

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 17 June, 1985.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. R. PENNER introduced, by leave, Bill No. 57, An Act to amend The Law Society Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur la Société du Barreau; Bill No. 58, An Act to amend The Mortgage Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les hypothèques; Bill No. 60, The Statute Law Amendment Act (1985); Loi de 1985 modifiant le droit statutaire (Recommended by Her Honour the Lieutenant-Governor); and Bill No. 59, The Statute Law Amendment (Family Law) Act; Loi modifiant le droit statutaire concernant le droit de la famille.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 24 students of Grade 5 standing from the Crane School under the direction of Mr. Piper. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

On behalf of all of the members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Cramer, Garth - promotion

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Premier. Earlier this Session we had some news of a promotion and a rather large increase in salary to the Premier's media secretary, one Garth Cramer.

I now understand, and I wonder if the Premier can confirm whether or not Mr. Cramer has now been further elevated in public service in Manitoba to a salary of \$48,436 per annum, compared to his starting salary of \$26,287 per annum on March 1st, 1982 - now, just three years later, as of April 1, '85, an 84.2 percent increase to over \$48,000.00.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Cramer has taken on responsibilities in a different position because of the

temporary illness of the individual who was fulfilling the other position, Mr. Scotten.

MR. G. FILMON: Over the past three years, has Mr. Cramer taken on any additional education or training that would enhance his qualifications for such a major increase in salary? I recognize that working for the Premier is an education in itself, but has he been given any additional training that would enhance his qualifications for this position?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I responded just a moment ago that Mr. Cramer has taken over the responsibilities for one that is ill at the present time.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, does that indicate that Mr. Cramer, should he relinquish this position, would be dropped back to his former salary, some \$8,000 less?

MR. SPEAKER: The question is hypothetical. Would the honourable member wish to rephrase the question?

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, how long is the incumbent, Mr. Cramer, expected to stay in this position?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I hope that Mr. Scotten will be able to re-establish his former responsibilities as soon as possible. Mr. Scotten is a very valuable member of the staff. He had unfortunate problems in respect to illness and I would hope that it would be very temporary.

Also, I don't know the basis of the honourable member's question, but there is no intention at all, in order to provide Mr. Cramer's additional salary, so I don't know where the Leader of the Opposition obtained that information because that is not so. There certainly is no intention to pay Mr. Cramer additional salary but to assume the quite onerous responsibilities that are required for him to fulfill because of the unspecified period of illness on the part of Mr. Scotten.

MR. G. FILMON: In view of the fact that Order-in-Council No. 805 of 1984 indicated Mr. Cramer was to be paid \$38,582, whereas Order-in-Council 695 of '85 indicates that Garth Cramer be appointed on an acting basis to the position of co-ordination and communications secretary at a commencing salary of \$48,436, would the Premier not acknowledge that this does appear to be a \$10,000 increase for taking on this acting position?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there's no question that Mr. Cramer would be entitled to take on the remuneration of the position that he is filling. He is taking over responsibilities because of the very unfortunate illness of Mr. Scotten, brought about some two months ago, and I would hope Mr. Scotten would be able to return to his place of employment.

I am glad the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has now acknowledged that it refers to acting responsibility and not, as implied through the Leader of the Opposition's first question in this Chamber, that it was some sort of fulfillment of a brand new area of permanent responsibility, but only of acting responsibility.

I would deal with the question of salary, Mr. Speaker, because I don't believe there's any intention to make the adjustment, unless Mr. Scotton is unable to return to his regular employment for quite some time. I'm hopeful that Mr. Scotton will be able to return fairly soon to his regular employment, despite his untimely and unfortunate illness.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, is the Premier denying that Mr. Cramer is going to be paid \$48,436 per annum, which is \$10,000 more than he was getting previously, because earlier the Premier seemed to indicate that he's not being paid the additional money. Is he or is he not?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker . . .

A MEMBER: He doesn't know.

A MEMBER: Sure he does.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Order-in-Council speaks for itself.

MR. G. FILMON: The Order-in-Council speaks better than the Premier does for the situation. It's a good thing we have some of these things in writing.

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

Old age pensions - de-indexation of

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question for the Premier.

There is a letter which appears to have been sent out to a list of people who, from my review of the situation, appear to be senior citizens. The letters indicate information about the passage of a resolution in the Manitoba Legislature on June 6th with respect to the topic of de-indexation. The letter is signed by the Premier, and I wonder if the Premier could indicate to whom the letters were sent?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, obviously to senior citizens in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, could the Premier indicate how many senior citizens were sent this letter by the Premier, directly from his office?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I will find out, but I hope the letter has gone to just as many senior citizens as possible in the Province of Manitoba, to ensure that senior citizens know that this Legislature, this government does not share the actions that have been

undertaken on the part of the Federal Government in regard to de-indexation of old age pensions.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the letter doesn't indicate that it was a joint resolution that was passed unanimously by this Legislature. It, in fact, seems to ignore that point and refers only to ". . . the government and my colleagues and I," the Premier says.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder then if the Premier could indicate what the cost of sending this letter was to all of the senior citizens in the province, or however many the Premier sent them to?

HON. H. PAWLEY: I'll take that question as notice.

Bilingualism in Manitoba - report re Supreme Court ruling

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. I wonder if the Attorney-General could indicate whether he has yet received a final report or opinion from the government's legal advisor, Mr. Twaddle, with respect to the implications of the Supreme Court decision on Thursday.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: That has been asked for and I expect it within the next few days.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Attorney-General would undertake to table a copy of that report in the Legislature after he receives it.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes.

High School Program - changing of

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I address my question to the Minister of Education. Last week Alberta's Premier Lougheed made a major announcement with respect to educational changes in the high school program. The changes indicated would include devoting 75 percent of class time towards the core subjects of English, Math, Social Studies and Science, reducing the so-called frill or optional subjects. — (Interjection) — I certainly do. That'll be my next question.

Is the Minister of Education considering changing Manitoba's high school program so that all of our high school students will have greater classroom exposure to the core subjects?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It certainly isn't my intention to make the changes that are being taken in the neighbouring province

because we don't have to make those changes, Mr. Speaker. We never went as far as they did in moving away from the core subjects that were being taught in our schools. We have never moved away from teaching core subjects and giving a very reasonable amount of time. On the other hand, they had something like - and I may be exaggerating a bit - literally dozens and dozens of options that students could take in high school. They clearly had moved to the extreme in moving away from having basic subjects and basic courses taught for a reasonable amount of time. We have never done that.

Our options have always been minimal, that have been allowed in our high schools. For instance, we're the only province, I think, in the country - one of the only provinces in the country - for English and Social Studies where we require those subjects to be taught in Grade 12. I think we're one of the few in the country that requires a mandatory English language program in Grade 12. We're one of the few that requires it in Social Studies, so that we have never moved into the extreme position and we don't have to correct all the mistakes that they have made. We certainly don't intend to change our system to meet a system that went far beyond where ours did.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, my question still stands. On the basis that today, within the high school program, out of the 20 credits required for three consecutive years in high school, 10 of them I understand are required within the core subjects, a requirement of 50 percent today within the Province of Manitoba.

My question still stands. Is the Minister giving any consideration to increasing that level to 75 percent?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I continue to reiterate that I think that the amount of time that we're giving has been maintained at a reasonable amount of time and with a reasonable balance between optional programs and core-required courses. As I continue to say, we are the only province in the country and several of the major curriculum basic programs that have continued to require these programs to be taught right up until Grade 12.

When we are looking at our high school program - and we are going to begin to do that - I imagine we will look at all facets of it and we may make some changes in all areas. We may look at the optional programs and we may look at the core percentage and the amount of time that is being spent on core programs.

However, we are not going to jump into major changes based on something that is happening in another province where their system isn't like ours at all. We'll examine our own system. We'll look to see what problems we have and we'll make our own changes. Basically, we have a good program that we have maintained over the years and we have never gone to the extremes that the other provinces have. Our changes will be more minor. They won't have to be as extreme as other provinces like Alberta.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, the definition of "good" of course, is in the eye of the assessor, in this case, the Minister of Education.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister just made reference to the fact that she was going to initiate a high school review. Organizations within Education in this province have been asking for that for some number of years. Is the Minister now consenting to that request? If so, is she announcing it by way of her response to a question today?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, certainly I would not be making it as an announcement here. I was responding as required to a question that was asked.

I have already had discussions about the high school review with all of the major organizations in meetings that I've had with them on major educational issues of the day that have taken place over the period of the last year or so. I raised this issue in all of my speeches to the Manitoba Association of School Trustees, to the superintendents, to the Teachers' Society. In direct discussions with them and in speeches to them in the last six months to a year we have been discussing this issue.

I must say though, Mr. Speaker, that the member opposite, the Member for Morris has indicated a concern about the high school review on a few occasions in this Chamber and I can only wish that they had that same concern when they were in office. In fact, the request for a high school review has been on the plate for the entire four years of their office; the entire four years. All of the organizations were asking for a high school review during their entire four-year service as a government. As far as I know, they never even recognized it or never said they were doing anything. We're discussing it and we're going to begin the process and we've had a lot of discussions with the educational organizations about it.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, the Minister seems to suggest our course of action was correct because she's followed along the same path.

Mr. Speaker, Premier Loughheed also indicated that there is far too much discretion today in the teaching of Social Studies. He also said that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. C. MANNES: . . . obviously there is a shortcoming in the way that history and its facts are presented. My question to the Minister of Education, will the Minister be reviewing her recently released Social Studies curriculum so as to make it more in keeping with Canadian historical facts?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Morris makes an incredible assumption that is not in keeping with historical facts and appropriate content. I don't know on what basis he would make that. I wish he'd stop worrying so much about what's happening in Alberta and what's being taught in Alberta, and talk about what's happening in Manitoba and what's being taught here and not raise a lot of fear or concern or worry over things that don't even exist in our program.

Budworm infestation - control of

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In the absence of the Minister of Natural Resources, I direct this question to the Minister responsible for Manfor. In view of today's Free Press article regarding record budworm infestation on Manfor's prime timber areas, can the Minister advise the House as to the severity of the problem and what control measures will be contemplated to control this infestation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Business Development.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Department of Natural Resources has been responsible for the identification and the review of the options with respect to controlling the current problem. The dimensions of the problem are quite significant and an estimate has been provided by the Department of Natural Resources, which would indicate that some 50 percent of the current mature stands of timber in Manfor's overall small timber areas are concerned, but it is a particular problem for the communities of Moose Lake and Moose Lake Loggers and we obviously are going to take a "wait and see" attitude with respect to the development of this problem.

My understanding is that many factors contribute to a decision to deal with the problem, in other than natural ways, and that is what the weather is like, whether in fact there is the kind of infestation that's expected, but that decision will have to be taken as and when it becomes it necessary.

It's my understanding that the department has reviewed the alternatives and has suggested that the most environmentally benign form of action would be the use of a bacteriological spray which has just replaced a chemical spray in the Province of Ontario. It's bacteriological. It attacks the budworm, I believe in the moth stage, and is believed to be environmentally safe.

As I said that is only in the planning stages. Whether in fact the infestation materializes will, of course, have to be reviewed on a moment-to-moment basis.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Yes, a further supplementary to the same Minister. Can the Minister indicate the time frame that would be required to control this infestation? Could he indicate as to when this spraying would have to be done, if this is the course of action taken?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I indicated that the area that we're talking about is relatively small in terms of Manfor's overall timber holdings. It would be a relatively short time frame, given the small number of hectares that are involved, and the dates of application.

If a decision was made - and I emphasize if a decision was made - to utilize the bacteriological spray, the time frame would depend on when the budworm was most susceptible or the spraying would be most beneficial - the moth would be most beneficially sprayed. That depends again on the weather and the timing of the outbreak.

MR. D. GOURLAY: A final supplementary. Are there ongoing discussions with Manfor management and the Department of Resources with respect to this problem?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the interests, I suppose, of Natural Resources and Manfor are coincidental. Manfor, obviously, is worried about the financial implications of the devastation of a merchantable timber area.

Natural Resources have many other concerns. Of course the control of that particular problem is paramount to them, but we have been aware of the potential problem for some time and certainly are keeping informed and working closely with Natural Resources.

Statutes of Manitoba - federal support re translating

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister and ask him if he could clarify a couple of comments he made the other day in regard to his discussion with the Prime Minister for seeking government support to translate the Statutes of Manitoba.

He said at one point that he was expecting the Federal Government to provide 50 percent of the costs of translation and a moment later he said 80 percent. Could he clarify what his position is in terms of demanding or requesting federal support?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would thank the honourable member for bringing that particular question to my attention. I would expect the Federal Government to make, by way of payment to the Province of Manitoba, a payment that will reflect the original commitment on the part of the Federal Government to assist insofar as financing of the translation of statutes, which I believe was 80 percent of the total cost.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd also ask the First Minister whether he doesn't think that the case can be made by the Provincial Government for the full costs of translation, given the fact that the Federal Government funded the original challenges of Georges Forest, funded the challenges of Roger Bilodeau, funds the SFM substantially every year and all of this, as a result, put tremendous pressure on the government to either translate the statutes or make Manitoba officially bilingual. Would he not put forward the argument, on behalf of all Manitobans, that 100 percent of the costs be funded?

A MEMBER: You're sure worried all of a sudden.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wish the honourable member had been just as concerned a year or a year and a half ago about the costs and we would not, at this point, have to engage in a discussion in respect to the costs. There was certainly a responsibility, insofar as our House is concerned too, that we did not ensure that we undertook the appropriate actions in order to minimize the costs that we're now inflicted with as a result of the Supreme Court decision.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, bearing in mind that the costs of translation are considerably less than the package of the Pawley administration, significantly less, I would ask the First Minister whether he might also consider saying to the Prime Minister when he's meeting with him or talking to him that if the Federal Government is finding a difficulty in providing funding for the full costs of translation, they might consider transferring some of the \$627,000 a year they give annually to the SFM for purposes of agitation and putting additional pressure on the Government of Manitoba?

Budworm infestation - ruling out of chemical control

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for Manfor. Can the Minister advise the House whether the government has definitely ruled out the use of chemical control for the pine budworm?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Business Development.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, to clarify, is the member referring to the use of chemicals other than a bacteriological spray?

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, the Minister gave the impression that he, first of all, was considering the use of a new biologically based control mechanism and I'm asking him whether he has ruled out the more conventional use of chemical means of control?

HON. J. STORIE: My understanding is that not only have I ruled that out but I believe the department has indicated that the other alternative is more environmentally acceptable and has been found to be more acceptable in other jurisdictions, including just recently the Province of Ontario.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could give us an indication of how widely used the new method of control is and how effective it has been shown to be.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I can only go by the information that I have received from the Department of Natural Resources and it has been indicated that it is quite effective and, as I said, has been used in other jurisdictions and will be used, as I understand it, the sole means of protection from the spruce budworm or jack pine budworm in Ontario. So I assume that it's been found to be quite effective and the superior alternative when it comes to that kind of forest protection.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, since the Minister seems a little uncertain about the use of this material, can he advise the House who will make the decision with respect to control of the jack pine budworm? Who

will make the decision whether or not it's necessary to spray?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I presume the Department of Natural Resources will make the final decision. Of course, it will be done in consultation with the Department of the Environment which would issue a permit for spraying.

Affirmative Action Program - visible minority hiring

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Minister of Cultural Affairs. A note from a Manitoba Intercultural Council Newsletter that he recently announced the commitment of the province to an Affirmative Action Program with respect to visible minority hiring in the Civil Service, a program which we on this side support and which obviously the MGEA has agreed to by way of their agreement with the province. I wonder if the Minister could indicate what the expected timetable would be for implementation of such a program.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I made an announcement of that program at a meeting of the Intercultural Council on behalf of the Minister of Labour so I would pass the question on to the Minister of Labour to give the answer to the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: The answer, Mr. Speaker, is immediately.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering why then there is a proposed agenda which I have that's been put out by - I believe it's his special assistant - Lauranne Dowbiggen, for a meeting tomorrow evening with members of the Caribbean Canadian community in which it says, "It is our intention to explain why we see this as a 20-year evolving program."

If it's an immediate implementation, Mr. Speaker, why does the Minister see it as a 20-year evolving program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, affirmative action programming, whether it be in government or whether it be in private business has to be done with care and consultation of workers.

I don't think the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is recommending that we set arbitrary standards and decide that we're going to fire or discharge X numbers of employees in order that we come up to the percentile

that is reasonable for affirmative action category groups. I don't think that would be the recommended course of action by any responsible person.

When there is an indication that a full implementation period may take an extensive period of time, that is being frank and sincere in the expectation of total completion of affirmative action. But that's not to say, Mr. Speaker, that there are not specific annual goals that must be met and those of the target areas in affirmative action specific annual achievement but full implementation over the longer period of time.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Labour could then indicate what is the target, what is the goal for this first year, for instance, of the program as to how many - the increase in hiring of visible minorities - how many it would be?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, in assessing department-by-department the goals that have to be attained, there is an involvement of affirmative action committees at each level. This is not a program that's being imposed from the top down. Guidance and policy decision-making is made at the top but the assessment of the program, the implementation of the program is being made department-by-department at the division level. There are committees that have been established and that has taken some time because those committees are composed of both employees at the staff level and at the management level.

I'm happy to announce that we have committees throughout this system now and those committees will be making specific recommendations in respect to the levels of attainment to be achieved each year in each department. I haven't at this time the detailed specific recommendations of each committee but that would be the process, Mr. Speaker, a democratic one, a pragmatic one and a reasonable one.

MR. G. FILMON: Are the members of the various visible minority communities and their elected representatives in various public groups aware of this 20-year timetable and are they supportive of it?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of attending a workshop of the Manitoba Association of Rights and Liberties and reviewed with that group the timetable in respect to implementation of affirmative action. I appreciate the announcement the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is making via the TV about the meeting that I'm going to have with the Canada Caribbean group, so that I can indicate to them the degree of success we've had in achieving an agreement with the Manitoba Government Employees' Association to add visible minorities to the affirmative action program and that there will be positive continuing commitment to that program by this government.

MR. G. FILMON: I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether or not these representatives, whether they be in MARL or in FAME or in various other groups, the Manitoba Intercultural Council are supportive of the 20-year timetable.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I know I didn't. I don't know whether any of my colleagues have asked

individuals for support for a specific program. Organizations have been requesting governments and I'm sure they requested the previous administration for action, Mr. Speaker, and nothing happened, but when they spoke to this Minister and this government something happened and a commitment has been made to pursue affirmative action for visible minorities, something that didn't happen before.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, are those groups aware that it will take 20 years to accomplish the goals and objectives that this government has set forward?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

I wonder if the honourable member would wish to rephrase his question to deal with the subject matter which is entirely within the administrative competence of the government.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Has the Minister made the various organizations who are concerned about affirmative action hiring in the Provincial Civil Service aware that it will take 20 years to achieve their goals and objectives?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the reason for my meeting with the Canada Caribbean group is to provide for greater articulation of the positive programs that we have announced. That program may find completion in a much shorter period. I don't know the exact length of time it will take to implement affirmative action, but all these groups know that they have a government in office that's prepared to do something, Mr. Speaker.

Pay equity legislation - status of

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder, following on a similar topic, if the Minister could indicate when the pay equity legislation will be introduced in this Legislature.

HON. A. MACKLING: Soon, Mr. Speaker.

MR. G. FILMON: Will the pay equity legislation require 20 years to implement as well?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member will have to contain his curiosity until the legislation is introduced into the House.

Autopac Centre, Swan River - renewing of lease

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister responsible for MPIC. Can the Minister indicate whether the MPIC Autopac Claim Centre in Swan River, the office facility lease will be renewed or does the department anticipate building or leasing a new facility with the Bay facility?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the lease was entered into last year. This is the first I've heard it. I will take that as notice and report back to the House.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Prior to Orders of the Day, I wonder if I might direct the attention of members to the gallery. We have 40 students of Grades 1 to 8 standing from the Boyne Valley School under the direction of Mrs. Groening and the school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. On behalf of all of the members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Member for Riel.

MRS. D. DODICK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have some committee changes.

On Public Utilities and Natural Resources, the Member for Concordia for The Pas; the Member for Gimli for Rupertsland.

On Economic Development, the Member for Churchill for Transcona; the Member for Osborne for Burrows; and the Member for Thompson for River East.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we will be moving the House into Committee of Supply. The Committee in the House, that section will be dealing with the Department of Education Estimates and in the Committee Room, with the Estimates of the department - I believe it's Energy and Mines now that they've started - yes, Energy and Mines.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask first if there is leave to dispense with Private Members' Hour today?

MR. SPEAKER: Is there leave to dispense with Private Members' Hour today? Leave has been granted.

HON. A. ANSTETT: I would then move the motion on that understanding, knowing that we would rise from committee at 5:30 to adjourn for the day.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. L. HYDE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak on a personal matter of grievance.

Mr. Speaker, while representing the constituency of Portage la Prairie in this Assembly for close to eight years, I have never taken the liberty to rise and speak on a matter of grievance. However, Mr. Speaker, I find the issue that I'm about to address so disturbing that I would, at this time, wish to exercise my privilege to speak out on this matter.

Sir, I refer to the proposed closing of the Psychiatric School of Nursing at the Manitoba Developmental Centre located in Portage la Prairie. It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister responsible for Community Services and Corrections has handled this issue very improperly. I am addressing this issue on behalf of four disturbed groups of citizens, who will be adversely affected by the proposed closure of the school of nursing at the Manitoba Developmental Centre.

I first wish to speak, Sir, on behalf of the mentally retarded patients being cared for at this centre.

Secondly, I wish to speak on behalf of the students who are presently enrolled in this specialized training program that has been carried out at the Manitoba Developmental Centre at Portage la Prairie for the last 25 years or so.

Then, Sir, I wish to speak on behalf of the staff at the Manitoba Developmental Centre. Today 80 percent of the nursing staff at the Manitoba Developmental Centre are graduates of this school of nursing. Mr. Speaker, I wish to emphasize that 80 percent of the nursing staff received their specialized training at the school of nursing at Portage.

Then, of course, I wish to represent the citizens of Portage la Prairie and district, who also stand to lose, should the school be closed.

Mr. Speaker, many concerns have been expressed to me regarding the proposed closure of the school, not only from within my own constituency, Sir, but from other areas of the province and indeed from concerned individuals from outside of our province. These people are concerned that the Minister who is responsible for the decision to close the school of nursing at the MDC is making a very serious judgmental error; an error that unless corrected now, will create far-reaching problems for the citizens of this province.

One must realize that the Premier of our Province, the Honourable Howard Pawley, the member representing the constituency of Selkirk, will be in line for much criticism regarding the decision to close down the school of nursing in Portage la Prairie, because, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister was present in this Assembly during much of the questioning and debate regarding this important issue and not once, do I believe, did he take any part in defence of the innocent people who are patients at the Manitoba Developmental Centre who are being cared for at this very moment and have been cared for, Sir, for the last 25 years by these specially trained men and women who have graduated from the Psychiatric School of Nursing at the Manitoba Developmental Centre, formally known by so many people as the School for the Retarded in Manitoba.

I know, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister of our province has received in his office, hundreds of letters from concerned citizens, requesting him and his Ministers to take the second look at the move that they have

proposed. Wouldn't you think that the Premier would listen to what he's being asked to do by the people who are requesting him to reconsider his move?

Mr. Speaker, why are so many people showing their strong disapproval of the proposed closure of this school of nursing at Manitoba Developmental Centre at Portage? This erroneous decision affects thousands of lives, including 762 mentally handicapped, who are residents in the Manitoba Developmental Centre. It not only affects the area of Portage and district, but all Manitobans, and further to this, Canadians as a whole.

Although, Mr. Speaker, we have three schools of psychiatric nursing in Manitoba, Selkirk, Brandon and Portage, the Selkirk and Brandon Schools deal mainly with the mentally ill; the Manitoba Developmental Centre emphasizes the care of the developmentally handicapped. Therefore, it would seem unreasonable to move the training facility away from the only institution that can offer and does offer the practical training suitable to care for these unfortunate people.

Mr. Speaker, some information that I have recently received is that the Portage School of Nursing has the lowest attrition rate of 14 percent which in comparison to other schools at Brandon and Selkirk where they lose in excess of 30 percent of their students before graduation. Of the students enrolled at the Portage School who complete the course and write the licensing exam, Portage has the greatest number of successful students, 90 percent.

Incidentally, Sir, each year in order to select a class of 20 to 25 students, the selection board processes 100 to 200 applications. Mr. Speaker, the Portage School of Nursing, the only school of specialized training available in North America for the last 25 years has been graduating a specially trained nurse to serve the needs of the handicapped person.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that of the 762 residents at the MDC, 87 are from Portage, 365 are from Winnipeg, 235 are from the rest of Manitoba and 65 are from outside of our province. Of these total numbers, 762, 510 are profoundly or severely retarded. It is my opinion and that of hundreds of Manitobans that the need for institutional care for our handicapped people will always be with us. We must not and cannot turn our backs on this problem. This problem is with us today and it will not erase itself as one of our major obligations to our society. When then, Sir, would anyone wishing to remove this school of nursing which has established at the Manitoba Developmental Centre in Portage la Prairie?

It is incredible, Sir, that this government, of all governments, would consider withdrawing services in one of the fields of such special needs, especially when it is a direct contradiction of their policy. One of the highest priorities on this government's list is the quality of health care.

Consolidating the programs in Selkirk and Brandon will deny prospective psychiatric nurses the opportunity to channel their training in a more specialized way.

Those who enter their training at the Portage facility are given specific practice in dealing with the needs of the patients who are born with mental handicaps. Mr. Speaker, who will be the voice of all these developmentally handicapped individuals, who because of their disability cannot speak for themselves? Sir, they are the potential victims. If alternates are not

carefully examined as to the consequences regarding the quality of care they need and deserve, they will be the victims.

Mr. Speaker, on March 12th in questioning the Minister responsible for Community Services, the Minister stated and I quote, "As government we have the responsibility to manage the affairs of the province efficiently and effectively and we intend to do so."

Sir, I say this Minister who is the Deputy Premier of our Province has made a very serious judgmental error; an error that unless corrected now will create far-reaching problems for the citizens of our province. This government must realize that we have professionally trained men and women with years of experience behind them dealing with the needs and the care of the mentally retarded.

The psychiatric nurse is a professional who is and will be in continual demand in this province both within and outside of our institutions. The time will soon be upon us, Sir, when we will have a shortage of these specially trained personnel.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my concerns of the effect this proposed closure will have on the school of nursing in Portage la Prairie. I am certain, Sir, the closure would have a serious impact on the economy of Portage and district in many ways more than one.

The initial cutback, Sir, in the number of jobs lost at the MDC from the school of nursing alone will create hardships to a small community like Portage la Prairie. The Manitoba Developmental Centre is our major post-secondary educational institution in Portage la Prairie.

Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party which today is governing our province is showing that it has little concern for smaller centres of our province, especially centres like Portage which is not represented in this Assembly by a member of their party. Sir, it is so obvious to me and to so many Manitobans that this proposed closure of their Psychiatric School of Nursing established at the former Manitoba School for Retardates for the past 25 years has now become nothing but a political move to try to strengthen their positions at Selkirk and in Brandon in readiness for the next election.

The proposed closure, Sir, would not only impose great financial burdens to our community, it would disrupt family ties in our community. Today, we have families who have been employed at this centre for many years; in some cases, Sir, into their second generation. They have established their homes in Portage, are raising their families and educating them in our school system. So, Mr. Speaker, you can see that this proposed closure can and will create far-reaching hardships that any small centre such as Portage would find hard to accept.

The lives of the patients, the students and the staff of the MDC, plus the citizens of Portage and district, will be adversely affected by this unreasonable proposal to close out the Psychiatric School of Nursing in Portage La Prairie.

Mr. Speaker, why has the Minister, in her infinite lack of wisdom, first chosen to change the name of the Manitoba School for Retardates in Portage la Prairie to the Manitoba Developmental Centre? Why is she now choosing to take the development out of that centre?

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'd like to have my opportunity to speak. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to talk about the closing or the consolidation of the schools to train psychiatric nurses in Manitoba in response to the comments from the member opposite.

Mr. Speaker, if the way we address the planning of program and the training of staff were to say that whatever had happened before and whatever exists in the present was the best that could be accomplished and all that we should do for the future, then I would agree with the points made by the member opposite. I would agree part way, but even with that short-sighted view, without taking a look to the future, there would be serious questions.

Mr. Speaker, the population at the Manitoba Developmental Centre peaked in the early Seventies at close to 1,200 people. Because of advances made in the training, in the working with the mentally retarded people, many of those advances developed in that very centre. It's been discovered that their further development can best be met in a more stimulating environment in the community. Not only can they receive the health care and the support services they've been used to at a developmental centre, they can also receive much greater opportunity for stimulus, much greater opportunity for being close to their families of origin and thereby preserve the ties. They can, in fact, live a more personally fulfilling life.

Not all, Mr. Speaker, and this government has said all along that the intent is not to completely close institutions which care for the mentally retarded unless, in our experience of moving to a more balanced service delivery system in the community, we are able to find that we can, in fact, cope with even the most severely disabled, but that is not in the books at the current time.

The present population of the centre is in the neighbourhood of 770. There's a targeted reduction to just over 500 to be accomplished within three years, Mr. Speaker. There is, as well, a program in place with the Welcome Home, not only to accommodate more of these people out in the community near their family of origin, but also to provide more supportive services in the community to prevent an equal number from having to go into the institutional centre.

Mr. Speaker, the teaching of psych nurses at the Manitoba Developmental Centre was scaled to meet the higher size of the centre. We currently have a surplus - a slight surplus, it is true - but a surplus of psychiatric nurses in the provinces. Looking ahead for the need for this particular type of trained professional, we find that the need in the mental health field is likely to go down slowly as we move more of that delivery of service to the community.

In the field of mental retardation it's likely to go down slightly, as we move more people out into the community, but in the field of dealing with the elderly, Mr. Speaker, the geriatric population which is growing, the need is likely to go up. In balance, the need for

psychiatric nurses in Manitoba is likely to remain fairly stable in the years to come, but the mix of services required, the mix of places where the jobs will be available will gradually shift.

In looking at training people for the future, we looked at the fact that we had developed, in this province, three separate schools to train psychiatric nurses. In Ontario and Quebec this specialty has disappeared as a speciality. There's a bit of additional training taken after an RN is achieved but there is no separate category of psychiatric nurses and, understandably, this particular category of nurses in Manitoba has been afraid they might disappear.

To the west of us, in Saskatchewan, psych nurses are no longer trained in hospitals at all; they are trained in community colleges. Looking at our problems and the fact that we were running three schools in a province of a mere one million population, we determined that the best way to manage the situation was to consolidate the three schools into two; to examine the curriculum in consultation with the psych nurses association that has special responsibility for dealing with that curriculum; to ensure that there is sound generic training so that the nurses going through today are, in fact, prepared for the kind of jobs that will exist tomorrow; to strengthen - not to remove - but to strengthen the training that all 75 nurses that are trained year-by-year in Manitoba, in all the areas of specialized work, to strengthen both their theoretical training and their length of practicum placement.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, although the name of the school at Portage la Prairie will, in fact, disappear, the actual facility will be functioning for two-thirds of the year, as it serves as a practicum placement for all 75 of the psych nurses that are trained in Selkirk and Brandon.

Mr. Speaker, the question has been raised that perhaps we will find ourselves short of specifically-trained nurses to deal with the mentally retarded in the future. If that occurs, and we will monitor the situation very carefully, there are things we can do to close that gap. There's a system of bursaries and incentives of on-the-job training that we can provide, but at the moment we feel that because of the down sizing of the institution and the current surplus, the changing pattern of work, that it's really an opportune time to make the change.

The mentally retarded who will be living in the community will be able to receive some of their service from people trained as psych nurses, but a lot of the jobs that will open up in that field will be significantly different. Some of the people will require training on the job; some will receive community college training; and some will have training that we have as yet to develop, because the pattern of jobs and skills required is being based on what the needs of the people are. We haven't started with saying, "We have so many psych nurses; they're trained to work in an institution; therefore we'll put the mentally retarded into an institution."

No, Mr. Speaker, we've started from the other end and we have said, "What are the needs of the people in the community? What do they need in order to live, either with their family, or in a variety of living settings near to their families? What kind of supports do they require? What kind of total training needs are there for the province, and then how can we put those training programs into place?"

It's a developmental program, Mr. Speaker, and much and all as we respect and value the work that has been done by the psych nurses in looking after the retarded in the past, and it has been very fine order and has certainly, in many ways, paved the way for the ability of the system now to move more people out into the community, but that skill and the particular package of skills, the particular type of training they receive has not been fully adapted to what the community needs are.

We are willing to see whether that kind of dual thrust is achievable in the future, but our responsibility to train psych nurses is not necessarily identical with our responsibility for training community workers. Again the Department of Health has been working very closely with us to blend the curricula of the training at the three centres. Although they have all taken a common certification, there has developed quite a different pattern in each one and yet the certification says that they have similar training. So I think, in a way, it's been opportune as well to look at the elements of their training that's generic and the elements that are specialized and see if we have, in fact, a pattern of training that is most satisfactory for the future.

In many ways the training of nurses and staff is more appropriately looked after by the Department of Health and by the Department of Education. We employ people, but when the Community Services and Health Departments were split, it was at that time that we ended up with one piece of a training program for health workers that is now more appropriately placed under the Department of Health. Our role then is to see that the people being trained are in sufficient numbers and with sufficient quality of training to meet the needs of the pattern of service delivery that we have in place.

Just a word about the impact on Portage la Prairie. I understand the misgiving of anyone living in a smaller centre, when there is any change or any apparent reduction in employment, Mr. Speaker. But in this case we have to develop a policy that's right for all of Manitoba, not just adopt a holding pattern for one town. I'm sure many of the citizens of Portage la Prairie are themselves mobile, and if anyone is being trained, would want to have a kind of training that would travel with them.

The Provincial Government has put other investments into Portage la Prairie, relative to other towns, Mr. Speaker. It's done relatively well, but I maintain, however sympathetic I am to a town wanting to keep its job base, I think in this case we must give top priority to the needs of the individual people who are mentally retarded and to their families and communities who would prefer to have increasing numbers of them receive the extra support services they require, closer to their home community.

Again, the future of mentally retarded programs in this province has, I think, been at a real turning point. It is true that the care in the past had primarily been taking place in a health-based centre.

Now while it's true that many of the mentally retarded and the multiply disabled, in particular, have very severe health problems, they also have other needs. Mental retardation is a condition of life. It is not just an illness; therefore, when designing the type of program that best meets their needs, we've drawn from the best advice we could get, not only from people trained in

the medical skills, but also from people trained in the psychological disciplines and the sociological disciplines and we've listened to the desires and expectations of the families of the mentally retarded in communities throughout the province.

I think the commitment that this government has given to services for the mentally retarded - and again we can go into this in greater detail when we come to Estimates - takes second place to no jurisdiction throughout this entire country. I think again, if you compare it to the type of projected cuts in the Canada Assistance Plan that we've heard about from the Federal Government and the political colleagues of members opposite, I really wonder at their ability to stand up here and accuse this government that has put a great deal of extra money into quality programming for the mentally retarded, to stand up and be critical of our program.

Change is difficult. It always impacts somewhat unevenly, and while I sympathize with the concerns of the staff and of the citizens of Portage la Prairie, I think that the way we have dealt with the training needs, with the needs of the mentally retarded, and dealing fairly with the community of Portage la Prairie, really can stand up to criticism.

Mr. Speaker, I make no apology for the moves we have taken. I think the psychiatrically-trained nurses, in the long run, want to have training that stands them in good stead and which guarantees them employment for years to come. I think the changes that are being made are timely and will result in better quality programming for all the citizens of Manitoba who require that type of special skill.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair for the Department of Education, and the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair for the Department of Energy and Mines.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - ENERGY AND MINES

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: Committee, please come to order. We are now considering Item No. 2.(a)(1) Energy, Policy Planning and Project Development: Salaries; 2.(a)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I wish to just acknowledge and thank the Minister for receiving information that we requested during our last sitting with respect to the actual projects undertaken in this department.

As I recall, we had devoted most of Friday morning to this particular item and from my point of view I'm prepared to allow this item to pass, unless my colleague has some particular comments to add to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)(1)—pass; 2.(a)(2)—pass.
2.(b)(1) Provincial Energy Programs: Salaries; 2.(b)(2) Other Expenditures - Mr. Minister.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairman, I thought that what we did on Friday was cover, basically, the energy

package because we dealt with . . . unless there's areas . . . I'm prepared to answer any questions on line-by-line.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I take it, on 2.(b)(1), 2.(b)(2), the major reduction in the Provincial Energy Program is, as stated last Friday, the federal-provincial program coming to a conclusion so I'm prepared to pass that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(b)(1)—pass; 2.(b)(2)—pass.
2.(c)(1) Provincial Audit Programs: Salaries; 2.(c)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, just on this item, how many people do we have auditing the Energy Programs that are involved?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Four engineers, three technicians and two secretaries.

MR. H. ENNS: That staff is the same as . . .

HON. W. PARASIUK: It's the same. We've basically taken over that function.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(c)(1)—pass; 2.(c)(2)—pass.
2.(d)(1) Cut Home Energy Cost: Salaries; 2.(d)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on this item, can the Minister give us some indication of the scale and scope of the program? The Minister, in his opening comments, spoke positively with respect to the program. What kind of response is the department getting with respect to . . . This is the program, I think, where homeowners call in the energy audits for advice and then, subject to the homeowner's response, they may privately improve, with the assistance of the grants available.

HON. W. PARASIUK: We administer the program and there's been approximately 5,800 loans for about \$4,600,000 and we're projecting that in the coming year there'll be 6,300 homeowners borrowing \$5 million from CHEC to undertake energy conservation retrofits.

Responses that I've been getting from people who do write in on it have been very, very good. Now, the one comment that they've said is that the \$1,000 ceiling seems to be too low in instances and we intend to be reviewing that this year for next year's Estimates.

MR. H. ENNS: What are the terms and conditions of the loans of the \$1,000.00? Is it this the one that is administrated through Manitoba Hydro?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Yes. It's a 9.5 percent loan over 10 years, I think - up to 20 years, sorry - a 9.5 percent loan up to 20 years administered through Hydro but the actual home checkup is done through this department and the audit.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, where does the money come from? Was this money provided through the Department of Finance, through the Department of Energy and Mines? I appreciate that Manitoba Hydro

is doing the administration of the loans but I would assume that it's not part of Manitoba Hydro's fiscal responsibility.

HON. W. PARASIUK: This comes from the Jobs Fund.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(d)(1)—pass - the Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Following up on my comments of Friday, I'm wondering if there is any process in place now to approve contractors who do energy retrofitting work or is there any consideration of bringing forward . . . (inaudible) . . . I believe, a contractor has to show that they are capable of building the a type building; the same thing with same with the R2000 Program? Is there any kind of an education process or kit that goes along with contractors so that we can be sure that the people who are doing the work are competent and know from the energy conservation perspective what kind of work is required?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Contractors have to do work to the CGSB standard which I gather is the Canadian General Contractors Standard Book. In terms of specific training there aren't any particular training requirements although I've had the contractors in a couple of times asking them what they thought in terms of bonding options or in terms of some way of, in fact, providing a system of, in a sense, industry policing. The people within the business want to make sure that they have reputable people. They themselves complained about one or two and the difficulty was what type of a system do you put in place to try and deal with the one or two people who may not be that reputable or are quick-draw artists.

We do our random inspections ourselves through the Home Checkup Program. If we find shoddy work, the people are called in. We've taken people and basically not put them on any type of list we have. We've tried this system. There's been some improvement and apart from, in a sense, going through something much more formal, there isn't a formal association as such. It's an informal one. There is no standards apart from the CGSB standards. There is a system that we put in place of random inspections rather than inspecting every home because inspecting every home would be very, very expensive. We're using this process. I think that it's improved somewhat. I think where there were difficulties - they were bigger before - was CHIP just gave the money. We've tried with the random inspections and people know that we're around and, again, that's why in some respects sometimes it's better to deliver through the province than through the Federal Government because the province is closer to the people.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Minister, on a final follow-up on that, has there been any consideration given to initiating some kind of a certification program where the builders, in order to earn or to be a certified builder in energy retrofitting, in particular, because that's what this program is all about, it's not new home construction but in retrofitting where they could perhaps even have the programs offered in off-season where there isn't

as much work being done or during the winter months, I guess primarily, where a course such as, perhaps what is presently being offered, although on a much different basis, that the department is, I think, very wisely sponsoring at Elmwood High School where there is a program, and that's not just retrofit. That's primarily aimed toward teaching students the ABCs of energy conservation and energy efficient home building.

Has the department considered offering some sort of a certification process? If it hasn't, would it be a reasonable thing perhaps - at least a thought - to entertain for future program development? I was just reading on the weekend that some 60 percent of Winnipeg houses were built prior to 1960.

As far as energy efficient standards and building codes go, we really never had anything in this province or in this country until probably '75, '76, in that era, when people started thinking about building homes a little more tightly. So there's a tremendous need in the future years of older homes that are anywhere between 25 and 70 or 80 years of age where work could be done, and I'm just very concerned that as we move into a program that could affect that many people, that it might not be a bad idea to have some form of a certification process so that the builders who are doing the work would be a little more assured that they knew the ABCs of the construction techniques, as well as for the consumers themselves to feel a little more at ease when they know the people who are doing the work are people who have had some training in it.

HON. W. PARASIUKE: We haven't done that to date. I will take that suggestion under consideration and discuss it with staff when I go through pre-Estimate seminars with them and when I have discussions with people on the Energy Council and people in the business generally and get their feedback on it.

MR. D. SCOTT: Before we move away from the Energy Conservation Program altogether, today's press reports on the, I believe it's an OECD statement, saying that Canada, of the OECD countries, has the second worst and certainly the worst of any larger country's record on energy conservation over the past number of years.

I suspect a good amount of that probably is due with our industrial make-up the country has. We have basically fairly old plants and very high energy consuming industries like steel and paper and your basic natural resource industries. But I'm wondering if you have any information on how Manitoba, on programs of energy conservation, stands up compared to the rest of Canada, let alone getting into the international comparisons. Are we doing better than the Canadian average or are we alongside of it or are we slipping back?

HON. W. PARASIUKE: We don't have anything of a major comparative nature within the country. That was one of the questions that I raised about the CREDA Program just in terms of how it was administered from Ottawa. We do have a fair amount of anecdotal evidence from people indicating that we have, with a number of our programs especially in terms of trying to get people to apply existing knowledge, been leading the way in the country. It may be that Ottawa when they do their

own reviews will come out with some comparative data that I could pass on to the member.

Just a comment on the OECD Report. I haven't seen it. I think on the one hand that Canadians have been, in fact, probably conditioned by an attitude of inexpensive power and so we probably use energy possibly more indiscriminately than people elsewhere. At the same time, I don't know if the report is completely balanced in that having lived in Europe their efforts in energy conservation, especially in residential insulation, sealing of houses is terrible generally. Some of the Scandinavian ones have been very good but a lot of them haven't been, so I think that I'd like to take a look at the report. I think that we've got as a country a long way to go, but it's something that I think has to be done in a slow but sure way. When you get a bit of a plateauing in prices, then people's attentions shift elsewhere.

MR. D. SCOTT: I'd like to thank the Minister for those comments and I would just hope and shall enjoy working alongside the Minister in trying to make sure that Manitoba does continue at the forefront and that we move even further in setting examples for the rest of the country on energy conservation programs. We may be low on energy pricing today but most of them other than electricity are non-renewable resources. I would very much like to see us continue and move along both in the home insulation, at least the residential side alongside the industrial and transportation sector where an awful lot of work can still be done.

I give my hearty congratulations to the Minister and the efforts that he has put into this program in the past. I know he has excellent staff, probably amongst the best staff in the whole country in his energy conservation section and I would like to encourage both those individuals within his department and himself to continue the good work and move on to new heights.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Just before we leave the item, Mr. Chairman. Partly, in some of my acquaintance with the Stonewall Project, and I profess to limited knowledge in this area, but I've been given to understand that the technique of infrared photography is a particularly useful tool in convincing homeowners or in this case in commercial operators to appreciate the energy loss, heat loss, in the manner and way it shows up by using that technology - very often, indeed, the convincing factor in convincing a hard-nosed businessman to invest some dollars to change the picture that he has shown. I'm just interested in whether or not the department has any plans to continue the use of that or whether that was just a situation where you had a program, the twinning of Pinawa and Stonewall, whether or not that technique is being contemplated to be used perhaps in an expanded manner by the department in the encouragement of energy programs.

HON. W. PARASIUKE: Manitoba Hydro has an aerial thermography program and it's doing about three or four centres per year, and the Department of Energy and Mines is working with them in order to try and publicize and communicate the product of the three

or four centres that are done on a yearly basis. It's the intention to continue doing about three or four. I know that there was some show in Thompson last year, where again I think that made a very good impact, a profound impact on a lot of the people who came through visiting the show. What we're trying to do is get more of that information put into the clients' or consumers' hands.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(d)(1)—pass. 2.(d)(2)—pass.

2.(e) Manitoba Energy Council - the Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, advisory councils of this nature are established by governments to advise. They're also sometimes established to provide the perception of a broader council being sought and advice to be received. I would ask the Minister, firstly, has the department referred any specific projects to the council? Is there any specific project that the Energy Council is pursuing at this time in their role as advisory to this department and to this Minister?

HON. W. PARASIUK: I'm not sure if the member is aware who is on the council. Maybe I'll just put that into the record. It might be useful.

The Chairperson of the Council is Dr. Carl Ridd, Professor at the University of Winnipeg. Other members of the council are: Wayne Cole, a private energy consultant, who has done work on retrofitting and energy sealing; George Dalgleish, President of George Dalgleish Building Services - his column is fairly well-known, I think across the country; John Hockman, an architectural consultant with Appin Associates; Lawrence Huska, a teacher at River East School Division; Judy Noble, Executive Secretary to the Solar Energy Society of Canada; Dudley Thompson, an architect with Prairie Partnership Architects; John Welch, Chairperson, Environmental Studies, Faculty of Architecture, University of Manitoba; and Dr. Vedanand, Professor of Marketing Faculty, Administrative Studies, University of Manitoba.

There's one thing that's been asked of them, that they try and do an assessment of some of the approaches to energy conservation in parts of the United States because there had been a couple of areas where that had been done on either small-scale, medium-scale projects, modern-scale projects. They are undertaking that.

Secondly, what I asked them to do was to take a review of what the department was doing, so that I could get, in a sense, a layperson's perception of how they saw the conservation programs of the department. We've had meetings from time to time on that and I'll be expecting to be meeting with them more frequently. I have something set up for them when the Session ends.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister confirms what I suspected to be the case, namely, that the Energy Council has been allocated some very specific areas to busy themselves with. But I recall how the Manitoba Energy Council came into being. It was felt by the New Democratic Government that succeeded the previous administration, which was deeply involved in some of

the major energy decisions of the day, namely, such substantial projects as the diversion of the Churchill River, Lake Winnipeg regulations, the entire Northern hydro development schemes, and the Energy Council was established with some fanfare that certainly a New Democratic Party Government would not be making arbitrary decisions of its own. They would be including a broader spectrum of the general public. Certainly, listening to the names, many of them are familiar to me, names that date back to the years of '69 and '70 when, I suppose, some of the more controversial decisions were being made with respect to energy development, generally, in this province.

I ask the Minister, what particular role has this Energy Council played? I have no doubt that they themselves would have assumed to play a role in such major decisions as this government is currently undertaking with respect to massive sales of energy beyond our borders, specifically to the United States, the sale that this Minister and government has contracted for to the Northern States Power group. I noted with interest that the Manitoba Energy Council maintained a watching brief throughout the 10- or 11-day hearings of the National Energy Board.

I can't recall - and I don't believe they did make active representation, but their presence certainly indicated to me that the Energy Council - and I would assume it to be appropriate that they were correctly concerned with the kind of major decisions that the Minister and government were involved in, in the overall energy field, to have asked this board to principally review the workings of his department or to check on the efficiency of some of the energy conservation programs such as CHEC, while certainly laudable - but it's my feeling, at least my feeling of the history of this council and their creation that that really wasn't the limited role that the Energy Council sees for itself today and indeed was, in fact, established.

I ask the Minister directly, what role, to what degree of consultation did this Minister invite his Manitoba Energy Council to play in the decisions that this Minister has made, specifically with respect to the NSP sale and the subsequent advancement of Limestone?

HON. W. PARASIUK: I'm not sure we're talking about the same council. The Energy Council was established by the Conservative administration in 1980. This is a particular council that I inherited and there was a Dean Shebeski on it who took a position in Africa, and contacted me saying that he would be resigning. I then put some other members on it and we put together an Energy Council, but this was established by the Conservative administration in 1980 to develop and propose to the Minister programs and measures related to the use, conservation, allocation or supply of energy, to disseminate to the public information regarding energy and to provide the Minister with assessments and recommendations concerning energy policy.

When I looked through what the Energy Council had done under the Conservative administration since they had set it up, I found that it hadn't been used to look at anything like an Alcan smelter development, or it hadn't looked at anything like the Western Power Grid which was being talked about at that time. Rather people were, in a sense, looking more at the energy

conservation and alternative energy areas and, frankly, I continued having the council work in that area.

I'm trying to recollect now. I do think that there was something like an energy council established probably about 1971 or '72 and I can't remember the specific genesis date of that. I do recall that was before there was a Department of Energy, however. I'm trying to remember. I believe at that time it was the Minister of Industry and Commerce who might have been responsible for it as a Minister. I'm not sure if it had that large a staff or whether it had that large a council.

I don't think that that continued to exist have '77. I think that it was replaced by this council which, as I said, was established in 1980, so I've just followed that tradition. I had, in fact, not referred to things like the Northern States Power sale or things like Manitoba Hydro decisions to it. Manitoba Hydro itself has a board of people who are, I think, fairly representative and that board has involved itself at some length and detail with respect to the Northern States Power sale and the question of advancing Limestone so I've, in fact, used their advice.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I was indeed referring to that earlier council, I believe, established at that time by the Minister Sid Green very much under the conditions that I described. Since that time, of course, the entire Department of Energy has been established. I suppose some of the scale and scope of what was intended for the original council has been assumed within the department.

Mr. Chairman, we hear this quite frequently from this government. We heard it just on another matter in the House a little while ago from the Minister of Education that whatever action the previous Conservative Administration took on a certain matter seems to be just about right for this Minister or this government. I suppose I should feel complimented on that. But the question really is, does the Minister not feel the Manitoba Energy Council as composed of a broader section of the general public should not have a role to play on the kind of energy decisions that this government and the Minister are making at this time?

HON. W. PARASIUK: No, as I said, with respect to the Hydro decisions, since Hydro itself has a board that I think is broadly based, that should be the body making those types of decisions.

When it comes to questions of energy conservation, alternative energy, ways in which we might get a better energy bang for a buck, I think that this group, indeed, does have a lot to offer and will have a lot to offer. That would be the type of activity that I would like them to undertake.

MR. H. ENNS: Well, Mr. Minister, I can't help but note that it was precisely for the kind of answer that you've just given that the original Energy Council was set up because certainly people like the Honourable Member for Inkster and Mr. Carl Ridd and others felt that these decisions should not be left solely in the hands of the Hydro engineers or of government that the major environmental decisions, major energy decisions ought to be vetted in a far broader way and receive that kind of input from disciplines other than the immediate ones involved.

I find it interesting, Mr. Chairman, and I leave it on the record, that the Minister and the NDP Government are, in effect, saying that in this respect the previous administration conducted itself correctly and appropriately with respect to those from whom they sought advice.

HON. W. PARASIUK: I'd like to add one caveat. I don't remember ever knocking the energy councillors' concept as presently undertaking its activities, but I do want to inform the member that there are some other entities in place that didn't exist in the early Seventies. There is a Manitoba Environmental Assessment Review process and Manitoba Hydro does have to go through that process and there are a whole set of various disciplines that aren't just engineering or hydraulic disciplines that, in fact, look at the whole Hydro project from different perspectives to make sure that the environmental aspects are looked at, to make sure that - just as an example - if there's any type of archeological information that should be checked out that would be done. There is a process through the Environmental Assessment Review process and through the Provincial Land Use Planning Committee.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, this is only for the public record but my personal files contain lengthy letters from some of the individuals serving on the present Energy Council, to name one, Dr. Carl Ridd, who thought it was verging on criminal the kind of development that was taking place in Northern Manitoba by Manitoba Hydro. I find it interesting that he is still serving on this Energy Council and is now quite prepared to content himself with checking the insulation factor in residential homes or businesses in Stonewall and not comment on what I know from personal correspondence that I've had with him, the interest that he showed in this particular subject matter from '69 up, to content himself and the council with that activity and not be concerned about the kind of major energy and development decisions that this Minister and this government are making.

HON. W. PARASIUK: No, I certainly have provided information to them on the type of decisions that the government is making. We've provided material like the NEB Report to them. They get that type of information, and Mr. Ridd certainly still has his broader perspective and that's one of the reasons why I was very interested in making him chairperson of the council. I believe that he does have that breadth and depth which is important and I certainly value his counsel and advice on a whole range of matters and the council certainly is free to raise broad matters. I've asked specifically, because I thought this was a vacuum, that they look at some specific areas, especially energy conservation, are getting what I would call a bigger bang for our energy buck in this province.

I can appreciate the Member for Lakeside's concern in wanting to put this on the record seeing as how, I believe, back in 1969 - I'm slightly younger than him and I wasn't around at that time - certain decisions that he might have been involved in relating to high-level diversion were quite topical at the time and elicited response, not only from people like Carl Ridd, but from

quite a large number of Manitobans. I think that possibly the sensitivities have moderated a bit in the intervening 16 years. There isn't a high level diversion.

What's involved with the Limestone development right now basically entails no environmental impact because we're talking about a run of the river system, whereby Limestone is 20 kilometres downstream from Long Spruce, the banks are high enough, there will be virtually no flooding. So it's because we've probably reached the stage of the development where the incremental effects, in a negative sense, are virtually minimal; that there isn't the type of outcry and concern from the general population that there might have been in 1969, when high level diversions were being talked about.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I don't dispute the Minister's last comments with respect to the environmental impact from here on in, in the sequential development of the Nelson River. However, just to have the record perfectly clear, this Minister, this government did not ask and did not receive any information from the Manitoba Energy Council with respect to their hydro development plans or their sales, export sales of power to the United States or other jurisdictions.

HON. W. PARASIUK: I did not ask them for that. I indicated to them what our policy was and certainly, in terms of continuing discussions, I'm trying to get the best bank for our energy buck, but those are continuing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(e)—pass.

Resolution No. 60: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty, a sum not exceeding \$2,880,600 for Energy and Mines, Energy, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

Item No. 3.(a)(1) Mineral Resources, Mineral Resources Management, Salaries; 3.(a)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Ian Haugh has been in charge of this division for a good many years. Can the Minister tell us where Dr. Haugh is presently?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Yes, Dr. Haugh is acting as a senior advisor to myself as Minister, looking at single-enterprise communities with a view to possibly doing further work on assessing legislation within the department and doing a complete review of the legislation. I indicated that to the Member for Lakeside on Friday when we discussed these Estimates.

MR. B. RANSOM: Is that a bulletined position that Dr. Haugh applied for?

HON. W. PARASIUK: No, it's not.

MR. B. RANSOM: Is this a promotion for Dr. Haugh or is it a demotion? Why would he take that position?

HON. W. PARASIUK: As I indicated to the Member for Lakeside on Friday, and I think it's in Hansard, there was some reorganization of the department undertaken by the acting deputy minister from November on, which

entailed some changes within the department, in part to the Energy area, where there were some changes there, and in part in the Mineral Resources area where there were some changes in some reporting relationships, whereby the directors were reporting directly to the acting deputy minister at the Civil Service level, the decision was that it would best be served without having an assistant deputy minister. The organization was made more flat in the Mineral Resources section, and as a consequence, Dr. Haugh no longer occupied a non-existent assistant deputy minister's position. He still acts as a senior advisory to me as the Minister.

MR. B. RANSOM: There are no assistant deputy ministers then in the Department of Energy and Mines, is that correct?

HON. W. PARASIUK: No, there is one assistant deputy minister at present, that's the assistant deputy minister for policy and planning, Mr. Charles Kang, who is now the acting deputy minister of the department.

MR. B. RANSOM: Is it the government's intention that there will not be an assistant deputy minister in charge of Mineral Resources at any time in the future?

HON. W. PARASIUK: That would be premature to say. The intention is to have a flatter organization in the Mineral Resources side, in that you're having, in a sense, the increased activity in petroleum plus certain types of activity with respect to mines. It may be that, organizationally, these people may not be at an ADM level but may, in fact, end up at a director-general level, but that would be premature to speculate on what that organization will be over the course of the next six months to a year.

MR. B. RANSOM: Is the Minister contemplating appointing an assistant deputy minister in charge of Mineral Resources Division?

HON. W. PARASIUK: I do that in consultation with the deputy and at this particular stage, there is not an intention to be appointing an assistant deputy minister in the Minerals Division. There'll be an assessment of the activity of people in the Petroleum, Mines and Geological Services Branches to determine the type of activity and how much activity is being done within each branch, but in a sense they're undertaking different types of activities, especially the activity that's taking place within the Petroleum section.

MR. B. RANSOM: The Minister is uncertain at this time what the final structure of the Mineral Resources Division will look like.

HON. W. PARASIUK: No, what I said is that it will be a flatter organization. I did not envisage an assistant deputy minister being appointed in the near future.

MR. B. RANSOM: It seems a bit unusual to me, Mr. Chairman, that the reporting structure of the division appears to be a little uncertain, yet the Minister removed an assistant deputy minister and apparently removed the position at the same time.

It would seem to me that, to take that sort of organizational step, the Minister would surely want to have in mind the exact type of structure with which he would replace the one that was there previously.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Yes, I have a structure in mind that is evolving and I think that these things evolve in a particular way and I would expect that, over the course of the next six months, it would reach that stage.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to indicate to the Minister that I will have a number of questions - or deal at length with the situation that concerns us all at Lynn Lake and I do that just by serving notice - some specific information that I'll be seeking where commitments were made by his colleague, the member for that area, and a colleague of his on the Treasury Bench.

Just before we get into that, just a few more general questions in this division. On March of '84, the government entered into an agreement with Sherritt Gordon Mines Ltd., who had approved a \$27 million mine development program at the Ruttan Mine with the Provincial Government providing a loan of \$10 million. Can the Minister indicate to us what the situation is at this time? Has the money been drawn down and is development proceeding? What stage, what level are we at? How much money has been called on, in terms of the loan provision by the government?

HON. W. PARASIUK: The money has been drawn down and they're in the latter stages of the whole development project. We expect the completion of that \$27 million development by the early fall. We have been informed of that and analysis indicates that after that development, Sherritt Gordon's Ruttan Mine should become one of the lower cost producers of copper in North America. It still won't be lowest cost in the world because there are the Chileans and others. It's just that if you can get your production costs down, there'll be some increase in production overall.

There'll be some increase in employment, but if you can get into the lower quarter of production costs among producers, there will always be a tendency on the part of North American consumers not to put all their eggs in one basket with the Chileans or the Zaireans or some others and that it would appear that there would be a medium- to long-term market there for copper out of Ruttan; but it is imperative to try and make sure that you're into the lower cost side.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister refers to production costs and of course that is, I suppose, the most identifiable single problem that the mining industry, not only in Manitoba but in North America, faces with respect to offshore competition.

I recall being shocked at the extent to which we have impacted by government action in this instance in contributing to costs. I was told by mining companies in a recent visit in the North that in one particular area, for instance, in terms of payroll costs, in the last three, perhaps four years, in four items - I'm trying to recall by memory - such as UIC payments, Workers

Compensation, I believe Canada Pension and, of course, our own unique payroll tax, we had increased the payroll costs per employee from some \$800 per employee to something like \$2,200 or \$2,300 per employee in three or four short years. That, Mr. Minister responsible for Mines and mineral production in the Province of Manitoba, has to be of some concern to you and ought to be communicated to your colleague, the Minister of Finance, and indeed to other federal authorities as well, because when we are already in a precarious situation in dealing with the substantially lower offshore mineral production - and I'm not suggesting for a moment that we can or should attempt to reduce our costs to those.

I think the reverse is the answer, to bring working conditions, including wages, in other parts of the world up to our parts of the world and of course we'd all be back to a better situation, but nonetheless, it seemed to me when this information was related to me, as certainly something that we ought to be cognizant of and take into consideration. That seems an inordinate cost in one area alone, payroll costs, the figures related to me by Inco officials and corroborated by Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting, and Sherritt that that indeed was the situation, that in the period of 1981 to '84, or '82-'85, this was referring to a visit in February of this year, that that indeed was the scale of increase to the companies with respect to payroll costs. This, of course, has nothing to do with wage levels. This is payroll costs that our companies in Manitoba have to take into consideration and are added to our production costs from \$800 to some \$22, \$2,300 per employee.

HON. W. PARASIUK: I don't have the specific figures. I will be getting a chance to talk to him later this summer in terms of their own individual cases, but if you look at the Health and Education Levy proportionately it would be very, very minor in comparison to that. In fact, one of the things that I've raised with the mining companies is the fact that UIC premiums, because the Federal Government has changed those premiums and raised them very significantly, have had a far greater impact on their payrolls. I must say that the Workers Compensation Board increases would have had an impact as well, but I think that one of the problems there is that the premiums were probably too low in the past and that's one thing about having them kept down and then having to have a larger bump-up because you haven't raised them at a proper time.

I would think that mining accidents are probably one of the biggest claimants of the Workers Compensation Fund. It's important that people be improving their mine safety record substantially because we've had to try and improve the mine safety record. I don't think our performance on mine safety in Manitoba has been that good. I think the claims on the Workers' Compensation Fund have been high.

At the same time, one tries to make sure that you're productive and keep your costs in line. I can appreciate the member's comments when he says we don't want to, in a sense, try and compete in terms of those types of costs with Chile because we'd have a different system. We don't want to try and sink down to that level but one has to try and be realistic and be practical.

I think the Health and Education Levy provides a way to provide for Health and Education within the

province which I think is substantive. It may turn out that Inco finds that our costs all told are cheaper than Ontario's because I've been told by them consistently that Manitoba is a cheaper place or less expensive place to do business than is Ontario. I was pleased that they moved their Port Colborne operations, for example, to Manitoba. I'm pleased that they're shipping concentrates from Shabandewan (phonetic) to Thompson taking advantage of our lower cost milieu. I know that they don't have to pay Medicare premiums, for example, in Manitoba and I'm quite certain that they would have to pay Medicare premiums in Ontario. I think if one puts these all into the hopper, Manitoba is a very competitive place to mine.

At the Mining Ministers' conferences that I've attended, and again I've looked and I can't pull out a page number of a particular report, but I know that we have been rated as being, in a sense, a good place to do business for mining.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, it's not my intention to deal with the desirability of having the best of all protection programs, whether it's Workers Compensation or whether it's provision of dollars and cents to provide the best of health and education programs, but it seems to me in this particular area of our commerce we face up to that question in its starkest manner that mines are operated or not being operated virtually solely on the basis of production costs. The mineral is there, as good as it was five years or ten years ago, but a mine management decision to operate or not to operate is based on construction costs. I believe the Minister has to acknowledge that. A mine company depending on the health of the company and certainly our companies have - companies like Inco - carried on for a substantial period of time if they have the strength in a deficit position but, sooner or later, a decision is made to cease mining operations because the recovery simply isn't there to cover costs. I think that's something understood by all.

As a matter of fact, further to this problem is the fact that, of course, such a substantial amount of the production is exported and has to compete in the international trade, not consumed domestically to the degree that we'd perhaps like to see it. If it were, then we would be in a better position not to feel the problems that the situation that I describe put on the mining companies.

However, Mr. Chairman, let me deal with another subject and that goes to another program that was established with this province in the \$2.4 million Federal-Provincial NEED Program at the Agassiz Mine in respect to gold - again the same question - where do we stand in that development? I know that the residents of Lynn Lake, of course, are extremely hopeful that this will provide some level of stability while other projects are pursued.

HON. W. PARASIUK: The province and the Federal Government were involved jointly in a NEED Program with Sherritt Gordon and they undertook a development drilling program. Basically what was done was surface diamond drilling, underground diamond drilling and drifting, rehabilitation of the existing Lynn Lake mill to process gold ore. Actually, it was the first two phases

that were implemented, funds for the third phase, no rehabilitation, were reallocated to the first two phases.

The NEED Project was deemed somewhat successful in that the quality and quantity of the ore reserve was improved, confidence in the ore reserve data was increased, drilling outlined the ore bodies sufficiently well to be able to select the appropriate mining method. So, all told there has been something in the order of 6.9 million spent on that project.

Now what we're going to have is that Sherritt now has to undertake the development decision or take that development decision which right now they are considering. Their board will be meeting, I believe, July 22nd to consider this decision. Involved is about a \$39 million development. They are at the stage now of considering making that type of decision and certainly we, at the provincial level and I would certainly think people at the community level, are anxiously awaiting that decision because it will have a significant impact on Lynn Lake, and the Fox Lake Mine will be running out in the fall.

There will be some mining activity in terms of exploration that's taking place in and around the area, but there won't be an ongoing mine to switch to and this would be a very good thing for the community, if the decision was made to proceed with the development of Agassiz. It wouldn't take up all the miners from the Fox Lake Mine, but it would take up a good number of them, I think over half. It would take up 160 miners out of 260 miners.

Given certain multiplier effects, I think that would basically keep your population decrease in Lynn Lake - if nothing else took place but the Agassiz - from 1,800, we'd bring it down to about 1,000, in that range, as opposed to going down to about 600 with Lynn Lake just in a sense just acting as a type of regional centre for some. Given the infrastructure it has, some of the people have retired there right now plus some of the outlying communities. So we are awaiting that decision from Sherritt ourselves as well as the community, but that's the time frame of it and that's the type of investment that they have to make.

One of the things that makes it more difficult is the fact that gold prices aren't quite where people thought that they might be at this time. Again it's a matter of taking another run and trying to determine where gold prices will be when that gold mine comes into production, as opposed to when it's being developed and that takes some guesstimates at what might occur in the future. In addition, I guess, they're going to be taking another run at trying to determine what their exact costs will be.

MR. H. ENNS: The Minister refers to - if I heard him right - some \$6.9 million of exploration and evaluation and development work under the NEED Program, original \$2.4 million of the federal-provincial input - the difference, was that Sherritt Gordon's money? What I'm asking is, to what extent did the company commit themselves to this in conjunction with the NEED Program, to the exploration and evaluation program that the Minister referred to?

HON. W. PARASIUK: I made a mistake. I'm glad you asked another question. The NEED program was \$2.4

million. It was almost \$1 million by the Federal government; just over .5 million by the Provincial Government and \$1.737 million by Sherritt. That was undertaken from August 12, 1983 to August 31, 1984; and then in October of 1984, Sherritt's Board of Directors approved the expenditure of a further \$6.9 million, so it actually takes it up, if you add those two numbers together, to \$9.3 million. So the company has been making some significant commitments.

MR. H. ENNS: So the decision that the board of directors on July 22nd, to some extent will be making, is whether for the time being they walk away from that, upwards to \$7 million, \$8 million of their money and we would be walking away from the \$1.5 million of public money.

HON. W. PARASIUK: That's part of it and of course the other type of costs that you have to look at are the type of relocation and transition costs for the community, if it goes from an 1,800 population to 1,000 population, as opposed to going from an 1,800 population to a 600 population. There are costs to Sherritt Gordon for that; there are costs to the Federal Government; there are costs to the Provincial Government.

MR. H. ENNS: Does the Minister care to quote some odds as to what the decision will be on July 22nd?

HON. W. PARASIUK: At this particular stage, I don't know and I won't even quote any odds. I know what I'd like them to be.

MR. H. ENNS: Just a question. I assume this has to do with the coming onstream of work which wasn't there the year before. But in the Annual Report of the Resources Division in the bottom paragraph of the first page here - revenues to the government from mining and quarrying during the year was some 35.8 billion (sic) compared with 1.1 million (sic) in the 1982-83 fiscal year.

HON. W. PARASIUK: That seems an anomaly.

MR. H. ENNS: An anomaly. Could the Minister give us some explanation of that anomaly? I mean as much I would like to credit this Minister and this government for doing things right, it doesn't seem to be in proportion to what I see.

HON. W. PARASIUK: That is undoubtedly an error, I would think, and I will certainly undertake to provide the member with the correct number.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)(1) - the Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: No, Mr. Chairman. We'll stay with this resolution for a little while.

I would like to refer now to the situation in Lynn Lake. Lynn Lake has regrettably been in the news, to some extent, with the difficulties that they like other single-industry communities face, when they are facing a pending situation of their one industry closing.

I want to make specific reference to meetings that were held by a committee of Lynn Lake who were, of

course, looking for some revitalization in that community. These date specifically to a meeting held on February 2, 1985, and these were particular commitments made by the Honourable Jay Cowan, MLA for that area, a Treasury Board colleague of the Minister and, I believe, still Chairman of the Treasury Board.

On February 2nd, the request from Lynn Lake was that in the first instance, because of the substantial federal involvement, acknowledge that every effort be made to co-ordinate the two levels of government, and Mr. Cowan agreed on behalf of this government, that direct deputy ministers would be contacted with their federal counterparts, that Mr. Cowan agreed to have a followup with Mr. Michael Decter on the status of a request to meet with Federal Economic Council. The committee of Cabinet will discuss contacts with Federal Governments at ministerial levels and a specific commitment was made that all these contacts would be completed by February 28th of 1985. Have these contacts all been made?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Yes, as far as I could tell they were. I remember the meeting with the Hon. Sinclair Stevens at Gillam and a major item on the agenda was Lynn Lake. Sinclair Stevens acts as the Chairman of the Economic Development Committee of the Mulroney Government. We made the Minister aware of the situation at Lynn Lake, what was taking place, and the fact that we certainly would like to follow up on this with meetings he might organize for us since he is acting as the Economic Development Chairperson.

He indicated to us that that's a good vehicle to use. We have had follow-up meetings at a subsequent time regarding Lynn Lake with - and there was Mr. Cowan himself, and I can't remember the specific date of it, but it was in Ottawa and I was in Ottawa as well. I had to meet regarding the Churchill line. Mr. Cowan was meeting with respect to the Lynn Lake situation with people in Flora MacDonald's department who undertook to contact other departments with respect to this matter.

At a Mines Ministers' Conference that was held in May, I again made a presentation to the Mines Ministers requesting that they consider the establishment of a national community mining reserve fund. I did that because it's important that the national government look at the whole problem of single enterprise communities, especially single enterprise communities that might have an orebody running out or might be faced with, or where a community is faced with either structural change because of the structural changes taking place in the mining industry generally or faced with cyclical variations in demand or price; and I indicated that I thought that this was a national matter as well as a provincial matter, in that sometimes you get a mining company with activities that transcend provincial boundaries. So how do you follow the money flows within a company as the money goes from, say, Manitoba or Ontario?

In the case of Inco, they're not broken out for accounting purposes. They don't break out the Manitoba profits from the Ontario profits. They're just into the company accounts; or how does one look at Sherritt Gordon, when you have a mine that conceivably has generated a fair amount of wealth and now is

running into some difficult times, and the question is, what is the staying power of Sherritt Gordon? The staying power is severely limited because it has a \$4 million debt for a fertilizer plant that it has built in Alberta and that fertilizer plant conceivably is paying, generating money in its own right and paying taxes, but those taxes aren't coming to Manitoba, they're going to Alberta.

You have that type of structuring of mining companies into something that just isn't a mining company. I must say that I have received expressions of interest from time to time by various other governments in the country but they've all been worried about jurisdictional concerns and they don't want to let the Federal Government get too involved in the mining industry or looking at mining resources. As a result, they have argued frankly that each province should fend for itself.

One of the provinces that said that in particular was Quebec. Quebec then turned around, was looking for special deals with the Federal Government to try and stimulate mining in its own province, and so I thought the position taken was somewhat contradictory.

To give the new Minister of State for Mining his due, he agreed that we should set up a group of officials to look very quickly at the whole matter of single enterprise communities and how they are affected by transitions and changes with the view to reporting back to Ministers by September, and Manitoba and the Federal Government will be working jointly on that. It is our intention to be talking about the problem in general, but also drawing specific cases examples from Lynn Lake so that we're not talking about the situation in an abstract way and, secondly, we want to use this as a vehicle to help co-ordinate federal efforts, in terms of what they do with respect to Lynn Lake as it goes through a transition which we can expect.

So that type of follow-up was indeed undertaken. I know there's a Deputies' committee here that has done reviews of the proposals put forward by the community itself. It's a matter of looking at the proposals to determine which ones are realistic or not. There's been a whole set of proposals just put forward. The easy thing would be to say, oh yes, they all look nice, but that really doesn't deal with realities. It's important to look at them and determine, from a departmental perspective, which ones are more realistic than not; so I believe that there has been a great deal of commitment and follow-through on the part of the government in dealing with the situation at Lynn Lake.

I've had the opportunity, when I've attended Mines Ministers Conferences, to ask other governments what have they done in these situations and I must say that there are no good models that I've seen to follow up on. Indeed, I believe that Manitoba is breaking some new ground in this respect and I certainly hope that we'll be able to break some of that ground jointly over the course of the next few months with the Federal Government because I do believe that they have an important role to play in this.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on February 2, the Lynn Lake community asked this government to designate Lynn Lake as a target area. I suppose that might be in specific reference to the kind of thing that the Federal Minister, the Minister referred to, Mr. Sinclair, did for

instance in Nova Scotia, when that industry on Cape Breton Island lost their major single industry, the heavy water plant.

The answer given by Mr. Cowan at that time was that no current long-term development strategy exists for Northern Manitoba. Mr. Minister, that was in February; we're now in June; the mine is closing in the fall. Does one exist now?

HON. W. PARASIUK: I think that there is a strategy for Northern Manitoba, in terms of allocating the activities of the Canada/Manitoba Mineral Development Agreement, that there is a strategy in place for MMR, in terms of its activities. There's been a strategy in place for the development of Churchill; there's been a strategy in place for the development of Limestone, so I would think that with respect to northern development there is a strategy.

If one talks about a specific strategy for the Community of Lynn Lake, that is a whole set of contingent variables right now. Will Sherritt decide to go with Agassiz? If they go there's a whole set of mechanics that one has to follow through on. If they don't, then one has a whole set of other options that one has to deal with. Specifically, I'd have to say that the future of Lynn Lake itself is uncertain. In terms of the North, certainly, there's a strategy.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on February 2, a Lynn Lake revitalization plan was presented to the government. It was prepared by a development officer, Mr. Dennis R. Young, submitted by Lynn Lake Steering Committee, the Lynn Lake Economic Development Committee, the Lynn Lake Planning Committee, approved by mayor and council of the Local Government District of Lynn Lake. On February 2, Mr. Cowan guaranteed action with respect to a review of Lynn Lake diversification ideas. Has that review been undertaken?

HON. W. PARASIUK: I'll give you an answer in two minutes. I want to take a two-minute break.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will have a break for two minutes. Mr. Minister.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Yes, there were some 40 proposals that were put forward at that time. A number of them didn't make that much sense. I think that the people within the community even acknowledged that but they were putting them forward because, in a sense, this was a community exercise of trying to put forward proposals. That has been reviewed at one level by an economic deputies committee here at the provincial level that's being resubmitted for some funding considerations, some of the proposals, to the Northern Development Agreement. There's some monies that could be available through that agreement for some type of activity in Lynn Lake.

We're also having our discussions with the Federal Department of Energy, Mines and Resources. I think meetings just took place recently in this respect so that we don't have "a specific set of things" to report but it's my expectation that by September we will have an idea of what's happening with Agassiz and we will have

a response with respect to the proposals that might warrant some consideration by the Northern Development Agreement people; by the Federal Government and possibly by ourselves in terms of some measures that might be undertaken through the Community Mining Reserve Fund.

Most of the proposals themselves weren't proposals as such. They were proposals for some further work. So, they're not the type that elicit or enable one to give a quick comment. You look and determine whether, in fact, you can get some people to do some of this. Some of them don't make that much sense and some of them do and some of them will, indeed, be followed up.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister put on the record what the current status of the Community Mining Reserve Fund is and, also, as I understand it, that fund is non-government, it is a surtax if you like on the operations of the mining industry? How is that fund drawn upon? What I'm after is what is the decision-making process in the use of some of those funds for the purpose for which it was intended? Should a particular project or idea be accepted by those involved?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Right now, you get funds through 3 percent of mines taxes. So it's not a surtax that you're taking away revenue that might go into consolidated revenue fund for purposes of building up this fund. It now has a balance of \$4.718 million. Monies have been spent from this fund over the last number of years. We've had, for example, grants in lieu of taxes to the LGD of Lynn Lake totalling \$67,456 because, again, their tax capacity had diminished.

There have been some job creation expenditures when there was a cyclical recession because, again, people were trying to keep the skilled workers there in communities like Lynn Lake or Leaf Rapids or Thompson or Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting. There have been two grants in lieu of taxes to LGD of Lynn Lake. All told, there have been, as I say, pretty significant expenditures under this fund but what we're trying to determine right now is what will be the call on the fund.

We've got outstanding a whole set - we've got some development proposals that people have put forward. We've got people talking about what relocation costs might be and we're trying to get an idea from the Federal Government as to what they will pick up themselves. We're trying to get some idea if there are any other types of transition costs to the community. Does Sherritt pick up some of those? Does the Federal Government pick up some of them and does the province pick up some of them? What are they and who will pick up some of these costs and how will they be cost-shared?

There's a whole question of is there any way in which equity in houses might be considered. This is what we've raised with the Federal Government. Right now, you've got miners up there who, their whole life savings are in their house and that house might decline in value tremendously once that ore body runs out. Some of them will stay in Lynn Lake to work. Hopefully more will stay if they've got the Agassiz Mine operating. What if they have to move to a place like Thompson or Flin Flon because slowly through attrition openings do

become available and people do want qualified experienced miners, but do they go into a new community at the age of 45 or 50 or 55 with no assets whatsoever?

Those are dilemmas that we're trying to quantify. Those are probable demands on a fund that we're trying to quantify to get some idea of what the order of magnitude is and to get some idea of what I would the cost-sharing. Whose responsibilities are these?

We've raised last year, for example, with the Federal Government the notion that possibly companies should be able to write off grants to miners in terms of transition for equity in a home in a single enterprise community. They are able to do that, they can write off certain costs with respect to the mine itself but they can't write off those types of costs nor can the miner. That's what we're hoping to address with this task force. I expect that we will be having draws on that fund and they could be substantial.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on February 2nd the Community of Lynn Lake requested of government that a Limestone Training Centre be established on site. A commitment was made by Mr. Cowan that the decision with respect to a site for Limestone training would be made within a month. Has that decision been made?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Yes, we have decided that we will be establishing a centre in Thompson at the Pipe Lake Mine and we will also be establishing another centre in Lynn Lake. There are negotiations under way with Sherritt right now with respect to the use of some of their facilities or the rental of some of their facilities. So there will be some Limestone training taking place at Lynn Lake and those negotiations are presently under way.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, understandably, also in that same meeting, the community of Lynn Lake requested that substantial stimulation of further exploration and exploration programs ought to occur in that region. A specific request was that the Manitoba Mineral Exploration Program in Lynn Lake be considerably expanded. Could the Minister indicate what has happened in this area?

HON. W. PARASIUK: I think that a great deal has been undertaken in the period 1975, following the closure of the Farley Mine at Lynn Lake, and March 1985. The Department of Energy and Mines has spent in excess of \$4.5 million in the Lynn Lake-Leaf Rapids region. This is basically for geoscience work. Some of those activities were undertaken in conjunction with the Federal Government.

With respect to the current Federal-Provincial Mineral Development Agreement, there is continued emphasis on programs in the Lynn Lake-Leaf Rapids area. Furthermore, MMR has spent an estimated \$4.5 million on exploration activities in the Lynn Lake-Leaf Rapids region.

Exploration expenditures of a joint venture, with joint venture partners amount to an additional \$3 million. In the last three years, Manitoba Minerals has spent an estimated 60 percent of its budget in joint venture activities in the Lynn Lake-Leaf Rapids area, and MMR

has budgeted an additional \$1.5 million for 1985, so there is a continued deep emphasis on activities for exploration and development in the Lynn Lake area and I believe that Sherritt Gordon themselves are undertaking pretty intensive exploration activities in and around the Lynn Lake area.

Hopefully that concentrated effort - despite the fact that it is an area that has been swept over a number of times, but the technology is changing - will lead to some possible mines being found. At the same time again, to be realistic, if a mine was found today, it couldn't be developed in time to accommodate everyone coming out of the Fox Lake Mine and I think that's why the Agassiz decision is an important decision.

MR. H. ENNS: Has this stimulated exploration, encouraged any additional staking, particularly with the other companies and/or MMR?

HON. W. PARASIUK: The department's work has extended its geological belt out by about 50 miles and that has been extensively staked. There is work taking place right now in that area as well as other areas in and around the Lynn Lake area. There is MMR involved; I know that Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting is involved; I know that Sherritt Gordon is involved; Granges is involved, so there's a fair amount of activity and I think that augurs well. There have been some showings, but a showing does not a mine make, so that one can't really comment on anything like that apart from saying that they are finding some showings and that's a good sign as opposed to say a few years ago, where they weren't finding anything.

I might just hark back on the Mining Community Reserve Fund. A process of a community seminar was, in a sense, paid for by the Mining Community Reserve Fund. The development officer that the Member for Lakeside has referred to, that salary has been paid for by the Mining Reserve Fund, so that the government through the Mining Reserve Fund is trying to be some catalyst, and at the same time is trying to ensure that people pick up their fair responsibilities as well, either the mining company or the Federal Government and we're in that process of trying to determine what that might be.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, again the community has some specific requests for extension of hydro service within the area to . . . and Brochet, an agreement was made that discussions would be undertaken with the Federal Government similar, I suppose, to the ones that predated the decision to provide the hydro service to the North, to Churchill. Are those kinds of discussions under way at the present time?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Yes they are. There are discussions under way for that area as well as for the Island Lake area as well. We're at a stage right now where I think the discussions will be proceeding. Whenever you get a change in government you tend sometimes to get a hiatus at the federal level and it's a matter of pursuing that to get them restarted, but they are taking place.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, there are a number of items that I know aren't particularly germane to the

responsibility of this Minister but were contained - of the many suggestions that the community of Lynn Lake put forward with respect to searching out every possible avenue for maintaining at least somewhere close to the present level of services in the area and, indeed, attracting additional services to that area that in the interim, if there was a period where mining activity was reduced, the community itself would still have sufficient base to maintain basic minimum levels of public services, and it's in this respect that Mr. Cowan had agreed with the community that the government would proceed to discuss with the Department of Indian Affairs, Northern Development, whether or not additional educational facilities, residences for surrounding Native communities would be considered in Lynn Lake to help, I suppose, a declining student enrolment, maintain their educational facilities. Has any specific action been taken in this regard?

HON. W. PARASIUK: I couldn't say on that one. I wouldn't know that one specifically. I do know that Mr. Cowan, virtually at every meeting that I've ever been to with Federal Ministers and also communicating with staff in Ottawa, has raised the whole question of Lynn Lake in other areas.

I can recall him trying to get the Federal Government to allocate a customs officer at Lynn Lake because there are a lot of people who use Lynn Lake as a jumping off point when they go to various tourist lodges in the area, and he felt that this would be a tremendous - it would help the tourist trade if they would be able to clear customs through the summer months in Lynn Lake, rather than having to clear customs in Winnipeg or some place like that. Again, the Federal Government undertook to try and give him a response on that but I do know those matters like that have been raised.

MR. H. ENNS: A further request by the Lynn Lake Community was to look at some of their other natural resources in the area, particularly the forest resources, and a suggestion that the government would approach Manfor to establish some operations within that area.

Has the Minister been apprised of any recent activity? I say this with full knowledge that, of course, Manfor is having difficulty in maintaining its current level of operation and indeed has laid off a number of people. Mr. Chairman, what I'm putting on the record of course is that Mr. Cowan agreed to, on behalf of this government, to a whole host of suggestions. I'm skipping over some of the more trendy ones like establishment of a Federal Penitentiary or Provincial Correctional Institute at Lynn Lake which Mr. Cowan agreed that he would provide the necessary information, but then suggested that he was not really in favour of setting up a private jail. I don't know what he meant by that, but getting back to more serious ones, with respect to forestry and/or expanded fishing opportunities, has the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation been called in to consult with the Lynn Lake people? Has pressure been put on by this government on the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation to see what alternative opportunities exist?

I share the Minister's concern that there are very finite limitations to what can, what is reasonably possible of happening in a community situated as it is, in terms

of distance from markets, economic factors that would preclude a great deal of other economic solutions; but certainly in the area of forestry, in the area of fishing, they to me hold out some hope for promise, along with of course the expanded development of the tourist industry, whether it's through more aggressive marketing of our great Northern lakes for angling, the likes of that.

Specifically, in this committee of Deputy Ministers, this committee that is revealing the plan, I appreciate this department's preoccupation with the expansion of mineral resources, what is the department - and I'm assuming it is the lead department - the Minister can correct me and I would ask that question, is there a group of senior - as the Minister referred to them, who is involved, what departments are involved and are they a formally structured committee of government assigned to the very specific problem that we face at Lynn Lake, a problem that has, in this instance, provided the government with substantial lead time. We were aware of what was happening to the Fox mine for some time. I don't think, in this instance, governments can plead, either provincial or federal, that sufficient lead time wasn't being provided to governments.

All too often that is the case where a fairly arbitrary decision is made by mine managers with little or no notice. That certainly was the theme of the one-day conference of a number of representatives of single industry communities that met just recently here in Winnipeg, the request that time be provided for alternative solutions to be worked out. It would seem to me that in Lynn Lake we have had time. I'm concerned with what we're doing with that time.

I'm referring to positions that have been put forward to this government on February 2nd. Specific action was agreed to and I'm attempting to ascertain to what extent this is being followed through with.

HON. W. PARASIUK: I go back to Square One. The reasons why the community is putting forward a range of proposals is the fact that it was the Government of Manitoba who sponsored a seminar, allowed them or paid for a development officer that they hired, asked them to set up committees to ascertain, not only development opportunities, but also ascertain what the transition costs might be.

You can talk about things like penitentiaries and that may have some realism or it may not. Out of the whole list of 40, some are more realistic than the others. I don't want to pour any type of cold water on any type of community effort, looking at various options, but some of them were more realistic than others and some of them were pretty esoteric. At the same time, we have asked the community to ask their committees to look at the transition costs, how many houses are involved, what's the equity build-up in those houses, what are the age of the people, what about the transition costs there, what will be the impact on their taxes?

You have to look at those aspects as well as, in a sense, tourism or forestry or fisheries. At the same time, there is a committee of deputies. It's a structured body that has been reviewing these proposals. There was a meeting between Mr. Decter, Mr. Kang, Mr. Singh and I believe, Mr. Young, I think, last week. Furthermore, it was indicated that some of these proposals were -

there may have to be some subsidization involved, would be sent to the Northern Development Agreement and there's a federal-provincial mechanism for cost-sharing and the province just can't make those types of decisions itself, noting the urgency and the fact that we want to have decisions by September, if not sooner.

Now, in terms of the time frame, we started this process last year. The community came forward some time in February with proposals. The proposals have been reviewed by a group of deputies. There's some further action being undertaken in some areas. We are undertaking some discussions with the Federal Government; undertaking discussions with Sherritt Gordon itself; trying to get a handle on what those overall costs will be; trying to get an idea of whether Agassiz will proceed or not. As I said, there are a lot of contingent activities going on. I think that they are coming together and will be coming together some time in September. A big factor in that process will be what is the decision on Agassiz.

MR. H. ENNS: We referred to the Fox Lake Mine closing some time this fall. Has the government been informed of a specific mine closing date?

HON. W. PARASIUK: No. I had a meeting with Sherritt officials just last week and they indicated to me that they weren't quite certain of the date in that they lost an underground pillar and they weren't sure what impact that would have on the rest of their mining operations. The date as yet has not been given specifically.

I hope to be informed of that in the next three or four weeks, possibly by that July decision. I would think it might vary by two or three months. Earlier, I had been given a rough date of October, 1985.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, certainly the official opposition wants to agree on record to encourage the government to accelerate its actions with respect to the problems facing the Lynn Lake community. I happen to believe that community has shown what I would describe as a considerable degree of resourcefulness in, firstly, recognizing that they are the ones that are facing the problem. They have demonstrated a remarkable degree of co-operation with management, with community, with local government district officials. I don't know if it was the initiative of the community or the initiative of the department or somebody else to put in place a development officer, but I concur with the Minister's comments that that is making it possible for us to at least be entertaining this kind of debate right now by having a considerable number of suggestions before us, some obviously better than others.

I would ask the Minister, at this point in time, the only resources drawn from the community mining reserves fund that can be directly attributable to Lynn Lake are those that he has already put on record; the payment in lieu of taxes; contribution toward the development officers' salaries, have there been any other projects that the community reserve fund has been drawn upon with respect to the Lynn Lake community?

HON. W. PARASIUK: At this particular stage, no, but the amount's that have been put into Lynn Lake

community would be in the order of about \$380,000.00. There have been payments made in the past to Wabowden and other communities like that from this fund. We are expecting some significant draw-downs of that fund for the Lynn Lake area. I would expect them to be substantial. I can't put a number on it. I don't want to have it act as a target but I do expect it to be a substantial number. That's what a mining community reserves fund is. It's there to deal with these types of fairly unusual activities that take place.

We don't want everyone just saying that the only fund is the mining community reserve fund when the Federal Government might have some responsibilities and the mining company itself might have some responsibilities.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister bring us up to date as to what's happening in Thompson at Inco? My last visit up there included briefing with respect to their new operations in the new open pit they were developing. I note with some optimism that Inco's own financial position seems to have turned around in this last quarter following a series of reverses financially in terms of profitability. Does the Minister hold out to the mining community at Thompson a reasonable, stable and good year?

HON. W. PARASIUK: I will be meeting again with Inco in the very near future, but I had discussions with them about three weeks ago and the indications were that things were progressing well, that the nickel prices were picking up just a bit. The problem is that mineral prices in the world have been terribly unpredictable. People expected them to be somewhat higher right across the board than they are today. Virtually across the board, they're quite a bit lower. The only one that seems to be picking up a bit more than the others right now, and only marginally, is nickel.

Now, we have two metals exchanges. You've got the London Metals Exchange and you've got the New York Metals Exchange and that's complicating matters quite significantly in terms of trying to determine what the prices might be. The word we have is that production from the first phase of the open pit is due to commence early in 1986, that they are proceeding on stream, that things are looking good and that they expect to have stable production and employment levels. If, in fact, there is some type of upturn in demand for nickel, I would expect that over the medium run that the open pit mine will be used as - not a lever, that's not the proper word - but it will be the one that is mined more in case of greater demand because it's not labour intensive. In case of a reduction in demand, that would be the one where its activities would be reduced so that you'd have some stability to the community.

The volatility in the mining industry produces a lot of volatility in the community in terms of school populations, in terms of populations in the community itself, housing values changing, business values changing. I think it's important to try and provide some stability in those communities.

Generally, I would say that the forecast for Thompson looks fairly good.

MR. H. ENNS: Does the Minister have available to him current prices of our minerals - copper, nickel particularly, zinc?

HON. W. PARASIUK: As of June 13, copper is 64.72 cents U.S.; nickel is \$2.52 U.S.; zinc is 32.92 cents, and gold is \$314.50. These are all in U.S. prices per pound, except for gold which is per ounce.

MR. H. ENNS: Does the Minister have the figure that industry provides or indicates they require for profitability in the mining venture?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Yes, 64.72 means that Ruttan, when developed, should make a bit of money, not that much, but a bit of money. Nickel - \$2.52, you are making a small profit. Zinc at 32.92, you are doing quite well with zinc; zinc prices have been quite good. Gold, it varies; it depends upon the miner. Most people in the industry would love for Manitoba mines to have something in the order of \$325-350 an ounce gold. That is why they have to really take a hard look at where they think their costs will be . . .

MR. H. ENNS: I'd like to take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to ask about a mine that I still refer to as San Antonio, but it is a Bissett operation.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Well, its status is that Lathwell had worked out some type of an agreement with Brinco who had spent about \$15 million on the mine and I guess they had taken a type of option on condition that they spend so much money for a certain percentage. They didn't complete that and my understanding is, and I just want to check whether in fact it is public or not.

There is another company, I can't divulge the name, a more established company, that is involved in paying the maintenance costs to keep the mine from flooding. Whether they are going to negotiate a lease or not or some type of an option arrangement or what might be called a farm-in arrangement is still to be determined, but there are interests again at the San Antonio Mine.

People have talked to me and they think there is gold way down, but right now you are talking about a mine that is over a mile deep, and the development costs of getting down there and doing further work are pretty high. I think Brinco had thought what they would do is that they would develop a profit by spending \$15 million, in a sense dredging out some of the reject ore at higher levels. Gold prices were such that they didn't make any profit. They lost \$15 million and they weren't able to have money in reserve to spend on the deep part of the mine. But there is other activity taking place of an exploration nature in that whole area because people are - I mean gold, although the price is 3.14, is still a hot prospect in the mining industry and a lot of people are chasing it.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, we had the opportunity to discuss the public involvement with respect to this high risk business, and we dealt with the Annual Report of the Mineral and Mining Exploration Corporation of Manitoba which divulged of course that the general public, the taxpayers of Manitoba, are yet awaiting dividends from their investments in such places as Trout Lake. I think the overall deficit occurred to the general public purse of some \$11 million in that venture.

My question is specifically to the Bissett operation: what ongoing obligations do we have? The Minister

refers to maintenance work being done. I assume there is no actual mining activity being carried out, but who is doing that and at whose cost? Is that the former owners?

HON. W. PARASIUK: MMR is not involved in the San Antonio Mine at all. They are always dewatering the mine, making sure that it is not flooding, and I'm not sure what other types of maintenance work has been done. Basically you are pumping the water out; you are maintaining the shaft; you are working the hoist. There is a lot of dampness in there. You want to make sure that it is in operating order, otherwise, it can rust up, flood up.

MR. H. ENNS: Who is doing the pumping?

HON. W. PARASIUK: It is the same company which is discussing participating and I can't give you its name. I can give it to you privately if you want. The only reason why I don't is that the other is just not on the public record right now. I think that would be wrong for me to do so.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, for general information, my recollection is that there was a move, or a proposed move, of the Safety Division of the department to the Department of Labour, occurred some time ago. Is that not correct or is my recollection faulty in this respect?

HON. W. PARASIUK: On April 1st of last year, those functions, Workplace Safety and Health functions, were transferred to the Workplace and Safety Division of the Department of the Environment.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, my specific question then, and I'm now just referring to the division's Annual Report that the safety and health of the employees in mining, smelting and refining operations for the conduct of geological investigations directed towards providing data base for mineral resource exploration. What caught my attention was the reference to that group which I had believed was transferred out of the department into Labour. The Minister is confirming that that indeed has taken place. Can the Minister indicate what was involved in terms of appropriation, number of positions? This was, by the way, a longstanding request from Labour that this be done. There was always a suggestion that housing this specific responsibility within the Department of Mines and Energy was not appropriate. I never, particularly, agreed with that concept; in fact, regrettably a former colleague of yours used to take great umbrage in taking me to task for that opinion - I'm trying to remember - the late Member for Flin Flon, Tom Barrow. He misrepresented my position that the Department of Mines and Energy was, in fact, capable of and was concerned about mine safety, as any other department of government would be. However, that change has taken place and I would just simply ask the Minister to indicate the scale, there were a number of safety inspectors . . .

HON. W. PARASIUK: Yes, in the order there were 13 staff years, plus salaries, and \$91,700 in operating expenditures that were transferred, effective April 1, 1984.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I hear persistent rumours that the Minister is about to announce a significant gold find. Would the Minister care to add to those rumours by looking me square in the eye and telling me what he is sitting on?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Yes, having had to try and negotiate with the Chinese over the last while in talking to them about potash, I'll try and put on my most inscrutable face, and tell him that there is no gold mine, but that I certainly hope that there might be one, or others, and that people are pursuing showings, and you never can go beyond that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)(1)—pass; 3.(a)(2)—pass.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions on this aspect of the divisions. I would ask the Minister, considering that I didn't take that break, whether he would be prepared to asking Committee rise and we will move into the Petroleum section. I have some colleagues from the southwest who would like to be present when we deal with surface rights and things like that.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Yes, sure, I understand. I know the one you're talking about, Waskada.
I move committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour is now 5:30 p.m.
Committee rise.

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: Committee, come to order. We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Education, Item 4.(a) Program Development Support Services, (a) Division Administration: (1) Salaries - the Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I know the Minister would love to pass very quickly through this major division but I can tell her, I forewarn her at this time, that we'll be spending a considerable amount of time within this particular area. So I'll serve notice to you, Mr. Chairman, that in spite of my wishing to pass specific areas, that the whole division will take some review.

Within the first appropriation, Mr. Chairman, I'd ask the Minister specifically whose salaries are included within, I believe, it is 4.(a) - I don't have my Estimates book with me, but I think it's the Division Administration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: The salaries are for the following branches:

Division of Administration; Curriculum Development and Implementation; Native Education; Manitoba School for the Deaf; Child Care and Development; Instructional Media Services; Correspondence Branch; and Regional Services. That's the salaries for those staff.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, maybe the Minister misunderstood me, 4.(a) Division Administration:

Salaries. Specifically what salaries are covered under 4.(a)(1)?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Assistant Deputy Minister, Program Development Support Services, two secretaries and an assistant, in that division.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(a)(1)—pass, 4.(a)(2)—pass.

4.(b) Curriculum Development and Implementation:
(1) Salaries - the Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Chairman, this is the specific area in which we'll be spending considerable time and although the appropriation itself, some \$2.2 million, possibly does not warrant all the time that will be devoted to this one area. It seems to me that within education in the province today that a large degree of attention is being directed toward this whole catch-all area of curriculum and development.

Mr. Chairman, there's a problem in education today, whether the Minister of Education, wants to admit it or not, whether the Minister wants to continue to blindly believe that although we may not within this Province of Manitoba have followed courses of action to the same degree or to a lesser degree than have been followed in other jurisdictions and by her view, therefore, we are excluded to some degree by some of the direct scrutiny that program development and curricula development are receiving in those other jurisdictions.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, today we in Manitoba, aren't an awful lot different than other provincial jurisdictions within Canada. The Minister may like in front of the TV cameras, in front of assembled people, try and convince those that, in fact, we are much different and that we do not have problems of significance. I tell her now, and I tell those who want to read the record, that Manitoba isn't an awful lot different and instead of attempting to say we are leading, why I would implore or ask the Minister to come to the realization that this province has to face up to some of the difficulties that are here; whether it's an area of student apathy; whether it's in the area of just a general lack of challenge that we present or provide for our students, particularly in high school; or whatever the outward manifestation is of what we have in place today, the reality unquestionably is that we are going to have to face up to some of the problems that now exist and attempt to find solutions for them.

Mr. Chairman, few people today understand financing of education. Last week, we spent considerable time within that area and I'm sure we can understand why. It's tremendously detailed. It's just difficult to understand. I just hope and pray that school administrators and elected trustees have a strong understanding of how education, through the various formulas, is funded within this province.

However, in spite of that, we are led to believe by the Minister's own internal survey and policy review conducted by her planning branch last year, that in spite of the fact that Manitobans do not understand an awful lot about the financing of education, nevertheless, they do believe that extra funding in large measure will not correct the problems, that they proceed, at least, in viewing the system in place today.

And I submit that the vast majority believe that the infrastructure; the public school system; the sound, is the proper vehicle to bring forward quality education. I strongly believe that the teaching profession is fully adequate, fully competent, to deliver quality education also. So, Mr. Chairman, the infrastructure, the public school system, the democratic system of electing trustees, is not under attack. But what is under attack, Mr. Chairman — (Interjection) — I would love to engage in debate with the Minister of Agriculture, but I'll save that for another time.

Mr. Chairman, however, the quality shortcomings are under attack and people are looking for something to blame that upon. So if the infrastructure isn't to blame, and if the level of funding isn't to blame, and I don't believe in the minds of many people today that those two are, then what isn't? Well you can see how very quickly the focus of that is directed towards programs and, of course, to curriculum content.

People have attempted to blame other things. They've attempted to look at mainstreaming, the fact that all young people aren't forced to stay in school but there's no reason why they shouldn't up to a certain age. Of course, we see the myriad of courses and electives and streams and that therefore lends some to believe that there's a deluding of the emphasis on the basic courses.

Of course within the schools there's the perception that most curricula today, the advents of new curricula, is attempting to address sensitive social issues of our times, and of course the greater demands is on the public school system to address all the issues, mostly social, of the day. When people see all these matters and regardless of what side of the fence they are or they aren't, Mr. Chairman, those who want to and honestly believe that there are problems within the public school system, direct the focus of that attention towards programs and curricula.

Like I said before, Mr. Chairman, people do not understand financing but they can recall - at least in their minds - the rigorous subject material they once covered as students. I have just sort of reviewed last year's Estimates, debates, and the Minister would like to point out it's the older people who were in schools 40 or 50 years ago - well, maybe not that long - 30 years ago who would say that we've got the greatest difficulty in our public school system today.

But I draw out conclusions from our own internal report that, in fact, just the opposite is the case. Those people who have just most recently graduated, and secondly, those individuals who have the highest level of education - and I'm talking about post-secondary educations - are the ones on average, they're the most critical of the public school system today.

Mr. Chairman, those statistics weren't developed in my mind; they come out of the Minister's own department. So let's understand that those people who are critical aren't those who remember a long gone day when there was strict emphasis on the core material. Mr. Chairman, these people who are very concerned, they're not professional educators or curriculum consultants, but no one will deny their views on course content or the supposed psychological training that is at work on the minds of their children. Somebody may try and tell them they don't understand financing, but nobody is going to tell the parents today who are

really interested in the public school system, nobody is going to tell them that they should have a better understanding of curriculum content, because they won't buy it.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that once professional educators cross the barrier into dealing with values and methods of psychological training, the curriculum development area course and program becomes a wide open subject and of course it allows everybody, regardless of their role or position in life, an opportunity to become involved in the debate.

In my view that is where we are today. Parents feel excluded from curriculum development and yet I couldn't help remembering the Minister's opening remarks when she said that - and she was talking about the successes of the department over the last year - and she said co-operation, this is one of the successes that her department had co-operated with school divisions in curriculum development. And she talked about joint programs and maybe she will have an opportunity to expand upon those because the feeling today, generally, is that the public and parents are being excluded from the whole area of program development.

I know there are individual parents who have been handpicked to be involved in curriculum development, but that isn't the reaction, the feeling, within the larger public today.

Mr. Chairman, parents still remain responsible for their children and what their children are taught and that will never change. Attempts to introduce subjective material within core curricula, so as to in a sense treat the public school system as a surrogate parent in place of natural or legal parents who have supposedly abdicated their responsibility, attempts to introduce such material will not be allowed without very close scrutiny and review, and I dare say to some degree without public outcry.

Attempts to exclude those parents who are concerned, or attempts to force those families to compromise their values in support of those children who come from less fortunate family situations, will not be tolerated to a large degree without major challenges to the public school system.

The Minister has turned her faith completely over to her consultants, to her Curriculum Branch and to those who she feels will lead her in the proper direction. In my view she has made major mistakes; she has abdicated her responsibility to some degree in not looking more directly at some of the processes at place in the material that is being developed.

I submit that she is hurting, through those actions, the public school system, and in doing so she has to be cognizant of the fact that she cannot shut out large percentages of parents who demand that they have a lot to say with respect to their children's own education.

Mr. Chairman, most of the quality criticisms today are directed towards curriculum content and program as well, and I can't help but repeat that because there is a growing sense of frustration out in the community; and again most people feel they have the right to direct criticism, if they have any, toward that area.

So, Sir, it is not my intent to cross-examine the staff who find themselves within this area of the Estimates, but I think we have to be very cognizant of the fact that today people are venting so much of their frustrations, with respect to quality of education, and

they're directing it towards curriculum in general. Nothing says it more and it was the reason that I posed some of the questions that I did to the Minister in Question Period today with respect to the changes within program development in the Province of Alberta. The Minister would like to say that we're isolated from that type of situation; that in fact the critical path that we have chosen to follow in this province is significantly different. Well, I grant the Minister that there are differences.

Mr. Chairman, one cannot help but recognize when six out of ten provinces in Canada today, there are departmentalized exams. One can't help but realize that this whole area of values and ethics that the Minister would like to sweep under the carpet to some degree, because of the experience we've had in this province over the last year-and-a-half with regard to the optional family life and sex education unit.

Just an aside, if I could digress for a second, Mr. Chairman, hopefully, the Minister will tell me specifically where that course is today because, if she doesn't, I'll just have to draw it out of her.

Mr. Chairman, when we look around us, and we realize that in so many of the subject materials there is a growing concern with respect to how values are treated and to what degree ethic studies should become involved, and whether absolutes have a place. Mr. Chairman, I submit that the Minister and the Department of Education today can no longer continue to try and walk such a fine line. They'll sway back and forth so much that they'll offend everybody. The time has come when they have to take some type of stand within this whole area.

So, Mr. Chairman, those are my opening remarks. The Minister may wish to respond to them. If not, I have a series of questions.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, I certainly wish to respond to them, Mr. Chairman, because the Education critic made a lot of points and a lot of points about some very important matters. I think it's important that I deal with some of the things he said and either explain or put my position on record.

I guess my overall reaction is one of disappointment. I say that, recognizing that the job of the critic is to be as critical as he wants to be and to raise the questions and to raise criticisms that are coming from both their party and the public at large, and that's fair ball. But when they are raised in such a way that there are major statements made about the education system that are not accurate, that are not true, that are not supported by information or facts, a lot of which is created by misinformation and misunderstanding in the communities, I think it's unfortunate that it is being perpetrated and expanded and accepted by the education critic who, I think, has a role to play beyond just mouthing inaccuracies and misinterpretation of curriculum that may be out there. I think, in this case, that's a lot of what is happening.

I guess, first of all, I want to say that there is always criticism of the education system. It's funny, you can look at quotes that go back 50, 60 years, and you can read a quote and honestly you could read it and say, what do you think about this, it just sounds like a quote that would be made today, because education is a

subject that a lot of people take an interest in - he's quite right - particularly parents, because the well-being of their children is their most important concern. In terms of that well-being, their health and their safety and their education are their top priorities. So nobody needs to wonder why parents are critical or are interested or concerned about the education system; they always have been, and they always be.

There always is a reasonable level of misinformation or misunderstanding and concern raised about the education system. That's one of the reasons why I had the survey done. I mean, I think it's important for us to keep reminding ourselves and finding out what information and knowledge is out there, and what level of support and concern is there, and in what areas that concern is. So the purpose of the information surveys and studies that we did was to get information that I could share with people in the education system that would help us improve the education system. It wasn't just to wring our hands and say isn't this terrible, or to say isn't this wonderful; it was so we could see where the problems lay and try to do what we could to improve in those areas.

I think one of the things, I guess, that disappoints me the most is that, although he tries to separate very hard where the problem lies, and he says there isn't any problem with the internal structure, and there isn't any problem with the quality of teachers, and the system we've got where we've got elected trustees and all of that is okay, but we've got this terrible problem with education that deals with content and with curriculum that has to be addressed and that is a growing concern on behalf of the public. Well I don't know who he thinks does this, because I don't do it and my curriculum staff that's here or out in the field does not do it in isolation.

The process that we've developed has been one that has been in place since the '70s and '80s through a number of different governments of different stripes, you might say. So it isn't one that has been designed by this government, it's one that was in in the '70s and '80s when they were in place.

What about the good things that are happening? Our curriculum development has produced curriculums that are models across the country. He never talks about the programs that are recognized as top-quality programs across the country, where they are copying, not only our curriculum and our programs, but our procedures. We have a procedure that is unparalleled - I believe that - in developing curriculum, where we have committees that are made up of teachers in the field, a wide-ranging group of specialists and people in the field, where we spend anywhere from one year to two years developing the curriculum. Curriculum has to be initially generated and developed by teachers, professional teachers who have the knowledge and understanding of curriculum development. But in doing so, they get a lot of feedback and information and advice from all other jurisdictions, including parents. So, initially, it has to be designed by teachers.

So we have a program where we have curriculum committees that have a broad range of teachers and specialists on them that then put it out into the field. They spend about two years designing a program; a lot of thought and attention goes into it. We put it out into the field and field test it, and that means it's available for all teachers in the province to examine

and react to and give their feedback to. After we field test it, we make changes related to the information that comes to us from the field which comes from superintendents, and principals, and teachers, and school trustees. Then we make modifications and changes, and then we pilot it. We pilot our programs for two years, and sometimes three years. When it's been piloted it is subject to change as we go through the experience of implementing a program - which is different from that of writing it - and then it goes out into the field and even after that we will need changes.

So he is trying to sort of suggest that we've got a good system out there with trustees and infrastructure, and that the problem is - and I don't know what he thinks it is - because our whole system is so integrated that that infrastructure that he talks about is the one that is responsible for and that carries out the curriculum development process, the development of it, the implementation of it, and the changing of it.

So when he makes these, in many cases, quite wild accusations and, I think, unsubstantiated, he's trying to hit me, that's what he's trying to do, he is trying to say we've got a problem with the Minister of Education. We've got a good system there, but we've got this terrible problem that she is trying to do some of these funny things, psychological things and no values in the system and no morals in the system, but we've got a good system out there if it weren't for her.

I tell you that, when he makes those allegations, and there is growing concern out in the field of education by teachers and people that carry the responsibility for this, that he would like to make them just to me, but he makes them to the whole system. He makes them to the whole curriculum development process, all the people, to the professionals and the teachers in the field, because he's suggesting that they're doing these things, that they're teaching these things, that they're in the curriculum and that they're being carried out. He is also suggesting that the school trustees and the board that is responsible for the programs that go on in their school divisions are accepting these.

So he cannot have the luxury or the privilege, I guess, of just isolating me and making these accusations and saying that we've got a problem with the Minister of Education and what she's implementing, because the whole education system knows that the charges that he's making, that the allegations and what he's saying about our system is being said about all of us, everybody that shares responsibility. It is in the laps of the principals, the superintendents, the school trustees and, particularly, the teachers.

So I wanted to make that point, that he is talking about a system that can do with some improvement, that has some faults, but it's been designed over a long period of time and served a number of governments well, and in many cases truly is recognized as a model for curriculum development, and some of our curriculum is being recognized as some of the best curriculum in the country. Our social studies, our science, our math and our language arts are models of excellence, and recognized as such across the country.

He made a number of other major points. One was related to the family. I guess one of the points I would like to make is I don't know where he is getting the information because, although there has been some

concern about curriculum and about the question of behaviour modifications and values clarification and psychological training, that is coming from a small group of people who are, by and large in a lot of cases, making their concerns voiced about curriculum that isn't ours. When we check the material and we check the curriculum and the things that are said, we find that they are talking about somebody else's curriculum, somebody else's studies, somebody else's information. A lot of the problem is that it is not relating. They are raising alarm and concern, but it is not about our curriculum in a lot of cases.

When the curriculum people and the staff go out into the field and meet with the families and meet with the parents and show them and let them know exactly what we have in our Manitoba curriculum, the concerns and the fears are greatly reduced if not eliminated completely after that. What is needed in this case, when we are looking at the problems we have and the things we need to do, is accurate information and is talking about what exists in our programs.

He is smiling, because I know he is going to point to some things he has in our programs that he thinks are going to make his point. But I am suggesting to the member that a lot of the concerns that are raised out there are not related to our curriculum and are related to misunderstanding and misinformation. It's very important that none of us tie into that, because we don't want the parents and the public unnecessarily concerned about things that do not exist.

We have never moved away from the family. I mean the suggestion that we are taking over the role of the family in our curriculum, it doesn't matter whether it's in health or family life or any of the other ones that deal with this, we have always said that the family is the first teacher and that the school is there to support. We have always said that the family has information about that child that the school must listen to, must pay attention to and must include in their handling of that child. We have always said that the values and the attitudes of the parents and of individual communities must be respected, because it varies from parent and family to family, parent group to parent group, and from community to community.

While we have broad-base values that we believe are acceptable to all, we must be prepared to accept that in different communities they may have some different standards and values that the school system should never interfere with, should always respect and should always build in, and we require that. Feedback, information and communication between the home and the school is an integral part of our curriculum and our programs where we are developing them.

I am going to go on record now, although I know we'll discuss this in more detail, as saying that we are not building in psychological training. We are not using values clarification. The concerns in those things that are being raised are not built into our program and we are not using them, nor would I accept them nor tolerate them, nor do I believe would the school trustees in the province and nor would the teachers do it. We use standard, accepted, traditional teaching practices and methods that have been designed over a long period of time.

We also recognize that in our teachers they have a lot of ability to know how to use material. This is one

of the other problems is that we are looking at material and, in some cases, totally disassociating it from the professional and the trained teacher to know how to use that material properly. There has to be some respect and some recognition given to the ability and the competence of our teachers, because I believe they are very able and very competent to handle material and to handle it wisely.

When we are talking about the concerns of youth - I have talked a lot about that - we do have kids that are apathetic, kids that are feeling very hopeless and very little hope. It's for a lot of reasons. One of the big reasons really is related to unemployment. I think that the insecurity of the future, when you are talking about our youth of today, it's not so much their education program as it is their concern of taking their education and turning it into employment for the future. That is one of their main concerns.

Of course, we know one of the other big concerns that is affecting our young people greatly today is a feeling of hopelessness related to the nuclear war, and its effect on their perception that they are not sure that they are going to live out full lives and have careers and raise families.

So the reason for apathy and concern is very complicated and certainly can't all be dumped on their feeling about the quality of their education system. There is much more to it than that. I would suggest that unemployment and job opportunity is one of their big insecurities and big concerns.

But he doesn't talk about the good students. I have really yet to hear him say anything very good about the system, about the students, about the quality of education. I mean, by and large, he seems to be willing to pick up almost any negative statement that comes from anywhere, whether it's another province or people spouting information about other documents that aren't ours, and pass them on as if they are fact.

What about the fact that we all know that our best students in schools today are better than our best students 10 or 15 years ago? Our best students are better than they were. What about the fact that we have students who are dealing in subject areas and advanced subject areas that we didn't even consider? The information and the quality of the programs has expanded tremendously to keep pace with changing information and changing facts. These students are absorbing all that we used to absorb and tons of other knowledge and information besides. In fact, we know that the information that is available is so tremendous that we can't even hope to teach our children all of the data and information. So we have to teach them more about how to learn than just stuff them full of information to regurgitate on a test, because they are going to have to keep learning all their lives and they are going to have to keep changing their knowledge and their information.

He makes big statements about growing frustration and concerns about psychological training, and I get back to the point that I made. I think it is important to talk about where this is coming from and how widespread it is, because I don't believe it is widespread. I don't believe that large numbers of the public believe that, feel that, or have those concerns, although they may be generated by misinformation and inaccurate information being presented to them.

In terms of parents' input to education, I think there are a number of ways that it should be done. The first one, the clearest one should be Home and School or community school associations; it doesn't matter what you want to call them. I have always encouraged those to the degree that I held public workshops on public involvement in education across this province. The first time ever the subject had been raised where professional development money had been used to deal with the issue of public involvement in education had the representatives from the communities and schools boards and from administration and teachers in every province, I think in every school division, practically every school division across the province, dealing with the issue of how to improve communication and participation of parents in major decisions about their child's education.

And I know as a result of that meeting and those workshops that there has been changed procedures. I've heard from a number of school divisions that said they changed their procedures because they didn't realize until they went through those meetings that they were out of touch, and they didn't have a system set up where parents could really get information and participate.

Our curriculum documents are all public and there's nothing that we are trying to hide. I just wish that more of the comment on curriculum would deal with our curriculum and not everybody else's.

We have representation, for the first time we brought it in, on the curriculum council and the curriculum committees. There was never any parent involvement or parent representation on that when you were in office, you know. You weren't holding public workshops on public involvement in education. You weren't doing any of the number of things that we've done to try and address the problem; and certainly the big one is elected trustees.

I mean the whole basis of having a two-tiered system, where the province has some responsibility and the local school division has the other, is that school trustees are elected from the community, by the community, to represent them. They don't have to be a parent - that's not one of the requirements - but large numbers of them are and it is up to the community to decide who can best represent them; and if they feel that it is somebody who doesn't have a child in the schools, well, that is their decision.

But to suggest that - I mean those clearly are the main fronts for getting parental involvement and communication - and while we can do some of it at the provincial level, the school, the home and school, and the school trustees through the school board are clearly the front line, I think, action for parental involvement in participation.

Just let me have one minute to see if I have covered all the major points. Oh, he was trying to suggest that I am blindly talking about a perfect system as if I, you know, blindly going ahead and saying we've got a perfect system and not listening to any criticism. The fact is I have raised more of the problems publicly, and the concerns and the issues about education in my speeches and in my discussions and in terms of bringing in programs, I raise more issues about what our problems are than anybody else that I have ever known.

I never talk about a program that's coming in without dealing with the issue of what the problem is, why it's

there, why we're making the change. I certainly don't blindly believe that we've got a perfect system, not at all. In fact, we wouldn't have made the amount of change and the amount of changes in program, in structure, in funding, in policy, in every level had we believed we have a perfect system. I don't mind admitting the problems and I don't mind saying that we're doing something about some of them and we've got others that we need to address, but I sure hate to hear the suggestion that we've got a system that doesn't recognize the good things that are being done.

So when I talk about what we're doing that's good in curriculum, I'm not going to say that we don't have any problems or we don't have any things we have to improve. But I sure would like the public and the education critic, particularly, who has a responsibility not unlike mine in talking publicly about the education issues and concerns, to recognize the improvements, the benefits, the good things, the good curriculum, the good procedures that we have, so he isn't trying to undermine and undercut and slam the entire educational system when he's trying to get at me, because that's what he's doing.

I think that probably covers both of our initial remarks and I guess I would just like to sum up by saying that I know the Member for Morris wants to talk about curriculum and we're quite happy to do that. I hope that in doing so he'll ask questions for information and not make general statements that are coming from a member of the public, that is, a general statement that is not supported, that is very negative, and bring it forward as if it is the case.

I think that when we can put forward how our programs are developed, the procedures we use, the content and the policies and the programs that we have, I think we will stand the light of day both in this Chamber and with the parents and the public at large.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I am happy to see that the Minister has risen to the challenge and has laid on the record some of her specific comments and certainly some of her rebuttals to the points I have made.

The Minister in her last statement says that she hopes that I am just not taking the views that may have been expressed to me by a very small segment of society and use this as a forum to push forward those views. Mr. Chairman, let me say categorically to the Minister, I would not do that. When I make a statement for the record, of course, I have to do so and realizing that it's my statement, and I don't speak for anybody but myself. Impressions gained, though, are gained over my specific circumstances and my experiences and I stand totally responsible for those statements that I make.

So if the Minister feels that I am going to use my position as an official critic to be used as a mouthpiece for individuals or groups in our community, who may have some specific concerns, which the Minister feels are very much in the minority, well, she can rest assured that I will not be using my position in that way.

Nevertheless, if those concerns that I see within the community, the larger community, I don't care if they're in insignificant fashion or in large or small proportion, if I feel that they are very important and should be brought up at this time, I will do so.

The Minister should realize that in spite of her wealth of experience in education over the years that I don't consider her to be the expert, the final authority within the area of education as much as she would wish that all Manitobans would consider her as such; the point is, Mr. Chairman, I will not.

The Minister goes on and she attacks me for mouthing misinterpretations - I think those were her words - and she says that I am fully critical of the curriculum development process. Mr. Chairman, I didn't say I was critical of the process; I didn't even come close to saying that. What I said was this, that people when they have concerns with the quality of education that is afforded by the public school system in this province, the area that they direct and focus that criticism is into the area of curriculum. That was the comment that I made.

I can't quarrel with the process, Mr. Chairman, the basic process of field testing and piloting and trying to, over the last few years - and I'll give the Minister her due credit - reach out to a greater share and to a greater array of our community, to have them involved in that process, I am not critical of that. So let her not put words in my mouth and say that I, and therefore a spokesman of the Conservative Party, is saying that the processes that we have to develop curriculum within this province are wrong, or incorrect, or insufficient.

So, Mr. Chairman, I react when the Minister attempts to take out of context some of the things I have to say. She says that I am trying to separate her away from the department in the whole area of curriculum development; there's partial truth to that. Yes, I am, Mr. Chairman, and the Minister says I can't do that. She says that if I run her down or if I'm the least bit critical of development, then I'm running down the trustees and I'm running down the staff in curriculum development and I'm running down every aspect of education within this province.

Well, that's nonsense, Mr. Chairman. All I'm saying is that when the Minister of Education releases a social studies curriculum and it says, approved by the Minister of Education, then there are two or three things that are incumbent. No. 1, that she has to have read the material. Secondly, that in spite of the processes that are in place to develop it, which are basically for the most part sound, that in spite of that she has to take responsibility for the methods of teaching our children that are in place.

Some say, Mr. Chairman, that there is major creeping in of social issues of the day that have no place within the curriculum. Some say that there is a major developing area of community standards that are under attack, not specifically in the sense that they are wrong or they are right, but the fact that they call into question their validity.

So, Mr. Chairman, the Minister says, you attack me, you attack the whole process. What I am trying to say is, as the highest educational authority in this province, she has to then put her stamp of approval, for instance, on the curriculum that says that facts, historical facts, will be given low weight. They'll be treated as minute building blocks. For instance, that Canada's contribution to the Second World War effort be treated as optional material. For instance, that the greatest threat to Canada's unity in years to come, comes from the United States.

All I'm saying is, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister of Education is saying that I can't criticize her because

I see that within the curriculum, then who do I criticize? Mr. Chairman, it's the Minister's name that's on the cover page saying that she has approved it. It is not the Curriculum Branch and it isn't those individuals who have given their time to try to develop a curriculum, it's the Minister of Education.

So let's understand our roles here and let the Minister of Education understand hers when she aspired to that lofty position of being the Minister of Education. Mr. Chairman, with it comes some major responsibilities. The old saying, "it's lonely at the top" has special significance, it means you have to take on special responsibilities and be prepared to accept the fall-out, political or otherwise, that comes from making those types of decisions.

So, Mr. Chairman, let not the Minister be so sensitive. She says I am trying to attack her. I could care less about the Minister of Education or the NDP Government or for that matter the Department of Education. My greater concern is the quality of education that is afforded to the children of this province, Mr. Chairman, and that's my only concern.

For the Minister to say that I am making these wild accusations, well, Mr. Chairman, nothing could be further from the truth. I say this Minister, as I indicated in my opening remarks, is tired; she's isolating herself from day to day in a greater way from the broad perception by the public and how the public views education today. She can surround herself with all the qualified professional people that she wishes, but today there is a much larger majority who are calling into question where curriculum is headed and to what degree social change is going to be included within various core subject materials.

The Minister can say that I am speaking for a very narrow minority. She can say anything she wants. But the point is, Mr. Chairman, when the Premier of Alberta says - and this is the Premier of Alberta - that he does not view the current curriculum as challenging enough and suggested it was time to recapture the goals of the systems from "the experts."

Mr. Chairman, I haven't come here to put down anybody, but the reality is, if the Minister continues to surround herself and her policy development that comes forward from the experts, then she is doing a disservice to education and I daresay more than that, she is indirectly contributing towards a growing outcry that will continue to augment every passing year.

So, Mr. Chairman, let's be totally candid as to where we stand. The Minister talks about her curriculum department. She says they have procedures that are unparalleled. She says that they have developed models of excellence and they have developed process models for curriculum that are used in jurisdictions outside of the province. I don't deny that. The Minister is totally missing the point that I am trying to make. She should not confuse that with the basic point that she is ultimately responsible for safeguarding, first of all, the whole area of education from all the pressures that are being exposed upon it by her colleagues and other Ministers, firstly.

And secondly, within the area of curriculum content, once you begin to move into the very sensitive areas of social reform and attempt to say what is right and what is wrong or even to attempt to guide young children, no older than eight or nine years in some

cases - and I'll develop that once we move on - to an area of critical thinking which puts into challenge some of the thoughts that they have been given in their own homes, Mr. Chairman, I say the Minister of Education is providing no service of major educational enhancement, in my view at least, to the system as it exists in this province.

The Minister says that curriculum development, or the system in place, program development was never intended to move away from the family and she says we will not do that. Well, Mr. Chairman, I hope she sincerely believes that, because I have some nagging concerns that maybe she, or her department, has not been as vigilant as they might otherwise have been, or should have been.

The Minister defends the system. She says that psychological training and value clarification and all that isn't taught. Mr. Chairman, I don't have a great training in psychology; I don't know if I would even recognize it if I saw it, but I ask the Minister if she would. I bet she doesn't, Mr. Chairman.

The Minister suggests I don't talk about the good students. Well, Mr. Chairman, the good students come through any type of system, because the good students are there to learn, and what isn't there they'll go out and supplement. It has been that way from Day One, and it always will be that way. So, Mr. Chairman, I don't applaud the good students, not that I'm not as proud of their feats as the Minister, but the system is in place for the broad average; those are the people for whom I'm concerned.

I'll move in later on when we want to talk about the broad average or the good students, Mr. Chairman. The good students, I daresay, a larger majority of them, academically good students, end up at university. Yet, the 1984 Report of the Presidential Task Force on an academic plan for the University of Manitoba, very interesting table at the back, it shows that in 1981-82, Mr. Chairman, out of the 1,800 students surveyed, 555 were given a Grade 12 standing, out of high school, of an A. Mr. Chairman, do you know how many of those 555 reached an A standing in university, first year? Forty-four. So, Mr. Chairman, when the Minister says that I don't compliment the good student, firstly, I recognized, in a general sense, the good student will always do well; but, secondly, who is the good student by her definition?

Mr. Chairman, I end my comments - the Minister says I pass on every negative I hear. Well, Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about the quality of education, and I think it's incumbent upon the Minister, when she talks about how she has addressed some of the negative aspects, to talk about more than the fact that education should have a higher rank amongst our citizenry if there are extra dollars to be spent, because that's what she has been saying on the platform. She's also been saying that Manitobans should have a higher regard for the public school system. She's been saying that on the platform. Indeed, she went on further to say that we have to devise ways so that our public understand what a good job we are doing. If that's what the Minister is saying, or is using as examples, as to pointing out some of the deficiencies, Mr. Chairman, I say her technique is as one-sided as she says mine is.

So, Mr. Chairman, those are my opening remarks. Again, I give the Minister credit, yes, she has supported

the Home and School Associations with some resources, she has attempted to reach out in some significant fashion to bring more community input. I acknowledge that, but she cannot back away from her responsibility as the Minister in the whole area of curriculum development.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I'm not sure about the procedure. I think this might be a little bit unusual where we've ended up having what basically is two opening statements. We've had an opening statement from the Education critic, and then a statement in response from the Minister, and then a response to the response from the critic. Usually, I think after two opening statements, they go right into questions. Since the Member for Morris has made a second statement, I feel that I want to respond, not at great length, but a bit to some of the points that he made.

I think the first point is the question of final authority and her responsibility as Minister of Education. I have never, either said that I was the only authority or the final authority, nor have I ever been reluctant to accept the responsibility that is mine, because it is a great deal of responsibility since most of us in this Chamber and in the public mind believe that Education is one of the most important things that can be put in the hands of people who are elected to do the job. So I don't take it lightly, and never have. I have always tried to accept all of the responsibility that is mine as Minister of Education, and it is a considerable amount of responsibility.

However, the point I was trying to make is that, although I don't mind the criticism of me or of my policies or my statements or my beliefs or my attitudes or my programs or my values, that's certainly what he's there for, I was simply making the point that, in putting them the way he is putting them and getting at really what is the substance of our education system, the curriculum, he cannot separate and have his criticism only come to me. I wasn't saying I wasn't responsible or I wasn't taking my responsibility but, because the whole system is built on a co-operative model where it is done by all of those people that I mentioned before, the points that he raises about the things that are in it that he doesn't like, or that he has some concerns about or about the process or whatever they are, are directed at all of us, at everybody who shares responsibility in the system.

I wasn't saying that to get away from my responsibility. I was saying that to let him know that he can't separate the statements that he makes about the education system and just direct them at me, because the people out there in the field know he's directing it at all of them. There is a growing sort of concern over what is being said about our education system, at it's teachers and the people that share responsibility.

He uses the words "a growing," about some say; there is a growing number of people who say that social issues of the day, to what degree should social change be included in our education system. But I haven't heard him say who they are. He keeps saying some are saying; some say this and some are concerned about that. But who are some; who are some people; who are they; how many are there; who are they; are they credible; what kind of a group are they; who are some; how

many are they; where is he getting the information from; where is the concern coming from? Let's hear where it's coming from.

The special interest groups. He talked about my responsibility to balance, and that's why I raised the questions about who are they? Who are "some people"? How many are there and where did they come from, and what are they saying? What is it based on? Because my job, and one of the toughest parts of my job, is to provide the balance between growing pressures and special interest groups on a lot of sides of a lot of the issues in Education, and that is becoming the toughest job.

I can remember saying, once, can't I have a clean issue in education, isn't there one that you can make a decision on that there isn't a body on the extreme right or a body on the extreme left that is concerned about what you're doing? There are so many groups, and these groups are special interest groups. That's one of the things that has to be remembered. They often have a narrow focus; they often have an agenda that is a narrow agenda for their own purposes. I never decided that, I say they can do that; that's their right. But it is my responsibility to make judgments between those special interest groups and to provide the balance, so we are not moving the system to either what might be, in some cases, the vocal minority.

We shouldn't suggest that the screams and hollers are the majority of the people of Manitoba. What we know is that those who are opposed are often very vocal, and those who are supportive are often very quiet. So what you often get is a very vocal minority, standing up and speaking out as if they're speaking out on behalf of the public at large and the parents in general, and they are not. So you have to be very careful, not just to bend, which is something he was suggesting I shouldn't do. You know, bend to the wind, because a group that is a special interest group is taking a particular bend dealing with their particular agenda. So one of the big jobs is balancing and weighing those special interest groups; what they want it; why they want it; where they're coming from and what it's based on in providing the balance between them? And that's one of the very difficult jobs that any elected representative and certainly, any Minister of Education has to carry.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is right. There are many vested interest groups and it's difficult to put an assessment on them, or at least a weighting on them, as to how important they are in the general community. I don't care if you're the Minister of Education or in what position you find yourself in a political fashion, where major decisions have to be made, it's pretty difficult to make those decisions on the basis of groups with spokespeople knocking at your door and attempting to convince you to move one direction or the other. That's why political parties, and a growing number of other policy makers within the community, turn to such things as surveys and polling and the Minister did that right within her department and the Minister had the results and those results show very clearly, Mr. Chairman, a growing concern with the quality of education and a growing concern with the program within the high school. And the Minister can

shake her head and she can say, well, it's always been that way. It's been that way for years.

Mr. Chairman, the little bit of evidence that I have been able to assess over a number of years point out, in fact, that there's a growing concern - and the Minister can challenge me and say well who are they; where do they come from; and all the other? Well, I can't specify that because, Mr. Chairman, that's why we use polls and we use surveys. Her government uses them; her political party uses them; we use them, to try and gauge public feelings; to cut through if you will, Mr. Chairman, the vested interest groups who knock on our door and say they speak for a large number of people. Maybe they do; and maybe they don't; but the reality is, we just don't know.

So, Mr. Chairman, I just want to leave that final rebuttal on the record and ask the Minister specifically, what does the Minister see as goals or objectives of the Manitoba Department of Education, specific goals and objectives?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, this is a very important question and, therefore, is going to take a little bit of time to answer.

We put out in Manitoba Education in 1984, which has been very good at getting information out into the field about changes and what's happening in education, goals of learning reviewed, and I think that we were suggesting to provincial educators at the beginning of the school year that they review the provincial goals of learning and they were developed by the early years, the middle years, in the Senior High Program Review Committee during 1980 and 1982, so we have had a review very recently about the goals of education. They were endorsed by the Curriculum Policy Review Council, which is the overall body over the three curriculum committees, and then recommended to me for approval and distribution to the field.

It said here that it's a shared responsibility and that the goals of learning are provincial policy for education; that the Department of Education school division, schools, administrators and teachers share the responsibility of working together to attain them. So that is something we're letting them know, this is something that we all work on together. The responsibilities, both shared and individual, are outlined in the administrative handbook and are related to curriculum development implementation monitoring and assessment, which is the nuts and bolts and the substance of the major concern, I think, by the Member for Morris.

We indicated the underlying concepts of the goals that should be known by teachers and administrators and provide a framework for the development and implementation for newly developed curriculum; that if the goals are fully understood one can see that many concepts are applicable across subject areas, grades and levels, because we have some goals that probably can be applied in four or five different subjects, not just in one. So we are making sure they know when we're looking at goals, that although we develop individual goals for individual courses, the broad goals often apply to many of the courses that we have.

Also, I have said in this article - I guess I should have sent a copy to the Member for Morris, he probably

would have been glad to see we were dealing with all of these issues - "In addition to providing direction and structure for program implementation," that's one of the purposes of the goals, "the goals are important in providing parents in the community with an understanding of the basic direction in Manitoba Education. They say that education is a continuing lifelong process which encompasses all of the learning experiences between the individual and the physical and social environment." I'm just trying to decide what it is that I should give you in terms of information.

"The school is part of the total education process; accepts responsibility for certain specific goals that are key to the broader goals of education which, in turn, are perceived as responsibility shared with the community as a whole.

The following goal statement incorporates both categorizations, the more limited exclusive commitment as well as the shared tasks, and provides direction for the design of a curriculum to meet a wide range of social expectations. Included are statements stressing the development of the students' skills in language communications, math, science and the arts. They reflect the interrelatedness of broad aspects of the curriculum in promoting the student's growth and development as an individual and a responsible citizen. The students' increasing capacity for critical thinking and decision-making is a major focus, which is one of the points I made earlier. We cannot possibly hope to give them all the information we need. We need to give them lifelong learning skills and tools. Critical thinking and decision-making is one of the major focuses.

We have to develop the full potential of the students mentally, physically, morally, emotionally and socially. In the process of identifying the major goals, it is reasonable to begin by describing the skills which a student is expected to develop.

I'm going to summarize and go through. This is the one that I would categorize as basics. In the school program, the students should demonstrate an increasing ability to: - and this covers, I think, the basics - listen with sensitivity and discrimination; articulate ideas, thoughts and feelings with confidence; read with an increasing comprehension of the deeper levels of meaning; write about experiences, thoughts and feelings with increasing clarity and sensitivity; use mathematical concepts and arithmetic operations with understanding; use measurement in relevant situations with an understanding of the concepts involved; understand relationships involving space and shape, and develop judgment related to distance, time, force, speed and direction; understand the changing environment in terms of its parts and the patterns that characterize it as a whole; express and communicate with confidence through play, song, dance, creative movement, drama, visual arts and other means; develop oral awareness and a sensitive response to music; develop visual and tactile awareness and a sensitive response to the visual arts; make informed and rational decisions. This capacity includes increasing ability in the skills of inquiry, analysis, synthesis and evaluation. They involve gathering and organizing specific factual information, observing events, measuring properties and rates of change and classifying events, assessing information communicated by all forms of expression.

Then we have goals of critical thinking, and then we have values. So we are dealing with all of the things:

the basic subject areas, goals for critical thinking and goals that relate to behaviour and values.

In goals related to critical thinking, they are to distinguish between fact and fiction, primary and secondary sources, correlations and causation, direct statement and implied meaning; recognizing bias and prejudice; making systematic comparisons; forming and defending an opinion by using a system of logical inquiry; develop a basic understanding of his/her physical and emotional nature by recognizing and responding effectively to her or his individual strengths and weaknesses within the context of an expanding range of interests, skills and abilities; demonstrating an acceptance and understanding of bodily changes and the shifting of social relationships and emotional adjustments associated with the onset of puberty; developing habits which contribute to independent problem solving and responsible behaviour; developing positive ways to deal with peer group influence, and institutional pressure, bias and prejudice.

In terms of values - I'll touch on the major ones - under responsible behaviour: exhibit habits of safe and responsible behaviour towards self and others; exhibit habits which promote lifelong fitness, good nutrition and continuing physical activity; develop an understanding of social relationships and interact effectively with others by recognizing the interdependence of all people, people in specialized roles and people in the various roles which the individual plays as a family member, student, worker and citizen; examining and considering responsible choices related to work, society and family; develop knowledge and reasoned pride in community and in Canada and an understanding and empathy for social and cultural groups different from ones own.

Under integrity of the individual, and this is values too: make decisions based on a personal value system which recognizes both the priorities of his or her society and the integrity of the individual; prepare for a transition from school to employment and/or post-secondary education by assessing personal interest, values and capacities related to work and education; understanding the dynamics of group behaviour in a work situation; knowing that prerequisite competencies are needed for a wide range of occupations and educational programs; knowing the available resources for secondary and post-secondary education and/or preparation for work; assessing the degree of skills required for a basic knowledge of computers or application in use; assessing a variety of projections of social, technical and economic change that may affect patterns in education and work; develop the primary knowledge and basic skills needed to enter a chosen area of post-secondary education and/or a chosen area of initial employment.

Now I must say that, although we looked at these again and we have put them out to remind people what they are and to encourage discussion and examination, these goals are largely and I think maybe even totally part of the last government's goals in education, too. It's one of the points I made earlier, that the system we have in place now has been there over a long period of time. It is not only developed by top people in the field of education and experts, but has been put in place through a variety of governments that have carried out their role, but have also largely continued and

accepted both the procedures and the processes and the policies and the programs in the curriculum as not being perfect but as being pretty good.

MR. C. MANNES: Two points, Mr. Chairman. Firstly, I recognize that the directions and the genesis of many of the programs in place certainly haven't come into being just over the last three or four years. I think I have said that on other occasions. I realize the people within the whole department basically and certainly within the Curriculum Branch haven't changed in any significance.

However, I asked the Minister a very basic question, and she provided to me a very - and I'll say in-depth, but certainly a very wordy response. Mr. Chairman, I can't argue with the response that was given, but the point is that if people who were not professional educators were not "experts" were given that definition of goals and objectives for the Department of Education, they would have tuned out either reading or listening within a minute. Nothing more strengthens the argument that I provided to the Minister just a few minutes ago that it is that type of educated - and I use that word with some advisability - responses like she has provided for me do very little to calm the again growing concerns of people.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, I wonder how many trustees in the Province of Manitoba, if you asked them to do a precis on what the Minister has just delivered as the programs and goals of education, I wonder how many of them would be able to put into a clear, concise form a review of the Minister's worded response.

Mr. Chairman, that's part of the problem. I'm not talking about the response the Minister gave. But where education is today, there is a very major distinction between those who have great influence, those professional educators, those people who have influence on the Minister of Education and the rest of us who have children within the system, grandchildren within the system, but yet who, from our view, have a very specific and yet a very sincere position on education of the day.

There is a major gulf between us, and the Minister giving that type of response to a layman like myself who asks, what are the goals and objectives of education? Mr. Chairman, I consider myself an educated person, to some degree - I must be, I have a wall covered with something - so what does that say about the rest of us who are supposedly educated, gone through the public school system, through our institutions of university, and are proud of those facts, but yet are laymen; and yet can say to the Minister, well, you are preaching motherhood? Of course, who can disagree with a sentence?

My next question then, Mr. Chairman: how are those goals manifested? Furthermore, how are they assessed? How are they measured within our public school system to take all those nice sounding phrases and sentences; how are we sure that all that is being done?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, first of all, I agree with everything that the Member for Morris said. First of all, that isn't the way I would put it to members of the public. When we are talking here the Member for Morris has repeatedly made the point that he wants

to get into the curriculum and curriculum materials and find out what the department is doing and what we are saying. The questions he is asking are very professional questions; they are not questions as a parent who is asking for information about what you are doing in a way that they can understand. But I have believed that they were, and that is why we are responding in that way - questions directed toward, in some cases, the integrity and, in many cases, the professional ability and direction of the Department of Education, the Minister, and the professionals that are working in the system. So we have responded in a professional way, I suppose, but I don't disagree with the points that he made.

First of all, if I were going to explain those in simple terms I would say that our goal has been that we want our children to develop communication skills, we want them to develop good math skills, development of scientific thinking, the development of aesthetic values that you would consider to be art and music, the development of understanding, appreciation of others, the importance of citizenship, the development of lifelong learning skills and abilities, and the development of good health habits and lifestyle and behaviour. That's the way that those things would be summarized in understandable words. I wanted him to know that they are built in in a more formal way and in a more detailed way so he could see what the curriculum is based on.

But, to his point about the public, first of all, I have often said - and I don't know if that's the speech that he is quoting from but I think it may be, that good speech of mine that he likes - I have said that the education system has to stop. We have developed a language of our own, and it has words and phrases that are understood within the education system that are not understood by the public at large. We tend to use them when we are talking to parents, and I've said we have to stop that because we have to put it in simple terms that they can understand and not try and overwhelm them or frighten them off by speaking with language that they don't understand.

The policies that we have on a provincial level are taken by the school divisions, and I think that most - and I don't know if I can say all - of the school divisions in the provinces have their own policies and their own policy books, and what they do is take the broad provincial goals - at that level I think they are in clearer terms - and put them into policy statements for their school division that are carried out through the overall provincial policies. Those policies should be shared with the community and with the parents, and should be understood, and should be put in lay language. So when I am talking to the public, I am talking to a group of parents, or a school parents meeting, so should my language, so should my communication be put in clear, simple language that they can understand. But when you are raising basic questions, when you are raising questions about either professional ability or capability or sort of basic questions about our curriculum, how it's done, and we cannot answer in any other than this Chamber, and answer in a professional and detailed way.

In terms of assessment, we then carry out the assessments on a subject-by-subject basis, although I think that school divisions and ourselves should review our policies and our goals every once in a while, and

we did in 1980, 1982. I don't know when the last major review was undertaken before then, how long they were in place, because they don't all continue to suit, or they don't all continue to meet the times. When they don't, we should change them because there is nothing worse than goals that aren't suitable any more, or that aren't accepted. So a lot of the assessment is done through the assessment of the curriculum which carries out the policies, because I related a lot of the goals to the development of curriculum where it is carried out in all of the curriculum.

I can give him the information on which subjects and when, but basically the answer is the assessment is done through, I guess a number of things, communication directly with the parents, either by me or by the school trustees or teachers; it's done through course assessment; and it's done through the policy examination and goal examination between the province and the school divisions.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, I accept the Minister's answer. She has provided the long answer to my question and also the short one and I thank her for so doing. Nevertheless, the Minister went on to say, well it's also part of the responsibility of trustees or school divisions to try and develop for their constituents also a listing of objectives and goals within their area, and I don't disagree with that, Mr. Chairman. But put yourself, like I am trying to after the Minister has responded, into the position of being the school trustee within a certain school division, and if I was asked to write that policy statement as to what I would hope that our school division could do in support of all the children that are educated within that division, I would say, yes, on average, I would like to send through school, or have graduate out of this school division, firstly, the greatest number of students possible.

If I could digress for a second, the Minister in other comments has indicated to me her great pride in the fact that over the last few years we have had such a high number of people graduating - and I grant her that that certainly should be a goal.

Secondly, the Minister, and I suppose myself and indeed yourself, Mr. Chairman, if you were a trustee, would want to send out to the world beyond high school, whether that is the workplace or whether it's another institution of higher learning, we want to send out the most rounded, educated person possible, a person, yes, that has some ability to critically analyze a situation, a person who is comfortable with themselves and their surroundings, and a person who can analyze various situations. But I would also, Mr. Chairman, want to challenge the vast majority of students to the highest degree possible, because these are very formative years, in my view, the most formative.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, I submit that in high school today through the process of mainstreaming and through the process of trying to allow every student to sort of set their course or whatever reason, today students are not being challenged. Maybe that's why apathy - and we'll move into this a little later - why I wanted and it comes, it's in an article in the October, 1984, "Manitoba Teacher," headed "Wanted, curriculum to combat student apathy."

So, Mr. Chairman, all of a sudden though if you begin challenging people, that's probably going to work at

cross purposes to graduate the maximum number of students because I don't believe you can have both. That's what I am trying to draw to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, indeed I guess I'm trying to draw it to myself if I were in that position of a trustee trying to set the goals and objectives of a school division, what is the goal? To have 100 percent graduation? Or is the goal to send out, on average, the greatest number of students who have the greatest number of academic skills and other skills so that they can enhance their own performances outside of high school, whatever their chosen paths may be? And they will be able to make the greatest contribution to society.

Mr. Chairman, that's what worries me about the Minister's attitude, to some degree, and also worries me about the direction. I'll say continuing direction - if the Minister feels a little sensitive and feels like my criticism is meant directly at her and the NDP Government - so we'll say the continuing direction of saying to students, come on in; we'll try and direct you along this very broad path where you'll have a bit and a dose of everything. At the end, you will have a certificate of graduation. That is guaranteed.

So, Mr. Chairman, that's where I am coming from on this issue. I'm putting myself in the position of that trustee, and I'm trying to say well what are we going to do for the students within this school division? I don't see coming in place today, in spite of the Minister reading me the two versions of the goals and objectives, the one that the professional educators have developed which is pure motherhood which you cannot disagree with one sentence of that; and secondly her condensed version, which you can't disagree with either.

Mr. Chairman, the point is there are a number of our young people who are being failed today. They are saying so by way of the Minister's own survey and I say it's time that we come to grips with this whole question of goals and objectives, and begin to pull away from the belief that we can do everything for everybody.

That's why I asked the Minister the question with respect to assessment. How do you assess the performance when you can't even define clearly the goals, Mr. Chairman? So I intend to move into this whole area of assessment next but if the Minister would like to respond, she may feel free to do so.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, I would. It's a chance to talk about some of the things, I suppose, that are talked about a lot out in the public arena and out on platforms and may not have a chance to put your position on the table in the Chamber, and it's an important forum, too.

As usual, I certainly don't disagree with everything or even a lot of what the Member for Morris says when he indicates his concern. I think we may end up having a slight difference of opinion as to why some of the things are being done and whether or not we should be doing them or move in a substantive way to change our direction.

He quoted an MTS article on apathy of the students. I think that they also indicated and they were talking about it as a societal apathy. I mean, it's a problem of society. What we are seeing in our students is a reflection of apathy that is generated in every generation

of our society today and they were not suggesting to my recollection that this is just an education problem; it's just that we have to deal with all of those things that society is dealing with because they affect our children. But they certainly weren't suggesting that all of the apathy of students is caused by the education system, whether it's challenging students or not. We have a lot of apathy throughout our whole society and our students reflect what we do and where we are at.

In terms of not challenging our students and not getting excellence, I would have to say that every school in the Province of Manitoba has excellent students and is able to develop excellent students, even the small schools which some people think are in a very disadvantaged position; that you can only get excellence from big schools with lots of options and lots of equipment is not true. So all of the schools in the province are presently producing top quality, excellent students.

In terms of the goals, one of the basic or main goals has got to be that we try to allow every child to develop to their full potential, to their full capacity of learning, and the challenge should be there for them to rise to the top and to the best level of their capability.

But our high schools now are serving almost 100 percent of our kids. When we look at the goals, we can't have goals that are narrow and diverse, that only meet the needs of a small number of kids. When we're challenging our students, that doesn't necessarily equate with failing a larger number of kids or having a certain number of kids get As or A-plus, that's not an indicator of challenging students to their top ability. Challenging students means that we have a variety of programs that give opportunities to all of our kids, many of whom didn't have opportunities before.

We know who those kids are. They're immigrant kids; they're Native kids; they're poor kids, kids who would have had doors closed to them before, and rising to their level of achievement and ability at this point in time in their life. That doesn't predetermine their capability nor their intelligence, but just the tools that they have to do the job maybe at the time that they're in elementary or junior high or senior high school.

It means that we could have excellence. We could be challenging students to the top level of their ability, but it could not appear to be excellence in the narrow sense of the word, excellence being 80 percent of the students getting achievements in As or A-pluses or top marks; that isn't the only indicator of quality. That isn't the only indicator of excellence. That isn't the only indicator of our children being given the chance to get to their highest level of ability.

The point he raises about the broad education is a very important one. It's one that, I guess, they've always grappled with, but I think it's a tougher question now than it ever has been before. So he is raising a question that is not an unimportant question and not one that we haven't grappled with and that people in the next decade aren't going to be grappling with too. We may not have taken the same road that he might have done in the last four years under the same circumstances were he in a position to make those decisions.

I would have to say that we have made a decision to carry on a broad base of education and to try and handle the technologies, the new fields of education, particularly the technologies; and keep our children

and our students and our education system up-to-date; try and meet the other training and education things that are related to societal changes, but continue to give them a broad-based education. And I'm not sure what he's recommending when he raises the question of, can we be all things to all kids, and can we give everybody this broad-based education? Or, I think he's saying, when we give them the broad-based education, are we limiting them from achieving excellence if we directed them in a given field, or directed them more to things that maybe are more substantial - I don't know what substantial means, but just to use that point to make my point.

We have students today that may change their job three or four times in their lifetime. It's not like it was before where you went in; you got a job; you got trained and you did it for 30, or 40 or 50 years and you hoped you got a pension when you got out of it and you left. Now, even if they stay in one field, they're going to be having to go through retraining programs to keep up to pace with the changing knowledge in that field, let alone the fact that we know that a large number of them will probably be changing fields and changing skills and knowledge for what they do in their career. We have to be very careful.

The other thing is that kids don't know what they want to do. And I defy any of us that are parents in here that see our kids going through the struggle, and they start to struggle in junior high and they carry it out in senior high, and when they're graduating from senior high and they're trying to decide what to go on to - college, a skill training, a trade, academic, graduate degrees, trying to make these tough decisions that you and I would even have problems with today if we were out there . . .

A MEMBER: We all went through it.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: We all went through it. But the point that I'm making is that they often don't know, either what they want to do, nor what their potential is, or what their interests might be down the road. The more we narrow their education, the more we limit what they are given, the more we do not give them the broad base, the more doors be closed to them. The more narrow the options, then the more doors that we have closed to them.

And we know that we've got a lot of people that are being educated in our access programs, hundreds and thousands of people who are becoming the professions of today, the professionals of today - social workers, teachers, dentists, doctors, lawyers. There's no field that is not open to these people, except there were no doors open to them before and the perception was that they couldn't learn or they didn't have the ability or, for many other reasons, they didn't have the opportunity. But they're showing the education system that we better be very careful about closing doors to people by giving them limited, narrow education, and giving them one that streams them into a particular field or vocation that narrows options for them down the road.

So I would argue that what we need, more than ever today, is not a student, as we move into highly specialized skills and highly specialized technology, and

highly specialized information systems in different fields. I think the tendency might be to narrow and to start streaming kids and moving them into that field that they're going into; but I would argue that what they need more than ever, as we go into specialized technological knowledge and information-based systems, that what the people need more than ever and the students, and the workers of the future, is broad-based knowledge and information and understanding. Because the things that they're going to have to deal with, both world issues, both issues of knowledge in their field and in other fields, and understanding of the people and, as I said, other world issues, really require a very broad-based knowledge and experience.

So I would argue, if we were into a philosophical debate or argument, that while maybe we have to make some improvements in terms of the question of excellence or making sure that we define ways that kids are being pushed or challenged to meet their true potential, and they're not being lost in the wash of general education program that does not recognize excellence - which it should; or does not push and pull and help students meet it. So maybe we would have to do those things, but I would argue that continuing with the broad-based knowledge and information is the way that we should go.

One other point I want to make about goals, because the Member for Morris was talking about goals and he couldn't have understood them, and I agree with that. I will even go farther. I put them in terms that I would communicate to parents, and I think that school boards and teachers should be communicating in that kind of language. But, even saying that part of the problem is communication, I would say that the goals of education, both at the provincial level and the school division level, are not either as clearly understood or as clearly articulated as they should be. I think it's something we don't talk about enough.

I don't think we put it into simple language and say the goals are this, this is what we're doing, and talk about things in simple terms that they can understand and indicate whether they agree with and whether they think we're still useful. So I think there needs to be - and one of the things that we've been looking at and talking about - there needs to be a way of setting up a public dialogue, more of a public dialogue, maybe not leaving it to chance, but setting it up in a formal way, where there is public discussion between the province, the Department of Education, the Minister, the school trustees and the parents about what the goals are and what they think they should be, and whether or not we are in agreement with the goals that exist for the kind of society - not what we live in today, because that's not what we need the goals to address - we need the goals to address the kind of society that our kids are going to be living in in the year 2000.

So I would agree with him on the question of more clearly establishing the goals, probably more now than ever, because the Member for Morris made the point that the pressures and stresses on the education system are increasing tremendously and they are.

We have more and more demands that the education system take over more and more jobs that were being done by other groups and other institutions and other people and, in some cases, they're jobs that were being

done by the family and they're raised by the societal problems that we've been talking about. As long as those increased pressures and demands are going to be there, I think we have to do more talking about what the goals are of education, and what it is we can do within education, and get some understanding and agreement between ourselves and the parents and the public at large. Because one of the other things that we learned from our poll and the survey, is that there is no strong message, or no clear position, or no clear statement, or no clear agreement on what quality of education is. It's one of the areas, when you question in a survey, that is the fuzziest, where they seem to have the most difficulty defining what it is they think is a quality education, and what they want done, and what they think the goals should be.

So that while some of the problem may be our articulation and our communication of it and our definition in going out and talking about it more publicly, part of the problem is and part of the, sort of, conflict and pressures, and a lot of them are being placed on teachers, is that the public itself isn't clear about what it wants the education system to do. There's a lot of confusion and uncertainty about what it should do and what it should be doing, and that's something that I think we have to deal with at the same time as we're looking at the question of raising the issue and talking about the question of what the goals are and what sort of support and understanding and agreement there is between the education system and the public. I think myself that, if we put these out in plain English where people could understand them and put out the goals and principles of the education system in general and, specifically, to the specific subjects, there would be very little disagreement on them by parents if they clearly heard them and understood them.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Chairman, I acknowledged that fact earlier on. I don't see how anybody could disagree with the basic tenets that underpin the statements of the objectives and goals offered to us by the Minister.

The Minister talks about evolution and that we are in a period of change but, Mr. Chairman, it has been that way over the last 150 years, since the industrial revolution set in. There has been significant change. All every member of this House has to do is go back to their ancestry over the last two generations and ask how many of them had a close identity with the rural parts of this nation and, even more directly than that, were involved in farming? Mr. Chairman, over two generations evolution has brought us to where we are.

We have never been in a state of static over the last 100 years and although the rate of change has certainly increased, almost so much so I say to the Minister, are we really wise to plan for the year 2000? Who knows where we will be? How do we, in certainty, prepare the student of today for the rapid changes that are going to face him or her in the next 30 years of their working lives when really, we all fully admit, anybody that understands economics realizes today that the post-war industrial revolution is over. We are into a new ball game. I haven't seen it readily identified to the degree that this Minister or indeed any Minister could say with some certainty, well we have to be prepared for the workplace of the year 2000 which is only 15 years away. In all honesty, we don't know what it'll look like.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say to the Minister, let's not spend too much time preparing our young people for their lives where, out of necessity, there may be changes in lifestyles and greater mobility. I say, and I agree with her, let's prepare them in broad, educational senses so that they may be better prepared for whatever eventualities come. That was the reason I asked the question in the House today with respect to basic core curriculum subjects, Mr. Chairman, no other reason.

The Province of Alberta, 75 percent to be directed now towards the core subjects in high school. That was the reason I asked. The Minister, by her answer, seems to agree with me. Provide for the student of today a base as wide as possible, but a base and to me that means maths; it means science; it means English; and it means social studies, that's what it means, the best possible grounding in those major subjects because they've held us in good stead for generations, they will in the future. This doesn't just mean, Mr. Chairman, those who are more academically proficient that can deal with these matters a little more easily, it means every student has to be challenged within this field to the best of their ability.

Mr. Chairman, that's why we hear this, "back to the basics". Of course, that has a terrible connotation in the minds of a lot of people. That, in the minds of some, has the fundamentalists running wild again. The Minister would tell me to be wary. Maybe that's a very narrow group, people who are out to sabotage the system. Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, in Manitoba we don't need it; we've been there for years.

So I say the reason for my question today in the House was to ask the Minister if she agrees, firstly, with the thinking in other provinces, or is she just going to turn her back to them because if we agree on the fact that we have evolved to this place we have; and secondly, that the change in the future is going to be very rapid; and thirdly, you can't predict with certainty where the world is going to be in 15 years, then the best thing we can do for our students of today is give them some foundation in which they will have to deal with the same basic principles and building blocks of the world that people with more or less intelligence through the ages have had to deal with and find solutions to the problems of the day.

So, Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether I am in disagreement with the Minister or not, but I guess what I am saying is that we are to the point in time where the Minister has to ask herself two or three things. To what degree is she going to continue to allow a compromise in the area of our basic language, international in nature and indeed our official language in Manitoba today? That's English, Mr. Chairman. To what degree is she going to closely scrutinize the social studies curriculum so that no historical facts have been perjured? To what degree is the Minister going to review, watch very carefully, the introduction within the areas of family life and sex education, the challenge to our basic family and national traditions? Because, Mr. Chairman, those are our building blocks. We built a nation upon it, and the Minister can't deny that.

From that point, Mr. Chairman, to what degree are we going to change the process of assessment and evaluation so we know that our youngsters are being not only fully challenged by what the curriculum lays before them, but also challenged to the degree that

we know we have some standards that cross all school divisions, some standards that bring into our institutions of higher learning and our workplaces the students with the very best in lines of abilities, such that those abilities have been groomed and nurtured through the public school system? Mr. Chairman, these are critical questions.

The Minister talks about this high school review. She has been asked for years - indeed our Minister was asked for years - to begin to initiate it. But the difference between herself and our former Minister is it is now four years later, and the Minister pays lip service to the fact that yes, let's try and decide where it is we want to go. Yet, Mr. Chairman, nothing has been done in her four-year tenure as Minister. So they are critical questions.

All I do, Mr. Chairman, in engaging in this long debate is to show the Minister that members of this side and members of the Conservative Party of Manitoba are not out of the mainstream in thinking when it comes to education and where it is headed. Mr. Chairman, we may not be supposedly as close to the professional educators, but indeed we are very close to the trustees, and we are all parents. So, I say our position, our vantage point is extremely legitimate and, indeed, we look forward, after the results of another election coming in, to try and take the course of education in a manner that is acceptable to a larger number of people within this province.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, a few points to respond; it's an interesting discussion that I think we are both enjoying the opportunity to have.

I want to make one point clear, first of all, is that there isn't any difference of opinion about the importance of basics in education; nor is there anything that I have said, in either my speeches or policies or programs, nor as said by the Department of Education, nor this government, that suggests that we are, either moving away from basics or do not believe that they are as important as they have always been. In fact, I have said the opposite.

I have said that the basics are required, and that in order for our children to learn, for instance, they must have reading and writing language skills, that this is a basic to the basics, to even being able to learn the basics. We have English, maths, science and social studies which always have been the basics in our elementary schools. English, science, math, Canadian history and geography, North American and Canadian geography, and physical education are the basics in our high schools and have been for a long time. So when we are talking about some changing programs, we have to move into the technologies, for instance, that is something we don't have a choice about.

While it's true that we can't predict what 2000 is going to look like, we do have to try and prepare the kids for it. It's one of the things I have said, even though we may have trouble imagining it, we have to try and prepare them for it. One of the things we know, we know that we are in the middle of a technological revolution and that they are moving into a highly sophisticated technological society. What we have to prepare them for, I believe, is not just the tools and the skills to deal with the technology to use them, but

the understanding, the knowledge and the ability to know how to use them in a world for the betterment of the quality of life of people in the world and the quality of life and the existence of the world.

Technology, by itself, is not very useful if all it is used for is production and improved capacity in production and efficiency, then it will not be used properly in my mind. Its purpose is to free people up from doing those things that can be done by machines and by technology to allow them to do things that they prefer to do, and that is better for them to do, and to free them up so that we are dealing with other critical, major issues, and it should be used foremost to improve the quality of life for people. So we have to prepare our kids.

We know about a lot of the societal change, and the breakdown in the family unit still exists, and a lot of the things that have to do done deal with the consequences of breakdown of the family unit. I mean our Day Care Standards Act, and the training that we are bringing in for training people to look after children in day care is coming about, not because we were looking at another program to add on or trying to empire build, but because we recognized the responsibility, given today's society, that day care and the care of children outside of the family is a reality, and that we have some responsibility to prepare and train people and to have some adequate standards in terms of care of children.

So when he talked about the rate of change, and he said there always has been change - I was glad he said that the rate of change is increasing; it has never been as fast - the rate of change now is almost beyond, in some cases, our ability to even comprehend or keep on top and know about it all. In fact, I think that the fact that the U.N. definition of health, for instance, and I have mentioned this before, no longer is the absence of illness, but the ability to adapt to change, is an indication of how rapidly change is coming and how much change affects both the health and the life of people. That is something that we have to give our children; our children can't just be given.

So the point I want to make is that English is important, science is important, math is important; they are basics. We haven't got any system in place that they can press a button and they don't need to have basic comprehension and ability and skills in all of those areas. It's as important now as it ever was.

But there are other things they have to learn. I said before, they have to learn how to develop thinking skills and analytical skills and the ability to continue to learn and develop, to keep pace with the changing information, because we can't predict it all, we don't know it all, and we can't give it all to them.

They also have to have a better understanding of the world, its people and its issues because many of the issues facing them are not just career issues, but they are world issues that we are going to hand over to them. We have maybe avoided dealing with some of them, but I am afraid our children are not going to be able to avoid it. Some of what they get in their education system, when it deals with understanding, tolerance and respect for people of the world, and appreciation for people and other cultures that are not the same as ours, I submit to you is as important to give them today as is - and that doesn't mean it's instead of, but it's as important to give them today -

as it is important to give them math and English and writing skills because that is going to affect their quality of life and life on this earth as much as their employment opportunities. So I really don't think that we are very far apart.

The basics are important, and we have to open up and expand. We are trying to do it by keeping the balance, give them the technology and the information. We could go to the extreme, we could begin to worship at the shrine of technology and we could say, my God, this is the wave of the future, all they need to know is learn how to use the technology of the future and they will be able to manage. I submit that would be a terrible avenue for education to take. They need all of the other things - appreciation of music and art, and the world and its people, ability to analyze, to learn, to understand - along with ability to handle technology and manage it - it is just a tool, it's a sophisticated tool but it's just a tool - and the basics.

We unfortunately, or fortunately, are the people and the education system that are having all of this responsibility, and all of these demands and pressures put on us, and we just have to do the best job that we can in meeting all of them because none of them can be ignored.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, D. Scott: The Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I refer again to this article "Wanted", and I quote, "Wanted Curriculum to Combat Student Apathy." It was in the October, 1984 issue of the Manitoba Teacher written by David Turner who teaches at the Winnipeg Adult Education Centre, Winnipeg. He is a member of the Society's Curriculum Committee. I would like to quote a couple of sections from this report within that publication, Mr. Deputy Chairman.

Mr. Turner says a number of things. Firstly, he says that the Society is involved in a project designed to stimulate a review of the senior high school curriculum in Manitoba. I would ask the Minister why is it taking so long for her government to conduct this review. I mean we have talked around the subject, but I will ask her, specifically, and that's one of the questions.

But anyway, going on with respect to the article, it says that the "American experience is clearly similar to what Manitoba high school teachers are observing in their own classrooms. Reasons were offered the conference for the docility of students. Some of the reasons related directly to the curriculum. For instance, when high schools attempted to be all things to all people, offering students a vast range of course options, a certain delusion takes place. This delusion may show itself in lowered expectations of students and in the gradual development of a curriculum that has undergone few radical revisions but has suffered from many courses being added piecemeal."

He goes on to talk about one of the speakers, a Dr. O'Keefe, who spoke of, "the information overload imposed on high school students."

Then Mr. Turner says in his second last paragraph, "Patchwork curricula and information overload are directly related to student apathy. Patchwork curricula lack coherent design."

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Turner isn't talking about Alberta or the States, he's talking about Manitoba. He ends up and says, "When the Manitoba High School Review takes place, one clear objective must be to develop curricula that will reactivate the students."

Mr. Chairman, there can be no more damning inference with respect to what is happening in Manitoba by the way we brought forward curriculum changes in the public school system. I think the Minister has to, if she accepts any of the arguments put forward by Mr. Turner, realize that we have aided and abetted our own program to the degree that it is causing student apathy in our schools and with apathy, of course, comes a closed mind unable to absorb processes of education.

So, Mr. Chairman, the Minister has to tell me whether she refutes what Mr. Turner is saying, if she does; and if she doesn't, can she tell me when we can expect this curriculum review to attempt to address some of the problems as indicated within the report?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: First of all, with all due respect, I don't know who Mr. Turner is, and I'm not causing any disrespect on the points he made. I didn't read the article and I don't know who he is.

So I'm assuming that he is a teacher with both some knowledge in information and some attitudes. He has put them down in an article and they are as useful as any other article that could be written by any dozens of other educators who would say maybe some of the same things and not some of those same things at all.

I do know that what he is saying about the curriculum is not represented by the opinion of council, of the Curriculum Council, which is a broad range of representation of a wide variety of teachers from kindergarten to Grade 12 who think the absolute opposite of what Mr. Turner thinks. I think one of the quotes that he used there was a quote about the United States. It was not a quote about Canadian education, but it came so quickly. I said I don't have it here and

I haven't read it, so we'll have to go over that and see; that I think that he may make some points that are reasonable and that are good points and we would look at them. But I don't, nor should any of us, have an article written or statements made by one individual, regardless of who that individual is, and automatically bow at the shrine of whatever it is they say. Probably we would agree with some of the points that he raises and disagree with others and you would have to have the whole article and see what the points are in order to deal with them in a reasonable way.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: 5:30, committee rise.
Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

The Committee of Supply has adopted certain Resolutions, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: The Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for St. Johns, that the Report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris, that this House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Tuesday).