

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 20 June, 1985.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

## CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - LABOUR

**MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos:** Committee, please come to order. We are still on Item 2.(b)(1) Mechanical and Engineering: Salaries; 2.(b)(2) Other Expenditures - Mr. Minister.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairperson, during the afternoon sitting of the committee, the Honourable Member for St. Norbert asked me - or it may have been the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, I'm not sure - about the union membership information, and I can give him a Directory of Labour Organizations in Manitoba, December, 1984. This may have been, we're not sure, tabled in the House or circulated to members, but in any event there is a copy for him.

The statistics in respect to comparative membership is found on Page 4. It goes to 1982. In addition to that, the information we have is that in 1983-84 - the data is not yet released by Stats Canada - preliminary indications are that union membership numbers are likely to recover from the decrease in 1982. In 1982, there was a decrease of minus 2.1 percentage points. I think that's all.

In respect to the concern for a report from the Labour Management Review Committee, we do not appear to have received a formal report in 1984 from that body. I'll send this down to the member.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** I take it, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the Labour Management Review Report that if and when the Minister receives it, he will table it in the House or distribute it to members of the House.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** That's correct.

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

2.(c)(1) Fire Prevention: Salaries; 2.(c)(2) Other Expenditures; 2.(c)(3)(a) Engineering and Technical Services, Salaries; 2.(c)(3)(b) Other Expenditures - the Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, the government has been studying the problems of fire calls which are being answered by the different municipalities outside of their boundaries. I have one particular case in the Town of Steinbach where they do get called from time to time to deal with problems on the Trans-Canada Highway, whether it be an overturned vehicle or some other problems, they are called by their law enforcement officers or people who are on the scene, and they of course have been having problems recovering costs on different things.

I wonder if the Minister could tell us, give us an update, as to what the government intends to do with

regard to possibly instituting a program or a policy with regard to that.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I'm advised that under the Department of Municipal Affairs there's been a \$10,000 fund established out of which this kind of payment can be made.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Is that program now in place?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** I wonder if the Minister could provide us with some details of the two volunteer fire training facilities now with regard to the number of people who are now being trained at those facilities.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I'll just get the numbers.

At the present time there are three locations: Thompson, Winnipeg and Brandon. The number of courses held were 226; and the numbers that were in attendance were 4,512.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** This would have been primarily volunteer firemen?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, having served on a volunteer fire department for a number of years, until I got involved in this field of endeavour which virtually froze me out of the department because I couldn't be on call, I guess I would be remiss if I didn't at this time at least make some mention of what I think is the tremendous community service that many of these volunteer firemen make to their communities. I think very often it's not recognized, the type of hours that are put in, not only by the people who are in the department, but also the employers who very unselfishly allow these people to take time off. Sometimes it's a real hardship because they might be in the middle of doing a particular job for a customer.

I know in Steinbach, if it's a mechanic, and he's in the middle of fixing a car for some person from Winnipeg who has purchased a car in Steinbach and he's come out for servicing. He's in the middle of fixing, he gets a fire call and he's gone, and the customer is waiting and everybody's mad, so it is something that the employers, as well as the people who are giving of their time and effort with regard to fire prevention, and of course firefighting in the rural areas.

So I guess I have a bit of a soft spot for them, and I know that if it wasn't for the volunteer fire departments throughout the province, not only would we be in a position of having to levy substantially higher municipal taxes with regard to those smaller municipalities, but I think they would not be able to, even with paid help, provide in many instances the type of service that these people provide. So I just want to state for the record - I think I do this just about every year, but it's something

that I think should be recognized - that I would like to recognize all the volunteer fire department people in rural and urban centres.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I just want to add a bit to the information that I gave to the honourable member of the 4,512, there are 724 who would be considered paid firefighters. I had indicated that they were all pretty well volunteer but with that exception.

I want to put on the record, Mr. Chairperson, also my deep appreciation, on behalf of the people of Manitoba for the exemplary citizenship that is involved in those who volunteer, in whatever capacity they volunteer, but is this particularly highlighted in respect to firefighting? As the Honourable Member for La Verendrye has said, in many instances men and women give up something that is particularly dear to them or very important to their livelihood to go to serve their community.

I know I will not miss an opportunity to, on behalf of the people of Manitoba, express my appreciation for that kind of dedicated volunteer effort. In many instances they risk their lives to be of service. I don't think we can say enough in appreciation for that kind of volunteerism and I heartily endorse what the Honourable Member for La Verendrye said. I wish that I could be a volunteer firefighter myself. One day, if I am not too crotchety, I hope they will accept me.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, on Page 32 of the Annual Report, it shows the table of number in dollar loss of fires from 1974 to 1983. It shows, with the exception of one year, 1980, when the loss was, I take it, in the \$52 million range, - a fairly constant level of fire loss - \$23 million in 1974 and in 1983, \$32 million. The previous page indicates that the data is used to provide information for the department as a whole, the fire and police services and the insurance industry.

Can the Minister indicate why, in view of this fairly constant amount of fire loss, Autopac fire insurance premiums as well as private sector insurance premiums have increased throughout this period fairly significantly? That may be beyond this department.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I really can't comment and provide any assistance to the honourable member in respect to fire underwriters' evaluations in the costing of insurance. I could give a little more definition to the types of losses.

I am advised that losses in respect to buildings is relatively stable from year to year, but outdoor property - outbuildings, garages, grass fires - that can fluctuate pretty dramatically from year to year because they are seasonal. If we have a dry spring, the losses can be much heavier. That's about the only variable I could indicate.

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

2.(d)(1) Employment Standards: Salaries; 2.(d)(2) Other Expenditures; 2.(d)(3) Payment of Wages Fund - the Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** The Minister has had first reading on a bill which I suppose will be before the Legislature

very shortly. It hasn't been distributed yet, I don't think. Has it? — (Interjection) — No, dealing with payment of wages.

I wonder if the Minister could tell us what the Payment of Wages Fund paid out last year.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The preliminary figure that I have for '84-'85 is \$299,000.00. I now have information on the full year, from April, '84 to April, '85 - \$411,748.63.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Were there any recoveries on that?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, \$238,982.80.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** So you netted out at about \$177,000 - \$178,000.00?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, the previous year. I haven't checked your mathematics, but that sounds . . .

**MR. R. BANMAN:** But about \$177,000.00?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes. I would point out that of the recoveries, \$98,271.09 were current year; and the prior years' recoveries were \$140,411.71. There is a catch-up because of the time lag in that.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Since the government has declared its intent to bring in legislation dealing with the payment of wages, and we haven't seen the bill, but we would like to discuss it, I would like to ask the Minister: in light of what I would gather now is an amount which we are looking at around \$200,000 to ensure that employees in this province receive their wages when a company goes broke, does the Minister feel with that figure, and its having declined in the last couple of years, that the legislation which he is introducing is still necessary?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, Mr. Chairperson.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** On what grounds?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Well, the amount that is in this Estimate is \$320,000.00. We anticipate that we may well require that kind of funding initially because what we do is pay the money to the employee and recovery may take place somewhat later and that's reflected in the report I just gave the honourable member.

I think we can be optimistic that with improved economic conditions there will be less demand on the fund, but I think we have to ensure that there will be sufficient money there to meet claims.

I might say - and I know the honourable member would like to know all of the detail of the legislation - except for the fact that we've got this Supreme Court matter. I'd hoped to be able to have given second reading to those bills. The bill in respect to The Payment of Wages Act primarily will provide for more efficient handling of the wage claims in order to expedite payment to workers who are owed wages when there is a receivership or bankruptcy or a termination of their employment without payment.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Is the Minister saying that \$320,000 which he is asking for in this appropriation, by asking

for that, is he saying that the Payment of Wages Fund will remain in place and that the bill essentially is just going to tidy up some of the administrative procedures with regard to expediting the payment to the employees of their wages owing them?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I suppose you could categorize it as a tidying up. It will make the workings of the fund and the Employment Standards Division much more effective.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Does it change any aspects of the rights of the first mortgage holder?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** No.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Does it include any levy to industry.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** No, there was a Payment of Wages Advisory Committee and this is an ad hoc committee comprised of the former chairperson of the Chamber of Commerce, Jim Wright; Mr. Jack Macdonald, of the Royal Bank; and Mr. Chris Monk of the Paper Workers' Union; an ad hoc committee to look at that whole area and make recommendations and I'm pleased to say that the provisions in the bill follow the recommendations that they made to government.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** On another subject which has been raised in the legislature and has been with us now for a number of years, and that has to do with the wages paid to construction employees and the construction wage schedule within the Province of Manitoba, and also within the City of Winnipeg as well as rural Manitoba.

One of the things, of course, that has come up now in the last number of years - and I know the Minister will say it was there from 1977 on - I think we should be resolving and looking at, and I would hope that the Minister would undertake to have a close look at it, and that is the problems that employers have when they're hiring students and are forced to pay \$13.20 an hour for an unskilled labourer, who has really no training. I raise the matter again because I think that we are doing a lot of our students out of jobs at a time when the student unemployment is high. I guess one of the regrets I would have, having been part of a government that had that particular structure in place and didn't change it, is that we didn't make some changes.

Now seeing the exact effect of what that is having and really being in sort of an anti-job creation thing, I wonder if the Minister is undertaking any studies to see how we can possibly make changes so that these small companies can, in the summer months, hire students, either through the government's Student Employment Program, or privately without any government assistance, so that they can pay a young student \$6, \$7 an hour, rather than the 13.20 which they, first of all, can't afford to pay and which any person realizes is not a wage that someone can earn just coming right in out of school and not having any trade.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I would want to agree with the honourable member that it is an area that, quite

properly, has to be reviewed. I have had a couple of meetings with the Construction Wages Board, the chairperson, Wally Fox-Decent. They have held public hearings recently in which there was a considerable interest, and they will be making recommendations to me in the very near future. I'll certainly want to carefully consider those recommendations.

I don't know whether they are specifically addressing the question of student wage rates, but certainly that is within their purview. If the current recommendations do not cover that, I will have a continuing interest in that concern.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I have a question on the decision of the Labour Board that involves The Employment Standards Act reported in the Brandon Sun in December of 1984. Up until the time of the decision, the practice in Manitoba was to pay only one hour's wages when employees are scheduled for one hour of work, but to pay for at least three hours, as required by law, when the employer asks the employee to work on short notice. In a case, decided by the Labour Board, they ruled that a city employee of Brandon is entitled to three hours pay even though she was scheduled to only work for one hour. The report indicates that the union was surprised by the decision, because previous decisions of the Labour Board had said that three hours pay should only be called for in callback situations, not where the employee was scheduled to work for less than three hours.

There was an indication that there might have been an appeal of that ruling. I wonder if the Minister can comment on that interpretation of The Employment Standards Act and whether he is considering taking any legislative action, or whether that decision was, in fact, appealed and overruled.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I am advised that the case that the honourable member refers to is presently before the courts, and so, therefore, I'll make no comment.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** It is being appealed now?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** It's before the courts, yes.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell us, in the negotiations with Vicon, the company that purchased some of the assets of CCIL, whether or not his department, either through the employment standards or conciliation and mediation services, was involved in dealing with the new company management, as well as with the union, who had the collective agreement in place with CCIL, to arrive at a solution for the company to locate here.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I'm advised that while staff were not involved in the bargaining or the negotiations per se, we lent our offices to assist in the new management staff and representatives having a thorough understanding and appreciation for existing labour relations law as it would affect the new owners, and facilitated any of their requests for information.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Could the Minister tell us if there was any change in the contract? Did Vicon take over the existing contract at CCIL or was it renegotiated?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The new collective agreement is not being filed with us. We believe that there were some modifications to the existing contract negotiated between the parties.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Has the Minister's department done any calculations as to what the effect of this legislation is when we are put in this type of a situation, such as the Sheller-Globe situation, such as the CCIL one in which the company which is coming in to try and take over the bankrupt company, is now forced to inherit the collective agreement in place?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I could ask staff to give me further information on that, perhaps they can write me a note.

But I would like to put on the record, for the honourable member, that the legislation in respect to Superior Bus and, I believe, the legislation as it would have affected the CCIL and Vicon, was essentially the legislation that existed prior to January 1, 1985, when the modifications to the labour law, generally, were made under the previous late beloved Minister.

The successor in legislation that we have in our act is very similar to the successor legislation that exists in our sister provinces. I wouldn't say that it is word for word, but it is basically the same, whether it be in Ontario or Saskatchewan. This is not unique legislation to Manitoba.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** We have now the legislation in place which we have just referred to which says a collective agreement is in place if a new owner purchases a bankrupt facility. The Minister has indicated that he will be, this Session, bringing in some more legislation dealing with plant closures. Is the Minister, in bringing in this legislation, outlining the procedures that a company will be forced to follow if they are phasing out a plant or closing a plant?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, there will be provisions dealing with closure.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** So the Minister is saying that if somebody is going out of business, they will then be asked for severance, pension benefits, or what is contemplated in this?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Well, I want to be responsive to the honourable member's questions. I'm somewhat doubtful as to whether I, in this forum outside of the House, reveal the exact particulars of the legislation. This is a committee of the House and so I have less reservation about talking about the proposed details of the legislation and yet the bill has only had first reading. So I have some reservation, Mr. Chairperson, about going into the precise details that the honourable member seeks. I don't want to be defensive about it, but I don't want, on the other hand, to be offending the Rules of the House. I, therefore, withhold giving the fuller answer that I could give.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Well, I appreciate the Minister's concern. I guess that's the dilemma we face here in

dealing with the Labour Estimates at this time, not having that bill before us. We'll have to deal with it I guess in greater detail when it does come before us. Is it the Minister's intent to seek approval from the Labour Review Committee with regard to the content of this legislation, and also to check with people within the industry as well as with labour, with regard to its content, before he puts it forward.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I believe I indicated earlier, in respect to an earlier question by the honourable member, that the Labour Management Review Committee did have this matter and others before them and, while there was some measure of consensus, there wasn't sufficient consensus for there to have been an affirmative recommendation to me. We sought a consensus in respect to proposed changes but, not having received definitive recommendations, the department had prepared the provisions of the bill that has been introduced and I have briefed the Labour Management Review Committee with the contents.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Can the Minister give us an indication whether it's half or a third of the bill that's supported?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I would hesitate to try and quantify it on their behalf, Mr. Chairperson.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, then what we'll have to do is we'll have to wait till the bill is introduced and at that time we'll have to make comment with regards to it.

The only thing I would say is we seem to be putting ourselves in a position where we're putting the type of legislation in place which almost puts the companies in the position very often, when they're coming in to hold the government at ransom. You got the Vicon deal where we had to give them \$1 million to just stay here, where the existing facility was here, and the people were here, and I guess if I was a businessman and was now going to have some problems or take over a company here, where we're almost into the situation where I'd press the government for everything too, because that seems to be the way that things are going and unfortunately, all too often it's the big corporations that get the money and it's the little guy that gets trampled on. So I hope the Minister in dealing with this legislation that he's going to introduce takes that into consideration.

I would like to ask him, today he held a press conference as well as introduced a bill in the Legislature, the Pay Equity Bill. He says the legislation will only be binding on the government and that he believes the employers will voluntarily implement the pay equity concept. I wonder if the Minister could tell us a couple of instances within the Provincial Civil Service that really have sort of led the problems within the Civil Service, within the collective bargaining unit an agreement, that have led him to see that this bill is necessary.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Well, before I get into that legislation, I would like to indicate that in respect to the employment standards' matters that we were talking about, in respect to the CCIL Vicon successorship, I'm given to understand that the new company was looking

at a number of jurisdictions in which to locate the business including our sister province of Saskatchewan, that has similar successor legislation and that province was involved in somewhat of a bidding arrangement in respect to that firm to try to get it to locate there. Regrettably, the honourable member is right that there is because of the difficult economic times, there is a very real desire on the part of society to ensure that there is continuity of employment and when it costs a good deal of money to provide a basis for employment, when with a relatively much smaller investment that appears to be needed to re-establish the viability of a company, certainly government has to look at that, and that's what we looked at in respect to Vicon.

I might say in respect to the difficulty, if that's a very real difficulty in discussing these estimates when there is legislation before the House, I would like to point out that I haven't identified within this item, the Employment Standards item, any more money that we're asking arising from the changes that I've talked about to be included in the legislation. I would like to point out that we were ready to go, I guess about a month ago, and if these estimates had gone then, the timing would have been more auspicious in respect to legislation. But I'll be as careful in providing as much information as I can without offending the rules.

In respect to the Pay Equity legislation, I would like to point out that during its negotiations with government, the MGEA, I think reflective of the concerns of organized labour generally in the province, indicated a very sincere concern in respect to wage levels for women in the Civil Service.

The Manitoba Federation of Labour, to which MGEA is a member, had indicated in their brief to government that pay equity was an issue that organized labour felt ought to be treated with very real priority by government. In its negotiations, the MGEA as part of its agreement with government, asked for and of course we readily accepted the establishment of a pay equity committee provided for within the terms of the agreement. So in maybe an overly long answer to the honourable member's question, both the government itself and the workers' bargaining agent, recognized that pay equity within government was necessary and overdue.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** So the Minister is saying that within government right now, there is a problem, and there has been a problem. Has he or the government identified some of the problem areas?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** There is a systemic problem within society generally in respect to salaries or wages paid to females as against males. It's been identified in many parts of the world. In many countries of the world they have provided for equal pay for work of equal value many years ago in Western Europe, for example, Australia. Laterally, or more close to home, we have seen initiatives within some of our immediate states southerly - Minnesota, California - and there is no question but the problems that were identified elsewhere are just as real and visible here.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Since this legislation will basically, as I understand it from the Minister's press release,

deal only with government, why wouldn't the government have implemented a policy years ago if they recognized there were problems instead of just introducing legislation at this time?

I guess I am asking the Minister, if he is introducing the legislation, if he could give us some examples that he has found within the Civil Service that were not included in the collective agreement that was negotiated by the union?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I want to indicate to the honourable member that it would be possible to probably, by policy directive, indicate instructions to the Civil Service Commission and through the MGEA, embark on a study, the initiative that we talked about.

But the concern of this Minister and this government is to signal publicly in a formal way and in a structured way a commitment to pay equity to enshrine within the legislation a specific formula for dealing with pay equity, to establish principles of pay equity in legislation so that it can be debated in the Legislature; so that it won't be something that is done just in the back rooms of government.

It will be something that will be articulated in the Legislature, and we hope will have a profound influence not only here in Manitoba but throughout Canada and North America, signalling that these initiatives are being taken here and they are being taken with care, responsibility to make sure there is full involvement through the negotiation and the collective bargaining of the workers, their full participation in the development of the system and the implementation of the system.

It's something for which all members of the Legislature should be proud that we are at long last embarking on a very responsible path to justice and equity for females in the work force in the public sector.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Who will determine what each job is worth?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The process will involve the collective work of both workers and staff in identifying first a method of evaluation and, when the evaluation systems have been agreed upon, then the criteria adopted within the system will be applied to the target groups. The target groups will be the male dominated and female dominated groups identified in the act, following which there will be an agreement negotiated between workers and management as to the implementation of the results of that evaluation.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Wolseley.

**MS. M. PHILLIPS:** Yes, Mr. Chairperson, I would just like to add for the benefit of the Member for La Verendrye when he suggests that either we are the only ones that perceive a problem more, that we have just identified a problem, there was a very comprehensive study done in 1974 on women in the Civil Service that pointed out at that time the gross inequities between salaries of men and women in the public service.

There also was extensive public hearings done by the Women's Bureau in 1976 throughout the province that asked for input on methodologies for dealing with sex stereotyping and inequality in pay and that report

was put together in October of 1977. Now in October of '77 there was another significant happening in Manitoba, which was the election of the Lyon Government, which set the whole process back four years and nothing was done.

In fact, where there had been across the board settlements that were narrowing those gaps, we went quickly back to percentage settlements with the bargaining unit and the gap continued to increase. Since we have been in government again since '81, we have been working very hard on narrowing the gap through the collective bargaining process and across the board settlements.

This is just the next step to try to eliminate those inequities altogether. I am absolutely delighted the Minister has tabled the bill today and that we are getting on with it after a break in that long effort.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, is it possible under this bill that in a comparison of the value of one position with another position, that the value attributed to one position may be lowered?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The bill provides that no individual will have their wages, their remuneration, lowered as a result of pay equity.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Why?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Well, in order to effect pay equity, we don't want to bring the remuneration of workers down. What we want to do is provide fair wages to women who have not been receiving fair wages.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** If I could just add, I can't think of anything more counterproductive to what everyone I think recognizes to be a gigantic step forward in equality in this area than to pit one class of employees against another, to invite a gender war. That surely would spell the destruction of the kind of consensus and togetherness which is necessary to make this kind of thing work in the workplace.

If an employer, in this case the government setting an example, believes on the basis of evidence that will be generated by the mechanism in the bill that the case has been made out and it is obligated under the bill to follow then the procedures of adjusting compensation over a period of time to bring the underpaid class - because that's really what has been established - up to the benchmark class, then it has to do that in the process of negotiating a fair compensation package with the particular union concerned. That's what the issue is really.

I think the kind of revision which has been adverted to is an important one so that all recognize that we're not loading the responsibility for generations of unfair treatment of female employees on the backs of male employees. I mean, they're not responsible.

Secondly, through the collective bargaining process, it has been established that at least, it seems to me, one has to assume, because all kinds of market forces

are taken into account in collective bargaining, that the compensation paid to the male-dominated group which has become, let's say, the benchmark in the particular example is fair compensation. To say that, in effect, you'll take the money out of the pockets of those who have bargained for it and give it to their female colleagues, I just don't understand an approach of that kind. It's a ruinous approach.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I don't dispute the principle that a woman should be paid for the value of the job she does. I have said that on many many occasions and just the other evening when the Member for Wolseley was here. In fact, this bill will not do — (Interjection) — Does the Minister have a response to the question he asked the other night in the other Estimates, which he indicated could be covered also in this committee? That was an up-to-date analysis of the classifications which females have in the Civil Service. We've gone through the November 1, 1982, employee analysis of females by salaries. Does the Minister have the up-to-date comparison with the sheet, because although he did indicate the other night that there was probably little difference with the number of women in the Civil Service who have reached the level of higher classifications during the past two-and-a-half years. Does he have that information with him tonight?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I think perhaps, Mr. Chairman, we might be able to deal with that under the Affirmative Action section.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Which section is that?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** It's under Executive Support which you've already passed, but we can deal with it under the last item, the Minister's Salary, if you wish.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Okay.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(d)(1)—pass; 2.(d)(2)—pass.  
2.(d)(3) - the Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** I just want to understand something. The Minister is saying that the bill that is being introduced is for government only. I just want him to confirm that it could have been done by government policy.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Minister, can it be done by mere government policy without introduction of the bill?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** What's that?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Pay equity.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Not in the manner in which I think would be most desirable, no.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister could answer this. Who will make the final decision on

what the value of a person's job is? Is it the Labour Board under this act, under your bill?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** In respect to the direct Civil Service, the parties will negotiate and bargain a decision in respect to the manner of implementation, the techniques and the system to be employed, and will similarly negotiate and agree on the implementation. In the event that there is any disagreement that has to be reconciled in respect to any portion of that decision-making, that will be subject to arbitration.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Which? The Labour Board is not involved?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The Labour Board will be involved in respect to the decision-making in respect to the Crown corporations and external agencies, not the direct Civil Service.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(d)(3)—pass.

2.(e)(1) Manitoba Labour Board: Salaries, 2.(e)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Can the Minister indicate the number of first contracts that were imposed during the past year?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Since the first agreement legislation was enacted in 1982, there have been 13 requests to the Minister that had been directed to the Manitoba Labour Board. This represents 8.7 percent - the 150 certifications granted by the Labour Board from 1982 to 1984. Of the applications received, the board imposed six first agreements which was 4 percent of the certifications granted.

From 1982 to 1984, the Manitoba Labour Board has dealt with the 13 applications under that first agreement legislation. Of those 13 cases, or applications, the board imposed six collective agreements. A further five cases were voluntarily settled by the parties. One application was withdrawn by the parties and the board refused another application. To date, there have been no applications filed in 1985 - none in 1985.

I might say also that, of those four applications in 1982, three of those were revoked subsequently. One of them has had a second agreement concluded as a result of negotiation. In 1983, of the five applications, three are in negotiation for second agreement and two have concluded a second agreement. The four applications in 1984 have a first contract that is still continuing.

I might say that from the statistics that I have read to you, Mr. Chairperson, it appears that the first contract legislation has been working out extremely well and we are well satisfied with it. It indicates that in addition to the fact that the applications that have been taken to the board for first contract, appear to have provided for a reasonable balance and a very successful conclusion to agreements, particularly when there has been a secondary agreement thereafter. The very fact that the legislation is there ensures that there will be a sincere effort to bargain collectively on the part of the parties.

I am given to advise that the table I alluded to was prepared somewhat earlier in 1985. There has been

one contract directed by the board in 1985. So I correct myself on that. And there are three applications presently before the board.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Could the Minister explain the reason for the 25 percent increase in cost, salaries cost?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** In which item?

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Labour Board.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** In the Labour Board?

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Yes.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Additional staff. I had indicated in my opening remarks that because of our expectation that the further work of the board will put greater demands on the board. We are providing additional staff.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** In what area?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** There will be two full-time and two half-time positions to assist the board in carrying out its more extensive mandate.

The new positions are as follows: an executive officer for administration who will be responsible for acting as the chief administrative officer of the board. There will be a case management clerk responsible for administering the management information system for the board, a librarian, a half-time position responsible for maintaining an efficient and comprehensive library for the board and a researcher, a half-time position responsible for analyzing information obtained from board applications in order to monitor the experience and affect of the provisions of the act.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I have a copy of the act for the executive officer. In the duties, it describes them as reporting to the Deputy Minister, fulfills a leadership role in directing the administrative activities of the Manitoba Labour Board. Is the Labour Board not more of an independent organization previously with its own employees? We have an executive officer for the Labour Board who reports directly to the Deputy Minister. It was my impression that the Labour Board was supposed to act much more independently than that.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** So the board will. The board has been given significantly more independence in the arrangements for its tenure.

However, the administration of government, the administration of boards, whether it be a municipal board or a transport board or whoever, it makes for much more reasonable administrative costing if boards don't have their separate administrations. We believe that the lines of reporting are not unreasonable. There is a slight change in that the director will be reporting to the Deputy Minister and not the Assistant Deputy Minister.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Following along that line, are records of the Labour Board accessible to the Department of Labour?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I'm sorry, what was the question?

**MR. G. FILMON:** Are records of the Labour Board or any information that comes under the Labour Board, any of its files accessible to the department?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Certainly any matters that are before the board are not accessible to the department. The department would have the same right of access as any person, other than government, to access to the files.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Such things as names of people who have signed union cards or any of those things, would they be accessible to the department?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Not that I am aware of, Mr. Chairperson.

**MR. G. FILMON:** By way of curiosity, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could indicate where his deputy is.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** She is attending the International Labour Organizations Conference in Geneva. She is recognized by the Federal Government as someone that has particular expertise. She has played a very significant role in assisting labour relations initiatives and considerations from a national perspective, and was sought by a number of groups to ensure her attendance at Geneva.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Did the Minister not feel it would be important for his deputy to be here during the Estimates process and at the time of announcement and release of the bill on pay equity legislation?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairperson, I want to add further that I am advised that, as a delegate to the International Labour Organizations Conference in Geneva, the Deputy Minister is paid by the Federal Government, her expenses.

I want to indicate that, while I value the assistance and the leadership of the Deputy Minister very much, I have very competent staff at hand, including the Assistant Deputy Minister and the directors of the departments, and I have no hesitation in saying that the department continues to be in good hands.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I am sure that the department continues to be in good hands, but this essentially is the most important time of the year for the deputy to be available to the Legislative Assembly, and I am rather surprised that the Minister has agreed to his deputy being away at this time.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition shouldn't be surprised at the degree of competence that exists within departments of government.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is making a case that he can do without his Deputy Minister then.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Minister, can you do that?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Do I have to answer that? No, all joking aside, considerable preparation involving the initiatives that have now come to fruition received very significant care and attention from the Deputy Minister prior to her leaving to attend that international conference. It's teamwork that ensures that the initiatives that have been under way now for many months will continue and will be handled very properly and responsibly by the good staff that this Minister has in the Labour Department.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Methinks the Minister doth protest too loudly, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. Norbert.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** No, wait, I want to respond to that.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister wants to respond to that one.

**MR. G. FILMON:** You are always here for that purpose.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Methinks the Leader of the Opposition is not Shakespeare.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate how many applications for certification have been filed since January 1, 1985?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The number of applications since the beginning of the year, 33.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** How does that compare with the previous? Is that for the first five months, did the Minister indicate?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** This is to June 19th, pretty well up-to-date.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** How does that compare with the previous three years? Does the Minister have it for this comparable time period?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I don't have before me the comparable statistic, but I am advised that it appears to be not dissimilar from a comparable period last year.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** How many applications for decertification have been filed since January 1, 1985?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Seven.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** How does that compare with the past three years for comparable periods of time?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Last year, the whole year, there were six. We have had seven in the six months, pretty well six months.



**MR. G. MERCIER:** Have the seven applications been granted?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** No, one certificate was revoked, one application for decertification was either dismissed or withdrawn - I don't know which one that is - and the number of applications outstanding are five.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, there was a news article about a month ago which described the position of six out of seven female tellers at the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce at Portage Avenue and Moorgate Street said they wanted out of the Manitoba Food and Commercial Workers' Union because they were getting little in return for their union dues. Their salaries were low; they don't have any benefits that other employees don't have, in fact, they noted other non-unionized tellers at other branches of that bank were making more than they were.

Under The Labour Relations Act, on what basis - and their application for decertification was opposed by the union - on what basis, under The Labour Relations Act, can a situation occur where six out of seven tellers in a union cannot have their certification revoked if six out of seven want it?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** This Minister is not able to deal with that question, because it's not within my jurisdiction. It is a Federal Labour Board and federal labour law issue that's involved here.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Can that situation occur under the provincial Labour Relations Act?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I hesitate to deal with hypothetical considerations, or we could have a lot of hypothetical argument. If you can give me a realistic . . .

**MR. G. MERCIER:** A specific example, we have a situation, obviously a small union, something like six out of seven people in the union want to apply to be decertified. What would stop them in the present Labour Relations Act from doing that?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I stray from what I would normally do here by answering this hypothetical question but, if six out of seven of a bargaining unit, six out of seven employees made application for decertification, the board would require a vote to be taken. That doesn't necessarily mean that the six, when they do vote, would decide to vote in favour of decertification. I suppose it happens that people file applications and then withdraw them, because the statistic I read out to the honourable member just a moment or two before indicated a withdrawal or a dismissal of a decertification request. So this does happen.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** I believe there would also be a 12-month limit in Manitoba. I don't believe they can apply for decertification within a year after having been certified.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The member is correct.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(e)(1)—pass; 2.(e)(2)—pass.

2.(f)(1) Conciliation and Mediation Services: Salaries, 2.(f)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** I wonder if the Minister could tell us the number of requests that the government has had with regard to Conciliation and Mediation Services this year.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Maybe we could just get a repeat on that, because we just . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** How many requests?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Since January 1st, 116.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** I believe last year the previous Minister mentioned that there was a capability within the department to deal with requests by someone who wanted conciliation or mediation services in French. Have there been any applications or requests made for conciliation or mediation services in the French language?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** None to date.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Has the department got somebody on staff that will handle those?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** If there is a requirement we endeavour to utilize some from the Federal Conciliation Service, if available, or hire someone where necessary.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** The services being provided, the Minister mentioned there were 116 requests. How does that compare with the year before?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I haven't got the numbers, but this appears to be up over the year before. As I indicated in my opening remarks, this has been a relatively heavy year for negotiation of new contracts.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(f)(1)—pass; 2.(f)(2)—pass.

2.(g)(1) Apprenticeship and Training: Salaries, 2.(g)(2) Other Expenditures - the Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I wonder if the Minister could indicate, during the past couple of years the questions that were asked, as I understand it, from last year's Estimates, fell under the area of Apprenticeship and Training, with respect to consulting contracts that were performed, in one case, by Lionel Orlikow and, in another case, by WMC Associates - I'd have to check my file. My question to the Minister is: does he have a report, or did he receive a report, from either of those consulting contracts? If so, what recommendations or initiatives flowed from those reports?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** This Minister didn't receive that report. The report that the honourable member is alluding to apparently was received by the Department of Employment Services.

**MR. G. FILMON:** That may be true of the former report, or at least the latter report from WMC Associates, but

I was given to understand that Mr. Orlikow's contract was with the Department of Labour.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** That is the information I have, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. G. FILMON:** So the Minister is saying it was Employment Services rather than Labour?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** That's the answer I have given you, yes.

**MR. G. FILMON:** And in each case, both of those reports?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** We don't have a copy of the report. I take it that maybe the contracts were initiated when it was the Department of Labour and Employment Services. But after the division of the department, the report went to Employment Services because it was more germane to Employment Services.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(g)(1) Apprenticeship and Training: Salaries - the Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate how many women were involved in the Women in Training Program in 1984?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Nineteen.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Is that continuing in this budget?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Could the Minister indicate how much is budgeted, how many persons can be handled in the program within this budget?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** \$100,000 was put in for this item, for Women in Trades Training.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Can the Minister indicate whether the program is resulting in permanent jobs for women?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The advice is, in the majority of cases it would.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(g)(1) - the Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** There is another \$25,000 grant. I wonder if the . . .

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Construction Industry Wages Grant.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(g)(1)—pass; 2.(g)(2)—pass.  
2.(h)(1) Pension Commission: Salaries; 2.(h)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** I wonder if the Minister could give us the figures with regard to the registered pension plans, the new plans that have been filed this year, and

also give us the figure of the plans that have been terminated this year.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The information I have is that there were 130 new plans in 1984, 47 terminated. This compared with 128 new plans in 1983 and 22 terminated in 1983.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** So it just goes to the end of 1984. This year's figures, to date, are they very much the same as they would have been in the last couple of years?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I'm given to advise that to date the number of new plans is very closely approximating last year, the number of terminations is down somewhat.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** If a smaller company establishes a plan based under the RRSP system, is the government aware, is there any registration with regard to those plans or are those administrated between the employee and the employer themselves?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** We have no jurisdictions over those RRSP plans.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Is that system of using the RRSP system, and now with the higher limits with regard to RRSP which were introduced by the Federal Budget, does the Minister think that there are going to be more smaller companies that will use that vehicle rather than going through the expense, I guess, and the additional paperwork with regard to registering a plan?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** That is quite possible.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** So would I then be correct in saying that while these figures that we have before us would really represent mostly the larger plans and the smaller companies with, let's say, 10 employees would probably now be moving into an area of where they would use an established banking system and deal with RRSPs rather than a registered plan?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** We don't know at this time, but that certainly is possible.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Well, since, Mr. Chairman, we are all concerned about pension and the portability of pension and the establishment of that, I wonder if the Minister would - I don't know if there is a method of doing that - but find out really how many people are now starting to really offer their employees the benefit of having a system of pensions.

The RRSP one, I guess, in looking at it myself for my business, seems to be the one which I think - I would suggest to the Minister - that a lot of companies will be undertaking because it gives the employee the total portability on the thing and also allows the company who is involved in it not to go through too much paperwork because the banks or the trust companies or the credit unions will administrate them.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Well, we don't have a problem with portability because we ensured that portability

would be available in the amendments that we made to the act.

While I talk about the amendments we made to the act, Mr. Chairperson, I want to put on record my pleasure at the commendatory statements that have been made by the present Federal Government about the Manitoba pension laws. They have been cited as showing leadership in respect to the changes that were made in this province providing for fair treatment of men and women when there is a breakup of marriage, the provisions for earlier vesting. All have been cited with approbation by the Federal Government and by others who are now looking at the Manitoba model as one that should be followed.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Has the Minister got any figure as to what the department has estimated the number of people that are recurrently on some form of pension plan in the Province of Manitoba, people in the work force?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I am advised that within Manitoba we have 186,000 people involved or participants in pension plans, that is, pension plans that are filed with our bureau.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, what are the costs to government in 1985 for implementing The Pension Act changes?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I regret to indicate to the honourable member that staff here don't have that kind of information. The Civil Service Commission and the Minister of Finance, perhaps, could give us that, but I don't have it here. It's not appropriate under this department.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Well, surely, they must have some access to it. I am advised, for example, that the cost to the City of Winnipeg, the additional cost for 1985 for the changes in the pension legislation is \$1.85 million, that the police pension plan is another \$387,000, and then the city has four or five other pension plans which would have additional costs.

But I would be interested to know what the additional costs are to the government, what the additional costs are to hospitals, to the universities, to the community colleges. Does the Pension Commission not have access to that information? Surely the Minister has.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The Pension Commission could obtain that information. It does not have it here. It's not information that they would obtain and make available to the general public.

I am advised that the pension fund that the MGEA or the Civil Service Superannuation Board administers, has been operating very well and there is surplus out of which it's anticipated the additional pension benefits will be financed. But that's a decision of the fund.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Could the Minister obtain and provide it to us when he gets the information as to the additional costs of the pension caused by the changes in the pension legislation, and to the government as

an employer, to Crown agencies and utilities, hospitals, universities and community colleges, and provide us with that information, and the City of Winnipeg?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The appropriate ministry for that information, for that request, would be the Ministry of Finance. I hesitate to give an undertaking because I have to seek it from another department.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Would the Minister seek it, and if he is refused by another department, let me know?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Well, it's not within my jurisdiction, and I don't want to therefore undertake to provide that information.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister is responsible for the Pension Commission. He, if there are any changes, brings in changes to The Pension Benefits Act. Surely he has the jurisdiction to provide the information that I am seeking.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The Pension Commission is obligated to ensure that the plan is operated in a manner that will ensure its solvency. It isn't charged with the responsibility of computing the costs of benefits to a plan per se.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I believe the annual report of the Minister says that, under legislation administered by the Department of Labour, The Pension Benefits Act. Surely, with that responsibility, he can find out from the employers that I have referred to, what the cost is to them of the changes in The Pension Benefits Act that were brought in for this year.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The Pension Commission supervises the pensions that are registered with it. It does not supervise and operate as a comptroller in respect to those plans themselves. It does not give out information about any of the pension plans that are registered with it, whether it be a private or a public plan. That information being requested of the Pension Commission is inappropriate.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I'm not requesting it from the Pension Commission. I am requesting it from the Minister. He is the Minister responsible, it says: "Legislation administered by the Department of Labour, The Pension Benefits Act. The Minister is responsible for that act. Changes have been brought in by Ministers of Labour changing the provisions of that act." I am asking him to provide information with respect to public employers, the Provincial Government, utilities, Manitoba Hydro, Telephone System, Crown agencies, universities, hospitals, community colleges, all supported by the public taxpayer, to determine what the cost is to each of them of the changes that were made in The Pension Benefits Act for 1985. They are public bodies. I'm not asking about private sector pension plans.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Chairperson, it would be an appropriate order. I don't know whether it would be accepted, but it certainly would be an appropriate

request to file an Order for Return to the Minister of Finance to provide that kind of information. I don't have that kind of information. I am not at liberty to undertake that I am going to provide that information. It's not within my jurisdiction of my department.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** It's your act.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** It's my act, but under that act I don't require Great-West Life or anyone else . . .

**MR. G. MERCIER:** I'm not asking about Great-West Life.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Well I know you're not, but those plans are treated in the same way by the Pension Commission as any private plan. I, as Minister responsible for the Pension Commission, am not going to go on record as undertaking to provide information about a plan that's filed with that body.

It's a terrible precedent.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** You don't want to find out, because you don't want to know.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(h)(1)—pass; 2.(h)(2)—pass.  
2.(j) Grants - the Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Could the Minister give us a breakdown of these grants?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes. The first one is a grant to the Manitoba Labour Education Centre - it's the same grant as last year, of \$200,000; a grant to the Community Unemployment Counselling Centre, the same amount as last year, \$62,000; a grant to the University of Manitoba Continuing Education Division of \$2.5 thousand; and a grant to the Labour College of Canada of \$4,000, the same as last year.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** How much has the government funded the Labour Education Centre since 1981?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Since what year?

**MR. G. MERCIER:** 1981, since you've gone into government.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I am advised that in the 1982-83 Budget, it was \$100,000; 1983-84 Budget was \$150,000; and last year's Budget, \$200,000; this year's requested appropriation is \$200,000.00. That would be a total of \$650,000.00.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Does the Minister or the department receive annual reports on the activities of the Labour Education Centre?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Could the Minister provide those to us?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** We haven't had the current report. Reports are given to the Minister. They haven't been requested in the past. If the honourable member wants a report, when I receive it for the previous year, I will do so.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Could the Minister provide that when he receives it, and also provide me with the previous reports?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** The previous reports?

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Do you have them on file?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** In previous years we've had quarterly financial reports and an annual financial report. This year will be the first year for a detailed operational report, a combination of operations and finance.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** You mean up until this year the government has not received any report as to the operations and activities of the Labour Education Centre?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** We've had activity reports and updates on activities, but not a comprehensive report. This will be the first year we'll have a comprehensive report. If that's the report the honourable member wants, we'll provide that.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Has this department made any grants for construction of the Union Centre in the North of Portage Development?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** No.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Is there any financial involvement by the government with respect to the construction of that facility there?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** If there is, it is not through this department.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** And the Minister is not aware of any other financial . . .

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I am not personally aware of any.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(j)—pass.

Resolution 107: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,450,500 for Labour, Administration and Finance, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

3.(a) Expenditures Related to Capital, Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets - the Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Has that got to do with the training centres?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** It is Fire Services communication system equipment. It is the mobile radio equipment

that we have been providing to the municipalities - mutual aid districts.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 3.(a)—pass.

Resolution 108: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$7,470,500 for Labour, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

Back to the Minister's Salary 3.(a)—pass.

Resolution 109: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$41,000 for Labour, Expenditures Related to Capital, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

Committee rise.

## SUPPLY - EDUCATION

**MR. CHAIRMAN, D. Scott:** We're dealing with Appropriation 4.(b) Curriculum Development and Implementation - the Member for Kirkfield Park.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make some comments and ask a couple of questions on the high school review. I understand that you have gone over this earlier. Is the credit system, which was designed back in the '60s, going to be reviewed and possibly renewed?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Madam Minister.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, we did cover the high school review at considerable length, but I'm quite glad to answer a couple of other questions.

I said that we would be undertaking a high school review and it's a very big job. When they undertook to review the elementary program, it took a number of years. I mean it was not done in just a period of two or three months, nor will the high school review be done in a period of two or three months. We will be looking at the whole program and, of course, that includes the credit system and the numbering system and a variety of programs that are in the high school program.

They may not all be done immediately. In other words, we are going to begin the review process and we will be beginning it this fall. I'm not sure at this point how long it will take or just at what stage we will be looking at the credit system, but it will be covered. It will be part of the review.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** I think the Minister said the review in the elementary took a few years, is that the case? I'm hoping that the high school review won't have to take quite that long to make some changes because I think that, and I know it has been covered, but the students who are going into community colleges and universities, the parents are somehow under the impression that when they've got 101 Maths or 301 Maths that they have enough because they are doing well to take programs that are in the community colleges. Of course, they are finding that it is not good enough. Some of the students who get into these programs with that Maths are finding that they can't keep up. So I know that parents today and I think students are looking for higher standards, especially

if they are considering going on to post-secondary education.

I have a question, and I'm not sure if it comes under this area, but the vocational programs in the schools, how many people are in the Department of Education who do consulting with the vocational program?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Four, Mr. Chairman.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Is there a plan or has there been a plan where the department is recommending combined courses of the 100 subjects and the 101 in high school, or is this something that is possibly coming out of school divisions?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, we have a combined program in one course, in an English course. The department has not made a decision or indicated that they're moving towards combining them. School divisions may do that and in some cases in the rural area where they have a small number of children and they don't have enough to make up courses, then it's quite possible that they might decide to integrate the children into one program and actually deliver the two programs through the one course. But it isn't a requirement or a direction that the department has decided to go in.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Yes, but did I understand the Minister to say they're looking at it right now and that it is a combined course in Language Arts?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, there is a course that is combined that's available if they want it, but school divisions have to decide how to offer it and what to offer, whether they offer it at 00 or 01 and it usually depends upon their student population, the numbers of kids they have and what programs they want to take. So if in the instance I gave, in a small rural community, they have a very small number of children, students that would be taking both programs, they do have a program that is combined, that they can choose.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Mr. Chairman, I'd like to find out a little bit more about where the department's going on the combined courses. What happens to students who end up with a combined 100 and 101 and then proceed along and end up with this combined course? Is that then a credit, a 00 credit to get into university?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, the entrance to university programs haven't changed. They can't change them in Grade 12. So if they're university entrance programs, they can't combine them because that requires that they take the specific course and it does not allow them to combine them.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Mr. Chairman, I guess what I'm asking then, does the student know that in Grade 10, that the combined course that they might be taking when they get to Grade 12 would not allow them to use it as university entrance?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that the students can take a combined

course in 10 and 11, but they can't take a combined course in Grade 12 and that when they take the combined course, if they do take it in the earlier grades, they know that it will have an effect later on. They know that they are required to take the regular course that is not a combined course in Grade 12.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Mr. Chairman, does Language Arts or any course, for that matter, does it not build as you're taking it in 10 and 11? What I'm wondering is how does someone take a combined course for two years in high school, and then suddenly switch to a straight 100 in Grade 12 without a great deal of difficulty.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, I think that the subject that we're talking about is one that probably does not affect very many students. I think the numbers that are taking the combined are very small. So while we're talking about it, I don't want to suggest that this is something that is common to a lot of school divisions and a lot of students. I think there may be only a few that are in this particular situation.

There are a lot of common threads in both courses. For instance, the language courses in Grade 11 have a lot of the same material. The 00 are heavier and the 01 are a bit lighter, but a lot of what they take is the same. It's possible that a number of things can happen.

One is that they can either take the combined and take the lighter program, and it may be for the purpose of catching up or, I suppose in some cases, it may be the workload. It's hard to know what the decisions were that would make them move into that. They then will know that, if they want to take it in Grade 12 and they need 00, they will have either have to work harder or that they will have to cover a course that is heavier than the one that they have been covering.

We have, I think, only one division in the whole province that is combining 00 and 01. I suppose one of the things we will be doing is looking at what is happening with that combined program, because there is some different feeling. There will have to be a lot of discussion on this, on whether you need the two separate programs or whether kids are being, in effect, streamed by being put into one or the other program which eventually closes doors, or may eliminate some access to some programs, once they're streamed into those.

So the one division has combined the two. I'm not sure what the reasons were for combining them, but I imagine that it suited the needs of that school division. My guess is that it had something to do with the numbers of students that were taking the program. I've just had confirmation from staff that was the reason why they combined.

So I suppose that we will be able to look at the experience they have, and see what has come out of it. The department has not made any decision to move in this direction, nor would we do so without having a lot of discussion and consultation and examination of the discussion. There are some feelings on both sides of the fence that they should be separated, and some feeling that they should be combined and it should be the teacher that is deciding what level and to what degree to present the material.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Mr. Chairman, just to pursue this further, the combining has originated in the department, am I right?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Yes.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** The Minister is saying that the teacher would make the decision on whether to combine or whether to keep them separate. Is that what I heard you say? That's very unclear.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** No, I was saying there are different feelings on both sides of that fence among teachers, among professionals and people in the education field. Some feel that, certainly, looking at the course, the credit system is one of the things we would be doing in the review simply because the whole program should be reviewed. But some people feel that having the two programs, one lighter and one heavier, is a good thing to do and there are all sorts of reasons for that. Others feel that you shouldn't have two programs because the two programs streams, and in the streaming, it has a fairly significant effect because if they go into 01 they may be eliminated from taking some programs later on in post secondary education from the fact that they have taken all their 01 courses. So some feel that there shouldn't be two separate programs; there should just be an English program and a social studies program.

When I said the teachers choose, I meant the teachers are the ones that take from the entire program the material and information to deliver to their class. As we know with any teacher in the classroom, she has a wide range of student ability even in a fairly homogeneous class, and the kids go at different rates and different paces. Sometimes they present things in groups and sometimes when people are a little bit slower, they present material a little more slowly and then bring them up so that kind of judgment is one that the teacher can best make and would be making if the courses were combined.

However, not wanting to cut off the subject, I don't know how much we should dwell on it because there is a very small amount of this going on. One school intake in one school division and no intention or indication of moving in that direction, so I think we'll just look at the experience they've had in that school division and use it as useful information.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, without wanting to dwell on the subject any further, I just find that if the department has brought this in, the combining, and one school is using it, that there is probably somewhere in the department someone who is wanting to push this certain area.

Until they change the credit system to get into university, this could cut off, even if it's just a small number, if it cuts one child, one student, from getting to university, and they think they have university entrance and maybe they take the 10 and 11 and find it too tough to take the Grade 12, we have created a problem for a family.

It's a bigger problem even if it's in rural Manitoba than it would be in the city because you are able to probably take more courses at different times in a division in the city than you might be at a rural school to pick up one subject. I know it has happened in my family once certainly, and we thought we were watching the credits very carefully but it can happen at any time.

But when you start mixing this kind of a mix, I think that you want to watch very very carefully what you are doing here because if it stops one person from having that credit and thinking they've got a goal, that must be explained very carefully. I see it as a further downgrading to make everything easier.

My own feeling is that if there is going to be a choice - I think there still should be a choice - or if there isn't, that certainly you should be grading English, the Language Arts, up; not watering it down. I have a feeling that that's what will happen when the two are combined.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, I think there was a question back a little ways, wondering if there was a course, if there was a choice and there was a school in a school division doing it, was this being promoted by the department or was there somebody in there who thought this was a good idea and was putting it out for trial. It originated from the CPRC, the Curriculum Development Committee, and I think there were some reservations within the department about moving in that direction. However, when strong cases are made about unique situations in a school division that they feel they can address in a particular way, organizing the way they feel better, then I think there is a reluctance for us to be so rigid that we don't allow any of that kind of flexibility. So that was the basis upon which it was agreed that, although we weren't promoting it, and we weren't suggesting it, that where they wanted to do it for their unique reasons in their school division that it would be allowed.

They can move from 00 to 01 and I think the experience we have had with crossover from 00 from 01 is fairly positive, that they have been able to cross over and there hasn't been too much of a problem.

I think that answers most of the questions. We have some of the same reservations as she did.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** I'll just make one more point on this. I think then, if a division is doing this, I would hope that there is a directive that goes out that tells the parents of these students that are taking the course exactly where their child is going to be if they are heading off to university. I think very often students will take these courses and nobody at home maybe knows. But I think in the case where the department has brought something out and there is a combination coming from a division, I think parents certainly should be made aware.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Yes, I wouldn't disagree with that at all and my understanding is that they do. In other words, that when there is a change and that is a fairly significant change, that the parents are informed of the change. Because I agree with her, also, it wouldn't be the first time that students on their own had chosen to select, perhaps an easy year, or to give themselves a bit of a break and, not being that concerned about the outcome down the road, and had a shocked family when they found out that they had not taken the program that would allow them to get into other programs.

I think more and more high schools, not even ones where they are dealing with a unique situation like this, or something a little unusual, but are having nights

where the parents come in and are informed about the credit system and what the options are so they know how to help the students make the decisions, and they are not just left totally alone, because I think the schools and the teachers have some of the same concerns about kids being caught down the road without enough credits.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Morris.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister some questions now regarding the health curriculum. I'd like to ask the Minister the present status of the mandatory portion of the health curriculum covering the six mandatory units. I'm wondering if she can tell me whether it is functional now in all school divisions within the province.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** No, it is not in place in all school divisions because, when we put a program out like that, we give school divisions a fair amount of time to buy into it, or to adopt it, or incorporate it. One of the reasons that we do that is that there is a fair amount of curriculum implementation and changes going on out there. School divisions have gone into it at different times, and sometimes they're in the middle of a fair amount of other curriculum change that hasn't been completed. There's just so much that the system or their school division or teachers can take on at a time.

We usually give two years in order to incorporate a new program that has been approved. In this case, we're giving them three years. So there is an additional amount of time. So they have a three-year period in which to make the adjustment.

It is my understanding that about 50 percent, about half of the school divisions now have moved into the new program. They will have then until 1986. I'm sorry, correction, they'll have until 1987.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, I have asked the Minister on several occasions over the past three months and certainly since we've been back in Session. I have asked her the status of the present optional units, specifically that dealing with Family Life and Sex Education. The Minister last August, of 1984, put a moratorium in effect in which she indicated there would be no further pilot testing performed on that particular optional unit.

I would ask her at this time, what the status is of the revisions that are taking place with respect to that unit. I would also ask her when the unit in question will be available to school divisions to be used as optional material in their classrooms.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, first of all, I'm not sure that I can give you an exact date, but I can give you a reasonable amount of information. The writing of the program is going well. The writing is going well. Usually, when we're writing curriculum of that nature, it can take up to a couple of years. In fact, our curriculum process, the writing and development process, while I believe it's a very good one, is a very lengthy one. It's one that was much faster when the Department of Education people wrote it by themselves and they didn't have to do all this consulting and discussing and have

all these people involved in the writing. So it's a longer process now.

We have been undertaking the writing and completion of the Manitoba curriculum for about 10 months. It's coming along very well, and I would say it's in the final stages of writing. I am not sure what else I can say. As I said, there is still some writing to be done and some reviewing to be done and as the member noted, it is very important to have the approval completed prior to putting it out into the system and that requires some study and examination and thought. But it's going well, and it's in the final stages of writing.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** Mr. Chairman, I'm so happy to hear that it's going well. I didn't realize that the Minister was prepared to give it such a review and take it through such a major revision. Obviously, something has caused quite a change, because that program was just about totally prepared and ready. Maybe the Minister can tell us what has come into place to cause her and the Revision Committee to take a full 10 months to this point in time to revise the particular unit in question.

Mr. Chairman, can the Minister disclose specifically all those people who are part of the Revision Committee?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, the members of the committee, first of all I'd like to say overall that it's a very wide-ranging representative group from education, from health, parents, administration, teachers and the Department of Education. So there's what I think is a very good representative mix, and they're also mixed in terms of representing the different geographical areas of the province because we know there are different attitudes and feelings from some different geographical areas in the province.

We have a health educator - do you want the names or do you want the positions? You want the names. Olga Chambers, health educator, Manitoba Health from The Pas; Don White is the health educator with Manitoba Health in Winnipeg; Dr. A.A. Campbell, medical officer of health, Manitoba Health in Winnipeg; Doris Fedun is the president of the Home and School Parent-Teacher Federation; Dr. Dexter Harvey is the professor from the Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba; John Evans is a teacher at Iberville School, Whitehorse Plains School Division No. 20; Florence Gerard is a teacher at Golden Gate School, St. James Assiniboia School Division No. 2; Kathy Hatcher is teacher of Riverwest Park Elementary School, Assiniboine South School Division No. 3; Mark Miles is a teacher at Scott Bateman Junior High, Kelsey School Division No. 45; Randy Penner is a principal at Langruth School, Pine Creek School Division No. 30; Bill Schaffer is the superintendent, Souris Valley School Division No. 42; Meryl Stepaniuk is a teacher of W.B. Lewis School, Whiteshell School District No. 2408; Helen Turner is a teacher of Margaret Scott School, Winnipeg School Division No. 1; Ken Valainis, teacher Selkirk Junior High, Lord Selkirk School Division No. 11; Mert Wichenko, teacher at Bertrun E. Glavin School, River East School Division No. 9; Jules Comeault, consultant from the bureau, Manitoba Department of Education; Joyce McMartin, consultant to Curriculum Development and Implementation Branch and Mary Brown, consultant,

Curriculum Development and Implementation Branch, Department of Education.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for that list.

I would ask her how it could be that out of 18 names that she listed, 17 of them are professionals, roughly 13 or 14 of them are either teachers or professors, with the remaining being consultants and one professor; and out of the 18, one of them being a representative of parents, coming through the home and school situation.

Could she tell me how she could possibly strike upon, in a list of 18, coming only to one individual who was not a teacher - and I realize that teachers are parents - but there are many people in walks of life that are parents too for the benefit of the Member for Dauphin, Mr. Chairman. How is it that out of 18, only one of them was not directly involved in the teaching profession; one of them not directly involved in health and only one of the 18 - how could there be one out of 18? - have no professional status in a sense of this committee?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, there are a number of answers to that. I suppose the first one would be that this is the kind of committee that has been set up for some time in writing curriculum and was involved initially, I think, when they were in office writing the health curriculum and there wasn't one parent member on it. There wasn't one representative of the community. The move to have a representative of the home and school was done by me and was the first time ever that a representative of the parents and of the home and school sat in on that committee. So I suppose that's the first part of the answer, Mr. Chairman.

Secondly, that shouldn't suggest or believe that that precludes the role in the involvement of other people. This is the group that acts in an advisory capacity and makes decisions on largely the content of the curriculum, but to do so they call on a lot of advice and information and consult with a lot of other people. So during that process, they have a consultation process that is set up where they pull in people from the Health Department and there are a number of them that they call on, just as we do with other curriculum, call on university and other trained people. So that couldn't seem to be the total resources that are used. There are many other people in the health care fields brought in.

In terms of the role of the community, I think what we are saying is that initially, it's this group that writes the curriculum because you do need professional people to do the writing and to develop the material and that the role of the parents in the community comes into play when it has been written and where there is something to react to. As you will know, in this case, with the optional family-life unit which he is discussing right now, we have indicated that it is absolutely required that the material be presented to the community if a school board decides to offer it and after it has been presented, they must not only see the information, but they have an opportunity to accept all or part of it; they can subtract; they can add to it as the community needs and community values indicate. So there's lots of opportunity for input.



We don't have to have a committee of 200 people to write a curriculum, in fact that would be quite impossible, but there is a good range of representation on the writing. There is parental involvement at that level; there's lots of consultation and involvement of people in the health care field advising in the writing and the role of parents in the participation and the involvement of the community and parents takes place after the curriculum is written.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Well, Mr. Chairman, is the Minister saying then that this is the result of this revision process, whenever it's completed and the Minister indicates it's going well and that may be soon? Is the Minister saying that really maybe what will be finally developed in the next few months is just another draft, that indeed there will be an opportunity again for the community to read the material and come forward and present their views in a manner that could allow again for another provincial model curriculum within this optional area that might be revised for a second time?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** First of all, Mr. Chairman, when we put material out even though it has been approved and it is provincial curriculum that has been approved, it usually is seen to be in a piloting period for about two or three years. Now this is normal procedure, where you develop a new curriculum and you don't assume that it's perfect and has no problems before it's been field tested and taught in the schools for a period of time. So we are always open to revision of curriculum, optional or not, that has been developed, that is first going out into the field.

So that means that any curriculum can have revisions to provincial curriculum. But I think we would be putting out a provincial curriculum that would be approved as a provincial curriculum, but that would allow community examination and decision making on that curriculum. So if they have something useful or we get feedback from a number of areas, that there's a deficiency or a hole, and in many cases you find out after you have put material out there that there is a problem.

One of the things that came up in the Session last year that we quite agreed with was a perceived deficiency in the existing material in terms of abstinence, and we quite agree that the question of abstinence when you are talking about a family life program should not be a question. It is part of the program and we should be teaching that abstinence is not only the desired option, but the option. So that is the kind of thing that is very useful where curriculum can be improved.

If we find information coming back like that from the field, we would change our provincial curriculum. But what is more likely is that they will review it and make decisions, simply what they want to incorporate themselves; in other words, they'll see the approved provincial curriculum and say we like three-quarters of it or we might like all of it, but we want some other things added to it. They might ask to have other things added to the provincial curriculum which is all within their rights, abilities and opportunities.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, my final comment with respect to the Revision Committee, and I'm sort

of shocked that the Minister, particularly in light of all the controversy that was raging last April, May and June of 1984, and the fact that there are a number of community groups, parent groups, that have organized - and the Minister may say they are very small in number, but they are not small in number at all - I'm shocked that she wouldn't reach out. Whether she wanted to take individuals who are part of the organized groups in opposition to the basic curriculum or not, that is a moot point, but the question is I'm shocked she wouldn't reach out to a larger number of parents.

I don't see one trustee, for instance, in the list of 18. I see a superintendent, but there is not one, other than Doris Fedun, there is not one representative of the community. Mr. Chairman, I'm shocked at the Minister, after all the controversy, would see fit to keep the circle maintained in such a highbred fashion.

My other question, or my specific question to the Minister is: why, in October or in September of 1984, would her department, the Curriculum Branch, and indeed the Minister herself, not release the names of the individuals involved in the Revision Committee? Why would she not release those names to individuals and people in the media who would ask for them?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, I suppose that one of the reasons is that it isn't normally done. It has never been done before to have the names released of people sitting on curriculum committees. The opportunity for people like trustees - I want to deal with the question about trustees and how shocked he was that there was only one parent on. I keep reminding him there were no parents on the curriculum committees when they were in office, but in terms of the trustees, the trustees sit on all of the curriculum committees. They sit on the CPRC; they sit on the Elementary Curriculum Committee, the junior high and the senior high and they . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please, order. Order please. Pass? The Member for Morris.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is obviously quite sensitive. It's funny when those of us are asked questions and we take a little banter from the other side, you know, we grin and bear it, but the Minister can't seem to be part of that, Mr. Chairman. — (Interjection) — The Chairman had called for order. Mr. Chairman, you had called for order and the banter had stopped. Well, if the Minister wishes to continue her answer, I'll gladly sit down, Mr. Chairman.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Yes, I was just making the point, Mr. Chairman, that trustees are very actively involved in curriculum and in fact give the final approval. They are sitting in quite large numbers on all of the curriculum committees that review all of the curriculum and approve it. That is the first place that their involvement is.

Of course, the second place that is the most important is at the school division level, especially with an optional program where the decision to have the program is up to the school board initially and the school trustees.

So they make the first decision and clearly that is where they would be reviewing the program totally and making the decision about whether or not to have it, all or parts of it, in their school division.

So there is lots of opportunity for parents and for health officials and for school trustees. It just doesn't necessarily, at the writing of the curriculum - in fact, I would suggest that curriculum is written by the professionals, by people who know curriculum, who know teaching methodology and know the ages and stages of children. All of those other things and all of the parts of the curriculum can be reviewed by parents, by school trustees, after the curriculum has been written. It is very hard to respond or to give feedback to something that isn't written and you cannot see.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Education should know that times are changing. Yes, of course, when you are talking about purely objective material in the traditional core subjects, Mr. Chairman, there was no difficulty with that. That didn't move into the realm of subjectivity. But, Mr. Chairman, times are changing. The Department of Education, particularly under the leadership of this Minister, is attempting to bring into the curriculum not only within Health, but as we indicated the other day, within Social Studies, is trying to bring in material that is very subjective in nature.

Mr. Chairman, what the Minister is saying is that still the professionals, the people she deems to be the professionals, will determine what subjective material should be presented to the children of Manitoba. Now, if she can't distinguish the difference, then she has lost total control, Mr. Chairman, of her understanding that you can't bring this material forward and exclude the community. And I don't care if they are professionals or not, you can't exclude them from the development of them. We're not talking about Maths or Science. Those are pure in form, Mr. Chairman; they're objective. I don't care what scientist from whatever nation in the world you come from, you understand the principles that work and there is no difficulty, but once you move into the subjective and you move into social reform and you bring that into the public school system by way of curriculum, Mr. Chairman, then you cannot exclude the community. — (Interjection) — The Minister says, well, I'm not.

We're going to set out the curriculum firstly and then, once it is in print, school divisions can use that as the model. They can subtract from it; they can add to it. They can ignore the whole thing if they wish.

Well, Mr. Chairman, when we're moving through our evolutionary development, when we're moving into this area of bringing forward subjective material into the school system, the Minister has to reach out to a larger circle of people. She most definitely has to reach out to the parents and, if not the parents, then the representatives of the parents in the community, the trustees, in the development stage of the curriculum.

That's what the problem is here, Mr. Chairman; that's the basic core of the problem. The Minister has a Revision Committee at work, 18 people that are all so-called professionals, and they will decide what the curriculum will be. Then the Department of Education and the Minister of Education will say to the school

divisions, here it is; take it or leave it, or play around with it as you will. Mr. Chairman, what that does, it leaves to the school divisions the opportunity to pull out phrases here, add some there, nothing more. They've had no input into the basic, underlying philosophy of the curriculum. So that's why there is going to be a problem, and there will continue to be a problem, Mr. Chairman.

Now, the Minister still hasn't answered my question as to why she would not release the names of the people. Now the Minister says we never do it in other curriculum areas. I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister had been asked two years ago who was developing curriculum within social studies she would have had no compunction whatsoever to release those names. Well why wouldn't she? Well, Mr. Chairman, here she was asked for the names of those people, and she deliberately withheld that information. I ask her why?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, I had started to answer that earlier, but I thought that they weren't interested in the answer that I was giving, they were so busy enjoying their own jokes.

Yes, there was a reason. First of all, one is tradition that the curriculum committees have never been named before. They are always respected people in the education community, very credible, known in the education community, people who are recognized over a long period of time as having given outstanding service and outstanding capabilities in the field of education and the field of curriculum development. That has always been recognized and respected and accepted. So that, in the past, this question has never come up; I don't recall it ever coming up before.

**MR. C. MANNES:** We're ploughing new ground.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** When this debate was at its peak, I must say that there was some concern for putting out the names, and I am prepared to say why. There was an indication that the people could be put under a lot of pressure. This came as a result of people whose names were identified who were subjected to what could only be called threatening and harassing telephone calls from some people that were very disturbing.

I think that we were very concerned that the identification of these names might subject people who were committed, who were dedicated, who were professional, who were doing a very important and a very credible job, to be unfairly subjected to harassment and threats in the course of doing that job. That is something that I don't think any of us like to hear, but it is a reality and it was one of the reasons, along with the fact of the tradition previously, that we were very reluctant to answer. I'm sorry to have to say that, but it's true.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister doesn't realize what she's just said. She just said she's prepared to bring in an optional curriculum that has been developed behind closed doors, a curriculum that is going to possibly affect the lives of many many young people in the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Chairman, she is saying that even though governments, particularly her government, believe that the public of Manitoba

should have a right to know what is happening in so many areas of government, she feels that this Revision Committee should be cloaked in secrecy to a degree that they should be protected and not have their names be made public.

Mr. Chairman, if there was one development area where government is involved that should surely be open to all people within the Province of Manitoba, at least to know who is developing curriculum, if there is one area, you would have to think it would be in the area of curriculum.

Mr. Chairman, there are 200,000 children in the public school system today, roughly, one-fifth of our population. Yet, the Minister of Education feels that the parents of those numbers of students shouldn't have the right to know who the people are that are developing the curriculum from Grade 1 to 9, for nine years of schooling, Mr. Chairman, to which they're going to be subjected.

I find that absolutely incredible. I only have one other word to say with respect to this committee, Mr. Chairman. As long as the group are going to work as a very closed circle and very much weighted toward the area of the professionals, and certainly very much weighted against the input of parents, then there is obviously going to be no other result but major attacks on that curriculum.

So I am disappointed, Mr. Chairman. I know many people have been trying to identify the people that have been involved in the revisions. I was hoping that a significant number would be parents. The Minister always had the final say as to who those parents would be, but she chose not to name any at all.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to know a little bit more about the revision process. Can the Minister tell me whether the revised drafts will be ready for the fall of 1985 implementation?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to just address a couple of points that the member made previously. I must say that I know there's a lot of interest in this area and in seeing the curriculum, most of the parents are waiting to see it. In fact, people that are interested and are very anxious want to see the curriculum, that's what they're waiting for, they are not waiting for a request to sit down and write it; they're waiting to see what the curriculum is.

I indicated before, and I think I just must respond to the point that he made again about the lack of parents on the committee. I think there is a time and a place. I think there is no attempt to write curriculum behind closed doors and keep it to our chest and not have a wide-ranging discussion with the public and lots of involvement with the public, but there's a time to do it. We may differ in our opinions on this, but I think that the curriculum always has been, and will continue to be, written by professional people, by teachers and people in the education profession. Then it should be put out for reaction and feedback and, in the case of an optional program, even for acceptance or rejection by the community.

All those options are available. The community and the parents will have full rights, full participation to see it, to review it, to approve it, to accept it, to reject it, to accept all or parts of it, and to revise it, add or

subtract to it as they wish. In fact, I would go farther, they will also be discussing with the school division how it should be handled and who's teaching it, and how the materials are going to be presented; what role the parents are going to play in the teaching of the program, and what involvement they're going to have, not just initially in seeing the program, but while the program is being taught, they also have to be included; and what form of continued communication there is going to be between the home and the school while this program is being taught, because that's as an important an element as the initial communication in seeing the program.

I indicated previously that I couldn't give him the date. I couldn't then and I can't now. I simply said, and my answer is the same, the writing is going well. It's going more quickly than writing of curriculum often is, and we are in the final stages of development.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, can the Minister tell me whether this curriculum, if it were to a point where the Minister was happy with it, could it be introduced during the school year? I am thinking the '85-'86 school year, if it is not introduced in September of '85.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Certainly it's possible, but a lot of that would depend on a couple of things: exactly when it went out; how much time they had to see it; and how much time the school division needed in order to go through the procedures that they will be required to go through prior to making a decision to implement; that is, that they must have the meetings with the community and the parents and must present the information. I suppose a lot of how quickly they are prepared to go into the program or put the program in will depend upon community reaction.

Let us not forget that, while we are talking about a program that the Member for Morris likes to suggest there is a fair amount of concern and worry, it is also a program which large numbers, and I think a very high percentage of the parents and the public, believe should be in the school system, and are waiting to see developed and available for the school system. As he knows, we now have more than 20 school divisions out of the 56 that are offering family life programs and have been offering family life programs for a decade or more. So the programs are out there. The need is there; the need has been identified by communities and by school divisions and parents. They are also saying we want material from the province. We want a provincial curriculum.

So what we are putting out there is not just something that there is worry about, but something that there is an expectation for and people are looking for and waiting for. Where a community is very supportive - and the communities will vary from place to place, neighbourhood to neighbourhood. Where there is a lot of interest, and they have had perhaps a family life program in place for years and this is going to be a slight expansion or a bit of an improvement or change, they may be ready to implement very quickly. A lot of it will depend upon the feedback and the reaction they get from the community. If the community has a lot of reservations about it or wants to examine it and wants

to set up a committee to look at it or wants to have some revisions and changes, then of course it will take longer.

So since we are not mandating the program and requiring it and putting it out there and dictating that they must have the program and that they must have the program at a certain point of time, it will be implemented slowly over a period of time that is determined by the community and the school divisions, the people that I think should be making that determination.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister must have suspected my next question, because I know on other occasions she has made reference to the fact that there are some 20 school divisions that have in existence and have had for a number of years some form of family life courses. I would assume, Mr. Chairman, that most of those are urban divisions, the greatest number. Well, Mr. Chairman, there only are - what? - six or seven or eight urban divisions, so it couldn't be the majority. But I assume that most of the urban divisions, the City of Winnipeg divisions, do have some form, or at least have in the past, of family life education.

But my question to the Minister, if the school divisions, 20 in number, have had this course for so many years, what has been its failing? Why has it failed? The Minister and those health consultants who like to sell this course to such a degree always talk about the statistics that have come from the adolescent pregnancies in Manitoba, the current status of future alternatives, and use that as the statistical base for their arguments.

What has been the failing then of the courses that have been in place for many many years? How is the new curriculum going to improve on that which has been in place?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, I don't think the failure is the failure of the curriculum, but it would be nice if we could blame it all on curriculum, wouldn't it? If we could say that all of the pregnancies . . .

**MR. C. MANNES:** I am not blaming it.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** No, he is saying what is the failure of the program.

**MR. C. MANNES:** But you are saying the failure.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** No, you said there was failure.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Well, you must be . . .

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** No, you said there was failure; I did not. He said what is the failure. What is wrong with the curriculum? What is the failure of the curriculum, if they have had it in place for all these years, and we still have these pregnancies in the statistics that are being put out?

Is that what you said?

**MR. C. MANNES:** Add it together as you did on some of them.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, the failure isn't in the curriculum. If there is a failure, and I believe there

is, it's a societal failure. The failure is a society that has been created; that bombards our young people daily with a lifestyle and with information that encourages them to do what they like, do what feels good; that bombards them on television and through the media with sexual expressions of all kinds dealing with everything from the selling of deodorant to heaven knows what. Everything has a sexual connotation, then we wonder why they are getting into this.

I mean, we have a society that even the adult generation has not been perhaps the best example they could be for our young people. Our media and television is encouraging them all the time. Then we sit back and throw up our hands and say what is happening. The breakdown of the family unit has an effect. The family was much more stable years ago. The breakdown of the family unit has an effect on the support, the advice and the help that young people are getting. When you add all those things together, you have got the failure, not the failure of a curriculum.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't disagree with what the Minister has said. I just asked her the question, what improvements are going to come via her new curriculum that are going to address the statistics? Because what the Minister is saying is we needed this new curriculum because of the reason she has given. We need this new curriculum to replace the old one which has been varied by school division.

All I have asked her to tell us is what is different in this new curriculum that is going to counteract the problems which she identifies quite well to the degree that, all of a sudden, we are going to be able to handle and face and improve some of these statistics? That's my question. I am not saying or casting doubts on the new curriculum. The Minister is - or the old curriculum that is - by bringing in a new one.

Now can she tell me what philosophical changes are going to be incorporated in the new curriculum that is going to improve upon the old one which obviously, by definition, must have failed? If it didn't, we wouldn't be reviewing it; we wouldn't be revising it.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, first of all, in terms of what will be different, we will have to wait and see until the curriculum comes out. But the reason that we are developing the curriculum is because school divisions want us to.

First of all, they have developed their curriculum slowly over a long period of time. Some of it was developed years ago. If we had developed it years ago and brought it in, we would probably be looking at revising it and changing it because information and knowledge changes. You don't write any curriculum 10 or 15 or 20 years ago, and leave it sit there without changes. So that that has been brought in . . .

**MR. C. MANNES:** You're telling school divisions to change it now.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** That that has been brought in previously would need some revision and changes.

Secondly, where there is a demonstrated need - and I would say that 20 school divisions wanting a curriculum and trying their best to develop their own is an indication

of need; that is an indication of need - what was happening before is that they were left on their own to do it. They said, well, you've got the option, and if you want a program you can design it, we're not stopping you.

But the Department of Education in the province was taking no leadership, no responsibility and no role. The department has that responsibility, as the Member for Morris has been indicating in this Chamber all along. We have a responsibility, where there is a need, to develop the program, and to have a provincial program that they then can choose from.

No, if they prefer their own program, they can keep it if they think it is better or they like it and it is just as good. But for those who have been struggling and who are not happy with their program or those where the program needs revision or those where they didn't have a program at all can choose from the provincially approved program.

I suppose it is more a statement of saying that the province had a responsibility perhaps earlier that they didn't take. They left school divisions fending for themselves and, in a lot of cases, they said to us this isn't really our job. I mean, we'll try to do it and we'll try to develop a program, but basically the job of curriculum development and an approved program is the province's responsibility and their right. They don't have as much expertise, experience and time to do the development that the province has.

The other disadvantage with it is that you get a lot of different programs. Instead of having an approved program that is accepted, you are going to have half-a-dozen or dozens of different programs across the division without any common base at all.

So I think that what we are doing is helping divisions. We are doing what divisions are asking us to do, and that is develop a program that they can use. We're doing what the public is asking us to do, because the public - and I just want to take a minute to say this - the public, actually in large numbers in everything that we have done in our discussions, our meetings and the surveys, indicate that the public at large and most parents want a family life program. It doesn't matter who does the survey, it is in the very high range, it will be from 78 percent to 84 percent. We've talked to particular groups that range from elderly to immigrant. You might think that there would be differences with some of those groups, or even religious groups. It doesn't seem to matter which groups you talk to or where the survey is done, most of the people, and certainly most of the parents, want a family life program.

They have a few conditions and, as long as they are met, they will be happy with the program. They want to make sure that teachers are properly prepared. They are very concerned about the ability of teachers to handle the program. It's one of the things that we have said is very very important. Teachers must be selected very carefully for this program. It can't just be a matter of slotting in a teacher because they've got a spare when that program is being taught.

Secondly, they want the teachers to have had some training. It is one of the requirements, we have said, that teachers must agree; first of all, must be selected very carefully, and must have some support and some training for teaching that program.

These are the conditions that are very important. They also want us to be very careful on age

appropriateness. In other words, they are very concerned that things are taught at the appropriate time, because there are things that they considered to be okay if the age level of the child is acceptable but, if taught too early, they feel can cause a lot of damage. We quite agree with that. We've taken a lot of care with looking at the age appropriateness of materials.

The third condition that they generally put is that they want the opt-out clause. As long as parents have the right to opt out, it is not a mandatory course and it is not dictated. As long as there can be some flexibility at the community level and the opt-out option for individual parents, then they not only are satisfied with the program, but actually want to see it go ahead.

So we're not developing this because we've got nothing better to do or because we are just sitting looking for work or looking for a reason to set up committees. We're doing this because school divisions are asking for it. We're doing this because parents and students are asking for it.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** I'm not surprised that students are asking for it, Mr. Chairman.

Let me say for the record, Mr. Chairman, our party too recognizes the statistics that the Minister has come forward with. We fully realize the vast majority of people in Manitoba and parents want to see some form of family life sex education in the schools. I mean, there is no disagreement there.

But, Mr. Chairman, the Minister says there are a few conditions people want. She talks about teachers, yes, and age appropriateness and opt out, but she forgets the main condition that a vast number of people want. That is, of course, a very clear understanding of values, and what is to be in place.

I find it incredible that she would leave that out, Mr. Chairman, because depending on who is going to do the survey of people and depending on how they build the case for the course and whether it has values or not, I can tell you that drop of acceptance, that 80 percent acceptance rate - which I agree with, by the way, generally on the question, do you want sex education in the schools? That would drop very quickly if you said, yes; but do you want your children instructed in a manner where there are no values? Of course, the Minister will come back and say well, we have values. We have responsibility and reason and on and on and on. But the point is, I find it hard that she would leave out the fact that those vast majority of people who are wanting the course in place would not say that one of the major conditions is that it include values.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister said that the department has been petitioned by those school divisions saying, it's the responsibility of the department to bring forward a common curriculum. I don't disagree with that either, although in an earlier answer she said, well every school division can vary it any way they want. But then she said the key, she said, but it has to come from a common base, Mr. Chairman. That is the issue of the problem - the common base.

The basis of it, of course, is going to be the Calgary curriculum revised by 18 people, professional in nature. That is the common base. Very subjective material like this that is, at the least, Mr. Chairman, of major concern to a lot of people, no more than one pure parent is

involved in setting that common base; that is the problem, setting the common base in some material that society as a whole could care less, but this is a different issue, Mr. Chairman.

So I just try to tie all that in together, and I know we are rethrasing a lot of straw, Mr. Chairman. But I would ask the Minister - here I go again, making a number of points and asking a specific question. I don't know how she can possibly listen to me when she is writing, but I hear she is very talented in a lot of things, and maybe she can do three or four things at the same time. The Member for Ste. Rose really accepts that. He knows quite well how talented she is.

Mr. Chairman, is the Minister sure? Is there any possibility that young lives will be hurt at all if this curriculum comes forward and, if they are, how will the Department of Education accept its responsibility in those cases?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** First of all, I must make clear or correct the statement that was made by the Member for Morris which is inaccurate. He said that the common base was going to be the Calgary curriculum revised, and that is not true. We are not revising the Calgary curriculum. Manitoba curriculum has been written from scratch with every word being written by Manitoba people to develop a Manitoba curriculum.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Do we take your word for it?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Well, you'll be able to compare. You'll be able to see it.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Good, because the first one wasn't.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** You'll be able to see it. So just wait. The proof will be in the pudding. The world will be able to see when the material comes out that it is a completely Manitoba-written, Manitoba program, that I will go on record now as saying that I think will be one of the best curriculums in the country and will be accepted when it's seen for exactly what it is by most of the parents in Manitoba.

There may be some additions and deletions but I think, by and large, it will be recognized and accepted as an excellent curriculum. So I don't mind making that statement and simply saying to the Member for Morris he will have to wait and see that this is not the Calgary material or Calgary curriculum in any form, or Calgary curriculum revised.

I would also like to say that I think it's important to mention the support that is coming from the program is not just from, I mentioned before, the parents and the public support, but the health agencies and social agencies, and MAST and MASS and MTS, our educational organizations and institutions, religious groups, school divisions and parent-teachers federations have all indicated a very very high degree of support and expectation, and it is an indication that they are very supportive of the program and very anxious to see Manitoba's curriculum.

I also want to go on record as saying that in this case I thank the Member for Morris for a point that he made that I neglected to make. It wasn't because I didn't know it, but he'll understand that in the course

of talking at the length that we are talking, he and I, about the number of issues and the amount of information, that it is not unreasonable to believe that one point can easily slip your mind out of the thousands of points that we are making . . .

**MR. C. MANNES:** That's not one point; that was "the" point.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** "The" point. He is quite right that in terms of the public support and the conditions, there were four points, and the question of values is one that they make and is a very important point. I should have said it; I intended to say it. I thought I had given all the points, and it wasn't till he brought to my attention that I realized I had missed one. So those are the four points and conditions that they put on it. Of course, we recognize that and we knew it before. We are, in the writing of the Manitoba curriculum, as we have in all other curriculums, taking the question of values very seriously and they will be there. They will, I think, be ones that are accepted by most of the public of Manitoba.

There was one final question; I know there were three or four. Oh, he did ask me if I thought it was going to hurt any of the children. I suppose that what we are looking at now is what is hurting them now. Nobody suggests that we have any perfect answers, nor that the family life program is going to solve all the societal or all the problems of students in the . . .

**MR. C. MANNES:** Not solve, I say creating.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** No, I am getting at another point, let me get to it in my own way.

I am saying that there are a lot of problems now and a lot of things that our students are dealing with. There are a lot of things out there that are causing them harm. They are everything from too early a sexual activity, and a very high number of our young girls who are having children, something like 60 a week. That's certainly not the only reason for a program like this. There are other factors, such as child abuse, that are becoming an increasing problem in our society. Those things are all causing harm to children. Anybody that thinks that that isn't harmful to both the individual mother, the child and society, I mean I can't think of anything much more harmful than that.

So what we have to do is try and deal with these things. If we build in all the protections and the safeguards that we must build in when we are developing a very important program like that, and that is that, first of all, we develop a good program - it's a responsible, solid, good program - and I believe that we are.

Secondly, we make sure that the teachers are well prepared and trained and able to teach the program, and I believe we will be.

Thirdly, if we give the elected representatives of the community full rights to make decisions on how they are going to handle the program and whether or not they are going to have the program in their school division, and then the ultimate protection, I think, is the total involvement and participation of the parents so that every child who is in a school has their parent

to, I guess, act as their protector and advocate in determining whether or not they accept or want their child to participate in the program, or whether they think that it's not beneficial for the child. They are the ones that are in the best position to say, whether or not there would be any problems with their child taking the program, certainly much better than you or I would be able to say that.

As long as we build in those protections, then I think that we have a program that, I don't believe will harm, but I believe will help the many things that are being harmful to our children today.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister whether this material, first of all, the weight that will be given on this material, or on this option, what time within the health slot, within a school division, will be directed toward the optional unit?

My understanding in the St. Vital School Division is that some 50 or 60 percent of the time, within the health slot, will be directed towards family life and sex education, meaning the other six mandatory areas, the traditional health areas, plus social and emotional well-being, will be given the other 40 percent.

Can the Minister tell me whether any guidelines or directives are being sent down by the department as to how the time will be split between the mandatory and the optional units?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Yes, of course, Mr. Chairman, whenever we have a mandatory program we have prescribed amounts of time for those courses so that our Social Studies, our Science, our Language Arts and Math, all those programs have prescribed times.

I just want to remind people that the family life program is an option within a mandatory Health program, and that Health has been a mandated program for 20 years; it's always been a basic. The amount of time for the Health program is that in K-3, it's 45 minutes a week; in Grades 4-6, it's 60 minutes a week; and Grades 7-9, it's 75 minutes a week.

The family life option, if they choose to put it in, will take about 12 to 15 lessons of 30 to 45 minutes each. Out of the entire year program, my guess is we are looking at about a six week option. We would have to add that up, but my guess is you have an entire year's curriculum; you are looking at approximately a six week option for the family life unit. The prescribed times are, as I suggested.

I think that probably answers the question, except the question about St. Vital. I haven't heard, or I have no information that suggests that they have 60 percent of their Health curriculum on family life. I don't know where the Member for Morris gets that information and I don't know if it's accurate. So I am only saying I don't know if it's a rumour he heard. My staff has not heard any information that suggests they are spending 60 percent of the time.

As I said, the range that we expect is 12 to 15 lessons of 30 to 45 minutes each out of a year's program that takes somewhere from 45 minutes a week to 75 minutes a week for the entire year.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Well, in terms of "week," Mr. Chairman, I don't know how many school weeks there are in a year. Are there roughly 40 or 35 or?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** We have just confirmed that we believe it's about one-eighth of the Health curriculum time; that gives the perspective, I think.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Well, I thank the Minister for that because that was quite a concern, and I guess I find that's an interesting number and certainly one that's most acceptable.

The Minister asked me about St. Vital. I can tell her I posed the question directly to one Mr. Dennis Norg (phonetic). I would not want to be quoted, Mr. Chairman, 60 percent may not be accurate but, as my memory recollects, it was between 40 and 50 percent. So that's why I asked the question, Mr. Chairman, because if in fact that was the case across all divisions, then what the Minister is telling me, that the mandatory part, the part that all our children should have, really would be weighted in a very small fashion. Consequently, it would bring into question the whole reason for the health curriculum per se.

Can the Minister tell me whether she envisages that this optional material, either this particular unit or the drug and alcohol unit, would be material that would be examined by . . .

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Examined?

**MR. C. MANNES:** . . . that would be examined by way of tests. Would it be material that the student would be examined on?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, I believe that it might not be unusual for them to have some testing in the health curriculum, in total. Whether or not they did any testing or any examination in this optional unit would not be done by being prescribed by us, but would be totally decided by the school division.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, what's the Minister going to do, or maybe she feels she doesn't need to do anything, in those school divisions that decide that they don't want to be part of her optional course, and it is found that teachers, well meaning no doubt, within their school rooms feel that this material should be part of some curriculum?

I believe we have an example on file. It occurred in May this year in the Langruth area where a number of people have become upset because Grade 9 Biology, Science, as a matter of fact - this is hearsay, Mr. Chairman, so the question is hypothetical. What stance is the Minister and the department going to take when it becomes obvious that teachers in school divisions use whatever course it is, whether it's pure science in the form of Biology, whether it's Home Economics, whether it's in Social Studies, decide to take it upon themselves to introduce family life and sex education material?

We have this case, we also have the case in St. Vital where a teacher, or somebody, handed out a number of handouts, and children who had been opted out of the course ended up receiving it and bringing it home. I'm wondering what safeguards the department and the Minister will put into place to make sure those divisions, and those students who have opted out, will not be subjected to any of this material.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, first of all, if the school division does make the decision - he was sort of laying out the hypothesis that a school division might decide not to have the program, they might have teachers that, for the best intentions in the world, thought that some of the material should be presented. If I understand him, he's suggesting that they might try to slip it in through the back door, through Social Studies or Science or some other program, and what protections would there be there?

First of all, I think I indicated before that one of the reasons that we have the guidelines in the curriculum is that there are limitations and we expect them to be followed. If there are deviations from them in the way that he suggests, certainly that should be taken up, I think, with the principal and the superintendent and the board. If they are violating regular program guidelines with other programs they can be told to conform to the existing guidelines of the other programs.

I think in terms of the question of the children getting material that they shouldn't have had, if we were going to not try to be either too suspicious or too unfair about a situation like that, it could easily have been a slip-up. I don't mean to say that we don't need to watch very carefully, but one doesn't need to suggest that when things like that are happening it's by design or because people are maybe trying to get material and trying to get to kids where their parents don't want them to have the program.

When you're distributing and you've got a lot of material, I suppose, they could have slipped up. They'll have to, I think - and we'll have some discussions with school divisions about what procedures to follow where children have decided, and families have decided, that they would opt out. Because it's an important question of what you do with them if they're not taking the program, because parents don't want their children to feel as though they are being either identified or ostracized or handled in any such way that it makes it very obvious that they are being kept out of the program.

So something substantive needs to be done with those children that the parents will understand and agree to while the program is going on. The school will just have to take every precaution that the material only gets into the hands of those children whose parents have approved it.

I do hope though that when the decision is made by school divisions, I would assume that it's been made by school divisions and the community. So you would have a situation where both the parents and the community and the elected representatives agreed that they didn't want the program in part or they didn't want it in its entirety. Then I would expect the teachers in the division to respect that, and I would not expect them to try and slip it in through the back door.

I don't know why we would have any reason to suspect that kind of behaviour might go on. I much prefer to think that we have a group of teachers and professionals who have a high degree of integrity, both in terms of personal characteristics and in terms of their commitment to their job, and that they would carry it out to the best of their ability. I cannot think of an example that I know in Manitoba, in all the time that I've been there, not just as a Minister of Education

but as a school trustee for nine years, where I have heard of a case where a teacher behaved in that manner or with that kind of abuse of their teaching profession.

So I think it's very important, when we're looking at precautions and we're looking at safeguards for the children, that we don't set up the questions in such a way that we are hitting at teachers or making suggestions about behaviour that we've never had any examples of in Manitoba. I wouldn't like us to overreact and set up possibilities that are not there.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, in many respects, even though some divisions have had this course for a number of years, we're still ploughing pretty new ground. We can't foresee all the pitfalls that may lie ahead.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister - she has seen the curriculum or at least she must have, because she says it's coming along well and she says it will be a written-in-Manitoba curriculum, and one that she knows that she'll be totally prepared to accept - can she tell me whether the base of the program will allow the teacher to say or indicate whether there is a right way or a wrong way in the consideration of the circumstances at hand of the student who is grappling with some of the decisions that we all go through and we've all been through? Will there be anywhere in the curriculum an indication or an opportunity for the teacher to express their personal views as to what is right and what is wrong, what course of action that a young person should take if faced with the realities of life, particularly as expressed in sexual drive?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, I think there certainly will be some areas. I'm not prepared at this point to go into great length on the content, because I think that will come out and is more appropriate to be dealt with when the material is there, instead of trying to deal with what is in the content without having it in front of us.

But just as a general answer, I will say, yes, there certainly will be right and wrong. I'll give an example. Abstinence is right; that's going to be clear. There isn't going to be any question that abstinence is something that we throw on the table and say, how do you feel about it? What do you think about it? What would you like to do? I think the message is going to be clear in the program, and that is that abstinence is the right way.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, I hope so because, if that isn't the case - and I know the Minister probably realizes this one year later that the community, even though they've been shut out of all this development. Do remember the August 17, 1984, press release from the Minister? I quote - (Interjection) - Page 30. Oh, I don't know what number it is, Mr. Chairman. I looked at 30, that's the end of the press release, of course.

Mr. Chairman, remember what the Minister said August 17th, when she was backtracking so quickly you couldn't even see her? I've never seen anybody backtrack that quickly, Mr. Chairman. But this is what she said in her opening paragraph when she was saying that the family life education curriculum steps listed.

She announced: "There will be no field testing of the family life optional program this fall, as was



announced earlier this year. Instead the Minister has instructed her department to complete the preparation for the Manitoba family life curriculum, based upon information gathered in field tests during the last year as . . . "— and I stress this, Mr. Chairman - ". . . as well as broad-based public input." Those are the Minister's words, Mr. Chairman, and I repeat them, ". . . as well as broad-based public input." Well, Mr. Chairman, that hasn't occurred.

All I'm saying to the Minister, because it hasn't occurred if she's going to introduce a revised curriculum that doesn't ask the question or state for the record, to some degree, what is right or wrong, give some basic moral direction, then she can expect more of these letters that have come from people like William Dohan, I take it a resident in the riding of the Minister of Labour in St. James.

He says, "I have supported the NDP for all my voting days, both here in Manitoba and most recently in B.C. from where I have just moved. However, recent decisions on your part with regard to the Education curriculum have raised questions as to whether or not I'll be able to continue to support the NDP." Mr. Chairman, I would love to read it all into the record. I won't, but I'll read the last paragraph. It says, "In closing, I can only reiterate that I cannot in any way support either the proposed curriculum . . . "— and he's talking about the one a year ago - ". . . or any persons who are responsible for its introduction into the public system."

Obviously, this individual wrote a very comprehensive and thoughtful letter, Mr. Chairman, because the Minister gave a very major reply to it. I dare say, there were many many supporters of the NDP party who haven't copied the letter to me that I know nothing about, but who have expressed those concerns. So I, today, take the Minister for her word that the course that is about to come forward in its revised state will address the values concerns, as expressed by so many people of our community.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** A few points, Mr. Chairman, first of all, to the points that were made in the letter and perhaps to some other people, one of the things that we knew - I think he was reacting to and believed that the curriculum was going to be the Calgary curriculum. There were a number of things that were identified in the Calgary curriculum that were put out by members of the public in a way that made everybody believe that was the Manitoba curriculum.

I can honestly say that most of the concerns that were generated, most of the fears and most of the worries and most of the things that were put out in the public through the media and through public meetings and through leaflets and information that was dropped dealt with material that was not Manitoba's material; that had never been in Manitoba's curriculum; that had never been put in a Manitoba school; that, in some cases, was everything from material from the States to the Calgary material. It raised and generated uncertainty and worry in the minds of some of the public and parents which was really unfortunate, because it was unnecessary. It wasn't there in our curriculum, never was. It never was intended to be, and never will be.

So one of the things we have to make sure is that, when we're talking about curriculum, we're talking about

what is in the Manitoba curriculum. We can criticize it and do whatever we want with it, as long as we're not raising fears and adding to the worry and uncertainty by communicating publicly about content that is not and does not, in fact, even exist.

I said, "broad-based public involvement," and it will be there. We may have some differences of opinion on at what stage it should be there, but it will be there. It will be broad-based and it will be wide-ranging, and I would suggest that I don't think there will be any program in any school that is brought in that has more opportunity for public and parent participation and involvement and reaction and changing, as will this family life program.

To his last question, it will have a moral direction.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister can say that the original piloted material wasn't Calgary-based. I don't know if she went through the curriculum like I did, but I've gone through now the material that she provided me and I have also gone through the St. Vital curriculum, which is basically the Calgary base. I can tell the Minister that before the revisions, both in the St. Vital and her own which I haven't seen but, before that, the base curriculums were very similar.

Now maybe the Minister didn't have the time to pore through that material like I did. — (Interjection) — Oh, well, the Minister says wait and see. Well, she's talking about the revisions. I'm talking about the basic pilot material that she piloted in four school divisions a year ago, Mr. Chairman. She can tell me 'till she's blue in the face but it was, for the most part, the Calgary material.

Mr. Chairman, what will happen in the St. Vital school division once the Minister brings forward her provincial curriculum? Can the Minister tell me whether they will have to adapt the curriculum within that school division to the base that she has presented, or will they be allowed to continue to revise the Calgary material that they have brought into that school division, saying even to the Minister, flaunting even the Minister's edict as of last August, saying that because they were the ones that brought it here, they have full right and control in deciding what they want to do with it? What will the Minister's new provincial curriculum, what impact will it have on St. Vital?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** First of all, I just want to go back to a point that was made earlier. I didn't say that the pilot wasn't Calgary. I said that our pilot materials, we used part of the Calgary material. So he would have seen some of the same materials, but we did not use all of the Calgary materials. Almost all of the things that were raised that were of public concern were elements of the Calgary material that we were not using.

In terms of the St. Vital, when I announced that we were stopping the pilot and that we were completing the writing of Manitoba's curriculum, I did indicate that those school divisions that had family life programs under way and that wanted to continue them should. I said that we are going to complete the writing until we complete it, and then we will pilot and make it available.

But school divisions should continue with their programs, so they were free to do so and St. Vital is

no exception. We didn't say all school divisions except St. Vital can decide what they want to do with family life programs. They all had a variety of programs and they were free to continue them.

St. Vital chose to continue with its family life program. It is my understanding that they are ranging anywhere from 88 to 92 percent support of the parents in the community. The children who are taking the program, the participation rate, is ranging somewhere between 88 and 92 percent.

I don't know why anybody in this Chamber or anywhere else would want to interfere with those parental rights, especially since we have all stood for them so strongly in this Chamber and spoken out so strongly for the rights of parents to be involved in their children's education. Where they have reviewed the program and they have made a decision in such large numbers, I don't know why he suggests or feels that I should interfere.

When the provincial program comes out, they will then have the choice, as does any other school division, to carry on with their own or adopt the provincial one. In most cases, and I don't think St. Vital is any different, they are waiting anxiously to see what the provincial program is like. They will review it and then they will make their decision, along with, I'm sure, as all decisions have been made in St. Vital, with the parents.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Well, Mr. Chairman, just a final comment and, again, it is somewhat in response to the Minister saying that there were wild allegations that were moving around the community, and a lot of it was taken out of context, a lot of it referred to material that wasn't even here, it was elsewhere. I think the point that some people were trying to make was that the writers, the very same individuals who had written this material that was so offensive, in the minds of some at least, the people who had written that were the prime writers of a lot of the material which would have been, ended up being the prime contribution to this common base material of which this Minister speaks.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, D. Scott:** The Member for Niakwa.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I was just sitting, paying close attention and finding it very interesting. I came in with some peace of mind and I'm going to be leaving without peace of mind, Madam Minister, concerning the curriculum in the St. Vital School District.

I'm not going to ask any questions on something further on. It is concerning this Manitoba curriculum on family life that was first discussed and which I am led to believe from what I hear that there will be a Manitoba curriculum not based on the Calgary curriculum, and the Minister is going to - this is what I heard the Minister say - suggest that this is the curriculum, otherwise she wouldn't be supporting it.

Now, I understand that the St. Vital curriculum is based on the Calgary curriculum somewhat. So the Minister is telling me that her new curriculum is fine and what I was accepting and the parents in the St.

Vital School District were accepting, with 88 to 92 percent, is really not acceptable. That is what I hear from the Minister because her curriculum is acceptable, the other one is not. — (Interjection) — Well, then the Minister tells me that her curriculum is acceptable and the St. Vital curriculum is acceptable. Then why would there be a difference of material from one district to the other?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, there may not be too much of a difference in the end. The St. Vital program has undergone a lot of changes from the original material and that has come about as a result of a committee of parents that they set up to work with their teachers and with their educators to make decisions about what changes and what revisions to make. So it is quite possible that in the end that the two curriculums will not be that far apart.

However, what I have said is that those who already had programs in place should continue them. It is our responsibility, I think, to develop a Manitoba curriculum, to approve it and to put it out there. Since it is an optional program and we are giving school divisions and parents the right to opt into it or opt out of it and to make changes, then there is some flexibility in terms of what the program will look like.

In the case of St. Vital, if, when the program comes out, they look at it with the parents and they look at their own programming, whatever changes they have made, and they either feel that they are very close together or that they prefer their program, they can continue with their program.

My guess is that probably about 80 percent of it will be the same and that there will be minor differences. Those differences will be a reflection of the community attitudes and values which we will allow for and allow the flexibility in each school division.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** I know what has happened in the St. Vital district because it has been of great concern to some of the parents that I represent.

I would just like to bring to the Honourable Minister's attention that the parents are concerned. You said that there was some parent input into the revision, but is the parent input into the revision from the parents who opposed the program right from the start, or is it from some of the parents - because I know some of the parents who have opposed the program and they still won't touch it - have they been given the opportunity to contribute to the revision of this program?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, my guess is only if their children are in the program. If they have decided they are opposed to the program and they have withdrawn their children and opted out, then they would not be involved in the revision. The revisions would be made by parents who have decided to have their children in the program who are then brought in, in a committee, to sit through meetings and make decisions about the revisions and changes that will be made. Those who have opted out have removed themselves, in effect, from involvement in the program.

It is possible that some of the parents who have left their children in don't agree with the whole program and that's why they have made revisions. But they have

decided to keep their children in and to work with the school division to ask for changes or to make changes and they are participating in deciding what those changes will be.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** I would think that the Minister is going to have some problems when the decision as to which program is going to be followed. I would think that the Minister will have great problems. Inasmuch as the parents who have withdrawn their children from the program might accept the new curriculum, which isn't based on the Calgary curriculum - that the Honourable Minister has just advised me - and they might want to support that type of a program. If they are in the St. Vital School District, and the St. Vital School District decides that they are going to support their own program because they have invested an awful lot of money and time, I'm not sure whether they are going to give it up even if the program isn't as good as the one that the Minister is going to be recommending.

So I think the Minister has got to take the bull by the horns and make that decision for them. I know the Minister wants to give the parents all kinds of freedoms and choices, but I think the Minister is kind of shirking her responsibilities by not making the decision which she believes to be right. You can't just say that the St. Vital School District has got the opportunity of doing whatever they like. I think that the Minister has to be consistent in her choice and hope that this can be all straightened around.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** I'm going to say at the end, Mr. Chairman, that I think with a range from 88 to 92 percent participation with a community that has already agreed to sit down with parents and make revisions together, that it's quite likely that they will look at the provincial program and, where it improves on the existing program, that they will make appropriate changes. So I have every confidence in the ability of both the parents in the community and the teachers and the school board to make those decisions and come up with what will be the best curriculum between their curriculum and the provincial one.

I just had one other point I wanted to make that I had forgotten to mention earlier and that I think is kind of interesting, Mr. Chairman. There is a psychologist in one of the school divisions that was saying that a number of years ago, when you looked at the problems for student referrals, that they focused on 80 percent academic problems and 20 percent social-emotional problems. Today, Mr. Chairman, those percentages are reversed. In other words, it's 20 percent academic problems and 80 percent social-emotional. I think that's one, and only one, of the very clear examples of why there is a need for preventative programs like this.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** Just one final question, if you don't mind. If the St. Vital School District accepts the Manitoba program, the Minister's program that the Minister is going to be recommending when it's finalized, will they be given some financial assistance and reimbursement for the time and effort and monies that they invested in developing their own program if they do accept the Manitoba program?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** No, Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't expect so. School divisions, over the course of a number of years, have made decisions to develop individual programs - it may be outdoor education, it may be the family life. They don't come and submit bills, after the fact; it's a decision they make to do with the staff that they have and I wouldn't expect we would be reimbursing them.

I don't expect them to throw out the old program. What I expect is that large amounts of the program are going to be exactly the same as the provincial one. They may find some areas that are unique because they have been developed or recommended by their community, and they should stay that way. They may find that there are another few areas where they think the provincial handling of a section or an area has improved what they have and they may add to it. So I think that it will be another slight revision that will take place when they see the provincial curriculum, and it will be a combination of what they started with, the revisions that are made by parents, and some changes that they might make as a result of the materials in the provincial curriculum. Overall, I think it will make it a very good and a better curriculum.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to just spend a couple of minutes on the other optional unit.

The Minister has had some representation from a group in The Pas with respect to the optional unit dealing with alcohol dependency. I would ask her, firstly, if she has read that curriculum - I believe I have it in front of me here - whether she has gone through it or not?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, I haven't read in the entirety, the whole curriculum, but I have had, as is usually the case, material presented to me by the staff that indicates what the general content and program is about.

In terms of the division from - well, I guess he didn't ask the question. We were saying that one of the school divisions . . .

**MR. C. MANNES:** Kelsey.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** I was going to say, was it Kelsey School Division? They were asking for clarification of the optional status of this, whether students could opt out of this program. The answer was that the school division had the authority to determine whether students could opt out of this program.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, did I hear the Minister right? It's optional in the sense of a school division, but once the school division has decided that, in fact, they are going to incorporate this into the curriculum, then the individual parent does not have the right to opt out their child?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** No, Mr. Chairman, I expect that the individual parent will have a right to opt out if they don't approve of the program.

I might just say a few words about the program because we have had very good feedback and response from this in terms of concerns and questions that have

been raised. There has been very little concern raised by this program and, in fact, they are entitled and can start this program in September. To date, we have 100 schools in the province asking to be participating schools in the pilot project. So this is an area where we have had very little, either concern or negative feedback raised. There seems to be a much clearer indication, or lack of uncertainty regarding this optional unit and a lot of support for it.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I confess, I haven't gone through the curriculum, although the brief developed by The Pas group lists out eight or ten concerns with respect to the curriculum. I suppose the only part, as I can remember the conversation, and maybe it's even in the brief, that concerned me was that there was a game involved in one respect, and part of the game, depending on what you rolled, in the form of dice or whatever you spun, in the form of a numbered spinner, as you moved along the game of life, so to speak, that part of that game in Grades 3 or 4 was that if you landed on some square that you would go backward three squares because you felt a little low and it was the day to take some drugs or something.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I only asked that because I can understand why many school divisions would want, certainly on any overview of this material, would want it. Indeed, I would want it too for my children.

But again I ask how closely the curriculum staff have reviewed it. Again, does it point out, when it tells the children that alcohol is used to increase pleasant feelings in celebrating a special occasion or social events, does it also tell them the legalities involved to minors using alcohol, and the dangers of overuse; and does it tell them about alcoholism and all that? Because my understanding is at the very early ages, when alcohol is introduced as just another form of coffee - and it's included in that list, Mr. Chairman - of coffee or tea, another drug, that indeed the very negative sides of it are not presented at early ages. I am told this.

I asked the Minister to have her staff look into it, and maybe they have, but if there is truth to what I say, and I say all of a sudden I have some concerns.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, first of all, he was asking if it had been reviewed by staff. It was developed by the Alcohol Foundation of Manitoba who, I think, should be congratulated on the initiative in recognizing the importance of the topic. So we were quite happy to work hand in hand with them on something like that. They developed it and staff have reviewed it.

I am informed that we are in the process of working with them to do what you might call "beef up" some of the areas that require it and that may be one of them. In other words, some of the things - and this is what we were getting at before - some of the teaching strategies and things related to it are a little weak, and that's because it was not initially developed by professional teachers who understand these things. So it's basically a good program, we have recognized some weaknesses because of that, and we are working with the Alcohol Foundation of Manitoba to improve. However, I do believe that built into the program is clear information about the effect of alcoholism on people and that it upgrade.

**A MEMBER:** What grade?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Grades 2-9.

**MR. C. MANNES:** I thank the Minister, and before we pass the item, I just want to thank those of her staff who have been involved in this rigorous review of curriculum. When I led off this particular area, I indicated that it would be rather exhaustive and for good reason. I feel that this is a major area in many respects, and it is becoming very high profile. It would be incumbent upon the Minister and myself and others to cover this particular area in some detail. I feel we have done it, and I want to offer my thanks to her staff for being involved in the long process.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** I want to thank him for saying that because I think that, in terms of Curriculum Branches, we have one of the best staffs. I also want to thank them for their support and the information that they have provided in terms of providing it for me and you and the public at large.

I agree that out of all the things that we discussed, curriculum is the most important area. It is the heart and soul of the education system, and we don't mind the amount of time that was spent on it at all, particularly when it gives us an opportunity to remove misunderstandings, misinformation and any suspicion about what is in the curriculum or isn't in, or what the intentions are.

So I think we have been able to demonstrate after this rigorous period of time what he has indicated is that we do have excellent curriculum. It is being taught by well-qualified teachers who were using very good and traditional teaching methods. The content is excellent. There is no hidden curriculum in it, and there are no attempts to do some of the things that were suggested in terms of raising psychological questions. I don't quite have the list of the things that were suggested that were concerns, but I think that we have been able to put those at rest because they aren't in our curriculum. We do have a solid, good curriculum, and we were all delighted with the opportunity to demonstrate that to this House and to the people of Manitoba.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister went too far. If she had said her words in two or three sentences, it would have been fine. The Minister says she is happy to have removed all suspicions. Well, she hasn't done that; she has removed some, unquestionably. There are still some very major concerns with respect to the Social Studies curriculum. I would not want for one moment to leave the record show that in fact all our concerns have been removed.

With respect to the family life area, we will take the Minister's word at this point in time and, of course, keenly await the publication of the material in question.

But, Mr. Chairman, with those points of qualification, I am prepared to pass this item.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** 4.(a)—pass; 4.(b)—pass.

Resolution No. 50: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding - oh, I'm sorry. No, we've still got the rest. Excuse me. Okay.

Committee rise.  
Call in the Speaker.

**IN SESSION**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, S. Ashton:** The Honourable  
Minister of Education.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** I move, seconded by the Minister  
of the Environment, that the House do now adjourn.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House  
adjourned and stands adjourned until 10 o'clock  
tomorrow morning (Friday).