

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 18 June, 1985.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - CIVIL SERVICE

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: Committee, please come to order. This section of the Committee of Supply shall be dealing with the Estimates of the Civil Service Commission. We shall begin with a statement from the Honourable Minister responsible for the Commission.

HON. A. MACKLING: Thank you. Mr. Chairperson, in introducing the '85-86 Budget Estimates for the Civil Service Commission, I would draw attention to the Sixty-seventh Annual Report of the Commission, which was introduced in the House on March 25, 1985. This report explains the organization, programs and activities of the Civil Service Commission over the 1984 calendar year.

I would also draw the committee's attention to the Supplementary Estimates Information which has been produced by the Civil Service Commission again this year in order to provide additional detailed information and clarification of the printed Main Estimates.

I would digress here for a second. The Clerk's Office has the supplementary information. Regrettably, I wasn't in the House at 2 o'clock to distribute and file that information. I have given the critic a copy of that supplementary information. I understand the Clerk will then get the copies, Mr. Chairman, and distribute them.

This information provides supplementary background, organization program and financial information designed to assist members with the Estimates review now before us.

The Budget Estimates for the Civil Service Commission are comprised of three main components. These include the salary and operating expenses of the Commission as set out in Item 1; the government's contribution to various Civil Service benefit plans as listed under Item 2; and the levy for health and post-secondary education as set forth in Item 3.

By way of a very general summary, it can be seen that the major area of increase is associated with the government's contributions required to fund the various government benefit plans. The majority of these plans are fixed through statute or collective agreement with the result that there is little or no discretion which can be exercised in terms of their cost.

The salary and operating expenditures of the Civil Service Commission, as set forth in Item 1, indicate the inclusion of a new initiative under the heading of Career Development Program. This program sets aside six staff years to be utilized in equipping selected candidates from the four affirmative target groups with the required knowledge and skills to enable them to complete successfully and function effectively within positions at the supervisory level. As has been noted, all salary costs associated with this program are Recoverable from Other Appropriations.

Organizational information, distribution of staff among the various divisions and branches of the Civil Service Commission, and detailed financial information are contained within the supplementary information package prepared for legislative review. It is hoped that this information will prove useful and assist the members with the review of the Estimates now before us.

With those brief remarks, Mr. Chairperson, I offer myself to the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As is customary with the committee, the leading critic of the opposition party may now present his reply to the Minister's opening statement. The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: I will pass on that, Mr. Chairman. We can move into the Estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The members of the departmental staff are cordially invited to find and take their respective places.

We shall begin immediately with consideration of Budget Item No. 1.(a)(1) Civil Service Commission, Administration and Finance: Salaries; 1.(a)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister, what is the average salary of a member of the Civil Service in Manitoba?

HON. A. MACKLING: Approximately \$26,000.00.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister to confirm that he, or this Civil Service Commission, received an analysis of the requirement for bilingual staff which would have been required under Bill 115 of the government's French language package that was prepared by the Manitoba Government Employees Association in February of 1984?

HON. A. MACKLING: The question is whether or not we did an analysis.

MR. G. MERCIER: Whether you received an analysis that was done by the Manitoba Government Employees Association?

HON. A. MACKLING: I'm not aware of any study having been received from the MGEA.

MR. G. MERCIER: When did the Minister assume responsibility for this Civil Service Commission?

HON. A. MACKLING: January, but I don't know the specific date.

HON. J. STORIE: January 30th.

HON. A. MACKLING: No, that's a good guess Jerry.

It was January, I don't recall the exact date. If that's critical, I'll — (Interjection) — January 30th, close enough. Fair enough, it is an auspicious day in any event.

A MEMBER: Auspicious, not suspicious.

HON. A. MACKLING: Not suspicious, auspicious.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, as the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission in relationship with the Manitoba Government Employees Association, would the Minister undertake to obtain from them, and table in this committee or, if this committee is completed, in the Legislature, a copy of the report or analysis that was done by the Manitoba Government Employees Association with respect to Bill 115?

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, if the Manitoba Government Employees Association has given it to government, I have not reason to withhold that; but if they haven't given it to me or my department, I would have to ask them for it. I would think that the honourable member, or anyone, might want to ask them directly if they haven't tendered it to us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Tourism.

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, for the edification of the Member for St. Norbert, the Manitoba Government Employees Association did put on record on a number of occasions, both their views with respect to Bill 115 and the implications of that bill on their membership. There were a variety of numbers banded about during that debate. I'm certain that the member is searching for a number that would justify the Leader of the Opposition's suggestion made on the Provincial Affairs Program on Saturday night, and I don't think he'll be able to find that. Certainly he is at liberty to contact Mr. Doer or anyone else from the MGEA, but from my recollection the numbers that they considered appropriate were put on the record and he might be advised to review the lengthy debates that took place, or the presentations that took place, in September of 1983.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister then undertaking to enquire from government, as he puts it, I take it that's other members of Cabinet, as to whether or not the government received a copy of that report, whether his predecessor may have received a copy of that report, and if he obtained the same, he will table same in this committee or in the House?

HON. A. MACKLING: I really have indicated that if my department, Civil Service Commission, my department as Minister of Labour, if I have such a report from the MGEA within the department I'll be happy to provide that information to the member. But staff indicate to me that they're not aware of an MGEA analysis provided to us. Maybe they have such an analysis, but they didn't formally provide it to us, they used it as my colleague, Minister of Tourism has indicated, in their presentations.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, just for the record, I am referring to an analysis that was dated February

1984. Mr. Chairman, to move on then, could the Minister outline the terms of the new contract with the Manitoba Government Employees Association?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, I'll ask staff to give me the highlights that I can review with him. I don't think you want a detailed review of the contract, I think you want the highlights of any of the changes that were effected in the bargaining process. I'll just take a moment because it is in a printed form.

Yes, staff has given me the highlights and I can review them very briefly. The negotiations resulted in agreement for a three-year contract that commenced September 28, 1984, for a 12-month period at 0 percent; then a 3 percent rise for the next 12 months and in the third year the cost-of-living index for that third year.

There was an undertaking that during the course of the contract period, there would be no discharge or early termination of any permanent staff, or no layoff. There were some benefit improvements including a one-week additional vacation during the first 12-month period. There was some improvement in the dental plan and in the long-term disability entitlement. There were some other provisions, the agreement that may be of interest, the inclusion of a commitment in respect to the appointment of a committee dealing with pay equity, among other things.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, for the first year each employee is entitled to take an additional week's vacation, is that correct?

HON. A. MACKLING: Correct.

MR. G. MERCIER: What does that cost out as?

HON. A. MACKLING: There are differences of view in respect to the calculation. From our calculation .6 percent, that is a little over 1/2 of 1 percent. Those are the hard replacement costs. Someone takes a week's holiday and in order to provide for that service the extent that there has to be someone engaged to do that work, that is our cost.

MR. G. MERCIER: That is just a 1-over-52 calculation. What is the other opinion?

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, the other opinion, of course, the MGEA what it is worth to their employees and they calculate, I believe, that if they got the pay for that time it would be 2 percent. But I repeat, from our perspective, it cost us .6 percent.

MR. G. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I suppose it cost .6 percent if the government finds that it does not have to replace these members of the Civil Service while they are away on this extra week of vacation, could the Minister indicate what the experience is in replacement of people who are taking an additional weeks vacation?

HON. A. MACKLING: If we didn't have to replace any of the workers, it would be zero percent, but to the extent that we have to provide additional people or provide overtime or whatever to compensate for that time, it is .6 percent.

MR. G. MERCIER: What is the experience then in replacement of people who are taking an extra week of vacation?

HON. A. MACKLING: About a third of the work force would require that in their positions they would have to be replaced during the week, so we are looking at .6 percent.

MR. G. MERCIER: About a third have to be replaced?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes.

MR. G. MERCIER: A cynic might ask . . .

HON. A. MACKLING: No, don't ask that, Gerry.

MR. G. MERCIER: . . . whether or not you could get away with them for another week, or another week on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What would a cynic answer to such a question by a cynic?

HON. A. MACKLING: Not being a cynic, I can't answer that. No, it's hypothetical, I will plead, Mr. Chairperson.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, in the third year the increase will depend upon the cost-of-living index. When is that calculated and applied?

HON. A. MACKLING: It will be the Winnipeg cost price index on the previous 12 months.

MR. G. MERCIER: Previous 12 months.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

HON. A. MACKLING: No, that's all right. I was just getting further elaboration which is a little more technical; that's all.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister expand on the government's obligation not to lay off any employees, I take it during the whole term of this contract? Is there a precise number of employees agreed to as at the beginning of the contract in that number, that no employee employed as at September 28, 1984, should be laid off for three years?

HON. A. MACKLING: I will just check the wording of the agreements for that. Usually I don't have to succumb to this, but it is fine print. I will read the two sections of the memorandum agreement that are applicable. The whole section is entitled "Layoffs" and the provision is that during the term of this memorandum, and it is March 15, '85 to September 25, '87, ". . . no layoffs of regular employees, no layoffs of term employees who have accumulated more than 12 months of service, no layoffs of departmental employees who have accumulated more than 12 continuous months of service unbroken by layoff. This layoff provision does not apply to term employees whose term has expired. However, it is the government's intention to maintain the employment of those employed in term positions

where the need for the job functions is expected to continue, term employees whose services are terminated following the completion of a specific job for which they have been specifically employed."

MR. G. MERCIER: The 1984 report indicates on Page 9 that total employment for 1984 was 17,059. Can the Minister indicate what the total employment was in 1981?

HON. A. MACKLING: '81?

MR. G. MERCIER: Yes.

HON. A. MACKLING: If the honourable member will turn to Page 29 of the report, there is a comparative employment chart and it provides the numbers for 1980 to 1984 inclusive. — (Interjection) — The Annual Report, do you have a copy?

MR. G. MERCIER: Well, I have one that was tabled before, I have both, thanks. But I have a previous one that I think the Minister tabled in the House, it was not, as printed.

HON. A. MACKLING: That was a photocopy; maybe you haven't got the pages numbered. Page 29.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, we have to find the - I'm working from the photocopy that was tabled in the House - but in that photocopy, on Page 32 of that copy, they refer to competitions by departments and in 1984 there were 641 competitions, that was up a bit from 1983 when there were 437; but down considerably from the years 1979, 1980, 1981 and even 1982; could the Minister explain the reasons why the number of competitions have been reduced significantly.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, just before endeavouring to provide an answer to that question, I just draw the honourable member's attention to Page 22 of the printed Annual Report and you'll find the comparison's there for the years. The honourable member refers to the reduction in competitions between the previous years and the significant reductions in 1983, 1984, and the answer, as I understand it, is that there was considerable control placed on a new hirings and, therefore, a reduction in competitions took place.

Then one other factor, Mr. Chairman, is that due to the economy there weren't the same number of turnovers, the same number of people that were leaving; people were holding on to the jobs they had.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, just for confirmation, I take it the Minister in these Estimates really only wants to deal with Civil Service positions, not with the number of Order-in-Council appointments. Does the Minister deal with those in this set of Estimates, or should that be done under Executive Council?

HON. A. MACKLING: I would be prepared to deal with them if I could, but I don't think that I would have the information. I think properly the Clerk of the Executive Council would be the person who would have all that information.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate the total number of female employees - to pick a date - as of the end of 1984?

HON. A. MACKLING: I can give the percentage, Mr. Chairman. In 1984 42 percent of the total Civil Service were female and, obviously, 58 percent male, as compared to 41.9 percent in 1982 and 58.1 percent in that same year.

MR. G. MERCIER: Pardon me, 41 percent?

HON. A. MACKLING: No, it was 41.9 in 1982 and in 1984 it was 42 percent female.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure where I got this, but I know I did request from the previous Minister and I did receive a letter from this Minister on February 22, 1985, comparative information with respect to males and females in the Manitoba Civil Service. I can give this to the Minister. It is an employee analysis by component, by salary interval, females, Compensation Services, November 1, 1982. Is Compensation Services within the Civil Service Commission?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes.

MR. G. MERCIER: Well, it indicates that total female employees accounted for in numbers, 6,869, which was 49 percent of total employees as of November 1, 1982. I'll give this to the Minister because the statistics that he is now giving indicate he is talking about 41.9 percent female in 1982 and 42 percent in 1984. I wonder where the discrepancy is.

HON. A. MACKLING: Apparently that's without the inclusion of departmental employees. Seasonal employees - there are more males that are engaged for seasonal and casual employees. So that overall changes the balance.

MR. G. MERCIER: Well, what would the comparative statistic be then in November 1, 1984, with that sheet?

HON. A. MACKLING: I'm given to understand that as at March 4, 1985, the comparison between males and females or females and males, without the departmentals, it is 49 percent female and 51 percent male. With the departmentals included, it is 42 percent female, 58 percent male.

MR. G. MERCIER: So, in effect, eliminating the casual departmentals, the figure is unchanged from November of 1982?

HON. A. MACKLING: Relatively speaking, yes.

MR. G. MERCIER: I wish I had a copy of that made because it is an interesting document in that it points out where the females are employed in government and classifications which is just as, if not more important than simply the number of females.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister has other information which indicates an up-to-date analysis of

females by - well, to use their jargon - salary interval, I guess. Of course, what I am interested in knowing is whether or not women have been moving up in the various wage classifications and whether there has been any improvement, not just in their numbers, but in the level of employment in the Civil Service.

HON. A. MACKLING: I can give the honourable member some comparisons in annualized salary female/male. In 1973, the female average salary was 69 percent of the average male salary in the Civil Service. In 1982, that percentage had moved up to 81 percent; and then in 1984 it had moved up another 1 percent to 83 percent.

MR. G. MERCIER: That's a percentage of the Civil Service average.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, that's a percentage of the Civil Service average salary. In 1984, it was 83 percent. If you want it as the female average salary as a percentage of the male average salary within the Civil Service, in 1973, it was 55.2 percent; in 1982, 70.2 percent; in 1984, 73.1 percent.

MR. G. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am looking at the material that the Minister provided to me on February 22, 1985 in response to my request to his predecessor on September 28, 1984. In this material it indicates that the female average salary increased from 1982 to 1984 from \$20,165 to \$23,396; and the male average went from, in 1982, \$28,745 to \$32,050 in 1984. Although the Minister is saying that the female average annual salary, as a percentage of the male average annual salary, has increased from 70.2 percent to 73 percent, it would appear that the male average, and certainly in the number of dollars, has gone up more than the female average. Am I correct?

HON. A. MACKLING: I am advised that there is an element of catch-up in this, that the female average went up 265 percent, as against the male average of 175 percent.

MR. G. MERCIER: Could you explain that?

HON. A. MACKLING: I was afraid you would ask. In 1973 the female average of the Civil Service average was \$6,422 - that's the female average; in 1984 that average was \$23,411, it's an increase of 265 percent. In the same periods, 1973 as against 1984, the male Civil Service average went from \$9,342 - pardon me, I will take the bottom one - from \$11,636 to \$32,032, an increase of 175 percent.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I was going from 1982 to 1984. The actual number of dollar increase for males is greater than the dollar increase for females. Is that not correct?

HON. A. MACKLING: It's because, even though it's a higher percentage in respect to female, you are taking it on a smaller base, therefore, it comes to a larger dollar figure. That's the problem with percentage increases, flat percentage increases.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, what has been the government's commitment to affirmative action with respect to female employees in the Civil Service?

HON. A. MACKLING: Women are part of the targeted group in the Affirmative Action Program, and the MGEA and the government have developed an Affirmative Action Program involving the establishment of committees department by department. Those committees have been established as at this date and they will be developing specific programs, department by department, to identify the targets in each department and strive for a program of implementation.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, in the material provided to me by the Minister in response to my questions, there is a comparison of female representation by component group prepared by Compensation Services, November, 1984, which compares 1982 to 1984, the total female representation has gone up from 41.9 percent in 1982 to 42 percent in 1984, an increase of .1 percent. Where has the program gone wrong?

HON. A. MACKLING: The program has been under implementation, as I had indicated to the honourable member, after agreement was reached with the MGEA in respect to the Affirmative Action Program. It required the organization of the committees, and it has taken some time to develop and organize the committees. They will be functioning throughout this year and I anticipate seeing more significant results as a result of the committees functions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wolseley.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Thank you. I would just like to add, Mr. Chairperson, that when one is looking at percentages and numbers of women in the Civil Service, the success of an Affirmative Action Program should be judged on which level the women are in, not whether there are more women, and what kind of movement there is between traditional occupations and non-traditional occupations, and what kind of upward mobility there is between clerical components and management components. So it certainly isn't just in the number of women, and it's not only in the number of women who are progressing into management, because of course everyone can't end up as a manager. But it's also, when you're comparing the average salaries, one has to look at the number of women who are in which classification and the kind of movement from one classification to another, because classifications might be similar in status, except that if it's a female-dominated classification it could have a very much lower average salary than a classification that is a traditionally male classification, based on the historic outcome of bargaining over the years.

And also we have to take into account the differences when we're looking at women's averages and men's averages, the impact that percentage bargaining has had on those averages as to across-the-board bargaining. Because if, for instance, when you look '73 women's average of being \$6,500 approximately and you take a percentage increase on that, versus the

same percentage increase on a male average of 11.5, you're going to end up with quite a different outcome in terms of actual dollars, when you start with a lower base. So in both cases, you have to look at the salaries and the impact of across-the-board versus percentage and the movement of women upward in classifications as well as a cross-classifications, into non-traditional classifications. It's in those kind of terms, the success of affirmative action should be judged, not just on whether there's 50 percent of each sex in the total because they might not be in the higher paying occupations.

HON. A. MACKLING: I just wanted to thank the honourable member for the rather full answer to the question. I just wanted to indicate briefly the point that I wanted to make that the numbers are not as critical as upward mobility, specific analysis of the target groups is under way in every departmental committee now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I believe I said that earlier and the Member for Wolseley agrees with me. That's why I would ask the Minister, the sheet that I showed him earlier, as of November 1, 1982, that shows the classifications and salary levels of women in the Civil Service, does he have an up-to-date analysis that would show whether or not there are any improvements in the number of women serving at higher classifications? Now to be fair, what the Minister would have to do is index these wage classifications because to put them on the proper and the same comparative basis to November 1, 1982, does he have that information so we could look and see whether there has been any improvement in the number of women in the Civil Service or roughly the same based on his previous answers, but have they improved on a comparative basis since November 1, 1982?

HON. A. MACKLING: That's exactly the kind of undertaking that is involved in the Affirmative Action Committee endeavours, to develop a specific analysis of the numbers and identify the areas for upward mobility, department by department.

MR. G. MERCIER: But, Mr. Chairman, could the Minister answer the question: does he have comparative information, up-to-date information, to this material prepared as of November 1, 1982, by the Compensation Services Branch, so that we could look at and see whether or not there has been any significant improvement of any kind in the level of jobs served by women in the Civil Service?

HON. A. MACKLING: No, I've indicated that's the work of the committees; the committees are working at that. They're reviewing and developing that data base, and a year from now I'll be able to give the honourable member an evaluation showing what they determined and what their progress has been.

MR. G. MERCIER: But I'd like to know what it is right now or the latest date that the Civil Service Commission did, so that we could see what happened in the last

two or two-and-a-half years and see whether there has been any improvement. Surely, if they did this as November 1, 1982, it must be available now.

HON. A. MACKLING: I'm advised that I don't have that available now or I'd give it to the honourable member.

MR. G. MERCIER: Would the Minister undertake to request the Civil Service Commission to prepare a comparative basis, keeping in mind the increase in salary levels that has taken place, so that we have a proper comparative basis? By that I mean, if the \$40,000 to \$44,999 may now be 4 or 5 or 6 percent higher, whatever it is, whatever the wage increase has been, so that we compare the proper classifications with the proper classifications as of November 1, 1982, I wonder if he would ask them to prepare that information and could we have it within, say, two or three days.

HON. A. MACKLING: I'm advised that it can be done and I don't know just how quickly I'll have that. But I'm sure that it will confirm the continuing necessity for the program that I've outlined that department by department the needs are being identified. There's no question but there is work to be done by each committee and that the stats I believe will justify that.

MR. G. MERCIER: That's one reason, Mr. Chairman, why I want the information because this government was elected on a commitment in the fall of 1981, for example, to introduce equal pay for work of equal value. And nearly four years later we will find when the Minister provides the information that I've requested that there's been no significant improvement of any kind in the level of classification which women are employed in the Civil Service. I think he's acknowledged that by saying that the statistics that will come forward will demonstrate the necessity of continuing attention to this problem. Hopefully, it will be not of the same kind that it's received during the last three-and-a-half years and that there will be some results.

Mr. Chairman, is the Minister then undertaking to provide that comparison to me just as quickly as possible and could he, perhaps in consultation with his staff, indicate how long that will take?

HON. A. MACKLING: The advice I have is one to two weeks.

MR. G. MERCIER: I thank the Minister, Mr. Chairman, for that commitment to provide that additional information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(a)(1) - The Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to raise a matter of some concern. A director from the Department of Northern Affairs who had submitted his resignation back earlier this year and then a week later took a severe heart attack and subsequently wished to withdraw his resignation, and during the Northern Affairs Estimates I asked the Minister why this individual had not been reinstated? The Minister indicated that he says there was a

consultation done again with the Civil Service Commission, the MGEA and also the staff relations officer, and they have all made the recommendation that we should not withdraw the resignation. Later on it was indicated that the Minister said, I am informed it was not a question of him having the ability to carry out the work because this subject is in a grievance procedure, all we can say is that we are advised by staff relations that we could not withdraw the resignation. I'm wondering, who defends this individual who wants to be reinstated after it has been brought to our attention that the Civil Service and the MGEA both agreed that he shouldn't be reinstated, yet his matter is before a grievance.

I guess what I am asking, Mr. Minister, is: who is really defending this individual to try and get some kind of work back, even though it may not necessarily be the same position he had earlier?

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, I'm given to understand that Section 18.01 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement which makes provision for the application or the settlement of issues dealing with resignations, provides for an employee with the approval of the employing authority withdrawing his resignation. The employing authority, as I gather, did not agree to the withdrawal of the resignation, but pursuant to the Collective Bargaining Agreement the worker can exercise his rights to grieve the grievance procedure and that is what's happening at the present time.

MR. D. GOURLAY: What kind of a chance would this individual have? He is already beaten before he starts, isn't he?

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, if the matter is open and involved in a grievance procedure right now, to talk about his chances - his or her chances - I think it would be improper for me to answer that question.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Well, even under a hypothetical situation, to me this seems like a useless exercise to put anybody through. If the game is over, tell him.

HON. A. MACKLING: It's up to the third party who may be called upon to arbitrate the grievance to decide whether or not there has been a violation of the agreement, so it is not open for me to say at this stage whether it is a good grievance or it's a bad grievance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(a)(1) - the Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister refers to a formation of departmental committees to deal with the Affirmative Action Program. Are there written criteria for the operation of these committees?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, there are. Under the Labour Estimates, under Affirmative Action, the director of the Affirmative Action will be here and can probably provide me with fuller responses to the honourable member's questions. If you want to do it under that heading, I will endeavour to answer questions at this juncture as well. But there are written criteria, yes.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, is this program not developed and implemented through the Civil Service

Commission? Do they not establish overall criteria to be used by departmental committees?

HON. A. MACKLING: There is a separate Affirmative Action Directorate that reports directly to the Minister. The Civil Service Commission certainly is involved in working with the committees, enhancing the work of the committees, but the Affirmative Action director reports directly to the Minister.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, not all of the departmental hiring is done by the individual department. I believe some departments have not delegated all of their hiring to the various departments. I find it somewhat difficult to comprehend how an overall Affirmative Action Program is implemented on a department by department basis without involvement of the Civil Service Commission, involved in the overall program. Surely, if it is to be effective, it should be done through the Civil Service Commission.

HON. A. MACKLING: The Civil Service Commission is fully involved in the Affirmative Action process and Mr. Hart sits on the steering committee and is very much involved in the full process. But the policy direction comes through the Affirmative Action directory.

MR. G. MERCIER: Is the Minister saying he would prefer to deal with this Affirmative Action Program in his Labour Estimates, that he is Minister responsible for implementing this overall program in the Civil Service?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes.

MR. G. MERCIER: As Minister of Labour?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes.

MR. G. MERCIER: Can the Minister indicate how many members of the visible minorities are presently employed in the Civil Service?

HON. A. MACKLING: The short answer is no, that kind of information I guess has never been compiled for us to look at as part of the specific analysis department by department I alluded to earlier. A survey is being made in each department as to the self-identified visible minorities that are there.

MR. G. MERCIER: Has the Minister or the department filed a plan and had it approved by the Human Rights Commission?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes.

MR. G. MERCIER: It has been approved?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes.

MR. G. MERCIER: Does the Minister have that plan here?

HON. A. MACKLING: Affirmative Action Director will have a copy of that plan when he is here for my Labour Estimates.

MR. G. MERCIER: Perhaps the Minister could, in advance of those estimates, provide us with a copy of that plan?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, I'll ask staff to make note of that and make sure that we have a copy. We'll give you a copy beforehand.

MR. G. MERCIER: What is the objective of the plan?

HON. A. MACKLING: The objective of the plan is to ensure that, within the Civil Service, there is engaged in the work force the relevant percentages that would appear appropriate within Manitoba, as a whole, of the target groups: Native people, handicapped people, women, of course, and visible minorities.

MR. G. MERCIER: What are those percentages that the Minister is referring to?

HON. A. MACKLING: I don't know whether staff here have the percentages. The Affirmative Action Director will have them with him when I have him with me. I would be guessing at the numbers right now, guessing on my recollection of the numbers. I have a copy of the Affirmative Action policy statement that perhaps you want me to read into the record. I can make a copy available to the member.

MR. G. MERCIER: Is this the one dated June 7, 1983?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes.

MR. G. MERCIER: The Minister doesn't recall the percentages?

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, I think I can take a run at them.

I believe, the visible minorities is 6 percent; the physically disabled is 7 percent; Native people 10 percent; and, of course, women 50 percent.

MR. G. MERCIER: And the Minister, I believe to use his answers the other day in question period, is identifying this as a 20-year program to establish numbers of these groups within the Civil Service?

HON. A. MACKLING: No, what I indicated is that there is no doubt that this program, which is a program that will work, not only from the top, but from the bottom up, will require an extensive time in which to fully implement. It is estimated that an outside time frame maybe as much as 20 years to fully complete, but that is an estimate only. I fully expect that the percentages that I alluded to are attainable in a much shorter period of time, maybe not perfected in each category as quickly as others. They do involve a significant number of people.

If you estimate that the Civil Service round figures at 17,000, it involves 1,700 Native people, 1,190 physically disabled people, and 1,020 visible minorities and, of course, it being 50 percent women, you divide the 17,000 accordingly - 8,500. It is expected that there can be significant progress made. It is a sheer guess that it may take that period of time, but the committees

will develop specific annual targets after they have made their full assessments and there will be a requirement that these targets be striven for and attained.

Included in the Affirmative Action Program is a requirement that the Deputy Ministers be fully accountable for Affirmative Action in the departments.

MR. G. MERCIER: In the policy statement of the government of June 7, 1983, it was indicated that the government would design a plan that would include Outreach Recruitments, Special Training in Management Development Programs, etc. How much money is being budgeted for special training in management development programs during the past two years, and how much is in this budget?

HON. A. MACKLING: The specific amounts will be determined and included in each department's action plan.

MR. G. MERCIER: Is the Minister saying that there has been no money budgeted to date and that there is none budgeted in this fiscal year but that, depending on the work of the committees, there may be money budgeted in the next fiscal year?

HON. A. MACKLING: There are monies targeted for employee development and that money, and any bridging, will be used to carry out the program.

MR. G. MERCIER: Has any money been spent on special training in management develop programs in this Affirmative Action Program to date?

HON. A. MACKLING: I will read a number of items concerning the Civil Service Commission's support to the Affirmative Action Program.

"A major emphasis has been placed on training departmental co-ordinators in both union and management representatives of the departmental Affirmative Action Committees. There were 21 training sessions held by Staff Training and Development Branch of the Civil Service Commission involving some 212 employees. A review of classification standards has been undertaken in order to eliminate systemic barriers within the employment system and provide Affirmative Action target groups easier access to employment within the Civil Service. Affirmative Action self-declaration forms are being provided to all applicants applying to Civil Service competitions. The Personnel Record System is introducing a program to accommodate the tracking and monitoring of Affirmative Action target groups throughout the government service.

"A career development program for Affirmative Action target groups is being introduced in this fiscal year to equip selected candidates with the requisite knowledge and skills to enable them to compete successfully and function effectively within positions at the supervisory level.

"Within the development and training programs provided for, there is an extensive list of management programs, human resource management programs, supervisory development programs, support staff development programs, training for trainers programs,

communications programs and learning process programs." I didn't list each one of the various programs under those heads, but, as you can see, there is an enormous amount of training involved in all of these programs.

MR. G. MERCIER: it would appear from what the Minister said that the bulk of any monies expended to date have been on training existing personnel to develop a program. Would that be correct?

HON. A. MACKLING: As part of the implementation process, yes.

MR. G. MERCIER: No one has been hired under the program to date?

HON. A. MACKLING: I am sorry, I didn't hear.

MR. G. MERCIER: There has been no one hired within these various groups to date as part of this program?

HON. A. MACKLING: No, I understand that hiring takes place all the time.

MR. G. MERCIER: What are the current numbers of employees that are members of visible minorities or physically handicapped?

HON. A. MACKLING: The honourable member asked me that question earlier, and I indicated that I don't believe that kind of statistic had been compiled in the past. Committees are now doing that kind of analysis.

MR. G. MERCIER: What is the Minister's, or the government's definition of a member of a visible minority?

HON. A. MACKLING: We have a definition which we have taken to the Ethnic Council who have indicated approval for it, and I believe the Human Rights Commission as well, and the definition is black, Asian, Oriental, East Indian.

MR. G. MERCIER: That's it?

HON. A. MACKLING: And any other person who declares themselves to be of a visible minority.

MR. G. MERCIER: There was one that was black . . .

HON. A. MACKLING: Asian. The examples only are black, Asian, Oriental, East Indian.

MR. G. MERCIER: And anyone who declares himself to be a member of a visible minority?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes.

MR. G. MERCIER: On what basis did the Minister come up with that definition?

HON. A. MACKLING: In consultation with the Ethnic Council.

MR. G. MERCIER: This is all set out, I take it, in more detail in the affirmative action plan that the Minister undertook to provide me with?

HON. A. MACKLING: Correct.

MR. G. MERCIER: It may very well be available. Could he indicate what page of the annual report shows the number of contract employees?

HON. A. MACKLING: Page 27 at the top, Table 2, shows "All Departments" and then "Contract Employment" there.

MR. G. MERCIER: Can the Minister indicate the present number of contract employees?

HON. A. MACKLING: The present being as this very date?

MR. G. MERCIER: Yes.

HON. A. MACKLING: I don't have that with staff. We can obtain that.

MR. G. MERCIER: Has it increased since December?

HON. A. MACKLING: The estimate is that it's remained approximately the same.

MR. G. MERCIER: Is Mr. Lionel Orlikow on contract with the government?

HON. A. MACKLING: I don't have that information; I don't know.

MR. G. MERCIER: Was he?

HON. A. MACKLING: We are not certain, no.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition filed an Order for Return - it must be a couple of years ago - for details of a contract by the government with Mr. Orlikow that has never been responded to. Would the Civil Service Commission not be aware of that information?

HON. A. MACKLING: Contract employees are not hired by the Civil Service Commission, they are hired department by department. Staff here do not have information on any specific contract that may have been entered into by a department.

MR. G. MERCIER: Is the Civil Service Commission not concerned with an increase in 48 contracts in one year?

HON. A. MACKLING: I am advised that the bulk of those contracts would be articling law graduates and New Careers' participants.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, is there not a provision in the contract with MGEA with respect to giving priority on the basis of seniority to new jobs? I'm just wondering how the Affirmative Action Program deals with that principle in the contract.

HON. A. MACKLING: The MGEA are full partners in the Affirmative Action Program. Any concerns about seniority are certainly handled with full involvement of the MGEA.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the annual report at the beginning deals with conflict of interest policy. It refers to a policy effective March 1, 1984. After March 1, 1984 there were a number of items raised, including the Assistant Deputy Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, Zorianna Hyworon, raised last spring and she was apparently told to put her private business interest into a blind trust.

There were other instances of conflicts of interest and I would ask the Minister if there has been a further review, because I believe it was undertaken at the time there would be a further review of the conflict-of-interest guidelines in the light of that incident and others.

HON. A. MACKLING: I am given to understand that a review of the policy has been undertaken by the Civil Service Commission staff with recommendations made regarding its continued development, refinement and in administration within the Government Services, in discussions with the Provincial Government auditor to develop refinement of the guidelines, and particularly, assistance in developing guidelines in respect to divestment and how that process can be properly proceeded with.

MR. G. MERCIER: Do those guidelines just apply to members of the Civil Service and not to excluded employees of the government? If so, are there separate conflict of interest guidelines for excluded employees?

HON. A. MACKLING: General application.

MR. G. MERCIER: It applies to everyone, whether you're a deputy minister or a member of the Civil Service.

HON. A. MACKLING: Correct.

MR. G. MERCIER: What is taking so long? This incident occurred a year ago. There was an undertaking at that time to further review the conflict of interest guidelines.

HON. A. MACKLING: I'm advised it's already been done.

MR. G. MERCIER: Has there been a new conflict-of-interest policy published then?

HON. A. MACKLING: No. What there has been is direction and advice given to departments in interpreting the existing guidelines.

MR. G. MERCIER: Just in general, what interpretation or direction has been given then as a result of those incidents that occurred?

HON. A. MACKLING: I am given to understand that the department is given assistance in respect to individual concerns as they are identified. There has also been assistance to the departments in

endeavouring to identify potential areas of conflict, and there has been a guideline developed in respect to the divestment procedures to be followed.

MR. G. MERCIER: What outside interest is someone in the Civil Service allowed to have then, particularly a person who is, say, an excluded employee, a deputy minister, an assistant deputy minister or a director area?

HON. A. MACKLING: Basically, I was going to say, it's really a common-sense principle. Everything is excluded that does not have any direct or really indirect relationship with their employment where any information or benefit from their employment is being applied elsewhere.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the report indicates that there has been a senior officer classification review covering some 230 positions. The results of this review are expected to be finalized and forwarded to Treasury Board early in the new year in 1985. Has that been done?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes.

MR. G. MERCIER: How was that accomplished? Not by Order-in-Council?

HON. A. MACKLING: It was an Order-in-Council, Mr. Chairperson.

MR. G. MERCIER: What generally happened there?

HON. A. MACKLING: As a result of the review, there was an upward classification of 21; a lateral move of four; a downward classification of eight; present incumbent only, 20; no change, 168.

MR. G. MERCIER: Does the Minister have the details then of those who changed? If so, I wonder if he could undertake to provide those.

HON. A. MACKLING: The details are attached to the Order-in-Council. I don't have the particulars here. That's the summary of the information.

MR. G. MERCIER: Would the Minister undertake to forward me a copy of the Order-in-Council?

HON. A. MACKLING: Sure, we'll do that.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the regulation, can the Minister indicate how many employees are working past age 65?

HON. A. MACKLING: The latest date, December 31, 1984, 108.

MR. G. MERCIER: Can he compare that to the previous two years?

HON. A. MACKLING: In 1983, same date, to December 31st, it was 89.

MR. G. MERCIER: That's 100 and . . .

HON. A. MACKLING: 108 as to 89 - there are 19 more. That's all under the Civil Service Superannuation Board, so that's Crowns included.

MR. G. MERCIER: And this has been going on now for I believe four or five years?

HON. A. MACKLING: Correct.

MR. G. MERCIER: How many employees are at age 70 in that group?

HON. A. MACKLING: The only one that was 70 or older was Mr. Aubrey Newport who did retire on September 20, 1984.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't asking for names.

HON. A. MACKLING: Oh, well, Mr. Newport was the individual who started the whole process; Mr. Newport has become fairly famous in Manitoba.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I frankly, personally, was not an advocate of mandatory retirement, but those many people who took that position said that if people are going to be allowed to work past the age of 65 that employers - and they would refer to all types of employers - had to more carefully assess the capability of employees prior to reaching the age of 65 in order to make a hard-hearted decision, perhaps even prior to 65, of whether they were capable of carrying out their duties. The observers said that in many instances the employers would keep employees on to age 65, knowing they had to retire at age 65, so that it was the easiest method of handling the individual situation. But those who said that without a mandatory requirement employers had to, as I say, more carefully assess the capability of employees prior to age 65, and sometimes make that difficult decision, that they were not capable of performing their task.

Is the Manitoba Government, as an employer, doing anything differently in assessing the capabilities of employees?

HON. A. MACKLING: Because of the relatively small number of those who have stayed on beyond 65, it hasn't been a problem. The average stay of those who have stayed on past 65 is about nine months.

MR. G. MERCIER: Is the Minister saying that the average length of time that employees have stayed on past 65 is only nine months?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes.

MR. G. MERCIER: Well, that is a very interesting statistic, Mr. Chairman. It's almost as if they were doing it as a matter of principle for which I commend them. It certainly doesn't justify the fears of many who worried about it, thinking that the people would go on working till 75, 80, 85. It would appear that most of them are simply staying on as a matter of principle, which I don't disagree with.

I don't have any other questions under this section.

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

1.(b)(1) Human Resource Management Services: Salaries; 1.(b)(2) Other Expenditures.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister just passed out the Supplementary Information. I am just trying to locate this particular section in the Supplementary Information. Is it located in there?

HON. A. MACKLING: What was the question?

MR. G. MERCIER: Is this section in this supplementary . . . ?

HON. A. MACKLING: In which section? I didn't hear the question.

MR. G. MERCIER: Could the Minister indicate the page of the Supplementary Information that this department is located in?

HON. A. MACKLING: There is a reference on Page 5.

MR. G. MERCIER: That's all?

HON. A. MACKLING: And then Page 12.

MR. G. MERCIER: I take it this is the area that the Minister was referring to that might have some expenditures related to the Affirmative Action Program?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, and Career Development found on the same Page 12.

MR. G. MERCIER: How much money is designated in this area for the Affirmative Action Program?

HON. A. MACKLING: If the honourable member would look at Schedule 3 on Page 5, Item (c) is Career Development Program and it provides a breakdown of Salaries, Other Expenditures and then indicates Recoverable from Other Appropriations. All of those sums are involved in Affirmative Action targeted groups. You see, the 195 is returned from departments.

MR. G. MERCIER: Nothing in 1.(d) is included with the Affirmative Action?

HON. A. MACKLING: Program staff costs are included in that item and a number of the programs that I alluded to earlier provided for under that head as well.

MR. G. MERCIER: How much money within this appropriation for Human Resource Management Services is designated for the development of the Affirmative Action Program?

HON. A. MACKLING: We don't have a breakdown as to the dollars involved. I've indicated it's staff salaries and some of the programs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(b)(1)—pass; 1.(b)(2)—pass.
1.(c)(1) Career Development Program: Salaries; 1.(c)(2) Other Expenditures; 1.(c)(3) Less: Recoverable from Other Appropriations - the Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: This is a new appropriation, Mr. Chairman, I take it that is solely designed to deal with the Affirmative Action Program?

HON. A. MACKLING: I have a long explanatory note, but the short answer is, yes.

MR. G. MERCIER: Summarize the long explanatory note.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, I'll read the last paragraph.

The program is purposely designed initially on a pilot project basis to run parallel with the development of departmental affirmative action plans. If the program proves successful, then it will serve as a useful vehicle to accelerate the training and advancement of affirmative action group members as they are identified through departmental affirmative action plans. This program is designed to compliment the individual initiatives that will be implemented by departments and expand the horizons and opportunities of target group members to include the government as a whole.

I guess it's hard to summarize this whole thing. Let me start from the first paragraph, maybe it's useful to put all this on the record.

The purpose of this program is to increase the equality of representation throughout the Civil Service for women, physically disabled persons, Natives and visible minorities by providing an opportunity for career path development through a special Training in Management Development Programs. Initially, the program will be introduced on a pilot-project basis with from six to ten potential placements on a cost-shared or cost-recovery basis with departments. The program requires a co-operative venture with departments to train and provide meaningful work experience for candidates selected internally and externally from the four affirmative action target groups. The work experience will involve temporary assignments in such areas as the Department of Finance (Treasury Board), Policy Section or Deputy Minister's Office, Align Management Unit, and the various branches of the Civil Service Commission.

Civil Service Commission is assuming costs associated with a design of training courses, the facilitation of work shops, acquisition of learning materials, purchase of consulting services and general administration of the program. Departments are being requested to sponsor candidates who are selected for the program and to assist in the identification of potential assignments. The identification of potential assignments and selection of candidates is targeted for the fall of 1985.- and then I dealt with the last paragraph already.

MR. G. MERCIER: How much money is in there specifically for training for management development in individuals under the Affirmative Action Program?

HON. A. MACKLING: I'm advised they will be receiving full salary while on training; the \$195,000 will cover Salary and then the \$63,700, the training.

MR. G. MERCIER: The money for Salaries here is for the salaries of people hired by the government under the Affirmative Action Program?

HON. A. MACKLING: Under this specific Career Development Program.

MR. G. MERCIER: Would the Minister explain how that's going to work? A position is advertised, there are a number of applicants. I take it a departmental committee that he's referred to selects someone who declares himself or herself to be a member of a visible minority, or disabled, or female; they're then hired for the position, say, may carry a salary of \$30,000 and they're paid that salary while they are trained for that position, and they're paid out of this appropriation?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, they'll be paid the salary that the job is bulletined for and they will be getting training on the job and in the classroom. Most of the work is on the assignment that they are slotted with, yes.

MR. G. MERCIER: So if the average salary of a member of the Civil Service is \$26,000, as the Minister indicated earlier, this appropriation would provide for the hiring of eight people?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, it could.

MR. G. MERCIER: Would the Minister care to lengthen his 20-year objective?

HON. A. MACKLING: This is a pilot project in respect to career development, not merely hiring, Mr. Chairperson.

MR. G. MERCIER: Is this or is this not the Affirmative Action Program that he is referring to?

HON. A. MACKLING: No, Mr. Chairperson.

MR. G. MERCIER: What program is this then?

HON. A. MACKLING: This is a specific initiative of the Civil Service Commission itself for career development within the Civil Service.

MR. G. MERCIER: Who are we focusing in on in this program, then?

HON. A. MACKLING: The same affirmative action groups. The idea is for the Civil Service Commission to set up a mechanism and, as I had indicated, it is a pilot project so that they can work out the technique and the system for on-the-job training in respect to affirmative action groups.

MR. G. MERCIER: Just so I can distinguish this program then from the Affirmative Action Program, is that the same concept that would be applied to affirmative action where people would be hired and paid while they are being trained?

HON. A. MACKLING: Not necessarily. It could well be that as a result of the affirmative action initiatives departmentally, it is possible to place affirmative action target groups within the department without any additional training. In many instances, affirmative action

target groups have been prevented from being considered available for positions because, in some instances the job requirements have been stated far too high. That is one of the factors, and there are many. I'm sure that there are others that the committees themselves will identify as impediments that target groups have had to deal with, access in respect to disabled persons and so on.

The pilot project that I referred to doesn't deal with the broad program but deals with accelerating their movement within the Civil Service.

MR. G. MERCIER: So this program would focus on people who are presently members of the Civil Service, not people from outside.

HON. A. MACKLING: It wouldn't exclude an external appointment, but primarily the upward mobility within the Civil Service.

MR. G. MERCIER: Pass.

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

1.(d)(1) Temporary Assignment Program: Salaries; 1.(d)(2) Less: Recoverable from Other Appropriations - the Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, how many people are presently employed under the Temporary Assignment Program?

HON. A. MACKLING: Three persons and two assignments have been approved and two positions are currently vacant, available for assignment.

MR. G. MERCIER: Who are the present incumbents?

HON. A. MACKLING: The present people on this program are Ron Johnstone, Alex Pursaga and Dick Chenier.

MR. G. MERCIER: What department is Mr. Pursaga in?

HON. A. MACKLING: He is on assignment with Industry, Trade and Technology.

MR. G. MERCIER: Did he come from outside the Civil Service?

HON. A. MACKLING: He came from within the Civil Service.

MR. G. MERCIER: And Mr. Chenier was with what department before?

HON. A. MACKLING: He was with Energy and Mines.

MR. G. MERCIER: And where is he working now?

HON. A. MACKLING: On assignment with the Manitoba Research Council.

MR. G. MERCIER: The Minister mentioned two others whose positions have been improved, he said?

HON. A. MACKLING: Two assignments have been approved for the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology and recruitment is currently in progress.

MR. G. MERCIER: From within the Civil Service or outside?

HON. A. MACKLING: It is open competition, inside the Civil Service and out.

MR. G. MERCIER: Has there been any assessment of this program and its merits?

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, it seems to be working very well. I don't think there has been a specific assessment made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(d)(1)—pass; 1.(d)(2)—pass.
1.(e)(1) Labour Relations Services: Salaries; 1.(e)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister answered some questions a short while ago in the House on the outstanding contract with I believe it is professional engineers employed by the government. Could the Minister advise whether or not that matter has been resolved?

HON. A. MACKLING: It is still under negotiation, Mr. Chairman.

MR. G. MERCIER: When was the last increase for that group?

HON. A. MACKLING: 1982-83.

MR. G. MERCIER: I don't want to get into discussing the negotiation, but I believe the Minister indicated in the House, perhaps he could confirm that this group have turned down the equivalent offers that the Civil Service has received during that same period.

HON. A. MACKLING: I don't think I indicated that in my answer. I think I had indicated that - really, I don't want to say too much about it since it is under negotiations, but I don't think I indicated that.

MR. G. MERCIER: Are there other bargaining units that received salary increases greater than the MGEA has received since 1982?

HON. A. MACKLING: Most of them have been relatively consistent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(e)(1)—pass; 1.(e)(2)—pass.
Resolution 26: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,407,600 for Civil Service, Civil Service Commission, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

HON. A. MACKLING: Do you want to finish it? Well, there are only a couple of items.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, I'll call them all.

2.(a) Civil Service Superannuation Act; 2.(b) Canada Pension Plan; 2.(c) Civil Service Group Life Insurance; 2.(d) Workers Compensation Board; 2.(e) Unemployment Insurance Plan; 2.(f) Dental Plan; 2.(g) Long Term Disability Plan - the Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Go item by item, Mr. Chairman?
On 2.(a), could the Minister give the reason for the increase?

HON. A. MACKLING: Page 30 of the Supplementary Information, Note No. 1 provides this information - a 20.2 percent increase is due to several trends and statutory requirements affecting the government's liability. These include an increasing number of normal and early retirements; (b) the required the July 1, 1985 indexing of pensions for those persons retired 12 months or more, the estimated price index increase is 6.5 percent; (c) the full year costs of retirements occurring during the last fiscal year; (d) the change in pension formula effective August 1, 1984, to calculate pensions on the average salary, the best six years of the last twelve years earnings and reduce the early retirement penalties; (e) various amendments to The Pension Benefits Act which increase the cost to the employer.

MR. G. MERCIER: What was the cost of (e), the amendments to The Pension Benefits Act?

HON. A. MACKLING: I haven't got a calculator, but approximately \$5 million over five years or \$1 million per year.

MR. G. MERCIER: Could the Minister explain the reason for Manitoba Regulation 77 of '85? The regulations to establish a money purchase accounts plan under The Civil Service Superannuation Act.

HON. A. MACKLING: That's an easy one, to make it consistent with The Pension Benefits Act.

MR. G. MERCIER: Is that a way of avoiding The Pension Benefits Act?

HON. A. MACKLING: It provides greater flexibility to the board where employees are transferring pension monies in or out.

MR. G. MERCIER: Is it a way of avoiding The Pension Benefits Act?

HON. A. MACKLING: The answer is definitely not.

MR. G. MERCIER: Pass.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: No, hold it. There is an increase in Workers Compensation Board assessments from \$800,000 to \$200,000.00. Is that a result of the increase in assessments by the board on employers in Manitoba?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Page 30, Point No. 2, Workers Compensation claims and award sizes have

been increasing over the last few years. Amendments made to The Workers' Compensation Act in 1983 have also increased employer costs by requiring increases in pensions being paid to workers with permanent disabilities, widows of workmen, children and other dependents.

MR. G. MERCIER: So it is a result of the increases in assessments by the Workers Compensation Board over the past - 1982?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, partially.

MR. G. MERCIER: No, entirely. Entirely.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, yes, I stand corrected.

MR. G. MERCIER: So it has increased from \$775,000 to \$2 million - \$775,000 in '81-82, on Page 33 of the report, to \$2 million this year.

Would the Government of Manitoba, considering the type of work of its employees, be considered an average employer in Manitoba for purposes of Workers Compensation Board classifications?

HON. A. MACKLING: Could you repeat the question, please? I was looking for the reference the honourable member made, and I got sidetracked.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the member repeat the question, please.

MR. G. MERCIER: The Workers Compensation Board have a number of classifications, depending upon the type of work or the type of industry. Perhaps the Minister can't answer this, but would the Provincial Government, as an employer, be considered to be at an average classification? By that, I mean not in a classification where the type of work is dangerous or involved in a lot of accidents so, by virtue of that, it pays higher assessment rates.

HON. A. MACKLING: The answer is we are consistent with the major public service employers.

MR. G. MERCIER: So we have had about a 125 to 140 percent increase in assessments as a result of the Workers Compensation Board policies?

HON. A. MACKLING: The answer is, yes, that's the increase.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(d)—pass.
2.(e).

MR. G. MERCIER: What is the reason for the decrease, or was the actual less last year?

HON. A. MACKLING: I want to go back to 2.(d) and comment further there because . . .

MR. G. MERCIER: I passed that. You have to have leave of the committee.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, I will deal with it under Salaries then.

A MEMBER: You don't have a salary.

HON. A. MACKLING: Oh, I don't have a salary. Oh, I will deal with it under long-term disability then.

MR. G. MERCIER: Okay. You trying to extend your Estimates.

HON. A. MACKLING: No, I just want to make the point that that figure is based on the calculations that are made by the Department of Finance, and it appears that they are calculations that have not always reflected the actual amounts that were required. So this is a substantial variance, but it's as a result of their recalculations.

A MEMBER: That probably would be the same thing, then, with unemployment insurance?

MR. G. MERCIER: What about 2.(e), the decrease in unemployment insurance?

HON. A. MACKLING: I am given to understand those are merely the assessments based on the insurable earnings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(e)—pass.
2.(f) - the Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, a dental plan or any type of insurance plan to my mind is one that, in the main, covers significant events. In a dental plan, one of the most expensive situations that an employee can find himself in is having a child who requires orthodontic work which is not covered by the plan.

Is there any consideration being given to adjusting the plan, and I am not recommending an increase in the expenditures, but any adjustments in the dental plan for employees that would assist them with that type of expensive dental work? It's something a number of employees have raised. I am not here to negotiate on behalf of MGEA, but it is a concern. It's an insurance plan that doesn't cover one of the most significant dental expenses that a person can receive.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, the member is just a matter of weeks or months late, because that was negotiated and agreed upon. The improvements in the dental plan included orthodontics to a limit of \$1,200 per lifetime. So that, if there are one or two children, it will likely cover most of it.

MR. G. MERCIER: When did that go into effect?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, when did it come into effect?

HON. A. MACKLING: May of 1985.

MR. G. MERCIER: Pass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(f)—pass; 2.(g)—pass.
Resolution 27: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$39,559,100 for Civil

Service, Civil Service Benefit Plans, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

Item No. 3. Levy for Health and Post-Secondary Education - the Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: What was the actual last year? The reason I ask the question so that maybe the Minister can deal with it at once is, he's indicated there is a zero increase in salary. Now I guess that's up to September 28, 1985, and then there is the 3 percent. Is that what accounts for the increase in the amount of the payroll tax?

HON. A. MACKLING: The increase in the levy for Health and Post-Secondary Education would be for the partial period.

MR. G. MERCIER: Does that cover an increase in the number of employees also?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, that would be included.

MR. G. MERCIER: What is the increase in the number of employees over the last fiscal year, 1985-86 compared to 1984-85?

HON. A. MACKLING: You'll find that information in the Annual Report. The snapshot comparison as of December 31st, 1984, I think, a variation of 564 employees.

MR. G. MERCIER: How much is it going up in this fiscal year, 1985-86?

HON. A. MACKLING: We won't know until December for the comparison.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 28: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$7,132,000 for Civil Service, Levy for Health and Post-Secondary Education, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

Committee rise.

SUPPLY - EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: Committee, come to order. We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Education, Item 4.(b), Curriculum Development and Implementation - the Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, when we recessed at 4:30, we were discussing provincial examinations and pros and cons either way. I have one final question within that specific area, Mr. Chairman, and the question comes forward from an article written in the Manitoba Teacher, June, 1985, written by Mava Gray, and it's entitled, "Exams - Do We Need Them?" This particular author says, and I quote: "Province-wide exams are not an issue in this province." She goes throughout the arguments either way.

This person indicated that she had taken a sabbatical and now has children of her own. Having been away, she reflects upon the Manitoba situation. She says: "There is undoubtedly room for improvement in

Manitoba's present structure because it is perhaps too flexible and uncontrolled. I found this out as a parent." This is a teacher speaking, by the way. That short sentence, I think, says it all. "I found this out as a parent. When my daughter started university she found that her high school grades in Chemistry, English and Mathematics in no way related to the same grades which had been obtained by friends who went to a different high school."

She talks about the lack of standardization in her article and then comes to an alternative and it's entitled, "Search for Alternatives" and she makes this comment. She says: "For students intending to go from high school into further education, there must be acceptable standards set for core subjects such as Chemistry, English, History, Maths and Physics." Then this person who is obviously a member of the Teachers' Society and recognizes the debate that's blowing within the larger community, tries to come up with a compromise, I suppose, of sorts and says: "Firm guidelines could be developed for curriculum content to be covered per subject. Final exams could be set by examination committees comprised of Teachers' Society, university, community college and Department of Education personnel. Exam supervision and marking could continue to be carried out by classroom teachers keeping flexibility and control within the individual schools. Final exam results would count for no more than 50 percent of a student's final mark in a subject. An uncontrolled, teacher-set exam status could remain within the non-core options such as Accounting, American History and Geography and Typing."

Mr. Chairman, that was one of the first attempts I have seen by anybody to attempt to grapple with this whole problem and come up with some type of alternative system to maintaining in place the teacher's responsibility and yet in the same place attempting to put into place some standardization.

The Minister doesn't have to comment. I'm not going to ask a question other than to say that to me it's an interesting system and one that I would hope her department and she, herself, would consider reviewing and that she would care to give comment or whether the department has already given her comment with respect to this article and she wishes to share it with us, I would be glad to listen to it.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, I think I have a few things to say about the article. One is that while clearly the person is concerned about the issue and has given it some thought, it still, as many of the other articles that the Member for Morris quotes from, is the attitude and position of one individual teacher. I don't say that there wouldn't be some good suggestions or ideas that come from an individual because often there are, but it has to be recognized that it has no more status — (Interjection) — than that.

I said that good ideas can come from an individual, but to suggest — (Interjection) — they all come from individuals. Is that your job tonight is to heckle? — (Interjection) — It is, that's what I thought, okay. When the member finishes heckling, then I'll give my answer, if they really want it. That position isn't held. We have an advisory committee that's made up of trustees and superintendents and teachers and administrators, and

that position and that recommendation isn't coming from that body. That doesn't mean that we can't look at what we're doing and I said I was willing to do that in preparing to set up a system where we did it.

It still is based largely, and you can't take an individual, either teacher or parent, experience with their child and extrapolate it and say that now means that that's happening in the whole system. She was saying that it was her personal experience as a mother with her child going to university and that's what she's basing her statements on, and a concern for changing the system. That, of course, isn't enough alone to make major changes in the system. It still is based on having a provincial exam that it doesn't matter who sits in and makes it up, whether it's trustees and teachers and everybody sits down together and makes it up, that is given to all the students across the province and it's going to have a major effect on their accessibility to other programs.

What I did at length, in fact there were some comments about the length, I think in the discussion for the hour-and-a-half previous, was to show the major deficiencies of provincial examinations, and there are major deficiencies. So I continue to say that I think we need to look at it again, but I would be very reluctant to move into either a complete or a modified form of provincial examinations that had all of the disparity and inequity and deficiencies built into it that I identified earlier.

MR. C. MANNESS: Well, Mr. Chairman, we won't belabour this particular subject.

I guess what I found interesting about this particular attempt to come up with some solution was that the individual, who was a teacher herself, realized that there had to be some teacher flexibility within any attempt to bring forward provincial examinations, and her suggestion was that in fact the teachers mark their own students within their own setting.

Mr. Chairman, moving on, I'd like to ask three or four specific questions and they have to do basically with questions posed by a constituent of the Member for Turtle Mountain in a letter that she sent to the Minister last August and asked some specific questions. I believe the Minister did respond to this and did send me a copy, but I am wondering for the record if she could give me the answers again to some of these questions. The third one was: what assurance does the public have that current departmental courses of studies are being followed? How do we find out who is responsible to ensure that these courses of study are being adhered to?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, we have a variety of checks, I suppose you can call it, on the system. The first one, I think, would be the principal in the school. It's the job of the principal to make sure and to know what his teachers are doing and to know that they're following the guides. Are we referring now to the letter?

MR. C. MANNESS: Yes, this is one of the questions.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Okay, I don't know. Like, I can't recall what the letter is about and what the subject is.

I'm just getting the question and it's totally out of context. Is it just a variety of questions?

MR. C. MANNESS: Yes, there were five questions and I would ask them as if they were my own.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Right, okay. So there are a variety of checks. The first one would be the principal; secondly, the superintendent certainly as the chief executive officer and the top professional in the field have a responsibility to work with schools, with teachers and with principals to make sure that they're being followed. We have curriculum consultants in all areas whose job it is to go out into the field and work with teachers and provide professional development programs and activities, and help them incorporate them into their classroom. So those would be the major checks.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Chairman, I take it from that then the Minister says that the parent of a student in Manitoba really doesn't have to worry, that these checks are in place such that the parent can be totally certain the program outlines and directions are being followed. I think that was the basic question.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: That was the gist of it.

MR. C. MANNESS: Well that was the interpretation I took out of it, Mr. Chairman.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I think that any parent who is interested to that degree and wants that kind of detailed information is entitled to ask and is entitled to get the information. The guides and the curriculum are no secret. They are public documents. They can see them, and I think it's not inappropriate at all for them to raise it with the teacher and, if they have some concerns about what is being done, to raise it with the appropriate level.

Of course, you start with the teacher which is where I think the first question belongs. Then if they have some concerns they should go to the principal, superintendent and ultimately the board if their concerns aren't addressed.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Chairman, now that I don't have the letter with me - I've given it to the Minister - I don't know what questions to ask. If the Minister wishes a copy, fine, but she has responded to this letter previously. I don't want to go through all the questions. There are only three or four.

The first question intrigued me somewhat. It said, "Why does the province permit schools to give students terminal passes in high school subjects?" I wasn't aware of this, and maybe it's just within that school division. For example, a mark 50-T, and I'm quoting from the question, "It seems like blackmail to advise a student that he/she will not be given credit for a subject in one grade if he/she agrees to not take that subject in the next grade." Mr. Chairman, I ask the Minister, does this occur in the public school system where you will receive a passing 50 percent grade if you promise not to continue in that subject the following year? — (Interjection) — We've got teachers answering from all over over there.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, if I answered that particular question in the letter, and I may have, I can't recall either the question or the letter right now. First of all, the school board has the authority to make decisions about the basis upon which students will be passed and, I suppose, if there is such a condition - I don't know if it is a legal condition to extract a promise such as that or not - but if there is such a condition being imposed, you would have to raise it with the school board to ask if that was accepted policy in their school division.

MR. C. MANNES: This is most interesting, Mr. Chairman. The Minister says there may be in place a situation, and yet it is not legally prescribed within any act under her purview, and yet we have a former teacher, the Minister of Autopac, saying that it has been in the school system for 20 years. I guess it is longstanding, at least in the minds of some people and in some divisions. The Minister seems to indicate that she is not aware of it. I suppose what I'll do then is I'm not going to hold her to whatever she said in the original response, that's not my reason for drawing forward the question. My reason for posing it is to whether, in fact, this is a situation or if this process of allowing passes from one grade to another are given under these conditions; I would like to know more about it.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, as I said before, it is not a practice that is either required or directed by my department and I have never heard of it before, because I can't recall if it was brought to my attention in that letter. The evaluation practices that do vary from division to division will have to be justified by the division and either the administration or, more directly, the school trustees.

MR. C. MANNES: My final question, and I'm not going to use the one verbatim that is within the letter, but do parents have the right to have a copy of the examinations after they have been marked? I'm specifically talking from Grades 9 to 12. Is there any law that says they have the right to have it, or is there any law that says they can't demand it, or is that strictly, again, a decision made at the division level or, indeed, within the specific school that might be involved?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe there is a law that requires it, but I also don't believe that there is anything that would stop it. In other words, I think that if parents want it that they are entitled to it and I don't think there would be any problem in having access to examinations.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, is the Minister aware of any situations or any school divisions or schools within those divisions that may not provide to parents an examination after it has been marked?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, I don't have any information that there is a problem, but it seems that the Member for Morris may have. If he knows of a situation and/or a school division where parents have asked for that and have not been successful in getting it, I think that rather than raise the question for the

whole student population and province, that he should let me know who it is. It still is in the purview of the school division and he should raise his questions with the particular school division if he has one. I imagine it's not a hypothetical question.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is becoming a little edgy. It is a hypothetical question; I don't have a school division in mind. I asked her the question as one of general policy, nothing more. So, Mr. Chairman, there is nothing sinister behind the question. I don't have — (Interjection) — well, we've got the sergeant up there saying I am fishing, Mr. Chairman, I'm fishing for information. If the Minister can't provide it, all she has to do is stand and tell me so.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: First of all, I have answered the question twice. The answer is clear; the answer won't change. He can ask it 10 times and it will still be the same answer. I don't know of any problem; I believe that parents can have access to exams if they want them. As far as I know, any of them who want them can get them.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Boring.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, we have that exciting of all people, the Minister of Finance, yelling "boring" across the Chamber. That's been his contribution to the Estimates procedure thus far, Mr. Chairman.

I would ask the Minister, because of the fact that this individual — (Interjection) — the Member for Turtle Mountain indicates that this individual is a trustee. I suppose she's asking as a publicly elected person who wants to know her . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The outside conversation is getting a little bit heavy from both sides of the House. I would appreciate it if members would give the relevant speakers the opportunity to be heard by the other side.

The Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I guess I pose this question. The individual who wrote the letter is a trustee and I would take it, one who has been in that public position for some period of time and maybe isn't absolutely certain as to the policies in place with respect to those parents of students who may want information or the answers to these questions. The Minister may have provided them. I remember seeing her answer; I can't recall in detail what it was. But I think my reason for asking the question was none other than again to try and attempt to find out whether there were policies that covered these situations.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to now move into some specific curriculum areas, and I will begin with the new Social Studies curriculum as laid out in the K-12 overview approved by the Minister of Education, 1985.

Mr. Chairman, this has become a course that has become topical these days, at least in the minds of some, because of what it attempts to do. As more and more people read the social studies curriculum, I think

more and more have a greater concern as to what it attempts to do and I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, in having had an opportunity to read it myself, I don't doubt first of all, the sincerity of the vast majority of people who have made contributions into writing this particular curriculum. But what is most obvious, is that somebody or whoever has had led the curriculum team to developing this overview in developing this curriculum over the number of years it's taken to come into place has attempted to marry geography, history and a heavy dosage of political science, some psychology, an awful lot of sociology, and attempted to bring a curriculum out that is titled Social Studies.

When one reads the thrust it becomes obvious, Mr. Chairman, that the thrust is to force students at Grades 1 or 2 to begin to challenge the facts that are presented to them, to challenge whatever ideas and values are placed before them. It's trying to get them to realize or to not accept everything for granted. The word says, the thrust, and it lists many, is to have people explain and interpret the world, their sense of right and wrong, of acceptable and unacceptable behaviour, e.g., their values and beliefs. It goes on, Mr. Chairman, to set as areas that students and teachers in presenting this material, the students should always realize, it sets out some of these basic areas.

It says that Canada is a country in which national unity cannot be taken for granted and it goes on, and in a lot of this we can't quarrel with it. And it talks about the strong feelings of regionalism that exist in this nation and one can't deny that. It says that is exposed to strong external influences, especially from the United States. It talks about our situation and it talks about our political system which is described as a parliamentary democracy, and it talks about Canada as being a nation that is undergoing a trend towards larger and larger institutions, both governmental and non-governmental, against which individuals often feel that they have little or no power. It talks about Canada as having a mixed economy with inequities in the distribution of wealth and power. Now these are the underlying tenets of principles, Mr. Chairman, of the social studies curriculum covering all grades, K-12.

Well, moving on it says on Page 4, "The Social Studies Program has included concepts from various social science disciplines. These interdisciplinary concepts have been called content organizers. They are threads which reappear throughout the K to 12 program in a spiral fashion.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I guess one becomes intrigued as you go through them. The thrust of the curriculum, the content I'll speak more to later, but then it talks about the knowledge objectives and this is what it says: "The knowledge objectives outline more than just the specific factual content which should be acquired. They include the concepts, ideas and generalizations that should be emphasized and developed. Facts serve as the raw material upon which instruction and learning are founded; they are the minute building blocks of the Social Studies."

What has been attempted, Mr. Chairman, is to introduce an element of history within this course and yet very little attention is being given to specific historical facts. They are just used, as this objective indicates, to be used as a small stepping stone toward the larger social consideration. I'll give details and specifics related to that in a moment.

In summing up the intention of the program, the authors say: "The intention of the Social Studies program is to present opportunities for students to identify, explain and evaluate their own, as well as others, feelings, beliefs and values."

Mr. Chairman, I submit, even without having seen the content, that reading that we are into a course in sociology, into a course dealing with social engineering, with social reformation. I'm wondering, and maybe the Minister can tell me later on, why it is that we are changing the thrust of Social Studies from what it used to be to the direction that it is taking under this curriculum.

Mr. Chairman, so much evaluation indicates what students should have learnt at the end of instruction. It is concerned with the following questions and I suppose then the authors of this curriculum, in their minds, feel that the curriculum has done an adequate job, or if it has been able to direct students down these particular avenues, such that these questions can be asked. How well have the students achieved the knowledge objectives? What evidence is there that certain thinking and research skill objectives have been achieved? How well have the students demonstrated that they have met the attitude and value objectives? To what degree have the students demonstrated they have met the social participation objectives?

Well, Mr. Chairman, I'd like then to move into the curriculum per se. Kindergarten - and the main thrust in Kindergarten is to have students realize that there are many facets of self as they are expressed in themselves and others. It is basically introductory. Grade 1 focuses on the difference between needs and wants, Mr. Chairman.

Grade 2 moves into some pretty heavy material. It asks the Grade 2 individual to consider how we change over time and how old age brings changes in people's lives. And, as somebody said, it asks a Grade 2 student to consider the question of mandatory retirement and where will they fit in into the world of growing technology when they reach that age.

Mr. Chairman, why is it that students of that age are asked to try and attempt to figure out the world as it may exist 50 years hence? Of course, unless, Mr. Chairman, the intent is to convince them that there is something to worry about. I know the Minister on many occasions has said that the greatest concern that our young people have is that there won't be jobs for them, firstly; and, if there are, there will be so much strife in the world, it won't be worth living in anyway.

So, Mr. Chairman, these are heavy heavy questions; but Unit 3, Grade 2, the unit provides children with an opportunity to speculate about how continued technology and environmental changes in resource availability might influence their lives in the future. Well how do you introduce that whole major subject, Mr. Chairman, and to what depths do you go, and to what degree do you allow teachers to move into that area which is foremost in the minds of all people, many of them taking this at higher learning institutions? Mr. Chairman, Grade 3 concentrates on communities today and Manitoba's place in them. Grade 4 talks about communities around the world.

What is attempted here, of course, is to place into perspective the individual, the student in Manitoba, living in a community within the Province of Manitoba

today, to begin to have that student try and compare their position to other people in other parts of the world, and somehow make them realize that Manitoba isn't an island, that we are one small part of a big whole.

But yet, Mr. Chairman, it says that it should be recognized these issues - and they are talking about development and levels of development throughout the world - it should be recognized that these issues do not lend themselves to simple or final answers. Except for obvious cases of serious inadequacies in the level of material life, it is often difficult to say which communities are more or less developed. For example, which of the following is more developed? and the student is asked to decide: is it a rural community in Western Canada whose members use sophisticated technologies and have a high level of material consumption, but who live scattered across the landscape and whose community life has little identifiable focus or is focused on a dying town or village? Or, and this is the other alternative, a rural village in a Third World region with simple technologies, a modest level of material consumption in a fairly integrated community life in which a wide range of needs, but social and physical, can be met.

Mr. Chairman, that is a legitimate question, but what isn't being said is that in many of those communities in those Third Worlds people are dying because of a standard of living, because of poverty, whatever reason or political system in place.

So, Mr. Chairman, if we are attempting to direct our children into a thinking process where they are going to weigh, in some fashion, their position in life vis-a-vis other communities and other countries, then aren't we obliged to tell them the realities, the facts as to how conditions are in those Second or Third Worlds, because nowhere do I see within the Social Studies curriculum an attempt in any way to single us out either on the basis of political freedoms, on the basis of our standard of living which, of course, is a reflection of our economic and political systems. No attempt is made to spell out how we are materially different, Mr. Chairman. I'll go on to prove that point.

"The point of the example . . . "getting back to my other comment, ". . . is not to romanticize what are often inadequate living conditions in Third World communities." That's right, Mr. Chairman, but let's tell the truth. Let's say we have a significantly higher standard of living, that our death rates are low or much lower, and that there are significant reasons for this. Yet, nowhere in the curriculum do I see where we're prepared to say it's distinct what the reasons are or may be.

Moving on, "Life in Canada Today" is the subject that's covered in Grade 5, Mr. Chairman. It just breaks Canada into the regions, and goes into a descriptive breakdown. I can see absolutely nothing offensive. As a matter of fact, from what I can see, it's a fine course outline for that grade.

Six, overviews life in Canada's past. Now we're moving into the historical aspect of our nation, Mr. Chairman. Unit One talks about the first inhabitants. Of course, it's directed towards our Native people. The second unit is the coming of the French. I find this interesting. "It must be emphasized that this unit does not stress the memorization of personalities or political and military events." Well, Mr. Chairman, I can see why

we don't want to overstress them, but these are important. Aren't the French explorers part of the history of our nation, and are they not important? Why is that aspect of our history trivialized?

It goes on, and it talks about the coming of the French. It moves into the interaction between the newcomers and the Native people, and the life of the new immigrants in New France. The very last item talks about the French being interested in establishing colonies and all the things that we've more or less learned. Then why did New France pass from French to British control? Throughout this and throughout other grades, the word "conquest" is used. "Life at the Time of the Conquest," that's optional. Mr. Chairman, it's the fact of the history of our nation that there was a war fought between the British and the French. Yet, there is not even a section leading up to that or describing the conquest. The word "conquest" is used, but at no time is there an indication that the teacher of the day should even just talk about it. It's optional.

Then we move on from the "Life at the Time of the Conquest," which is optional into the "Coming of the British," as if they're not related. It talks about the Loyalists coming to Canada, the settlement at the Red River and immigration and so on. I question the Minister how it is that basic facts of history are in no way described within this curriculum. I realize this isn't Canadian history, but, Mr. Chairman, if we are attempting to marry all those disciplines, surely we can't deny the facts of our nation and the dates.

That's when, and I used it in question period, Grade Six, the final part is "Life in Canada During the 20th Century." Unit Five talks about life in Canada from 1900-1930 and then during the 1930's and since 1940. The heading is: "What Was Canada's Involvement in World War II?" That's optional, Mr. Chairman. I can't believe it. I mean, that's part of our history.

The Minister and the members opposite, they want to remove all reference to war, but it's a reality, Mr. Chairman. Our citizenry of that day made tremendous sacrifices. Yet, the Minister is saying that teachers of the day do not even have to tell of the contributions made by our people in that world conflict. Why are facts that are tied in any manner to military conflict totally removed?

Mr. Chairman, to continue, Grade Seven talks about the Planet Earth and - I found this interesting - "Patterns and People Around the World." The overview talks about: "The unequal distribution of resources in the world necessitates political and economic interaction and interdependencies among various regions." Mr. Chairman, it has also led to war on many occasions, this unequal distribution of resources. Yet, there is not an attempt in any way to explain that.

The Minister breaks it then into first, Second and Third World countries. Yet, in the first world, the United States is missing. In the Second World, the USSR is missing. The teacher is told: "In studying the countries of each world, care should be taken that contrasting factors such as environment, culture, population density and growth rates and level of development be considered." But, Mr. Chairman, what about personal freedoms? Are they to be considered? Not at all. Property ownership differences between the various countries? Religion? Public assemblies, political parties, are they to be considered? No, but they are factual.

Yet, they're not to be touched, Mr. Chairman. Why? I think the question is legitimate.

Grade Eight, and this is an interesting one too, Mr. Chairman, because it attempts to talk about people through the ages. It says: "The intent is not to examine 3,000 years of history, but to encourage students to compare a wide variety of ways of life." There is nothing wrong with that. That's social studies as I remember it.

But yet, when we move into ancient civilizations and, because the nation is multicultural in nature and our people come from different civilizations, Mr. Chairman, "A minimum of one ancient civilization is to be selected from each of the topics." The civilizations are three. Of course, the Greek or Roman, Mr. Chairman, and that's, as we all know, that was the civilization that spawned democracy and it spawned laws and representation by population. Yet, it doesn't have to be covered, Mr. Chairman, and yet those are our roots as a civilization.

Well, we talk about life in the modern world, and the First World countries are again England, Australia and New Zealand, and the Second World are Russia and Cuba, and the United States aren't even mentioned. I can understand why, though, because in Grade 9 the United States is considered our greatest threat to the nation.

Then we talk about life in a contemporary communist society. After we have talked about an industrial society, First World, we talk about it in the Second World, and the questions, how do people in the communist countries meet their basic needs of food, shelter, clothing, health and security. Well, Mr. Chairman, they don't; they can't. The nation of Russia can't feed themselves today - the most fertile land on earth. There are many of us that are farmers that know what that means first-hand. We are able to make a living, because we can export to those nations, Mr. Chairman.

But yet any attempt to draw those differences, I can't seem to detect any at all, no absolutes, because we don't want to allow the child, the student, to reach a decision other than by attempting to give to them certain material, and in the minds of whoever wrote the curriculum, material that is not in a negative light and allow that student to reach their own conclusions.

Grade 9 talks about the Canadian studies and Grade 10 - well, Mr. Chairman — (Interjection) — I hear the comments from members opposite, it doesn't bother me an awful lot really. Of course, you know, Mr. Chairman, they have come through school and they don't have to worry, I suppose.

Mr. Chairman, those are basically my concerns with respect to the overview. I know the Minister will challenge me for bringing out of some material which she will say that I quoted out of context and that the intent wasn't made at all, but my final point is there is a whole element of social engineering and social reform that is being brought into this curriculum.

There is an article - oh, Mr. Chairman, I can't go to it now; I can't find it - but it talks about life in Canada and how the labour unions of our nation have contributed to the well-being. Yet, Mr. Chairman, nowhere in this text is reference made to enterprise and the fact that profits allow people to pay taxes. It's biased; it's skewed in one direction in such a major fashion. I'm surprised, and yet I'm not, that the Minister of Education could approve it.

That's why I asked the question in the House. I asked if she had read it because if she believes that this is what our students should learn, that in fact as a nation we don't have to come to absolute decisions as to whether we are a better nation or that our standard of living is somewhat better for some reasons. Mr. Chairman, the Minister and her government don't understand our history and really have no idea as to where this nation is going.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, it's a little difficult to know where to start and where to end on a statement that is as complex and detailed and goes into as many points without stop and without question as that one does, while raising a large number of very serious and very detailed questions. So I am going to do my best to respond to the general comments that were made and then some of the specifics. I guess some of the answers he might expect and some of them he might not, but I think in the first place I want to put on the record how it was developed. That was one of the questions that he raised is how was this developed.

You know, it was developed over a long period of time from '76 to '83, and it was developed by the committees. I am going to go in a little bit into the makeup and the representation on some of the committees. But for that period from 1976 to 1981, we sent the first documents out to the schools in September, 1981 and the review and the comments from school divisions was extremely positive. The current version, we made changes according to information that came from the field, as we always do, and the current version of the overview document was sent to all schools in May of 1985.

This curriculum has been sent across the country, Mr. Chairman, and although we have heard in the Chamber about how some of the provinces are moving in other directions than we are, in some areas like assessment, that this curriculum has been identified as being an excellent curriculum from all of the provinces that have received it. It is recognized as being a very very good curriculum and a very solid curriculum and we have been getting that feedback from all the provinces across the country. So it's not just internal education system, but it's recognized for its quality right throughout the country.

I suppose the first point that should be made, and the Member for Morris said that I would say he quoted out of context, and I am not going to say that because he was reading direct quotes from the guidelines. While it is hard sometimes to take the context that they were intended to be used, I wouldn't suggest that he was either taking it out of context or misquoting, but what I do have to indicate is that he is quoting from guidelines, he is quoting from teacher guides.

What he needs - like there is more to it. I guess the important point for the Member for Morris to know is that while he has a teacher guideline, it is not the detailed guide and it does not have what goes along with it, the textbooks and support materials that go along with all teacher guides. So what he is quoting from is the most superficial document that relates to the social studies program.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, I will go into this one then.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Well, anyway, he is quoting from the most superficial document relating to this program, and there are a number of other points that I want to make. So he has to look at what teachers have access to.

The teacher guide, first of all, it's not curriculum. It's exactly that; it's a teacher guide. It's meant for the use of professional teachers, and they have been trained in both methodology and trained in understanding the development of children, how they learn and at what ages they learn, and it is done in a very broad way for them to use as a guideline in teaching the curriculum.

Without showing any disrespect for the member opposite, I would say that if you are not a teacher and you have not been trained in methodology and the learning stages and stages of children, the development of children, and have all the additional information that is at your disposal, which is textbooks, resource materials and detailed curriculum guides, then you really don't have a solid enough basis to make the statements that you are making about how it is being used and whether or not it is adequate and what the deficiencies and the inadequacies are, because most likely a great deal of them will show up in the more detailed guide and in the textbooks and materials, because the guides that he quoted from are just bare bone. They are just bare bone guides for the curriculum. So I suppose that's one of the first points that I want to make. I must say, Mr. Chairman, that I listened without any comment coming from this side and gave all my attention to the points as they were being made by the member and I would appreciate the same opportunity.

In our elementary curriculum, I think it's important to know too that all of our programs in our elementary schools are integrated. In fact, a lot of them are integrated and they don't necessarily just teach Social Studies and Science alone. So that it very well may be that where he is raising inadequacies, he's saying well it isn't really Social Studies, but you should have history in there. The fact is that these things are taught in their own courses and teachers are taught. In elementary school, they particularly do it; they don't do it as much in high schools, they teach just a course in high school, but in elementary school, they integrate all their courses and it's quite probably that where they're teaching a subject in one area, in Social Studies, that they would turn to information that fitted in to the program that was in other courses and integrated because that is the basis of the changed program; one of the major principles of the changed program of our elementary school is integration of courses and curriculum.

One of the things, he talked about the age appropriateness, and he seems particularly concerned about the younger children, Grade 2 and Grade 3, and you're giving them this information and you're asking them to look at early retirement and you're asking them to look at some of these other issues and are they really ready for it? I think the answer there is that we have to start teaching our students how to analyze information and fact and we have to start teaching them critical thinking at a very early age, I think from the beginning of school.

We don't wait until our kids are 18 years old and put them out and then say, now you are responsible; now you think; now you start analyzing and criticizing

and giving analytical thought to it. We don't do that with our children at home and we don't do it in school. We start developing their responsibility, their knowledge and their ability to analyze and understand at the earliest age. All of those things that he quoted would not be put in the words that he used because they do appear to be beyond a Grade 2 or a Grade 3 child, when you use that terminology and those words. Those are written for the teachers and the teachers take that and put it down to the level that the children can understand it, the age-appropriate level for the children. So they put whatever the concept and idea is in terms of what the children could understand.

I have some concerns about the major statements that he continues to make, where he says that the course is concerned about what it attempts to do. I think it's the kind of thing where he's making suggestions again about what the curriculum is attempting to do, as if we're hiding things in there or attempting to slip things in, that are not either consistent with regular teaching practices or not consistent with values and not consistent with facts and content in knowledge and information. So first of all, we have to say that the first thing that we do is that the information that is in the curriculum is taught on fact on historical fact and on geographical fact. All of the content is based on fact and that fact may not be found in the curriculum guide. It may not be all of the details on the fact, but it will be found in other materials, textbooks.

The values that we follow, first of all the goals, it is related to the original goals that we spelled out earlier, that he said everybody agrees and nobody could disagree with and they don't think there would be any disagreement; that's the basis of developing the program is on the goals and the values that we've based it on are those values that are accepted by, I think, all of our society and we've got critical thinking, problem solving, tolerance, respect for others, responsibility, fairness, those are the values that I keep indicating are the values that are built in to all of our curriculum and those that we believe are not special-interest values, or special group values, or particular religious values, but values that are common to all of the people of Manitoba and indeed of Canada.

The membership on the committee, you know, is very wide-ranging and when you say who is doing this and who is writing this curriculum and why did we change? Well, I suppose, one of the reasons that we change curriculum always is that curriculum has to keep pace with changing knowledge and times, the facts and information.

One of the points he made was why are we taking away memorization? Because, surely, these things that happened in our history are very important things and we shouldn't be either downgrading them or not teaching them to our children, because they should know what happened on certain dates and certain times in our history because they're important moments. Of course, that's quite right. But what we are suggesting is not that they shouldn't learn them or they shouldn't be given the information as facts, but that they shouldn't focus just on memorization. Because one of the things that we know we did before that was a deficiency of the earlier programs, is we gave kids facts and figures and dates, 1892, 1467, 1427. All they did was regurgitate

or memorize what happened on those dates; who were the people involved so that they could spew them out at a test. It gave them absolutely no understanding of their province or the country or the world. It gave them no understanding.

So what we have said in terms of the point that he raised the fact that we have said that they should not only memorize facts in detail, should not be interpreted to say that we do not give facts and information about important dates and days and periods and activities in our history, because, of course, that's what we have to do. We have to give our kids a better understanding of what it really means. It has to be related to reality, to their community, to their neighborhood, to their family, to their province, to their country, in a way that they really understand where they came from and what happened; what their parents and their grandparents and their great grandparents did. So that they have an identity and strong feelings and understanding about their country in its relationship to the world and not just a regurgitation of information.

So if we look at the membership of social studies working party and without going into necessarily giving names, which I could do but I think the representation is important, clearly we have representation from across the province which would give a wide range of sort of attitudes, I think, of people both teaching and as parents, because a lot of our teachers are parents. But we've got representation on the K to 12 working party from Rolling River, Lord Selkirk School Division, Pelley Trail, Flin Flon, Winnipeg School Division, Brandon, University of Manitoba and the Department of Education. And in the middle years, we've got River East, Rhineland School Division, Frontier, Morris Macdonald School Division, St. James, Evergreen, The University of Manitoba and the Department of Education. Clearly, in each of one of these, we had a K to 12 working party; we had early years K to 4 social studies task group; middle years 5 to 9 social studies task group; senior years, 10 to 12, social studies task group. Every committee that you can see has a good representation of all of the organizations and groups in the education system, and a good range from the different geographical areas, from the North, from the rural area, from the city which, I think, should give a good perspective.

So what we've got is a situation where the Member for Morris is picking out sort of individual details where he doesn't have all of the information in front of him. That's one of the problems. Secondly, we in this Chamber are not teachers and are not taught and trained in how to use these materials. He's trying to suggest that we're being led by the experts. Certainly you want a broad range of perception and ideas but, to suggest that you would develop curriculum without the knowledge, without teachers who are trained in methodology and teaching and trained in child development, would just be ridiculous. So we have to depend to a large degree on the professionals to develop it initially.

We've got the involvement of superintendents, of school trustees on every committee. We have school trustees sitting on the curriculum committees. We have superintendents, principals, teachers. I think that they spent a long time and have developed not a perfect program, once again, because it can always be

improved, but one that is solid. It does have good content. It includes solid, societal values. It's got high academic demands. It is based on credible and acceptable teaching strategies and methods, and it's based on fact. The content is based on solid fact and information.

There may be some changes in terms of presentation that are a little difficult to understand, because they're different from the way it was presented when we were in school. But I think that those changes were made for a reason. They were made because we were not giving our children adequate knowledge and understanding probably - maybe facts, yes, but knowledge and understanding - of their country and the world issues as we are in this program.

If I just heard a little bit of swearing under the breath, and I don't suggest where it came from, I might say to the Member for Morris, if he's going to stand up and read from materials and documents and take three-quarters of an hour to do it and raise 47 questions — (Interjection) — or whatever the amount of time was, a reasonable amount of time, and raise a large number of questions, then that's what he has to be prepared for in terms of the answer, the same amount of time and the same amount of attention. I didn't know who it was that swore under their breath, and I assumed that it had something to do with the length of the response.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is feeling a little guilty. I didn't find her answer inordinately long at all.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, not guilty.

MR. C. MANNES: As a matter of fact, it was one of her shorter ones, and I compliment her. So I don't know why she is so sensitive. She may have heard some buzzword over here that sent her flying. But, Mr. Chairman, I don't know why she would be quite so sensitive.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me say for the record I am not critical of all the people that have contributed, no doubt, in the most sincere manner to the development of the new social studies curriculum. I have no doubt in my mind that 95 percent and maybe more of that number made a very strong, sincere commitment to a new curriculum which they believed will be a source of good learning for our students.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, I would like to still be critical of it in some two or three areas. It's the general direction. I think we have an awful lot to be proud of in this nation, not only where we are today, not only where we hope to go, but from where we've come, Mr. Chairman. I don't detect, although every political party in this land is attempting to somehow have Canadians develop their own sense of identity and their own sense of pride in their nation, Mr. Chairman, you can't do that by, first of all, denying your history. I mean, it's a fact. Our history is being denied in this particular curriculum.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, the Minister talks about values. I say they are being denied too. I don't think there is a deliberate attempt to destroy home values. I don't see that, Mr. Chairman. But students are taught

that their values are of no greater consequence than any other, and the Minister can't deny that, Mr. Chairman. When the Minister talks about society's values, what are they? She can't in any way describe them, Mr. Chairman. I know the Minister will talk about respect and reason and responsibility, and those are society's values.

I invite the Deputy Premier, Mr. Chairman, instead of muttering there for the last three-quarters of an hour to enter the debate. It's her right, Mr. Chairman. If she has something to say, then by all means she doesn't need my invitation to enter into the debate. I'm sure she's aware of it.

But, Mr. Chairman, when the Minister talks about society's values, what are they because obviously every attempt to develop curriculum today in almost any area is bringing into greater question society's values and what they should be. Mr. Chairman, I'm not saying that the Minister is attempting or the curriculum is attempting to destroy home values, but what I am saying is that no consensus is reached.

Imagine this. We're challenging students in Grade 2 or 3 to begin to closely scrutinize their own values or how they're taught at home to look at different people, to look at different nations in the world. Yet, nowhere do we tell them, after they do this critical thinking, they're on the right path or they're on the wrong path. We don't tell them what the consensus is, Mr. Chairman. We challenge them, and then we leave them go. That's my criticism with this particular curriculum.

They're let go after they've been brought from some stable values, whether they're right or wrong. I'm not going to pass judgment just like the Minister. But they're pulled away from that mooring and then they're told to consider all other elements, and then they're set adrift. They're not told what's right or wrong, but they are told to look very closely at what they bring with them into the school setting. I see some major danger in that, Mr. Chairman. To me, it's the greatest criticism.

The third part that I just can't tolerate is the attempt to preach pacifism to such a degree, Mr. Chairman, that we will not admit to our own students that our way of life within our nation is something that we should be proud of and something that should be considered superior to other political orders in this world. We won't dare say that because, on the one hand, we're telling students to create their own values. On the other hand, we don't want to tell them that we may live in a better world.

Consequently, when my - and the Minister says, well all I have here is the teachers' guide. I don't have the curriculum. Well that scares me even more, Mr. Chairman, because when my Grade 8 student or my Grade 8 son comes home from school and tells me what he's been discussing during the day is the Communist world and particularly Russia, and the teacher tells him how great living is within that nation, how people share in that nation, how if you have a TV that breaks down you don't worry about it because their neighbours rush one over to you and how they share, Mr. Chairman. I swear that is what has happened in my case.

So, Mr. Chairman, all of a sudden we have given this powerful weapon to the teachers of Manitoba and when we hear - oh, well, we move into this area of terrorism. Of course, in some early grades, there is talk about terrorism and its place in the world.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, the Minister has colleagues and she knows them well, who would go into a classroom setting and who would say that the United States of America is as great a threat to our security and as great a potential enemy as any on the face of the earth. — (Interjection) — Today, we are debating . . .

A MEMBER: Amnesty.

MR. C. MANNES: That's right, and members opposite become very upset because we bring in an amendment on torture. Well, I digress for only a second, Mr. Chairman, but there are teachers today, who believe and they are teaching my children and maybe they are teaching the children of the Minister of Finance - and maybe he wants them taught that way, but I don't. I don't want my children taught that there is a way of life in a Second World Communist nation that is better than what I can provide for my children in Manitoba.

Unless the Minister can guarantee that the teachers of this province, however small the percentage, are going to take some liberty to put in their biases, Mr. Chairman, then we have a problem. All of a sudden, Social Studies no longer is the study of different cultures without passing judgment, but different cultures. Mr. Chairman, then we'd have a problem.

That is basically all I have to say in there. I am sure the Minister would want a rebuttal, but, Mr. Chairman, that is my concern and I daresay it is a concern of many many people who have had an opportunity to move into greater depths into the curriculum and the Minister can say, yes, it is accepted in other jurisdictions. Mr. Chairman, have they used it? Is it accepted by people other than the curriculum branches in other provinces? Have parents in other provinces seen the curriculum?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I think I'll deal with the personal situation and the point that the Member for Morris raised about his child in the classroom and the concerns he had. I would make a couple of points there. It appears from what I have heard or what he has expressed that that teacher may be going beyond the suggested strategies. — (Interjection) — If it is being presented in the way he described, the teacher is going beyond the suggested strategies and I think one of the important things for a parent like himself who is willing to wade through curriculum guides, and not everybody is, not everybody either wants to or is interested.

Parents approach it in different ways. Some of them say, the teacher is the professional and we accept that they know what they are doing and that we leave the job up to them. Others say, I want to know exactly what is being taught and what is going on in the schools and not only the content but how it is being taught. Where they are willing to spend the time and have the interest and want the participation, I think they are entitled to it.

So whenever something comes to your attention that you don't think sounds right, I think the first place you should take it up - while it is fair to take it up in this Chamber when we are in estimates - is with your child's teacher and that you should be doing that in order to give yourself or to carry out the rights and the responsibilities that you have been arguing so hard for

here, the rights and the responsibilities of the parents to be involved in what is being taught in their schools.

I can't buy the point that he makes that we are downgrading our country so that we are denying our history. There isn't anything that I know, in fact, the basic goal of the program is to have pride in it, to be very proud so that we are not denying our history or the facts or the information. It is part of the program. I'm not sure that we gave them a pride before in the way that it was presented in the old program. I don't think they had an understanding. I don't think they had a strong feeling of identity and I suppose part of what we have to recognize is that we are a very young country, a very young country, and we don't have the amount of history and things that are behind other countries that clearly have had a longer period of time to develop both a sense of identity.

I think we are still finding ourselves as a nation, who we are and what we are, what Canadians are and what Canada is. I don't think we have totally defined that yet, but to the degree that we have, we should be passing onto our children what has been done to build this country by their parents and their grandparents and what is the history so that they No. 1. understand it; and No. 2, are proud of their country and to be Canadian.

The values are very hard to understand because I have indicated what the values are that are built into it and we make it clear that we don't make it judgmental. We don't say, do you like these values, or do you want to carry them out? They are very clear and I said before their respect, honesty, responsibility, fairness and tolerance - we build in critical thinking and problem solving. But in terms of the values, we don't say it is not right or do what you want with this. We don't say, throw it on the table and let them make a judgment.

We say very clearly in all of our curriculum, these are basic values that are throughout the curriculum and therefore we are saying that it is wrong to be dishonest. We don't say, it is nice to be dishonest or be dishonest or honest if you wish. We say, you should be honest and it is wrong to be dishonest. That it is wrong to be insensitive and disrespectful and intolerant of people. That is what we teach. We teach a respect for themselves and for people of other countries.

In terms of terrorism, and I'm trying to remember just how the context was raised, but I think there was some question about it being, if they are in Grade 12, and I think because we need an understanding of the world today and it is not taught as being right or being better, it is simply being taught as something that is a reality in the world today.

I could spend time going into some examples as the member did about how we teach our young children, Kindergarten children and young children, how the values are handled and taught so that you can see clearly that we are teaching that the values are important. A major portion of our program is a section called "Attitudes and Values," and it deals specifically with the development of attitudes and values that are necessary in a responsible society.

When they take the Kindergarten children through those programs, they take them through in a way that they are showing them that there are rules, why the rules are there and why it is important for them to keep the rules. Not, there are rules and you can do whatever

you want about them. You don't have to follow them if you don't want to. We don't put information and material and present it to our children in that way.

So, I think that I don't disagree with some of the general concerns that the member has except that I don't believe they are either there or not there. The things that he is concerned about not being there, I believe are there through teacher's use of textbooks and other materials and resources. I think the things that he wants to be there and he thinks are not there are there, the personal values and characteristics like that. I continue to say that I believe that it's a program that probably can still use some improvement and will undergo some change, but the process has been long and lengthy, it's been a good one, and I think overall it's an excellent program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have listened with interest to the exchange that has been taking place tonight, and I find that what the Minister is saying to be of some concern, but perhaps I am misunderstanding what the Minister is saying.

I am sure she can correct me if I do misunderstand, but she seems to be saying that those of us who aren't teachers can't really appreciate what is in this curriculum and that somehow teachers not only are the people who should know how to teach but they somehow have some special corner on what should be taught.

I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, if I am misinterpreting her, whether she believes that teachers as individuals or as a group have any more right to determine what is taught in our schools than anyone else has, because I can tell her, my view is that they don't have any more right to determine what is taught. We hire them to teach because they presumably have expertise in how to teach, but it seems to me that it is one of the fundamental rights of a democratic system that the parents have the right to determine what it is that their children will learn and what kind of values their children will be taught.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate some response from the Minister as to whether I have misinterpreted her and, if I haven't, where she would see that the teachers have this special right to determine what is taught.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, yes, I appreciate the opportunity to expand a little on those points. First of all, teachers have some special abilities and knowledge. I didn't say they had a God-given right to determine the entire education system or exactly what would be taught or even how it would be taught without some discussion and consultation with the public and the community. But they have been specially trained, and that special training does give them knowledge and experience that the rest of us don't have.

While some of us learn it and we learn about child development and how children learn the hard way by raising children and raising a family, and that is very useful information, I have often said to teachers and to people in the education system that they should be listening to parents, they should be listening to the public, because the parents often have knowledge and

information about that child, first of all, about how that child learns and about important characteristics of the child that the teacher should know, so I do not think that the teachers have all the knowledge, all the information and a God-given right to determine the entire education system.

But their training is in a number of areas. One, it is in how to teach, it's in teaching methodology. We teach our children at home all the time but we don't use, we are not trained to do it, and there are ways that are better than other ways. So they are trained in methodology and they are given training in child development that I wish I had some of when I was raising my kids. I suppose, when I look back on it, I can say, well, I didn't do so badly under the circumstances. They are all healthy and reasonably independent kids. In fact, I think one of them was going to be - no, he is not here which is good; he wouldn't like to hear me talking about him - but there is information that I would have liked to have had about at what age level children develop in certain areas so that I would have been a little more informed in terms of . . .

MR. B. RANSOM: They are all different; there are no two the same.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I know they are all different, but there are some things that are same and common to all.

So that teachers are not God-given rights, they are not special and unique, but they have had special training. In all the professions, and I think teaching is a profession, and special training, I think that we recognize in our society the special knowledge and information and training that those specialists have. We may not rely on them totally. We don't rely on our medical profession and our doctors without questioning some of them sometimes about what they are doing in terms of our health and our care, or lawyers about how they are handling a case in court, but we do respect that they have knowledge and information that we listen to and sometimes accept and sometimes do not.

One of the things that I have always said, and I think it might be in that speech that the Member for Morris likes to quote and thought it was a good speech, but I have always said that the education system was not there for the running of the professionals and the education system and professional educators, that we did not have the right to do it alone.

The reason that we didn't have the right to do it alone is that when you are teaching children, you are not just passing on knowledge and information and facts. You are influencing, to a degree, both the development of the child which is very important, and you are also influencing the society because I think as children are taught you are having an impact as the family does. I think the family has the first major impact but the school probably has the second on the development of the child and some influence on the way society goes. So that's why they don't let us do that job alone.

I mean I said why don't other professions have elected people like school trustees? Why doesn't the legal profession? You know, they don't have boards that are

elected to serve a local community that have responsibility over budgeting and programming and policy and delivery of service. But the education system does, and it does because they refuse to let us take the responsibility for education just with the educators and just with the professionals. I think that's right. I think they say that we want to be involved in deciding what the education system is going to be, what is going to be taught and how it's going to be taught, and they do that in a variety of ways.

One of the biggest ways in terms of the democratic process that we have now that they determine that is through the election of lay people representing their community largely and often parents who are there to help make decisions on their behalf, decisions like that. It doesn't mean all the decisions are made by elected representatives because there is still a role to play for parents to have direct involvement and participation.

So I don't think there is anything wrong with, and I think there was a point that I can't - I am having trouble reading some of my own writing because I didn't do terribly well in writing along with some other subjects. But I think one of the things that you have to do when you've got a guide like that or a teacher teaching something is that you have to go to the teacher and talk to them to find out what they are doing, what is being taught and how it is being taught, because unless you have that additional information, you don't have all the information that you need. You do need to say I've got a guide here, I've got an outline, but how are you handling it, what is being taught? I see some deficiencies here. Are you building them in in some other ways that I can't see in just looking at this?

So there is a big hole in terms of knowing what is being done unless you talk directly to the teacher in the classroom. Now a lot of parents don't want to go to that trouble and that time but some do. It's those that do should get the information and should have the answers. They may, at the end of it, be satisfied and they may still have some concerns, and if they are not addressed with the teachers then there are routes to go to take them so that they are addressed.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I am really quite surprised that the Minister would try and draw that parallel between lawyers and teachers because the parallel is not a parallel at all. It illustrates the point that I was making, that if I go and hire a lawyer, I tell the lawyer what I want, the lawyer advises how to do it. That's exactly the point I am making with teachers, that the parent, the individual has the right to determine what it is that they want the teacher to do and the teacher teaches, the parallel with the legal profession doesn't stand up at all.

But the Minister used a very interesting phrase at least three times. She said that she didn't think that teachers had God-given rights to determine the curriculum.

I would like to ask the Minister if she thinks God gives anybody rights and if that appears anywhere in the curriculum that God gives people rights.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, we do have some courses and some programs that deal with religious studies. Where they deal with religious studies, they

would go into information and facts about religion and the variety of religions, because there are many. Some of them deal with God and some of them do not, but they are not part of the social studies curriculum or other curriculums that deal with other facts and knowledge that have been taught throughout the whole period when these courses have been basic courses in our education system.

I don't think, when we talk about parents' rights to determine their education, that anybody thinks that they're going to write curriculum. I mean let's talk about how far we go and what it is you're talking about. Parents aren't going to write curriculum. They couldn't write curriculum. They don't want to write curriculum. The curriculum that we're talking about is basic curriculum that has been in our program, our education system, Social Studies, Science, Math, English. Nobody is arguing that those should be removed. The question is: are they being handled in an adequate way? Is there enough time for the basics? But there is no argument about removing them.

The discussion is clearly focused on content and what is being taught, the amount of time that is being spent and the distribution of that time in terms of the total program for the schools. So there is a role for parents, but it certainly is not and cannot take over the professional role of trained teachers. It has to be carried out by them in things like writing curriculum.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I suppose we could make two points. Firstly, the Minister says that a lot of parents, of course, would not be interested in looking at the curriculum guides or the teacher guides. I suppose that was the point I tried to make in the first place. That's why, to me, the Minister of Education has such a critical role when curriculum within social areas is released, within areas that bring into question values, that deal or don't deal with absolutes. Mr. Chairman, it's critical that the Minister of Education has a very significant role in the release of new curriculum.

Mathematics is virtually pure logic, Mr. Chairman. Mathematics hasn't changed in centuries or indeed thousands of years. That's why there are no great debates associated with mathematical equations. So, Mr. Chairman, once we move into these other areas of curriculum development where the school system now is more than eager, more than prepared and ready to attempt to deal with society's problems, then it's very incumbent upon the Minister of Education of the Day, regardless of how long the particular curriculum committee has been in place - and I realize fully that the genesis of this occurred in 1975 or '76.

But it's incumbent upon the Minister to see come into place a curriculum that is not going to in any way upset the vast majority of parents within the province, because quite honestly, Mr. Chairman, parental input into the development of this curriculum was minimal. I know parents' groups saw drafts and all that, Mr. Chairman, but the professional people have developed it. So the Minister then, because her name's on it - it's approved by the Minister of Education - has a very important role.

I would like though to use those comments I've just made in the line of questioning developed by the Member for Turtle Mountain to ask the Minister if it

was she decided that peace should be taught in Manitoba schools, Mr. Chairman. Now was this something the professional educators, the teachers said should be taught in schools, or was it something the trustees, the representatives of the parents who by theory should decide what should be taught in schools, was it the trustees who requested of the Minister that peace be taught in our schools?

Because I submit, Mr. Chairman, if it was the Minister's idea or her government's idea that it be included in the curriculum, then we have the Minister wanting the best of both worlds. When the curriculum comes forward, she says no, it's been developed in the proper way, I approve it because of the process, and on the other hand, saying the initiatives in education and curriculum should not gain its derivation from the voices of parents, the elected trustee; no, it should be done by me, I should decide or the government should decide what should go into curriculum. Mr. Chairman, this is a very very critical decision that the Government of the Day makes. Who decides what changes and what material should be brought forward and included in the curriculum of the day?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, to deal with the last question about peace education, any decision on bringing in curriculum or adding to the curriculum, because if peace education were to ever be brought in, I don't see it being brought in probably as a separate subject, but it would be integrated into existing subjects where it was appropriate. But if it were to be brought in, it would be brought in after, to me, what is a required period of time and discussion between all of the people involved. So the first thing I want to say is there has been no decision made to date that peace education will be taught in the schools.

The Member for Morris is frowning and looking at an article that was written in the paper that relates to a speech that I gave at a recent peace conference about a month or six weeks ago. The reason that I was there speaking is that the topic of the conference was Peace in Education. In other words, the whole conference was focusing on the teaching of peace in education. What I did was outline a number of reasons why we not only should but, I thought, had to consider the question of both a balanced approach of knowledge in our curriculum, which I don't think has been there, related to peace and conflict and peace and war, and what I could see and what led me to believe that we should be looking seriously at how to and whether and when to introduce peace curriculum.

The first thing that I said is what we were doing presently is simply studying what was happening in other jurisdictions. We're getting information about what's happening in other provinces, in other countries, how they're handling the issues, and what materials and resources they're using to teach this. When we have that information gathered, then we will open it up for discussion with the appropriate people.

So you're one step ahead of the game in terms of being concerned about a decision. All that is happening is that we're gathering information in order to begin to discuss the issue with school trustees, with teachers, with superintendents, with the public. I raised a number of concerns that I had that if they were going to talk

about peace education - and it wasn't up to me to predetermine what their recommendations or what their position would be at the end of the conference; they were a wide-ranging group of individuals from a number of organizations concerned about the issue of peace, and they will determine their position and their recommendations. But as the Minister of Education, I gave a number of cautions. One of them was that any thoughts given to this subject that they would have to understand that it had to be handled in a balanced way. In other words, it would have to be peace and conflict studies, that one could not introduce one without the other and that they had to go together.

Now I think that in the past, we have had an emphasis on conflict, because we have studied wars and how we got into wars and what happened in wars. We've done very little to study any things that have been happening, trying to deal with conflict, teach kids how to deal with conflict or deal with peaceful solutions or options to war.

So my first point was that it has to be balanced, it has to have peace and conflict. It has to have both sides of the issue. Secondly, it would be very important that it be age appropriate. It had to give a lot of consideration as to when materials like this would be introduced and how it would be handled. Age appropriateness on sensitive issues is a very important area. We didn't have time and we can't continue to build in and add on new curriculum. The concern is when we need this amount of time for basics, for English, Social Studies, Science and Math, we can't take 30 minutes additional to bring in curriculum on environment or curriculum on peace. But there are lots of places in our regular curriculum where these things can be built in and integrated in a normal and natural way and that should be done, but one of my most important points was that it would have to have the involvement of other than the group that was there. The group that was there was a group of physicians, I think, who have an organization concerned about peace; a group of teachers who have an organization concerned about peace; I can't remember the others, but there were, I think, five organizations that had come together to put this program on.

I said you are going to have to go beyond your own professional groups and your own organizations and go first to the public at large and then to parents, because you are going to have to get a broad based acceptance, approval and agreement for the involvement or for the handling of any programs like this, that they would have to go to the public at large. They would have to start raising the issue for discussion opening up the opportunities for a public dialogue, because I think it is something that needs a lot of talking about.

So I think from my answer that the Member for Morris can see, 1) that I had not announced that there was a peace curriculum; 2) that we are in the very initial stages, there has been no decision made; and 3) that I have outlined safeguards and concerns that I have that would have to be taken into consideration if there were to be any consideration given to the incorporation of this into the curriculum, and approval and support and agreement and discussion by the public and parents would be one of the main conditions.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, did the Minister of Education talk with school trustees of Manitoba or the

Teachers Society of Manitoba and indicate to them that she wanted to pursue the development of a peace curriculum or a peace-in-school initiative? Did she have any preliminary discussions with any of those organizations before making the statement that she did before the meeting - I can't find specifically what meeting it was, but did she have an opportunity to discuss with those associations her wish to see this item included in the curriculum?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, what I have said is that the point that we are at is the very initial gathering of information and until I have that, until I have a report and I have information presented to me, which I have not to date, until I can see what it is recommending and how it is being handled and what the information is about the materials and how it is being handled in other areas, I am not sure what I want to do. I think, in general, there have some discussions. When I meet with all those associations and organizations, sometimes we talk specific resolutions and sometimes we talk in general terms about the things that are happening in education and the pressures and the things that are causing us problems and that we are dealing with.

I know that I have discussed on many occasions with many groups the question what concerns me and trustees and teachers a great deal and that is the effect on our young students today of the threat of nuclear annihilation. This is a serious problem. It affects their studies. It affects their planning, personal and career. There is a hopelessness among our students. There have been studies that show that with young people their major concern and fear is usually that their parents are going to die - this is young students. We now know that over 60 percent of them - and there have been a number of studies done in quite a number of jurisdictions that show that fear of nuclear war and nuclear annihilation has now become the No. 1 fear. This is being demonstrated in their essays. It comes through and shows in their art. It comes through in their behaviour. It is shown in an earlier and earlier age. It isn't just the junior high or the senior high kids. This is being demonstrated in elementary schools. All teachers are seeing the effects of it.

So it is something that we can't avoid. We can't avoid recognizing the fact that the threat of nuclear war and the feeling that nothing can be done about it and that it is going to happen and that it is hopeless, and that it's going to happen, they're not sure when, is something that we have to deal with.

When we will deal with it and when it will be raised in a formal way is when I have the information and the report before me and I can study it. Then I'll take it to the organizations and raise it for initial discussion. So it would have been premature for me to have raised it without having the report and the recommendations.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, the Minister forgets the TV camera is off. I asked the question: had she consulted with the trustees? Because, Mr. Chairman, this is what she said at that meeting, and the Minister would lead us to believe right now that it is in the conceptual form, why is the Minister less than forthright, less than candid because this is what she said at the interview. She said in a later interview, "The Education

Department is studying which topics to include, how they can be integrated into the regular curriculum and at what age they should be taught. The study is slated for completion this summer," she said, adding, "It's findings probably will recommend the department begin implementation in the next school year." That's two months away.

Have the trustees or any trustees been consulted at all, and how are they going to put input into this particular program, and what happens if they don't want the program, Mr. Chairman? Are they not the representatives of the parents? The Minister went on to say, "There will be consultation with teachers, parents and children." No reference to trustees, Mr. Chairman.

Sir, the trustees have a role to play in developing curriculum and that follows on the question asked by the Member for Turtle Mountain, or are they just to follow along, handed a curriculum, approved by the Minister, after the fact? That's what's in essence here, Mr. Chairman.

What is the Minister's role? Is it her role to tell parents in Manitoba what material it is that should be covered, or is it the role of the trustees to come to the Minister? In some cases now, for many years, pleading for a high school review, their great concern, and I cannot remember one resolution that they've passed asking that the Minister of Education bring a curriculum devoted to peace into the public school system.

Mr. Chairman, it makes one understand why the editorial writer in the Free Press said that if Mrs. Hemphill wants to expose Manitoba pupils to an historical bout of propoganda, she will encounter stiff resistance. Teachers need to be aware what the students have on their minds when they arrive in class, but they should not be obliged to shift gears every time the Minister reads another opinion poll.

How could it be that the trustees in this province have had no input into a curriculum that's coming into place, by what the Minister says, potentially within two months. And furthermore, have they been invited at all in any formal manner to make representation or to be involved in this whole consultation process? If they have, I'd ask the Minister to tell us when the letter has gone out to the trustees.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: First of all, the member quotes from an article that - as is often the case with newspaper articles and I say this not to be critical of the person that wrote it - doesn't take in everything that was said and in this case, unfortunately, the article was written, the person missed my speech. And she was sorry and so was I. But she got there after the speech had been given and we were in an awkward position where she wanted to report on what was said, but she had missed the speech and the speech was about forty minutes long. You know, I can't quite remember how long.

So a lot was said in the speech and what was done is that she gathered some information from some notes from talking to some people and from throwing a few questions at me as I was running out the door, I think, to come back to the Chamber. So it's quite - not only possible, but reality - that not everything that I said was reported. One of the things that was not reported was the peace and conflict. It totally shows there that it just suggests that I'm talking about peace. And clearly,

all the way through my speech, if you read it, and I can show you the scribbles, I'm talking about peace and conflict studies. One of the criticisms was that it's biased and it's one-sided because she only wants to show one side of the issue. The problem there is that they're getting the information from a report that doesn't tell the whole story and doesn't say everything that I said.

In terms of the quote in the paper suggesting that we're going to talk to parents - and what was it? - parents and teachers and children and didn't deal with trustees. Trustees are always involved in the discussions and I don't know why she has only those three are in the article, but my main point there was that they had to go to the public. Who we deal with and consult with in the education system doesn't change: its teachers and trustees and superintendents on curriculum. So that never changes and I don't even remember dealing with that in my speech.

What I did deal with, at great length, was the need to go to the public and get broader public support for this kind of a program, and in terms of his saying that it's already prescribed, because we're looking at age appropriateness and materials and how it would be delivered, whether it's integrated, I mentioned all of those things. But those are things that we're looking at - the information from other jurisdictions, looking at what they do, what age levels, how they integrated, how they handle it and what materials - so that we've got something to deal with, something to discuss.

In terms of his suggestion, because I think he was making the suggesting that new programs should only come from trustees because they're elected, he was sort of suggesting, what is the Minister doing, raising the question of a new program or new curriculum coming in? What about trustees who are elected? Certainly school trustees have a role and curriculum can be initiated either by teachers in the classroom or staff in a school or by school trustees identifying - and I don't know another province where school divisions have as much ability.

They can have school initiated projects that they approve, individual initiated projects that they have to approve, and they're involved in all curriculum development at all levels, totally involved. They sit on the committees and approve. School trustees sat on that Social Studies Curriculum Committee and approved it and agreed with it and supported it and recommended it.

But if the member - who likes to talk about the role and the responsibility of the Minister of Education, and how much responsibility I have and he referred to it in terms of curriculum development - suggests that I don't have a leadership role or that I simply sit back and wait until trustees decide that a program should be brought in, is not the case. I suggest we both have a role and we both have a responsibility and the Minister of Education is responsible for exercising leadership, not just following the path.

So school trustees can initiate suggestions about curriculum and program and I think we listen to them and follow them, but so can the Minister. All the Minister will be asking is that the same consideration that we give, when they initiate and want new programs brought in or changes, is given when we initiate and want them brought in, and that is that we're prepared to talk about

it and look at it and discuss it together and make some decisions together on how it will be handled, so that what we're opening up is a dialogue to look at what is a serious question in the education system and one that I don't believe we can avoid, but one that I do not have predetermined ideas about how it would be handled. I haven't seen the information yet and I'm waiting to see it and waiting for the discussions with the appropriate people, largely school trustees, teachers; but as I said to the group also in this area, parents and the public.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Chairman, the question was very specific. I asked the Minister, in view of the fact that the study is coming in - she said in summer - and in light of the knowledge that there was going to be some attempt, if things go right, to have this curriculum in place in the fall of 1985, can the Minister tell me how she intends to consult with the trustees. More importantly, has she sent a letter to them inviting them to be involved in that process, indicating specifically how it is that they will make representation, given that her department will not be reporting on this in the form of a report until some time in the summer?

Mr. Chairman, I ask the question of the Minister, whether she had even included the trustees in her consultations. She indicated to me that she hasn't. But I would ask then how she will get the words in, as to what's on her mind, because they're the ones that are being asked the questions by parents wanting to know more about this program. Now the Minister has set out her thoughts completely to a group of 90 people at a meeting, Mr. Chairman. Isn't the least she can do is do the same thing with the trustees of this province who are being asked questions by thousands of parents - potentially by thousands of parents - I reword that, Mr. Chairman.

Again my final question, my very specific question, how is it that she intends to involve the trustees in this consultation process, bearing in mind that we're two months away from introducing the curriculum?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, first of all that's the point I meant to address in my earlier remarks and it slipped my mind. There is no suggestion that there is going to be a program in place in two months, so that's the first thing.

What I indicated in my speech is that I was gathering information and when I gathered that we would be setting up a process for examining it within the system and with the public at large, for discussion; so that there is no predetermined time at which it must go in or no predetermination that it is going to go in at a certain time or how it's going to go in. That's the first thing, so let's get away immediately from the suggestion that I have a curriculum in mind that I'm going to have in, in September, because that is not the case.

Secondly, there will be no curriculum without the consultation process that is a part of our decision-making and a part of our curriculum development process. There will be no curriculum that does not include that. As soon as I have the report and I can see it, I will be making contact with the appropriate people and school trustees included, and I will be outlining then - and I'm not sure what form they will

take - some process for bringing together people that are involved and share responsibility to begin to look at the issue.

My guess is that the first thing that we would do is look at the process. In other words, the first question would be how do we deal with the information and how do we look at it? Do we set up a committee; do we have the department bring in a paper that they then respond to? There are quite a number of ways that one consults and deals with programs like this and raising the question of inclusion of a program like this, so I'm not sure what form it could take.

I simply say that the curriculum is not going to be in place in two months. There is no predetermined curriculum, there will not be without the consultation process and the process for decision-making will be determined between the department and those others involved, such as school trustees.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Chairman, moving on to another curriculum area, can the Minister tell me what final comments her Curriculum Branch has had with respect to the major report developed by Mr. Macek in which he made the conclusions, and I'll review them in a very general sense that, in his view, only three to seven Science topics are covered in Grades 6, 7 and 8, on average per year, compared to European programs where 16 to 20 topics per year are covered.

I know the Minister met for a short period of time with Mr. Macek; I also know that he had a more detailed meeting with the Assistant Deputy Minister. I'm curious to know whether the Minister feels that his conclusions, as drawn, have any significance, and whether they are worthy of being followed up with greater study and greater action in the years ahead.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Morris raises a question about a report that was done by Mr. Macek that is a major report and a very extensive report dealing with the teaching of Science in our education system, and comparing it to traditional European models of teaching of Science in education and basically suggesting that we have a deficient program in a number of areas. In the amount of time we spend, it is in the method of designing the curriculum. He wants more time spent, they want the curriculum to be designed - if I recollect - by scientists and not by teachers, and really a system that we would have to describe as an elite system. It's one where they don't give Science to the broad masses of children, in fact, something that we've been addressing here when we've been talking about curriculum, where all of our children are given a basic understanding of Science, but where you actually identify those kids that would be sort of the Science specialists. They're streamed and you are training and educating an elite group of, I guess, scientists, at the expense, I must say, of a broad understanding of Science and its role in the world by all of the children.

So I suppose the first thing I want to say is this, is that it was a report that took a lot of time and attention and a lot of his time and a lot of his consideration; and there are some, as I thought there would be and as we said there would be, some reasonable points to be given consideration. In general, I have to say that

the report suggests a major revolution of our education system, not a minor, but a major revolution. If you took what he says and the recommendations and incorporated them all, we would be totally throwing out everything that we have and totally revolutionizing the education system.

One of the things that concerns me about the Member for Morris bringing things like this forward is not that there aren't some reasonable points to be made about our system and some improvements that can be made and some recommendations that are reasonable and practical, but he raises these things in a way that, well, here's this report with 140 pages, like, what are you going to do about it? What are you going to do to incorporate the recommendations, without looking to see at whether they're reasonable, whether they're practical, whether we want to go in that direction because . . .

MR. C. MANNES: That's what I'm asking now.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: . . . it's a major change to move towards a European model. I don't think that, when he talks about how parents feel and how the public feels, I'll tell you that I do not think that they would be happy with this and that we certainly wouldn't do it just because somebody has written a report. We wouldn't do it, would we, without all the consultation and all the discussion with all the groups that we've mentioned, which is parents and school trustees. So it's a major, major change and we would not consider going into it.

In fact, we've got a number of reactions. First of all, some of the countries that are incorporating this, interestingly, are moving away from it and moving towards our model. In other words, at a time that he's recommending that we go to theirs, which is a narrow education for a top group of kids with sort of trained scientists or just scientists developing the curriculum, I think it's in Czechoslovakia, is it, that they're moving towards adopting our program, so that we have to be very, very careful when we look at reports like this that we do it sort of saying, well, there's some good points there, but what is practical and reasonable.

There are a couple of things that he suggested that are reasonable. One is that he thinks we shouldn't be dealing with multi-text. He doesn't like the multi-textbook approach because he thinks it's too watered down. There isn't enough focus and the textbooks aren't strong enough. When teachers can choose from a variety of textbooks, he thinks that there's too much option and not enough concentration of what all of the students will be getting. It's not a bad point and, in fact, the trend in North America, interestingly, is to move away from a package of books, I think, over the last few years, and move towards a single textbook authority, where that textbook would be seen to be the most authoritative text in that area. So that's a point that we don't disagree with and that I think we've been moving toward and also the publishers are moving toward.

Five years ago they were developing a multi-textbook and putting out a package of texts, that would be a wide variety of texts, and now they and we are suggesting in moving toward the singular text.

He wants university Science personnel on the Science 7-9 committee, in addition to Faculty of Education representatives, and we don't disagree with that. In fact, wherever we can, we try to pull in experts in the field to sit and give reaction to and to give advice and to help in the writing of curriculum. It's very difficult to get people from Chemistry and Biology. It's hard to find people that are willing to put time in to sort of evaluate, look at curriculum and give recommendations, but it's something that we try to do more and more; and I think that it doesn't hurt to have him remind us that perhaps we should be making an extra effort to get specialists in those fields to help review material for accuracy.

And he wants more rigorous scrutiny of content in curriculum materials during evaluation, and I suppose he wants the development of clearer statements for parents about the nature of curriculum, for inclusion in future curriculum documents.

Some of those things we have no problem with, but the overall, I would think and I should put clearly - first of all we spent a lot of time with him, not only have I met with him but the department has met with him at length, not just once, not just twice, but have had numerous meetings; gathering and listening to him and getting information and giving him information back about how our system was working.

The one thing I believe is that over the course of these meetings, there has come to be a little better understanding of both sides of the issue. In other words that's one of the things that happens when you spend time talking to people. We have a little greater appreciation and understanding of where he's coming from and what he's suggesting and why; and he has a little better understanding and appreciation of what we're doing in our system in classrooms today and why; in some cases has been a little more satisfied about some of the things that are being done than he was when he first started out and didn't have all of the information that he has today.

Overall, I'm saying that we're willing to accept some of the recommendations as good advice, from somebody who is very concerned and has spent a lot of time studying it. I am not willing - and I said this directly to him - to take his report and crack open our whole system and bring in a total revolution that makes a major change that is totally contrary, to both our system for developing curriculum and the basis and the way that we teach, and that's what he's suggesting in his report, when he asks us to follow the European model.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for that full answer. I take it from her response that either she is going to prepare a letter, or something that will expand on what she's provided to me, to send to the gentleman in question. Is that right?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Well I think, to date, we've been having direct communication, which is probably better than any letter. I met with him about a month ago and I communicated what I've communicated tonight to him directly, and we set up a subsequent meeting with staff, which was one of I don't know how many meetings that have taken place, but the last one took place after

my meeting. You met with him again, so it had to be within the last two or three weeks, and the information that we got then was that he was going out of town. He's in the bush for four months, and I'm not sure if the member heard that . . .

MR. C. MANNES: Yes, I heard you. He's in the bush; just left last week.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Okay. He's away out of town; he's away for four months, so I don't think we'll send a letter to him during that period of time, but I think when he comes back, we'll probably have some additional communication that may be by letter and may be by direct communication, which he seems to prefer.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I accept that. I suppose the final comment I have to make within this area comes out of an answer given by the Minister. She was talking about the qualifications of people sitting on a Science curriculum committee and how some of the best people may not be able to find their way sitting on that committee because of other pressures. I find it almost impossible to believe that a curriculum branch would not make those individuals, somehow full-time employees for a period of a couple of years, or whatever is needed to change or review Science curriculum.

It's just so important, Mr. Chairman, and I know the Minister obviously would realize that, but I question the qualification, I suppose, of all the people on the Science committee. Are they basically academics or are many of them practising scientists? And again, who makes the basic decision that so few topics are covered in our curriculum, vis-a-vis what the Minister calls the European model, and I find it passing strange that the Minister talks about the Czechoslovakian model moving toward our direction. From memory, I believe it was the Czechoslovakian model that he tabled and is tabled right now within the Legislative Library, for anyone to scrutinize that wants to delve in greater depth into the document he prepared.

So, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to belabour the point. The Minister has indicated, and I know her staff has met with the gentleman in question on many occasions. I'm glad that she takes his report and his very deep-seated feelings on these matters very seriously, because when I see a member of the public who is prepared to go to that extent to prepare a position and support it, I think that individual deserves a fair amount of attention. I'm glad to hear that the Minister and her staff has provided that to him. I hope she would only finish it off by preparing for him some worded response, directly from herself, covering many of the items or the conclusions that she hasn't reached in reviewing the report.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like just to finish one other subject tonight and that is again, information or letters that have been directed to the Minister with respect to the Science Council of Canada's Report, Science for Every Student, and I think the letters have been directed to the Minister by the Manitoba Association for Bright Children. I think their request isn't an awful lot different than Mr. Macek's, even though they're coming from different perspectives.

The Association for Bright Children wrote to the Minister expressing their concern, "Under the belief that the Science education must offer greater challenge to enthusiastic and capable students," and it currently does, Mr. Chairman. It goes on saying, ". . . it's been our observation that bright children often are creative and have exceptional reasoning and critical thinking ability."

I think another letter makes reference to recommendation No. 3, within that report, the Science for Every Student Report coming from the Science Council of Canada, ". . . that high achievers and Science enthusiasts receive greater challenge." I think the President, one Jamie Sterling of Souris, Manitoba, asked the Minister whether or not there were some changes that would be developed within the curriculum of Manitoba, or any programs that would reach out and challenge those of our brighter students in the area of Science, such that they may be challenged more fully throughout their formal schooling?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the position and the suggestions made by the Science Council of Canada are I think very important and ones that we do pay attention to, because they are made up of people that are not only very interested and very knowledgeable in this area and have a lot to tell us, to help us decide how to deal with this very important subject in our programs.

They put out 13 recommendations. First of all, they did a couple of things. One, they reviewed the Science curriculum across the country, and I don't have the statement right here in front of me, but I think the gist of it was that they said that the Manitoba curriculum was a model, was one of the soundest, one of the best curriculums and suggested that it was a model for other provinces to look at. Now that came from the Science Council of Canada.

I'm just saying that we have been impressed by the Manitoba system of a K-12 Science working party or Standing Committee made up of teachers and others in a lot of places and, I think, sometimes we did it ourselves. We just had the consultants and the specialists sitting in a room writing the curriculum, so this move to sort of the democratic process and all this involvement of a wide range of people is unique.

The International Association for the Study of Educational Achievement, which is an international body dealing with educational achievement, says that the Manitoba curriculum guide for lower secondary Science K-6 and 7-9 is the most complex of those reviewed. I think that's two bodies, outside of the education system, largely concerned with Science, reviewing curriculum across the country who have recognized and given positive statements and recognized both the process for developing curriculum and the curriculum content of our Science programs.

Out of the 13 points that the Science Council made, which was strategies for implementation of Science, which do deal with the question of excellence and challenging of students and getting more girls into Science and all of these recommendations that are here, out of the 13, we have dealt with nine of them, I think, have already moved and developed on nine of them. So, clearly, while we still have a little ways to

go, in terms of their suggestions for handling it and their examination of our program, we're doing quite well.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Chairman, I just propose to ask another couple of questions, clean up questions, and then if it's acceptable, I would like to rise tonight.

Mr. Chairman, I've heard about, and I confess a total lack of understanding, that there's a Tomatis Learning Centre in the Red River School Division. It aids listening skills of children and maybe I'm in the wrong division, but it appears that the Red River School Division is the first using this European approach. Can the Minister tell me anything more about this program and whether it's being developed at all in other divisions?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, D. Scott: Madam Minister.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Chairman, it appears on first blush of hearing the information that none of us have heard about it before and have no knowledge of it, so if you could provide it to us, we could get some information on it for you.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Chairman, it's spelt T-O-M-A-T-I-S and that's all I know about it also. It's apparently offered by the Red River School Division in St. Pierre, so I just wanted to know a little bit more about the program.

In a news release November 9th, 1984, the Minister indicated the kindergarten assessment is announced by the Minister. What is it that the Minister is attempting to do in assessing kindergarten? Has the program now been in sufficient time that the Minister wants to review its goals and objectives? Why is it necessary that her department assess the kindergarten standing at this time?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: For a number of reasons, Mr. Chairman. First of all, because it's never been assessed before. The program's been in since the late Sixties and there has not been an assessment of the program and any time you design a new program, it doesn't matter what level it's at, at some point you should have an evaluation and an assessment of it.

The kindergarten program's a very important one because it's a school preparation program and it has goals and objectives and it has programs and it has

skills and knowledge and abilities that are supposed to be the outcome of a child going through that program and they are measurable.

They may not be measured in exactly the same way as we do our other testing, where it's done largely by testing. There may be some other ways of measuring, but it's important I think that we do the evaluation and this came through as a recommendation from the Joint Committee on Evaluation which has trustees, superintendents, teachers sitting on that Joint Committee for Evaluation and they recommend which areas they think are in need of assessment. They have had on their plate, I think for some time, the kindergarten assessment and we have agreed to do it this year.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Chairman, I just want to rise to serve notice to the Minister that it's my intention to finish this whole area tomorrow. We'll be spending probably the rest of the time within the Health curriculum area, so I can tell her that in case she wants to prepare for that.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I appreciate that and I must say I've appreciated the way it's been organized, because we were hoping that, while some of our opening statements dealt with curriculum in general and mentioned a number of curriculum items, as we've been going it, he's been focusing on a particular curriculum and it's much easier for us when all the questions come in one field; so we appreciate knowing that Health is going to be the topic for tomorrow. I rather suspect we guessed it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Committee rise.
Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. Eyles: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I move we adjourn. Seconded by the Member for Ste. Rose.

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