

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 11 May, 1982

Time — 2:00 p.m.

MR. CLERK, Jack Reeves: It is again my duty to inform the House that Mr. Speaker is unavoidably absent and would ask the Deputy Speaker to please take the Chair of the House in accordance with the Statutes.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Deputy Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Jerry T. Storie (Flin Flon): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. PHIL EYLER (River East): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report same and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for The Pas, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before we proceed with Oral Questions, if I may direct the attention of members to the gallery where we have a group of Grades 7, 8 and 9 students from Pembina Crest School under the direction of Mr. Bedoin. They are represented by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

As well, we have a group of 26 students of Grade 5 standing from the Allard Elementary School under the direction of Mr. Ron Pratt and they are represented by the Member for Kirkfield Park.

An additional 21 students of Grade 4 standing from the Margaret Scott School under the direction of Mrs. Poronkosnyk, and are represented by the Honourable Member for Burrows.

Finally, we have a group of 50 Grade 4 students from the Valley Elementary School under the direction of Mr. Klassen. These students are from the United States.

On behalf of all the members, we welcome you here today.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. STERLING LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker,

a question to the First Minister: in view of the fact that Manitoba Hydro has announced that it is making all of its computations with respect to Capital expenditure, with respect to rate charges, with respect to other future developments in that great Manitoba utility based upon a commencement of the construction of Limestone Generating Plant on the Nelson River in 1987 to be completed in 1992, could the First Minister advise the House as to when he was first informed that the construction of Limestone was going to be delayed by five years and thereby the consequences of that construction of thousands of jobs that would be created put five years down the line?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I've not been informed that Limestone would not be proceeded with until 1987. I expect that the Inter-Tie will be in place within the next few months and we'll be proceeding early.

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, while we are, of course, heartened by the comments of the First Minister, may I suggest, Mr. Speaker, if the First Minister would read the transcript of the deliberations before the Public Utilities Committee this morning he would see that the fundamental projections of Manitoba Hydro are based on a construction of Limestone taking place in 1987 and thereafter to be completed in 1992, based on of course as they said, based on the Manitoba load-growth assuming a status quo position without Alcan, without the Grid, etc. Now, is the First Minister saying that this is news to him today?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. WILSON PARASIUK (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, since we're having the Leader of the Opposition trying to read some nuances that weren't there into what took place this morning at the Public Utilities Committee, I think it's important that the public of Manitoba have a very clear idea of what Hydro was saying.

Hydro prepared those financial forecasts throughout the summer of 1981 and they were completed by November of 1981. I asked them to be reviewed. At that time they were looking at the impact of domestic load-growth with respect to future inservice state of Limestone and they said that on the basis of domestic load-growth, that Limestone wouldn't be required for inservice state until 1992, Mr. Speaker. That's not news.

The point is that we are in fact, presently negotiating the Western Inter-Tie which indeed could lead to the beginning of construction this fall of the Limestone project. We are also re-activating, Mr. Speaker, the aggressive pursuit of markets to the south of us which I think were neglected by the previous administration and we believe that those opportunities for export sales can indeed, enable Limestone to be proceeded with sooner than 1987.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, a question to the First Minister — not to his alter ego — the question to the First Minister, and it's a fundamentally important question because the Western Power Inter-Tie or Grid is one of the largest developments that could take place in this region and Manitoba would be one of the greatest beneficiaries from it, can the First Minister give an assurance to the House that the instructions that passed between the previous administration and Manitoba Hydro and the response made thereto by Manitoba Hydro in October of 1981 to begin the demothballing of the townsite next to Limestone on the Nelson River and to begin the preliminary constructions of Limestone this year, can he give the assurance that those instructions to hydro have not been countermanded by his government?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, we have another instance of the Leader of the Opposition using his selective amnesia to try and reconstruct history that didn't exist. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, there was no instruction by that former government to Hydro to begin construction. Now we have him some few months later getting up and saying, "I made those instructions." Mr. Speaker, that is not the truth. Those instructions were not given. The instructions were made for Hydro to begin to do the work that would enable them to be in a position to restart construction, Mr. Speaker, but there were no instructions by that government that construction should proceed.

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, given the usual imprecision of the memory, to say nothing of the uttered words of the Minister, who takes it unto himself to respond for questions that are really of importance to be answered by the First Minister, not by his second in command or whatever he may be.

Can the First Minister, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) — I wish you'd run some show. Mr. Speaker, the comment was made that they're not running a one-man show the way we did; they're not running any show at all; they're not running the Government of Manitoba except like a peanut stand. I'm asking the First Minister, Mr. Speaker, whether the exchange of correspondence that took place between the previous government and Manitoba Hydro with respect to the beginning of the de-mothballing of the townsite and the preparation for the beginning of construction of Limestone, whether or not that correspondence has been countermanded by his government?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General on a point of order.

MR. PENNER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Beauchesne at Page 131 states quite unequivocally with respect to questions, that questions are improper seeking information about proceedings in the committee which has not yet made its report to the House. — (Interjection) — No, it has not. It has not made its

final report to the House as the Leader of the Opposition well knows. Today was the first of what may be two or two-and-a-half days in committee. It will be in order when that committee has reported to ask any questions that haven't been dealt with by the committee. But otherwise, in my submission, Sir, the question is out of order and the questioning in itself is out of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Honourable Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, as usual my honourable friend the Attorney-General, the putative House Leader for the Government, is imprecise in his interpretation of Beauchesne.

The question, Sir, would have been in order whether the committee was sitting or not. The question, very simply, is has this government done anything to countermand the exchange of correspondence that took place between the previous government and Manitoba Hydro which would have seen the beginnings of some work on Limestone this year? That has nothing to do with the committee. Has the government done anything to countermand that, because Hydro is basing its projections now on a start-up in 1987. Why?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, first I would point out to the Leader of the Opposition and members across that we do not intend, like the previous government, to be a one-man show. We operate on the basis of a team. It has been always my finding that a team works more effectively and more competently when, indeed, that work is properly delegated and distributed in an even way throughout. Then, Mr. Speaker, we ascertain some orderliness out of the process of government.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased that my colleague answered earlier because the Leader of the Opposition asked a question based upon, apparently, a false premise that was not correct and I appreciate the fact that was pointed out very clearly to the Leader of the Opposition that the premise that he was utilizing in this House was a false premise.

Insofar as the instructions that were passed on, it is my understanding they were not countermanded but, indeed, that plus other work was undertaken.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable First Minister had been at the committee, he would realize, rather than speaking through his mouthpiece, that the premise upon which the question was based was not false. The tables upon which Hydro was making its exposition to the committee this morning were based upon a Capital start-up of Limestone in 1987.

Now, having cleared that out of the road, let me ask my honourable friend whether he has instructed his Minister of Mines and Energy to proceed with the meeting on May 12th, which I believe is tomorrow, with his Saskatchewan counterpart, if not also with the Alberta counterpart with respect to the continuation of the extremely crucial negotiations for the Western Inter-tie?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, my Premier had contacted the Premier-elect in Saskatchewan before he was sworn in and raised a number of these issues with him. I contacted the office of the new Minister responsible for the Saskatchewan Power Corporation yesterday, the first working day of his swearing in. He was completely tied up in meetings. I have been informed today by officials through Saskatchewan, that he has asked for a postponement of the meeting that would take place tomorrow. I had been in consultation with the Alberta Minister responsible for negotiating the Western Inter-Tie for the Alberta Government. It was agreed that if they did desire some type of pause that we would show him that courtesy. It is our hope that we might get together as soon as possible, hopefully within the next two weeks or so but the ball, Mr. Speaker, right now is in the Saskatchewan Government's court. I hope that they want to proceed as expeditiously as the Manitoba Government wants to and as the Alberta Government wants to.

Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet, it is very important to correct for the public of Manitoba a grossly misleading statement that was just made by the Leader of the Opposition when he said that Hydro's projections, based on domestic load-growth, somehow under the New Democratic Party changed to a start-up date of 1987. Those projections, Mr. Speaker, and people were informed of that today, are developed by Hydro in a preceding year. Work is done through the summer, the projections were developed in November of 1981, when that government was still in office. Now if the Leader of the Opposition again practising his selective amnesia, refuses to take cognizance of that fact, then we are back in the same state we were in Manitoba when that man who went over to Switzerland to sign the CFI Agreement refused to acknowledge that he had been to Switzerland and had signed the CFI Agreement.

Mr. Speaker, that is one of the reasons why the people of Manitoba threw that person out of office because they didn't want a politician or a government statesman who would practise that type of deceptive selective amnesia.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, by way of a preliminary, I'm happy that the First Minister and his running mate, the Minister of Mines and Energy, have seen fit to follow the good advice that was given to them from this side of the House and that they have made contact with the Premier-elect and with the Minister in charge of Hydro Development.

I would earnestly counsel the Minister of Mines and Energy in this respect that far from the ball being in Saskatchewan's court the ball remains in Manitoba's court because it was Manitoba's idea and Manitoba is the greatest beneficiary from the Western Inter-Tie. So he need not think, Mr. Speaker, that he can slack back in the traces.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the First Minister whether or not he feels that his recent foray on a

partisan trip into Alberta, wherein he apparently took cheap shots at the Premier of Alberta, is going to help the status of these negotiations and help the people of Manitoba to achieve this vastly needed Inter-Tie with all of the thousands of jobs that will go with it.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I can understand the misunderstanding, I suppose, that's given rise to the question on the part of the Leader of the Opposition. The New Democratic Party is such that we do demonstrate an interest in the affairs of the New Democratic Party in other parts of this country as well as in our individual provinces.

I was invited to the Province of Alberta to speak to a nominating convention in the Province of Alberta. I had made some comments pertaining to the New Democratic Party in the Province of Manitoba and, Mr. Speaker, I made some general questions pertaining to the factors that give rise to the growth of separatist movements such as the Western Concept Party which is now unfortunately very strong in the Province of Alberta. I made some comments as to contributions that may have been made towards the growth of that party by different politicians, including the Leader of the Opposition while he was the Premier of this province, including other premiers of this province, statements which I gather the now Premier of the Province of Alberta acknowledges indeed, may have been a contributing factor toward the growth of what indeed is becoming a very very strong movement in the Province of Alberta; a movement that we hope will not form government in the Province of Alberta for the good of Canada after the next election.

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, at a time when Manitoba in particular is engaged in crucial bi-province negotiations on something as important to the future of all Manitobans as the Western Power Inter-Tie, negotiations which have to be carried on at the highest level and with the best of good faith by the three premiers of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, does the First Minister of Manitoba not feel that it would be in the public interest if he were to set aside for awhile this partisan anachronism of socialism which is, that they can go in, heap dirt on whatever premier there is in whatever other province and then expect to sit down at the table and negotiate with him in good faith? Would he not set that aside in the interests of the people of Manitoba, socialism and solidarity notwithstanding?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I could if I wished to recall that the former Premier of this province had to say about Premier Allan Blakeney in Saskatchewan during times of negotiations with respect to the Inter-Tie. I regret very much that the Leader of the Opposition is of the view that I heaped dirt on what Premier Lougheed was doing in Alberta. In fact, I was very careful not to engage in discussion as to the provincial government itself in the Province of Alberta and what it was doing in respect to the Province of Alberta.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this and I want to make it very very clear. I would not hold it against

Premier Peter Lougheed if he should decide at the invitation of the Leader of the Opposition to come to Manitoba to speak in the Province of Manitoba on behalf of the Conservative Party of the Province of Manitoba, I would not hold it against him. I would expect that it would indeed be reasonable that Peter Lougheed, being a Conservative, might indeed be invited to attend at the next Conservative Party Convention if there be one provincially — I know not whether they hold provincial conventions or not — to be their guest speaker. I can assure the Leader of the Opposition I would not for a moment be so low as to hold any personal antagonism towards Peter Lougheed.

Mr. Speaker, I also am of the view that Peter Lougheed is a big enough individual not to stoop to such triviality as to hold against the Premier of the Province of Manitoba for expressing his political views in the Province of Alberta.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Socialist Premier of Manitoba that the Conservative Premier of Alberta would have more class than to do what he just did in the Province of Alberta.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS (Cont'd)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If I could interrupt for a second, I'd like to draw the members' attention to my right where we have a distinguished visitor. The Honourable Terry Sargeant, MP for Selkirk-Interlake is present and we welcome you here today.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, just a minor point for the record, I rise on a point of order.

There was a non sequitur made by the Minister of Mines and Energy to the effect that I travelled to Switzerland and signed some agreement in the past with respect to ManFor. I put it on the record only for the benefit of the record that I did no such thing. Mr. Speaker, the only reason I rise is because we are becoming accustomed to the misstatements of the Minister of Mines and Energy, in as polite a way as I can in the face of that kind of an outright mistruth, I correct the record for him.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines on a point of order.

MR. PARASIUK: If the Leader of the Opposition states that he didn't go to Switzerland, I certainly acknowledge that it's true then and I withdraw that part of the statement. But, Mr. Speaker, if indeed the Leader of the Opposition is trying to leave the impression that he didn't sign that document then I think that again is another case. I didn't hear that he denied that he signed the CFI Agreement that committed Manitoba to the wastage of about \$140 million.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, it's not my desire to continue this business with the Minister of Mines and Energy. I merely want to state to him that the members of the Roblin Government at that time did sign the

agreement. I was one of the signatories to the agreement under which in 1969 there had been \$11 million paid out when my honourable friends came to office and proceeded to pay out another \$125 million.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, on that same point of order that the Leader of the Opposition was speaking on. Mr. Speaker, we have been urged time and time again by the former Conservative Government that we should blindly accept everything that they were negotiated prior to the change in office that took place on November 17. Now we have the Leader of the Conservative Party saying that the NDP should have completely repudiated that terrible agreement which the Conservative Government signed in 1969. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have learned from their mistakes. We take a very careful look at anything the Conservative Party led by that individual has been involved in, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, to continue and not to expand upon your graciousness in permitting this all to continue under a point of order, I merely say, Mr. Speaker, that I made no such statement at all. That's a figment of my honourable friend's imagination which is greater than his sense of the truth and I merely say to him that he and his colleagues are demonstrating today that they can't run a peanut stand any better than they could in 1969 and onward.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health on a point of order.

HON. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): I'd like to move that the debate be adjourned, Mr. Speaker.

ORAL QUESTIONS (Cont'd)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. CLAYTON MANNES (Morris): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture if I could. I'd like to know how many formal applications, and I'm not talking about inquiries, but formal applications have been received to date under the Farm Interest Relief Program?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. BILL URUSKI (Interlake): Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice. I know there have been more than 200 formal applications forwarded to MACC for processing, but I will take the specifics under advisement.

MR. MANNES: Possibly the Minister would also like then to take as notice the questions: How many applications have been approved? And, to date, what has been the total provincial payout under this program?

My other question, though, is consideration being given to increasing the levels of eligibility, the criteria under the program to allow a greater percentage of

Manitoba farmers to apply for that program?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, that decision will be, if there will be any change, will be made when all the applications that are in process now will be dealt with. If there is need to make some further revisions, we will certainly look at that and that'll be a policy decision which will be made in due course.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. DONALD ORCHARD (Pembina): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Agriculture. Could the Minister indicate how many producer meetings have been held or scheduled by his newly appointed advisory committee for beef producers to give their views on his newly announced Beef Income Plan?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that question as notice and check with the committee. I can advise the honourable member that I will be meeting with the committee later on this week to share some of their views from the meetings that they have had and some of the views that they've got in terms of what direction they feel that the department should be assisting them in providing information for the development of the program.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Speaker, since the Minister is not aware of how many meetings have been held, I might refresh his memory in that there are very few being held. Could the Minister of Agriculture confirm that the reason there are very few meetings being held for the producers to voice their views on his plan is that the members of his advisory board don't want to hold meetings with producers?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the regional committees are the committees that will be dealing with producers in their own areas. How and what form the meetings take will be up to those committees to decide and they will be meeting with me very shortly at which time they will be providing some advice and information that they wish back.

The honourable member may have wanted a whole host of public meetings that would — (Interjection) — well, Mr. Speaker, obviously it appears that the members opposite don't want the producers themselves to sit down and work out the details of the plan which they are now in the process of doing.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact that when he made his announcement on May 4th of the advisory committee, and in response to a question from the Member for Turtle Mountain indicated that the advisory board would be meeting with producer groups in the province to obtain their opinions on his plan, would the Minister of Agriculture now consider instructing his advisory board and his appointees to the advisory board to hold those meetings to gain the legitimate views of the cattle producers in the province as his First Minister has indicated is going to happen? Will he instruct his group to do that and have

those meetings?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm certain that the committees have held meetings various regions. They may not have been to the liking of the Honourable Member for Pembina but, Mr. Speaker, those committees are holding their own meetings, they're having their own discussions and they will be coming forward with suggestions not on the program in terms of devising the details to the program. We announced the principles that we envisaged the program to be developed around, and now the producers are working on the details, Mr. Speaker, not as the honourable member suggests.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, in the areas that have not had a meeting amongst producers, will the Minister instruct his appointees to the advisory committee to hold such a meeting to listen to the views of cattle producers?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I've had representations made by one group to my office who indicated that they wanted to make an input to the committee. I've advised them to make their views known and their views certainly will be given to the committee and it'll be up to the committee to meet with that group.

MR. ORCHARD: So then, I take it that the Minister of Agriculture is saying that there'll be no public meetings to hear the views of the cattle producers in the Province of Manitoba in response to his ill-conceived Beef Income Plan.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have received many submissions from producer groups. I've received submissions on the basic plans from the MCPA and from other groups. The producer groups will be holding and have held either formal and informal meetings with producers in their regions and they are now working on the details as to what they feel should be the basic details to the plan. They will be going on that process for as long as it takes them to make a plan which then I expect, Mr. Speaker, they will relay to the farmers of Manitoba and discuss with them.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. Could the Minister indicate how many applications have been received by Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation since he took office and how many have been approved? How many applications have been received by Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation for agricultural loans and how many have been approved?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the applications for loans would be handled in a normal way, but I'll take that question as notice.

MR. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Has the Minister completed his review of the highly popular program of selling agricultural Crown lands that was instituted by the previous administration?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, in terms of the Crown lands that the member is speaking of, that review is being undertaken by the Minister of Natural Resources and the government and when changes and the review is complete, that will be announced. I believe, as well, announcements were made that those applications that have been in, are being presently reviewed, in process.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, about a week ago or at least during the course of Estimates review, the Member for Virden had put a question with respect to the amount of premium dollars collected by the Motor Vehicles Branch for MPIC along with the licence revenues for the last fiscal year. I want to indicate to the member that the basic insurance premium amounted to \$8,854,014, the additional premiums based on demerits amounted to \$3,851,743, and surcharges based on accident involvement amounted to \$270,350 for a total of \$12,976,107.00.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. HARRY GRAHAM (Virden): I want to thank the Honourable Minister for that information.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain on a point of order.

MR. A. BRIAN RANSOM (Turtle Mountain): A point of order, Mr. Speaker. We do appreciate getting the answers from the Honourable Ministers but I believe that questions that were placed during the Estimates could be best answered in written form rather than taking up the time of the question period.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Could he indicate to the House what the reason for the removal of, or the dismissal of, one Assistant Deputy Minister of Agriculture in the Marketing Branch? Was it to make room for one of the civil servants who would be moving in from Saskatchewan?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. URUSKI: No, Mr. Speaker. In terms of the ongoing re-organization of the department that position has been posted as redundant and the new position is being advertised and is being bulletined.

MR. DOWNEY: In other words, Mr. Speaker, could the Minister confirm that he feels that the head job of marketing, responsible for the marketing of Manitoba agriculture products, that thrust is redundant in the Province of Manitoba? Is that what he's saying?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the Marketing Branch is and has been intact, and is proceeding as it always has been proceeding in terms of its priorities in this government and the member well knows the discussion we had and the thrusts we are undertaking in the marketing area dealing with agricultural products in this province.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, how many more employees of the Department of Agriculture does the Minister plan to fire in the next six months?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, that question really doesn't deserve an answer.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MRS. CHARLOTTE OLESON (Gladstone): My question is to the Minister of Natural Resources. Has he or any of his departmental staff met with the municipal officials in the Rathwell-Treherne-Holland area to discuss the plans concerning the Holland Dam?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. AL MACKLING (St. James): Not that I'm aware of, Mr. Speaker.

MRS. OLESON: In view of the fact that the Minister promised during his Estimates, to keep the people informed and in view of the fact that several of the people in that area have called me to find out what is going on, I wonder if the Minister would tell the people what his plans are for that project.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I'll be happy to communicate with anyone who makes inquiry to me. If they made inquiry to the honourable member I would suggest that they redirect those inquiries to me and I'll endeavour to answer them.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Honourable Member for Fort Garry asked me a question with regard to newspaper reports charging laxity on the part of custodial staff at the Remand Centre. I can advise the honourable member that I have received a report now from the Deputy Commissioner of Corrections, Mr. Eric Cox, who says he has investigated the situation and has found no negligence on the part of the staff at the Remand Centre.

I can state briefly that the staff were advised that Mr. Goulet, the person in question, was a possible suicide problem and that therefore he was moved to Block B where he could be under constant television surveillance, and indeed he was visited by custodial staff more or less every 15 minutes or at brief intervals. The morning of May 4th, Mr. Goulet was visited by his lawyer and at that time the staff went to see Mr. Goulet to get Mr. Goulet at 10:30 to bring him to see his lawyer. At that time he was found sitting in his cell

with a towel draped over his head and a piece of blanket tied around his neck and the other end was tied to the bars at the foot of his bed. The strip of blanket was removed and the on-duty nurse who checked the vital signs and reported that there was no need for concern. He was then subsequently moved to the Segregation Unit No. 1 for observation. Because of his supposed attempt at suicide, Mr. Goulet was transferred within two hours to the psychiatric ward of the Health Sciences Centre for assessment where he is, at the time of writing of the report, which was yesterday.

With the reference to the allegation of the three inmates that Mr. Goulet had not been under supervision by the staff, I repeat that he was in a cell where there was TV monitoring and he had been visited at frequent intervals. I suppose that if there was a more serious attempt made and the strip of blanket was tied higher in the cell, the TV monitor would have picked this up. At any rate, I just make this last observation, Mr. Speaker. The other inmates in the cellblock, including the three making the allegation, had every opportunity to draw this man's situation to the attention of staff but chose not to do so which makes suspect their belated concern for the well-being of Thomas Goulet.

At any rate, the Deputy Commissioner of Corrections, having investigated this situation, finds no negligence on the part of the staff at the Winnipeg Remand Centre.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): I thank the Minister for that information, Mr. Speaker, and for his reassurance - I take it as a reassurance - that the suicide watch at the Winnipeg Remand Centre is being maintained at the level that is required in a detention facility of that kind, and I take it also from his comments that the report carried in the Free Press, based on a letter from two murder suspects, was exaggerated to say the least.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Co-operative Development. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister can advise the House if he can report any sales of the surplus cheese at Rossburn and Pilot Mound since he announced his program a few days ago?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Co-operative Development.

HON. A.R. (Pete) ADAM (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, the people from Manco, the new Board, has met with me and they are putting a proposal together, a formal proposal, indicating what the problems are as they see and I have requested that they come back to us once they have formalized a document that we can look at very closely to see really what the problems are at the present time as far as cheese is concerned.

There is a major problem of surpluses in Ontario, Mr. Speaker, that makes it almost impossible for Manitoba producers to tap into that market at the present time, but we are keeping a close watch on the situation and I hope that the Manco people will be back before too long with some of the problems that they are facing and we will see then what our department can do to assist them, Mr. Speaker.

MR. McKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In light of this manifesto, "A Clear Choice for Manitobans - Policies of the New Democratic Party" statement whereby they would ensure reasonable prices for basic needs, the government assist locally owned business and co-ops on the retailing, processing and transporting of food and materials. Can I ask the Honourable Minister if he's now prepared to sit down with these 50 unemployed workers at Rossburn and Pilot Mound and with the dairy industry in both those communities, to discuss with them in fact, that they haven't any future at all in this province.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Co-operative Development.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Manco people and other cheese factories, producers in Manitoba have met with the Milk Board and the Marketing Board to discuss problems. They expect to meet again to see what can be done to put Manitoba in a more competitive position as opposed to the price cutting that is taking place from eastern producers at the present time, that it is creating some hardships on Manitoba producers.

I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, you are well aware that Manitoba is sitting in the centre of Canada with markets in the west and markets in the east and they are faced with the 5 cents a pound freight cost to tap into those markets and on the other hand, you have the eastern producers who are cutting prices well below the Belleville price of cheese, which makes it very difficult for Manitoba producers. But we are meeting with them and they are trying to address this problem and I'm sure that given time, they will.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question then for the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder can the Minister of Agriculture advise the House if the reason that he removed the Assistant Deputy of Marketing was because they weren't able to move this surplus cheese?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. URUSKI: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D.M. (Doug) GOURLAY (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs. Several weeks ago the Minister indicated that he would be signing a new Northern Development Agreement and also a special Art Agreement with the Federal Minister early in May, hopefully. Can the Min-

ister tell us today when he'll be signing those new agreements?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. JAY COWAN (Churchill): Yes, I believe if the member checks the record he will determine that I indicated that I would be negotiating and continuing negotiations on such agreement with the Federal Government. I had hoped to meet with the Minister responsible, the Honourable Herb Gray in early May. He has indicated that he would wish to meet in later May and I'm looking forward to that meeting at which time we will be discussing those differences which currently exist between the positions of the Federal Government and the Provincial Government in respect to the negotiations of the Northlands Agreement.

At that time I'll be providing further information in detail to the member in respect to those discussions and any successful conclusion of the negotiations at that time.

MR. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether he has any agreement with the Federal Minister with respect to retroactivity on some of the ongoing programs that are in place now but are being paid for by 100 percent provincial dollars.

MR. COWAN: Yes, there are a number of programs which are ongoing now which existed as a part of the agreement previously. Some of those are being paid for by 100 percent provincial dollars, of course, some of those are being paid for by 100 percent federal dollars as well. I can assure the member that that will be an item of discussion at the time I meet with Mr. Gray sometime, I would hope, in late May.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Oral Questions having expired, we'll move to Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. PENNER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, may I just announce that with respect to Estimates there will be just the one Committee today in the House on Education and that following the debate on the Budget there will be a switch in the order in Committee as between Consumer and Corporate Affairs and the Estimates of the Attorney-General. The Estimates of the Attorney-General will follow immediately the Budget Debate.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Energy and Mines 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 and 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 The Pas in the Chair for the Department of Education.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY — EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, Harry M. Harapiak (The Pas): Call the Committee to order. We're on Education. On 3. (b), Miscellaneous Grants.
The Member for Niakwa.

MR. ABE KOVNATS (Niakwa): To the Honourable Minister, it was concerning the school buses and it's just a very short question. I just want to get something established in my mind that the safety factors in the school buses as to directions if anything happens as to emergency exits. Are the school buses well signed in either French or English for whatever young people are using these buses?

I also notice that there is an immersion Hebrew class that's going to be started very very soon and will the buses carrying these children be signed in Hebrew? The same with the Ukrainian, the ones that carry the Ukrainian children to the immersion classes in Ukrainian because this is the language that these children are learning to speak and understand in. Are the proper precautions being taken to keep these children in a safe state while travelling on the buses?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. MURIEL SMITH (Osborne): Mr. Chairman, the practice to date has been that the signs for "Exits" on the buses is in English only.

MR. KOVNATS: Well, to the Honourable Minister, I guess it's just a suggestion because these children who are being trained in a particular language might not be able to understand and I'm sure that there is proper adult supervision, but what happens if anything happens and these children have to make their way to an Exit that's not properly signed in the language they are being trained in? Would the Honourable Minister take that into consideration so that these signs could be placed in the buses so if an emergency does take place, that there won't be the danger or any loss of lives or anything that we'll be sorry for in the future?

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, we're all very concerned about safety of children on buses and there is a regular safety program that is carried out with regular drills, where the children practise what they are supposed to do in case of accident and where the Exits are.

While it is true that a number of children are beginning to take Hebrew programs, other language programs, they're all also taking English and are all able to understand and read English, therefore they will not have any trouble understanding the written information about where to go.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Tuxedo.

MR. GARY FILMON (Tuxedo): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would consider making a note for future reference to provide me with — and I believe

this request was made of our Minister last year — an analysis of the 1981 budgets by division which I understand is not normally available until about June. If she could provide me with that at her leisure after it becomes available, I would appreciate it.

With respect to the Item 3.(b), I wonder if the Minister could indicate what grants are covered and perhaps a brief explanation as to the difference in amount this year versus last year.

MRS. SMITH: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The major increase for the grants between this year's Estimates and last year's Estimates is in very small part to minor increases for some of the previous grants that were given. The major effect of the increase is due to a decision to host two national conferences in Manitoba; one being the Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers and the other one being the Canadian School Trustees Association. The Canadian Association of Second Languages was \$11,000 and the Canadian School Trustees Association is in the range of \$30,000 although I do not think it will be that much. The rest of it is just minor increases of existing grants.

MR. FILMON: May I just clarify again and I believe that this information was given and confirmed by the Minister that the special \$2 million grant to the City of Winnipeg School Division No. 1 is nowhere in these Estimates. —(Interjection)— Yes. So that was a supplementary appropriation that will be covered in Supplementary Supply next time around.

MRS. SMITH: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I think there was another part to the question. Did you ask for information on the grants or just the general? Did you want a list? I think you did mention it.

MR. FILMON: Although I did ask for a list of grants, I know they're in small amounts and I know that I receive information on them through Government Information Services as they're announced. I just wondered as to the difference between this year and last year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(b)—pass—the Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. GERRY HAMMOND (Kirkfield Park): Yes, would this be, Mr. Chairman, where the Manitoba Association of Student Councils would come in or was that under another category?

MRS. SMITH: No, that's in this category.

MRS. HAMMOND: Yes, could the Minister indicate if that \$5,000 grant to MAST was for a special project or was it just a general grant?

MRS. SMITH: It was a general grant to support the work of the Students' Association, although in their presentation to me they did indicate the major activities that they were undertaking and the work that they were planning in the coming year but the grant was not to support a project. It was to support the work and activities of a Student Association. Just as many of the other grants that go to home and school and

Manitoba Association of School Trustees for instance, is to support the activities of the association and not specific projects.

MRS. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister be able to indicate how many high schools actually belong to the Manitoba Association of Student Councils?

MRS. SMITH: I do remember being given and asking for information about the numbers of schools that were represented and I do not remember the exact figure that was given to me. I was interested as the member opposite is in the representative nature of the organization and how many high schools that they were serving. We can get the specific information if she wishes and give it to her.

The one thing that I do remember in the discussion is, that was to be one of the major undertakings of the association in the coming year. In other words, they were suggesting that because they were strapped for funds and they had limited resources that they had not been able to do as good a job as they hoped to do of contacting high schools and getting them involved and one of their major activities was to increase their membership in the coming year.

MR. HAMMOND: Yes, I would appreciate if the Minister would get that information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(b)—pass.

MR. FILMON: Just one question on that, and I apologize if this was covered, is there an item under that Manitoba Association of Student Councils for a student handbook and is such a handbook available from them?

MR. HEMPHILL: I believe that the Student Councils Association does publish a handbook and is in the process right now of either revising or compiling a handbook, I can't quite remember which it is, that it is not yet completed but when it is it will, I imagine, be available to students.

MR. FILMON: I wonder if the Minister could undertake to get a copy for us, of the Manitoba Association of Student Councils handbook and, secondly, how many schools pay fees and belong to this organization?

MR. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I believe that question is along the same line as the question from the Member for Kirkfield Park where she wanted to know how many high schools belong to the organization and, I believe, that the question related to how many are paying dues is the same question, and I can forward that information to you when we get it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(b)—pass; 3.(c) Assistance to Schools in Remote Settlements.

The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. FILMON: Could the Minister just give us a general indication of the purpose and practice covered under this item?

MRS. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, through Section 207 of The Public Schools Act the Minister of Education performs and has all the duties and functions and powers that are vested in a School Board in cases in unorganized territory where there is no other school authority. The schools in remote settlements that are under my jurisdiction in this category are Falcon Beach, with an enrolment of 41; and Hillridge with an enrolment of 186 students. There are other very minor situations where there might be an individual student or two in unorganized territories throughout the province where we cover their education in a particular way. The increase in the appropriation in this area is a general increase and some increased costs in transportation, fairly long transportation routes for some of these children, and that allows for most of the increase.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(c)—pass. 3.(d) Teachers Retirement Allowance Fund.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I assume that the additional amount is just simply reflective of the government's portion in terms of the employee benefit scheme.

MRS. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, this is a fixed amount under the Teachers' Pension Act and it is the amount that we are required under the Act to put in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(d)—pass. 3.(e) Child Development and Support Services.

MR. FILMON: I wonder if the Minister could indicate, there appears to be a rather major reduction in this item and could she indicate the reasons for it.

MRS. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the amount in this Estimate was reduced by \$1,313,000 when support for Clinician Services was shifted into the Education Support Program; that accounts for the reduction. The remainder of the Estimates was increased by \$253,000, or 19 percent, as a result of the ordinary incremental changes in salary and the addition of one teacher in the Rehab Centre Program at the Health Sciences Centre. So there is one additional staff person in the Estimates, regular incremental changes and the reduction is from shifting Clinician Services.

MR. FILMON: On that topic of the transfer of the clinicians under the Education Support Program I think the program allowed for divisions to hire clinicians under this special area. So the Minister is now telling us that has been added into the Education Support Program which, I guess, in effect is a reduction of funding that otherwise existed under the Education Support Program and somewhat of a reallocation of funding. So what's the amount involved in that particular move then, Mr. Chairman?

MRS. HEMPHILL: The amount involved is \$2,628.7 million.

MR. FILMON: That's the total amount on clinicians, that's the amount on clinicians that's transferred into the Education Support Program?

MRS. HEMPHILL: No, the amount that he is asking is the original amount that I gave, the \$1,313,000, is the original amount.

MR. FILMON: That means that the former amount of money that was covered under the Educational Support Program has been reduced by \$1.3 million if they're now expected to take into account these clinician services that have been previously provided under this appropriation. If they're now expected to provide them under the ESP it's now a reduction of \$1.3 million in the ESP funding, in effect, is that right?

MRS. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, no, there is not a reduction in the Educational Support Program, there is an additional amount put into the Educational — the reduction is at this end. The increased amount or the same amount has increased in the Educational Support Program.

MR. FILMON: Except when the Minister says that she has increased the funding to the ESP by \$46.5 million, that she's now requiring them to do \$1.3 million of additional services that was formerly provided under the other program, then it really means that she's only added, instead of \$46.5 million she's added \$45.2 million over what was there last year.

MRS. HEMPHILL: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FILMON: What is the department's role with respect to the clinicians? Is there a development role here where the department is responsible for training or developing these clinicians or is it just a straight hiring of specially trained people to work in divisions and no other role, other than funding, on behalf of the department?

MRS. HEMPHILL: The major role that the department takes is the development role.

MR. FILMON: As well, are divisions developing their own clinicians or is it pretty well all confined within this program?

MRS. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, there is a little bit of crossover between the discussion taking place about clinicians now and relating to the clinicians in the field in school divisions and the item of 4.(j) which is Child Development and Support Services where the clinicians that are going out into the field are actually under that appropriation. But there is some crossover and I could answer the question now.

School divisions also are taking a role in hiring and developing professional development programs for the clinicians that they hire. They have a choice presently of either hiring through the department or taking the responsibility themselves in the field. It's apparent that a number of them are finding it advantageous to turn to departmental resources where they can get portions of different kinds of specialists instead of having to hire just one perhaps that could just cover a narrow role and they seem to be leaning in that direction.

MR. FILMON: How many divisions are developing

and hiring their own and how many are taking advantage of the provincial resource?

MRS. HEMPHILL: 24 divisions are under Child Development and Support Services and the rest are hiring their own.

MR. FILMON: Is that increasing or decreasing and can the Minister indicate what she sees as the future of this sort of arrangement? Does she see the thing eventually becoming one of the department handling that role exclusively or does she see the option remaining in the future?

MRS. HEMPHILL: It is about the same as it was before although there does appear to be a leaning towards the departmental resources and I think that is something that we will be looking at within the next little while. There are certainly advantages to school divisions both ways and looking to decide whether to leave it the option or whether to go one way or the other is something that I think will be under review.

What we would want to accomplish is the availability of resources and help that will give the best utilization and the best support to school divisions as is possible for these special professional people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(e)—pass.
The Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. MCKENZIE: The Child Development and Support Services, it's broken down into what? 6 regions:—Winnipeg, northern region, Interlake, southeastern, Parkland, there are six, are they all allocated budgets of their own?

MRS. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could just explain a little, that the major questions we are getting into now are related to Child Development and Support Services under (j) and that the program that we are in now, which is Child Development and Support Services, Financial Assistance to School Divisions, is mainly related to our providing funding support for educational programs in treatment centres and hospitals, programs for blind or deaf children in school divisions. So that it's a very special component of programs in institutions and hospitals, is the appropriation we're on right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(e)—pass;
Resolution 51. RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$350,909,800 for Education for Financial Support for Public Schools for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1983—pass.

No. 4. Program Development and Support Services; 4.(a)(1) Salaries.
The Member for Tuxedo.

MR. FILMON: Has the Minister got any opening remarks on this general area?

MRS. HEMPHILL: Very minor I think, Mr. Chairman. Simply to indicate that there is not an increase of staff in this area; that the 8.1 percent increase is a result of incremental changes on Salaries; that it is the same

staff and the same organization instructor as we have had previously.

MR. FILMON: Have there been any changes in administrative staff as a result of the new government taking office?

MRS. HEMPHILL: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(a)(1)—pass; 4.(a)(2) Other Expenditures—pass.
The Member for Morris.

MR. MANNES: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, I don't know if the question I'm about to ask is in the right area or not, but what I would like is a comment from the Minister as to her feelings as to a comment that I have heard expressed—and I won't say who expressed it and it may seem like an almost radical viewpoint, I don't know—but the view's been expressed in some areas at least that some teachers are becoming overly qualified, particularly those that are teaching elementary grades and it has a tremendous impact upon, of course, the total budget. I'm wondering if you understand what I'm saying and, if you do, whether you'd like to make a comment about that whole area?

MRS. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, just to see if I do understand, is the Member for Morris wondering if I believe that teachers are being overtrained?

MR. MANNES: Partly yes. I'm not talking in certain skill areas, I'm talking about achieving higher academic qualifications through allowing themselves to move up the pay scale in the salary range with—(Interjection)—that's right, those that are now attempting to obtain their Masters of Education and things like that and maybe teaching Grade 2 and 3. The comment I have heard made is that in fact that type of qualified individual is not required to teach at that level.

MRS. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, it may be that there are teachers teaching in positions that are not totally related to, or in line with, their background and academic qualifications. In fact, I'm not sure if the Member for Morris was in when we discussed the research branch of my department, but one of the research projects that they had undertaken related to teacher supply and to what they call teacher placement. They were looking to see if in special areas like Special Needs areas or bilingual programs if the problem really was, that we didn't have enough teachers or if we had teachers who were inappropriately placed.

Now this is partly an answer to his question because what they found is that there are quite a considerable number of teachers who have background and qualifications in certain areas and are being placed in and teaching other unrelated courses. So that one, we do not have the best utilization of our human resources in terms of their training and abilities to deal with programs.

Directly to the point I think that he's making although I think this is a legitimate part of the response is, I believe that the entire structure that's been established over a long period of time operates

on the assumption that people receive increases in pay for two reasons; one is increased experience and time and the other is increased academic qualifications.

Since we know that in the field of education, it is like the financial structure and the system for education finance that he deplored in its complexity or indicated concern about that I understand - okay? Yes, indicated concern about and I understand and I agree with it. So is the education system becoming much more complex with teachers having to know a great deal in special areas. Even regular classroom teachers have to know a great deal because of the mix and variety of children they're getting. They need to be better trained. They are getting better trained when they put the time and the effort in and they are better qualified than the rationale has been that they are entitled to increased pay.

MR. MANNES: Well, certainly in the area of Special Needs and Special Skills I have no problem accepting that. Certainly, without wanting to incur the wrath of the Teachers' Society which I certainly do not, which half of the many members are, over opposite, I guess I have to ask the question on behalf of many representatives of municipal concerns as to what happens when - and again I don't find fault with any teacher that wants to improve their lot in life, that's not the point - but what happens when you're locked into a group, a fixed number of teachers, given a fixed enrolment within a division and just through nothing more than teachers upgrading their education qualifications that are forced upon you, a much higher level of spending, an increased budget and therefore an increased tax solicitation. That's specifically what I'm driving at.

I'm not asking for an overturn in the system but I'm wondering if it's something that's recognized within your department and is it something that you consider a reason to be concerned about at all?

MRS. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, no, I don't think I would describe it as something that I am concerned about. I accept the point that the Member for Morris is making and the suggestion that there might be times and places when people are teaching in positions for which they do not require all of the academic training that they have. I think that is not only possible but probable that those situations are going to occur.

However, the determination and the hiring of those individuals, the decision on the qualifications to hire and the continued determination of use of resources within the school division and redeployment if their original decisions aren't reasonable at a later date, is the responsibility of the school divisions, both to hire, to locate and utilize the human resources. I think if there are any problems there that they are in the best position to know who they have in their division and what to do with them.

MR. MANNES: Certainly in theory I can buy that answer if you have a dynamic situation. But if you have a relatively static division where few openings are coming about, well then you do not have that same opportunity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Tuxedo.

MR. FILMON: I wonder if I could follow up on that discussion. Education is I suppose unique in terms of the manner in which people qualify for additional income in the sense that it's a question of having certain degrees, not necessarily applying what's learned in obtaining those degrees. I speak in terms of for instance somebody, whether or not there is any benefit to somebody who has a Master of Science or a Ph.D teaching high school mathematics, whether or not they're any more capable or qualified of teaching it than somebody with a Bachelor's Degree and an Education certificate or degree and yet there's no question that under the system they're paid at a higher rate because they have a Ph.D and yet it may not necessarily equip them any better to teach Grade X Maths.

That whole question and there's plenty of examples of that as the Member for Morris has just indicated, the concern that arises in terms of budget in smaller school divisions, it becomes more apparent where a particular teacher teaching primary education at the lower grades in elementary school with a Master of Arts degree qualifying for higher salary, yet essentially not being any more qualified or capable of doing their job of teaching Grade 1 and 2, that whole question. Is the Minister having that reviewed as part of the mandate that she's given either the research group or others to just review how qualifications, in terms of educational degrees, can be in some way related to qualifications in terms of teaching the subject matter in the areas that people are assigned in the educational system.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. HEMPHILL: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think I can only reiterate what I said previously and that is the people in the best position to determine what is required is the school board who is responsible and has the authority to hire. I do not believe that they make their choices just based on academic qualifications. That will be one of the factors that they look at. The needs of the school division and the background, experience and the openings that are available will be other items that they look at.

I do realize that smaller school divisions with stable populations or with a declining enrolment don't have as much flexibility and may not be able to move personnel around to get the best use out of them. That, among many others, are some of the many problems that we're all struggling with in the school system related to the declining enrolment issue which we all understand.

MR. FILMON: I think that raises a number of issues that teachers I know have brought to my attention and one is, if you say it's up to the school division and there is somebody who has perhaps, a post graduate degree or even two and would like a teaching position because of their own personal career goals that they've chosen, and because of the number of the degrees that they have, they may be too qualified to get into the system today and they're prevented from getting into the system because boards won't hire

them because they carry too great a price tag. Therefore, it's a detriment to their being employed in a career field which they choose and might well be prepared to enter at some lower level but they have, one their degrees are evaluated, an automatic classification that must be paid. I've talked to many teachers who say, "I would take a lower classification in the interests of getting employment in a field that I choose and wish to pursue as a career but I can't because of the structure."

The second thing is, that divisions don't have a choice when somebody is hired and achieves tenure and then proceeds to take the second and third and fourth degrees while on the job, because of the many opportunities that all of us acknowledge are available to teachers and others in society to take evening classes, summer sessions, or even on sabbatical take another degree, post graduate degree, which automatically qualifies them for a higher paid classification and they're not doing anything different when they come back and aren't necessarily better qualified to do what they were doing when they left, depending on what degree area they choose. It may be just simply something that's in their particular sphere of interest but not pertinent to what they're going to be teaching. So the structure doesn't allow for that kind of choice-making by the school board. They're either locked in with somebody who has tenure or their only option to determining whether or not they should hire that person is not to hire them because they carry too high a price tag because of degrees.

MRS. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, as is any large bureaucracy or system, there are going to be some problems attached to regulations or criteria and I suppose this one is no exception.

In general terms I would suggest the increased education that they're getting, more and more I think is being applied because they are moving into fields and areas where they feel they are deficient. I know a lot of teachers who are going on for additional training and in fact, they are recognizing what their deficiencies are in terms of their initial training and a lot of it might be related to such things as Special Needs where they have a regular classroom and yet have to have a better understanding and knowledge, or they are deciding to move into a particular field and upgrade their knowledge in that way.

My general feeling is, that in most cases there would be some increased knowledge, some improvement, understanding and ability to do their job. In terms of priorities, concerns, it is not under active consideration at this time. I received the points made by both members on this matter.

MR. FILMON: I have no hesitation in agreeing with the Minister that we could address that and accept her comments in general terms but the specifics of the matter are, as I've pointed out, that it is a problem and it will continue to be a problem unless somebody takes the initiative to study the matter and see whether or not we can overcome these specific problems that are occurring.

Just simply to say in general terms, somebody is going to do a better job, is like saying that somebody who is a qualified plumber and well occupied and well

employed as a plumber should go and take a Master's Degree in Mechanical Engineering if he wants to come back and continue to be a plumber, in general terms he'll know more about what he's doing. That's right but he's not likely to be paid more if he remains a plumber even if he has a Master's Degree in Mechanical Engineering, but if he were a teacher he would be automatically paid more, so that's the problem as I see it.

I know we're not going to solve it in the Estimates process but I say that the problem has existed and will continue to exist unless there is a desire and an initiative to change the system whereby people are paid more for their degrees if it's agreed between them and the division or somebody in authority that their degrees are relevant and important to their furtherance as an instructor, as a teacher, and will further enhance their professional ability within the division but the division doesn't have that choice.

If a tenured teacher makes that determination to go on to further degrees right now, the division just pays the shot as they walk in and demonstrate their new degree, give evidence of having their new degree, regardless of whether it's in any area that is relevant to what they're doing now or going to be doing in future for that division, so if there were a third-party kind of option to the division then the Minister's comments may have been relevant but there isn't at the moment. I say that is a problem and I say that that's something that we perhaps, are just urging the Minister to take a look into in her discussions with Manitoba Teachers' Society, Manitoba Association of School Trustees and others who are interested in this particular matter in the field of education.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(a)(2)—the Member for Morris.

MR. MANNES: I would just like also to sum up my feelings in that whole area and reiterate some of the things the Member for Tuxedo has just said.

I think the time has come when it's time for any Minister of this Crown, particularly the Minister of Education, to begin to swing maybe a little bit away from the Teachers' Society in this area because the school board desperately is looking for opportunities at this time to cut expenses.

I can tell you without cutting staff, if I have a hired man on my farm and he's achieving \$30,000 and somebody comes along that can do the job as well at \$15,000, these days the option to replace that person will have to be there for the good of the whole system. I'm saying that and there's nothing different in this case whatsoever so I hope the Minister would look into it.

MRS. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, just a short response, I think, to the concern. I have had numerous meetings in the last five months with the major organizations, Teachers' Society, trustees, superintendents, who would be in a position, along with the Board, to be concerned both about professional qualifications and budgetary controls. Each one of them had an opportunity to present to me a list of major concerns and problems facing them with an indication of what was the most important and I can simply say to the members opposite that nobody has raised

this. Now, I'm not saying that that doesn't mean there are individual problems; I'm not saying that when we sit down for continued discussions there can't be some exploration to see if anybody is sensing this as a problem but it was not raised by the School Trustees as a major problem of Boards at this time.

MR. FILMON: The Minister can tell these groups the next time she meets with them that she has now met with Members of the Legislature who have expressed a concern about this particular item and therefore she can add it to the list of topics that she discusses next time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(a)(2) Other Expenditures—pass. 4.(b) Curriculum Development, 4.(b)(1) Salaries. The Member for Tuxedo.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I sense that there may be a number of areas under Curriculum Development that we should be discussing and perhaps the Minister could begin by indicating what the initiatives currently are, in terms of Curriculum Development, by her department and what items she sees as coming forth on the horizon in terms of Curriculum Development at the moment. I believe there are a number of advisory bodies that funnel in information and sit on this and perhaps she could tell us about their structure and makeup and their terms of reference.

MRS. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, perhaps a bit of an overview. We do have the two areas. We have Curriculum Development Branch and Curriculum Services and I imagine that some of the questions and discussion will overlap between the two departments. In terms of salaries for this department there has been no additional staff and there is simply a 1.6 percent increase that is due to incremental changes and my recollection is that it is a smaller percentage than perhaps some of the other departments because of the number of people being on maximum. Sometimes when you have younger staff there are more of them getting the incremental change that he was just discussing related to teachers.

The other expenditures have a 10 percent increase and that is due to general increases in costs. There is an additional program in this section Curriculum Development Branch and it is an increase under Other Expenditures of \$149,000. Now, some of it is a general increase and \$49,000 is due to inflation and regular increased costs for the overall department; \$100,000 is for increasing support for Heritage Language Programs. It is to continue the work in the Ukrainian Bilingual program that was undertaken as a pilot project by the former government and which, if we get into a discussion about the value of Heritage Language Programs, the study that was done by the research department has very interesting and good information about the value of that three-year project which has now been turned into a regular program going into Grades 4, 5 and 6.

The Curriculum Development Branch does an overall review of school programs, all areas of school programming and the review that has been undertaken over the previous years has been very active review, is almost complete up to the end of Grade 9, in

other words, the curriculum review process that has been undertaken has heavily concentrated on the elementary schools and they have almost completed the review in that area. What is left is the review of the curriculum in high schools and while it was identified as the next place where work had to be done, and we recognized that too, we have not yet begun the process.

A fair amount of the funding in this department is for the curriculum committees that the Member for Tuxedo mentioned and I think I was both surprised and pleased to find that we presently now have about 450 teachers in the province who are actively working, in some way or other, to revise and develop both curriculum and resources and materials to go along with the curriculum. I think that probably is enough to get us off the mark on this.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I did want to pursue the growth of Heritage Language Programs and I also wanted to, as part of that discussion, talk about French, Ukrainian, German and now Hebrew so I'm not sure, since I suppose the one that's largest in scope and has the most history attached to it, in terms of experience in our province, is in terms of French language development. I wonder whether or not the Minister will permit me to perhaps just leave it all for discussion under the BEF or shall we discuss it here.

MRS. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the members saying that some of the points, or the discussion, will be much the same related to the different programs, however, I think we would be better - I don't know if better off - I will allow the member to do what he would like to do in terms of asking questions. My feeling is that it would make more sense to raise the questions related to Core and Immersion French and that program under the Bureau and to have any discussions or questions related to the expansion or movement in the Heritage Program under the category that we're in right now.

MR. FILMON: What are the plans with respect to the expansion of Heritage Languages, other than French, at the moment with the department and within the overall public school system of Manitoba. In saying that I refer the Minister to the fact that I believe that the Metro Toronto School Board just last week passed a resolution which would permit the development of heritage language programs in something like 20 to 30 different languages within Metro Toronto. Given their ethnic and language cross section that they have there it's rather staggering but apparently they have passed the, shall we say, the Enabling legislation that would permit them to go into 20 to 30 different languages of instruction in heritage language core programs. So, is that the kind of thing that the Minister sees on the horizon here in Manitoba or what are they plans?

MRS. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, the plans are two-fold. One is to, I think, simply continue with what had begun and what had been put in place previously and to develop a comprehensive policy related to this question because it is a very big question and because it has a lot of potential, a lot of expectation perhaps

attached to it.

We are as the Member for Tuxedo realizes, one of the most multicultural provinces in Canada and that our minorities are no longer the minority. Our minorities are now the majority. So, I think it's clear that there is a lot of potential interest in this area.

The Ukrainian Bilingual Program that the former government undertook was really a very good pilot project. It was established on a very sound solid basis and it is giving us good information in which to look at expansion in heritage programs in other areas and we will be using it. It had a very good built-in evaluation and it had tremendous support from both the broad community related to that ethnic population and the parental community related to the schools.

Right now, the Ukrainian Bilingual Program has gone, as I said, from its pilot project stage in Grade 1, 2 and 3; it has moved into a regular program and is moving into Grades 4, 5 and 6. Apart from that we are continuing the activities that had begun in relation to some program for Portuguese and Philipino and the curriculum development work has been going on for practically a year and is now ready for some implementation in the school system in September.

Other than following through with those and that is what the additional \$100,000 is for, I think it's our intention to look at what's happening in Toronto; look what's happening in other places and come in with an overall comprehensive policy to deal with this very important issue.

MR. FILMON: Well, I'm pleased to hear the comments of the Minister and to understand a bit about the thrust that's being pursued in this area. Let me say firstly, that I am a great supporter of alternate language programming in our education system as an enrichment; as an avenue for minority groups to maintain not only their culture but their language heritage and so on. As a parent of two children who have been in French Immersion programming and as a product of a family where English was not a first language, I recognize and would like to further and foster the development of this type of programming.

But looking at it in its most objective terms, I say to the Minister that the evaluation and the analysis of what any new programming thrusts does to the existing educational framework and structure is vitally important not only in the assurance to the community at large that we are not, by transferring resources out of one area and putting them into another area, damaging the existing framework and reducing the quality of education that is available. There is a danger of that, of course, if heretofore 100 percent of your resources were channeled in a certain area and somewhere down the road 25 percent of those resources have been channeled off into language programming in other languages, then that will have some spin-off effect and a react to every action there's a reaction on the other side where the loss of resources will be felt in certain ways that are not apparent, initially.

Just to ensure that the community at large and the support of all Manitobans for their public educational system remains at a high level, I would suggest that the Minister ought to, through the research branch, through the curriculum development branch, or

whatever vehicle is at her disposal, ensure that all of the factual background information of the effects of this programming is available so that in future as we continue to expand it or develop it in other ways, we're on solid footing in being able to discuss it, debate it and present it to the public as a wise and good means of enhancing the educational system in Manitoba and avoid the kinds of confrontation that are starting to occur as teachers fear the loss of their own jobs because they happen to be capable only of instruction in one language — being English — and they see their job future as being threatened by resources being put into these other language programming areas and I see that happening.

I see that happening in terms of the confrontation and anxieties that are occurring throughout school divisions in Manitoba but principally within Winnipeg area school divisions, as schools are transferred into partial second-language programming schools. We now have a situation where one school is carrying two and will possibly be carrying three different language programming immersion programs if the board makes the decision as such. So when you have immersion programming in three different languages going on in one school, I think there is the potential for parents and students to say, is this affecting me if my choice is not to go into one of those immersion language programming areas? Am I going to be on the short end of the stick and having an inferior quality of education as a result? I think all of those things are far too complex and comprehensive for the Minister to give me any answers on today.

I say with respect to the possibility that there will be storm clouds on the horizon that she or future Ministers will have to deal with as people develop resistances to what have started out to be a very very fine initiative, if it isn't carried on in the best possible means of having the backup information and knowing at all times what the transfer of resources does to the rest of the framework of education throughout the province.

I say that it's not only the focus on these new initiatives but it's the focus on the backup and the evaluation to these initiatives that's going to avoid the problems in the future.

MRS. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the concerns and points that were raised by the Member for Tuxedo. That's why I was pleased with the pilot project, it had a built-in evaluation program that not only did the technical things from the school but really looked at attitudes and effects outside.

Just to give a very quick summary because I found it very interesting, they learned that the children in the Ukrainian bilingual program did as well in their other courses as the other children did. They did as well in their English language program as the other children did and in addition they were learning a second language. While I found that interesting, I found some of the response I got from the parents when I went out to speak to them one night to tell them that the program was going into Grades 4, 5 and 6. I said what are you finding about this program? Do you see any difference in the children? What do you think about the program? They recognized the ability in terms of curriculum and program but they were saying that it

made a difference to the relationship within their family, that there seemed to be instead of being ashamed of the language and having grandparents speak the language children now had a much improved relationship with grandparents where they could talk to them in the language and they were happy with it. It also improved the ability of the parents in their own language because the children were challenging them and teaching them and they were kind of picking up their socks, so to speak, to keep up with the children.

The most interesting thing of all I thought, was that it seems to have a very strong effect on identity, on self-image and identity on an understanding and a feeling of who they are and what they are and since I think we all recognize that that is going to have a lot to do with how a child does apart from their intellectual abilities, then that as a benefit of a program like that is very important for us to recognize.

We will look at things like the additional costs, the allocation of resources and distribution of resources and certainly the pilot projects and the things that we are doing now will give us direct information about what those increased costs are. It may be that they're not as much as we think they are. Children have to be taught and they have to be taught by people. It may be more a case of proper location, proper use of people than it is at add-ons and we'll be looking at that very closely.

MR. FILMON: I'm sure there are all those positive benefits and even more than those that have been briefly listed by the Minister. There are some negative ones and since I think we ought to be open about our concerns, the negative ones are that for whatever reason teachers, administrators encourage almost a segregation in some schools which leads to children being told not to play at recess or noon hour with children who are speaking another language — it may be English — and they're being told this will affect adversely their immersion programming and you should only play in the playground with those who are in the immersion program and so on and so forth. So it has damaging social effects because I think of ill-considered instructions and ill-considered objectives on the part of maybe some of those who are involved in the programming. So I think those are all things that obviously are not going to fall on the Minister's head because they're decisions made within divisions, since the authority for administering the programs lies within the divisions and not on the Minister's part.

But I'm saying that if there is an overall look at the situation being taken that those considerations ought to be made because social values and interpersonal relationships are just as important to people's education as are the things that they gain from within the classroom, so that's all part of, as I say, the support mechanism that ought to be in place to ensure the success of these programs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 4.(b)(1) Salaries—the Member for Tuxedo.

MR. FILMON: I wonder if I can get a comment from the Minister on the development of curriculum changes in general — and I realize that I may be

skating between (b) and (c) here — but during the recent annual meeting of the Manitoba Teachers' Society comments were made about implementing changes in curricula too rapidly, or without sufficient backup material, or people being asked to change curricula and having to do a great deal of their own digging and spade work because materials weren't ready and so on and so forth. I know that the Minister expressed sympathy towards this and I hope that her sympathy was perhaps only related to the process or the lack of support and not to the general thought of developing new curriculum and changing curricula. If we're going to say that there's no good argument for changing curricula from time to time and that we ought not to be changing too quickly then — this is a world of change and I think somebody said that the only thing that you can be sure of in future the only constant will be change — that's the only thing that any of us can look forward to with any consistency. So if the world is changing then obviously the curricula which we are utilizing to teach our children has to change to keep pace with what's happening out in the world. I know it's all too easy to be sympathetic and the Minister will probably be on safe ground both with administrators, school boards and teachers if she says, let's go slow on change, but there should ultimately be a happy medium.

I know I've heard teachers get upset over the fact that they've changed the entire curriculum in a certain subject because now they have to throw out all their notes and start all over again developing a new set of notes and lectures. I've heard school boards get very upset because they have to throw out all the textbooks that they had for that particular subject and we've now adopted a new textbook and we're into a new curriculum so the Minister will find ready and willing ears for people who do not support change in curriculum.

I do not believe it would be a good one and I do not believe that it's one that she supports but I'll be interested on hearing her position. In particular, when I initially heard that there was only a very minor increase in funding for this area, I wondered if there was now going to be a de-emphasis on curriculum development and change.

MRS. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, yes, I'm quite happy to respond to the points that the Member for Tuxedo raised regarding curriculum because I quite agree with him about the importance of curriculum development and changes in curriculum. I think the curriculum in our schools is actually the heart and the life blood of the program to a large extent.

The concerns that have been raised are not related to changing curriculum when it needs to be changed. In fact, I think we need constant review to make sure that we're at least making some attempt to keep pace with the rapidly changing times that we find ourselves in because change is the order of the day in our society now and our children have to be prepared to adapt to tremendous change. I think it's widely recognized that we've done a fairly good job of developing curriculum in the last little while. We've got a fairly good system of review and people in the field to review and make the changes and develop resources and materials to go along with it. Where, I believe, we

have fallen down is implementation, where we could improve is implementation. I think that we have prepared the curriculum in the department and with the help of people in the field, but the timing and the process for getting it out into the hands of teachers and giving them information and support for the changes and for the new curriculum and the timing of it where there have been situations where they might have been hit with several courses at a time and it's very hard to accommodate and adapt in a short period of time. That's the area that we have to improve, is the process of getting the curriculum in place and helping in giving support to teachers who are going to have to put it in the classroom.

I do not see a downgrading of this item in the department. It's one that I give a high priority and a lot of importance to. The reason for not seeing a major increase in the department is that we're going to take some additional time to do the planning, to decide what, if any, additional resources or support are needed in the department. I didn't just want to add like Topsy, saying this is an important area, we'll get more people without having done some conscious thinking and planning about who they needed to be and what they needed to be doing. It's because I give it a high priority that it's a status quo in this budget because we're going to take a good look at it and then come in with specific requests in what I believe will be the important areas.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. FILMON: Well, in the implementation phase, I'm sure that one of the problems is getting the teachers out there who have no part in the curriculum development committees and I know that there are 450 teachers out of I don't know how many tens of thousands who are in the process and I'm sure that it's difficult to get them all to buy into the idea of changing a curriculum entirely or making major or drastic changes in it if they've had no part to play in the recommendations that lead up to it. So that is a problem of the system and perhaps creatively can be worked on by the Minister and all the various interest groups such as MTS or MAST or others to ensure that the implementation phase matches the kind of care and attention that's given in the development phase, so that the two get together.

Is this the area that I ought to be asking the Minister for whether there are initiatives being taken or materials being developed with respect to sex education? Is this something that the Minister's department is working on at the moment?

MRS. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, the province does not presently require the teaching of sex education in the schools, but they are prepared to give support and help to any school division who decides to go into the program and that kind of information is not separated as a separate curriculum or program, but it is built into other curriculum and programs like the Lifestyles Program where there will be components within the course that they can either follow or delete as they require or as they wish.

What we are finding, though, is that although it has

not been mandated that there is a tremendous increased interest in bringing in programs into more and more schools and that this is being supported in large measure by communities while it's still a sensitive area and there are still some school divisions in some schools who don't think it's appropriate or do not want to get into it or do not have the personnel to handle it. This is one of the big problems; it's not just deciding to put programs like that into schools, but it's having qualified people comfortable, not only capable but capable and knowledgeable and comfortable enough to deal with such a sensitive matter. So that some of the process and some of the activities will be related to the ability of school divisions and school boards and teachers to handle it.

Apart from that, it appears that there is an increasing public recognition of some of the problems related to the very significant increases in teenage pregnancies in younger and younger girls, where we have a situation now where we have children bearing children in fairly large numbers and there is less reluctance and more support for these programs. Where the support is there, our department acts as a resource and help to school divisions and to teachers with the program.

MR. FILMON: Is the Minister or her department considering developing then sex education curricula that could be used throughout the province?

MRS. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I do not see us developing a special course called 'Sex Education,' since the topic in life is not separated from a lot of other things; nor do I think it should be isolated and separated in curriculum. I think it properly belongs in a broader program and my feeling is that we would continue to develop and expand and improve the curriculum in that area along those lines, contained within other areas where it can logically be developed.

MR. FILMON: What role does the Minister see her department playing with respect to censorship of materials used in curricula within the province?

MRS. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, presently in past practice and the continuing practice is that we do not censor as the Department of Education, but we are involved in a very extensive evaluation of materials and books that are made available through the education system and we participate in this evaluation system with other western provinces, so that materials are reviewed and evaluated and lists with information related to them are made available to school divisions.

In the field of literature I might just separate the evaluation of some materials from the field of literature where we do not do an evaluation but we list books that are available and the decisions are up to the school divisions to decide what they're going to have in their schools.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd would like to ask the Minister whether it's her intention to make public the internal report that is to be prepared in this whole area? You said you were going to do an

internal review.

MRS. HEMPHILL: I'm confused, Mr. Chairman, about what internal report the Member for Morris . . .

MR. MANNESS: In your introductory remarks you made comment to the fact that you were doing an internal review.

MRS. HEMPHILL: I can clarify that then. The review that I was talking about was the ongoing review of curriculum that is being done by the Curriculum Committees related to courses and programs in the schools.

MR. MANNESS: I'm wondering, does Manitoba have its own specific curriculum or, in fact, if it does not, would there be some opportunity to work more closely with other provinces in an attempt again to make more efficient this whole process, where maybe more minds could work towards the same end and that some attempt could be made to develop a curriculum more appropriately devoted to, let's say, the Prairie Provinces?

MRS. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I think activity takes place in both arenas on this issue. A large part of it, of course, is done in Manitoba where we are developing our own curriculum, but there is also more and more co-operation and contact at the national level and that would usually be with the many national organizations that are involved or concerned with education. It could be the Council of Ministers, it could be national school trustee or teacher bodies where they do take on projects and look at some aspects of curriculum nationally. A large amount of it would be done provincially and there is some co-ordination and effort.

MR. MANNESS: Would the Minister not agree that there would have to be some opportunity for savings in this area because, for instance, the Prairie Province, where we basically share a common heritage and background, that indeed, with a population of five million people, that supposedly we could reduce the number of planners that we have in this whole area.

MRS. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Morris is quite correct when he suggests that there could be, and perhaps are, a number of areas where there is a reasonable amount of common ground and that everybody does not have to go off perhaps and invent their own wheel. The organization that I mentioned, the Council of Ministers, has had a Curriculum Review Committee attached to it and it did examine curriculum across the country with a view to identifying the areas, like science and mathematics, where there would be a lot of common ground and where materials and resources and curriculum could be developed and shared on a national basis.

MR. MANNESS: Well, hopefully, the Minister will continue to lend her support to that developing trend. I'm also a little concerned about the whole area of censorship or evaluation in regard, particularly, to the literary field. I know there's a particular situation in my riding where, in fact, there's a book review committee

developed in an attempt to prevent a major outbreak amongst a community. One half the community terribly opposed to the inclusion of certain books and the other half, of course, seeing nothing wrong with them. I'm wondering if the department has a role, some increased role, to play in this area? I don't know if it's a form of guidance or whatever but I see this becoming an increasingly greater concern, certainly in some certain regions, rural areas of this province. I'm wondering if the Minister is content to say that, in fact, no, let the local areas completely look after their own problems in that area and make their decisions or, in fact, is it going to become serious enough that the Provincial Government should attempt to help as these particular problems develop?

MRS. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, first of all, the Department of Education does take a role in evaluating and looking at and listing what they feel is appropriate literature so that there is a list or information about what has been reviewed and an indication that what are on those lists will be appropriate. I suppose it doesn't go quite as far as to study and list and review what isn't appropriate so that, in the first case, school divisions and schools, there is an abundance of literature and resource material available within the list that you can get from the Department of Education that has been evaluated and considered suitable, so that there is lots of potential for sufficient resources if you just followed that.

It does not preclude people from bringing in or making decisions to buy or have resources that are not on the list and I suppose we'd be reluctant to do that since no list can be that comprehensive, and you might be ruling out very good and very valuable material simply because you've never come across it or you haven't reviewed it. I'm not sure that it is just a concern for people in a rural area, I think it is, perhaps, a matter for a community and a school with a lot of involvement, perhaps, if there are sensitive areas between parents and staff and teachers in making what, in the end, are really value judgments and relate to attitudes and values in a community which may vary from place to place, so that they can access to information that will have them avoiding some things that might be appropriate should they wish and they have the lee-way to have additional ones if they want.

You mentioned a parents' book review committee which is a very good idea where they get, not only professional attitudes towards books and materials, but the feelings of the parents in the community at the same time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Tuxedo.

MR. FILMON: I just wondered, in following up on that, if the Minister believes that morality and values ought to be taught in the public schools.

MRS. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I think it's very difficult — in fact, probably almost impossible — for anybody to teach anything without communicating attitudes. I think that we might try or might think they could do it. My guess is that they cannot, that we're always communicating attitudes and values in anything that we do when we're dealing with children. I do

not see it as a — like sex education — as a separate component or a separate curriculum. I think that we teach our young people from the time that they come into the schools about respect for other people and for property and about what is fair and just. So, I think that we are doing that on a daily basis and that we also teach them not by what we say but by what we do as adults. So, it's always being done in everything we do, but I do not see it being done on a formal basis where you develop a curriculum that would predetermine what it was.

MR. FILMON: How about the question, specifically of religious exercises in school such as having opening prayers and that sort of thing?

MRS. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I might have to take the question under advisement. I do know that there are some schools that have religious exercises and some schools who do not. We are not quite clear at this time whether it is optional and where the decision is made, but we'll check that out for you; whether it's in The School Act as a requirement still. We're not quite sure.

MR. FILMON: When the Minister brings back that information, could she also venture an opinion as to what she believes ought to be the case?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. HAMMOND: Yes, just briefly, Mr. Chairman, following that point. Are schools required to have opening exercises such as the children singing the national anthem?

MRS. HEMPHILL: Perhaps we'll cover both of those questions if we can under the same Order for Return, if you want to call it that. I wonder while I'm on my feet if I can give the Member for Kirkfield Park the information she asked me last night about the outdoor education centre in River East. I think I remember what her questions were and I'll give her a summary of the program and then if she has any specific questions she can follow up.

The River East School Division did put in a request for approval to establish an outdoor education centre outside of their division in an area southwest of Portage la Prairie. This request did receive quite considerable and quite in-depth review by my department prior to approval being given because there were a number of concerns raised and they likely fall into the same category as perhaps the concerns that the Member for Kirkfield Park might have. They were related to who pays and what the additional costs would be and where the money would come from and then other matters related to the program when the Manitoba Department of Natural Resources Land Branch had approved the lease of a quarter section of Crown land for that purpose.

In my communication with the school division we made it very clear to them and made sure that they were in agreement that all financial responsibilities for this program were to be met with no provincial funding. In other words, they required Ministerial approval to provide the program outside of the boun-

daries of the school division, but it was not an area that is presently funded under any existing category or any special grant category. So, that if they want to continue with it we're required to commit an understanding that they were taking the responsibility on themselves.

Staff from my department consulted with Mr. Rouse, who is the chairman of the division, and received the assurance that the school division was initiating the project with full knowledge of all implications and that I believe we had information that suggested that the estimated cost by the division was going to be about \$30,000.00. They were planning a 1,500 square feet of construction on the rented Crown land and that the division was going to provide seed money of \$5,000 and the staff and students were to raise the remainder and operate the building. The building construction students are to be involved with the construction of the facility and it's intended use is outdoor education, survival training, science projects, cross-country skiing, etc.

I, after reviewing and going over all the concerns from my department, I authorized them to establish an outdoor education centre and to construct the building of approximately 1,500 square feet on rented Crown land providing that the construction met with the approval of all relevant authorities including Department of Labour, Health and Manitoba Hydro.

MRS. HAMMOND: Yes, I thank the Minister for that answer.

The \$30,000 with \$5,000 coming from the division; the division, I take it, from then on would be covering the operating costs? Did they have any idea of what the cost for this program would be? The ongoing costs?

MRS. HEMPHILL: In the material that I have here I don't see an estimate of the ongoing costs — the operating costs — although, there will be costs, simply to indicate that the question of covering the operating costs was raised with the school division and it was clear and they agreed that the operating costs would be picked up by the school division.

MRS. HAMMOND: Yes, one of the questions I have about the curriculum and the curriculum development, does the Department of Education use any lay people on their committees; the curriculum development committees?

MRS. HEMPHILL: No, we do not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. HAMMOND: I wonder if the Minister possibly might consider using lay people on some of the committees that are dealing with the curriculum especially now when, not just parents, but people in the community seem to want to be so much involved in their schools and if she would give that some consideration.

The other questions I have are about the Heritage Programs. I wonder, just for information if the Minister would indicate, are the bilingual programs or the Heritage Programs, what is the percentage of the lan-

guage versus the English language, 75-25, 50-50 or what?

MRS. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, in the Ukrainian bilingual program that is in place, 50 percent of the curriculum is taught in the Ukrainian language, social studies, health, particular courses are taught in the language.

I wonder if I can comment on the points raised by the Member for Kirkfield Park related to the curriculum review. While the curriculum committees that are developing the curriculum do not have lay people on them presently, they are made up of professionals in the field, largely teachers with knowledge in that particular subject matter, that their program review committees do have a broad representation that would include representatives of — I'm not sure if it would be home and school — but certainly the Manitoba Association of School Trustees and organizations like that are represented on the review committees. I sat on a number of those myself, on the elementary review committee and on the articulation council and I considered myself a lay person on those committees.

I would also like to suggest to the member that I considered the point she made about the involvement of parents on curriculum review, it would be an interesting one and one that I would take under consideration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour is 4:30, I'm interrupting proceedings for Private Members' Hour. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

COMMITTEE REPORTS

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. HARAPIAK: The Committee has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report same and asks leave to sit again.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for River East, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

RES. NO. 5 — 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE GARDEN

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Time for Private Members' Hour. The Resolution of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park has 17 minutes remaining.

MRS. HAMMOND: I have finished, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, may I request the member's time that she forgave, I have quite a few things I'd like to say about the Peace Garden. Mr. Speaker, I want to, as well as my colleagues and the members of the government who spoke on this resolution, first of all compliment the Member for the Turtle Mountain constituency, a constituency within which the Peace Garden lies as well as a neighbouring constituency to the one which I represent and, of course, the Peace Garden is a very important part of not only, I'm sure, his constituency but mine as well. It provides an area of the province for people to go, relax and to have family functions and carry out many activities of family gatherings as well as the many activities that have been identified or mentioned by some of the previous speakers.

Mr. Speaker, the area in which the Peace Garden is located is truly one of peacefulness and an area that I think that many Manitobans from not just in rural Manitoba, but I would hope that a lot more of the urban citizens of the province would take the opportunity to proceed to spend some time at. Of course, when one has the opportunity to visit the beautiful surroundings and the area which not only has friendly people, but people who have had the ambition and foresight to recognize that part of this province and this country as a symbol of peace.

I think probably, Mr. Speaker, I have in my own family upbringing in relationship with that kind of a boundary that has been mentioned in the resolution, an undefended boundary, I can have a little closer feeling for the kind of reasoning that it is undefended and has been undefended and probably can remain undefended because of the family ties that are connected both north and south of the boundary. I happen to have one older member of my family that was born in the United States because of our proximity to the 49th Parallel and the U.S. Boundary it was closer to go to a nursing home or a hospital facility in the United States than it was to proceed to a town in Manitoba or in Canada. So when one has a direct member of his family born or a citizen for several years of his life as an American citizen, you have an understanding that really because there is an imaginary line or because there is a dividing line there of an imaginary sort, that really there isn't anything changes our desires as a nation and their desires as a nation upon which the private individual and the freedoms of those individuals can be protected. I have a pretty good feeling for that kind of a closeness, at the same time respecting one another's Constitutional rights and, of course, the governing system which we have both had in our different countries as well as many other members of my mother's family are living in the south side of the boundary, the same with some of my father's ancestors. So it's a matter of having family ties both sides of the boundary and understanding that really we have the same kinds of objectives.

So to the member for introducing the resolution, Mr. Speaker, from the people of Arthur, I am sure that all my constituents from the Arthur Constituency would want to congratulate the forefathers or those people who had foresight to establish this monumental piece of ground, this monumental area in Manitoba along the United States boundary. I think the people would be pleased that I were to congratulate the peo-

ple who have put their life and effort into supporting and maintaining the grounds. At the same time they feel very comfortable, I'm sure, being residents along the boundary of the 49th Parallel which, of course, south of it lies the United States of America, one of our most important and treasured trading partners. As a member of the agriculture community, I think I can feel comfortable in saying that we have enjoyed a good relationship. I think we can continue to enjoy a good relationship unless we see the attitudes of the Americans turn somewhat against us with the kind of Reagan bashing we are now seeing coming from the Premier of Manitoba. It's unfortunate that those kinds of comments come from statesmen or people who are supposed to be statesmen because it does very little, Mr. Speaker, to continue on with the spirit of living in North America in the friendly way in which we have lived in the past.

Mr. Speaker, again, from the people of Arthur to the people who have built and supported the Peace Garden and as my own job as an MLA and a member of the Legislative Assembly, I too want to support this resolution and hope that all members of the Legislative Assembly see fit to support the resolution that is before the House congratulating the Peace Garden on their 50 years of successful operations.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. STEVE ASHTON (Thompson): Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I must say, on this particular occasion, how glad I am to see the bipartisan support for this motion because I believe this is actually a first in this Session in which we have actually been able to agree on something. I think it couldn't be on a more appropriate subject here today because in looking, as we do, at the longest undefended border in the world, I think we should realize how lucky we are, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to have this peaceful relationship with our neighbours to the south because as we debate this motion here today, there are many other countries which wish they would have such a relationship with their neighbours.

There are, in fact, I believe something in the neighbourhood of 80 or 90 nations around the world which have border disputes with each other. There are a number of nations, of course, which are currently in conflict over those border disputes and it is, I think, perhaps significant if one looks at the situation we have with our American neighbours that despite the fact we have one of the longest borders in the world, not just one of the longest undefended borders, but despite the fact we have one of the longest borders, that we have been able to maintain peace with them for over 150 years now.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I would second the sentiments of the Member for Arthur in terms of the family connections that go across the borders because I think if one looks at the background of many Manitobans and the background of many Americans just across the way that there has been a great deal of inter-tie there. We have many former Americans in our midst, Mr. Speaker — right with our own caucus there are a number former Americans — and we can see the movement in that direction and of course

there are many Canadians now living in the States. So I think it's quite appropriate to talk about the strong family ties that do exist.

In terms of the Constituency of Thompson, that we, of course, are located some distance from the border but that does not mean that we do not have strong ties with the United States. In fact, we have strong ties with the Peace Garden itself. The many camps which are held in the Peace Garden are well attended from Thompsonites. In fact, I have seen many strong community fund raising efforts related to sending people to these music camps. In fact, my brother attended the music camp there last year and he indicated it was a very good experience for people from the Canadian side of the border, the American side of the border, to get together and realize both what we have in common as nations, as individuals, and also the differences that we have because I think those are equally important too, you know, the strong American identity our friends across the border have and the strong Canadian identity that we have here in Canada.

On behalf of the people of Thompson, I have no problem in supporting the motion put forward by the Member for Turtle Mountain, a motion which I would add that he debated very well; I think expressed the common hopes of the members of this Legislature, all 57 members regardless of region of the province that we represent or regardless of what party we're in, that the strong ties that have existed between the United States and Canada, as symbolized by the Peace Garden, continue. I would heartily endorse his resolution on behalf of the people of Thompson and would urge all members of the House to do so.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak on this today. I would like to first read a communication that was forwarded on April 8th of 1982 pertaining to the best wishes and congratulations by the other government of the Province of Manitoba, indeed all the people of the Province of Manitoba, pertaining to the 50th Anniversary of this our joint symbol of peace and I would read the message into the record as same was expressed.

"I'm particularly pleased to extend to all members and supporters of the International Peace Garden, the heartiest congratulations of the Government and people of Manitoba on the 50th Anniversary of our joint symbol of peace.

"Americans and Canadians take a justifiable pride in our long and continuing friendship in our combined efforts to advance the cause of peace with freedom.

"When the beautiful International Peace Garden was dedicated a golden half-century ago, a deep and responsive chord was struck by those inspiring words: 'TO GOD IN HIS GLORY . . . We Two Nations Dedicate This Garden and Pledge Ourselves That As Long as Men Shall Live We Will Not Take Up Arms Against One Another.'

"Like our friendship, this Garden has been nurtured and maintained by dedicated people on both sides of the common border and both enriched by time. Please accept our warmest wishes on this

important anniversary."

That was forwarded on April the 18th to the interested parties.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that all members of the Chamber will indeed join in supporting the resolution that was introduced by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

There's only one unfortunate note that I will not refrain from commenting on, Mr. Speaker, because to me it really represents a lack of understanding of freedom, what freedom is all about. The Member for Pembina made a comment — it's hard sometimes to remember — made some sort of comment about the fact that well the government and the Premier have spoken about Reaganomics. They haven't shown friendship because they've attacked American policies. Mr. Speaker, I . . .

MR. ORCHARD: When did I say that?

MR. PAWLEY: Oh, the Member for Arthur, I'm sorry, it's the Member for Arthur. Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the Member for Pembina although I must say that the words spoken by the Member for Arthur might have been more representative of what could have been expected from the Member for Pembina, because this is not the relationship that exists between . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Pembina on a point of order.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I'm sure that you will ask the First Minister of this province, after having made the first grave error of attributing remarks to me that I didn't make, to surely ask him to apologize to both myself and to the Member for Arthur for those obtuse comments of his.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge that which I attributed to the Member for Arthur was not spoken by the Member for Arthur and, therefore, I see no reason for apologizing to the Member for Arthur. They were not remarks that were uttered by the Member for Pembina, but I must say, having heard the Member for Pembina on previous occasions, I would not have been surprised to have heard those comments coming from him.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's very very important to make the distinction that some honourable members across the way apparently don't understand within free loving countries that border one on the other. Mr. Speaker, the comment by the Member for Arthur would indeed be very pertinent if this was Poland. Yes, if the leadership in Poland criticized the policies that exist in the Soviet Union, then indeed there would be a kind of reaction that in some way would be disloyal. In fact, Mr. Speaker, if we had a situation involving the relationship between Nicaragua and Honduras, or if we had the situation between El Salvador and Honduras, or if we had the situation between Guyana and Venezuela, but fortunately, and I say this to the Honourable Member for Arthur, in Canada we have the freedom to speak; we have the

freedom to voice our opinion of the positions that are being taken by policy makers in the world, whether they be in the United States, whether they be in the Soviet Union, whether they be in Argentina, wherever they be in this world, and similarly, the spokespeople in the United States. Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not intend to be dissuaded by that sort of amateurish . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Arthur on a point of order.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister would submit to a question.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, when I've completed the point that I wanted to make.

So, Mr. Speaker, friendship between two nations indeed embodies that; it embodies respect for each other, respect for the opinion, the process, the systems that exist in the two countries. It does not mean bootpolishing; it does not mean that you do not speak frankly about the views that are held by the political leadership of one country or another, because that is the democratic, that is the free way. So, Mr. Speaker, I fail to understand the comment by the Honourable Member for Arthur and I doubt whether very many other Manitobans would either.

But, Mr. Speaker, what is important is that we do join together and demonstrate the joy that Manitobans have in regard to the formation of the Peace Garden, what that reflects in regard to the peaceful relations that has existed in this country as well as in the United States for many many decades. We cherish that, Mr. Speaker, and certainly the Government of the Province of Manitoba, as witnessed by the earlier communique that was issued, strongly supports the spirit of the resolution before us.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I understood that the First Minister would submit to a question. Was that correct?

Mr. Speaker, I couldn't agree more with him that we do have the freedom to say and to criticize and to comment on policies of other politicians not only in Canada but throughout North America and I can't disagree with him. Has he, because he does not agree with the interest rate policies of Ronald Reagan, has he sat down and written him a personal letter suggesting that he does not support the kinds of interest rates, so he can do it directly to him and get a response in all fairness to the President of the United States? Or is he just sitting back in Manitoba taking some cheap political shots, that he's trying to do again now, hoping that the airwaves will flow down south to Ronald Reagan and that he makes remarks as a Premier and that the President of the United States has no opportunity to respond to the criticism or has he written a letter? The question is, has he written a letter saying I do not agree with your policies, they are hurting us, would you please change them? Has he done that, Mr. Speaker?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable

First Minister.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the Honourable Member for Arthur appears not to have a very intimate knowledge of our system and the way our system works. That kind of message by the way of —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate if I'd be permitted to speak. The Honourable Member for Pembina attempts to make it very very difficult.

Mr. Speaker, what is very important within our system, and the Honourable Member for Arthur knows it so very well, those kind of messages must be expressed from one national government to another national government. Mr. Speaker, my criticism has indeed been directed towards the kind of national policies that have been pursued in Washington, I make no secret of that. That message should be related to the President of the United States by the Prime Minister of Canada; it should be related to the Cabinet of the President of the United States by the Cabinet of the Dominion of Canada, Mr. Speaker; and indeed that is what we are doing in respect to the Garrison office.

There is . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PAWLEY: There is indeed that kind of relationship of the Federal Government whether honourable members appreciate it or not. That is irrelevant to the resolution that is before us.

Mr. Speaker, although the Honourable Member for Arthur may attempt to intimidate members on this side of the Chamber in respect to Reaganomics; he attempts to intimidate members on this side of the House because obviously they are so worried, they're so worried about the abysmal position that they have taken in regard to high interest rates. They are so worried about Conservative monetary policies that they've fastened themselves to, Mr. Speaker, they cannot now unglue themselves from those policies and we, of course, do not intend to permit them to unglue themselves from those policies that have been so destructive and so irresponsible to the whole of Canada.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would also like to add a few comments and add my support to this resolution. Unfortunately, it started off being very nice and clean and now it got a little cloudy at the tail end here. I hope that our American friends won't necessarily be reading Hansard.

I think it is very commendable for the Member for Turtle Mountain to introduce this resolution and that this House support it. I think the relationship that we have between the two greatest countries in the world is something that is very unique and is something that could be used as an example for the rest of the world.

I would like to just broaden a little bit on the resolution itself in terms of the relationship between the two countries especially in the area that affects my constituency. I think it's probably one of the longest boundaries of any individual member at least in Manitoba.

The area that I represent starts at the Town of Emerson and all the way to the Ontario boundary and we have a very unique relationship taking place there between our American friends in terms of the kinds of activities that take place business wise in terms of hospital services and dental services. —(Interjection)— Well, I still like them anyway.

The other thing is that we have four separate ports of entry along the boundary that I represent and there is a lot of activity that takes place between the two countries. Many of the services that we cannot provide because of, I suppose lower population, are being provided by our American counterparts in the Towns of Rosseau, Warroad and what has happened, relationships have been built up between the neighbouring countries, between the people themselves. They don't even regard the border as a border at all; communications are going back and forth, the visiting that takes place back and forth, the services that are being provided. We have a case where many of our people citizens of Manitoba, are born in American hospitals, and I mentioned this when the Minister of Health had his Estimates up. They end up they have dual citizenship papers until they are, I believe 21, where they then have to make a decision as to which country they want to belong to. The fact is that many of them don't make that decision until they are 21 because they like it in both cases. They have no problems in either country and I think it's sort of unique; I think it shows the kind of relationship that we have.

I think in some cases some of our people along the border have maybe a closer relationship with the communities to the south than they do with their neighbouring communities where there is more of a competitive attitude from time to time. Further to that, another unique situation that applies between the two countries, in the Town of Piney, we have an international airport where I had the occasion just a few years ago to officiate at the opening and you land in one country with your plane and you come to a stop in the other country. It's very unique and I think this kind of thing illustrates the relationship that we have and should be expanded on with many other things. I think it is something that if the rest of the world could have that kind of attitude and experience, this kind of relationship, there would be a lot less problems.

I just wanted to add these comments to the resolution that is before the House here now. I have had occasion to visit the Peace Garden; I think it is fantastic. As I indicated before, I think we should enlarge other activities along these lines, monuments like the Peace Garden, like the international airport, other things of this nature.

From time to time, we have differences with our neighbours to the south. It is illustrated in the Garrison problems, for example, Roseau River problems. But when we talk of the flooding problems along the Red River Valley, for example, there is a joint effort being made by both sides to try and resolve these problems. This is something that I think is very commendable and it for this reason that I support the resolution, Mr. Speaker, and I think everybody should. I hope nobody wants to cloud the issue anymore than in the way it was done before. Thank you very much.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member

for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID R. (Dave) BLAKE (Minnedosa): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too want to just add words of support to this resolution that is very timely and has been brought in by the Member for Turtle Mountain whose constituency takes in this garden spot in our province. There's not much more that can be said that hasn't already been said without being repetitive, Mr. Speaker, but that garden has become a cultural centre for the province and for the State of North Dakota and, indeed, for the whole nation of Canada and the United States.

The Peace Garden itself was opened on July 14, 1932 and while I did not attend the opening, I recall quite well although I was a small child then, my father and a bus load of citizens from our area went down to the opening of the Peace Garden on that date. I recall him coming home and we were looking forward to him having some glorious tales to tell us about this wonderful garden as we pictured it; Peace Garden, everyone thought of it as a place of great beauty. When he arrived home — I forget how many thousand people were there that day at the opening ceremony, but there were very, very limited facilities — there were no booths for soft drinks, there was no water available, it was a blistering hot day — and his account of that visit to the opening of the Peace Garden was anything but we had expected him to relate to us when he got back. But since then, I have had an opportunity to take him back there some years later to see what development had taken place and it has indeed been tremendous growth there from a cultural point of view, from the athletic facilities that have been developed and the music camp which is known internationally.

Those facilities have not come about easily. There has been a tremendous amount of volunteer effort and a lot of voluntary contributions of funds. The Masonic Lodge have contributed greatly in building a fairly large centre there, the Independent Order of Daughters of the Empire have contributed a pavilion, the Legion have built the sports facilities there and, as I say, they have contributed tremendously to the development of our young athletes. I had a daughter attend camp there some years ago and I have been down there through various Legion activities observing some of the events and some of the courses that are provided.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the International Peace Garden should be a beacon for the free world on how something as symbolic as that can stand to indicate the unguarded frontier that we have had almost from sea to sea. This, I think, can be a lesson to other parts of the world that haven't enjoyed the good friendly, neighbourly relationship that we have had with the United States and especially our good neighbours of the State of North Dakota.

The late Earl McKellar, who represented that area for many many years was deeply involved in the operation of the Peace Garden and spent a great amount of his time in promoting it and seeing it further develop.

During my years in the Chamber of Commerce movement I had the privilege of serving on the board of directors there for one or two sessions. Of course,

through that became a little more involved with it. I always felt at that time that the amount of money that was contributed by the Federal Government and the Provincial Government was very very minimal to the development of that particular beauty spot in our province and in the state to the immediate south of us.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those words I want to again congratulate the Member for Turtle Mountain for bringing the resolution in and to urge all members of this House to support it wholeheartedly. I know that our neighbours to the south will be only too pleased with the support that we have given the resolution and I know it's going to receive unanimous approval.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The resolution by the Member for Turtle Mountain is one that I know all members of the House are going to support because we've heard from several members from the government and they are in agreement with the intent of the resolution. I understand the Member for Springfield may not support it. He may change his mind after I finish speaking.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution is, I think, particularly appropriate to come forward at this time and I have to point out to members who are not familiar with Pembina constituency, but it has a great length of that undefended border as the southern boundary of Pembina constituency with several border crossings that are available during the normal hours of business, and being an undefended border there are a number of border crossings in that undefended border that are used when the regular ones are not open. That, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, is an example of the kind of trust and the kind of friendship and the kind of nationhood that has grown up between the United States and between Canada. Let us hope — each and everyone of us — as Manitobans and Canadians that attitude of co-operation and trust stays and grows between our two countries.

The people who envisioned such an International Garden dedicated to peace back in the '20s, and finally coming to realization in 1932, certainly deserve a lot of credit and a lot of recognition at this time. The concept of coming up with an International Peace Garden crossing the border of two friendly and co-existing nations has to be something that is indeed unique. For that to occur and that investment to be made in 1932 during the very early and very devastating stages of the Great Depression has to clearly demonstrate that our two nations, despite economic problems, appreciate one thing above and beyond the kind of temporary problems that economies can get themselves into and that is the recognition of the same values, the same principles, the same beliefs in freedom and God and justice that our two nations have.

The Peace Garden as has been commented on by a number of the speakers has been added to in its first 50 years by a number of organizations putting up buildings dedicated to the concept of peace, to the concept of the international co-operation that we have between our two countries. The function of the Peace Garden in its athletic camp and music camp is,

I think, probably well renowned beyond the Province of Manitoba and beyond the State of North Dakota with many young people availing themselves of the facilities there and I suppose more importantly of the unique environment and atmosphere of that Peace Garden.

I think probably the most important component of that Peace Garden was the inscription on the monument as placed in 1932 to the effect that it is the deep hope of the province and the State of North Dakota that our two nations should never take up arms against one another and that we should live forever in peaceful co-existence. You know that, Mr. Speaker, is an example that will never fail to be valuable to all nations of the world.

Right now we have happening on a number of fronts in the world conflicts between nations. In southeast Asia there's an ongoing conflict between nations there. There is increasing tensions between the Soviet Union and China along their border, which in terms of length is somewhat similar to our border. It's interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that Canada and the United States share a lot of the same principles of economic freedom and political freedom, religious freedom. We're countries based on capitalistic democracies. We have co-existed peacefully even though we have a different system of parliamentary government compared to their style of government. We have differences of opinion from time to time on economic policy and on international policy even, but we have maintained that undefended border. We don't have troops stationed along our border on our side, neither they on their side. It's interesting to contrast that to the 5,000 to 6,000 mile Sino-Soviet border between China and Russia because those two countries both share a political philosophy and a political belief imbedded in the principles of Marxism and Leninism. They're communist countries.

Theoretically, if we were to translate our two economic systems — the United States and Canada both being free-enterprise economies — and we're able to maintain an undefended and a free border and we are able to live in peaceful co-existence, it should translate that if the communist system of government, as represented in the Soviet Union and in China, are representative of a system which allows nations to co-exist peacefully, they should not need defenses along their borders; they should not need armies; they should not need tanks and guns; but they do.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that clearly demonstrates that we have a lot to be proud of in the free heritage that we have in this country and that the United States has and in the fact that North America is probably the embodiment of freedom and justice and reward for the individual and the hallmark of those principles in the world. I think it draws to us at a time when it's increasingly important to observe neighbouring nations throughout the world who have their differences and are run by different political systems than the two that are present in Canada and the United States, that indeed our system, the capitalistic system, has a lot to offer to the world and has a lot to commend itself to the world. No more contrasting example exists I submit, Mr. Speaker, than the Sino-Soviet border, the same length, two countries of similar political beliefs, founded on the same basic principles that were de-

veloped back in the early 1900's and late 1800's, and yet they cannot peacefully co-exist as we can with the United States. There are other examples of that; I think Chile and Argentina have their differences of opinion politically and they have some friction and some concern over the intent of each country towards the other. We don't have that particular thing to worry about in Canada.

I suppose that one of the things that we should be very careful of, from time to time, is how rabidly we, as individual members of society in Canada and Manitoba, choose to condemn our neighbour to the south for embarking on various policies which are, I submit, not well understood by those who are protesting the loudest. —(Interjection)— The Attorney-General is making some comment not even from his own seat. I didn't really catch it but I suppose it will be valuable. Maybe he'll speak on the resolution, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

From time to time we do find that it's pretty easy in Canada to identify some of the problems that we have in Canada that are our Canadian problems. We find it very easy to dispel those problems with the simplistic view that if only the United States were not so powerful, were not so influential on our economy, that if they weren't so interruptive in our economic affairs, that Canada would be a better nation and we find that when our policies in Canada have, from time to time, not produced the results that Canadians had hoped for and indeed the politicians had hoped for, that an avenue of last resort is to blame it on our neighbour to the south, that all our problems are emanating from there.

The Member for Arthur made a brief reference to that and that's what I'm referring now today. We even have our Prime Minister, for instance, now saying that the Reagan interest rate policies are the sole reason why Canada's economy is in difficulty right now, failing to realize the contribution that he has personally made in the last 13 years towards that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think this resolution deserves the support of each and every one of us in this House, because what the Peace Garden represents between Manitoba and North Dakota and, in fact, between Canada and the United States, is a goal that if all nations sharing a common border could accomplish what was accomplished in 1932 in the establishment of an International Peace Garden, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I submit it would eliminate a lot of the tensions and conflict in the world. What we have in Manitoba, shared with North Dakota, is an example of peace, an example of individual freedom, an example of the common goal for the betterment of man that can bear itself well to other nations sharing a common border and I commend this resolution to the House and I congratulate the Member for Turtle Mountain for bringing it to us.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MRS. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is indeed a pleasure to rise to add my remarks to the record concerning this very worthwhile and timely resolution brought forward by the Member for Turtle Mountain.

It's been my privilege to visit these beautiful gardens

several times over the years and to see the changes that have taken place. We're very fortunate as a province that this site was chosen years ago as a symbol of the friendship and the trust between Canada and her neighbour to the south.

I noticed over the years that several different organizations, international and individual, take an opportunity every year to visit the Peace Garden as part of their annual yearly program, and in that way to get together with people, their counterparts on both sides of the border, to discuss their ideas and have a good exchange of ideas and fellowship.

Some others have also mentioned Earl McKellar, the late Member for Souris-Killarney, who was a Board Member of that Foundation for many years. It was my pleasure and privilege a couple of years ago, I believe it was, to attend a ceremony at a site in the Peace Garden where a beautiful spot was dedicated to Earl's memory. In that quiet spot is included a picnic shelter and a plaque which commemorates the work that he did in furthering the extension and the work of this Garden.

It's also noteworthy that while including a great number of buildings and man-made features, such as flower gardens, cairns and so forth, there has been maintained in the Garden as much natural beauty as possible. Shady quiet drives, calm lakes surrounded by natural flowers and trees, as much of a natural setting as one possibly could while they're building so many things there. I think that is one of the features that I enjoy most about that Garden is that it doesn't appear crowded. There's room for many many people to have large family gatherings, small picnics and to use the large number of facilities and still there isn't that crowded feeling that you get when you go to some resorts, where you feel you are cheek to jowl with everyone that goes when you try to picnic, etc. So this Garden isn't confined or crowded, it is in a natural setting and has maintained the natural state of the area.

Other people have mentioned the fact of the long undefended borders of this country and the United States. Long may it remain as a symbol of the co-operation and the friendliness between our two great countries. I believe the Member for Pembina made reference to countries which certainly have far different problems at their borders than we do. There are countries in this world who have border blockades to keep their people from getting out, so it's certainly commendable that there are two countries in the world that have such a long, undefended border and, in fact, put up a monument to emphasize that fact.

I'll add my congratulations to the Member for Turtle Mountain for bringing this resolution to this Assembly and also to add my voice to the people who have congratulated the Board of the International Peace Garden and who help to continue its progress.

I commend the Garden to all of you to visit, not only during this their birthday year, but anytime. It is a very worthwhile place to visit.

Thank you very much.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I just, in closing debate

on this resolution, would like to express my personal thanks to all the members who have spoken in favour of this resolution and once again look forward to seeing a number of the Members of the Legislature there when International Peace Garden celebrates its 50th Anniversary in July.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. PENNER: May we call it 5:30 p.m.?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: With the consent of the House, we'll call it 5:30 p.m. and I'll return at 8:00 p.m.