

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 29 July, 1986.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - EDUCATION

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Hon. J. Cowan: Committee come to order.

The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I have some questions about the social studies curriculum. I had asked a person who is teaching social studies how they felt about the curriculum and they mentioned the one thing they were doing differently with it was how it moves from 1800's up to say present, back and forth in the different categories they're dealing with. He said by and large, they were finding that any teachers he was talking to in other divisions, they preferred to teach it in a chronological order because the students didn't get confused that way. Has that been one of the things where there's been feedback in that curriculum?

MR. CHAIRMAN, M. Dolin: The Minister of Education.

HON. J. STORIE: I'm told by staff we haven't had that specific comment directed to us by teachers.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: What are the objectives of this particular curriculum and to what extent are the objectives being met?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, one of the staff is getting that information. If you have another question, we can just continue.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Again, when I checked with St. James on this particular curriculum, they indicated they have a tightly structured curriculum. They felt when it was delivered from the department, if they didn't structure it more tightly - and I mentioned this in connection with the language arts - they really felt there wasn't the continuity from school to school or even would be from division to division. How do you get around that when you have a curriculum that leaves a lot up to the discretion of the teachers about what is being taught?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, there is a greater degree of flexibility in the early grades, the K-4 years and part of that, of course, is because part of the focus in the social studies program is the community, which obviously will represent a different location for all children in the comparison between communities and there is some flexibility left to the early years teachers to define what communities and the scope of the study of those communities.

It gets increasingly more structured as you move through the system and into the 8-12, 9-12 years, when you have programs like "Canada Today," a Canadian

studies course; and "North America, a Geographic Perspective;" and "Canada, a Social and Political History" in Grade 11; and "World Issues," which is an optional course in the 300 level.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Actually, it was in the junior and high school curriculum that they were dealing with, that they were structurally more tightened.

HON. J. STORIE: The content generally, in the 5-8 span, would be "Life in Canada Today," "Life in Canada's Past", which is a Grade 6 social studies program. Grade 7 is "Spaceship Earth;" Grade 8 is "People Through the Ages." As you can see from the titles, there is a bit of moving around, that we're talking about civilization, the development of civilization, early civilization. We're talking about Canada's past, Canada's present. I guess one could argue about the sequence, particularly dealing with Canada specifically, in Grades 5 and 6, about whether one should precede the other.

The only other comment is that the 7 through 12 is specific; about 75 percent of the course content, the curriculum content is fairly specific and there is some flexibility, 25 percent up to the teacher and the administration in terms of the emphasis that's placed on specific materials.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Are you ready to come back with the goals? If not, I'll ask another question.

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, continue.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I'll go on to the maths curriculum. I wonder if the Minister could indicate how much of the maths curriculum is taught as a core - meaning everyone no matter if they're at the 00 - is being taught as a core subject and how they're teaching it? If they are in semester, do they get so much in one?

HON. J. STORIE: Is that true in high school?

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I'm talking of high school.

HON. J. STORIE: I understand about 60 percent is core and that wouldn't matter how the course was structured, whether it was a full year, semester, trimester.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Here again - I feel as though I'm repeating myself all over the place - but here again the same comment was made - that the way it's structured and they hadn't given me 60 percent; I hadn't realized it probably would be that high - was when it's common to all that it's far too easy for some and too difficult for others?

HON. J. STORIE: I suppose that's always the case in a classroom, and it's very much up to the teacher to individualize within the classroom setting to ensure that while everyone receives the core, that everyone is also

challenged and it's not always easy. But I think the concept of individualizing is one in the elementary K-9 system and is rather well established, and I think it's a good practice.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Is that a new curriculum, or is it the way they're dealing with it, or how long has it been that way?

HON. J. STORIE: The maths curriculum is relatively new. It was piloted four years ago and it has been in effect for approximately three years.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: What efforts are being made in the early years to encourage girls to take maths through high school?

HON. J. STORIE: There are a number of specific things that have been done over the past few years. We have been providing some in-service opportunities and have also prepared a videotape, I understand, for use in in-servicing and for use by career counsellors in our high schools to encourage female students to continue with the Math-Science programs, I guess.

It is a concern; it's been raised by other professional staff within the system and I guess there are a lot of explanations for it, but I think it's something that we cannot deal with alone within the system, that there's an attitudinal, societal influence being brought to bear there which is difficult to deal with and it's been in the system for a long time and despite the best efforts of, I think, teachers and counsellors, it's difficult to overcome.

The best data that we have shows that approximately 42 percent of students in selective math classes were girls and that, again, going by other comparisons with other jurisdictions, we're doing quite well at the high school level.

I expressed concern some time ago about the relationship between what is happening at our high schools where I think we are doing a better job and what happens at universities where - and this goes for male and female students - if you go to graduation exercises at universities, you'll find there has been a decrease and it's not just in Manitoba; it's across North America, across Canada, where jurisdictions are bemoaning the fact that there are fewer people registering in the hard sciences.

Apparently there has been in fact an increase of a couple of percent a year over the last few years in females in maths and science. Clearly modest, but there has been some improvement. I don't know if that's a reflection of the work that the department's been doing or it's the culmination of a lot of changes that have been going on generally in society about the attitudes toward women and math and science endeavours.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Are the textbooks reflecting women in differing trades and in non-traditional female jobs? I'm referring to all the curriculum.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, staff inform me that all of the curriculum, K-9, have been reviewed for sex stereotyping over the last two years and that any bias, pictorial or otherwise, has been removed or an attempt

has been made to remove any. To the extent that there are any stereotypes which come through and are overpowering, they are noted so that the teaching staff is aware and can make appropriate reference, I suppose, to the images or the language where necessary.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I welcome that. To deal with science, Mr. Chairman, has the Minister read Mr. Macek's report?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, I have.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Have the recommendations that the former Minister accepted as good advice been put into place?

HON. J. STORIE: I can't say that all of the suggestions that Mr. Macek made have been implemented. I think there were some legitimate concerns raised. I have referenced those throughout my comments over the course of the Estimates when referring to the science curriculum and the need to continue to strengthen the curriculum to make sure that it is attractive and is meeting the needs.

The curriculum has been reviewed this spring as part of the regular ongoing curriculum assessment. The science curriculum was tested. If there are further modifications necessary. I expect that would be reflected in the comments by the curriculum review committees and there will be additional changes.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: This is one of Mr. Macek's recommendations that he made. Has the Minister considered seconding someone from the Faculty of Science to review the science curriculum, or has that sort of thing already been done?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, the steering committees in each of the curriculum areas have representatives from the university community on them, as well as teachers and representatives from other interest groups. You know, it's as broadly based a group with as broad a range of experience as we can pull together. There are no limitations to that group; again, representatives from the community, from Manitoba Education, from Manitoba Education, from the teachers in the speciality area group, one from the specialty area group involved, as well as at least two people from the universities and colleges, and one person from the relevant industry or relating to the application of that particular section in the curriculum.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Just a broad question here. Are there parents represented on the review committees, not just science, but any of the review committees?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, both on the Curriculum Policy Review Council and on the steering committees. There are parent representatives from home and school associations, the Manitoba Parent Teacher Federation.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Considering the amount of work that Mr. Macek put into his brief, I was wondering if the Minister had considered asking him to sit on the

Curriculum Review Committee or some curriculum committee dealing with science? He was shown a spectacular, I think, interest in the subject and has come up with some very good recommendations and is someone that may be worthwhile to have sitting on that committee.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, I believe Mr. Macek actually wrote and indicated that he would be willing to sit on the High School Review Committee. I believe I indicated that I appreciated the offer and certainly I agree with you, he has done a herculean job in preparing material and presenting a perspective.

I would certainly take the suggestion that either the Curriculum Policy Review Council or the steering committees could certainly invite or use his talents at some point in a more in-depth review of particularly the science curriculum at the high school level, or perhaps even moving to the junior high level, or the middle years, I should say.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I just have one more question on that. Aside from Mr. Macek, who has, as you have said, shown a great deal of initiative doing this, I feel that there are other parents in the community who have a certain expertise in different areas that are not necessarily school professionals. I think it would be very worthwhile to sort of comb the communities and put one or two on the curriculum. I think parents in general would feel a little bit more relieved if they knew that there was someone who was there who was not, say, from the MTS or the department and yet without putting someone on that possibly had no knowledge of the area at all.

I wonder if the Minister would take that into consideration and get out into the community a bit because I think, today, there are so many people who have done so much work and could offer a lot.

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, I do take that seriously and I can indicate, as I have, certainly there are parents and non-educators on both the curriculum policy review council and on the steering committees.

In the case of the Curriculum Policy Review Council, there are at least five potentially out of a total of 15 who would be non-teachers, or could be non-teachers. The same is true of the steering committee where there's one from the industry or the applied field, one from the home and school association, a trustee which is usually a non-educator, as well as a number of teachers and people from staff.

So there is that opportunity, and I recognize that we hold no stranglehold on expertise either in the department or in the university necessarily, that there is all kinds of expertise amongst our parents, they are a resource and we do try and recognize that and use them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. L. DERKACH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to continue some questions with respect to the Macek Report, but before I do that, I'd just like to say that listening to the answers the Minister has been giving all afternoon, it is clear the Minister is trying to,

I don't know, deliberately or perhaps because he's just new in the department or has new responsibility for that department, it appears the Minister is evading the issues and evading addressing them directly, giving flowery answers which really mean nothing. I'm going to ask the Minister for some specific answers and I hope he can screw up his courage and perhaps accept some of the ideas that have been presented as perhaps good ideas.

I would simply point to the Macek Report as one that an individual has submitted as a concerned parent to the Department of Education, and from the time this report was first submitted to the department to this present time, I would say there has been very little action on the part of the department - or the former Minister in this one - in implementing some of the concrete proposals that were put forth. If one examines the example of a science curriculum that is mentioned in this report and takes a look at some of the recommendations that are made, one would have to say the report is right on and the fact the science curriculum is in dire need of revamping and upgrading.

I would like to ask the Minister, first of all, could he describe what corrective measures have been taken to date by his department to correct the faults, to correct some of the errors and improve some of the areas that are mentioned by the Macek Report?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, I guess we would all like to live in the simple kind of world the Member for Roblin-Russell lives in. Unfortunately, we don't. He seems to be in that world by himself.

I don't know who he has been listening to over the last number of hours. I have not attempted to whitewash any of the issues. I believe I acknowledged where there are problems and where we need to make improvement.

I believe I've also indicated improvements are being made; that things have changed over the last few years. I've tried to address it in the area of curriculum development. I've talked about some of the initiatives of the past couple of years and some of the things we're working on.

I've indicated yes, Mr. Macek has presented a brief. It's not as if attention hasn't been paid to his presentation. Meetings have been held numerous times, the concerns have been discussed and I've indicated here there are other experts or people who perceive themselves to be qualified to comment on science curriculum who have said no, things do appear to be alright. They're not perfect but the science curriculum is appropriate. It is not out of step with the learning stages of children in Manitoba and while it would be nice to impose another system that one might believe would work, the system we have appears to be working. It's not without its faults. We are attempting to make improvements.

The member wanted to know what has been going on through the department. I have mentioned inservicing. I have mentioned the importance of the high school review in terms of establishing what we expect from our science curriculum, our science courses in high school. What we want to establish is a core curriculum both within the science and math areas and language arts area.

So it's not as if some of the concerns, the legitimate concerns that have been raised by Mr. Macek and

others are not being dealt with, are not taken seriously. It's simply, in some cases, a legitimate difference of opinion about what merits action and what doesn't; and in other cases it's a matter of taking the time to address the concerns in a logical and consistent way and not be stampeded into precipitous action.

MR. L. DERKACH: Stampeded. Well, it's the Minister who is living in a simple world, I think, all of his own. I think the statement he made refers to himself only.

I'd like to ask him again specifically about the Macek Report, specifically about the science curriculum. What specific measures has he and his department taken to eliminate some of the faults to correct some of the errors to improve some of the areas which were mentioned in the Macek Report? We're not talking about the curriculum in general, we're talking about the specific area that the Macek Report referred to.

HON. J. STORIE: I'm told there's three or four specific things: (1), we have, as I've indicated already, increased funding for in-servicing in science education; (2), we have added additional support in regional services for responding to information requests; (3), we've spent additional monies for developing and making available resource material for teachers of science and; (4), and also the department undertook a survey of the teaching skills of science teachers and the background of science teachers to determine whether there was any lacking in that respect.

If I can indicate to the member that one of the areas we did find a weakness and one which has been referenced by other people is the lack of specific and related studies of science teachers across the province; that there is a need for improvement in the background, the academic qualifications for some of our science teachers. That was a result of the survey that was done and we are moving to correct that in consultation with the Faculty of Education.

MR. L. DERKACH: The Minister has indicated that he has read the Macek Report and I would think that after reading the Macek Report, he has probably made himself aware of the science program that is referred to in the report. Does the Minister agree that the Macek Report does address problems within the program, and does he agree that parts of the Macek Report should be adopted in terms of improving the program?

HON. J. STORIE: I've indicated that some of the concerns that were raised were legitimate. I believe that staff have met with Mr. Macek and indicated where there were efforts on behalf of the department being made. They also indicated that some of the assumptions simply didn't fit into the current curriculum development procedures, or the perceived utility of the same by other people involved in science, professors at the university, etc. It's one person's view of all of those issues and many of them may be relevant observations. There is, I guess, another opinion on many of the other issues that are raised.

MR. L. DERKACH: Would the Minister then table those recommendations that Mr. Macek made which he feels are going to be incorporated? Would he also indicate

which of the recommendations the department rejects, and why they reject them?

HON. J. STORIE: I believe Mr. Macek has a letter indicating the position of the Department of Education. All I can tell you, I will certainly try and get you some corroborating evidence, that our science curriculum is not substantially different and I suppose, therefore, not substantially better or worse than curriculums across this country. They follow a fairly consistent pattern.

A couple of the essential underlying assumptions that Mr. Macek makes is that number one, the science curriculum, as it exists in Manitoba, is not valid science. Again, there were a couple of specific reference materials that were discussed, but recognizing that the overall science curriculum is designed not to be an elitist sort of program, it is designed to be attractive to, and appropriate for, the age grade.

MR. L. DERKACH: The Minister has not answered the question specifically. Perhaps the department did answer Mr. Macek and explained to him specifically what areas the department was going to implement because the Minister stated that there are some areas of Mr. Macek's report that are valid and that they are going to implement.

Now, I want to know which those recommendations are that are going to be implemented, and I want to know which ones were rejected and for what reasons. Whether Mr. Macek received that information or not is not important to me. I want to know, and I want to have a copy of the response from the Minister so that we know which areas the department is going to implement, and which ones were rejected and for what reason.

HON. J. STORIE: I could give you a long answer and read this letter of November 18, 1985 into the record. I think that if I provide it to you, it will simply give you an indication of the areas in which we have said yes, here is an area we're working on. If the member would prefer me to read it, I will certainly do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, do you want a copy of the letter or do you want copies for other members?

MR. L. DERKACH: Well, whatever. I think the Macek situation is an example of how frustrating it must be for an individual to present a concern to the department and to get a response from the department and from the Minister to those concerns.

We hear the Minister talk about the importance of the participation of parents in discussing elements of the curriculum. I'm wondering whether the Minister has now changed the policy with respect to the accessibility of parents to the department and to himself, as Minister, in making the public concerns available.

HON. J. STORIE: Well, you know, to suggest that, it really does a - I shouldn't use that word - it's really an unfortunate reflection on the time and effort that a lot of staff and people in the department have spent on Mr. Macek's concern.

The K-12 Science Committee met with Mr. Macek. The people in the department, the Director of

Curriculum Development, the Assistant Deputy Minister, the Science Teachers' Association of Manitoba president have had approximately six meetings altogether with Mr. Macek, a couple of other meetings with the science consultants, a meeting with the Curriculum Policy Review Council, and innumerable phone calls. I hardly think that's neglect.

The fact that an individual with a particular viewpoint was not successful in achieving all that he hoped to achieve is a reflection of the fact that developing a science curriculum is not a simple matter. If the member is suggesting that, on the word of an individual, he would adopt or change the curriculum to suit that individual, I would certainly hate to be a part of the system he was running.

MR. L. DERKACH: Let me then use a specific example. The Minister can baffle me if he wishes, but let me give you a specific example of . . .

HON. J. STORIE: I thought that was pretty clear, Len.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Roblin-Russell, in a parliamentary manner, please.

MR. L. DERKACH: Yes, in a parliamentary manner, sir.

On April 8, 1985 the Honourable Maureen Hemphill ordered that her department would critically study the Macek Report. In October, Mr. Macek had not yet received any kind of written evaluation of his report after numerous calls. One of the reasons given was that the reply to the report was not in a proper form. After pressing this further, it was revealed that actually there wasn't an evaluation that existed at the time; it was all through conversation and dialogue.

This is the kind of frustration I'm talking about that parents and concerned people, who may not have the same view as the department, the kind of frustration that people run into. I'm wondering, is this Minister now going to be prepared to accept the views of parents in a more positive light with responses in a more timely fashion?

HON. J. STORIE: I have indicated a number of meetings that have been held between Mr. Macek and representatives of the department, phone calls. I don't think that's neglect. I have indicated that some of the concerns that Mr. Macek raised have and will be addressed and are being addressed. It isn't a simple matter, and I'm certainly not about to change the curriculum, implement a one textbook or - what's the word for it? - a teacher-proof system on the basis of one person's analysis.

I have indicated that people from industry, people from the university community obviously have differing views on that matter. I would also indicate that parents have been involved in the development of science curriculum. They also are concerned that science material be age-appropriate, that it not develop into a system where those with exceptional abilities at an early age develop the abilities of abstract thinking and so forth succeed and others fail.

The science curriculum, as I've indicated, is not dissimilar to science curriculums across the country. I believe that it is age-appropriate. I believe that it covers

some of the fundamentals in science that children need to know, and that there is some need for improvement, particularly in the area of training teachers. There is some need for a strengthening of the curriculum and making it more attractive to young people so that we have an increase in the number of students taking science and math and, I suppose, that the High School Review will be determining at what appropriate level and appropriate time frame that science curriculum should occupy in the high school course.

MR. L. DERKACH: Well, the former Minister, along with the present Minister, have concurred that Mr. Macek certainly does have some expertise in the area that he addressed. I'm wondering whether this present Minister is prepared to second the expertise of Mr. Macek on a science curriculum review committee.

HON. J. STORIE: Well, I have indicated that he has offered his services in terms of the High School Review, and I indicated that I had many, many individuals and groups who approached me and would like to serve on that. I certainly would invite Mr. Macek to present his views to the High School Review Committee when they hold public hearings. I would also take under advisement the issue of whether Mr. Macek could offer his services through presentations to the Steering Committee on Science Curriculum or in some other capacity.

MR. L. DERKACH: That's very generous of the Minister, but he didn't answer the question I asked.

With respect to the qualifying criteria for the High School Review, now can the Minister first of all, before we get to that, tell me who is heading up the High School Review panel?

HON. J. STORIE: I have indicated that I will be making announcements within the next week on the composition of the committee and its terms of reference.

MR. L. DERKACH: Well, surely the Minister knows now who the person is who's heading up the review panel. I think he has known that for some time.

HON. J. STORIE: I've indicated when I will make the announcement.

MR. L. DERKACH: Well, can the Minister then tell us what are the qualifying criteria for the people who he's selecting on the committee? Does he have criteria which he follows for people to qualify for the committee, or are there in fact any qualifying criteria for those people?

HON. J. STORIE: Well, I'm not sure whether the member is now changing his position. He indicated only moments ago that he would not want all professionals, that he thought parental involvement would be appropriate. So I'm not sure what qualifications he meant, other than an interest in education, an interest in high school education, a reasonable, intelligent, thoughtful person, I think would be legitimate requirements for being a member of the committee.

MR. L. DERKACH: No, I'm not referring to that at all, Mr. Minister. I'm talking about the professional people

who you are going to be seconding or going to be appointing to that committee. I'm wondering whether these people are going to have a background in the high school education area, or are you in fact going to be getting people who have never worked in the high school area. I would like to know, the people who you are selecting, what their specific qualifications have to be in order to qualify for sitting on that committee.

HON. J. STORIE: We're talking about a broadly based committee to review the high school curriculum, requiring expertise in many areas as well as sensitivity of the interests of parents, special interest groups, industry, post-secondary institutions. I can only tell you, as the member may be aware, that a number of organizations with a long-standing interest and involvement in education have been asked to submit names so, in all instances, I will not have control over who is finally appointed. Some people have already been recommended by other organizations and groups, but I can assure the member that the people on the committee will be capable and will represent well, I guess, the multiplicity of interests in Manitoba.

MR. L. DERKACH: Are there going to be people on the committee, of those people who the Minister is going to be selecting, are they going to come from all parts of Manitoba, or is there going to be regional representation as well?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we have dealt with some of the problems with respect to the size of the committee, but I can assure the member that we will certainly be trying to make it representative and to have urban and rural and Northern representation on the committee.

MR. L. DERKACH: In terms of the consultation paper or document, who's going to be responsible for the creation of that consultation paper or process?

HON. J. STORIE: Well, the committee itself is going to meet and prepare a consultation paper for distribution, and I've indicated previously that it will be as broad as possible distribution for review.

MR. L. DERKACH: Well, because I feel that the High School Review is such an important process and it has to be, I feel, done correctly, is there going to be any input from parents in developing the consultation paper?

HON. J. STORIE: It's really unfortunate the Member for Roblin-Russell wasn't here earlier this afternoon, because all of these questions have been asked. The explanations have been provided.

But I do indicate and I take quite seriously the concern that parents be represented, and I can indicate that, yes, there will be parents, not only parents whose other capacities are professional or representatives of other groups, but representatives of Parent/Teacher Federations, as an example, and people with no affiliation other than interested members of the public who are parents.

MR. L. DERKACH: Will that criteria then be made available to all concerned groups and individuals so

that people who wish to make presentations before the committee will then have before them the criteria to help them stay within the parameters that the committee's going to be dealing with?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, I've indicated that the terms of reference will be issued at the same time so that people will understand what the committee is about in general terms and, as well, that the consultation paper, after it's produced, will then provoke, I presume, additional comments from individuals and parent groups, represented associations, etc., so that we can have a full and complete dialogue on the issue.

I've indicated as well that I intend to meet in all of the regions of the province, in as many locations as possible, with parents, students, teachers and school boards to develop a political sensitivity to the issues that are being raised so that when the final report is issued, I will have some sensitivity to the overriding concerns for the issues that are being raised, apart from the specific presentations that are made to the High School Review Committee.

I would like to add just one thing, that I too believe that this is an important opportunity for us to review and revise the scope of high school education in the province, and will be dealing with this as an important part of gearing up the system for the next decade, perhaps.

MR. L. DERKACH: It is my hope that the High School Review panel will be more objective in dealing with presentations from private individuals and from concerned public and will, I guess, address those concerns that the public make, in an open-minded fashion, knowing that there is a great deal of concern among parents - and even among teachers - with respect to the standard, the quality of education that is being offered.

I guess we can pretend that Manitoba's education system is fine, but if we do that we are not really facing the truth because, no matter where you go and if you talk to educators and if you talk to parents, and I think we have seen in the last year parent groups get mobilized and try to impress upon the powers that be that there is a problem with the quality of education in Manitoba and that we had better take a look at improving the quality.

The I.B. program, for example, is just another example that there is a need for improving the overall quality of education in our schools.

Before I go to another topic, Mr. Chairman, my colleague has a question with respect to the Macek Report and before I go to another area, I was wondering if he would be allowed to ask that question.

HON. J. STORIE: Before the Member for Morris asks the question, I would just indicate that I recognize that there are problems within the system, but the member is indicating his general, overall consternation about the state of the system. Earlier this afternoon, his colleague, the Member for Kirkfield Park, indicated that her children had gone through the public school system and said, yes, she thought they did receive a quality education.

I don't know who the member — (Interjection) — well, I believe, essentially, that's what the member said.

Perhaps her colleague, the Member for Roblin-Russell, could check the record with respect to what was said.

I want to indicate that in the two-and-a-half months that I have been Minister of Education, I have met with representative parent groups on many occasions and not once was the issue of quality of education raised. The question of parental involvement has been raised; all kinds of other questions, records questions and specific guidelines questions, funding questions have been raised, but I don't believe that is representative, that there is that overriding concern.

There are specific concerns. It is true that no review of the system has been done for more than a decade and it's time to do it. The forum for that review, I think, has been established and will be announced within the next week and I'm looking forward to it. I think it's a healthy process, one that we need to go through and one that should help us establish our priorities for high school education over the next decade.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I've enjoyed the discussion to this point in time, and I'll reverse the tables on the Minister a little bit, who is so famous for putting words in one's mouth.

It seems to me that, given his last comment, that what he's saying is, yes, he's going to concede that maybe we should have a review of the quality of education, even though in his mind he doesn't think we need one. The Minister shakes his head, but he also indicated that he's had several meetings with parent groups and not one of them have mentioned quality of education to him so, ergo, in his mind, it can't be a serious problem.

Mr. Chairman, what has disturbed me the most over the last half hour is the fact that this Minister is sounding so much like his predecessor . . .

HON. J. STORIE: And that disturbs you?

MR. C. MANNES: . . . the former Minister of Education, and of course I'm happy that the former Minister is here to hear it.

Mr. Chairman, this is a serious matter, and I say to you and I'll end my 10-minute discourse with a very specific question; but in my view, our students, generally, in high school - and I stress, in high school - are not being sufficiently challenged and in no area is that pointed out more clearly than within the area of science learning.

Two years ago when Mr. Macek brought forward his report, I honestly thought the Minister and the department at the time would seriously look at some of the recommendations and, more importantly, accept the objective analysis, at least the methodology that was put into place to develop that report.

In my view, the department did not treat the particular individual that fairly, even though I concede to the Minister and the former Minister that there were many meetings held between Mr. Macek and various department staff; but I think the chronological series of events - and I won't go through them because my colleague has done that - would indicate that this, like so many other areas of education, in my view, has not

been taken terribly seriously in a quality sense by the Minister, by the Minister past and by the department.

Mr. Chairman, I remember when the optional Family Life material came in and the Minister at the time would try and convince the public at large that the criticisms that were being directed toward that particular Calgary curriculum were those of people coming from a very narrow conservative view, people who really were trying to make an emotional issue out of it; and yet, two years later, with pressure, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, with considerable pressure from the community at large and also from the Opposition, the Minister finally laid before the House and the people of this province a curriculum that I think is to a large degree acceptable.

So I say to the Minister, when he's considering either Family Life or he's considering a science curriculum, don't be in such a rush to accept the status quo. Don't be in such a rush to accept what the highly paid professional curriculum development specialists and people within the education community, professionals, are saying, because there are people outside in the community who also have very much a vested interest, mainly that being their children's education, and people who also bring with them a large degree of experience in a whole host of areas that can make major contributions. Nobody should have the complete say as to what curriculum development should be. Indeed, Mr. Macek shouldn't have it. I shouldn't have it and nobody should.

Mr. Chairman, I think we've gone through an exercise where pressure has caused a major revision within the Family Life optional material, something that was not seriously considered by the government when it was originally released. Pressure has caused that and I would hope that the Minister would seriously consider a request from the Opposition. I would hope he would take this as a formal request, that Mr. Macek be appointed by him, by the Minister who has the authority to so appoint to this Science Curriculum Review Committee.

Mr. Chairman, there are a large number of people on there and we're, as the Official Opposition, requesting that this Minister name one person and that person is Mr. Macek. There can be no reason, no rationale, because I'm prepared to bet there hasn't been an individual in this province over the last 10 years who has delved into greater detail, into greater depth, into any curriculum subject matter than Mr. Macek and brought forward, not for political gain, not to embarrass anybody, but to bring forward for the well-being of all science students and all students within this province, a better curriculum. He's laid it before the Minister. His pedigree is the document itself and therefore I request that the Minister would name that individual to that Curriculum Review Committee.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, I answered that request previously. I have indicated that I will consider it. I recognize that it's a request, and I have indicated that I'm appreciative of the work that Mr. Macek has put into documenting his concerns about the science curriculum.

I want to indicate two other things: No. 1, the department does refer the science curriculum issues to people outside of the department, from the university

community, from the industry. So it is safe to say that there is another perspective being offered, not only in the science curriculum but in every other area.

The second point, I have indicated that, yes, the whole area of science curriculum is a concern. It's, again, something that the department has been attempting to deal with but, you know, I referenced the fact that parents had met with me and not raised the question of quality education specifically. There are perceptions out there about the acceptability of high school programs generally and some of the concerns are legitimate and need to be addressed.

In terms of the science curriculum, Mr. Chairperson, I have met with the university presidents. To my knowledge, there has been no communication from our community colleges or universities which lay out any specific concerns about the relationship to the science curriculum in the high school, to what is going on in universities, to the quality of the graduates from our science courses and moving into the universities.

So, I have to raise the question that if the system is so inadequate, the science curriculum is so inadequate in our high schools, why hasn't this issue been addressed to me by university presidents, by the deans of sciences, by university faculties, by the universities themselves? They have never raised that issue with me other than to reflect on the fact that we don't have as many science graduates and that is not simply a phenomenon in Manitoba.

I want to, as well, indicate that on the whole issue of quality, the Department of Education is not alone in that. While we try to provide leadership, clearly, there are some 60 school boards, some 800 school principals and administrations, and some 14,000 teachers who also are concerned and working toward providing a quality education. Having said I think that's what we're providing, it doesn't preclude a review to improve and enhance what we're doing.

Finally, Mr. Chairperson, I would like to table recommendations from the "Science for Every Student," which came from the Science Council of Canada, statements about what they feel should be included in the science curriculum across Canada and what the response has been K-12 from the department, and just to indicate some of the areas which have been raised; some of the concerns which have been raised; and some of the suggestions which have been made by the Science Council of Canada which is not a curriculum review body, and to indicate the department, the science curriculum consultants attempt to maintain contact with outside bodies interested in science and science education to ensure our curriculum is appropriate.

I know that we don't like odious comparisons to other provinces, but I reference again the fact we are not substantially out of step. In fact, we are leading in some areas in terms of science curriculum development.

I would like to table that as well, Mr. Chairperson.

MR. C. MANNESS: Just two very brief final comments, Mr. Chairman.

Firstly, the government takes great pride in the economic side whenever they're leading the nation and in telling us they do so. I just suggest to the Minister there's nothing wrong with leading the nation in the

development of a science curriculum. So let's take a lead from ourselves and from our own people within the community who have a vital interest within that.

Secondly, I want to thank the Minister, Mr. Chairman, because it's great to enter into some discussion on science curriculum and not have the fact thrown at us that our science curriculum must be doing well because we've won four or five major Canadian awards . . .

HON. J. STORIE: I forgot. Excuse me, Mr. Chairperson.

MR. C. MANNESS: . . . and I want to thank him for that.

HON. J. STORIE: In fairness to staff, they asked me to say that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. L. DERKACH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to move into the area of the curriculum and the combination of the 00 and 01 programs. Can the Minister indicate how many courses in the high school system are being combined at the present time?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, I don't believe I gave the number but those issues, as well, were dealt with this afternoon. Essentially there are only two subject areas where that is occurring. It's language arts and social studies at the 10-12 level.

MR. L. DERKACH: Can the Minister tell me when the decision was made to move in that direction?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, about three years ago.

MR. L. DERKACH: Mr. Chairman, I would like to indicate what was said last year in Estimates by the former Minister of Education when questioned about the combining of the 00 and the 01 programs. The remarks by the former Minister was, I quote: "But it isn't a requirement or a direction that the department has decided to go in." Is the Minister of Education now telling us that this decision was actually made three years ago?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, I don't have the reference the member refers to. I don't know the context in which those comments were made and I obviously wasn't the Minister at the time.

I can only tell you staff informs me that the decision to move in that direction was made some three years ago and, just to make it clear, the courses themselves are not delivered concurrently; the curriculum guides are prepared in a way in which both levels can be subsumed under one.

MR. L. DERKACH: Mr. Chairman, I have to pursue this topic for a little bit because I think there was some misinformation given to Manitobans last year when, in Estimates, the Minister indicated that in fact only one school in one school division was doing that and it was not a direction the province was going to be going in. So, I'd like to know why all of a sudden this year we're

saying that particular decision was made some three years ago?

HON. J. STORIE: I don't know how that confusion arose other than to say it is an interim curriculum at this point and will be until next year. It has been phased in at the 10 and 11 year and this year will be phased in at the Grade 12 level, or the 300 level, and so in that context it may have been only referred to as interim, I don't know.

MR. L. DERKACH: If the Minister would wish, I would certainly provide him where it is he can find that in Hansard and then I'd like an explanation of those comments by the department then.

HON. J. STORIE: Do you just want to give me a reference, a page number there, Len.

MR. L. DERKACH: It's Thursday, June 20, 1985, Page 3192, 3193, and 3194.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you.

MR. L. DERKACH: Mr. Chairman, the questions last year were asked by the Member for Kirkfield Park with respect to the combining of the 00 to 01 programs. I know that topic was broached this afternoon. I have some questions I would have liked to have asked at that point in time but could not get in.

I would like to ask the Minister whether or not we have a new program, the blend of the 00 to 01 program? Is that a new program or have some of the skills been eliminated from the 00 program, or diluted in other words, so that the 00 or the 01 type student could handle these skills.

HON. J. STORIE: No, the exact opposite actually. There has been no reduction of the expectations or the requirements of the 00 students. The only difference is I suppose the opposite could be said that given the curriculum guide now reflects the similar goals and objectives, the higher objectives that we're expecting more from the 01. I say that because we're all aware of the need of improved reading, writing, listening and speaking skills in students and the decision was made to allow more flexibility for the teacher to develop higher expectations. You use higher level resource materials within the context of the 01 course.

So it hasn't been weakened. There has been no lessening of the standards in terms of the 00 course. What we've tried to allow the teacher to do is to use the 00 courses in the 01 areas when it's appropriate, and to use other materials when they feel that there's a necessity because of the level of skill of the students or special interests or whatever.

MR. L. DERKACH: So would the Minister tell me whether or not the standard for, say the Language Arts in Grade 10 now is, the 00 level? Is that the standard?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, the standard is 00 level.

MR. L. DERKACH: In other words, the Minister is now telling me that we have eliminated the 01 program and

the 01 standards and we're into the 00 program and the 00 standards for all students.

HON. J. STORIE: What I'm saying, Mr. Chairperson, is that the 00 standard in Grade 10 is as it was, the objectives and the goals of the 00 course, Language Arts, are as they were; that we now believe it is appropriate to have the same expectations in the 01.

However, recognizing that some 01 students will not have the same language facility, some of the resource materials, the instructional materials, some of the strategies that are used in the 01 course, and they're separate courses, will be somewhat different.

MR. L. DERKACH: Well, this whole concept then escapes me because the reason that the 01 program was implemented some years ago, was to allow those students who could not handle the 00 program to get some level of skill development but not to the level that the 00 program provided.

The 00 program was meant for university entrance, and the skills in that program were of a higher level. Now the Minister is saying that we can bring up that 00 student to the same level, or the 01 student to the same level as the 00 student, but not in all cases. So what is the standard, what is the variation factor for that 01 kid now?

HON. J. STORIE: I think what we're trying to do is to give the teaching staff the flexibility to move students along in the 01 course, to get them as close to the 00 standards as we can be, rather than set a minimum standard a 01 curriculum which perhaps in some people's view is less appropriate, less acceptable, we're trying to leave the teaching staff some flexibility, trying to set again the goals for both Language Arts Programs in the 00 and the 01 as being equivalent and yet letting the teachers use some flexibility, recognizing that students always don't go into the appropriate level course. There can be a variety of reasons why students choose 01 or 00. All we're trying to do is make sure that students in Language Arts throughout high school get as high a level of skill development as is possible.

MR. L. DERKACH: Mr. Chairman, has this area been discussed by the department with the university and with superintendents and with school principals throughout Manitoba to get their full acceptance in the direction that the department is moving because no matter how you say it, there still has to be some lowering of expectations in order to have the two students, the 01, the 00 student come up to a standard where they can both enter university.

HON. J. STORIE: Obviously one of them is taking a 01 course. That 01 dedication would only mean that different materials, different strategies may have been used in the classroom. But I've indicated a couple of times that the idea behind it was to expand the 01 Language Arts Program to make it more compatible with what the expectations are of students when they graduate from high school.

The thrust of the revised program is to make it a more language development program, to emphasize more than just literature but to emphasize writing and

speaking and reading and listening skills to all, both levels.

The question was raised about whether there was consultation and yes, there was, that before the curriculum was revised that individuals from the university, the Faculty of English and the Faculty of Education were a part of the review and the process.

MR. L. DERKACH: And was the concept accepted by the Superintendents Association, by the Principals Association and by all the universities in Manitoba?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, on the Curriculum Policy Review Council, those groups are represented and yes it was on both counts.

MR. L. DERKACH: So we are seeing the beginning of an end for the 00 to 01 courses in Manitoba then, and what we are going to have one course, a blend of the 00 to 01 and any students taking those would then be able to go into university?

HON. J. STORIE: No, Mr. Chairperson, the member is being careless in his listening skills. There has been no suggestion that there is amalgamation of these two courses. There are still two distinct and separate courses being offered in the high school program in Manitoba, a 01 program and a 00 program.

MR. L. DERKACH: There is right now, yes.

HON. J. STORIE: And there still is, today and for the foreseeable future. There is no amalgamation. The amalgamation has only been in the area of the goals and objectives of the English Language Arts - no longer designated solely as English - but as a Language Arts Program in high school. The purpose behind it has been explained. The purpose is to make sure that we're giving the very best that we can by allowing some flexibility in the 01 program to introduce new materials where appropriate.

MR. L. DERKACH: I see we're not going to get too far with this particular topic and this Minister so we might as well abandon it. But I would like to ask the Minister whether or not in the programs that are taken by Grade 12, is there going to be a demand of Grade 12 students to take more than just the one compulsory Grade 12 program as it is now.

HON. J. STORIE: I'm not sure what the member's real question was.

MR. L. DERKACH: At the present time, I believe it's true that a student graduating from high school can graduate and take only one compulsory Grade 12 program and that is English 300. Is it going to be a demand or an improved standard by the department so that students have to take more than the one program in order to get a high school graduation diploma?

HON. J. STORIE: Recognizing that to get into university, they would need at least a minimum of three 300 Level courses, but I think that again is a question of whether

that is appropriate. One of the questions that I'd raised earlier as being an appropriate question for review by the High School Review Committee and that is the designation of core curriculum and level as well throughout the high school years. A good question.

MR. L. DERKACH: Is there going to be any change with respect to the 04 programs that are being offered in the small high schools across the province right now?

HON. J. STORIE: I'm sorry, I . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . asked was there any change in the 04 programs in the small rural high schools.
The Minister of Education.

HON. J. STORIE: No, Mr. Chairperson, the 04 courses have been redeveloped. I believe that process is just finishing.

MR. L. DERKACH: Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to know what the findings were from the Kindergarten assessment and were there any changes recommended?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, I understand that the report and the recommendations are just being finalized at this time.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Can the Minister tell us what changes were recommended?

HON. J. STORIE: No, the committee has not made its report. The report and the recommendations are in the process of being prepared and I expect that they'll be ready in approximately a month's time.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman, the former Minister had indicated that she was going to bring in something called peace education, I think; curriculum on peace? Has the process begun to deal with peace education in the schools?

HON. J. STORIE: Well, I don't know that it will be formulated as peace education per se. I think the whole issue of peace and conflict as a world issue is an appropriate one for discussion in the high school system in particular. I think there are opportunities to discuss peace and cooperation and conflict in the context of the Social Studies program at other levels. But the department is only collecting resource materials at the present time. Again, I suppose, well there are many who would like to see a full-fledged program of peace education or peace and conflict education on the curriculum. That is probably going to take some time to develop and receive approval and become part of the optional courses. It is, of course, a part of the current issues in Grade 12, or at least it's referenced.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: The Minister looked a little unsure when he said it's referenced. What organizations are they receiving the resource materials from?

Tuesday, 29 July, 1986

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, the department is developing bibliographic lists from libraries and those kinds of things at this point. No particular source, other than, I suppose written material, is available publicly in various quarters.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Would it be possible to get a list of some of the resources, I guess; some of the organizations or library resources that they are looking at?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, I can certainly try and get the member a current list of the resources that have been identified.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, Mr. Minister, what is happening with the middle years; the junior high schools? Are they coming to an end or are they K-8's or K-9's and then high school? What's happening; and what direction is the department heading?

HON. J. STORIE: Essentially those decisions are being made at the school division level but I guess it would only be fair to say that the models vary; that there are K-9, K-8, K-6 and K-12 schools, although the K-12 schools tend to be administered somewhat differently or be part of the school divisions; small schools in rural school divisions.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, there are a few new schools being built. Are they all over the board, too, or are they generally taking one direction?

HON. J. STORIE: I guess if you can develop a trend from the last couple of years, it tends to be more K-8.

I just wanted to add a point that really dealing with the middle years, really it's an approach to adolescence in teaching middle years' children rather than an organizational approach per se that I think is the important point to remember.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Well, considering the middle years, if the schools are going from K-8, and then 9-12 is going to be high school, will they still be separating 7-9's then?

HON. J. STORIE: In the K-8 schools, the middle years would then represent 5-8.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I'd like to ask about the home education. If the Minister could tell us how many students are being educated at home, not through being in a remote area say, but through choice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me. Is the member referring to Item 4.(g) Correspondence Branch?

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Well, if that's where it comes under . . .

HON. J. STORIE: Frankly, I don't know what appropriation number it comes under. Let's say 6.(e). There are under 200. Now how many of those are taking home schooling because of remoteness, I don't know.

I don't think we have that broken down, but there are under 200 in total. Some of those will be taking correspondence courses from the department; some of those will be receiving instruction in the home using curriculum material and some others being used from an eclectic variety of sources by parents or others.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Who validates or measures or tests the quality of home education?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, there are two people attached to the department who interview and are responsible for verifying the adequacy of the instruction and evaluating the student's progress.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Is there a sampling of the home ed students who are writing the provincial assessment test?

HON. J. STORIE: No, there hasn't been.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Dealing with home education and the quality of the education, are these students getting computer literacy, phys. ed, a second language - just how is it dealt with? How are these subjects dealt with?

HON. J. STORIE: Again that would depend on the resourcefulness and the resources of the parents who obviously have made a decision to educate their children at home. I don't think we have any breakdown of what kind of resources are being put in, but certainly I expect there are some home-school situations where the children do have access to home computers, PC's, etc. So there are no requirements other than checking for the adequacy of instruction and evaluating student performance from time to time.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: When I was just doing a bit of checking into home education, an educator told me they were watching CBC and a Mr. Roland McCurdy - I don't know if he's with the department; they thought he was a consultant, I believe, on CBC - and this person found it a little bit embarrassing to find someone from the department would be extolling the virtues of home study and more people should be taking advantage. Is that a correct assessment of that program? Did anyone catch it?

HON. J. STORIE: Obviously there are some parents who believe that's a good option for a lot of different reasons and sometimes it reflects religious values in the home, deeply held religious convictions of one sort or another.

I believe the public education system provides a quality of education and an assurance of quality that won't always be there if parents choose to educate their children in their home, but that's not saying there aren't parents who do an adequate job within the home and I believe if they feel that's a choice they want to take, they have a right I suppose to do that.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I guess my question is dealing with someone from the department advocating things. That seems like a strange place that reports are coming from.

Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to ask some questions on the different curriculum that's in the - what's this thing we've got - the annual report? Special needs - the Minister mentioned earlier that with the Welcome Home Program, the department and Community Services were working together with the divisions - how closely are they working? Are all the children who are moved into the community, are the divisions notified as to what instruction level they're at? If they know there's going to be say a group home where there might be three or four, is the division notified to let them know where the homes will be located?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, there is a good deal of cooperation. I indicate that only a couple of weeks ago the Deputy Ministers from Community Services and Health and Education met with the Superintendents Association to establish a better understanding of the relationships and who would be responsible for what in that process. But there is a good deal of pre-planning that is undertaken before the move. Sometimes that is directly with the department, other times with the school division. The school divisions, obviously, when they become aware of the fact that special needs students are being moved to the division, then will avail themselves of the services of child care and development and any of the appropriate grants that are provided to assist school divisions with special needs students.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: With more mainstreaming, at least more advocates for mainstreaming, students who are mentally handicapped, if a group home, or two or three should happen to move into one division, does the department provide extra grants or extra services to that particular division or have they come to an agreement on this yet?

HON. J. STORIE: There is a formula for both low incidence support and that may include, depending on the degree of handicap, up to \$13,300 per child in assistance. As well, obviously, support services from the department as needed in terms of assessment and that kind of thing.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: If these students are being moved in all through the year, if a budget is struck, is the money forthcoming to the division in that fiscal year or do they have to wait for another year?

HON. J. STORIE: I understand there are two points at which Low Incidence Grants can be provided.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: What kind of training has been given to teachers to deal with mainstreaming? Has there been something to prepare teachers up to this point other than, say, in-services? I would think that if a teacher was going to have two or three students, there would be a fair amount of stress and there would be a different type of teaching that they would have to provide to some of these students.

HON. J. STORIE: Of course, the in-servicing and professional development opportunities that either are made available through the professional development

activities of the local Teachers' Association or the school division are available, as well as any personal involvement in professional development. So many of the teachers are becoming involved in special ed, because of mainstreaming or because of an interest in the area, are doing their own development.

Again, because of the fact that those who are multiply-handicapped receive Low Incidence Grants, there is sometimes additional support provided right in the classroom for the teacher to reduce the stress. I don't think there is any doubt that for many teachers without a great deal of experience in dealing with handicapped children, it is traumatic. There are all kinds of expectations, some of them realistic and some of them unrealistic about what is going to be accomplished. It's difficult, but most teachers seem to be coping with it and obviously, I guess, we would always like to be able to provide more assistance, but I think school divisions and the department are essentially doing the best they can.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Coping is a pretty tough word. When one copes, usually often you see an end to and a solution.

Are there summer school courses? Has the department made any arrangements with, say, the university on special ed, for summer courses for teachers to take advantage of?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, there are a number of special ed courses offered through intersession and summer school at the University of Manitoba. I believe most of them are at the University of Manitoba, and at Brandon. I'm told there are courses at Brandon as well.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: The health curriculum: The Minister has just released the Family Life education, the optional unit. Have any of the divisions indicated that they are going to participate this fall?

HON. J. STORIE: I haven't heard anything subsequent to the release of the material. I did have an indication from, I believe, it was Winnipeg 1, that they were interested in looking at the optional material as soon as possible. Again, a number of other divisions and groups such as the Superintendents' Association had raised the issue with me requesting that the province move in terms of Family Life Education programming. I think there are a number of divisions who are looking for a base upon which to build a Family Life program.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Is the department planning to pilot this once again or are they just going to give it to the divisions?

HON. J. STORIE: No, it has been approved as a part of the health curriculum.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: When the Minister says it was approved, will they be looking to the teachers, then, to make recommendations for further changes once it's into a division?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, it is entitled an interim curriculum because there is an expectation that there may be

Tuesday, 29 July, 1986

modifications. Certainly, school divisions are free to adapt the material to include or exclude, I guess, materials as they see fit, but I can't say that at this point when additional adaptations would be made to the curriculum. It would depend on how successful or how many concerns are raised about resource material in the curriculum itself.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Turning into health, the Drug and Alcohol Program, how many divisions are using the material and have there been any major changes to the program?

HON. J. STORIE: I understand that there are four or five divisions currently using the program and that an additional 20 have indicated an interest in starting in the next year.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I thought the Minister might be interested to know and possibly had been informed that in St. James, when they did a survey, that was the overwhelming response from both parents and the community, that they wanted more drug and alcohol . . . I think it sort of floored them that there was that much interest in the community.

HON. J. STORIE: It is going into its final form September of this year and that's, I assume, why there's the interest in many of the other divisions. Certainly, any literature I've seen indicates an overwhelming support on the part of parents for that kind of information as well.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Getting back to the health curriculum, I understand that there are resources for the first two units, but there aren't any for the rest of them and there are seven units to complete. Is that correct, that there aren't any teacher aids, any kind of resource material for the other units?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, I understand that there are two to go out in September and two by next September.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Vocational: The Winnipeg South Vocational School, is it totally completed now?

HON. J. STORIE: The South Winnipeg Vocational Centre, I believe it is completed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the Member for Kirkfield Park, the Minister said he believed it is completed.

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, it is.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: There was a press release, and I had it at my fingertips a minute ago, that indicated that they were looking for something like \$300,000 funding. Did it say from the community? I apologize. I had it at my fingertips a minute ago, and I've managed to lose it again. I know what it was. It was a press report, that's what it was.

HON. J. STORIE: Am I answering a question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question was about the 300,000.00.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I apologize.

HON. J. STORIE: I didn't know what the question was. You don't have to apologize.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: It indicated that the school was looking for . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: It might be an appropriate time to take a short recess.

I will declare a short recess for five minutes, and we will return at 10:00 p.m. This will allow people to find notes and do other things as they feel appropriate.

RECESS

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The article I'm referring to said the centre is still looking for another 300,000 from non-government sources to cover remaining equipment needs, including the possibility of using loaned equipment from industry.

HON. J. STORIE: The Winnipeg South Vocational Centre was set up in a kind of unique way, and it was always anticipated that the board, which is a separate board, would be soliciting, trying to attract funds from other sources, industry and private sector, other institutions, to be offered in a cost recovery kind of way, as well as obviously support in terms of provision of equipment materials.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Have they been successful?

HON. J. STORIE: I can't honestly say that I've even toured the facility yet, but that's an oversight that I intend to correct in due course, recognizing that there is funding from two sources currently within government. One, of course, is the regular GSE Program, which funds the high school portion or a part thereof, and funds that come from PACE, which supports the adult training that's going on there.

It's an interesting mix in terms of its conception and operation. It seems to be establishing itself. Although it isn't to capacity yet, my understanding is that it's moving in the right direction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd just like to notify the members that the time is ten o'clock for voting purposes. I assume we wish to continue.

The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: The article indicated that the Technical Centre is operated by Assiniboine South, St. Vital and Fort Garry with each allocated student spot based on their total high school enrolments. If one division finds they have fewer students, will they allow students from another division to take some of their spots?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, it's certainly possible that they would. They're operated as a separate board so, while they had their origins from those three divisions, they are a separate board and, I suppose, could make

arrangements with other divisions as they saw fit, recognizing, I presume, there's some either written or unwritten understanding that those divisions would receive priority.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Are there any new initiatives in vocational training?

HON. J. STORIE: Certainly, I think the South Winnipeg Vocational is a new initiative. There are several other new initiatives taking place in high schools in Manitoba. I referenced one somewhat earlier in the debate when I talked about the relationship which is developing between the community colleges and high schools for the provision of certificates that actually are provided in the high school as optional courses. So that is something new and creating some interest, and something specifically that the High School Review is going to address, is the question of vocational education, its appropriateness, and its future in high schools, how it might develop.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: That would be like the child care at Sturgeon Creek as an example.

I'm going to ask the Minister if there are any new initiatives in business education. I'm just going to continue on. I mean outside of what is in the annual report.

HON. J. STORIE: The only other thing, Mr. Chairperson, would be a proposal for a keyboarding program. I gather that's in the initial phases at this point. But I'm interested, just as an aside, whether the member has any comments about the program that's being offered at Sturgeon Creek, about the Child Care Program.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I haven't really heard an awful lot about it, except that I know that it's been well accepted and that they were pleased with it.

In the business ed, I just was wondering, are they expecting to have more young men in business ed now that pay equity is into place?

HON. J. STORIE: I'm very glad that the member referenced pay equity because, you know, when she was asking the question, I was formulating my response and it was going to relate very directly to pay equity. I assume that you would not find women's job ghettos to the extent you do if there, in fact, was pay equity.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: The home economics, I had one question, first of all, because I imagine, although I understand - are there both men and women now, young men and women taking home ec at high school?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, in both home ec and industrial arts.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: The one thing I notice that's missing in the home economics course, they talk about clothing, housing, design, foods and nutrition. I see that financial planning is missing. Is there any move to including that in the home ec course at high school?

HON. J. STORIE: I'm told that, in terms of curriculum, it's assumed in each of those areas.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: The reason I mention that, I find that this is one area that women are lacking when they come out of school. If they don't end up in jobs that they're dealing with budgets and if they are in the so-called women's ghetto, I was just wondering if it's possible to have a special curriculum or part of the curriculum developed for more emphasis on financial planning. I think it's especially important for young women because they very often don't get that kind of experience or expertise in the job force.

HON. J. STORIE: Two responses - No. 1, in terms of the high school and, again, it's certainly an appropriate question about the content, I think, in terms of high school review. I think the member makes a good point particularly now, that there is some more sensitivity to the needs of both males and females to receive some practical experience on family living - whatever the term is - and I think the issue of financial management would be very appropriately incorporated in a more obvious fashion into the curriculum with that area and I would like to take that under review.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I'll expect to see it in the next annual report.

HON. J. STORIE: Can you just pass me your report and I'll put that in now.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Physical education, are there any new initiatives in phys. ed.?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, the phys. ed. curriculum is going to be assessed in the coming year, next spring.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: In the annual report it indicates that there are workshop topics, including CPR. Are the students given CPR instruction? The reason I'm asking if there's been any changes to the mouth-to-mouth resuscitation since AIDS has become such a prominent topic as far as health is concerned.

HON. J. STORIE: I'm told, in terms of a health concern, there is a requirement that they use a removable mouthpiece, so it isn't . . .

MRS. G. HAMMOND: In Art, are there any new initiatives?

HON. J. STORIE: The senior high school program will be completed this year.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Heritage Languages - there is German, English, English/German bilingual, junior and senior high German, German in Hutterian schools, Hebrew, English-Hebrew bilingual, Icelandic, Polish, Yiddish, Ukrainian, Italian, Latin, Spanish, Portugese, Filipino, Chinese.

My question is: Is there one person in the department in each of these specialities who does the curriculum? Exactly how does that work?

HON. J. STORIE: I understand there are four language consultants who work with teachers and, in some cases, community representatives to develop the material.

Tuesday, 29 July, 1986

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I'm sorry, I didn't catch the first part of that.

HON. J. STORIE: There are only four consultants in the department assigned to work directly in this area, they work directly with representatives from the community, in some instances, and teaching professionals to develop the curriculum material.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: How are the Heritage Languages assessed? Who would do the assessing of the teaching of the languages and how well they're being taught?

HON. J. STORIE: I guess the question of how well is best answered by the schools and the parents. Obviously the school divisions who deliver the programs attempt to get the best qualified people they can. I think in most instances they have been able to find people with language experience within their division, in schools, to offer the programs.

In terms of evaluation, evaluation again is done by administration and I suppose that evaluation is based on (a) the curriculum and (b) the performance of the teacher.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: The Minister mentioned parents. I'm sure very often the reason some of the children are taking other languages is that the parents lost it themselves, so they're maybe not a good judge on how the student is doing in the languages.

How much time is spent on Heritage Languages? Are there 50-50 programs in Heritage Languages or is it just like the basic French?

HON. J. STORIE: There are bilingual programs in which there is 50-50; those are referenced. The other ones are anywhere from 30-40 basic programs, essentially like basic French, it would be 30-40 minutes per day.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Are any of these programs taught outside of school hours?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, as a matter of fact I met today with the Manitoba Association for the Promotion of Ancestral Languages and got a full briefing of the very many courses that are being offered in what they call supplementary schools which operate in community halls and, in some cases, before school, after school, Saturdays and Sundays. It's been fairly well accepted and seems to be creating a lot of interest in the communities.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Do they get grants or are they doing this on their own?

HON. J. STORIE: The grants that are used to support those activities come from the Department of Culture, Heritage and Recreation.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: English as a Second Language, I think if memory serves me correctly there was a report that some of the immigrant students were going into French Immersion and didn't have a handle on the English language. Am I correct and, if so, how is this being handled?

HON. J. STORIE: I understand there are very few cases where that is happening. I can only say the parents, for whatever reasons, have chosen that. I presume it's that they have some confidence that the children will be able to assume other languages. Perhaps some assumption that the English language, perhaps being the predominant one in the community, would be absorbed through the normal course of living and what they're looking at is trilingual offspring rather than bilingual.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Even if there are just a few, it must cause some sort of problem if they're taking English and if it's the 75-25 and 25 percent of your time is English, are these children being given extra support; or what's happening to them?

HON. J. STORIE: No, not to my knowledge, unless there's special support requested, the school division may in fact be offering additional support. They're not in a substantially different position from Francais students who attend school and who are learning English in that proportion of time.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Multicultural Education, are there any new initiatives in this area? How long has the Multicultural Education been offered in the schools?

HON. J. STORIE: Multiculturalism is not a course per se; it is a policy and the policy was developed and has been circulated. I don't know if it is referenced in the annual report, I assume that it is.

It's been extremely widely circulated. I have had responses from most of the school divisions, from community groups, intercultural councils, many others who have indicated support for it, I believe, including the school division of St. James which sent back a letter indicating that yes, they in fact not only supported it, but it had been in effect implementing their own policy, I believe, for some time. So that is a new initiative. Depending on whether we get consistently good responses, I presume it will be adopted as a policy and if there are some concerns we'll have to address them.

But it's at that stage right now where we are looking at the responses to the policy as they come back.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Have there been any suggestions coming out of the division for change or to better deliver the policy? Have some of the divisions come up with good ways to share with others, of dealing with the multicultural policy?

HON. J. STORIE: I think basically, although not referencing the policy, school divisions have, by example I suppose, demonstrated the importance and the ethnicity of having a multiculturalism policy. Winnipeg 1, as an example, had a pretty extensive series of activities around Multiculturalism Week. I presume that multicultural policy would not necessarily endorse that, but want to expand the activities to encompass all areas of the curriculum and expand the school year as well.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, is it the Advisory Council that is connected with Culture Heritage? Do they have any input into this - it's not a program - but into this part of the annual report?

Tuesday, 29 July, 1986

HON. J. STORIE: MIC has been consulted and asked for a response to the policy but they weren't involved directly in the development of it. That was done internally and with consultants in the department, in consultation with MIC and many, many other community groups. Within the department, I think the member knows that there is a Multiculture Education Resource Centre. There are a lot of contacts within that group as well who have expressed interest in and contributed in one way or another to the development of the policy.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I would think with such a resource as the - what is it called - the Intercultural . . . ?

HON. J. STORIE: Manitoba Intercultural Council.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: That's right - with that type of resource set up by the Minister of Culture, the department would be making good use of them.

HON. J. STORIE: I can only indicate, Mr. Chairperson, that many of the people who serve on the Intercultural Council are in fact members involved in so many of the other groups throughout the community. But they too have been involved in a sense that their opinion has been sought and their counsel taken.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, the Material Selection Process; are all the materials and books that are used Canadian content? Say if there was a good book on World History that came from the States and was American-made, would that book be used in our curriculum - and I use the States as an example meaning it could be written wherever.

HON. J. STORIE: That's another issue. I'm beginning to get a little concerned here. The member and I are thinking a lot alike in many respects. One of us is wrong.

The question of the use of Canadian material as part of the curriculum and as resource material I have raised on a number of occasions with library staff. I was approached by the Manitoba Writers Guild with raising the interest in having Manitoba-Canadian authors promoted. In reviewing - and I did review the Manitoba Textbook Bureau offerings - and was pleasantly surprised to see that we do have a pretty wide array of offerings from Canadian authors in a variety of areas and some Manitoba works represented as well. But I certainly think there is significant potential for enhancing the visibility of our own authors through the school system and perhaps providing a little more incentive for our own aspiring authors.

So, it's something I intend to pursue and ensure that where possible our talent is highlighted in the curriculum and in the resource material.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: The next one and essentially we dealt with it, there's just one area, Womens' Studies, Bias and Prejudice. It indicates that there's an Annual Career Symposium emphasizing career opportunities for women in visible minorities. They say they're specific teacher in-service programs. Do they have anything like this that students can attend to get direct input?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, I'm told that the Career Symposiums, both the one in Brandon and the one in

Winnipeg had a heavy emphasis on women in a variety of roles, etc., and that, in fact, there was a special science and technology conference for young women, which emphasized the importance of their role and their contribution to science.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: How were the women chosen to attend the conference?

HON. J. STORIE: There was no limitation. Essentially, their involvement was solicited through the counselling services in school divisions.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Was there good attendance? How many would you say would come from each division or was there one division that sent more than others? If they're going to hold any more, would there be more emphasis placed on seeing that young women get to these conferences?

HON. J. STORIE: I'm told there were approximately 500 young women involved in the Science and Technology Conference that occurred in both Winnipeg and Brandon.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Next, guidance and counselling. One of the areas that is dealt with in the annual report is the child sexual abuse prevention and the classroom teacher, and right now at the forefront, of course, is MTS looking for guidelines on whether and how safely they can protect themselves by touching children. Has the Minister or has the department been able to come up with any guidelines and if not, will they have some before school starts in September?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, as a matter of fact I met with the President and the General Secretary of MTS today to discuss that issue, along with a number of others. I just want to put on the record my concern as well in terms of that issue.

I've indicated to MTS and I think it's important that it be said, that teaching is a very personal profession and that the relationship between a student and teacher, in my opinion, is critical to success in the classroom; academic, social, emotional success. I would certainly not want the current concerns of the profession to be translated into guidelines which inhibited that relationship, that affection is a very powerful motivator and that displays of affection work to reward students and to motivate them and, certainly in the elementary grades, has been used as a motivator and a part of the art of teaching for a long time.

It would be indeed a tragedy if fear and mischief created a situation where teachers could not perform in that kind of a fashion. Rather than be prescriptive in terms of setting down a list of rules that, well this is situation 7(a), we're in a Grade 5 classroom and this is expected so I shall only pat Jane or John on the head rather than display some true affection or emotion. I think that would be the wrong way to go.

Instead, what I've suggested and obviously this will have to be discussed further, is the notion that what we need to have is a very studied approach after allegations have been made, that we're not stampeded into guilt, trial by media or trial by accusation, that in

fact due process and the presumed innocence be the established practice. There may, in fact, be a way of dealing with protecting the reputations of teachers, protecting students obviously from abuse at the same time, but it's a difficult issue and will obviously require a bit more thought.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Will they be asking teachers, when they are being certified or moving into the province from another province - are they looking into it to see if they have a criminal background or if they could be on the Child Abuse Registry for that matter? Is that sort of thing being looked at now?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes. I want to point that's quite a separate issue from the one we've just been discussing. That issue was also discussed and I've indicated I've taken a number of steps as a result of the most recent incident which has been reported. No. 1, I have written to my counterpart, the Chairman of the Council of Education Ministers for Canada, indicating that I would like the issue of developing an interprovincial protocol for dealing with the transfer of problems from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. I have met with MTS. I will be meeting with MAST and the Superintendents' Association to see if we can develop a provincial protocol to make sure that those kinds of things don't fall between the cracks, between the department's responsibilities to certify, which to this point is meant essentially that we are checking professional qualifications and not doing a reference - we are not the employer in this instance - but to make sure in fact that is done.

My greater concern is that for whatever reasons, inadvertently or intentionally, there appears to be a willingness on the part of sending jurisdictions to misinform, that in fact we are receiving, school divisions are receiving glowing accounts from people who have had previous convictions. Now, that may be in the form of a to-whom-it-may-concern letter. That isn't acceptable. That certainly is not an acceptable practice between divisions or between jurisdictions.

I think what I'm seeking and will be seeking in my meeting with my counterparts across the country is some recognition that we have to have a way of dealing with this, we have to be able to exchange information, and we have to be honest and up front. Because this is too important an issue to be on the grounds of expediency for relieving ourselves of a problem to be creating a problem in another jurisdiction.

So we'll have to deal with it on that level and perhaps come to some understanding about what we're going to do internally to make sure either the employing jurisdiction or the department does the appropriate checking.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I guess to get back to the guidelines, or no guidelines, as the Minister is indicating, this is going to be a pretty tough thing for teachers because once someone has made - and maybe in a city school area - the name may not be well known, may not get around the same way, although I doubt even that, but when you're into rural areas and a teacher has been put under suspicion of child abuse, it would be pretty hard to clear that person's name, because

if ever there's an instance where there's smoke there's fire, I think this is going to be it.

I don't know how teachers and how the department is going to deal with it, but in spite of the fact it's nice to hug a small child and to show affection, that teachers may end up having to give a pat on the head and a nice smile to avoid running into some of these things. I think it's foolish but maybe in a way to leave it up to the teachers, because I think if these things happen to them, it can destroy not only a career, but it can destroy a whole family.

Everyone is so conscious today of this and I would think the teachers really should get a fair amount of guidance from the Minister in this area because it's so important and we're seeing examples in your own mind when you read about them in the paper, you're not sure if it's true or not. You tend, if it's a child, to think it has to be. Yet, sometimes it's a mistake and it's been a mistaken charge, I'm sure of that.

I say to the Minister I really do feel this is one area he maybe should rethink because it just can be a terrible, terrible thing to happen to a teacher - certainly we know to the child; we've been all through that and we all agree on that - but I think they are in a particularly hazardous job these days with that always in the back of their minds.

I wanted to ask how many of the divisions supply or have counsellors at the elementary level?

HON. J. STORIE: Unfortunately, not that many school divisions have full-time counsellors at the elementary level. I understand it may be as few as half-a-dozen that have full-time counsellors at the elementary level.

I just wanted to comment on the member's previous remark about rethink. What I'm indicating is yes, something needs to be done to provide some security for teachers. I think rather than trying to prescribe how the relationship between the teacher and student develops, other than common sense which teachers use, is the question of how do you deal with the accusation because it is debilitating; it is professionally damaging if not fatal. You want to deal with it from that point on. In those instances where, I think it's important one's innocence should be presumed and all involved should act that way and provide as much support and continuing support as possible through that difficult episode.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes well, human nature being what it is, that's a pretty onerous and difficult task.

The next part in the annual report was the assessment. I think we pretty well dealt with assessment earlier, so I'm going to carry on. School Library Services - are there any new initiatives in that area?

HON. J. STORIE: I guess one of the changes the member referred to was the involvement of school library consultants in the curriculum area, one person assigned to curriculum branch, to ensure that coordination, I guess, between the materials and the curriculum is done adequately.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I think that's all I'll deal with as far as curriculum from the annual report.

I have the Winnipeg Labour Council Minutes from April 22, 1986 and it indicates in Note No. 4 a lengthy

letter from Maureen Hemphill regarding labour issues and labour history placed in the school curriculum. Would it be possible for the Minister to table that letter so that we would know what the Minister was telling me may be cancelled about labour issues and labour history, placed in the school curriculum.

HON. J. STORIE: Well, if there are specific questions about the government's position, I'd be more than happy to respond.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Will the Minister table the letter?

HON. J. STORIE: I haven't consulted with my colleague, but I'm indicating that if there are any questions about the government's policy, I can certainly indicate to the member right now what they would be.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: What is the policy? I guess the reason I would like to have a copy of the letter is to maybe have questions on, when it says lengthy letter from Maureen Hemphill, possibly the letter itself would lead to one or two questions. But what is the . . . ?

HON. J. STORIE: Without having seen the contents, I can give you a brief synopsis. I'm quite certain of what the letter indicated and No. 1, it's been a long-standing interest by the labour movement to ensure that the curriculum, as members have indicated, there is a need to reflect the interests of women, the interests of our multi-cultural society. There is a need to include information relevant to the labour movement and its history in Manitoba. What they are seeking is a labour education course and, to this point, the position of the government has been that yes, we are attempting to incorporate all of our history, in all of its aspects, in our social studies program, and that we want to ensure that there is a fair balance of perspectives provided through that program so that all people can feel that their interests are presented in social studies courses and in history courses and that their interests are given a fair and open review. So that's essentially what is the essence of the communications that have gone on.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: If it's possible, maybe the Minister would consider tabling the letter.

The last thing that I have to ask in this area is: has the Minister got an answer now for the question I asked about objectives and the extent the objectives are being met as far as social studies curriculum?

HON. J. STORIE: We can certainly provide a copy of the assessment review which gives the full set of objectives and an overview of the results of that particular section of the curriculum, and I can provide that to the member. I think it's a fairly thick document and going over all of it would be fairly time-consuming.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: I'd like to make a point, Mr. Chairman.

I'd like to return just very briefly to some of the statements that were made recently about teachers and their concern with regard to child abuse accusations

against them. I'd like to tell the Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, that I think it is very important that there be no specific guidelines, that one teacher out of 12,000 being accused of child abuse represents .008 percent - well then let's make it .0016 percent. I think that supports must be there for them, aid must be there for them through both the Teachers' Society and through the Department of Education. But, as a former teacher, I will, if I return to the profession, continue to hug a Grade 12 student if that child has, for example, lost their father and needs a hug at that particular time. I would like to think that all members of my profession would continue to do the same thing.

HON. J. STORIE: Hear, hear!

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: In terms of some specific questions regarding the high school review, will we be continuing to implement at the high school level new curriculum that is now in the process of being developed, even though the high school review might, it may not, but might, declare that curriculum to be invalid or inappropriate?

HON. J. STORIE: The only answer I can give is, yes; that would sort of be prejudging what the high school review might say. We're on to a process. I wouldn't expect - I said we shouldn't prejudge and then I'm prejudging - that we would have a wholesale condemnation of any part of the curriculum. What is more likely is a rearranging within the curriculum of priorities, in terms of time, accentuating one over the other, parts of the curriculum over the other. So that's the kind of expectation I have. There may be some other substantive changes in the organization of high schools, but I think that we would want to continue. The process has been established, much of the groundwork has been done and, in all likelihood, it will be required in any event, although there is the possibility I suppose that aspects of it will be suggested, or removal too.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: I would also like to return to a discussion that was given earlier by the Minister for Roblin-Russell with regard to the 00, 01 curriculum. I became very confused, because I know that Language Arts at the Grade 10 and 11 are not combined, but it is true that at the 300 level, they are in fact combined; that for the three basic units the 301 students and the 300 students are brought together and then the 300 students do two additional units separate and apart. Now this may not occur in every high school, but it is in fact occurring in some schools.

I would like the Minister to comment, if possible, on the reaction of the teachers to this, because when it was first proposed I know there was great concern on the part of teachers that the time of many of the 300 students would be wasted because the curriculum might well have to be watered down for the 301 participating students of that class.

HON. J. STORIE: There has been nothing, again formally, to me, but correspondence to the branch indicates that department heads have indicated that they are finding it acceptable and workable and things

Tuesday, 29 July, 1986

are proceeding well. So there have not been violent objections from any quarter.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, S. Ashton: The Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Does the Minister have any numbers as to how many schools actually do have 300 and 301 English students together?

HON. J. STORIE: No numbers, no, but it is fairly common.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: The Minister indicated earlier, however, the 200 and 201 and the 100 and 101 will not be combined. Is that correct?

HON. J. STORIE: The only time that wouldn't be the case would be in small schools where a school is making that decision consciously.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: In the area of physical education curriculum, can the Minister tell me if there's been any movement towards the granting of physical education credits for those young athletes who are participating in intensive athletic programs, for example, a figure skater who skates 20 hours a week? Is there any consideration being given to an opt-out provision so that the youngster does not have to take phys ed 10 and phys ed 20 in light of the physical activity that she or he is engaged in?

HON. J. STORIE: I'm not sure whether that's been considered seriously. Just an off the top of the head comment, it seems to me you would be into a situation where very quickly someone would be arguing that my 20 hours of chess are an intensive recreation sport activity, or darts. There would then become a pretty broad-ranging discussion about what merited that kind of special treatment and what didn't.

Secondly, I guess the goals of the phys ed curriculum are not simply to provide physical exercise, although that's a prime consideration. There's also the consideration of developing a lifelong interest in and knowledge of and skills in a wide range of sports, both extremely competitive and what are called life sports.

I think that those students would be missing something, although certainly you would have to recognize the pursuit of excellence, I think, is the kind of thing you're talking about. I think that is done probably in a lot of informal ways in the school system, in that recognition is given to those people who are involved in the pursuit of junior national championships and so forth, in terms of absences, in terms of special considerations in a lot of ways.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: I think it's easy to identify those almost near professional-type athletes in our high school program. I mean, a young man or woman working at a gold test level in figure skating is obviously a child who is involved in a recognizable program where there is professional coaching and teaching going on at all times and where they can be easily certified to have been participating at that kind of level.

We deal frequently with an example of a structure in which phys ed is compulsory at Grade 10 and Grade

11. They must have that half-credit course at those levels. I think it puts these young athletes at a disadvantage. It's not that they haven't participated in life skills sports; they have for nine grades at that particular point. I think that I wouldn't like it to pertain to all young people, but I think there have to be exceptions to this rule whereby the Minister could, in fact, grant a kid that credit on the basis of exceptional effort in a particular physical area.

HON. J. STORIE: I guess what we're talking about here, then, and I suppose that if a school division felt that it was important enough to deal with that concern, they could certainly offer a local course, an 05 designation. It would be similar to the credit that is granted for those who have a second language facility credit. So there may be opportunities for school divisions to explore that on their own.

I suppose, as a department, we would want to maintain that a curriculum provides a lot broader objectives than that, but there may be a way around that. Maybe that's something we could suggest if that issue is raised.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: On the comment that the Minister made earlier about pay equity hopefully leading to an elimination of women's job ghettos, I invite him to come and to meet my male secretary.

HON. J. STORIE: Oh, you're kidding; I've been looking for one for years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, I'm looking now at 4.(b)(1) in particular. The 1985 Estimates indicated a sum of \$2,271,500 but, in effect, the expenditure was some \$100,000 more. Can the Minister advise where that increase came from?

HON. J. STORIE: I'm sorry, are we back on the Estimates?

MR. C. BIRT: 4.(b)(1).

HON. J. STORIE: Apparently, secondments from school divisions are paid out of that appropriation, which accounts for the decrease.

MR. C. BIRT: Secondments?

HON. J. STORIE: Secondments of curriculum consultants, which come from the school divisions. I can give an example of one who came from the Flin Flon School Division. He was a computer consultant.

MR. C. BIRT: Well, you mean the 100,000 overage or additional expenditure was solely due to the borrowing of staff from other school divisions on secondment?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes.

MR. C. BIRT: What was the original amount budgeted, then, for secondments? Why did it go overbudget

\$100,000.00? If it did go over \$100,000, what was it they were doing? That's a heck of a lot of teachers.

HON. J. STORIE: It's not over budget. It's taken out of one appropriation, and the surplus shows up in another. So it's paid out of Operating, I should say, which is Salaries. It's budgeted in the Salaries section, but it is paid out of Operating. So you end up with a deficit in Operating and a surplus in Salaries.

MR. C. BIRT: Is the Minister referring to the Operating being line (b)(2) Other Expenditures? Because that was budgeted for \$1,392,000 and in fact you spent \$200,000 more, so that's up \$200,000; the other one was up \$100,000.00.

HON. J. STORIE: No. Are you talking about 4.(b)(1) and (2)?

MR. C. BIRT: 4.(1) and (2).

HON. J. STORIE: 4.(b)(1) is . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you talking about last year, 1985-86?

MR. C. BIRT: The Estimates for 1985-86 for (b)(1) Salaries showed \$2.27 million. You spent \$2.37 million according to the figure that's here.

In Line 2, (b)(2) Other Expenditures, it was budgeted at 1.39 and you've come in at 1.53, so it's not quite \$200,000.00.

HON. J. STORIE: The staff are confused again, because you're referencing 1985 print over 1985 actual.

MR. C. BIRT: Yes, the Estimates of last year to a final figure.

HON. J. STORIE: This is the adjusted vote. What's shown here is the adjusted vote, so the explanation I've provided you is correct.

MR. C. BIRT: In those two items, there's approximately \$300,000 spent over and above what the Estimates contained last year. What I'm trying to find out is where did the expenditure come from?

You've indicated that operating line which, if it's (b)(2), expenses are taken out of there and applied to (b)(1). It still doesn't make sense because you've overspent in both.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps if we could just leave the questions and perhaps when we next return there might be an explanation that's readily available.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's theoretically possible, yes.

HON. J. STORIE: I'm quite certain of that.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, the reason I was asking was because when we were going through one of the earlier parts of the department there was a staff transfer, I believe. It probably was out of Administration; maybe it was Communications, of some \$45,000, was the person and monies, yet there was no actual increase

in Salaries. There's a slight decrease of some \$2,000.00. Why isn't the increase reflected?

HON. J. STORIE: There is some in and some out. The one is transferred in, but . . . The one referenced earlier was from the school libraries?

MR. C. BIRT: It's either that or Communications, I'm not sure which.

HON. J. STORIE: I believe it's to that one and there were several transferred out, which accounts for the reduction. Those transfers occurred to METV.

MR. C. BIRT: Is it four positions?

HON. J. STORIE: Four positions out, one in.

MR. C. BIRT: And the four went to TV.

HON. J. STORIE: Pardon me, three went to METV; one went to transfer secretary to School for the Deaf. I don't have the appropriation number.

MR. C. BIRT: So your total of SY's then declined for that particular . . .

HON. J. STORIE: In the sub-appropriation, by four, yes.

MR. C. BIRT: Okay. Mr. Chairman, I move that we pass a couple of these subdivisions and then I could go into Native Education and I just have a few questions in there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(a)(1)—pass; 4.(a)(2)—pass; 4.(b)(1)—pass; 4.(b)(2)—pass.
4.(c)(1) - the Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, in the Estimates yesterday we went through a fairly detailed breakdown of the financial support and under two or three separate lines there was funding, some of it large, some \$2 million, some of it \$400,000 directed to Native Education. I believe you can find bits and pieces throughout the Estimates of Education dealing, in a very broad sense, of Native Education or Native support for education.

I'm wondering why isn't it all brought together in one subsection or whatever you call this because this does not seem to reflect the true sums of money that are being spent by other departments, as it relates to Native Education.

HON. J. STORIE: Most of the other references have been made to the grant system, the categorical supports, the other - I guess they're all categorical supports - provided through the Government Support to Education Program. There have been a number referenced. The Native Language Development Program, the additional support to school divisions because of loss of enrolment of status students, so those are all issues that are dealt with through the Finance and Admin. Branch. These are program-related involvements, primarily K-12.

Tuesday, 29 July, 1986

MR. C. BIRT: Maybe I can get it this way. Then is this the department that deals with all Native Education matters, even though, say, expenditures or some services may show up in other departments? This is actually the nucleus or the centre for all Native Education matters in the Department of Education.

HON. J. STORIE: K-12, yes, in the public school system, and then there are other . . .

MR. C. BIRT: Could the Minister indicate the number of staff people that are in here, please?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, the number is 14 - that's unchanged from last year.

MR. C. BIRT: And there seems to be some decrease in Other Expenditures of some 20-odd thousand. Why is that?

HON. J. STORIE: Minor reductions in a number of areas - reduced support for external events, reduced development activity in terms of travel, reduced resource acquisitions, those are the kinds of issues, a total of a \$19,000 reduction.

MR. C. BIRT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: I just have a couple of questions as well, Mr. Chairman.

What is the grant that is given to the Manitoba Association for Native Languages Incorporated?

HON. J. STORIE: The grant is \$150,000.00.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Is that a direct grant from your Other Expenditures in this particular section of this budget?

HON. J. STORIE: No, that would be in 16.(5), the PACE Division.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Can the Minister tell me if there is any curriculum development going on in this section of Native Education.

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, there is.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: How many of the staff years would be allocated to curriculum development?

HON. J. STORIE: Three.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: What is the coordination, if any, between Manitoba Association for Native Languages which is also developing curriculum and the three staff years who are developing curriculum at the Department of Education.

HON. J. STORIE: Well there is certainly liaison, but the Association for Native Languages is involved in the community, basically pre-school and adults. That is their focus.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Well they're certainly, Mr. Chairman, developing curriculum materials that I understand is being used in many of the Native schools throughout Manitoba. My concern is: is there a real sharing of curriculum materials between these two organizations?

HON. J. STORIE: I'm told that, yes, there is.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: The Manitoba Association for Native Languages, which is a relatively new organization, has a budget requirement of, this year, some \$286,000.00. At least, that's what they would have liked their budget to have been. What was the reason for the department's decision not to increase their budget allotment?

HON. J. STORIE: Essentially two reasons, I believe that some of the funding that the group was expecting from the Federal Government did not materialize, or there was in fact a reduction. We have stayed with the allocation of resources from last year, so we're providing the same level of funding. There is obviously some intention to review the activities and do an evaluation of the activities to ensure that there is justification for continuing support to that organization.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: In response to the question from the Member for Fort Garry on the \$20,000 Other Expenditures cuts, once again, the Minister showed it in the areas of professional development and resource acquisition. That is in addition, of course, to professional development and resource acquisition cuts in Curriculum Development and Implementation. I'd like to again put on the record that, of all cuts in Education, I find this one the most difficult to comprehend.

HON. J. STORIE: Well, I can only indicate that it is a very small reduction, some 5,000.00. There are two points I want to make in this area. One is that many of the services that have been offered by the Native Education Branch over a long period of time have gone directly to support the activities of Treaty Indians. It is my intention to find a way to recover, find some way to cooperate with the Federal Government in terms of the provision of services.

I think it's important that, as bands attempt to establish a school system on a reserve, the band-controlled schools, that they be supported. It's putting the province in an extremely awkward position of wanting to do that, and yet not receiving any reciprocal assistance in a lot of other areas where we haven't made requests.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: I agree with the Minister that every opportunity and methodology must be used to get the proper amounts of money out of those most responsible for Native education. However, I do think it's important that we remember that we inherit the problems that are not met by an education system. Therefore, it is imperative that, if they're not met by the level that should be meeting them, we don't also reject our opportunity to ensure that these people have the training that they require to enter into a modern society.

HON. J. STORIE: Well, the only other comment I can make is that the reductions in this branch, there have been small reductions as we try to trim our expenses, and then there has also been an equal thrust on the part of the department to provide more of its dollars directly to school divisions. If you actually track over the last few years, you'll see that a decreasing proportion of our spending has been spent internally, and an increasing proportion has been allocated to other authorities in the province who obviously feel and I feel have a very great understanding of the local needs. So it's been a process of trying to meet the needs in the local school divisions and the local bodies by trimming what we're doing.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Mr. Chairman, I think that is an interesting concept. However, as long as we are going to write curriculum at the central level, we must be prepared to do the professional development and implementation of that curriculum to ensure that the curriculum is, in fact, challenging, and that the challenges therein are recognized and supported by the teachers teaching it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(c)(1)—pass; 4.(c)(2)—pass.
Is that it? So we finished 4.(c)(1) and (2); we're on 4.(d). Okay, we will continue on 4.(d).
Committee rise.

SUPPLY - HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: Committee of Supply, please come to order. We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Health. We are now on Item 7. Hospital Program and Personal Care Home Program.
The Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to raise a few questions with the Minister under the Capital Program. With very keen interest, I note two of my communities are involved under the Capital Program. Would it be appropriate, Mr. Minister, if I raise a few questions at this stage of the game?

If Mr. Chairman doesn't rule me out of order, with reference to the Vita Hospital and to the St. Pierre Hospital, I wonder if the Minister could just sort of give an indication - the Vita Hospital, to some degree, ended up being a bit of a controversial one during the campaign itself in terms of who made what commitments somewhere along the line. I think both the present administration, as well as ourselves, made some commitments to rebuilding a hospital in Vita. I noticed under the capital projects, the Vita Hospital, it indicates hospital replacement with six multi-use beds, clinic space, and additional PCH beds.

I wonder if the Minister could maybe just indicate the time frame. When we talk about a five-year program, that's sort of a looney-gooney situation, depending a little bit on the approach of the Government of the Day when they want to proceed with it. Could the Minister give me an indication as to how he sees it happening for Vita in terms of a replacement out there?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It's not a whim of the present government. This has been approved for construction. The thing is that it took an awful lot of time, as my honourable friend knows, because the community did not go along, see eye to eye with the recommendations of the Commission. My honourable friend remembers that we met - he was part of that when we explained the situation.

I can't tell him exactly when it will be finished, when they're ready to go to tender and so on, but they're not ready yet because of all the changes they have. Apparently they didn't understand - I don't know why, because we made it quite clear what we wanted to do with the six multi-purpose beds and more personal care homes. I think we've allowed a little more than was recommended at first. When they're ready to go, I guess they'll go to tenders but I can't tell when that will be finished.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I'm not necessarily asking the Minister for a commitment as to when it will be tendered. He raises a little question in my mind when he says there seems to be some disagreement. I was under the impression that between the Health Services Commission and the board, they had reached some kind of an agreement in terms of what we call a functional program. Initially I had been a strong promoter to some degree and have raised it many times with this Minister over the course in the years I've been in Opposition, about the possibility of having a replacement there and I was promoting maybe more active beds. Finally an agreement was made between the board and the Health Services Commission. I wonder if the Minister could just be more specific? He says there's some confusion as to not agreeing on the actual functional program. I thought there had been an agreement established as to the functional program and that from here on in it would go through the necessary steps, I wonder if he could clarify that because I got the impression that there was not agreement yet and I thought that had been established.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: What I said was that there was a delay originally. It was a long time in working on the functional program. Yes, I believe that my honourable friend is right; there is an agreement now with the functional program and we're ready. Well, this is the official thing that I have asked Cabinet to receive and announce it here that approval can go to construction now.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Well, I thank the Minister for that aspect of it because I've always felt very strongly about having a health facility in that corner and raised all the concerns about people going state-side to Roseau and stuff like that. Now we are at the point where this thing is going to move and I appreciate that.

I don't want to delay these things too much longer, in terms of the Capital Programs, but I just wondered if the Minister could indicate what is happening with the St. Pierre Hospital.

I notice under page 5 - and yesterday I was listening to the Minister who indicated - and it says "replacement or major upgrading of hospital and possible additional PCH beds." I wonder if the Minister could indicate -

we have, I think, a very good hospital in St. Pierre. The building itself is a questionable thing but we have good staff there; we have good doctors and they are providing a service for a big general area. They have been working very hard in terms of developing a functional program that I think, together with the Health Services Commission, in terms of establishing something that would be agreeable both to the Health Services Commission government and provide the kind of services that are required.

I'm wondering if the - and the meeting with the members of the hospital board from time-to-time. I'm just wondering whether the Minister could indicate where it's at in view of the Health Services Commission and what we are looking at in terms of developing in that general area because I get a little confused with replacement or major upgrading. I was under the impression, talking with the hospital board, that we were looking at a replacement. When we're talking in the Capital Program here, major upgrading; I wonder if the Minister could be more precise in terms of exactly what is designated.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, it is approved and it is in the category to go to architectural planning. The functional planning is not quite finished; that's why the number isn't there. It is either replacing or renovation. That is not finalized yet; they are in the process of discussing, but it's moving up. If we can get that, as soon as we get that, they have the authorization, the approval and I have the approval to go to architectural planning. That's why the numbers are not specific in there, because that's not finished yet; that's not determined yet.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I wonder if the Minister could maybe just define that a little bit more specifically. You've indicated that it hasn't been decided whether it's upgrading or a replacement because the request, I believe, has been for replacement and the Minister is indicating well, the functional program has not quite been agreed on. I think there's a feeling out there that we're talking replacement and if the Minister's talking upgrading it gets to the point where it can go to architectural - maybe the Minister can indicate what the Health Services Commission's position is on that, whether they are the ones that are pushing for upgrading. Because I know that the board and the people in the area are anticipating in terms of replacement and if there is a major stumbling block here, in terms of replacement, or upgrading then we might be a long ways from an architectural program. I wonder if he could be more precise on that.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: What I'm trying to say about St. Pierre, that it is not finalized yet. When I'm talking about functional program, I'm talking about how many beds they'll have and so on. Then you get the architectural drawing. Now the approval has gone up to architectural drawing but it is not yet decided. It might well be that we'll need replacement or upgrading what they have now, that final decision isn't made. It might be that they're under the impression, they might be right, but I'm talking as far as I'm concerned, as far as Cabinet, as far as I can announce here today it

is not finalized yet. In fact Vita is a little different. They agreed on the number of beds but the final thing is still under review and should be ready pretty soon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River East.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Mr. Chairman, I believe before we adjourned at 5:30 p.m. the Minister left a few questions unanswered as far as the Psychiatric Unit at Concordia Hospital goes. I'd like his comments on what the long-range plans of his department are as far as providing some psychiatric services for Concordia Hospital.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: By popular request coming from this side of the House I might say, I was keeping my answers very short or not repeating the same thing over and over again because I could say a lot about Concordia and some day we will have more time.

Now as far as psychiatric, nothing is determined yet. As I say, we're looking at the whole field, and we looked at the situation. But I will say this. My honourable friend is going on the assumption that you have a hospital for every corner and serve a certain population.

The Conservatives of the Day at the time did not want to build Seven Oaks for one thing. In fact, when they came in power in '77 they froze it and they wanted to stop but it was too far gone. Even the MMA at one time went on record as being opposed to that. So the situation is we're - I'm not saying it doesn't serve at all but especially with the freedom to get your own doctors. We saw that, we have records of that that the people might leave the North End to come to St. Boniface and the people from St. Boniface might go to Grace. So it is not just that this is just the area. If people have admitting privileges, doctors have admitting privileges in all kinds of hospitals so that doesn't mean a community will not be served. We will not have every single discipline, every thing at all in every single hospital, especially in smaller hospitals. I'm not saying it's never going to come but I haven't got that long-range plan yet. We're not that far ahead.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Mr. Chairman, I know that the Minister is indicating that people from certain areas may go to other areas of the city depending on where their doctors go and the services available. The point that I'm making, Mr. Chairman, is that when an ambulance picks up a person because of an emergency call in a specific area of the city, that ambulance is required to take that patient to the closest hospital.

I'm indicating that in the area that Concordia Hospital services, there are people who take overdoses, people who need psychiatric help. If it's not available at the hospital that they're taken to, I'm indicating that those patients are the ones who are suffering as a consequence. I believe very strongly that psychiatry should be a basic part of Concordia Hospital. I think this government has to look very seriously and start to make some plans in the near future for implementation of a psychiatric unit at Concordia Hospital.

I know with the extended treatment unit that's being added to Concordia Hospital right now, the government is looking at adding two floors onto the hospital, two

floors to accommodate 60 extended treatment beds and I know that one floor at Concordia Hospital right now houses approximately 60 patients. I know with extended treatment that there is occupational therapy, physiotherapy, activity rehabilitation that has to go along with the extended treatment beds. But I believe that there is probably some room that could accommodate in those two floors a psychiatric unit. I would encourage this government to seriously look at that when they're making long-range plans as far as Concordia Hospital goes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hospital Program - the Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have a couple of points I want to bring up, both letters from the Hamiota District Health Centre. The first has to do with the tenure of health care trustees and the letter is objecting to the provision here in Section 32 of Manitoba Regulation 186/76 and I'll read the 3.2 regulation: No one may serve successive terms, the aggregate of which exceeds a six-year term.

In other words, the health district people are objecting to the limitation of two three-year terms for membership on the board and I will quote their statement that knowledgeable policy decision-making is enhanced with the length of experience of serving on the board. They are supplementing their request here by showing me that the 1985 Annual Health Conference and the 1986 Health Conference both passed resolutions in the same direction that they are in opposition to the two three-year terms as well as the Union of Manitoba Municipalities. I'm wondering what action the Minister is taking in this direction.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: You'll find different points of view on that. That is not finalized yet. The government hasn't made a change on that. Some people feel, I think, that board mentions talking about no rules at all. They can go on forever. I think that the staff and the Commission at one time was suggesting they increase it a bit.

We are getting other complaints, not necessarily in that area. Another area that it is the same people all the time. It is a self-perpetuating board. So we're looking at the situation there and, in fact, if you want to develop leaders in an area and so on, they feel that you need new blood once in awhile.

But right now, I cannot announce any change. I'm aware of that. I'm aware of the presentation. We've asked for the recommendation from the Commission and I have no change to announce at this time.

MR. G. FINDLAY: In talking with them on the telephone, what they're telling me is that it takes that first three-year term to really get comfortable with how to operate and function on the board, and then they get one term left to participate and they're out. Could the Minister give us some idea as to when there will be a decision made whether to make a change here?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I want to make it clear that I'm not saying that there definitely will be a change. There could be, and that's why I'm saying that I have

nothing to announce at this time. I mean, we're considering it. We've had recommendations of leaving it forever. We've had other people say, leave it the way it is, and other people say, well, go to nine. There's no change to announce at this time, because you can find as many people on either side of the issue.

It has some advantages and some disadvantages, and we've had some concern, not necessarily about this hospital or other hospitals, that are talking about a self-perpetuating board and the people feel that is wrong also. These people can come back after a term anyway, sit out a term and come back; just one year, not a full term, just one year.

MR. G. FINDLAY: The other concern they raised to me is a copy of a letter which was also sent to the Minister, and I will read from the letter.

"The Hamiota District Health Centre would like to draw your attention to a statement made in the Manitoba Health Organization Chairmen's Newsletter, dated January 13, 1986. The statement was made, forming health facilities, that no additional funds would be available at the present time for non-union staff." What they're referring to is: "Unionized staff will receive funding according to the union contracts. Supportive administrative staff, not being unionized, will not receive salary increases as per the statement by Mr. DeCock, the Assistant Executive Director. This action will certainly affect staff morale of non-union positions. It creates discrimination between union and non-union staffing."

I'd like to ask the Minister if he's responded to that letter, and what he said.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I think it is a touchy point. It always was that there was a differential between the two, the same as you do in the private sector and so on. If you have no union and so on, the union is bargaining for that.

I think what is being discussed at this time is there's too much of a differential now. I think that is the concern now. This year there has been the same increase, no catch-up. This is not the year for catch-up, but there has been the same increase for the non-union, I believe, that there has been for the union. But there is still a difference, and I admit that. This is something that we're looking at, and I hope we can solve that some way.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Have you responded to the Hamiota Health District in that context?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'll have to check. I remember their request, and I don't remember if the letter has gone out yet. I don't know. It might be that it hasn't. My response was it's not necessarily the only hospital that has that problem.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Will there be some changes in this situation in coming years?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: This year, the only change I see is that there will be the same increase in dollars, not percentage, but that will not close the gap, not this year. As I say, this is certainly not a year for check-up. There is some concern in the private sector; that

happens in the private sector also, in the union shop, in the non-union shop. It is felt that, you know, like anybody who is bargaining, there is no doubt that the unions are obtaining contracts and it is felt that it wouldn't be fair to automatically ride on the back of the union and not pay dues or anything like this. I'll probably bring some legislation that the medical profession has recognized the same kind of problems and they are submitting and they have a vote on it, that all the people, even if they don't want to join the union will pay certain dues, will pay the full dues. I'm talking about the MMA, I'm giving that as an example.

So this year, the only thing that we have now is money to bring in the same increase, but there is not catch-up. There is no doubt that it has fallen back over the years.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Will you be attempting to close the gap next year and the year after?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'm aware of it and I'll be discussing it with my colleagues. I don't close the gap alone and we all have to work together on that. I can't give a position before it's approved by Cabinet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a question to the Minister.

This spring, Mr. Chairman, in March 1986, Howard Pawley, the Premier, sent a letter to Mr. Sparks, RR2, Selkirk, Manitoba. It said:

"Dear Mr. Sparks: In 1981, Howard Pawley and the NDP promised to take action on reproductive health in order to assure accessibilities to programs and information. A great deal of work was required after four years of neglect and opposition to such programs by the Conservatives. Greater access to therapeutic abortions now exists in Manitoba. In fact, between 1983 and 1984, there was a 38 percent increase in the number of therapeutic abortions performed in Manitoba hospitals."

This was a letter sent by the Premier to someone in Selkirk during the election campaign.

My question is, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister. Would he give the committee the number of abortions performed in 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984 and 1985?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The abortions December 1983 was 1,715; January to December 1984 was 2,257, a 31 percent increase; January to December 1985 2,352. Now at the same time also, I haven't got them all, but just North Dakota, there has been a reduction of 1983 from 814. We were talking about over 1,000 abortions performed outside of Manitoba and just the one clinic went from 814 to 444 in the same year, from one year to the next. That's outside the province; that's in one clinic in North Dakota. The reduction in abortions from Manitoba people, — (Interjection) — I haven't got that; I just have 1983, before and after these changes were made.

The situation is this. In fact, I'm very familiar with this letter; it was in every mail box in St. Boniface last week with an article from a - I don't know the name of the magazine - in case you don't know, that same

letter that was read was also a subject of a story, of an article in - what's the name of that - Byfield Jr. is running that new magazine in Edmonton, Western Report.

The situation is this. When we talked about the policy, and I touched on this a bit this afternoon - the situation is we said, all right, we will ameliorate the facilities for abortion. There was a lot of criticism. We will not force any hospitals, we will not try to force any hospitals who are saying, no, we don't want abortions, such as St. Boniface, Misericordia and so on, but we did, and the rural area, many of them didn't want facilities for abortions at all, so we made some improvements at the Health Sciences Centre. That was one part of it that we announced in the House.

We also said that the main thing was education and programs and there we would try to respect, we talked about that last year also, the different point of view, the different religious beliefs and so on, so a new clinic was set up to do that, that's No. 1 - the Youville Clinic in St. Boniface and Serena also and there have been others who have been offering, not preaching abortion, but including abortion as an option to get rid of unwanted pregnancy. But the main thing, we've tried to, in all of them together, in all these clinics and all the advice that was given and the advertising and so on was to help people to take the proper precautions and so on, not to have the unwanted pregnancy, so that was one of the things I think changed a bit.

Also what was done, the same rule that the members on that side and the Liberals and the members on this side have said that they go along with the present law, the Canadian law. The Canadian law now is suggesting, is saying that if you have a therapeutic abortion, that under certain conditions, fine, you can have an abortion.

There are definitely more abortions in Manitoba, that's correct, more known abortions, more legal abortions. I think that there's certainly way less illegal abortions and complications and so on or people who have tried to abort themselves; but also there's no necessity to go to the States any more or to go somewhere else. So it's not creating more abortion, but giving safety and protection to people who have abortion here and not causing them to go to the States. I'm not saying nobody at all goes to the States. There's some that no matter if you had abortion on demand in clinics and so on, they would still go because that's their preference. They want to get away from their place of residence.

So I would think that the number of abortions - we haven't got all the figures; it's impossible, for they go to different places. Total abortions performed on Manitoba women is not that much on the increase, but there is no doubt that are more abortions being performed here.

Another thing, if you remember in Quebec, the government did not want abortion there. They didn't want to make it legal in these clinics and so on and the courts ruled that there was a necessity. That was a concern here also, the necessity, and they allowed the opening of these clinics and that hasn't been done here and they could not make any point. — (Interjection) — Well I'm answering the question. I'm not going to answer it the way you want; I'll answer it the way I want. You're trying to be funny and play politics. I'm going to answer the way I want. If you don't want it,

don't ask me the questions. I'm not going to let you take this anywhere else. Do you think I'm going to tell you just what you want to hear? Don't ask the questions. You use your figures then if you want. You're not going to tell me how to answer.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Ralph Cramden always gets his way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, we ask the Minister specific questions. We're trying to accommodate members opposite. The Minister should answer the question, period. That's all the information we're seeking from him. He thinks he can bully everybody he deals with, but he's not going to bully anybody on this side.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: You're trying to bully.

MR. G. MERCIER: Just answer the question.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'll answer the way I want.

MR. G. MERCIER: I'll ask you another question. How many applicants were turned down by therapeutic committees for abortions?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We have no record of that at all. Talking about the answers, I'm giving the answers. Do you think I'm just going to tell you how many and give the impression that this is just more people and more abortions. That's what you want me to say and I won't.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, how many abortions were performed after the first trimester of pregnancy?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: All I can tell you is that the guidelines that were accepted by the hospital - it's up to the hospital and the committee - that they would not perform an abortion after, normally, unless some circumstances, after 12 weeks. That's all I know; I haven't got any other record than that.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, we asked two questions, a little bit of detail, how many people were turned down, and he doesn't know. How many abortions performed after the first trimester and he doesn't know; and yet he's trying to tell us in this committee how well he carries on his responsibility as Minister of Health in this province.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Do you know?

MR. G. MERCIER: You're the Minister; you're supposed to have the information.

What has the increase in expenditure been on abortion services since 1981-82? What is the total increase in expenditures on abortion services up to and including this budget?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We haven't got this here. That will be available; we'll look for it and give you the information.

MR. G. MERCIER: Will the Minister undertake to provide me with the information that I asked with respect to the two previous questions?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Just the last one. I have no way of knowing the information and you should know that, for the other two questions.

MR. D. ORCHARD: You don't know second trimester?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: If I can. I'll get all the information I can get. We'll find out from the hospital if at all possible. I don't think they keep all these records. Whatever information, and we'll ask the same questions that you asked and we'll give it to you.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I'd like the Minister then, if he can't obtain that information, would he indicate to me why he can't obtain that information then?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Because I can get the answers of any information that the Commission has. The rest I have to rely on hospitals and I don't know all the information they have. That information is not kept at the Commission and they haven't got that information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the Minister's policy that he's established in the new hospitals which now have therapeutic abortion committees are set with a guideline from his department that only first trimester pregnancies are terminated. — (Interjection) — That isn't the policy of your department?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The policy of the medical profession. We don't dictate to the medical profession. They're the experts and that is done because of safety. The guidelines were recommended by the Chief at the Health Sciences Centre, that I gave you, and that's what you're saying was what I mentioned here, 12 weeks, unless there were some circumstances, maybe to save a life or something. Normally, the doctors would refuse and the hospital would refuse to do it after a certain time. That's up to each and every single hospital to decide.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is saying that within all of the information systems he has in MHSC and all the billing records he has in MHSC, he would not have a record of first trimester versus second trimester abortion? I would say given that physicians are recommending, from a safety standpoint, that would be a very key point of information he would have and should have. If he doesn't have and if they aren't providing it, they should be providing it. Very, very crucial information in terms of therapeutic abortion services, whether they're first or second trimester, and would he undertake to have that information provided from now on?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We don't because the Commission doesn't monitor those standards. There's a College of Physicians and Surgeons. By law, these

people have had the mandate to be responsible for the standards, for the conduct of their members and so on. That could be said not only of abortion, of a lot of other things, of who has an operation and why and so on. That is left to the medical profession and the College of Physicians and Surgeons has that responsibility, not the Commission.

MR. D. ORCHARD: The Commission, as the paymaster for that, wouldn't have any right, you're saying, in asking for the information of first versus second trimester; is that what you're telling me?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I guess in a free world you have a right to ask for anything. But would we get it? That's something else. That is not something which is the responsibility of government. The standards and the conduct of the medical profession, as you know, are the responsibility of the College of Physicians and Surgeons. It was and it has been since this right was given; it is something the politicians have given the right on, that mandate to the medical profession. That is done in every province in the same way. You'd be the first one to criticize if all of a sudden we start trying to dictate to the medical profession.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the Minister likes to confuse the question that's being posed. No one's dictating to the medical profession what decision they make. What we're asking him to do is have the MHSC collect the statistics as to what's a first trimester versus a second trimester. That's not saying and dictating policy to doctors; that's trying to determine what trimester abortions are given in.

If the information isn't available now, it should be made available. It doesn't infringe on any doctor's right or any hospital's right to grant an abortion in the circumstances that he says; they might go beyond first trimester because of the health of the woman. It doesn't dictate that at all. It simply identifies how many abortions are happening in what trimester and that's important information. It's not information which impinges on the decisions of the medical profession. It's information the department can and should have.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I have already told you I will ask the information. I'll rely on them. You asked me then if we'll insist on getting the information, and I said no. We will rely on the hospitals, the College of Physicians, and the medical profession. I told you it is a guideline. It is something where each hospital might be different. It is up to them. They're looking only at the safety; it's not a question of abortion or against abortion. It's a question of safety of the patient, and it is a decision which was taken by the medical profession and by the hospitals, not us.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I won't pursue the Minister. He has decided he doesn't want that information and for whatever reason, he won't request it. So, that's fine.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I did not say that. I said I'll try to get it.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Yes, and if you can't get it, you won't insist on getting it.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That's right.

MR. D. ORCHARD: That's right. That's exactly what I just said. If you can't get it, you aren't going to ask for it.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague dealt with union versus non-union budgetary allotments in the facilities. The Minister said this year was an equal funding of union and non-union staff. Can the Minister indicate whether it is the policy of the government to close the gap between union and non-union in the next couple of budgets that he's going to present to the House or does he intend to have union staff being paid more than non-union staff doing the identical work in non-unionized facilities and fund them at less money?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I gave my answer to that. I have nothing else to add to that.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Did you answer whether in future budgets, you're going to attempt to close the gap that you admit has widened over the last four years?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, I did.

MR. D. ORCHARD: You are going to attempt to remove it?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I answered that.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Did you say you were going to introduce budgetary measures to reduce the gap in the next two or three budgets - yes or no?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I answered that. We're not in a court of law that you're going to tell me - you or the Member for St. Norbert - that I'm got to answer yes or no. I answered that. You asked me to be brief in my answers. I answered to a member. If you're running in and out, find out from your mate in the back.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, it's a pity this Minister of Health is so sensitive about an obvious discriminatory policy his government has been part of.

During the years from '77 to 1981, the gap between union and non-union wage settlements, which had grown over the Schreyer years, was closed. It wasn't closed completely and in the last four years it has grown substantially again. It has stimulated two resolutions from the MHO, one last year, one this year again. They have urged the government to close the discriminatory gap between union and non-union wages. This government has passed equal pay legislation which this Minister told me earlier on in the implementation that if it requires more money - and he doesn't know how much - he'll simply get it from Treasury Board. That is to comply with legislation passed on equal pay.

Yet, this Minister refuses to answer whether he goes to the Treasury Board and will demand the same amount of money for non-union facilities to bring non-union wages up to and equivalent to union settlements, union wages within the province. In other words, this Minister is going to go to Treasury Board, find the money which he says is short, which isn't around, because he's going to comply with the equal pay legislation throughout the

province regardless of what cost it is. He doesn't know, but they simply go to Treasury Board.

He's going to continue to have the discrimination between union and non-union staff exist because this year's budget didn't close the gap. The same discrimination is in place and he refuses to answer whether future budgets are going to address that discrimination and that gap in wages. The non-union workers in this province are very proud of that kind of a government.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'm asked to keep my answers short, not to repeat them.

That point was made by another member from that side. I answered it. The same question was asked. I answered it and now I'm told I'll have to answer yes or no, the same as the previous question which was brought in to try to embarrass me and divide us. I've given the full answer, the full implication of it, and that is not accepted.

Now I'm told I've got to answer this again. I answered that. My friend is saying he's right. He's saying that I said if they passed legislation and I'll have the money - I said the government who is making that decision will have to pay for it.

Now you're asking me for my opinion before anything else is done in Cabinet. I've told your colleague in there that I recognized and I agreed with everything which was said was done, and I said it would be looked at. He asked me for the future, and I said I don't know, and, will you make a presentation to Cabinet? We don't answer those questions. You don't ask me what I say to Cabinet and what representations I make to Cabinet.

The example you gave, that was a decision of Cabinet. When there is a decision of Cabinet - and I made it quite clear there wasn't a decision of Cabinet - that we would do something about it.

You didn't close the gap in the Catholic schools, that you're using now, in the four years you were there. You can laugh all you want. You did exactly the same thing. You widened the gap.

MR. D. ORCHARD: You're funny Larry, you're funny.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yeah.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Now, we're into Catholic schools, Mr. Chairman, because the Minister can't answer whether his policy in the Department of Health and his government's policy is to close the gap in the discrimination between non-union and union workers in the health field. That is a policy this government either has or hasn't.

I suspect right now, with the funding this year, they have a policy to maintain the discrimination.

Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with a couple of items in terms of - the Health Sciences Centre, one of our teaching hospitals, was on a one-year probational accreditation status last year. They were reviewed either December or January of this year to determine, because when you're on a one-year probational accreditation status your review has to occur annually. You only get, as I understand it, two years on probational accreditation before your accreditation is removed. Can the Minister indicate what is the status of the review

that was done on the probational accreditation in the last several months?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We haven't been notified officially, but we understand that they get the full two years, but we haven't anything official yet.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, are there any efforts in cooperation with the Medical Faculty and the Health Sciences Centre to reinstate the Ophthalmology Program? Is there a cost that the department has estimated in terms of reopening the Ophthalmology Program?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We give the information that we tried to make it possible to have more surgery; that's one thing.

As far as the accreditation, that is the responsibility of the university. We are awaiting a presentation from them. We informed the Health Sciences Centre that we'd provide the equipment and so on needed. As I say, we're waiting for a presentation from the university.

MR. D. ORCHARD: That, I presume, is on ophthalmology per se specifically.

Mr. Chairman, it is the university's responsibility, within the Faculty of Medicine, to allocate presumably their funds in the teaching hospitals into whichever particular discipline they wish to put them into.

But I think the case will be made when the Faculty of Medicine makes their presentation that they don't have sufficient dollars to look after all programs. I think that is why we had the one-year probational accreditation status last year, because certain areas of the teaching programs were not keeping pace with the national standards set by the National Council on Accreditation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't think there's any way that the Faculty of Medicine can reinstate ophthalmology at Health Sciences Centre and through the university without additional dollars coming from the government. My question of the Minister would be: does he have an Estimate of how many dollars we are talking about for the reinstatement of ophthalmology so that we have an idea of whether it's \$500,000, \$200,000, \$1 million?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The accreditation of ophthalmology is not the same thing at all as the Health Sciences Centre. They're two distinctly different things.

No, we haven't. The costs, I can tell you this, that the University Medical School has asked a consultant to recommend what is needed to start the program all over again, reopen the faculty. So that is what we expect to get from them when the consultant has done his work.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, how quickly is that process under way? Are they intent on presenting you as Minister with their proposal by this fall, so that any funding decision that may flow from a positive response to that request for reinstatement of ophthalmology would be part and parcel of next years funding? Is that the time schedule they're working on?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I sincerely would hope so, because I'm told that the report is finished. It's just

that we haven't received notification yet. This hasn't been presented to us. I'm told the consultant also is finished, and that is the report that we haven't received.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, in general terms of construction, can the Minister indicate - the second opening, I guess it was, of Children's occurred a couple of weeks ago - when will Children's Hospital be occupied and fully operational?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: My information is that it should be completely opened within a question of weeks, except for 11 beds that the Commission and the hospital agreed shouldn't be opened yet because they haven't got the volume yet.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, has the Minister received information from the Health Sciences Centre as to how many dollars they have now spent on the renovations to make that Children's Hospital useable?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That is information that hasn't been shared with us. The Health Sciences Centre set their responsibility. I mentioned that last year; I mention it this year. This is not something that the taxpayer will have to pay. There certainly has been no approval from us. This is something that will probably be dragged through the courts for a number of years. It is something with the responsibility of the construction, when we give the approval. It is the responsibility in this case of the Health Sciences Centre, who chose the architect and the contractor and so on. That will have to be settled with them, and they haven't volunteered any information.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I find the Minister's answer that this fiasco with Children's Hospital will not cost the taxpayer any money because, from my recollection, the Health Sciences Centre is 100 percent funded by the Province of Manitoba through the Manitoba Health Services Commission. If they incur a deficit because of their construction costs, they will eventually pass that deficit on through. If they are borrowing the money at the bank and selling bonds, those bonds have to be retired through funding that we've discussed earlier on that is part and parcel of 8.(b) and the Hospital Program line, for interest in the one and for capital retirement costs in the other.

How does the Minister contend that the Health Sciences Centre - and the only circumstance under which the Health Sciences Centre would not be paying for this is if they are successful in their lawsuits and they recoup all of their additional costs, some estimates have been as high as \$2 million, and I don't know whether they're right or wrong - but how, other than having very, very successful litigation in the courts and that litigation isn't successful, how is the Health Sciences Centre not going to have those additional costs reflect on their budget and reflect on the taxpayers of Manitoba?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It is clearly understood that the responsibility of the Commission is what has been approved. If the people decide, or a hospital or an institution decides to put in gold taps, for instance, the

Commission doesn't pay for it. They have money from parking; they have money from other sources. They have paid for construction at times that wasn't approved.

This is the responsibility of the Commission. It is now, and we have no intention of approving something which is not our responsibility. We're not going to pay twice for a hospital.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I want to read to the Minister page 50 of his Health Services Commission, Construction Programming Division. "The Commission is responsible, through the Construction Programming Division, for planning and funding of a balanced program of maintenance and construction of hospitals, community clinics and personal care homes. Construction officers with qualifications in engineering, architecture, interior design, construction and financial management monitor all design and construction activities for capital projects, extraordinary and preventive maintenance and minor construction. The division effectively budgets, schedules and approves construction funding."

Mr. Chairman, that would lead a person to conclude that the MHSC has been highly involved, in terms of the financial management, construction and the monitor of all design and construction activities. Does your annual report not correctly reveal and indicate what your Construction Programming Division does?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I don't see anywhere in there that it says that we pay for the construction twice. "The Manitoba Health Services Commission is a funding agency for the construction; is one of fiscal control, in terms of both capital and operating costs. This control is exercised by a close monitoring of the project throughout planning and construction to ensure that approved space and dollar limits are not exceeded and that the appropriate patient care standards are maintained.

"The board of each health care facility has the autonomy to enter into contracts with architectural and engineering consultants of their choice and subsequently with contractors on their competitively bid construction project. The function of contract administration construction inspections are provided by these professional consultants and by hospital staff.

"Government agency involvement is quite properly limited to an overall advisory and control function on the 100 or so large and small health care construction projects under way throughout the province during any one year. The services provided to the hospital staff consultants were to be duplicated by having Manitoba Health Services Commission administer the project and inspect the construction, a vast increase in staff would be required . . ."

Now the situation has not changed. The situation is the same as it was in the days when my honourable friends were in power. The institution has the responsibility once something has to be approved by the Commission. It is the same as any construction. They say you can't go past this amount unless there is a change order or something that has to be signed. In this case that hasn't been done and the Health Sciences Centre is accepting their responsibility.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister yesterday tabled a \$742 million five-year construction program. It would be interesting to know whether the Minister, and whether the Manitoba Health Services Commission, have investigated internally the activities of the Construction Division and their role. I believe the design was approved by MHSC because that's part of the function of your Construction Programming Division.

It would be interesting to know whether the internal investigation has been done to determine whether there were any steps left undone by staff in MHSC so that in undertaking the major construction that the Minister is projecting to do over the next five years, that we don't have a similar fiasco because it doesn't really matter whether the Minister says parking is going to pay for this construction mistake at the Health Sciences Centre. If the money is going to pay for that, it could have also paid for the CAT scan two years ago, etc. etc. Money has been wasted in the Children's Hospital, there's no question about it.

What I would be extremely interested in knowing - and the Minister doesn't have to share the information with me - but if there hasn't been an internal investigation in MHSC, to see whether their role was carried out completely, there should be to make sure that the direct line of this department has not been, in any way, negligent in their duties so that it wouldn't happen again. That's what we're here for, is to make sure it doesn't happen again.

I ask the Minister if any internal investigation was done to determine, on the Commission's standpoint, and to the satisfaction of the Chairman and the Executive Director of the Commission and the Minister, as to whether there is any problem with the way that we monitor the construction and design.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It's not a question of not sharing any information. I don't mind sharing the information.

There has been no change from Day One of the Commission. The Commission does not have the architects when you say they approve the design; the general design, about the rooms and that kind of thing, but why do you think that they hire an architect for? An architect is the one that says if this can be built in this fashion or not; if there has to be some changes. That is the responsibility of the institution.

Now, the members on the this side of the House are telling us get away, let the private sector handle it. We're told that the private sector can do everything better than the public sector. Now we're getting pretty close in suggesting that we hire the architects and that we do all that work ourselves. We have the responsibility of designing the architectural design plans and also supervisor will be responsible for construction. This is one area we didn't change anything from the days of the Conservatives. We have that responsibility, yes, to the board; the boards have responsibilities.

Frankly, the only one who is trying to make a case and suggest or leave the thought there that the fiasco should be blamed on the Commission are the members on this side of the House, or some member on this side of the House, nobody else.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, you know, the Minister has a very convoluted way of reasoning when

questions are posed. Can't he see the value in knowing for certain and having the knowledge in his hip pocket that his Construction Programming Division operated effectively and properly because he's undertaking \$750 million worth of construction?

It's not a major request I'm making to him, but he want to fly off on other different tangents as if someone is trying to pin him to the wall for something. You know, if you've got a mistake, it doesn't hurt to admit it. If you haven't got a mistake and you've investigated and clearly shown you haven't, and that your process in this particular hospital was carried out without fault, without flaw, then stand up and say that's what your investigation showed. It's important to the people of Manitoba to know that it isn't going to happen again.

If the construction officers, with the qualifications that are listed in your book, your Manitoba Health Services Annual Report, unless it's a misprint, they clearly say in here they monitor all design and construction activities. Now, if that isn't exactly what they do, then fine, change the wording in here.

I'm asking the Minister whether he's satisfied, through inquiry, through discussion, through questioning, that the Construction Programming Division is operating without flaw so that we can carry on and expect confidence in a \$750 million building program; that we won't have a repeat of the Children's Hospital fiasco?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I admit that there have been problems with this. You're dealing with human beings who make mistakes. Talking about the system that we have; nobody is suing us; nobody is blaming us, because it is clearly not our responsibility and the hundreds and hundreds of construction that went by in the past; there was no problem at all. That was done well.

No, I will not guarantee that there will never be any mistakes. There is a mistake with that overpass; also with the people - we are talking about taking the private sectors as partners as much as possible. And this was something that we inherited from the Conservative Government. I'm not criticizing, we're not blaming anybody, I think it's working well. Nobody can say that nothing will ever change; that's a possibility. But if you change, you know the direction that it's going to go. You've been getting away from Crown corporations, in general, the Conservative party are saying get rid of that and give everything as much as possible to the private sector.

Now, we work on a functional program to see what has to be done for the standards and the general approval and then they go to the private sector, to the architect of their choice and also they ask for bids for construction. You pay the percentage. You pay a certain percentage of the whole construction to an architect so he can take his responsibility. Then you do the same thing to a contractor.

Are we going to pay again or are we going to do that work again? Is it a sin, are we doing anything wrong by having these people take their responsibility and relying on that, on the system that we have now of going to tenders, of having people taking the responsibility and being well paid for construction and the architecture also? That is exactly what we're doing.

Why does my honourable friend insist that he has to insinuate or try to find a way that there is something

wrong with the Commission? The Commission did not at any time pretend that it was doing anything else but what it's doing now. It never at any time took the responsibility for that. It isn't the responsibility of the Commission. The Commission and the public are saying, all right, we need this facility. This is what has to be done. This is what it will be. We approve the total cost and then that's it. It is the responsibility of the architect and the contractor to make sure that the construction is going well, to supervise everything and take the responsibility. Now are we being told that we've got to bail out the private sector if there are mistakes being made?

MR. D. ORCHARD: I don't recall making that suggestion to the Minister. I made the suggestion of him assuring himself that the Construction Programming Division was working and working well. And now he says from his seat it is, that's the question I asked him some five or ten minutes ago.

Mr. Chairman, in the Personal Care Home Program, we have got a new agreement with the pharmacy providers. Mr. Chairman, that agreement applies, as well, to the pharmacy providers to rural personal care homes and it has been, I'm not sure of the status, the Minister can inform me of the status. Are the new guidelines and the new method of providing pharmaceuticals to rural personal care homes in place and established or are those guidelines still under negotiation with the rural providers?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Any dealings that we have with that or any negotiations are done with the association. We're told that we don't talk to them and that point was made last year. We had made a decision and then I announced that yes, providing it wasn't any ideology hangup, that we wanted to get things done to improve on the standards and then also to save money. And we made that study.

I had met with some of the groups. They figured that we didn't give them a chance. I met with them again and I told them that's all I wanted. They were encouraged and we negotiated and talked with the association. The guidelines were accepted by the association, but not by every single pharmacist. I think that there could be a problem in the rural area and I've had staff to discuss it again. I think that it might cause some area in the rural area to tell us no, there is no problem. I visited some of them and they explained their system. Some of them find it a little hard and I've asked the officers of the Commission to see if they could not, what would be wrong in maybe have two different models.

It might be that the standards are too high or we're asking for too high standards in the rural area. Now, if the people are ready to accept something a little different, fine.

So I'm suggesting that we're ready to talk to them again. But right now it has been discussions and guidelines. If there is a battle or a disagreement it is with members of the association and that's officially who we talk to. But I'm ready to, at the request of anybody to see if we can have two different systems, one for the rural and one for the larger institutions.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I think there is a problem with some of the smaller rural providers and

it's based on the way - first of all, my understanding is that they've got to go up with the unit dosage, that's part of the package. Secondly, they have to establish, I had it according to the book here, a Pharmacy and Therapeutics Committee at each personal care home, with a pharmacist, medical director and director of nursing and presumably provide from time to time staff meetings and staff briefings, etc.

The difficulty, Mr. Chairman, occurs not in all pharmacies in rural Manitoba but in some, and the number of communities may not be all that great, but I've heard from several of them. The circumstance is generally this, that the pharmacist is operating his pharmacy as a single pharmacist so that any time he is away from his business undertaking some of the commitments at the personal care home, he has to close his pharmacy because he's not allowed to stay open without a registered pharmacist on premises.

That simply is impossible to a number of the smaller pharmacies and generally these same pharmacies are often serving a fairly small bed count in the personal care home in their community. I'll just go through some of these: Altona 25 beds; MacGregor 20 beds; St. Claude 18 beds; and there are a number of them under the 30 bed category throughout rural Manitoba.

Generally the communities that have the smaller personal care homes have pharmacists who are single proprietary pharmacies and meeting all of the standards including the unit dosage because the equipment for unit dosage for that specific customer far exceeds any return or any potential return he is going to get for that. I don't believe the system was working inadequately before by not having unit dosage as one area.

I do believe, as the Minister has indicated in his answer, that if there are difficulties, maybe you've got to set up a two-level system, where if you have a two-pharmacist business serving the personal care homes so that the establishment of the committee, the work in the home doesn't close the business and furthermore that the volume of business is sufficient to justify the expense to go into the unit dosage packaging system, then fine, I don't think you'll find too much objection. Because I know a lot of the pharmacists in rural Manitoba, several of them in my area, were already doing the unit dosage for the personal care homes that they serve. So this was no imposition to them. But there are a number of them that are serving the very small personal care homes that simply weren't doing that.

I would highly recommend to the Minister that he undertake, and his director of the personal care home line probably is familiar with each and every one of them that has a problem, that you do accommodate their concerns because in a rural community, we don't need impediments to the local pharmacists. Often they have enough difficulty maintaining business faced with competition from some of the major pharmaceutical chains in the larger communities and indeed the City of Winnipeg. If they were unable, through regulations which were overly protective and not necessary, because I don't think the past record showed that their delivery of service was incorrect or endangering the patients to establish a dual system so that those people can indeed continue to operate without some of the fairly onerous requirements on a small pharmacy.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the honourable member. There is no doubt that causes problems. In fact, I can add that there is not only in some of these areas a single pharmacist, but maybe a single doctor and a single nurse in the personal care home which compounds the problem. So we will do everything we can. It has been a year now. It has been successful. There has been quite a saving. The standards have been improved and maybe not necessarily two way and two rules, but the interpretation and depending on the situation could certainly - we should leave a lot of flexibility and we'll do everything we can to meet with these people to try to improve the situation as much as possible.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, dealing once again with personal care homes, I want to make sure that I understood from last year because I believe we discussed this last year. You've still got four levels of care in your personal care homes, Levels 1, 2, 3, and 4.

In terms of funding for proprietary homes, they are funded on a per diem basis, so many dollars per day per patient of a given level of care. Can the Minister provide me with what those per diems are for this year and can the Minister indicate the criterion by which those per diems are arrived at?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, there are four levels, but the payments are the same for Levels 1 and 2, and also the same for 3 and 4. The proprietary rates are based on the median of the non-proprietary personal homes.

Levels 1 and 2, the gross is \$48.55; in 3 and 4, it's \$67.25. That's per diem.

MR. D. ORCHARD: In addition to that, the home also has the \$16.40, or whatever the per diem is?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, this is gross; it's not in addition. That's taken off that.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay. The 17.05 that's presently being charged is deducted from the \$48.55 and the \$67.25.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicates that these funding levels are arrived at by choosing the median from the non-proprietary homes, so that what we have in terms of determining that is presumably - when we go to the Health Services Commission, Table 7, where you get the personal care home net MHSC payments - presumably what you have in each of the homes is a factoring of the patients in terms of Levels 1 and 2, 3 and 4, to determine what each one of them is costing, per patient, for the patients of the two levels of care that are reimbursed.

Mr. Chairman, that gets me into a series of questions. The proprietary home, and I realize that this government does not allow any new construction of proprietary home, but if a person received approval to build a proprietary home and he built a 100-bed and it was all Levels 3 and 4, he would receive \$67.25 per bed per patient day that's in there.

From that he would be responsible or she would be responsible for all of the costs incurred in providing

patient care, plus the capital retirement and interest on the building because that would be inclusive within that, would it not?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The formula is not quite as simple as that. For instance, it is a negotiated rate in this sense, that some of the lowest and some of the highest are excluded. In that rate, there is \$2.40 for the older homes, for the capital, and there is a larger sum than that in newer homes, allowing for the capital debt.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Is the Minister saying that the 67.25 is not the entire payment to those homes, that in some of the newer ones there is a higher per diem paid for capital retirement, and a lower per diem paid for some of the older homes? Is that what the Minister is indicating?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It is included in that, except in two homes, the two newer homes built around 1980. There is extra money . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: This is proprietary you're talking about?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'm just talking about proprietary. There's an extra 9.50 a day in two of the largest, newest built homes, 9.50 per day for the capital.

MR. D. ORCHARD: When we move to Table 7 in the MHSC Annual Report and we go through the various homes, we come up a range of costs per year per patient, because the assumption being when it says there's 100 beds, they're usually running at 98 percent occupancy, so you could pretty well divide by the bed count to get your yearly per-patient cost, your annual per-patient cost.

When we run through these - let me establish a couple of things with the Minister - when we establish the range of costs from \$24,460 down to a low of thereabouts - I'm going on Page 91 by my calculation a low of 5,800, which I presume is hostel care only - when we go through that range there are a number of things that will vary the per-patient cost per home. First and foremost, the level of care because hostel care is naturally going to be down at the \$7,000, \$5,000, \$8,000 range and, presumably, as you approach the top end of the range you would have more Level 3 and 4 at the higher funding level. So that's one variable within that annualized cost per patient per bed.

Can the Minister indicate to me whether these figures are inclusive of the capital costs that we just mentioned for the proprietary homes, the additional per capita for those two proprietary homes built in 1980?

Secondly, in the non-proprietary home, does that figure, the total MHSC net payment, does that also include an allowance for the interest cost and the principal payment that's to be made on that mortgage?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, it's all included in there, except in the case as I said for the total thing, it's the median of the non-proprietary homes and in the proprietary homes, the capital is included in whatever they get. That is exactly what it is. It is exactly the cost in the non-proprietary homes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Did I hear the Minister correctly a few minutes ago, indicate that the 67.25 and the 48.55, the median is arrived at by deducting some of the very lowest and some of the very highest, so that you are talking as close to average as you can get?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: As I say it's negotiated, but in arriving at the median rate, all the personal care homes, non-proprietary, that are juxtaposed to hospitals, are excluded also to make it fair.

MR. D. ORCHARD: The question that I pose to the Minister now and to the Commission staff, is given that you've got a very substantial range in terms of per bed costs on an annualized basis. For instance, just going through, and my figures may be out by \$1 or \$2, but not too much more. We've got, for instance, on Page 91 here, Winnipeg Homes, we've got the Luther Home, for instance, at 16,929; we've got Oakview Place at 17,470; we've got St. Joseph's Residence at 19,953; and St. Norbert at 19,044; and Sharon at 16,912; Tache Nursing Centre at 24,464; and I believe outside of the Kiwanis Centre for the Deaf that Tache appears to be at the top end of the range.

Now, Mr. Chairman, has the Commission taken and factored out the Levels 1 and 2 care patients from each of these homes and attempted to determine the per diem costs in each of them, for Levels 1 and 2, and then for each of them in Levels 3 and 4, so that you can find out for each home what their costs are per day, and annualized obviously, for caring for the two categories of patients, the Levels 1 and 2, the Levels 3 and 4?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That is correct. Some of the homes that were mentioned, such as, Luther, Tache and Holy Family especially, those have a high concentration of Levels 3 and 4 care. That's one of the reasons why some of them aren't taken out because the propriety nursing homes are not asked to provide that type of care. It's pretty well just the three that I mentioned, they're attached practically like a hospital to be service that we like to give.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay, Mr. Chairman, given that . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The only one that was taken out of there is Tache. The others are left in and they have a pretty high level of care also.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, this fits with a discussion we had earlier on when we introduced the Estimates.

If the numbers are broken out by the Commission to determine, between homes within the funded personal care homes, what the per diem costs are for the Levels 3 and 4 versus the Levels 1 and 2, then obviously the Commission has established a range of costs in there. I would guess that range could have a variance as high as \$6,000 per year in terms of per patient cost per year.

And, Mr. Chairman, theoretically, if you're talking Levels 3 and 4, there shouldn't be necessarily that kind of range of costs within the personal care homes

because presumably they're both meeting with Commission standards, because if they're not meeting Commission standards they simply don't get funded or they must bring their standards up to Commission.

And when I take a look at this and, of course, my look and my numbers that I break out are very rudimentary because I don't have the ability to determine at the Sharon Nursing Home, how many 1's and 2's they have versus how many 3's and 4's. Okay?

But if we were to have that breakout it would be interesting to know, from the department, from their analysis of the breakout, which shows a significant variance per patient cost per year, why that cost variance is there; and if in fact we could not achieve something similar to what I suggested earlier on, where we've got the report Manitoba and Medicare showing us some \$40 per patient day higher cost than the Canadian National average in our hospitals.

It would appear to me within the personal care homes we have a significant range to provide care to the same care-requirement patients, and I ask the Minister if that has been investigated by MHSC to determine whether some homes can reduce their cost-per-patient day and bring it more in line with the median because we're not talking apples and oranges when we compare homes dealing with Levels 3 and 4.

The only variation might be in terms of the newness of the building, where possibly a building that's only 5 years old might certainly have a higher interest and mortgage payment, and that could be factored out relatively easily.

Has the Minister made that kind of analysis, or has the department made that kind of analysis, and have they come up with any recommendations as to whether there is an area to be examined for budget savings?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It is not only the level of care. Level of care is one thing, then there's the capital cost which is not the same, you have a variance of different buildings, some were built prior to a certain date, some are a little larger than others, the rooms and so on; then there's the non-insured case, in other words, third party for instance, the Native and so on who is not covered, that's covered by the Federal Government. Also some of them have in-house pharmacy.

So if you exclude that, those four things which vary in all the homes - which could vary in all the homes - then with the maintenance and the salary and so on, it is very, very close together.

But these reviews are made, and an individual review also of the homes at Budget time.

MR. D. ORCHARD: So then, Mr. Chairman, is the Minister indicating, when he mentioned specifically that some have in-house pharmacies, prescription costs are above and beyond the 67.25 in homes that don't have in-house pharmacies, is that correct?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, it is the same as the non-insured parties also and non-insured group, also that is over and above.

MR. D. ORCHARD: So, Mr. Chairman, what the Minister is indicating that when that analysis is done that there isn't a great deal of difference between the homes in

terms of how they are able to provide, so that one would be, in effect, misled when you take a look at Tache as a very expensive home, and some of the others that are median, around \$18,000, \$19,000.00.

Then can the Minister indicate what are the factors that make Tache, for instance, one of the highest priced? Is it the in-house pharmacy? Is it a newer building with higher capital costs, etc.?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I think you have to remember what Tache Hospital was even before the event of the insuring of the personal care home. It is very, very close to a hospital. They have their own pharmacy there. It's a very, very high level of care. That is one of the complaints of people in the area because it is very hard to get there because they come from all over the place. They seem to have the facilities that take care of sicker people, people that need the care.

They have their own physiotherapist in some of these programs. It's very close to a hospital in many ways. So that is the case there also and that's the only one of the top ones that is removed when they do the median, there's some of the bottom ones, but that's the top one.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I understand, Mr. Chairman, that the non-proprietary homes this year are being provided - I don't know whether it's been done already - but they're being provided certainly with their global budget, but they're also being provided with a line-by-line budget as well.

Mr. Chairman, when you're going through the line-by-line budget, do you find variations, for instance, in food services and the cost of food services between homes, and the costs of providing laundry services between homes when you've reduced it down to the line-by-line?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It is fairly close because there are guidelines for the kitchen and the food also. So I'm told that it's very close.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, a number of the homes are using a contracted out food service and that is primarily in the City of Winnipeg. Can the Minister indicate whether the line-by-line in those homes using contracted-out food services, is there a significant variance from homes with in-house food services and, if there is a difference, which way is the difference? Is it more economic?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The best information that I can give, yes, in most instances, it is slightly higher when they're not contracting out and the main reason seemed to be in the volume purchase that these people have who might have more than one personal care home or other areas that they serve that they're catering to. My question was, could we look at that like we said we would with the drugs also and the problem there would be that we would have to go into warehousing and so on; but that's the information I have. Yes, it is slightly, in most cases, in general, an average.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, that seems to be the information that I have received from talking to

administrators in some of the personal care homes. I haven't talked to them all, naturally. There's just simply too many of them. They find that where they have contracted out certain services that they are confident that they are maintaining, No. 1., a quality service - and there's no question about that because the service is monitored. It has to meet your standards or else it simply isn't approved.

They believe that they are achieving some, in their estimation, significant savings through the option of contracting out. Earlier this afternoon the Minister said, "Give me some ideas on where we can save dollars within the health care system." I believe - and that's why I posed the question to the Minister some time ago about whether contracting out was an option that was available, and the Minister indicated it wasn't an option that was available and got into some of the reasons why, which I don't think are necessarily valid reasons.

I believe that when we are asking administrators of personal care homes to comply with a budget increase, I believe this year of 3 percent in terms of their budgetary increase, and we're asking them to attempt to run their facilities with the same level of care, the same quality of care with that sort of money available to them, with that sort of a dollar increase, that you can't at the same time tie their hands from potential savings that they can demonstrate they can achieve through contracting out of some of the services that they use in their homes, services such as the food service, services such as the laundry service, services such as possibly even the cleaning and maintenance of the building.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated in his answer to me in question period that was not an option and, indeed, I believe is a direct about to the administrator saying that they shall not enter into any contracting out arrangement.

I think the government is wrong in not allowing that. I believe that is an option that should be available. There have been instances, and my colleague isn't here from the Interlake, but I think one of his hospitals in the Interlake got into a lot of trouble with the Commission because they contracted out. They were denied the opportunity to contract out; they ended up in a double costly fiasco.

Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister gets hung up sometimes accusing me of being philosophical and having a philosophical bias to my approach to certain things. I think this government, this Minister, with that directive are demonstrating a philosophical bias, because where, for instance, food service - if it was contracted out as an option - would naturally lead, in a unionized facility, to staff layoffs in the kitchen. The jobs would be equally created or nearly equally created elsewhere with the firm that was providing the contracting. It may even be the same people. Who knows? It could well be the very same people who were working in the facility. I don't believe there would be a great deal of difference in the jobs; but the government, philosophically, is not wanting to see that happen, and if there's a different reason - I don't know what it would be - because standards have to be met, if standards for food service aren't met, then the money doesn't flow.

(Mr. Deputy Chairman, C. Baker, in the Chair.)

There are penalties; there are directives; there are all sorts of things that can happen and from time to time do happen, I believe, from your Director of the Personal Care Homes. If the Minister's truly looking for ways to save dollars in the health care system, I think he's got to reverse that directive and leave that as an option, a demonstratable option that can be investigated by the administrators and the boards of the personal care homes. I think he'll find that there can be dollars saved without the jeopardization of patient care, quality and standards; but it's an option that's closed from, I believe, a purely philosophical bias that it might mean to an NDP Government loss of unionized jobs within the health care facilities.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I can't argue too much with the assessment made by my honourable friend. I think he's very close.

There is no doubt that in certain areas there is a difference of opinion. That's why you have the different parties and in many things we could work together in some areas for some reason, sincerely on both sides, but there's no agreement.

I did say at the time that this was not an option because of the directive and that's correct; but I also said that, with the overall change we're going to do, I'm going to present a lot of things to Cabinet and there's nothing that won't be looked at. I'm not saying there are going to be changes, but it will be presented with the facts and so on. But right now the situation is pretty well like it was stated by my honourable friend.

The difference is this, that this government feels that this would make things much more difficult in the labour relations. There's no doubt that certain things that we will do, and my honourable friend mentioned that earlier, will be more costly. When this new legislation goes in, as I said, I'll have to get the money to pay these people and that is a decision to be made. That is going to add to the cost of health care and this is pretty well the same thing.

(Mr. Chairman, C. Santos, in the Chair.)

The savings are there. It could be the same people; they might cut some. It could be that at times they might even be paid more, in certain instances. In most instances, they probably will be paid less, but also there will be more split shifts and those kinds of things, with the things that labour - I'm just stating now probably the difference between the two parties, the things that have been gained by labour over a certain time, that this party and this government feel has been fair and that we should provide.

There is no doubt that the cost is very important, and you could push this to being ridicule and say, let's go back to cheap labour, to slavery, and I'm not suggesting for a minute that the other side are suggesting that; but I'm saying how far we can go in a direction. This government feels there has to be certain protection for the workers also, for those people in society and that is the reason it's being done. In fact, we're not too sure that it would be. It could be cheaper in a special instance, in a special home; but overall it might be something that we'll have a lot of trouble with labour and it could be that in another area it could add to the price.

But I can't argue very much with the way it was explained by my honourable friend. This is a situation, this is an area, certainly as of today that there is a disagreement between the two parties for different reasons. I believe that both parties are sincere in this and it could be that this is adding to the cost - well, it not could be, it is.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, when the Minister is presenting a number of options to his Cabinet, presumably based on his Review Commission, presumably based on a number of other pieces of information he has, I don't believe that if we have the goal of providing best care for the dollars we're spending, that you can leave any stone unturned.

I don't ascribe to the philosophy that if you turn a service over to the private sector that all of a sudden the employees are going to be trodden upon, etc.

In this day and age with the labour laws there are in Manitoba, if a food services company that was providing contractual service to personal care homes treated their employees badly by reducing their wages, etc., I think there is a chap by the name of Bernie Christophe who would be pretty successful in organizing that private sector firm very, very quickly. I don't believe there is that kind of a danger there.

What I do believe is that, in terms of providing a progress in where we have come from and where we are right now in terms of wages, in terms of benefit packages, etc., that when you're looking at the health care system, you find that those represent 80 percent of your costs. If you're going to come to any method of cost control within the health care system and you're going to be effective at it, you're going to have to look at labour costs because they are the biggest single component.

It may well be that one of the options this Minister is going to have to present to his Cabinet is that we can no longer afford the kind of settlements we've got in the past and maybe, as has been mentioned in a number of the other committees outside the House where we're comparing, for instance, Manfor and whatnot, where we have unions settling for reduced salaries simply to preserve their jobs.

In the health care field when we've got a major amount of our costs tied up in labour and where we've got the competing forces on our taxpayers of ever-rising taxes, budgetary constraints on governments at all levels because of the deficits and taxpayers who simply can't bear to pay any more. There is a great deal of resistance out there and I think you just have to take a look at what's happened in the last several budgets you've increased - well not the last two because you did it the first two or three - you increased liquor taxes and you find your revenues in the Liquor Control Commission leveling off and not growing with tax increases because you reach a point of deminishing return on taxation, and that's where we're at in society today.

I don't believe for a minute that you would have anybody unduly treated by the private sector. I don't believe that is a problem. Because I think the Minister in presenting some of the solutions to his budget problems over the next year or so, you're going to be looking at many of the same things that I'm talking

about in terms of labour costs, wage rates, hours of work, etc., and all its facilities and that's going to be directly with labour. So that makes, as I've said before, his job in presenting that to his Cabinet very, very difficult.

But he's not there as Minister of Health and this government is not elected simply to protect unionized workers or even non-unionized workers. Our responsibility in this House is to the people we serve and the majority of them are taxpayers. I believe the Minister is going to have to look at that in a serious fashion and I hope his colleagues, when he's presenting those range of options to him in Cabinet realize the kind of difficulty we're going to have in maintaining our health services in our hospitals and our personal care home beds, given the present set of circumstances as identified in Manitoba in Medicare in our hospitals, as I believe could be identified similarly in our personal care homes.

We're talking a major portion of it being labour. There are opportunities to save labour and by contracting out, save costs and that can be in a number of areas that aren't directly related to the day-by-day care of the patients. I'm not suggesting contracting out the nursing services and the support services to the nurses. I don't think that's a viable option. But certainly it is viable in my estimation in food services, very viable in laundry services, I think maybe even very viable in the maintenance and the day-to-day cleaning of the building, the janitorial services, if you will; and those don't affect patient care. Your standards are still there that the homes have to abide by if they contract out. The people who undertake to contract that service understand it.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge the Minister to seriously look at that in terms of the range of options he's considering and I urge him to, in the very near future, reopen to the administrators and to the boards of the personal care homes the option, the option of presenting to the Commission, contracting out of food services and other areas that I've mentioned tonight. I think it would end up helping those facilities stay within budget and saving this Minister dollars in his overall budget.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to try to keep my answer from getting too long because we could get in quite a debate. I'm not suggesting for a minute that this shouldn't be debated here, but I think the member realizes we're not trying to pass the buck, that those kind of decisions are made there as a Department of Labour and a Minister of Labour and certain policies like that are made not just in the Department of Health. I'm not saying that they're not right. I'm just saying that it is not a discussion that can be discussed here, but I think it has more value when we discuss the labour-management policy.

But I stated, to give us some idea, and as I said, this will be placed in front of my colleagues. There is no doubt that they will have to make a decision. We will have to make a decision collectively. We want to treat the people at the bottom of the ladder, at least give them some protection. Now it is easy when you're doing something when the money is coming in, and in the service area it isn't.

But I want to say to my friend, if we look at that, is he going to look also at the nurses and those other

groups? Or automatically are we going to try to attack a government and say, well, the nurses said there are not enough nurses. This afternoon we were told there weren't enough interns, just by reading the paper, and that was the gospel truth, and that was it. We were told that there weren't enough residents in the area, in the hospital, in certain areas, and that might be right. But are we ready to look at that also?

Then we're talking about the times that you have to save, it's on staff. There is no doubt about it. The hospital has 70 or 80 percent in salary, but then you also have the situation with the doctors. Are you ready to look to see if we should do it maybe like B.C. and say we've got to limit the doctors? Are we ready to look at that? Not only the saving of the fees from the doctors but also the saving of the beds, and that's where the big savings are.

You stated a while ago, and I believe you were sincere, but did you really realize what you said? Are you ready to tell your friend, who was worried a bit about the policy on the hospitals that, because we're looking at standards you said in cost and care of patients, are we ready to maybe tell him? I'm not saying those things are all decided. I said we'd have to look at that, the same as I'm ready to present those views or the savings that could be made in changing policy, but are we ready, and are you ready to tell your friend, yes, it is for the welfare because we can't afford it; we will have to close some of your hospitals.

That's a tough decision isn't it? It is a political decision. I don't think you'll argue with me too much that this is absolutely needed for the care of the patient; it is something up. That doesn't mean it's bad but it is adding to the cost of the health care. It is maybe making a certain contribution to the people in that area to help them in other ways and those I'll have to look at.

If we're ready to look at your suggestion, I think you should be ready to look at those things because they're adding cost and they're not necessarily bringing anything better; in fact, at times, the care is not as good; the standards are not as good. So we will look at all that.

That's what I was saying when the decisions will be tough. There's two ways. We can argue on things. Let's say we say, no, that's a question of policy, that's what we think should be done, and you don't think it is. There is no doubt we're going to have these arguments. I think that's fair. It's when we argue on everything, on things that we know, like on the Brandon thing. I'm not too sure that, in many ways, you don't agree with me. That is pretty tempting out there. That might be a seat we can win and there could be the same thing on this side also.

I say we go all the way. We argue on the things we feel are right, because we won't agree on everything. We have different policies but there's a lot of them - there's no doubt - we're all coming from the same society, we're not that much different. There's a lot of things we should agree on, that we shouldn't automatically have to disagree, or if one party or one government is in trouble that, fine, we add on, we add fuel to it, when we know that's wrong.

Yes, I think there shouldn't be any sacred cows. That doesn't mean everything will be changed, that the only way we're going to decide is going to be by the cost.

I think that is a factor, but I don't think it is the only factor. As I said to make a point, to exaggerate, we're not going to reinstate slavery. It would be a hell of a lot cheaper. Those are some of the things we have to look at, so it might be that both sides will have to take another look and look at the situation. It might be that they, after thinking, don't want to change. I think we feel that has to be a protection for the worker, and especially at the bottom.

You know, my friend said no, we're not going to contract out nursing. We don't think it can be done. The workers, they're the people who need the most protection also. They're the people who have to go or they might lose their jobs and all that. Why not? It could be - I'm not suggesting it could be - that maybe we should contract nursing. They have a private organization that gives this service. They have the Victorian Order of Nurses and so on. I'm not suggesting it; I'm saying that's a possibility.

It would be the same thing in many ways. There's certain things that will not change because that will cost money. There's no doubt about that, but in certain areas - and that's why you often hear me say I have no political hang-up on that, on certain instances like when I was talking about the pharmacist, I wanted to increase the standards and increase the savings and we've done that. They're still in there. We had talked to them before but nobody was paying attention. The same thing as when we brought in Autopac a few years ago; the insurance company had been warned and warned and warned to clean up the act, and they did.

I'm getting away from the subject, but I think my honourable friend knows I'm ready to at least make these presentations to my colleagues in all the difficult decisions we make. I think you have to make sure, also, that you can do the same thing in your areas; for instance, when we're pensioning people off, administrators and so on who have been here for years, what is being allowed and so on. That has to be reviewed also.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, just on that last note by the Minister. I think he was part of the Opposition when we were in government and Flyer Industries was the topic. We considered divestiture of Flyer Industries at that time as the best long-run economic move for the province. That was decried and stalled and fought by his party, that has now divested the province of it, the only difference being that we put another \$65 million of taxpayer money in.

We're not the ones who resist changes quite often that are for the benefit of a taxpayer. — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm just pointing out to the Minister when we made suggestions of change in government that would have been good for the taxpayers, for purely political reasons his party resisted them and then turned around and did them four years later - Flyer Industries being the example.

If this Minister wants to work and . . .

A MEMBER: What about CFI . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: Sure, sure. We can argue all of those things. All I'm making to the Minister is the point that he better not paint different sides. I've made

suggestions to you tonight that I think will be good suggestions for you to carry on. You've added some new dimensions to it. We'll talk about those next year when we get into Estimates. If the Minister has got some proposals to make at that time, we'll talk about them. We've been willing to look at the tough decisions in government and we always have been, and you've finally come to the stage in some of your Crown corporations to looking at it.

Mr. Chairman, I've got just a couple of quick questions on personal care homes. On Page 39 of the annual report, you mentioned therapy services in the personal care homes are provided by Community Therapy Services of Manitoba. Where is the money for Community Therapy Services found within the Manitoba Health Services Commission line and how many dollars is that Community Therapy Services of Manitoba costing us?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, the total in Community Therapy Services for the '86-87 vote would be 1,936,000.00. Now there are some that have their own also; some like Tache have their own and other areas have their own.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Where's it paid; under the Medical Program?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It's paid under Personal Care Homes. It is people on salary in the institutions, through this non-profit organization.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I presume the Community Therapy Services Program is delivered by salaried MGEA employees presumably on staff, or is this contracted out?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It has been the Victorian Order of Nurses. It is a non-profit organization that is in some areas. Some have their own and are paid as staff.

MR. D. ORCHARD: The other area that seems to be fitting very well with the Personal Care Home Program is actually two areas. First of all, it's the Adult Day Care Program; and the Respite Care Program. Can the Minister indicate whether more personal care homes are dedicating beds to the Respite Care Program this year and, secondly, in terms of the Adult Day Care Program, do the plans - we've got a number of facilities that are in the planning stages right now in terms of personal care homes, both replacement and new. Is it the policy now to include facility for adult day care in all new facilities being built now?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: These programs are changing somewhat. We will not build just a free-standing personal care home without trying to get the services such as day care for the elderly and so on, and some of the services that they can give the community around also to help keep people out of the institutions. We explored the possibility of Meals on Wheels and so on from these institutions if at all possible. This is definitely one of the areas.

The Respite Care also is improving all the time and, in fact, it's changing. There are some areas that are

trying, and that has been working well. There's been certain beds that are not just for people going in on holidays, what we know as Respite Care, but an area where the same bed will take care of two or three patients and so on. You know, I think I mentioned that before.

So yes, those programs are working well. I think they're the programs of the future and the programs that we need to keep people out of institutions as much as possible.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I know that program works quite well in Morden at Tabor Home. It was an area that we discussed back in 1980 with them when I had Bud Sherman, who was then Minister of Health out there and I think that's been an excellent addition to the community. It complements, if you will, the Continuing Care Program. It complements a number of other programs, and I think has a very cost-effective delivery mode.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think one of my colleagues has just a couple of questions, and then we can move right along.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Portage.

MR. E. CONNERY: In the Portage area, the Minister I'm sure is familiar with the Holiday Retreat in Portage. Is there anything happening in the way of new construction? I know the Hospital Board has already built Regency House. Are there plans to get rid of that Holiday Retreat? It's a terrible blight. I see there's something in the Estimates for Portage. What area are they looking at in Portage when your extra supplements were put out?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That is a project that should be tendered this year. There will be the existing sub-standard exactly, provide a home with a new 60-bed personal care home run by the Hospital Board.

MR. E. CONNERY: When will that be completed?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I can't tell you that, but we've agreed and so on to go ahead with tenders as soon as possible. It could be a year-and-a-half or so, but they have approval to go for tender this year.

MR. E. CONNERY: Will the Holiday Retreat building be demolished then?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Let me say this, that it will no longer be a personal care home. Now it's private property. I don't know what will be done.

MR. E. CONNERY: I want to thank the Minister for that. It's been a blight in Portage's history for quite awhile. I've had complaints, and I've got a letter on my desk right now, people who have gone to it and just can't believe that people would be living in those conditions. So, I thank him for that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are we ready to pass these two items?

Hospital Program—pass; Personal Care Home Program—pass.

Resolution No. 88: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,061,202,300 for Health, Manitoba Health Services Commission, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1987.

The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, just before we pass the Health Services Commission, could the Minister undertake to provide, as I understand from the discussion this afternoon within the Hospital Program and the Personal Care Home Program lines, there is a portion of those dollar figures that are going to pay the interest costs on facility mortgages. Can that be broken out and provided at a later date?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 88: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,061,202,300 for Health, Manitoba Health Services Commission, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1987—pass.

Item No. 8., Expenditures Related to Capital - Manitoba Health Services Commission, (a) Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That's the information that you want here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pass?

The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, my understanding from this afternoon when we went through and attempted to correlate the announcement on the building program where the funds are available, it was my understanding that there is no capital authority required for the capital costs of hospitals and personal care homes; that they are financed by the boards through banks, through bond issues, through municipal bonds, etc.

The only thing that applies here in the \$29.58 million or, more appropriately, the \$27.8 million, a portion of that will end up back in the Hospital and Medical line when we account for it in the annual report as a contribution towards capital retirement from here; that actually none of the capital grants, \$27.8 million per se, end up funding any of the capital projects that were announced. Okay.

But, as well in the Hospital Program and the Personal Care Home Program within that \$800 million roughly, there is a portion in each of those lines which is covering the mortgage interest costs of those facilities. That's what I'd like broken out in there so I can get an idea of what portion of the total Hospital and Personal Care Home Program lines is of interest.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 8.(a) Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets—pass; 8.(b) Capital Grants—pass.

Resolution No. 89: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$29,584,500 for Health, Expenditures Related to Capital - Manitoba Health Services Commission, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1987—pass.

We are going back to budget Item No. 1.(a), relating to the Minister's Salary.

The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I note there was no great enthusiasm to pass this one on the other side, so I feel compelled to say a few words.

Mr. Chairman, we have taken not as much time as last year to discuss the Estimates, and there's no question that we could have spent probably considerable more time on the items we covered in the last two days to further search out problem areas and to identify problem areas. We got into a number of what I consider to be the key areas, areas that I think the Minister has to be looking at and has to be addressing over the next year.

I think it's fair to say, Mr. Chairman, and I'll say it, that the Minister had previously done some groundwork in terms of the Health Services Review Committee in which we now have a report which indicates certain directions that may well be taken to improve and to remedy some of the anomalies in our health care system.

I have to tell the Minister that, in reading that - and I never dwell on it when we were in the Estimates - I think there was maybe more forthright suggestions discussed around those Committee tables than actually ended up in the reports. I think that the Minister has some ideas that are good, out of that Health Services Review Commission, that can be useful in their application. I don't think there is any question that it confirmed the trend, I think, that's been recognized by at least the last two governments, in terms of providing non-institutional services as much as possible.

I think that as I went through the Manitoba Health Services Review Commission in detail, in preparation for the Estimates, there were a number of programs, in terms of services to seniors, in particular, that were brought in under Bud Sherman's stewardship of the Department of Health and respite care, I believe, was one of them. There were a number of initiatives in terms of support services in the community to our seniors that were brought in and enhanced over the last couple of years. I believe they proved to be a cost-effective way of delivering services to the seniors. There's no question there are a number of other like areas in the Hospital line that can be expanded upon over the next number of years - not for admission surgery, all of those areas are areas that any government, this government included, is going to move on.

I think that the Minister, in presenting this series of Estimates, has not yet come to grips with the challenges in front of him. I think the next set of Estimates are going to be the ones where we will enjoy a very full and free debate on the direction that he is going to be proposing because, by then, as the Minister has indicated a number of times during the course of these Estimates, he is going to be presenting his Cabinet with a number of options and alternatives. That's going to make for interesting Estimate perusal this time next year, I believe, because the Minister has got no choice in it; he's got to proceed with some of these.

This government was elected; it's got a four-year mandate in front of it; the Minister himself has identified, on a number of occasions over the last year-and-a-half to two years, the problems that we face in terms of funding, and that funding is just maintaining the

present program. So that this Minister is going to be making some probably quite controversial recommendations to his Cabinet. They no doubt will get watered down as the political process requires.

I don't think there is any question that when we deal with Estimates next year, we're going to see a significant number of changes in the Department of Health and in the way the Manitoba Health Services Commission is operating. We intend to follow those developments very, very closely. We will be offering our critical analysis of those steps as the Minister proposes them. There will be some areas that we will agree with; there will be other areas that we're going to indicate to the Minister in very strong terms that we think he's chosen the wrong path, and we've done that already this year. We strongly objected to the cut of the home ec. services and we have a partial resolution in process, if and when we get home ec finally moved over to Agriculture, that may well be able to offer the same kind of services to Manitobans that they did in the past. But that is not an area that we ascribe to in terms of reducing the cost in the budget.

I've identified for the Minister in this discussion of the Estimates, some targets for his research group to determine answers on. I think if those answers are found by his research group, he will at least have a viable option to present to his Cabinet in terms of methods of saving dollars in the hospitals and reducing the overall budgets to hospitals and indeed to personal care homes. Whether they choose to accept them or not is a political decision; I think we all understand that.

Mr. Chairman, there's no question that in the global analysis in the Province of Manitoba right now, we have the system grinding to a slow halt in many areas where it is not delivering the kind of services that the expectations of Manitobans have been built up to, not only expect, but in many cases demand from the health care system. As I said in my opening remarks, that is partially a function of expectations built up by this government, particularly built up in 1981 when they were elected on the promise of restoring the health care system. As I said last year in Estimates, on many occasions, and several times this year in the Estimates, that restoration did not take place. At best, in many areas, there was a maintenance of the status quo. In a number of other areas, such as elective surgery and waiting time for personal care home placement, the service provided to Manitobans decreased.

We're facing a number of challenges - and the Minister is addressing one of them, in terms of diagnostic technology, where we're going to have over, presumably the next year-and-a-half to two years, a total of five CAT scanners in the Province of Manitoba. That is something that we recognize costs money; money that's scarce and not readily available. But we certainly concur with that kind of a direction.

I want to tell the Minister that I think in the long run, there are many things in the organization of the hospitals that can save him dollars; one of them being a new and reliable CAT scanner. I have some personal experience in that with an instance fairly close to home. I have to tell the Minister that in the process of this individual going through the diagnostic process at the Health Sciences Centre, he occupied a hospital bed for upwards of five days at a time to undertake several tests. One of them involved the CAT scan and, my Lord,

the problems they were having in getting an accurate picture with that machine, No. 1, and in even having him scheduled so that they could do it was a problem. Replacement of that machine, if there was a new machine in place this winter when he was going through those tests, they could have been done in a day or two days at the most. But, by having that outdated equipment, it took several days longer and he occupied a bed at some cost to the system.

Even though the CAT scan is going to cost us dollars, I think in the long run it will straighten up and clear up and streamline the diagnostic tests in those hospitals that are going to receive them. You're going to have patients not tying up beds waiting for diagnostic tests and, when you get your diagnostic test with the CAT scan, with the new machines, it should be accurate and shouldn't have to be redone as it was in this particular individual's case.

So even though you're spending money, you're going to save money. The example that's the closest to that is, I suppose, Mayo Clinic. You go down to Mayo Clinic and within a day you have had a battery of tests done, which a number of them aren't even done in Manitoba. But they're done all within one eight-hour period of time. There is no tie-up of that facility. Those tests are scheduled and done and the patient is out of there with his diagnosis. If further intervention is need, that's scheduled within several days. They have a very efficient and streamlined operation down there. It's also, no doubt, probably more expensive on a per patient basis than any hospital we have in Winnipeg. I don't know that, but I think it probably is.

What I'm talking about is undertaking the diagnostic tests that we're doing right now and getting them done within that eight-hour period with the equipment he's going to be putting in place. That alone, I believe, will save considerable time because the Minister himself has had many, many calls; many, many complaints reach his office about tests being cancelled, about elective surgeries being cancelled because of back-ups and block-ups at the hospitals. Those are the areas that have to be addressed. In addressing them, I don't think there's any question that there's dollars to be saved.

Mr. Chairman, we have got a number of challenges that are going to be put to the taxpayers of Manitoba, in terms of the global funding of the system. The Minister said that his directives right now from Cabinet are that they want the services maintained; they want new services added - and he gets many of those requests from us as well - but he can't increase the deficit, he can't bring in user fees, he can't bring in premiums because those are not part of the policy decisions that the government's going to make.

I think when the Minister comes back next year we may well find that some of those options are being explored in a more reasoned and thoughtful manner and maybe we might see, for instance, less use of emergency wards in hospitals by some sort of a registration fee. Not a user fee but some sort of a registration fee, the objective being to reduce the workloads of the Emergencies in hospitals. Those are options that this government is going to have to take a look at. They may not decide to go with them; they may decide to do something entirely different.

The challenge is there and the mandate is there for this government to continue with providing change to

the system. It's been studied now for some three-and-a-half years; there's a number of documents which provide useful information and provide some pretty useful-sounding solutions to the Minister, to his department and to his government. I think now, with the beginning of a four-year mandate, that we look forward next year to when Estimates come down, to seeing some of the innovation that this Minister is talking about in next year's Estimates that we can debate. This year's Estimates were basically an extension of last year's debate. There were very few dramatic changes being proposed this year.

In the process, Mr. Chairman, if I can offer a last piece of advice to the Minister. Within his department he has a number of very good people that can provide him with the kind of information he needs to make those decisions. As well, I have found in my discussions with Manitobans involved in the health care system that there is one heck of a wealth of people out there that are capable, knowledgeable, have excellent ideas and would want to share them with this government and with any government indeed. They're out there and they are a wealth of resource, a wealth of ideas, a wealth of support for the kind of changes and the kind of new direction that the health care system is needing and is going to take.

I urge the Minister in his deliberations over the next six years, not to exclude that wealth of talent out there. That wealth of talent extends from board members, to administrators, to directors of nursing, to nurses, to support staff, to people at the MHO, to people within his department. They're there, they can be utilized, and they can provide him with some excellent, excellent ideas on how this system can be tailored for the Nineties because that's what we're aiming for right now. Any changes he implements over the next year-and-a-half will have their major impact on us in the Nineties, when dollars are probably going to be even shorter than they are today.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to be too long. We've had some interesting discussions. I'm sure that during the next three to four years there'll be occasions to discuss many . . . as my honourable friend says, some areas where we will agree and other areas where we won't.

I would like to thank the committee; I think it was a good exercise. Of course, I didn't agree, nor did anyone in the committee agree with everything that was said. We had our differences. If I seemed a bit agitated earlier this evening, I want to explain the situation that we're not in the question period, and I don't think that anybody, when something is questioned, a program or something, that it is the responsibility of a person, and especially alluding to an article and a letter which only says part of it, I think it is certainly my right and my responsibility and my duty to explain the whole situation. I don't regret that at all. It is unfortunate that maybe this happened. All in all, I think it's been a good exercise.

I agree and I think we've proven that we feel we can't do it alone. We can't do it alone and I'm not again just talking about the Opposition. I think it is important. If there was a way - maybe I'm dreaming, maybe this

cannot be done. It could be done in areas where we feel that we would both win politically. I don't know. I would like to explore the way, to see if that could be done. I think it is unfortunate, and I think if it can't be done, if it isn't done, I think that politicians from both sides of the House are missing a bet, because things change. They change with different governments and so on, and we cannot have the luxury of starting all over every time there's a change of government.

There has to be certain things that are done. My friend talked about the different groups that have something to offer and that's what we've done like today, and I guess it's natural during the Estimates, they seem to be - and I suppose that if the seats were reversed, maybe the same thing would happen again. I guess it would, where we're trying to find fault with the government and so on, for instance, the Children's Hospital. I think we have to look at the situation.

I think that also for admitting and long waits and all that, we have to see; it's not just the bad government. Even the CAT scan, we were told that that will save a lot of waiting. That also cost a lot of money and that caused problems in admitting also because of the shortage of CAT scans, and because everybody wants a CAT scan no matter how many CAT scans we will have. Also there are some doctors that would admit patients to the hospitals on some pretext just to try to be in line earlier and get their CAT scan before, and that could be five or six days with one patient who has no business being there. So there's an awful lot; the challenges are scary, there is no doubt about it, what we have to meet.

I think, also, one of the things that I want to say is the expectancy. I don't know if we're doing a service. When you say - it's not necessarily rationing but we have to look - that things are getting more difficult, no doubt about it. You could replace Manitoba by anywhere in Canada. We can compare the efficiency of some of the things in the States, that is a helluva lot easier when you haven't got a universal program. Those are all factors, when you're treating with the people who can pay, it is costly; the people are coming with their bucks to Mayo and areas like this and it is easier.

That doesn't mean we can't keep on trying and that certainly doesn't mean that we should do away with the universality of this program. I think that's what makes it the best plan in the world. There's no doubt that the elite in the United States are better served than probably the majority of Manitobans but I think that the universality is very important.

So, yes, I think we have to pick up the challenge and we haven't got that much time. You know how slow governments are, I think we have to impress that things have to be done faster. Some of the legislation, if we're going to be realistic, will have to be done next year and the year after, if there's need, the legislation of the last year. We know we're not going to do too much before an election. We know that isn't done. I think we have to realize that.

I hope we can work together and, again, I'd like to thank the members of the committee and the method in general. There are certain things that I didn't agree with, but in the way that this exercise was conducted, I think we're all the richer for it.

Thank you very much.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the discussion we got into tonight and we got into a couple of other

discussions with the Minister in Health, where he objected to the way we were questioning or the way we did things. The seeking of information by members on this side of the House can't be denied, can't be thwarted and can't be changed; that's what we're here for. If the Minister has some concern about the approach, the issue; the issue was more his problem than the approach used by the member because the member did not pose anything but straightforward questions.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: He told me to answer yes or no.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, that was after a 10-minute diatribe, explanation, long-winded explanation by the Minister. That's what the problem was. The Minister would like to always end up having a discussion go his way. He's always been that way and we accept that; that's the nature of the Minister. The nature of us is we're going to get the information that we want, one way or another, and that may take longer and if we hadn't decided on our side of the House that we were going to finish Health Estimates tonight, we'd still be debating it in a number of different areas. We could have pursued the issue of abortion with the Minister a lot longer tonight. So if he has any objection as to how that happened tonight and how the discussion went tonight, don't object too long, because it could have taken an awful lot longer. I don't think you like to be here late at night talking about those kinds of things.

In terms of some of the other references the Minister made about approach on some of the departmental Estimates and some of the problems that I attempted to point out to the Minister in terms of morale in his department, once again, that had to be done.

The other thing that had to be done was posing the very precise question to the Minister about the new regionalization of Winnipeg, which was tried, which was in existence in the early Seventies and was changed by the Schreyer administration to a single region. Now, we're going back to three regions. Given the experience that we've had in the Minister of Community Services' Department with the Children's Aid Society, I think the Minister needed to know those basic pieces of information so that he could bring some cautions to his departmental staff. That could end up saving him a lot of time, a lot of trouble and save the taxpayers a lot of money by having that discussion made.

In terms of his ADM, that was information that the Minister needed to know. Whether he'd like to know it or not is another case, but that's information that he needed to know, because it's a new position. In many cases, in discussions with staff, whether they're the old boys' club that the Minister referred to or otherwise, that new ADM was sourced as part of the morale problem. The Minister may accept that as part of her duties, that's fine. That's his decision. But it's my responsibility to pose those kinds of problems to the Minister. He can do what he wishes. He can choose to ignore them, to agree with them or to solve them or to let them continue on. That's his choice as Minister, but it's my responsibility to point them out.

As I say, if we had had an earlier start to this Session, we probably wouldn't be finishing Health Estimates

tonight, because there are other areas that need further exploring. There's no question. But we're not going to resolve those problems exploring them at this stage of the game, as we approach the end of July, but we will explore them next year when this Minister comes forward with his next set of Estimates. We'll explore them from probably as detailed or more detailed an approach as we used this year. The Minister may not like some of the things that he finds out during the course of Estimates, but that's the purpose of Estimates, and that's what we're going to continue to do on this side of the House, myself and my colleagues.

We will help this Minister make the Department of Health a better department, not a worse department but a better department. We'll also help him in terms of making the Manitoba Health Services Commission and its funded agencies operate better too when we point out problem areas that are there, because sometimes a Minister gets sheltered from those kinds of problem areas. We don't intend to let that happen to this Minister, because we're here on this side of the House to make sure that the taxpayer of this province is well served. That's one of the prime responsibilities of being here, and we take it quite seriously on this side of the House.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I think my honourable friend has either misunderstood or is misrepresenting the short statement that I made. There are things that we did not mention purposely, definitely that I didn't like, and we can discuss that. I think that there are certain things, but I did not criticize the questions or the information that they wanted.

I singled out a point, and I said that I don't think it was fair for somebody to ask me questions and expect me to answer just what they want to hear or just the area that they feel might be damaging. I very strongly think that this is wrong, when the Member for St. Norbert who asked me a question, and especially - this is not during the question period. It's not a question of you're in court, and yes or no. The question is that we were exploring an idea, and I explained what the situation was done, exactly the policy of this government and my participation in that for a good reason.

Now the area, there is no doubt - and my honourable friend says, well this Minister is known for somebody who wants things to go his way. I don't know of anybody here who wouldn't like things to go their way. You're trying to get things your way. I feel that everybody in this House is sincere. You're trying to sell your point of view. I don't think there's anything wrong in that. I've never tried to dictate to the people.

I objected in this matter, because I insisted more than objected, insisted that I was going to answer the way I wanted. It was that side of the House that objected to the way I was answering the question, if you remember. So you know that, okay, was a few minutes and, if we're going to talk all night on that, I don't think that I've tried to evade any answers. I don't know all the answers. I've tried to give them. I don't think that I've - sure, there are certain things I don't like. I don't like to be here all night, and I broke every record in this House in my Estimates. So if that has to happen, it happens. If it's too hot in the kitchen, I will just have to leave, that's all. That's the situation. I don't think I will leave, but I think that's the situation.

Now, as far as the employees, I don't . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: How long do you want to be, Larry?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I don't want to be long, but I mean I think - well, you brought in the question of my Deputy Minister again. That was finished, as far as I'm concerned. I'm going to finish then by saying that the Estimates — (Interjection) — no, I don't agree with that, and we can discuss that another time. I don't agree with the way it was done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I don't agree with the way it was done either because, when I asked for the information, it wasn't presented in total. That's why it ended up being dragged out of the Minister and dragged out of the department. Tonight, when just easy questions were posed, the Minister then took a lot of time to get his point of view across because the area's sensitive to him.

You know, we got into this Monday afternoon. We got into it again this afternoon, etc., etc. It wasn't solely for our advantage that we decided these Estimates would end tonight. It was for all of us. If you wanted to continue on in Health Estimates, we could continue on in the Minister's line for days. That would serve no useful purpose.

But, Mr. Chairman, the Minister's problem is - and he does it on a consistent basis, and he knows it, is this — (Interjection) — is he helping you or is he being his normal — (Interjection) — yeah, he's quite a help to you.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister, when confronted with a circumstance that he doesn't like to answer or doesn't like the answer that he's going to have to give, ends up in either a diatribe or a bafflegab.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: What do you do? You're doing exactly the same thing.

MR. D. ORCHARD: You're absolutely right, Mr. Chairman, because I want to point out to the Minister why it happens. You see, Mr. Chairman, in this particular case, it was the Minister's fault but, of course, this Minister never does anything wrong, never has, never will and never will admit to it. That's the nature of the beast.

We accept that on this side of the House, but we don't stop questioning this Minister and we don't stop posing areas of concern and identifying problems for him. We expect him to take the legitimate concerns that we pose to him seriously and attempt to resolve them. As long as the Minister understands why we're doing it, and I'm sure he does, then we accomplish something for the taxpayers.

But you know, from time to time, we'll end up with some real good hair pulls, and they help to clear the air and get the course back down to normal, etc., etc. Tonight, I suppose, was one of them on a sensitive subject. The Minister is very enjoyable to debate with and I always like debating with this particular Minister and we will continue to debate and we will continue to discuss the issues I think are important for him to

Tuesday, 29 July, 1986

know and important to know what our position is and more important, from time to time, to indicate to him problems that he's got.

It's up to him, as I said before, to determine what he wants to do to resolve those problems when they're identified. He's the Minister; he makes the decision, and we're going to point them out to him as often as we can, whenever we can and we would be derelict in our duty if we didn't.

So, Mr. Chairman, I enjoy it with this Minister and I enjoy working with some of the problems in the Department of Health and in the Manitoba Health Services Commission and I hope that when we present the Minister with problems and with concerns and with suggestions, that he acts on some of them at least, and I think he probably will act on some of them and that will benefit, in the long run, the people we're here to serve.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're ready to pass 1.(a) Minister's Salary—pass.

Resolution No. 82: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,668,700 for Health, Administration and Finance, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1987—pass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is the pleasure of the Committee?

Committee rise.

IN SESSION

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, C. Santos: Do I hear the motion to adjourn the House?

The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance that the House do now adjourn.

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