that contribution, and for all intents and purposes did exactly what the intent of the program was set up to do, provide the service, provide full-time ongoing care for children of families where parents are working and need that kind of support.

Yet, over two technicalities these individuals ran into enormous barriers and were threatened with deportation and, throughout it all, it never made any sense. It never made any sense. In the case of Leonora Panis, as the member for Inkster has already pointed out, here is an individual who ended up being diagnosed with cancer and in order for her own health and well-being and with the consent of her employers, felt it was best to live outside of that home while she was receiving cancer treatments. In the case of Gloria Ulip, it was through mutual agreement with herself and the

employers that it was felt that it would make more sense if she lived outside of the employer's residence.

* (1730)

Yet, those were the grounds, those were the reasons for the consideration of their deportation. It is quite unbelievable when you consider that underneath it all, there was no wrongdoing, there was no dishonesty, there was simply the intent to provide the service and to be good participating members of Canadian society. Yet, on the other hand, we have the Immigrant Investor Fund with the likes of Bob Kozminski using taxpayers' money to track business deals that end up being no more than the paper they were written on, allowed to sell entry into this country for \$250,000. Where is the decency and the fairness in our immigration policy that this kind of discrepancy occurs and these kinds of clearly misplaced priorities result?

Mr. Acting Speaker, let us look broadly at the Conservative government's approach, whether it is provincial or federal, to immigration and settlement in this country. We once prided ourselves on being a country that received and welcomed people from all over this world, regardless of their background, regardless of the circumstances they found themselves in in their homelands. We welcomed those individuals in. We had an open-door policy, and we knew that kind of immigration to this country was good for Canada and good for our economy.

Recently, we have seen the philosophy of Conservatives of this country deal quite a horrible blow to immigration policy that has resulted in a change in our very open-door policy. What is it about this government and Conservatives today that are so intent on keeping out ordinary folks who want to really work and contribute in this country but are open to dubious investors and people buying their way into this country? Where are their priorities?

Why do we have a federal government right now making changes to immigration policy that will make it harder for families to bring their parents and grandparents into this country? Why is family reunification at the bottom of the list of priorities for this government when it comes to immigration? Why has this government turned its heart and soul and mind away from refugees from many countries who need our help and need openness and responsiveness to their situations? Why do we

have a government following along the lines of these, what would seem to be, fairly rigorous, often silly, regulations around the Live-in Care Program? Why do we have a government that is requiring two years more education for domestic workers? Why is the federal government—and apparently with the support of these provincial Conservatives—considering requiring domestic workers to have 12 years of education before they can come into this country and work as domestics?

Let us just look at that kind of requirement in the context of individuals and domestic workers from the Philippines, a country where basic education takes 10 years. We are saying to individuals in that country, you must find two more years of education in order to be considered qualified domestic workers to be allowed into this country, regardless of their work in the child care field, regardless of their experience as domestic workers, regardless of the contribution they could make to families here in Canada, regardless of the contribution they could make to our economy, regardless of the fact that they could be excellent citizens of this country. We are suggesting that we are prepared to put in place artificial barriers and add a couple more years of education and training in order for them to be accepted into this country.

Mr. Acting Speaker, the examples we could give are numerous. We could go on and on with the unfairness, the injustice, the lack of rational approach to the whole area of immigration policy. It does not make sense.

What is most serious of all is that Canada is losing or maybe already has lost its international reputation for being a country of openness, tolerance, understanding and a willingness to accept people in from all walks of life all over this world regardless of their economic circumstances and of the political situation that they found themselves in.

We have, in the past, been nonjudgmental and willing to make Canada a cosmopolitan centre, a true mosaic in terms of appreciating individuals' heritage, culture, language and religion. Yet now, over the last number of years, we have seen slow erosion of that policy, subtle changes, the doors are closing, foolish obstacles, unnecessary barriers are being put into place of individuals who have every ability, every experience, to make a contribution to this country.

So, Mr. Acting Speaker, at the bottom of this resolution involving two individuals, Gloria Ulip and Leonora Panis, who are from the Philippines, is a much bigger question, a broad policy issue that requires our serious consideration.

I would hope that as this resolution states that this government would take a new approach and a more enlightened position with respect to immigration and settlement and do some active work with their new leader, Kim Campbell, who has suggested that she is representing a new change in the party and in the government. She talks about inclusiveness.

Well, if this new leader, if the Conservative Party of Canada and if the Conservative government of Manitoba believes in inclusiveness, then they will start with the immigration and settlement policy here today, because that is truly the mark of seriousness and an indication of how serious Conservatives are with respect to inclusiveness.

So we urge the Conservatives today to take that message of inclusiveness when it comes to immigration and settlement and speak to their leader, Kim Campbell, and to restore Canada to its internationally recognized position of openness, tolerance and understanding for people of all countries, races, religions and heritage. Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Mr. Jack Reimer (Niakwa): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to stand and put a few words on record regarding the resolution brought forth by the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) with Resolution 35.

I would like to just point out, before I speak about the resolution, a bit in the reference made by both the member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) and the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) regarding the Filipino community and the two individuals referred to in the resolution.

* (1740)

I have had the great opportunity over the last while to become exposed, to become part and to become friendly with a fair amount of individuals within the Filipino community, because here in Winnipeg, particularly in Manitoba, we are blessed with one of the largest percentages of Filipino communities within Canada outside of Toronto. I believe that Winnipeg has the second highest percentage of Filipinos in Canada which represents

almost 40,000 individuals here. They are very strong contributors to the economy, to the welfare and well-being of Manitoba in regard to their participation and character of community and sense of family within Manitoba.

They bring forth a very strong work ethic, a very strong involvement in contributing to Winnipeg and to Manitoba's economy. It is a very progressive and a very active community. As mentioned, I have had the opportunity to go to quite a few of their events and be exposed not only to their culture and their food, but also some of their fine friendship. I have gotten to know quite a few of them on a very personal basis, and indeed they are a very productive part of Manitoba's economy.

Here in Winnipeg and in Manitoba, we are noticeably a very multinational and multicultural part of Canada. In fact, we have the highest percentage of non-English, non-French speaking peoples here in Manitoba than any other part of Canada. Our percentage of non-English, non-French speaking peoples here in Manitoba represent almost, I believe it is, 45 percent of the population. So we have a very large mosaic of peoples here in Manitoba that have contributed a lot to the economy.

In fact, a lot of times we use the word mosaic. We use the word Manitoba tartan, in a sense, but I like to think of it in a sense of something like a salad bar where you have various degrees of ingredients, if you want to call it, in a salad bar, each with their own individual flavour, their own individual characteristic and their own individual contribution to the end product. It seems that in Manitoba, we are blessed with this type of situation that we have each individual group or culture contributing, but at the same time having their own characteristics and their own ability to mingle and to get along with all peoples here in Manitoba.

In regards to the resolution brought forth by the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), I would just like to put forth regarding the two individuals who were at the time involved in Canada's Foreign Domestic Workers' Program. The Foreign Domestic Workers' Program was replaced in April of 1992 by the live-in caregiver program which is a labour market program addressing this specific type of shortage, namely the live-in caregivers. This immigration admission program was very unusual for it exists for only one reason, to meet a shortage of live-in caregivers in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, members should be aware, there is not a shortage of general domestics in Canada, only live-in caregivers. The program is unique as these live-in caregivers can be landed in Canada while other immigrants can only be landed outside of Canada. This is a very special privilege available to these caregivers and it shows the sensitivity to the special circumstances under which live-in caregivers come to Canada.

The program's primary focus is to assist employers who need live-in positions such as housekeepers, companions, domestic servants, babysitters, children nurses and parents' helpers. There are three main requirements to qualify as a participant. The first is successful completion of the equivalent of a Canadian Grade 12 education. This is to ensure that those who apply for permanent residency after two years will qualify for jobs in the general labour market.

The second originally proposed that six months full-time training in the field or occupation related to live-in caregiving be required. This has been amended after consultation with the provinces and the concerned groups to include equivalent work experience now. The third criteria is the ability to speak, read and understand either French or English.

Since 1987, this program and its predecessors allowed approximately 1,470 foreign domestics to enter Manitoba to be employed in this area. Mr. Speaker, it is important to describe how they were able to come to Canada and enter employment in this field, to explain the conditions as they understood and were followed by the vast majority of the participants.

An interested employer submits a request to hire a live-in caregiver at a Canada Employment Centre in Canada. This is to ensure that there is no other Canadian citizen or permanent resident who is able to fill the need. The offer is validated by federal employment officers and then sent to the foreign post where the employer has identified someone who may be interested in applying.

Applicants are then interviewed in their own country to determine if they are eligible for the program. The applicant must meet the requirements as previously stated as well as a medical and a background check. If these are satisfactory and the requirements are met, the visa is issued and the employment authorization is

provided. This is valid for one year and then renewed for a further year.

The employment authorization is valid for only one employer. If the live-in caregiver wishes to change employers, they must inform Employment and Immigration officials and can only do it with the permission of the department. Again, this is a requirement where normally employers and employees know the requirements and the conditions of the program.

The caregiver is obliged to live in the household for the duration of the employment authorization, is able to take courses to upgrade and prepare herself or himself for the general labour market and to change employers if necessary once Employment and Immigration Canada is informed and concurs and has 24 out of 36 months of sustained continuous full-time employment.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to focus on the two individuals identified in the motion as I believe they are an exception to the rule. The vast majority of the live-in caregivers follow the terms and the conditions of the Live-in Caregiver Program to the full extent. Having met with representatives of such groups, I know that they seek to ensure that everyone complies with the same conditions. Live-in caregivers are eventually able to be landed and, if they choose, seek other forms of employment.

Mr. Speaker, it is possible to construe this issue as a debate over the exploitation and devaluation of women and their work. However, such a position has the effect of diverting our attention from the real issues at stake. Under present immigration legislation there are procedures and regulations available to protect the rights of individuals. This process has been made available to two individuals in question. They were provided with the right to appeal their removal before the federal court. One would assume that they have the right to remain in Canada while their case is heard. I agree with this principle.

This is a federal program and provincial governments are not in the position to be given all of the facts necessary to review each immigration case. However, this government is interested in the general policies and the regulations which impact on our role in immigration and settlement matters and their impact on residents in this province.

I am advised that the individuals involved have followed due process and have benefited from legal counsel advocated on their behalf. I am further of the understanding that one of these individuals has chosen to leave Canada and the other remains in Manitoba.

* (1750)

Mr. Speaker, I believe, as Manitoba proceeds with the intention to negotiate an immigrant agreement with Canada, all members of this House must take the time to investigate and understand all aspects of the immigration law, its legislation and its regulations with respect to orderly and just process.

With that in mind, I must move an amendment to the motion brought forth by the member for Inkster, and, at this time I move, seconded by the member for Turtle Mountain (Mr. Rose) that Resolution 35 be amended by deleting all the words following the first "WHEREAS" and replacing them by the following:

WHEREAS since 1987 the Foreign Domestic Program and the Live-in Care Givers have allowed approximately 1,477 foreign domestic workers to enter Manitoba and be employed in this area; and

WHEREAS the Live-in Care Giver Program requires the domestic worker to reside in the employer's residence; and

WHEREAS by two separate letters dated May 30, 1992, the federal Department of Employment and Immigration instructed Gloria Ulip and Leonora Panis to leave Canada because they were in violation of the "live-in" clause with their respective employers; and

WHEREAS it appears that the program guidelines were not understood by both the employers and the employees; and

WHEREAS Ms. Ulip and Ms. Panis were subject to deportation by December 15, 1992, unless the federal Minister of Employment and Immigration intervenes on their behalf; and

WHEREAS the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship has written to the federal Minister of Employment and Immigration on their behalf; and

WHEREAS Ms. Ulip has already returned to the Philippines and no further action will take place with Ms. Panis until the results of her medical tests are known.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba recognize the work of the Minister and staff of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship in resolving this case; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship urge the federal government to implement a process whereby live-in caregivers and their employers understand the terms and conditions of this program, and ensure the integrity of the Live-in Care Givers Program is maintained.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Motion presented.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member's amendment is in order.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I just want to rise briefly to say that I followed the debate with interest and I am aware of the circumstances surrounding this case. I think that the circumstances surrounding Gloria Ulip and Leonora Panis's case is very typical of what can develop in regard to a number of immigration matters.

I had a case recently, which I am pursuing now, of an individual that had applied for immigration status, gone through all the necessary steps, and, in the meantime, because of the delay, had become married and was very concerned about the impact that could have on his immigration status.

There are a lot of people that, through technicalities and interpretations, live in fear because of our immigration laws. I do believe it is important to have sensitivity to the particular circumstances, as I indeed are pursuing now on behalf of this one individual because I feel it is immaterial that he became married in the meantime. It had no impact on his application and certainly should not be a question for now, but there are many people who are afraid, Mr. Speaker, out there because of the interpretation that is provided. I do wish that when we debate this particular resolution, we recognize that fact.

I have known a number of people who have been live-in caregivers, to call it the official title, and I know the difficulties that have arisen related to the circumstances. I do think it is a program that could do with some review in terms of the degree to which certain regulations are followed, and, in this particular case, it is a clear evidence of that.

I do believe that, in the 1990s, it is a program that applies across the world. There are similar programs in many other countries.

I think the strictness of interpretation can be a major problem for some of the individuals under this program and can lead to exploitation. I have, as I said, known people individually who have gone through it. I have known, in one case, of one individual, as I mentioned, able to obtain landed immigrant status, and now is a permanent resident of the country, outside of this particular program. I know the concerns she went through.

So I would say, it is an interesting resolution. I do not think it is necessary, in this particular case, to do the usual Conservative thing and pat people on the back. That was not the point of the original motion.

Whatever work the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship has done will certainly stand on its own right, Mr. Speaker, so I am not sure if we really need this particular amendment, but it is certainly something that we could consider.

I know that the original mover of the original resolution has a number of comments, so I will defer to him, Mr. Speaker, in terms of what he might wish to add on the amendment.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, very quickly, I just wanted to make note the member for Niakwa (Mr. Reimer) talked about the Grade 12 equivalence, the six months full time, and the requirement now for them to speak English or French.

The English or French is not a problem, but the Grade 12 and the six months are. That will prevent individuals—he made reference to 1,400 people that came to Manitoba. These individuals would not have been able to come to Manitoba under these new rules or at least a good portion of them.

In terms of Ms. Ulip, she was asked to leave. If she did not leave, she would have been deported. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the amendment for Resolution 35, as moved by the honourable member for Niakwa (Mr. Reimer). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: No. Order, please. The question before the House is: Shall Resolution 35 be amended? I can dispense with that? [agreed]

All those in favour of the motion, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Second Opposition House Leader): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I just want the House to indicate that it was on division.

Mr. Speaker: On division.

Is it the will of the House to call it six o'clock?

An Honourable Member: No, the motion as amended.

Mr. Speaker: The motion as amended. That is passed. There is not the will to call it six o'clock.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Yes, Mr. Speaker, my understanding is we were voting on the amendments, so there should have been a following vote on the motion as amended.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, let us do it that way, again, now.

Now, the question before the House is on the main motion, as moved by the honourable member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), as amended.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt that motion?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: No? All those in favour of adopting the resolution as amended, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, not wanting to say that the Yeas apparently do have it, but let it be known that it was on division.

Mr. Speaker: On division.

The hour being 6 p.m., I am leaving the Chair with the understanding that the House will reconvene at 8 p.m. in Committee of Supply.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, June 21, 1993

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Introduction of Bills

Bill 47, Residential Tenancies Amendment Act (2) McIntosh	4457
Bill 48, Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1993 Manness	4457
Bill 49, Summary Convictions Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act Manness (for McCrae)	4457
Bill 50, Statute Law Amendment Act, 1993 Manness (for McCrae)	4457
Bill 51, Municipal Amendment Act (2) Manness (for Derkach)	4457

Oral Questions

Cortelco Canada Inc. Doer; Stefanson	4458
Gretchen Family Chomiak; Orchard	4459
Repap Manitoba Inc. Alcock; Manness	4460
Cadham Provincial Laboratory Cerilli; Orchard	4461
Repap Manitoba Inc. Wowchuk; Manness	4461
Substance Abuse Carstairs; Orchard	4462
Substance Abuse Legislation Carstairs; Orchard	4463

Fatality Inquiries Act Carstairs; Orchard	4463
--	------

Workforce 2000 Maloway; Vodrey	4464
-----------------------------------	------

Apotex Inc. Storie; Stefanson	4464
----------------------------------	------

RH Institute Storie; Stefanson	4465
-----------------------------------	------

Civil Service Plohman; Praznik	4465
-----------------------------------	------

Economic Policies Plohman; Praznik	4466
---------------------------------------	------

Nonpolitical Statements

Recognition of Southeast Mutual Aid Sveinson	4467
Doer	4467

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Committee of Supply

Education and Training	4467
Health	4484

Private Members' Business

Proposed Resolutions

Res. 35, Gloria Ulip and Leonora Panis Lamoureux	4505
Wasylycia-Leis	4508
Amendment Reimer	4510
Ashton	4512
Lamoureux	4513