

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 18 June, 1985.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

## OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding:** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Culture.

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

I'd like to table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Development Corporation for the year ending March 31, 1984.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table a return under Section 30.2 of The Law Society Act and another one under Section 20 of The Public Officers Act.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Prior to question period, may I direct the attention of members to the gallery where there are 81 students of Grade 7 standing from the Beliveau School under the direction of Mr. Labelle, Mrs. Leonard and Mrs. Lavergne. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister for the Environment.

There are 75 students of Grade 5 standing from the Hastings Elementary School under the direction of Mr. Bushby and the school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Riel.

There are 25 students of Grade 5 standing from the Robert Smith School under the direction of Mrs. Kulpack. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable First Minister.

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

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Manitoba Economic Conference - cost of to government

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

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

My question is for the Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. It has to do with the Manitoba Economic Conference which was held about three

weeks ago in Winnipeg. I wonder if the Minister could indicate how much the putting on of that conference cost the Government of Manitoba.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Culture.

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

I don't know the costs to the province of that conference as there was payment by registration as against the cost, but I'll get that information and provide it to the member once I have it.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I wonder if the Minister could also indicate what the organizers of the conference, Canadian Trend Report, were paid for organizing the conference on behalf of the province.

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Yes, I can get that information for the member, but also point out that the response to the conference was excellent from people within the business and industry in the Province of Manitoba, people from other parts of Canada, and indeed people outside of Manitoba who came here to look at the various opportunities that are availing themselves in the next decade of growth in the Province of Manitoba; so I might just add that the conference has been very successful, in terms of increasing the awareness of the economic development that's taking place in the Province of Manitoba.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, that raises another question. I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether or not we could be provided with a list of the registrants to the conference.

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Yes.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, were the speakers who were on the panels paid by the conference organizers or the province?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** No, none of the speakers were paid for their speaking at the conference.

### Civil Service - average salary of members

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Finance. Could he inform the House as to what the average salary of members of the Civil Service are in Manitoba?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** I don't have that exact number; I'll take it as notice.

**Bill 115 -  
MGEA analysis of**

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, a question to the Government House Leader.

I wonder if the Government House Leader could undertake to table in the House a copy of the Manitoba Government Employees Association Analysis of Bill 115 which was provided to the government outlining the bilingual staff requirements for their proposed Bill 115, providing French Language Services in the Legislature.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I believe that any information which was available was tabled and the representations made a year-and-a-half ago by the MGEA. I don't recall any further information than the detailed analysis contained in the brief at that time; but that's a year-and-a-half ago, Sir, and both that legislation and the committee hearings on that are both long since past and dead.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, the members of the government have a short memory.

I'll ask a question to the Deputy Premier. Would she undertake, on behalf of the government, to table in the Legislature a copy of the Manitoba Government Employees Association Analysis of the number of bilingual civil servants that would be required under the terms of their proposed Bill 115?

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

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, I think that question has already been responded to.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, my question is the Acting Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission, whose Estimates will likely begin tonight. I would ask the Acting Minister to undertake to provide to the committee tonight, or whenever the Estimates start, a copy of the Manitoba Government Employees Association analysis of the number of bilingual civil servants required under the government's proposed Bill 115.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Culture.

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Thank you. I believe that question has already been answered by the Government House Leader.

**Norquay Park -  
privatization of**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Natural Resources. During the examination of the Estimates of the Department of Natural Resources, the Minister indicated that there

would be a certain amount of privatization take place with respect to roadside parks.

My specific question, is the Norquay Park, situated on the Trans Canada, among those being considered to be put out to tender for a private operation?

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

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not familiar with all of the park names that have been on the list for the tender process, but I will take that question under advisement. It may be, but I'm not certain that it is.

**MR. H. ENNS:** A supplementary question to the same Minister. I appreciate the Minister may not have this information readily at hand. I would ask for him to take notice of one more particular park at Lynch's Point. But perhaps he could generally indicate to me whether or not that program is succeeding. Are a number of these properties being turned over to the private sector?

**HON. S. USKIW:** I am certain that Lynch's Point was advertised and we did get a response to that. I believe there's no agreement concluded and I'm not certain that there will be. The option is still open as to whether it becomes a private operation or remains within the public domain. I think we still have that option.

**Milk - price setting system**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. The maximum price of milk charged to consumers will be increasing some time this week, as advertised by the Milk Prices Review Commission. Will the minimum price be raising the same amount as the maximum?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I understand that the commission has been meeting with all representatives of the industry, the processors, the distributors and the retailers, in a follow-up to an undertaking last winter that they would review the entire costing structure of the production costs and will be making their decisions. Whether both will be changed, both the minimum and maximum, Mr. Speaker, I have not received any advice yet from the commission to this effect. When they make their announcement the honourable member will be aware as well.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister. Does he, as the Minister, think that the minimum price should be increased or removed?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The question seeks an opinion. Would the honourable member wish to rephrase his question to seek information?

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Will he remove the minimum

price-setting system for the consumers of milk in this province?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I can tell the honourable member that the reason that we move - I'll repeat to him again - that we had to move to re-establish controls in the milk industry was precisely for the reason that massive discounting was occurring and, in fact, the price discounting to retailers and not being passed onto consumers. In fact when the increase to producers was announced in February of 1984, the subsequent increase announced by retailers and processors far exceeded - in fact, any increases that have taken place to date, including the increase that is being proposed and is being looked at by the commission, one can clearly state that this July increase will still keep milk prices in Manitoba below those that were increased in February, 1984. That's really the bottom line, the actual price of milk to consumers in the vast majority of stores in this province.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, why won't the Minister of Agriculture give those low-income families in society, those elderly people in society on minimum incomes, why will he not give them the opportunity to have mass savings in their milk consumption, the price of the milk that they consume, as he has indicated were there? Why will he not remove the minimum price and give those low-income people and small children the opportunity to drink milk, Mr. Speaker? Why won't he take action?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I guess the best way to answer that question - if the honourable member is indicating that a 14-cent-a-litre increase in February of 1984 was giving poor people a chance to drink milk - I'll let him answer that question, because our milk prices are lower today a year-and-a-half after we imposed controls than they were in February of '84 when there were no controls.

### **Boissevain Land Titles Office - court facilities, continuation of**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please.  
The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Government Services. Can the Minister advise the House whether or not it's the government's intention to continue to provide court facilities in the old Land Titles Office in Boissevain?

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

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** The Department of Government Services has no plans at the present time to discontinue the provisions for that service from the Land Titles Building, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, were the Minister or staff in his department giving consideration to moving the facilities out of that building?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Speaker, the members of the Planning Section of the department are always looking

at the most efficient use of government facilities, and it may be that they have been discussing some of those options with the other user departments, but there has been no decision or any recommendation made from the department with regard to any changes to the current status there at the present time.

### **Highways Department - leasing of space, Boissevain**

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

**MR. B. RANSOM:** A further supplementary to the Minister, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister tell the House whether or not it's his intention to continue to lease space for the Department of Highways from the town and municipality, in the Town of Boissevain?

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

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** We have no plans at the present time to change any of the leases in Boissevain, dealing with the Department of Highways. If there is such a plan or recommendation, I have not received it from staff.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, could the Minister provide some kind of assurance to the Town of Boissevain and the Municipality of Morton that the government will not be terminating its leases or will not be off-loading its costs onto the local government with respect to changes flowing from moving the land titles facility out of town?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** I don't know. I think the member should be more specific about what he means in terms of offloading the costs of the Provincial Government on to the town. If he has some specific thoughts on how that is happening or how that might happen, I'd like to hear from him on that. I have no plans in doing that at the present time. I've received no report to that effect from the department. It is possible that they're looking at more efficient ways of utilizing space and that is something that they undertake in the general course of their duties and when recommendations come forward we'll consider them at that time.

### **Festivals, provincial parks - regulation re expenses**

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

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Natural Resources can advise the House if the Parks Branch of his department has a policy in place for the regulation of expenses incurred during rock festivals or musical festivals in provincial parks, such as the one that's planned for Birds Hill Park on the 26th and 27th of July.

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

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I believe what the member is suggesting that we get involved with respect to the question of management of those kinds of events. As the member knows the event that is being proposed by the Lions Club. We, of course, are not involved with their internal operations. There is no current policy, however, with respect to who should be eligible and under what circumstances should park use be permitted and we will be developing a policy in that regard.

At the moment, the proposal that has been advanced and has been accepted with conditions is sort of an ad hoc arrangement in the absence of a policy.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for those remarks.

I wonder can the Minister advise the House if the Parks Branch give any consideration at all when granting a permit for the use of Birds Hill Park that the annual musical festival at Boggy Creek, which is in my constituency, is held on the same three days as the one that's slated for Birds Hill Park and a lot of the experts figure that one or the other is going to lose their shirt during that weekend and likely it'll be the one at Boggy Creek. I wonder was any consideration given to the granting of the permit under those conditions?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose that's a thought that could be taken into account. It's something that has not been considered to date because of the absence of a policy. When we do develop a policy I hope that we can deal with some of those kinds of problems. Conflicting events, if you like, might be a criterion, but at this particular point in time we don't have a policy and this arrangement is purely ad hoc not having had the experience before.

### Robert Fletcher Building - renovation of

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Morris.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Speaker, I address my question to the Minister of Government Services. In introducing his Estimates for the year, he probably stated that the Robert Fletcher Building, where there had been renovations, won a Heritage Winnipeg Award in the architectural conservation category and we are very pleased with that. I know the staff in the department are very proud of winning that award for that building.

I understand the other day 50 government employees had to leave that building because of irritation of eyes, throat and nose. I would ask the Minister can he disclose what errors his department made in planning with respect to either design or material selections that caused some number of Education staff employees to leave that building?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Education.

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

Yes, I'm glad to be able to answer this because the member - I'm glad to answer it anyway — (Interjection)

— that's right. The Member for Morris was relating the problems, the health problems, to the building that was renovated. The building that was renovated, which we're very proud of, because it's an absolute first in renovating the outer shell of a building, and I'm sure it's going to win awards and act as an example for us to renovate other older buildings in the province without having to destroy them. But the building we renovated is 1180 Portage and the one we're having problems with is 1200 Portage, No. 1.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** The Department of Education has two buildings, right across the street from each other, so it's understandable, I guess, getting them mixed up - 1180 is the one that was renovated and 1200 . . .

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Especially Conservatives, they always get mixed up.

**A MEMBER:** 1181.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** 1181. Yes. The problem, Mr. Speaker, is one of air control. We've had extensive examination and we found out that there is not a bacteriological problem related to this, which was our first concern, it seems to be ventilation and air control. We've had meetings between the Department of Education, the union, the Workplace Safety and Health, Government Services, and my department, and we think we will have it settled by the end of the week.

Right now, staff are working and they're working in other accommodations.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Speaker, seeing the Minister of Education is an expert on governmental affairs matters, can she tell me what it cost to upgrade the Fletcher Building that she drew reference to?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Education.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Speaker, I can get the exact figure for the member at a later date, but I can tell him it was a lot less than it would have cost us to destroy the building and put up a new one. Since . . .

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Actually, it was a very good thing to do because a lot of work had gone into renovating the inside of the building . . .

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Speaker, the outer shell of that building was in such bad shape, the ventilation,

the heating, we were losing so much money in heating, we had two choices: Renovate the outer shell, which had never been done before; or destroy the whole building, and since about a million dollars had been spent on renovations in the interior, clearly we made the right decision in renovation. Also, it's going to be an example for everybody else to follow in renovation of older buildings.

**MPIC -  
garages, Autopac repairs**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Attorney-General must have attended a cell meeting; he's exceptionally buoyant today, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible for Autopac. On Thursday of last week I posed a question to him as to why Autopac was insisting on deducting from a claim payable to my garage owner in Carman, when in fact the garage owner had collected the deductible from the owner, from the insured. Why is Autopac persisting in penalizing my garage in such an obtuse fashion?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Housing.

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** I don't know the specifics of that particular case, but it's my understanding that the firm has not committed itself to . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** . . . not carrying out the practice of waiving the deductible. Until such time as the firm in Carman agrees to comply with the policy of the corporation, the corporation will keep deducting the deductible portion from the settlement with the auto body shop.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, I have a simple question to pose to the Minister: When will he get control of Autopac? Obviously, the garage owner is complying with the policy because he's deducting and collecting the deductible from his customers. He is complying with Autopac policy and they insist on removing the \$50 from his reimbursement. Will he stop that practice?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

May I remind members that Oral Question Period is for seeking information and not for giving it to the House. Does the Honourable Member for Pembina wish to restate his question?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister indicated that when the garage complies with Autopac policy, they will stop deducting the \$50.00. It's obvious the garage has complied with the policy because they have deducted and collected the deductible from the . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

I will repeat, Oral Questions is a time for gaining information not for giving it. If the honourable member has a question will he pose it?

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, will the Minister accept the responsibility that he's been given in Cabinet and ask Autopac to quit penalizing the garage owner in Carman who is complying with their policy by collecting the deductible on windshield replacement, then it will be treated as any other firm. This situation that the Member for Pembina mentions where the deductible has been paid by the policyholder may well be an isolated incident. Until, as I indicated, the firm consistently follows the policy as laid out by MPIC there'll be no change towards the way it's being treated.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Housing.

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** Yes, I suppose that once MPIC has a commitment from the firm that it will consistently follow the policy guidelines, then it will be treated as any other firm. This situation that the Member for Pembina mentions where the deductible has been paid by the policyholder may well be an isolated incident. Until, as I indicated, the firm consistently follows the policy as laid out by MPIC there'll be no change towards the way it's being treated.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister responsible is, how many examples of compliance with Autopac policy does he need before he will intervene and stop this perverse penalization of my garage owner in Carman?

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** May I say that perverse penalization is a fairly strong term. I should remind the Member for Pembina that last summer this same firm agreed to abide by the policy guidelines of MPIC. Apparently last February that firm must have felt it wasn't doing well enough and had to use some little scheme so it could attract business to put it in a more favourable position than the neighbouring auto repair shops then it started waiving the deductible. Until such time as the firm consistently and commits itself to following the same rules as are required by other firms then it will be treated . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible for Autopac. In view of the fact that this policy that the corporation put in place last June is designed to remove any benefit a customer might receive from an individual undertaking Autopac repairs, can the Minister indicate whether auto body firms who are offering a rental courtesy car free of charge to the customer while their vehicle is being repaired, whether the cost of providing that car is deducted from those body shops providing that free service to the customer?

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** Yes, I'll respond to that. First of all, let me remind the Member for Pembina that the rates that are paid to the windshield replacement firms are negotiated rates. Apparently, the member doesn't understand what an agreement is all

about. This was an agreement that was negotiated by the corporation and, I believe, the ATA on behalf of the windshield replacement firms and apparently his constituent doesn't want to abide by the rules of the game. If the firm doesn't abide by the rules of the game, then it will be treated as laid down by policy last June by MPIC.

With respect to the provision of the use of rental cars for major repairs, that is not a matter that has been addressed by the corporation because there's been no concern expressed by the auto repair industry. In the case of the windshield replacements, there have been complaints to the corporation that it was an unfair practice and, therefore, the corporation took the steps it did in the best interests of the policyholders and the windshield replacement firms.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** So then is the Minister now indicating that we operate in Manitoba in a completely controlled society as far as Autopac repairs go, that no entrepreneur can do anything outside of what the corporation dictates?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. Order please.

If the honourable member has a question seeking information, would he pose it?

#### **Director of Criminal Prosecutions - appointment of**

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, a question to the Attorney-General. I wonder if he could inform the House if he or his department have yet appointed a Director of Criminal Prosecutions.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** The department as such does not appoint a director of prosecutions. That is in a category where it must be a Cabinet-approved appointment. There are recommendations that will be addressed by Cabinet either this week or next. I expect the appointment will be officially made and announced within the next few days.

#### **Civil Service Commission - hiring of visible minorities**

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

**MR. G. FILMON:** My question is for the Acting Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission. I wonder if he could attempt to find and bring to committee tonight, unless he has them readily available, the statistics on how many visible minorities are currently employed in the Manitoba Civil Service.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Culture.

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** I think that question would best be asked when the committee reviews the Civil Service Commission.

**MR. G. FILMON:** In view of the fact that we are going to be starting the Estimates of the Civil Service Commission later today, I'm simply giving the courtesy of notice so that the Minister may have that available tonight for the discussion.

I wonder if he might also pass along to the Minister for tonight's Estimates debate a request for information of the number of women and the relative pay rates in the Civil Service Commission.

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** I'll pass those comments on to the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission.

#### **Bankruptcies, farms - rate of**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact that in 1982 to 1984, Manitoba led the way in farm bankruptcies with 154 family farms declaring bankruptcy, that compares to Saskatchewan of 117 and Alberta of 145, Mr. Speaker - could the Minister of Agriculture give us an update as to this time in 1985? Are the number of bankruptcies carrying on at the same rate or is there a decrease?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take the specifics, in terms of numbers, as notice. I know that the bankruptcy rate in the Province of Manitoba has been decreasing. It's still of major concern to us.

What I can tell the honourable member is that there has been, in terms of net farm incomes, a greater increase than anywhere in any province in this country, there's been a 77 percent increase in net farm incomes this year over last. That's still far below what we would like it to be, Sir, but it still shows a greater increase in net farm incomes of any province in this country. But the government is clearly still very concerned with the number of bankruptcies that are there, whether it be in Manitoba or anywhere in the country. Farm financing is still the key issue, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that our net incomes are reported to be up, why have we seen the increased bankruptcies in Manitoba? Why are the bankruptcies increasing in Manitoba when the net farm incomes are going up?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I'll answer the question for the honourable member this way. Had we not inherited a continued support of high interest rate policy, of both the present administration and the previous Liberal administration, Mr. Speaker, many farmers in this province and across this country would not have gone through the crisis that they are going through, in terms of the support that they had for high interest rates.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** If it's high interest rates, then why did he raise the interest rates for the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation from 10 to 13 percent?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should be aware that the changes in the program were those that were enunciated by his administration. All those loans were, in fact, on five-year renewals issued by his administration. Sir, as well, all loans under the regular lending program are now, and went down for this year, I'll remind the honourable member, to 8 percent, something that his own colleagues in Ottawa were not prepared to do.

Instead, what we see is FCC rates consistently higher by half to three quarters of 1 percent than those of the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation. What we do see is a \$65 million cutback in November of '85 to agriculture in this country, \$50 million in this Budget and an additional \$50 million over the next three years. Is that what you call support for agriculture on a national basis, Mr. Speaker? It is a complete abandonment of agriculture in this country.

### **Grasshopper infestation - proposed control program**

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I heard a report this morning on one of the local radio stations as I was driving to the Legislature, indicating from a grain company that the grasshopper infestation was less of a threat now than it was several days ago.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that through my own personal observation and contact with farmers, that is not the case and that the grasshopper infestation is continuing at a very rapid rate, will the Minister of Agriculture break down and finally help the farm community and provide spray for the farmers so that they can kill those grasshoppers?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I'm advised as well that the grain company, whose information the honourable member is challenging, I understand that they also said that chemicals were available for farmers, which he challenged a week ago, that they were not available. I hope he heard that . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I presume the honourable member doesn't want an answer. The plans that our department put into place in co-ordination with the municipalities and local groups are working as effectively as we had set out and we began this winter.

The chemicals are available. There was - I have to admit - in certain localities, spot shortages for one day of certain chemicals, not of all chemicals, of certain chemicals and I will tell the honourable member the reason why.

Some municipalities decided to purchase their entire spray program in one lump sum, leaving those spot shortages of particular chemicals; but there were other chemicals that were available if people decided to use alternatives, so that was the only reason.

Mr. Speaker, the longstanding program in support of the farm community of providing for the costs will continue, Sir. There is no intent on changing the policy. If one compares our situation as compared to Saskatchewan, which is viewed as eight to ten times

as severe as ours, in terms of acres covered, the Province of Saskatchewan doesn't even provide near the type of assistance that is being pushed by the honourable members opposite.

### **Interest Rate Relief Program - billing and collecting repayable portion**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Minister of Agriculture. During the Estimate process, the Minister indicated he would provide me information as to the number of failure-to-pay the loan portion of the Interest Rate Relief Program, as far as the farm portion of that program went. Could the Minister indicate when he might be able to make that information available to me?

**A MEMBER:** Never.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I thought I had done that; I will check. In the event that I didn't, I will bring the honourable member that information. I asked the corporation to provide that information for me, Sir, and I will do so.

### **Borrowing requirement - status of**

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

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. He's been travelling so much, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to see him back.

I believe that the government had a net borrowing requirement of some \$1,400 million. I wonder if the Minister could update the House as to how much of that money has been borrowed to date and what the outstanding requirement remains at.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** I want to thank the member for that question. He'll understand my spending some time in conversation. I've had very few questions this Session. In fact, it's sort of nice, once in a while, to have one.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** It's so nice to see this smiling bunch, Mr. Speaker. They're all in such good shape today; but I should tell the member I was back on Friday and I don't recall any questions.

I was trying to start providing information. One of the reasons I can't give all of the information right now is that I don't have the latest numbers, with respect to the Manitoba Properties share; I believe the one-year period there is pretty well over. I know the latest

I saw was that we got about 185 million out of that in this - 185 million approximately. But I'll get a complete update to the member. He knows of the other loans as well.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have leave to make a short non-political announcement or a comment.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Does the honourable member have a question? We are still in Oral Question period. If there are no further oral questions - the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

### NON-POLITICAL STATEMENTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I think that the occasion should not go unnoticed that the Honourable Sam Uskiw, who is one of the most popular and well-liked members of this Chamber . . .

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. R. DOERN:** . . . has just celebrated his 25th year in public life and had a major social event last weekend in Beausejour with 500 well-wishers and I think that all members would want to wish him well on his Silver Anniversary.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Hear, Hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.  
The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**HON. H. HARAPIAK:** I would like to make a non-political statement.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed)  
The Honourable Minister.

**HON. H. HARAPIAK:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to commend and congratulate Roger Schwegel of The Pas on his excellent performance in Sunday's Seventh Annual Manitoba Marathon, which was held on June 16th. Roger ran the race in 2 hours, 22 minutes and 32 seconds. This event is held annually to raise funds for the mentally handicapped in Manitoba.

Roger Schwegel has represented not only The Pas, but Manitoba and Canada well. He's been the top Canadian in this international event for the last three consecutive years.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.  
The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that it's in order, but I do wish to acknowledge the well wishes

and the comments of the Member for Elmwood; and also to acknowledge the representation from the Conservative Caucus at the event, and others that had attended. Thank you very kindly.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, since members are in such good spirits and I arrived a couple of minutes late for the House today, I'm wondering if I could get leave to make a Ministerial Statement on Mainstreet Manitoba.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Does the Honourable Minister have leave? Leave has not been granted.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY COMMITTEE BUSINESS

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I would propose to move the House into a Committee of Supply, but first I wish to advise honourable members that the Standing Committee on Economic Development, which is scheduled for this Thursday and next Tuesday, will sit and will continue consideration of the Manfor Report until its completion. On completion of that report, we'll commence consideration of the A.E. McKenzie Report, and following that, Manitoba Development Corporation.

I will advise members shortly as to the date for the next meeting of the Standing Committee on Public Utilities, once I have consulted with the Minister on available dates for that committee to consider Hydro.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines, and subject to leave, if it is granted to waive Private Members' Hour - perhaps I should ask for that first.

**A MEMBER:** No.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** No, okay.

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

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

### CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - ENERGY AND MINES

**MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos:** Committee, please come to order.

We are considering Item No. 3.(b)(1) Petroleum, Salaries; 3.(b)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Lakeside.



**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I'm just confirming that we are on Item (b) Petroleum. I believe my colleague from Turtle Mountain has questions.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

I don't know whether the Minister has the copy of the Annual Report of the division at hand. If he does, perhaps look at Table 6, Page 37. There are some figures in this table which I find extremely interesting and we have referred to these before, that beginning in 1980 with the new expansion in exploration, the total oil sales in 1980 came to just under \$55 million and the following year in 1981 the industry reported total expenditures were just over 55 million; 1981 the sales were 64 million, the expenditures over 82; in the following year of 1982 - in that same year of '82 then, sales were 100 million and the next year in '83 the reported expenditures were 116 million and so on.

The interesting thing here to me being that, in recent years, the industry seems to have been putting more money back into the industry than the total sales value. I'm wondering if there's any indication of how that has been continuing for 1984 and 1985.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Minister.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** We have the numbers for '84. The total production was \$169,296,154 and the industry reported total expenditures are \$125 million. That's an estimate. We don't have our '85.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** It would now would appear then that trend is falling off. I suppose that's the revenues, the sales in '83 which was over a 50 percent increase. I'm assuming that would largely reflect the new production coming in from the Waskada field.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** This would be both increased production and new oil prices.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Can the Minister give just a rough indication of how much of that would be attributed to increased prices and how much to expanded production?

Mr. Chairman, it's not necessary to take the time - we can probably calculate it from the information that's available in the table.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** We don't have the calculations. If you want, they can do a calculation and pass it on to you while we're talking.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** It's evident enough I guess, from the figures then that he's provided. If he could give us the production . . .

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Take a look, it goes from 582 to 737.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** What would the production be then for '84?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** 793. To '84.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** One other question that I have has to do with the deep drilling. What kind of activity has there been, if any, in terms of deep drilling in the southwest to get right down to the Cambrian, or whatever the formation is, that's below where production's taking place now?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** I'm informed that there's been in the order of three to six per year over the last few years. I know that one of the major companies has been doing a lot of seismic work and we've just had discussions with them and they still think that the deep wells will indeed bear fruit. It's just that the great success has been with the Spearfish zone wells.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, I'm very pleased personally with these statistics that show the increase in exploration for oil and increase in production that's taking place in the southwest, because I think to a very significant extent it came about as a result of changes that were made in royalty structures and a return to the leasing of Crown lands. In view of the success of that, I'm wondering if the Minister has given any consideration to providing some kind of additional incentive for deep drilling.

I'm not talking about incentives that take money out of the taxpayers' pockets and give it to companies, but that would simply perhaps provide a longer royalty-free period that would encourage companies to do deep drilling rather than the sort of exploration that's going on, which is admittedly important but centres mostly around areas of known production and production from already proven strata; so has the Minister given any consideration to some further incentive?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** I've been informed that the existing program does provide some incentive for deep drilling. The program expires next year, so it's a matter of taking a look at either extending that or making some modifications to the incentives program. I usually sit down with the department through the summer, with some seminars, and certainly I'll take the member's suggestion under advisement.

I've just had a meeting with one of the major producers in the area, one of the company's that's had a long experience in drilling, also drilling some deep wells, and they didn't raise anything of this nature; but certainly I'll take the matter under advisement and I'll have some discussions with people in the industry, generally.

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

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, there doesn't appear to be a great deal of change in the appropriations for this section of the Minister's Estimates.

When we were dealing earlier at the committee stage, or when the Manitoba Oil and Gas Corporation was reporting to committee, the staffing information was given and Manitoba Oil and Gas Corporation of Manitoba operates with what I would describe as a reasonably lean force. But my question to the Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman is, is the separation between Manitoba Mineral Oil and Gas Corporation and the departmental function total and complete, or is there

still, at this stage, any functions being carried on that could be described, in the interests of the corporation, in the initial years?

In other words, there's no cross subsidy coming out of this petroleum division of the department that could be so described.

**HON. W. PARASIUKE:** No, there isn't.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.

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

3.(c)(1) Mineral Resources, Mines, Salaries; 3.(c)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, we had an opportunity to discuss at some length mining activity, generally, under the initial heading of this resolution, entitled Mineral Resources.

Departmentally, the Minister seems to indicate by his appropriations no significant staff changes other than those that he mentioned in his introduction of the division, with respect to senior staff and specific responses that he made to the Member for Turtle Mountain earlier. The activities of this division are again not in any way cross-subsidizing the operations of the same question I asked just a moment ago, of the Manitoba Mineral Resources?

**HON. W. PARASIUKE:** The answer there is no as well. There's a complete separation.

**MR. H. ENNS:** The ongoing commitment that Manitoba Mineral Resources has to the Trout Lake operation, which goes back a considerable number of years, is entirely managed through the Manitoba Mineral Resources Corporation and not through the department?

**HON. W. PARASIUKE:** That's correct.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, on the item of Salaries, I note a minimal increase which I would assume to be principally salary adjustments during the course of the year. However, earlier on, the Minister indicated to me that as of last April, I believe, several members of this division that were related to the safety inspection of mines had indeed been transferred to the Department of Labour — (Interjection) — or Environment and Workplace Safety, in any event transferred out of this appropriation.

Would the Minister care to go through the figures a little bit with me and indicate to me why that doesn't appear to be showing up in this appropriation?

**HON. W. PARASIUKE:** Since that took place last year, it was in previous years reflected in those Estimates, and this is reflecting what exists within the department on an adjusted basis, last year to this year. There was a Reconciliation Statement on Page 63 of the Estimates last year, relating to a transfer of, I think, \$617,000, and staff that I indicated yesterday.

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

3.(d)(1) Geological Services, Salaries; 3.(d)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, this is the division that procures the kind of base data geological information for the branch and for the industry, to the extent that we publicize that information. I would assume that with the emphasis being placed - the exploration emphasis being placed - I believe, if I recall rightly, of both the Manitoba Mineral Resources Corporation and the branch in the Lynn Lake area - I'm trying to recall by memory - it was indicated I believe that upwards to 60 percent of the activity was directed in that area.

Can the Minister assure me that that is not at the expense of other areas that the department normally services within this appropriation?

**HON. W. PARASIUKE:** The 60 percent referral was to MMR, which is the corporation which is doing exploration and development. The geo-science work or geological services work is, indeed, being spread out through the province. At the same time, there is some emphasis on the Lynn Lake-Leaf Rapids area. Since this is providing geo-science data of a general nature and people will make specific decisions off that data, this is more spread out.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, our attention is, of course, riveted on those main mineral resources that are known to us and, particularly, those and again in those areas that we have by reason of policy every reason to concentrate on, that is to try to find additional copper, zinc and nickel geological information that would continue that exploration work.

However, there are, of course, other resources and from time to time one hears of gypsum deposits, tin, iron. Does the branch have any information with respect what I call these other resources that don't receive the kind of attention that the principal mineral resources do?

**HON. W. PARASIUKE:** I don't have any specifically here. I know that the department and its geologists publish papers and attend conferences where they will have private sector companies who are considering their program for the upcoming year or two years or five years and we've presented papers on potash; we've presented papers on chromium; we've presented papers with respect to gold as gold came back into the limelight.

Obviously, there's stoneware clay from the Ste. Rose du Lac area; shale from the Pembina Mountain area; sand, from a variety of places; they have non-swelling bentonite used mainly in the clarification of petroleum and vegetable oils and that's mined by Pembina Mountain Clays near Morden; we've got gypsum and we have, indeed, been looking at the whole question of limestone used in the production of cement; work being done in the Mafeking area in addition to the limestone that's being quarried at Steep Rock - there's a big quarry at Steep Rock - it's also being quarried at Mafeking and people are taking a look at further limestone possibilities in the Mafeking area.

Then, of course, there's the whole matter of the high quality silica sand from Black Island and other potential prospects for silica sand in and around Lake Winnipeg.

In another area that I think is important is the sphagnum peat moss that is produced in southeastern Manitoba and used for horticultural purposes. I think that there is an interesting value added and some interesting possibilities.

So these are your less glamorous areas than the others, but we don't have anything major of a non-glamorous nature looming on the horizon. I think the one thing that is interesting is the work that indeed is being done by Tanco. That's proceeding nicely, so . . .

**MR. H. ENNS:** I'll just ask this general question, not particularly germane to this particular section of the Estimates, but silica sand that is being poured from Black Island, is that all being exported or have we had any success in applying it here in Manitoba? It seems to me we had an operation . . .

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** I would have to take that one under advisement and try and check back. I know that there have been a number of discussions from time to time with groups, practically from virtually around the world, trying to interest them in the high quality silica sand, especially also since we've got long-term low-cost power. There have been discussions bloom a bit and then they recede, but I don't know specifically and I'd have to take that under advisement. I thought that some of it might have been used in foundry work, but I would not want to be definitive on that.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Just one further question, Mr. Chairman. In the Geological Services undertaken by the division, the Other Expenditures are virtually unchanged. Has this section of the department utilized aircraft to any extent and would that cost be included? To me, it would not appear so, but is in the Geological Services Branch and that, I gather, in the use of aircraft of any significant consequence?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Our aircraft would probably be put into the next one, (e) Canada-Manitoba Mineral Development Agreement and we're worked out arrangements with the Federal Government, in terms of the Federal Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, because that's where they do a lot of geo-mapping, work like that.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 3.(d)(1)—pass; 3.(d)(2)—pass.  
3.(e)(1) Canada-Manitoba Mineral Development Agreement: Salaries; 3.(e)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister to briefly describe what it is that we are doing currently under this item, namely, the Canada-Manitoba Mineral Development Agreement. What year are we in?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** The agreement was formally signed by myself on February 22, 1984 and by, at that time, the Honourable William Rompkey, who was Minister of State for Mines, on April 18, 1984. The agreement is for a five-year term, 1984-1989 and the Federal and Provincial Governments will contribute \$14.8 million and \$9.9 million respectively, for a total of \$24.7 million, so it's a greater amount of federal funding than provincial funding.

There are technical subcommittees established for each of the four sectors of the agreement as follows: Sector A is Geo-scientific Investigations; Sector B is Mining and Research and Technology; Sector C is Development and Marketing Studies; Sector D is Public Information, Evaluation and Administration.

In Sector A, you have geo-scientific projects co-ordinated by Manitoba Geological Services Branch and Geological Survey of Canada. The 1984-85 activities were augmented by 14 applied geo-science research agreements contracted to universities in Manitoba and elsewhere in Canada. And a field program consisted of 53 provincial projects, 16 federal projects and completed and reported upon in a meeting with the industry which was held November 14th and 15th, 1984. During the initial stages of the agreement emphasis has been given to areas surrounding existing mining districts at Lynn Lake, Flin Flon and southeast Manitoba.

Again part of that is because you're starting out from some type of an existing infrastructure, so that the incremental cost of bringing on a new mine isn't that great and you tend to work from some areas where you have some strengths and existing knowledge.

Sector B. What we've had there - there's an Industry Government Liaison Committee established between the Manitoba Mining Association and the Department of Energy and Mines to encourage industry input and co-operation in the development, monitoring and execution of projects under Sectors B and C; Sectors B and C, of course, being mining and research and technology; and Sector C, development and marketing studies.

In a November 16, 1984 meeting there was a number of industry proposals, particularly in the mining and smelting area made by Hudson Bay and Inco. In the fiscal year 1984-85, the province initiated projects to develop computer-assistance systems for designed underground mining operations, as well as research into disposal of mine tailings.

The federal activity focused on mineral processing, ground control and underground communications systems. One project with potentially economic, significant economic ramifications to Manitoba mines is studying the applicability of a hydro metallurgical process to mitigating the problem of SO<sub>2</sub> emissions in Manitoba's Hud-Bay Smelter; and there we may end up with sulphur, and frankly sulphur is becoming a fairly valuable commodity in the world right now, so we may be able to deal with a problem of sulphur emissions, and at the same time possibly alleviate the cost of all that by having a by-product that can achieve some profit.

In Sector C, in 1984-85, one project assessed economic factors related to the province's copper-zinc industry. A second assessed the impact of changes in mining activity in the Lynn Lake region and work has also commenced on a comprehensive information package to develop an expansion of the province's industrial minerals area, and that's the type of activity or the area that we were just discussing a couple of minutes ago, when you're talking about things like Limestone or gypsum or bentonite.

In Sector D, work that is under way includes Minerals Identity Package, a brochure explaining the agreement and evaluation framework to measure the impact of output stemming from agreement activities and long-

term communication strategy, emphasizing acceleration of geo-scientific activity as a support to the private sector.

In terms of this year, there are work plans under way for 1985-86 in which Canada will develop some, I guess all told, some \$3.2 million in minerals programming; and Manitoba, through a couple of its activities, both on the capital side and through the enabling vote, will be delivering some \$2.3 million all told, a bit more than this Estimate, but it's highlighted in a footnote on Note 1 at the bottom.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I'd just ask the general question. It's my recollection that in calling on some experience in the Department of Natural Resources, for instance that Manitoba sometimes gets less than what I would call it's "fair share" in these federal-supported joint agreements, partially because of the scale of our operations. I'm more familiar with the forestry operations where the bigger provinces, such as British Columbia or Ontario or Quebec, with a bigger forestry operation, tend to proportionately receive a greater measure of support. I recall having to constantly battle on behalf of Manitoba's position to retain some equity in respect to the Federal Government's participation in resource development in our province.

I would just ask the Minister, recognizing that much the same can be said about mining in Canada, that certainly some of the other provinces like British Columbia, and notably, Ontario, are major mining areas in the country; is he satisfied that we are doing as well as we can with respect to federal participation in assisting the department and the government in this activity?

**HON. W. PARASIUKE:** I guess we're all a bit like Oliver Twist and we'd like a bit more. But at the same time I think that with respect to this agreement, at this particular stage I'm pleased, in the sense that I think - and I mentioned this yesterday or certainly on Friday - that some of the provinces have been hung-up debating jurisdiction over mining with the Federal Government, even though we're in a - I think a fairly severe - transition over, I'd say, a 15-20 year period in the mining industry and I think it requires focused effort on the part of the Federal Government. I think it's going to take focused efforts on the part of Provincial Governments and focused efforts on the part of the industry, labour communities themselves. I mean that's the reality and they have to realize what it is and try and cope with it and do the best possible that one can, under conditions that I think aren't going to be the same as they were just after the Second World War.

So we have adopted the approach of trying to work in as co-operative of a way as we can with the Federal Government and we've gotten off the mark quickly on this one. As a result, I think that we have received a pretty good effort on the part of the Federal Government. I think there's always a bit of work to do in terms of sorting out who delivers what, how it's delivered, and I've said that before, that I think that in many of these instances the Federal Government should establish some priorities, establish some strategy and probably leave more of the day-to-day delivery to the province. I think that works best in trying to set

up a duplicate delivery service, although in the case of a geological survey it's been around for a long time at the national level.

So I'm not displeased with what I see happening here. We tend to do an update all the time to see what other provinces are doing and I think, on a per capita basis or proportionate basis, we've held our own and probably have done a bit better by being quicker off the mark.

The one area where I'm hopeful that we might be able to do something additional and innovative concerns the whole area of single-enterprise communities. That again is breaking new ground. As I said before, I'm not sure of the extent to which other provinces are supportive of the Federal Government getting involved.

I take a very strong position that the Federal Government should pay attention to these, for reasons that I won't go into again today, and we'll see over the course of the next two to three months how well we do there, because it's just not a matter of Lynn Lake facing a closure of the Fox Lake Mine, this is what every mining community faces. And to the extent that we put our heads in the sand and don't look at these things, and try not to, or avoid developing mechanisms or processes to deal with these problems, which perhaps one can't predict the exact date but it's a bit like death and taxes, you know they're going to be happening and one should be trying to make allowances for them or make adequate preparation on a contingency basis.

We think we're doing a bit with the Mining Community Reserve Fund. I think it's a good idea. It provides a focus for attention. I think it does help a community feel that they aren't there by themselves. We do have a fund that the community is looking to. They're not quite sure what else exists out there and, hopefully, we'll be able to do some work over the course of the next two to three months and, as I said, it's my hope that we would be able to report back to the people of Manitoba that we have achieved some success and made some progress in this whole area of single enterprise communities adjustments.

**MR. H. ENNS:** I thank the Minister for that statement. The Minister indicated earlier that it would be perhaps under this appropriation of some \$1,104,800 that any chartering of aircraft that the department engaged in would be included. I wonder if the Minister can break out that item, give the committee some idea of the amount of air charter time that the branch is, in fact, employing.

By the way, just before the Minister answers, on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. You normally maintain reasonably good control of committees, but the level of side discussion is becoming such that it's getting more difficult for the Minister and I to engage in a conversation here.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I call upon the unnamed members to please be considerate to the Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** That means you, Inkster.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I did not name anybody. The Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Well, I asked the question whether the Minister could break out the air time that the department is engaged in.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** I can undertake to try and get the exact information. I take it that around \$85,000 to \$100,000 is spent on chartered aircraft.

**MR. H. ENNS:** My specific reason for asking was - does the government use charter Manitoba Air service or is this outside charter? If it is government air is the appropriation paid to Manitoba Air?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** We have to pay for whatever charter service is used, so that would be Manitoba Air or there might be some specific companies that are outfitted a bit better for that activity.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 3.(e)(1)—pass; 3.(e)(2)—pass.  
3.(f)(1) Surface Rights Board, Salaries; 3.(f)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, some of my colleagues have some information that they would like to raise at this particular time.

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

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have some general concerns as have the farm community dealing with the past and present operations of the Surface Rights Board. I have some specific questions dealing with a letter the Minister of Resources received, I believe it was in December of 1984 - I'm not sure, the constituent either lives on the border of my constituency or in my colleague's constituency of Virden. I received a call again yesterday from this individual. I have a previous letter from him or a copy of a letter, an open letter sent to the Minister on May 17th. The concern of the call today and yesterday was the fact that a letter as of December 1984 still has not been answered by the Minister and the individual is anxious to hear from him. I would ask the Minister why he hasn't answered that individual?

As well, I want to put on the record this open letter that was sent to the Minister on May 17th from the same person, Mr. Philip Francis. I'll read it because I think it's important. The information that it contains relates directly to the Surface Rights Board, the fact that the regulations as I understand it are not in place, so they have not got any regulations to operate by. The concerns brought forward in the letter I think should be answered by the Minister and I would expect his response.

I'll read the letter to the committee. "The Honourable Wilson Parasiuk, Minister of Mines and Energy, Legislative Building, Winnipeg, Manitoba. Dear Mr. Parasiuk: Last Wednesday, May 15th, I attended a hearing held by the Surface Rights Board of Manitoba. Also attending for Chevron Canada Resources was a lawyer, I believe, from Winnipeg. It seemed to me all through two hearings held that day that he, the lawyer, was making and having accepted rules and regulations for the said board. On one occasion the board made a ruling on a matter only to change that ruling after

the lawyer mentioned would not accept their first ruling. A fairly interesting situation. I feel the board should have enough authority to make a ruling and have it stand against the lawyer for either of the parties which it is mediating between.

"Again, in the afternoon, much of the same thing happened. The board said they would accept a written submission by a landowner only to have the lawyer argue they should not. Lo and behold, again, they changed the ruling and said they would not accept the written submission. With no rules or regulations in the act, we and the board are at a disadvantage to Chevron's lawyers who have been involved for many years with hearings before Surface Rights Board in Saskatchewan and Alberta. At present, there is no way we can compete with Chevron who are prepared to spend thousands of dollars on cases which are only worth a few hundred dollars to a landowner. Then if the board's ruling is in favour dollar-wise, of the landowner, take it to appeal, another large amount of money to spend. It is time now for you to take a stand for the landowner or give jurisdiction over to another department of the government, preferably Agriculture. I remain, a dissatisfied landowner, Phillip Francis."

The first question to the Minister is, why was there no response to the Individual's letter of December 1984? And what about the status of regulations and directions as far as the Surface Rights Board is concerned? Does the Minister have any comments?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** My former Acting Deputy Minister had been involved in helping to get the Surface Rights Board just administratively off the ground and when that letter came in, it was in his files and my former Acting Deputy took ill, and frankly - and I apologize for that, I think Mr. Francis might have been contacted yesterday - that letter was misplaced. We just came across it when we were going through and looking through in relation to the May 17th letter, and it was a matter of that letter being misplaced. That's with respect to the letter not being answered.

With respect to the question of regulations, my understanding is that the board is in the process of developing the regulations. They have a lawyer and I expect to be apprised of that in the near future.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, is the Minister not concerned about the accusations of Mr. Francis, and the fact that there appeared to be some inconsistencies, some change in direction of the board? Is he satisfied that the regulations and activities carried on by the board, following the late Judge Ferg's comments last year on a judgment of his, that the board was inept and incompetent in their activities? Is he satisfied with the development of regulations in that whole area, that things are being handled in the best interests of the landowners?

Because I can assure him, talking to the Landowners' Surface Rights Association and many individuals, they haven't been happy for quite some time in the activities of the board. They've lost confidence in the board, and I'm sorry, there's been a strong request for changes for the responsibility of the board to be transferred to the Department of Agriculture or another jurisdiction. Has there been any action or move by the government to change the board to another department?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** I'd certainly like to speak on that because I don't feel possessive about the board. I mean, if there is a perception out there on the part of the public that there is a bias because it's reporting to the Minister of Energy and Mines, then I'm quite prepared to look at where it might go.

I'm not sure whether, in fact, taking it from the Department of Energy and Mines and putting it under the aegis of the Department of Agriculture puts it into a neutral spot; or maybe it's something that should be put - since it is a quasi-judicial entity - under the Attorney-General's Department because it does operate on that basis. I'm certainly not against looking at that and I'm in the process of looking at that whole matter.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, that will probably give some individuals a bit of relief that there's at least some consideration being given to taking it from the Department of Energy and Mines, because the disastrous way in which it has been handled and has not been working in the best interests, in general, of the farm community and/or the oil companies, because you cannot have those individuals who are not getting along in the way in which they are doing so in the past. As I said, confidence has been lost in the board and the activities.

I ask the Minister, will he be meeting with the Surface Rights Association to help develop some of the regulations? Will he carry out discussions in the near future to see, before those regulations are put in place, that they're acceptable in a general way with those individuals as I would expect him to carry out with the petroleum industry. I think it's incumbent upon him to get on with the job.

There's some oil development being held up because of lack of regulations in place and working together. There are some injustices being caused on some of the landowners, who don't know where they're at. There are excessive legal costs being incurred by many people and it just has to be dealt with.

So I ask the Minister if he's prepared to meet with the Surface Rights Association and the farm community as well as the oil industry, to discuss some of the regulations and some of the changes that have to be made.

**A MEMBER:** What regulations?

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Well, before he puts the regulations in place.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** When the board has finished that work, certainly, I would intend to make sure that it's circulated to people in the Surface Rights Association, to municipalities and to people in the industry.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether I feel that comfortable with the board writing the regulations or not. I would think that the Minister, it's incumbent upon him to fully discuss the kinds of regulations that are going to be implemented with the Surface Rights Association and with the oil companies. Granted, I don't expect them to write the regulations, but I think that because we've had some experience now and the difficulties they've gone through, possibly

it would be fruitful to have some discussions with the Minister and the Surface Rights Association before they implemented them. I ask him if he plans to carry out such a meeting or a process of meetings.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Certainly, I would expect that that would be done over the course of the upcoming months.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, again, I go back to the question as to the transfer of responsibilities. How soon will he be making recommendations, either to the Premier or to his Cabinet, that the responsibility should be changed from his department to either the Attorney-General or to the Department of Agriculture? And if one were to follow the wishes of the farm community and those people affected, it should go to Agriculture. If he was looking at the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, it should go to Agriculture. That's where it is in those two provinces. In Alberta it's in Agriculture, as I understand it; as well in Saskatchewan it answers to the Department of Agriculture, which by the way was recommended when the bill was being heard before this Legislative Assembly. I believe Mr. Kohaly from Estevan made that case to the committee when we were preparing legislation, the surface rights legislation.

I think there's a major disappointment in this government because there was a strong lobby put forward, following the Nugent Report to proceed with legislation, and legislation was proceeded on. They made their case before the committee but, unfortunately, there are a lot of dissatisfied people. In fact, the way it has been carried out, there are a lot of people questioning as to whether or not it has worked to the advantage of anyone other than just to further break down the relations between the oil companies and the farm community. In many cases, in my first-hand experience, there are certain individual landowners who feel very badly treated by the performance of the board.

As well, Mr. Chairman, I have to make a comment. I asked the Minister some time ago if he would table in the Legislature - and I haven't got a copy of it - I guess maybe he has tabled the Annual Report of the Surface Rights Board? It really is very obvious that there is very little in it. I know that the board has carried on certain activities. There are no comments as to costs of operation, any major initiatives, the fact that they're working on any regulations. I find that there are about four pages and it really doesn't have any financial matters, any comments or any statement as to how they've expended the monies, the numbers of meetings, and some of the dissatisfaction. I'm really quite disappointed in the content of the report. There's more cover than there is anything else. So I think it might be helpful to the board - and I say this to probably help them - if there had been a more complete coverage of what kind of activities have taken place.

I plead with the Minister to take as immediate action as possible to have the Surface Rights Board transferred to another department. I plead with the Minister, as well, to meet with and to discuss the surface rights problems with the association before regulations are finalized so that at least the intent of what the government are planning to do are fully discussed. That discussion, I feel, should be carried out with the

operators as well because there are two groups involved - and get on with the job.

I would hope that the Minister would take seriously the judgment of the late Judge Ferg, when the comment came down of his judgment, and the fact that he considered them inept and incompetent and I think that's a reflection on the Minister. I have no other thing to conclude but that, that he's prepared to leave that judgment on the record and, really, no one has repudiated it. It really stays on the record, that that's the kind of activities that they're carrying on. So I say, as a result of that, there isn't any confidence in the whole carryings-on by this Minister and the Surface Rights Board.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** If, in fact, the member's logic, his way of thinking is to take one judgment by one judge and infer from that a whole condemnation of the board and then to go beyond that and infer condemnation and lack of confidence in the Minister, that obviously reflects his thinking style, and that's fair enough. I take it for what it is.

I certainly don't get into debates with judges. One could; there are a lot of incidences where one might want to, but I don't. A judge has made a ruling; I'm not sure. One could look at that and look at a whole set of Justice Ferg's rulings over a whole period of time, but I don't do that. They've made a ruling. I've received a number of comments and letters from time to time. There have been favourable statements about the Surface Rights Boards; on occasion there's been a negative statement. One side is happy with one ruling, the other side isn't happy; then another side's happy with the ruling a while later and then the other side isn't going to be happy. You're going to have that with something like a Surface Rights Board.

You're not going to have a Surface Rights Board that's going to come up with decisions that everyone is happy with. I think that the Surface Rights Board has, in fact, achieved a lot. There's a lot happening in the oil area there. I think there have been some modifications; I think people have had an opportunity to have surface rights agreements opened up that have been outstanding for 30 years, where they never had a chance to get any compensation, any change for compensation.

Some of them complained that when it was opened up they didn't make enough money from that. They made a lot more than what they were making 20 years ago or 15 years ago or 10 years ago or five years ago. They have made those arrangements themselves years back, or their predecessors have made those arrangements years back.

When one says, we didn't follow specifically the advice of a Mr. Kohaly, there's some advice that we follow and some advice we don't follow from Mr. Kohaly; and I've looked at what's happened. I've had chances to discuss this from time to time with people on the surface rights and, as I said, I don't feel terribly possessive of it. But I do have a concern when someone says, well, we want to put it under the Department of Agriculture because we want judgments that are only good for the farmer, because that's not a fair approach to take to that as well. I think it has to be a balanced approach and I think the member should, in fact, try and take a

balanced approach on this as well, because I know that there are municipalities in the area and that there are farmers in the area who want the oil development to take place.

One of the things that they sometimes would like to see, obviously, is they would like to see a surface rights lease be as big as a mineral rights lease - and I had, and the member had nothing to do with the historical circumstances of split mineral and surface rights leases. That happened a long, long time ago, and I can appreciate the concerns that farmers have when they have looked after the land maybe for two or three generations and they have someone come in with a mineral rights lease and say, I, in fact, want to go onto your land to do XYZ. In some instances, people can reach an agreement and in some instances the farmer doesn't want the person on their land in any circumstance. That's understandable, but we do have laws pertaining to mineral rights leases that existed a long time ago. One can't remake history; one can try and just ameliorate some of the injustices of the past and ameliorate some of the circumstances of the past and hope that one can do that in an evolving way. I believe that, in an evolving way, the Surface Rights Board is carrying out its functions and I have confidence in them.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I made comment about the report and the fact there was no financial activity reported by board. Is there a copy of the financial activity of the board, the numbers of meetings and that type of thing?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** I do not have that with me. I can get it for the members.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** I would appreciate that, Mr. Chairman. I think it's important to know. I note that the amount of money requested is the same as last year. It's just a matter of getting an idea of the activities of the board in financial matters.

The Minister has not answered me specifically regarding when he sees the regulations being in place. What kind of time frame does he see for that to happen, because I again go back to Mr. Francis' letter where he makes reference to changes made by the board on the day of the hearing. I'd like him to comment as to how fast he thinks that will take place, and is he satisfied with that kind of report that he sees from Mr. Francis?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** I won't comment on Mr. Francis' letter. I would like to hear from the surface rights people themselves. I never take a position of only saying, well, what is in a letter. I try and hear both sides of the story and I certainly intend to try and hear both sides of the story on this before I pass comment on it. I would think that would be a fair approach that the Member for Arthur might take as well.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, will we have the opportunity to hear what the Surface Rights Board have to say in response to the comments of Mr. Francis? If so, I would request that we see what the response is and that the Minister make it available to us when it's available. Will he do that?

**A MEMBER:** That seems fair.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Seeing as how it was an open letter sent with a copy to you, I certainly would expect to make the reply available to you as well.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** His reply will be made available. Will we hear the comments of the Surface Rights Board?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** If the Surface Rights Board answers the letter directly, they would be hearing from them. Otherwise, I will be taking their comments and incorporating them in a letter that I respond to.

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

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Mr. Chairman, I think that when you look at it, this is really the first time that we've had an opportunity to look at the Surface Rights Board before this committee. We have to note that it was the previous government that set up the Nugent Study and when this government came into office, I have to commend the Minister, he grabbed the ball and he ran with it. On surface rights legislation, he went out and he met with the people and he promised them legislation and it came forward in this House and it passed with the approval of all sides of the Legislature.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Right. I remember that day well, Harry.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** So, Mr. Chairman, up to that point, everybody was in perfect agreement; everybody was happy, but once the legislation passed, things sort of died. He appointed a six-member board, fired half of them and at the same time, to my knowledge he has not given any direction to the board in the form of regulations and the board has been struggling - a new board - in the absence of regulation and I'm sure the Minister has numerous letters on file requesting direction, regulations and that. Yet, we haven't seen any sign of any regulations coming forward. The Member for Arthur has asked about regulations. The Minister hasn't yet given any clear indication of when regulations will be coming forward under the legislation. I think it's very important for the people who are appearing before the board. I think it's important for members of the board and I think it's important for the general public to know just what kind of regulations the Minister intends to draft to administer the Surface Rights Board. This board has been trying to operate for a year-and-a-half and it's operating more or less in the dark. Perhaps the Minister can give us some indication of what is going to happen.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** There are jurisdictions that operate without regulations. The Surface Rights Board members have gone to take a look at hearings in Saskatchewan to see how they've conducted their affairs. They talked to people in Alberta as well. There are different ways in which one can approach this. They were taking a look at what the experience in those other jurisdictions has been. I would expect that they would be coming forward with something to me over the course of the summer and we would see where we'd go from there. It may be that I would want them

to be revised and modified before I would have them discuss with the industry but, certainly, that process will be undertaken as I indicated to the Member for Arthur.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** A second question to the Minister and it arises from his answer. Is he then contemplating changes to the Surface Rights legislation that would remove the regulation section from the act?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** No, certainly not at this Session. I wouldn't expect that would be necessary. We would see what happens over the course of the summer and the fall.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Well, Mr. Chairman, we have seen what most people consider to be good legislation. Everybody seemed to be quite happy with the Surface Rights legislation when it was put in place. There has been an appointed board according to the Annual Report that we got. They have issued 12 orders.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** What's the year end?

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** This report is 15 months behind times. We haven't seen any other report. We have seen no updating of that even though it's three months past the year end, we still haven't seen an updated report. We understand that most reports are three, four, five months in the making so we're not condemning him for not having that report before us at the present time.

But what we have occurring is a general dissatisfaction in the oil community at the present time. We're finding farmers who are very dissatisfied. We're finding oil companies that are very dissatisfied. It looks as though there is some breakdown somewhere in the operation of the Surface Rights legislation. There has been suggestions that maybe it's because there is no leadership shown in the form of regulations. The Minister is not giving any indication so far that regulations are going to be forthcoming or even necessary as the Member for Lakeside has said.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Point of order being raised.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** I think what I clearly said was that there are some jurisdictions that do not have regulations, that I expected to have something coming before me over the summer. That's what I said.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** I thank the Minister for that information. He said some time over the summer. Does that mean it'll be - summer, I imagine, ends on the third week in September so it'll be some time after that that there might be some leadership shown with the Surface Rights legislation. What time frame are we looking at?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** I'd indicated that I would expect to receive material over the summer. I said I'd look at it to determine whether it needed any revision before it went out to the general public. I would expect that some time in later summer or early fall it would be



going out to the farming community, to the municipalities and to industry.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** What the Minister is saying is that it may be considerable time after that before we get things out where people can take a look at some regulations.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that by that time that there may be a severe dissatisfaction in the communities with the activities of the Minister. I suggest to the Minister that we all know that the efforts he is putting in in Hydro, with Limestone, trying to improve the image of his party prior to an election, he's doing that in one field, but I suggest the Minister is slipping badly in another field. — (Interjection) — He may be slipping badly in them both.

What we're seeing is a great disappointment in the public image of this Minister in the Surface Rights legislation field. He has not provided the leadership. He offered tremendous encouragement with the alacrity with which he moved on Surface Rights legislation and then just left it dangling in the wind. Maybe there was far too much expectation of the Minister by the public in the beginning and that's entirely possible.

At the present time, the community in the oil industry is very disillusioned with this Minister particularly in the field of Surface Rights legislation.

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

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I have a question of the Minister dealing with the removal of three members of the board. This happened at a time when one of the members was being challenged by one of the oil companies as to whether or not she had a conflict of interest. Has the Surface Rights Board or the province picked up her legal charges while she was acting as a member of the Surface Rights Board in that regard?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** No, they haven't. She was informed that they would not when she went out and incurred the expenses.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, so there is no compensation or there isn't any costs being picked up when she, in fact, did appeal the case?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** No, they're not.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Does the Minister plan on replacing any of those individuals that he removed from the board to increase the number of the board or is he going to carry on with a three-member board?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** At this particular stage it would be my intention to carry on with the three-member board, but I will certainly have an opportunity over the course of, I'd say, the next four months to have discussions with, again, people in the farming community, municipalities and the industry and determine whether, in fact, there should be any expansions or not. I would do that after a period, but I don't have any intention at this particular time.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, there were 12 board orders issued - a year ago, that's right and the report

that we held before us. It says, "Although the board has issued a total of 12 orders, several under appeal . . . "Have those appeals been settled at this point or what stage are they at, Mr. Chairman, and how many were under appeal?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** I'll have to check and get a bit more specifics on that. I believe that there were something in the order of eight under appeal. All told there have been 51 board orders issued. I must say that in the whole set of areas the process seems to be working. There are something in the order of 433 leases and agreements registered over the course of the, I think, the last year and I had my data up to January, 1985, I guess. I don't have more recent data at this particular stage.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated there were 433. Was there a major withdrawal of those people who had applied to the Surface Rights Board for reconsideration or settlement or judgment on their cases?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** No. I think there are something in the order of 93 applications for variation of compensation as of January 1985.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Were there 95?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** 93.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** 93 variations of compensation. What has been the highest as far as that is concerned - the variation of compensation, as far as applicants to the board?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** I don't know what you're getting at. What's been the high award?

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** No, what has been the highest number of applications to the board on variation of awards?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** That's the high level that I have right here. I really couldn't say. I'll have to get that information for the member.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** One of the concerns I want to bring before the Minister, as it indicates again in their report, there were a large number of applications for variations. "It was felt that by choosing several pilot cases, the board may be able to have the majority settle without the necessity of hearings. Pilot cases are to be held in April of 1984."

Following those pilot cases, I know that my colleague from Virden and I had met with the surface rights people, and they brought forward the concern that it could, in fact, further damage some of the settlements that were being made if they weren't satisfied with it. So I wondered if there was a withdrawal of people wanting to get their settlements solved by the board or if the number maintained the same?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** I will have to take that question as notice and get the information.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** I would appreciate it if the Minister would report back, because there were concerns brought to our attention that in fact the pilot cases were not going to assist, but were going to damage some of the negotiations that had been carried on by the individuals without using the board.

I guess, Mr. Chairman, my concluding remarks would be that I would urge the Minister to - and I do think it's extremely important that the board operate in fairness. I don't believe that they should lean one way or the other, that we want to see the development of oil take place. We want to see fairness; the surface rights owners treated fairly. We want to see the opportunity to develop the oil carried on by the operators.

But as I see it, as it's brought to our attention by the Surface Rights Association and by individuals that it is not being carried out in that manner today; that there is a desire to have it transferred from his department; that there is need for some guidelines, as far as regulations are concerned, so that we don't have occurring what has been brought to our attention and what has been put on the record by Mr. Phillip Francis. I'm sure that further checking would substantiate from the Surface Rights Association that this kind of thing had carried on and it cannot be tolerated in the best interests of fairness and development of the oil industry.

So the quicker the First Minister of this province takes action to take it from his responsibility, and either puts it in the Attorney-General or Agriculture, which I think would be fair, because it's proven to be fair and working well in both Saskatchewan and Alberta. I may not be correct in Alberta, but I know that in Saskatchewan, it reports to the Department of Agriculture and I think it does in Alberta, as well.

But I want that kind of action taken, and I would think it's incumbent upon this Minister to draw the guidelines, by regulation, but do so in consultation with the Surface Rights Association and with the petroleum industry, or else we will continue to see disruption and dissatisfaction and, in fact, delay of oil drilling activity in the southwest, if the landowners aren't treated fairly because they'll continue to try to block the development that has taken place in the past.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 3.(f)(1) - the Member for Virden.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Thank you very much.

The Minister indicated there were 433 transactions. Were they transactions that were negotiated by the Surface Rights Board or were they registered?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Registered.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Registered, and of those 433, was it 91, 93?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** You have 93 applications for variation of compensation. That could be an ongoing basis. Before they go before the board, people could reach agreement on them, that happens. There were 51 board orders issued.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** In the 51 board orders that were issued, how many of those were for right of entry?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** I don't know.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** The Minister doesn't have a breakdown on that?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** No, I don't have that detailed information.

**A MEMBER:** Why not?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** I don't have it. I could fly the guy in.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate how many of those 91 that the board rendered a decision on, how many were appealed?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** My understanding is that eight were appealed, but I would take that to get the specific detail and provide that to the member.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** The Minister doesn't have the information as to who initiated the appeal, whether it was the farmer or the oil company?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** I think it was the oil company but I can't be certain. I think it was the oil company that initiated the appeal.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Mr. Chairman, I don't have too many further questions on the Surface Rights Board, as such on that.

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

Resolution 61: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$6,170,300 for Energy and Mines - the Member for Virden.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Mr. Chairman, this is a fairly significant amount of money and when we were dealing with the Standing Committee on Economic Development, there were several questions asked of the Minister at that time which he suggested that we ask in this particular committee. Now, unfortunately, other commitments prevented me from attending this committee hearing yesterday afternoon but I would like to carry on, if I may, asking the Minister some questions dealing with ManOil and their involvement in a pipeline from Waskada to Cromer.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the Minister indicated that there was an original agreement or an understanding, I guess, with the Inter-City Gas on a 25-75 share basis to enter into an agreement to construct a pipeline. I believe that agreement was entered into before tender proposals were called by the Natural Oil and Gas Corporation.

Subsequently, we find that of the four tenders that were called the one that was selected was the Inter-City Gas and we find out later that the 75-25 was changed and the province now has a 10 percent interest and I believe Inter-City dropped some of their shares and we now have a third member in that.

At the time of the tendering, the Minister indicated or when I asked him questions - it's on Page 36 of the Hansard of the Standing Committee on Economic

Development - the Minister said, "When I took that question as notice I had to, unfortunately, leave the country on government business and I have not had a chance to take up the matter fully. I certainly will have it taken up by the time my Estimates come before the Legislature."

Can the Minister now give me the particulars of the tendering process?

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, D. Scott:** Mr. Minister.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Yes, first of all, I'd like to impress upon the member and other people that this was a notice for application that was made and not a call for tenders as some parties may have incorrectly understood. The parties making application were doing so in order to be able to construct and operate a pipeline, not to build a pipeline for the government. As the Honourable Member for Virden is aware, four separate applications were received and through public notice in late October 1983, were made available for review by any interested parties.

The companies making application to the board were Consolidated Pipelines Company, Pembina Resources Limited, Inter-City Gas Corporation, and Simmons Pipelines Limited in conjunction with Omega Hydrocarbons Limited. This was reviewed by the Oil and Natural Gas Conservation Board. A public meeting was scheduled for December 8, 1983 but when no interested parties indicated they wished to appear to present their positions to the public meeting, it was cancelled.

I might just give, I think, the prices that were put forward with those applications; Consolidated Pipelines Company, \$4,063,000; Pembina Resources Limited, \$5,681,000 and their bid included an additional lateral and pump station and this is basically the Newscope battery; Inter-City Gas Corporation, they had a capital cost estimate actually - was \$4,326,300 including the Newscope battery; Consolidated Pipelines Company didn't include the Newscope battery and Simmons Pipelines Limited-Omega Hydrocarbons Limited, their estimated capital costs were in the order of \$4,344,000 not including the Newscope battery.

Based on a review of the application and discussions held with the individual applicants on December 8 and 9, 1983, it was announced on February 29, 1984 that ICG Manitoba Pipelines Limited had been granted a construction permit. It was envisaged at that time that Manitoba Oil and Gas Corporation would participate up to a 25 percent interest. During September and October, 1984, negotiations between the parties involved resulted in ownership of the pipeline being changed, as the member indicates, or being modified. Inter-City Gas Corporation, which is the operator, has 60 percent of the pipeline; Omega Hydrocarbons, which is a major producer, has 30 percent and Manitoba Oil and Gas Corporation has 10 percent.

Construction of the pipeline began on October 3, 1984. It was completed by December 31, 1984 and the first oil was pumped through the line in early January of 1985. Inter-City Gas is currently conducting final right-of-way restoration work and all survey drawings for registration of survey plans are being finalized.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Mr. Chairman, is the Minister telling us that there was no understanding, that no negotiations

took place with Inter-City Gas prior to the calling of those tenders?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Prior to the calling of applications.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Of applications.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Prior to the calling of applications, the applications were called in terms of the exact date. This was May 17, "Notice To All Operators." I indicated April 28 - this is 1983 - that the Waskada pipeline may be built and operating in 1984 and on May 17, 1983, there was a notice to all operators regarding application to construct and operate a Waskada pipeline to be accepted by the Oil and Natural Gas Conservation Board. There were no discussions at that time. This is 1983.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** In 1983. Can the Minister give me those dates again? In '83?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** I said that there was a notice to all operators regarding the application to construct and operate Waskada pipeline to be accepted by the Oil and Natural Gas Conservation Board and this notice was May 17, 1983.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** May 17, 1983.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** The applications to construct the pipeline were received on August 5, 1983, after an extension from July 15, which was the original deadline 1983, to August 5, 1983, and it was extended to August 5, 1983. That was when the applications were finally received.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** They were awarded in November, was it?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** No, the discussions were December 8th and 9th and the awarding was February 29, 1984.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Awarded on February 28th or 29th? When did the province first enter negotiations with Inter-City Gas through ManOil?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** I have no idea, frankly. The companies had had some discussions with Manitoba Oil and Gas Corporation and I don't have specifics as to when discussions took place; but I do know that they'd indicated that they would be interested in being involved with Manitoba Oil and Gas Corporation.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Mr. Chairman, this pipeline has not been considered to be a public utility. Is that correct?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** After discussions with the industry, they advised that we shouldn't be dealing with it as a public utility, that in other provinces it isn't dealt with as a public utility and that one does it through market forces, although I felt that if there were problems, then I would have to consider treating it as a public utility, but we haven't treated it as a public utility. We've tried to, quote, "let the market work."

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** At the present time, could the Minister indicate how much of the oil produced in the Waskada area is utilizing that pipeline?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** I've been informed that it's in the order of 80 percent.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** And the one-fifth of the oil that's not utilizing it, is it because there are no feeder lines or is it because of the price factor in the negotiations for the utilization?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** There are no feeder lines right now and the truck terminal that could be used as a terminal for that pipeline isn't operating yet and we'll see what happens after the truck terminal's in place.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Mr. Chairman, at the present time, could the Minister indicate which oil companies are not utilizing the pipeline?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** The companies at present that are using it are Omega, Chevron and Newscope.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** There are only three oil companies that are presently using the . . .

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Constituting 80 percent of the production, yes.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** I believe Omega has pretty close to 70 percent of the production in that area.  
I have no further questions then, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I was in the middle of reading the resolution. I will read the resolution again.

Resolution No. 61: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty, a sum not exceeding \$6,170,300 for Energy and Mines, Mineral Resources, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

The Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** If the Minister will undertake to provide to me, either in the House or by memo, some details relative to the Expenditures Related to Capital, Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets, I want to indicate to him that I'm prepared to pass these Estimates at this time.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Sure, I will present that information to him.

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

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Mr. Chairman, just one final question of the Minister. On the Oil and Gas Conservation Board, is Mr. Chenier still the Chairman?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The time being 4:30 p.m. I was instructed by the Clerk to interrupt.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Okay. I will have to take that one as notice because I think he's still on the board.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The appropriation is passed.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Including the Minister's Salary?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Are we going to pass everything? (Agreed).

4.(a)—pass; 4.(b)—pass; 1.(a)—pass.

Resolution No. 59: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty, a sum not exceeding \$1,600,500 for Energy and Mines, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

Resolution No. 62: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty, a sum not exceeding \$1,306,400 for Energy and Mines, Expenditures Related to Capital—pass.

The committee will meet again at 8:00 o'clock tonight.  
Committee rise.

## SUPPLY - EDUCATION

**MR. CHAIRMAN, P. Eyles:** Committee, come to order. We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Education.

Item 4.(b) Curriculum Development and Implementation - the Member for Morris.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I believe when we finished off last night, we were discussing the wisdom of increasing the time allotted to the basic courses, the basic core of curriculum within the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move to a different area today and ask the Minister a number of questions, again as a form of exploratory questions.

An article in the paper, March 28, 1985, indicated that the Manitoba Teachers' Society decided that there should be public school for children at age four, Mr. Chairman. I'm curious as to whether the Minister feels this proposal, even though it's obviously just in a conceptual form, whether a proposal such as this would meet in favour with her feelings and her attitudes towards education?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Education.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Certainly it's an interesting suggestion and one that is quite complicated and would need a lot of study and thought and discussion, but it's certainly worth exploring. We got into a fair discussion the other night with the Member for Fort Garry, where he was suggesting to me that it was logical to move the day care program into the education system, because we've got some empty classrooms and some empty spaces and because there would already be educational standards and criteria that would be set up; and rather than develop a brand new system, perhaps we should consider moving it into the other one.

I suppose my answer on this one, without going into the length of it, is along the same line, that there are differences of very young children. What we're looking at in day care is the care of children and some programs that recognize how children of that age need to be looked after and how they learn. A lot of the learning is done through informal activities and a lot of it is done through play. They are not developed mentally, actually, at the age of four, to move, into what we would

call, a traditional education program delivered in the normal traditional ways.

So if there was going to be examination, we'd clearly be looking at a number of things. We'd be looking at the cost. We'd be looking at program and looking at how to develop a program that suits the care and learning of young children, preschool, without automatically accepting or moving them into an education system that was developed for children of other ages that does not in fact suit the younger children. So it would have to be done I think very carefully.

However there is one aspect that would be very positive, I suppose, and that's early identification, in that one of the things that people are always talking about is that the earlier we identify learning disabilities, speech disabilities, problems with children, probably the less problems they're going to have with it down the road and the less interference with their learning.

So there are some good things to it and some things that actually could be dangerous and would have to be considered very carefully. We're certainly willing to explore it, if a number of the groups and organizations within the education system believe it is a top priority and worthy of exploration.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, not to, in any way, contradict those words spoken by my colleague, the Member for Fort Garry, I don't honestly believe that these issues are quite the same. Certainly when the Minister or society as a whole decides or gives consideration to a program, whereby those children aged four, can find their way into the public school, the system, I don't think can be construed as being synonymous with day care. I mean there are many instances where these young children would be coming from homes where there would be adequate care, adequate parental care in place.

So to me the issue can't be decided on the basis of those merits, or is the Minister saying from her point of view, that the consideration as to whether or not four-year-olds should find their way into the public school system, voluntarily or otherwise, will be determined, in a major part, by circumstances that have parents or a parent, a single parent, working outside of the home?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, I didn't mean to - there is some relationship, because the suggestion was from the previous member, that kids from two months - or whatever the age is - up to school age be incorporated into the school system and he was saying the day care program that takes care of children up until they are school age. So there is a crossover there, with the Member for Morris suggesting only that we look at children who are four years old.

I still make the same point, that any major expansion like that, we would have to look at a number of things. One of them, in limited resource period, would be the expansion of a program, at a time when we're having some difficulties maintaining the existing programs. Certainly if the need is identified and people agree that it's a top priority, then you can look at redistribution and perhaps the decision would be that this is important enough for us to do.

We'd also have to look at readiness of the child and the age and development of the child and how those children are handled, because they are very different, in terms of what they need and what you do with them, than the school-age children, where you assume that they are ready for a school situation.

So there has been up to date, and I know society is changing, but general agreement that care of children will be done by the home up until school age. The reason of course that this is coming about is that there is a lot of concern about the number of mothers that are working, the number of single parents, and the lack of care or sometimes inadequate care that some children may be getting at home, and maybe we better move them into the school system so they're looked after there.

I still continue to say that if everybody saw it as a top priority, that we should explore it, and that we would have to take a lot of things into consideration; not just the cost but how the program would be developed and how you would handle the children. Because I'm very reluctant to put very young children out of an informal learning mode or atmosphere and move them into a very formal rigid structured atmosphere, when they are not ready for it. So we'd have to look at a lot of issues in the examination of that issue.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, a final supplementary.

The Minister rightly acknowledges that at these early ages children are at various levels of ability and understanding and preparedness for schooling. No doubt, that's one of the reasons why kindergarten is voluntary. Would the Minister care to speculate as to whether or not she could see where society in all its forms would want to see the lowering of school age dropped to four, now that five-year-olds, those that are directed into the present voluntary kindergarten classification, begin their formal school education and therefore five-year-olds would be considered to be in Grade 1?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** No, Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't like to consider that at all. Kindergarten right now in its design and in its present delivery is a pre-readiness program. Its purpose is to prepare children for the education program and for formal education. It is not as rigid, as structured, as formal as the education program. It's to get them used to learning in a group situation. It's to get them used to being in a classroom with a teacher. They still do a lot of their learning through play and through much more informal activities. If there was any suggestion that they went in at four it would have to be adjusted to be accommodating to the five-year-olds that are in the pre-kindergarten, pre-readiness program, not make the four-year-olds the readiness-for-school program and the five-year-olds the first Grade 1, considered to be in Grade 1.

I think that's too early. The programs that were designed were designed for a reason and the development of children and the way children learn has a lot to do with the design. I wouldn't think we would consider changing it unless there was considerable data and information that the design that we had was not useful or not meeting the purpose for which it was intended.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, the Throne Speech Debate, Thursday, March 7, 1985. It was in the area of Education and indicated that the Government of the Day will take steps to improve and protect the quality of education in our province. I suppose the writer, the government, believed that there was some shortcoming and that some steps had to be taken.

To continue, the Throne Speech said, "We will examine existing practices to enhance our efforts in four areas: teaching and instruction; programs and curriculum; public involvement; and assessment."

I'd like to ask the Minister - I asked this question one other time in the House - I'd like to ask her again. When the government, through the Throne Speech, indicated that it wanted to develop and improve Education through enhancing efforts in the area of assessment, specifically what was meant?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** I think first of all, I have indicated in the House previously that we are increasing the assessment that we're going to be undertaking and that we're going to be doing an assessment in a number of major areas. I think I responded the other day to say that we're doing a first-ever and a major assessment of the Kindergarten Program. We were just talking about that. The Kindergarten Program was brought in the late '60s and it hasn't been assessed, hasn't had an evaluation. It's a very important program and it's time we took a look at it. We want to make sure that it is doing what it was intended to do and that is preparing our five-year-olds for school in an appropriate way.

Our next series of assessments are going to be in the area of Science. We just did Social Studies and Reading; we're doing kindergarten; Science in Grades 3, 6 and 9 will be the next one that's done; Maths in 3, 6, 9, and then Science will be done from K-6, and also a survey of 7-9. So, one of the ways that we're going to improve our assessment, I think, is through the subjects and the programs that we are assessing and the importance we're placing on getting that information.

I think the second way that we're going to look at the question of assessment, because it's an important question and a big question and a complex question and it doesn't have easy answers, one of the problems that we have is that those - and most everybody is concerned about evaluation and assessment of students, and often see what are maybe simplistic answers to a very complicated question and one that doesn't really deal with the issues that we want to deal with. So, while we want to look at assessment and we're prepared to look at it collectively with all of the people involved in the education system, we don't want to either be pushed or move into going back to the old system which had a lot of warts and a lot of faults and a lot of deficiencies, nor moved into a system that appears to the public - and I must say that at some times it's appealing to be able to go into a system just for the purpose of being able to say that we've got this one exam and this one exam is going to tell us everything about this child's ability and intellect and capability to handle this program and future programs, and then go out to the public and say, this is the measurement and you can count on it and it shows that we're doing our job. We're assessing these kids

and we know what they're doing and we can say where everybody is at right across the province, but it's not accurate. It doesn't take into consideration all the things that should be taken into consideration. It has a lot of deficiencies.

What we want to do is look at things like the CTBS tests which are presently used, which are not designed and do not deal with Manitoba curriculum. They deal with some of the things that are in Manitoba curriculum and some of the basics but not designed to test on Manitoba curriculum.

We will be starting, I think, a number of activities, one of which is continuing to undertake the assessment program that we have announced and that we have planned for the next year or two; the second is to start working with trustees and superintendents and particularly school divisions that are faced with particular problems and find out, look at the testing that we're doing and start talking about what testing are they doing; how is it working; what testing are we doing; what are the deficiencies.

We might, for instance, as a result of those discussions agree to develop a Manitoba test that is used instead of the CTBS test that would give us more accurate information than does the CTBS test and that would take into consideration the student population that we have. It's ridiculous to have a test that, for instance, in a school division like Winnipeg School Division does not do anything to address the fact that you have a large population of children who have English as a second language, and who may have great difficulty in the early years and their heaviest emphasis would be in bringing up their language ability, reading and writing in English; so that when there's nothing that takes into consideration those kinds of differences, nothing that takes into consideration the different programs, then I think we have a system that we need to talk about.

I suppose to sum it up quickly without going into more detail is that I'm prepared to look at it. I am prepared to say that assessment is an issue that we should be looking at, that I think overall we've got one of the best systems that shares responsibility between the Provincial Department of Education and local school divisions and teachers. I think that's the best one. I don't think it ever should be taken from the schools and the teachers and the school divisions and put in the hands of a Provincial Department of Education to test and determine what the ability and intellect and capacity of the 100,000-200,000 students in the province are. We clearly cannot do that as well as they can do at the local level.

So, we've got a good system that accepts the balance, but I think we have some deficiencies and they might in the kind of tests that we use. They might be in the kind of test that we use; they might be in the application of the test; they might be in the recognition of the test to the different target populations we have in our student population, so I'm willing to explore those things. What I'm not willing to do, I suppose, is move into a simplistic solution that says a provincial examination is the answer to all of our problems in terms of quality of education and assessment of children; but I am certainly willing to set up a process and intend to do so over the summer, where we look at the assessment program that we have in place and begin to study what we can do keeping

the basic system that we have, but what we can do to improve what we're doing and how we're getting the information out to the community and the public.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, the answer just provided by the Minister tells me that she's all over the place, quite honestly. Firstly, the Minister talks about assessment for the first half of her speech. I thought that, obviously, her understanding of that word and the meaning that she puts to that word was completely different than mine and, not only that, was certainly much broader.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister can talk about the fact that they're assessing programs and yet, again, within that same Speech from the Throne, reference was made just before that to programs and curriculum. I would think that was concise, in the sense that there would be assessment done in those areas. But assessment, as spelled out in the Throne Speech, to the Minister, means assessment in all respects. So, Mr. Chairman, let me then use a different word.

When I'm talking assessment, I guess I'm meaning evaluation of students' progress in school and let us not, at this point, stray into the area of assessing programs.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister talks about tests, although she seems to admit at this point in time, some two or three years since we began to ask questions of her, that the results, particularly as they come from the Winnipeg School Division No. 1, have caused her some concern. Now the Minister says, well, maybe it's the tests' fault. Maybe it's not suited or adapted to the Manitoba situation. Of course, she points out that maybe it's the specific problems that are inherent within that particular school division. As the Free Press editorialist said, February 27, 1985, "Why is it that 42 percent of Grade 10 pupils show below average reading comprehension and only 11.6 are above?" These groups should normally be 23 and 23. I think the point the editorialist is trying to make is that a slight variation from normal could be attributed, unquestionably, to the makeup of that school division.

But the difference here is massive, Mr. Chairman, so the Minister, in reviewing the results becomes very defensive. She can't throw them out; she just can't dismiss them, so she then claims that we'll have to tailor a test specific to the Manitoba situation. We'll move into that a little later also.

But I asked a specific question last year in Estimates; I asked the Minister if her department would provide for me a listing of all those school divisions that conduct the various tests that are available to them and the Minister mentioned the CTBS tests, at other times we've discussed the GED tests. I would ask her now if she can provide for me a listing of all those school divisions that conduct those two tests.

Secondly, can she provide for me the numbers of students in various grades within those school divisions who have completed those tests? Furthermore, I'd ask if she could provide a score, an average score by school divisions, that have been determined from the results that would have come forth from those tests.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister can no longer state that we don't need testing. She no longer can say categorically, don't worry about it, that divisions and

teachers are the best vehicles through which we can measure the learning progress of the vast number of our students. I don't question that, in theory, it should work that way but, in reality, something is going amiss.

I would like to bring the debate, if we can, to some common ground and I'm wondering if the Minister can provide the answers to the questions that I presented.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I can respond to the specific question and some of the points that the member made in his remarks.

He took a bit of exception that I began to talk about assessment in the broad range. We were talking about assessment in the broad range, in the whole range of assessment in the Throne Speech, and he was asking me what my plans were and so I was not separating it because I do not separate this from the testing of children at the school division level and the testing of children, for whatever reason, at the provincial level. They simply are not separable, in my mind.

The assessment program is an assessment of programs and courses and students and it is shared by the local school division and the province. While he may want to have a simple one that just tests the child and gives a simple answer, that's not our program and it's not the way I intend to respond, nor the way I would address the issues.

The Winnipeg School Division results are results that we didn't have to have the survey to know. It's the case where we often have the information and the knowledge and we know and surveys simply reinforce already known information. There is no change there; that has not been a tremendous change. It's just that there hasn't been any attempt to do anything about it, I think, in the past to recognize it.

But they have always had a very high proportion and high population of at-risk, disadvantaged children, for any number of reasons. It can be because they're Native; it can be because they're immigrant; because they don't have the language; because they're poor; because they come from single parents; because they move a lot. There are a lot of reasons and the point was that you cannot simply provide a test that is suitable for children who don't have those deficiencies and problems and that tests every child as if they're functioning at the same level and evaluates them on the same basis; so there are unique things to Winnipeg School Division problems.

We have been trying to address them since we came in, through a number of avenues, compensatory grants, the special grant, the 1.3 delivered through the core which is providing special support and programs to these kids, and one of the other things I think, clearly, we are going to look at is how we evaluate and test kids in a wide variety of programs that we have in place in Education now, and the wide variety of children that we have, both in terms of background and culture, and ability and problems. I mean years ago we didn't have handicapped special needs programs, programs for kids with learning disabilities; none of these kids would have been in our system. It was quite all right for us to have one examination or at least more acceptable, an examination that tested all kids at the same level, because they either handled that program or they were put out.

It is silly to have one test that measures kids that have a variety of levels of abilities and difficulties and are in a variety of programs, and test them all on the same basis.

In terms of the comments that were made about how you can account for this. Well, okay, those problems in the Winnipeg School Division account for some change, but they surely don't account for all of the change. There are a few points that I would like to make that affect the results of the Winnipeg School Division. The standardized tests provide general indicators of student performance on several aspects of the program. When you're interpreting these results, you have to do them with extreme caution for several reasons. Here are three reasons that are factors that will result the results:

No. 1 is that the tests are not based on Manitoba curriculum, I already said that, although they cover in a limited way some of the objectives of the Manitoba Program, they do not cover many important objectives of our Manitoba Program.

The tests are not designed to accommodate students with cultural and language background differences, and only small numbers of these students are featured in the national norms. Any group of students containing substantial numbers of students with non-English backgrounds can be expected to have difficulty with these tests. It isn't unusual, I think there's one school that I remember hearing about, that had 52 percent of the children had English as a second language.

No. 3 is that the tests use a particular type of question, multiple choice, that makes them easy to score. They did that, because they're doing it for the the children in the province, but this item produces some difficulty with students less experienced with the English language and particularly with this type of testing. Multiple choice items are not the common way that teachers test their students. Further, this item is suited for certain program objectives but not others, many of which are extremely important and part of the Manitoba Program.

So that gives you three reasons why, other than the kids are testing out lower, and there are problems, and the problems are related to program and unique individual difficulties with large numbers of children - these are other reasons that affect the total outcome that have to do with the easy application of the test for purposes of quick grading of children right across the province that don't take into consideration either the target population of the children, or the kind of test that they've designed or what the test is testing for.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister and I could discuss all day the results that have come forward from Winnipeg School Division No. 1 and not totally agree, because we don't have access totally to the form of testing that was taking place although I'm led to believe that every school in the division through Grade 4 was tested. Yet Grades 7 and 10 at those schools which would have a larger proportion of people coming from lower socio-economic backgrounds were underrepresented in Grades 7 and 10 in that test. Indeed the results for Grades 7 and 10 were poor.

So, Mr. Chairman, what I'm trying to point out is that on the basis of those tests, once those schools having

that proportion of individuals to whom the Minister says there's a cause for the overall results, once that effect is removed you would think the result would improve, but they don't. Again, I'm starting to debate the results from Winnipeg School Division No. 1 and that won't lead to a definitive agreement between us.

That's why I asked the Minister last year, and this year I want to see them - I want to see the results for other divisions within the Province of Manitoba, because the Minister can make this special claim with respect to Winnipeg School Division No. 1 and I have to accept it, but I'd like to see what results are in place from other school divisions.

The Minister has access to them. I do not, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to see them, because in spite of everything the Minister talks about tests that have been conducted and whether they're prepared within Manitoba's jurisdiction or whether they're prepared outside, and whether they cover the course content as laid down within our curriculum, that is all subjective argument, Mr. Chairman, but what I have before me isn't. I referred to it the other day, and it's on the background of the 1984 Report of the Presidential Task Force on an Academic Plan for the University of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, it surveys 1981-82, incoming high school graduates, from all schools, from all divisions, and the methodology is spelled out in detail at the bottom of the table, but I'll give you some of it - "1,860 students shown on the table are a subset of 1981-82 first year students' questionnaire survey population." Mr. Chairman, those 1,860 students that came into what they call direct entry programs, i.e., programs using high school graduation as a basis for admission; those 1,860 students came to university with these grades: 74 had A pluses out of high school; 481 had A's; 328 had B pluses; 359 had B's; 292 had C pluses; 195 had C's; 131 had D's. If you add up all those you come to 1,860.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we're not talking about, in my view, the academic average that is in the public school system. If they're skewed in one direction at all, obviously they'd have to be above the norm, and yet what grades did they achieve in 1st year university. Well, the 555 that were accumulated between A plus and A, 44 of them achieved A grades and A standing, the grade point average in university. Out of the 328 given a B plus in high school, only 231 received that level of achievement in 1st year university. At the level of B, 326 were given a university standing versus 359 at high school standing of B.

Of course, now what we're seeing is, Mr. Chairman, obviously, it's axiomatic, a greater number are going to receive a lower university grade than the grade they had coming out of high school. I suppose the most telling figure - 385 received a D grade at university, whereas 131 of those received a D grade on graduation from high school.

Mr. Chairman, these figures in themselves are not the be-all and end-all, but the point is - and I say to the Minister - they say something. So she's right, I can't accept wholeheartedly the Winnipeg School Division No. 1 results that allows me to reach some final decision with respect to the quality of education, and I don't. But I am seeking out other information, and I can tell the Minister that this table is very very informative, and it has a tremendous amount of impact.



So we have one school division that's graded down. I don't know what the other school divisions are doing, basis the tests. I don't even understand the test system. I'd like to know how many students and how voluntary the procedures are by which these students - whatever their numbers are - take the GED test within the province, Mr. Chairman.

Because there's something in black and white, in the form of a table, that says, "Our students, on average, are graduating from high school without the proper preparation." I would submit, Mr. Chairman, for further additional learning or indeed the workplace. — (Interjection) — The Minister says, who says that? Mr. Chairman, I submit it on the basis of the information that I have available to me. If the Minister has other information that can, in some way, refute what I say, well then I'd hope she would put it forward. Indeed, I question why she doesn't, because I've gone - and I didn't bring it with me - the Annual Report of the department makes reference on the back appendix pages to some of the testing that is done.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I do have a number of points I'd like to respond to. First of all, I think there's a little bit of confusion about the testing, and I can understand it, because there's a lot of tests that go on and it's hard to know - CTBS at the division level, testing done by the province, but the GED tests are not tests that are done to determine the ability of students, either by testing of the province or as school divisions. They are equivalency tests that were brought in, that allow people who have not gone through the normal high school program, but who have gained knowledge and experience through life's experience to be tested, and if they test out all right, to be given the equivalency of high school graduation. So we'll separate the GED tests, I think, from the testing of students that are in the system. That's to give an opportunity to those who didn't go through the system, but who have the knowledge and the information.

I will agree with one point that he made. He said, "These say something." They do say something, but they don't say everything, so you have to be very careful about taking any individual test, never mind who applies it, whether it's done by the university or the school, and making strong general statements about, either the education system, nor the ability of the students, based on that one test.

Now, first of all, I would argue, there's two types of testing going on here and we're talking about the public school system and the assessment and the evaluation and the testing that goes on in the public schools where they have the children for a large number of years, and then an additional test that is being applied by the university. So you might end up with two different sets of information, where you have to compare the knowledge and the information by the teacher and the school division that have taken the child through the system and have tested them, and have scored them and have indicated that they're operating at a certain level. It might be a different evaluation coming about through that particular test at the university.

I don't want to belabour this, but I only want to make a few points about the first year of university, when kids are in there. First of all, that's a year where there

may be a lot of change, and there is a lot of change in delivery of program, and perhaps even in the way they test, between the public school system and the universities and the post-secondary system and sometimes our kids find quite a shock.

They're in one system and they've been used to it for four or five years, and they're used to the way it's being handled, and they're used to a certain kind of support and help from their classroom teachers and from their academic environment. Then, often they feel like they're sort of thrown out there in the big world to sink or swim for themselves, because the support is not there often, the attention is not there, the testing may be done in a very different way. And if there's one thing we know about first-year university students, is that often, even good students or students who have handled themselves and managed quite well in the public school system, have trouble adjusting and accommodating to post-secondary education, whether it's in the universities or the colleges or wherever. Some of it is related to the changed environment and the changed methods of teaching and the changed amount, but a lot of it's related to support.

One of the things I know that universities are looking at, because often if the kids can get through their first year and adjust to the changed climate and what's going on in the post-secondary, they will be okay. I know one of the things the universities are looking at is improved support for students that are in their first year, to make a better transition between the public school system and the post-secondary system.

So while I'm not ruling out completely that he's identified a test that has some results that give him some concern, I would accept that; but just to say, don't assume that that tells you a lot or everything about either the education or the abilities of the students that are being tested. It's only one test; it's only one measurement and there are a lot of factors to be taken into consideration.

The feeling that I get when the Member for Morris talks about evaluation and testing, is that when he talks about quality of education, is that he identifies quality, or defines that, as a high test score. While I really get the feeling that if you could just have a test that would show you that 60 percent or 70 percent of the students were at a certain level and had a certain test, that you would go home happy with the quality of education and what was being done in the schools because you would have a mark and a measurement, and enough of the students, in your mind, would be at that top level.

As I said the other day, quality of education and achievement and success is many different things for many of our different students in our classrooms. An achievement for one may be learning how to read, for that child a major achievement may be learning how to read; and for another child, top achievement in reaching their top will be that they are at the top of their class and are really able to - in the brighter kids - just do things that are really quite incredible, in terms of their ability. But it isn't any less an achievement of the one child than the other child, so we have to be very careful when we define quality and achievement.

Now I have a few points that I want to make about testing, because I want to make an overall about all testing when we get into what the school divisions are

doing. First of all, you can test too much, and I hope the Member for Morris realizes that. I mean tons of testing is not good and you can overtest. We have found, in some cases, that we were testing, school divisions were testing, teachers were testing, and nobody was paying any attention to what anybody else was doing, and these poor little kids were literally being tested to death. We found that we've had to do much more talking and sharing of who's testing and under what circumstances, so we know the purpose and we're not overtesting because that's also a possibility.

But because the Member for Morris likes research, and I will get the quotes of where the research is from because he may like that and I don't have it with me today, but there is enough research and quite a body of research that all agree that the best predictor of how a student is going to do in university or post-secondary education is the grade assigned by the teacher, that in terms of predictors that is the best one, that it's better than entrance exams. It's better than provincial testing done by the province and it's better than a predictor that is done by an entrance examination by the receiving institution. So the best determiner is that teacher who is teaching that child and the grade that is assigned by that teacher.

Even though that is the best indicator, it is not perfect, and as good as teachers are and the best ones to be able to determine that child's ability and capabilities and the best one to measure it with the measurement tools, and it's more than one. God knows in classrooms they don't just use a test. They don't just teach a child for a year and give them three tests - they used to do that but they don't do that anymore - and say the average or the results of these three tests are the conclusion of where your level of achievement. They take into consideration everything.

My recollection of when my kids were in high school, which was a few years ago I admit, but they were moving a lot more away from relying just on testing to looking at the work the students were doing through the year. It might be 60-40 and it might be 50-50, so that 50 percent of the mark that's given by the student will come about from essays and projects and things that the teacher assigns that he/she grades and testing. It's a combination of the two of them usually that the teacher uses to give the grades.

Even with all of that information and knowledge and all of those tools - because we should use as many tools as we've got - that the teacher has to grade and assess a child, that teacher's measurement even is not a perfect measurement. We must be careful of not relying too much for that reason on any one test or on any one indicator. The test results show us that even the grade by a teacher will have a reasonable margin of error when you relate their grade to the child's ability or the student's ability in university or in post-secondary education. It's particularly bad when you're talking about disadvantaged students because the relationship, they have shown, that with a disadvantaged student the ability to predict is even less. They're less able to predict with a disadvantaged poor student than they are with a good student, so that using a provincial exam as the only criteria for access to post-secondary education or determination of how they can do is going to penalize the disadvantaged students because it is a less accurate predictor than it is for non-disadvantaged students.

I'm not sure why that is. I thought it was an interesting point when I heard it just in case you're going to ask me why. I'm not sure why that is but I intend to ask to see if we know why we are less able to be accurate in predictions of poor and disadvantaged kids. Maybe there's an obvious reason that I just can't see right now, but I think we should look into that.

The point I'm making is that testing is a tool; it's one tool. There's a variety of tests. They're delivered from a variety of places and for a variety of purposes and we do know that exams are not a terrifically good predictor of success in life or of ability to achieve success in post-secondary institutions. There is a lot of evidence to show that kids who don't get terribly good marks in school go on to quite reasonable achievement later on in post-secondary education. There's a lot of reasons for that and one of them is motivation. We all can think back to our high school days and think of kids who were in our classes who were at the top of the class and got very good marks who later just sort of fizzled, didn't go on to post-secondary education studies, didn't advance themselves, didn't go into career, and other students who were modest, moderate or even in my own case, Mr. Chairman — (Interjection) — Yes, this is going to be a - what do you call it? - true confessions.

**MR. C. MANNES:** You were probably fooling around too much.

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

**MR. C. MANNES:** You probably weren't applying yourself.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** I wasn't applying myself. Of course, you better believe it. We don't all march to the drummer at the same time.

What happens is that sometimes it's for a lot of reasons and the reasons can be motivation and applying themselves, but a lot of students who just don't care to meet the requirements. Some kids in school are very good at doing what they need to do, to be at the top of the class and do well. Other kids either can't be bothered or don't know how to play the game as well and some of them aren't as motivated. Some of them wait until later on in life, until 18. In fact, our Mature Student Program is showing clearly that large numbers of people who didn't manage well in the public education system are now doing beautifully. Their retention rate is better than our traditional programs of our Mature Student Programs in the professions and their ability to get jobs. They just are really good students once they get in there and decide to apply themselves.

We have to be very careful. When you wanted us to come up with a simple exam that tests all of the students across the province and says this one student compares to the other 198,999 students in this way, it doesn't tell you a hell of a lot. It is a very superficial indicator that is not a true measurement of a child's ability to learn, nor of anything else other than the knowledge that is in that particular test. As I've pointed out before, a lot of the tests don't even test some of the basic information that we're delivering and providing in our Manitoba curriculum.

So my point is that we need the two-tiered system. We need the province involved and we need the school divisions. I continue to be willing to rely and depend on those who are best able to test and evaluate the ability of a particular student and that is the teacher in the classroom. I then depend and rely on those who are best able to determine the capacity and abilities of the students in their jurisdiction, in their school division which is what the school divisions test for. So you've got the teacher testing for the individual child; you've got the school division testing on a school division basis to see how their students are doing within their school division - most?

**MR. C. MANNES:** Some.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Almost all. You've got the province testing for curriculum and how the curriculum is working and what deficiencies and problems there are in curriculum and how the students in the province are doing, but how they're doing in that program across the province so we can see if there's any deficiencies or problems related to a particular program and how the students in Manitoba are doing.

I think that's the best way to go. I think we can improve it but I think we should keep with the existing design and roles that we play and that we should look for better ways to improve our ability to assess and evaluate without just totally relying on tests because they are not the only factor or determiner of success.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is putting words in my mouth again. I don't think I ever indicated that tests certainly of a provincial nature were the be-all and the end-all. I never ever indicated that if they were in place that the quality of education would improve. The Minister must think I was born yesterday, Mr. Chairman. I can't believe that she would feel that anybody would say that.

Mr. Chairman, however, I have to react to a few of her statements. Mr. Chairman, the Minister says that I - or at least I give her the impression - and I believe if we had provincial testing in place, mandatory in nature in some respects, that it would lead to greater quality enhancement of education. I guess I can say to the Minister, as I've heard her say on many occasions, that her measurement of quality is the fact that 85 to 90 percent today of people coming into schools are graduating. So, Mr. Chairman, I can take that argument and throw it right back at her and say that's her measurement of quality, because she's used those figures on two or three occasions in my presence.

Another measurement of quality, to the Minister, is the fact that 90 percent of teachers in place today have degrees. I'll dig it out of Hansard, Mr. Chairman. If the Minister wants to play loosely with words that she feels are emanating from my tongue then I guess I can be excused if I do the same. Now just like I don't believe that that's a true measurement of quality, I hope the Minister would give me some understanding at least and say I wouldn't believe that provincial testing in itself is going to enhance quality.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister says that teachers and teacher evaluations are worth more than any provincial testing programs that might come into being. In the

perfect world, if one existed, where everybody had access to the universities or post-secondary education of all types or to their chosen job career right out of university, if that's what they wished, Mr. Chairman, there'd be no problem. There would be absolutely no problem at all. The teachers could put on any grades they wished, but there's something wrong and again, the magnitude of the differences suggest there's something wrong.

I've gone to university; many members in this House have gone to university and the Minister talks about the first year difficulties of fitting into that environment; she's accurate; there are some difficulties. But, Mr. Chairman, look at the magnitude of these differences. Not 10 percent of the graduates coming from high school, not 10 percent of them that were given an A standing in their schools, achieved an A standing at university the first year.

Now if that was 75 percent, I'd have no difficulty with it. If it was 50 percent, I'd have no difficulty, but when it slips down to 6 percent or 7 percent, there's something wrong. The Minister can say, well, it's something to do with university. There's a different way of testing; there's the new trauma of exams that set in and there's a new lifestyle to contend with. Well, Mr. Chairman, the magnitude of the difference and the statistics say there's something more.

The point that concerns me even more than this is that we don't live in a dream world where everybody can choose a faculty and move into it freely, and the reality of today is that there are going to be greater restrictions on entry into post-secondary education, whether it occurs at the university level or at the community college level.

The basis of deciding which student gains entry will be those high school marks, unless it's another system, an entrance exam maybe, which I suppose is the same thing. The Minister can talk about the realities of high school education where some students don't apply themselves and yet upon graduation realize the benefit of schooling, the benefit of applying one's forces and energies toward schooling and upgrading and then doing quite well. The Minister has seen them; and I've seen them. As a matter of fact I've seen it in my own family. I've seen it in my own children, how they can improve so vastly in a year or two, particularly after being in high school for two or three years and I've seen the reverse too; and the Minister says that they will be denied. They may be denied because they didn't apply themselves and, for whatever reason, they were given an unfair grade.

Mr. Chairman, the reverse of that, if somebody's going to be denied because their teacher gave them a true assessment evaluation, gave them a B, and yet the teacher down the road in another division, in another school, who knows how to play the system or for whatever reason, gives to their student, somebody who maybe didn't apply themselves any differently, gives that person an A or an A-plus; and who gains entry into those very limited spaces available within the university or within the community college setting? Well, Mr. Chairman, under today's basis, it's that individual who has an A-plus or an A.

Now where's the fairness in that system? Of course, there isn't any, and that's what people are crying out for. They want some form of standardization so they

know that their students, their children, if they come from Morris-MacDonald or if they come from Frontier School Division or if they come from any school division in this province, have equal access in academic achievement to those very scarce places available in post-secondary education. They ask for nothing more, and unless the Minister of Education can show me where there is standardization in the way teachers across this province from school to school, treat the curriculum and also apply tests that cover the basic core curriculums, unless she can show me that, then I say standardization does not exist.

All people ask for - I don't care what their economic background is - all they ask for is to be treated fairly, nothing more, because the reality today, Mr. Chairman, isn't that everyone can achieve entry into post-secondary education. It's far from it, and the Minister is well aware of it. She deals with it on a daily basis and she knows that faculties within universities and selected courses within community colleges have enrolment limits and they do so because we have resource scarcity. So, Mr. Chairman, on what basis are selections made? All the people request that I speak to, is a fairness of access because they realize not everybody can take higher education.

So the Minister can run down the Winnipeg School Division No. 1 results as being unrealistic because of the very special set of circumstances that exist in that school division; she can run down the University of Manitoba entry comparisons of high school marks and first year university results, but the point is, Mr. Chairman, there are many many people - and the Minister might want to say, who are these people? - she knows very well because they're knocking at her door also, that want to know where their children stand; want their children once they've graduated and are given a piece of paper on a stage in the month of June, starting right now and for the next week, want that piece of paper to mean something and that's no guarantee of increased quality. But the point is, at least it's a benchmark, it's a standard.

What do we have in place today? All we have in place today are the professionals and the Minister of Education and Lionel Orlikow saying that provincial exams are not worthy of consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I think it's important that we realize what we're talking about. I don't claim that they're going to increase or improve the quality of education either, but they're going to certainly allow people to believe that there's some fairness in the way students throughout the province, throughout the division, and throughout the schools are compared to each other, because obviously that's the basis under which they find their way into very limited available slots within further areas of further education.

I think, Mr. Chairman, those are my remarks. The Minister said that most school divisions are testing. I'd like her to expand on that; I'd like her to tell me what percent does every student and every school division that still test, take a test, or is it only certain grades? And out of those certain grades, is it only certain students who voluntarily submit to taking those tests? I want to know more about the testing procedures that are in place in most school divisions.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, as always, because these are always very both interesting and complex

points that the Member for Morris raises, he asks one sort of simple question at the end of a long, sort of dialogue that contains four or five points that aren't related to the question. So I hope you will understand if I not only deal just directly with the question at the end but with the points that were raised earlier.

It wasn't my intention at all to run down the Winnipeg School Division testing or to run down the test that you've done, that you've presented there from the University, it's to talk about them and explain. I'm not running down, I'm saying that they're not simple answers and that those tests are not perfect tests, and if I had to choose - in other words, I think that the ability of the teachers in the school system who have had that child for heaven knows how many years, who have tested them, who have seen their work throughout the year, have given them tests in a combination of testing, because they test and examine in a variety of ways, are in the best position to know about the ability of that child.

I think that the record of our teachers in the schools is high. I think that their record of ability to predict is high and higher than is anybody else's, so it may not be perfect, but I think it's the best place that we have to turn to, to ask the questions about the student's ability.

The level of standardization that he wants is higher in the public school system than it is at the universities; and I think it's higher because they're dealing with curriculum guides and with the goals and with the program that they're all addressing. I think that the reliability of the high school scores is probably higher than it is of the universities, because the universities have designed a simple test related to probably fairly narrow questions and do not really deal with the complex and the variety and the width and the depth of questions, testing that is done by the teachers in the classroom.

I would hope, in terms of the question of accessibility, which is a serious one, while universities are saying that we have to have some way of evaluating students' ability to handle the programs, because we can't afford, as a system, and they can't afford, on a personal basis, to go through programs or be accepted into programs that they can't handle or perhaps aren't interested in. But their marks are only one of the things that they look at, it should only be one of the things that they look at.

While they've been designing some tests, I have been saying all along that I hope that they do not use a simple test or just one test to either accept or keep students out of post-secondary opportunities. While it may be useful, it should, at that level, also still be just considered one factor and one tool. They should be looking at attitude and aptitude and needs and other things that are related, because those are as big a factor in students' ability to achieve as is their intellect. We talked about how much apathy interferes with the students' ability to do their work.

So that when they're doing those tests, they should be looking at other things, and they certainly should be looking at the measurement that is coming out of the school, to totally rule out and eliminate and ignore the results that are coming from the teacher and the school and say that we will give one test, and that test will be the measurement, I think would be too narrow

an application of a measurement tool that would, more than the enrolment limitations, would keep people out of universities or colleges or post-secondary institutions.

I also want to indicate - he asked how many people were taking the tests - we can get the exact number if you want and the information - about 95 percent of the school divisions are involved in applying the CTBS test, and they do have — (Interjection) — pardon? No, they don't do it at all grades, I was just going to say that. They do have the right to make the decisions on - a lot of them are applying them at the same grade level, but they could make a decision on whether to apply them to all of the grades in their school divisions or at what levels and what grades, and that of course comes out of not just a policy but it comes out of the law. Because under The Public Schools Act, one of the school division responsibilities is that they are responsible for individual student learning, both depth and pacing, and assessing student performance rests, at the local level, with the teacher, the school and the school board.

Evaluation is carried out in the first place in the classroom by the teacher, whose task it is to ensure the program objectives and evaluative procedures are clear and understood, so that parents are informed of their children's progress and understand the manner in which it is determined. It is the responsibility of the board to ensure that appropriate policies for student evaluation are established and that schools have the necessary instruments to carry through these policies.

Evaluation of student achievement should be based on clearly defined objectives; the objectives established by the classroom teacher should be compatible with the objectives of the school, school division and the province. We believe that they are. We believe that their tests - in some cases, one of our arguments was that the CTBS tests are not based on our goals and our objectives but on broader, national ones that don't always suit.

We've got that system because we think it's a better one, but it's also there because that is where the authority has been given, and there's a reason for that. That has been done because that is recognized as being the best place for that responsibility and authority to lie. It doesn't remove the province from any responsibility and authority, but the responsibility is not the measurement of an individual child; it is the measurement of the system and of the courses and the programs that are offered and how the students are doing on the whole in the province.

Just let me have a quick look to see if I answered - okay, I think I've dealt with the main points that you raised.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, can the Minister tell me then, if our system is so perfect, why six jurisdictions within this nation have decided to implement provincial exams? Could part of the reason be, and I'm quoting from an article written in the Free Press by one Lionel Orlikow, "Manitoba has a province-wide assessment of student learning. Since 1977, these assessments are neither designed to evaluate students, nor to compare schools and school divisions. One or two subjects are sampled each year. Reading, Maths, Social Studies, over several grade levels, the

assessment examines the condition of a subject." This was the former Deputy of Education.

Mr. Chairman, the former Deputy was saying that the assessment practice in place now isn't even for the student. It's for the condition of a subject. So what is the Minister trying to hand me? Who is being assessed, Mr. Chairman? Is it the student or is it the subject material?

I don't want to get terribly emotional on the issue because it's not that relevant at this time, except I tell the Minister that she cannot continue to get away with some of the statements she makes with respect to how well our students are being assessed; and secondly, how it is the responsibility of the teaching profession to conduct. Because, Mr. Chairman, the logical question after that, who then evaluates the teachers to make sure that there's some standard there between them?

You know what the Minister's response to that is, well that's up to the school boards. It's up to them in concert with the superintendent, to find methods to evaluate the teachers, and the Minister washes her hands constantly of any responsibility that she might have or should have with respect to teacher evaluation.

Mr. Chairman, all I know is that when I go up to Northern Manitoba into the Frontier School Division and talk to parents there who have the same concerns as any parents in the province, nothing upsets them more when they give a Grade 12 standing - and they're so proud of their new schools - those schools graduate a student with a Grade 12 standing, then that student comes for further education at a community college and that person has to take two or three years of upgrading; nothing upsets parents more than that.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister talks about this system of university entrance whereby universities should look at more than high school marks. They should look at, she said, aptitude and attitude, and all that. Well, Mr. Chairman, take that down logically a few steps forward. If the Member for Pembina had an A and I had a C from high school and we both graduated let's say out of the same school, and we then went for these series of tests at the university and I gained entry because of these other tests that measured some subjective elements, and the Member for Pembina didn't, can you imagine how enraged he would be, or his parents? What kind of system is she talking about? So it brings into question and I guess it begs the question, under that type of system, what value would marks be at all? Why even measure?

So, Mr. Chairman, the Minister has no answers. She talks about this perfect world, but where is it, Mr. Chairman? I submit the Minister is trying for some reason - and I know the reason - she's just fearful of stepping out of line with her mentors, the Teachers' Society and the teachers of this province. She's afraid to step out of line within one degree and challenge them in respect to this issue.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the subject has turned from the assessment of kids to the evaluation of teachers, and I suppose that the suggestion is that if we're going to rely so much on our teachers to do the assessment, then how are we evaluating the job that they're doing, so that we know that what we're relying on is a good indicator and is capable, and that's

not a bad question. But I can't think of a single jurisdiction that has the government evaluate teachers. I can't think of one that has the government . . .

**MR. C. MANNES:** I didn't say that.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** . . . No you were saying, who evaluates teachers and then you went into a big production saying you guessed that I was going to say that the people responsible for evaluating teachers was school boards and principals and superintendents, because that's true.

What I'm saying now is that it not only is true here, it's true everywhere else, because there isn't another jurisdiction I can think of where the Provincial Government takes the responsibility for evaluating or gets involved in evaluating teachers and, of course, the evaluation of teachers is a very very important issue.

**MR. C. MANNES:** I said in developing the process.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Ah, but we have been involved in developing the process. There is a big difference and we do have a role to play there and we have played a role. The members opposite weren't too thrilled with the steps that we took, but that was for exactly that purpose, improving the process of teacher evaluation. Do you know what it was called? It was called due process, and we brought it in last year.

One of the results of due process, and let's say what due process is: Due process simply says that if a teacher is going to be fired, they have to be told what they are being fired for and they have a right to a hearing before an objective body. They have to be told what the reasons are. What we said when we talked about due process, is that teachers should be evaluated, teachers must be evaluated and we have to improve our evaluation system because the public does not tolerate incompetent teachers or teachers they believe to be incompetent.

I think in some cases, and I've said this before, I think their level of tolerance for incompetency by teachers is less than the education system tolerance itself, because sometimes systems - and all big systems have this - have difficulty dealing with the question of competency. But we said we want to be able to evaluate competency and ability of teachers and due process means that school divisions will have to have evaluation procedures.

They said, our problem is that we can't do it within that period of time. They said we can't do it within a 10-month period, we need to have two years. I said, if you need two years to evaluate then take as much time as you need, but you shouldn't be letting anybody go then until your evaluation process is completed. The deficiency was not the amount of time, it was the lack of procedures and the lack of understandable procedures that everybody could see.

So what we've said is, the purpose is to evaluate and measure teacher competency and ability. Its purpose is to help them do a better job, not to get rid of them. The purpose of evaluation should not be to get rid of people and to dump them out on the street, but to find out who's doing a good job and who needs some additional support to identify the deficiencies to

the teacher and give them some help to upgrade and improve, give them a reasonable amount of time to do it, and then indicate what you're expecting, clearly. — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, he is the one who raised the question of teacher evaluation and tied it into assessment and ability to evaluate children. So he said, how do you do it and I'm telling him how we do it and we're doing it . . . Pardon?

**MR. C. MANNES:** I'm not arguing about due process.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Well I'm telling you what the procedure is to improve the evaluation of teachers at the local level, and it is through the due process that we passed last year.

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

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, I haven't been sitting in on the Estimates process, but it's a rather opportune topic of discussion this afternoon, and my colleague was posing some problems that students face upon applying for post-secondary education institutions, university, community college, etc., etc., and the problems that the grades have in terms of either access or denial of access to that institution. I have to admit that I listened carefully to what he was saying and he brought up an aspect that I hadn't considered before which adds certainly a great deal of weight to the whole question of grades and evaluation of student performance.

Mr. Chairman, from the onset, I have to say that I graduated from the school system during that archaic and medieval time where we actually had provincial exams where, horror of horrors, all students across the province had to write a standardized set of examinations and, basis on those grades, presumably was weighted a certain portion of their future capability to enter university, to go on to trade school, to go on to nursing school, to go on to even education, at that particular time.

Mr. Chairman, that was, in the eyes of Dr. Lionel Orlikow and others who have had access to change the system over the last few years, sort of medieval times. You know, I've thought about that fairly extensively from time to time and, particularly with the trauma that I've seen some students find themselves in and the problems they encounter after graduating from high school where they've sort of left the protective nest and they enter the real world of university, community college or any other training facility, or they enter the job market.

During my time in high school, I realized that all throughout the 12 years that I was in school that we had definitive rankings of students in our grades. I mean there were, horror of horrors, actually some students that failed during the various 12 years I was at school; and you know, some of them, when they reached high school, were unable to complete Language Arts courses but were extremely good in, of course, the Math and the Physical Sciences and managed to squeeze through their provincial exams and have very excellent positions in a number of the banks, etc., etc., where their skills in the literary arts aren't necessarily needed.

Exams were traumatic to them, I make no bones about it. But the exams, I believe, in those medieval

times when I graduated, provided me and every student that came through the system with an example of the kind of challenges that he or she was going to be facing when they left that protective nest. I believe, sir, that such a rude awakening isn't present today to our high school graduate. There are exemptions and, indeed, the level of testing and qualification, as proven through the written exam process, is not nearly as tough as it was just 20 years ago.

Mr. Chairman, I guess in the overall philosophy, one has to ask himself, well, who have you benefited? Have you benefited the student by making this process considerably easier to graduate from high school? I guess if you read from time to time some of the positions that are put forward by various faculties at the university, they say, no, students come in very badly prepared sometimes to meet the challenges of university and academic life.

So I realize the de-emphasis from provincial exams and the standardized curriculum and testing and pursuit of excellence that was dropped during the Lionel Orlikow years of the Schreyer term was to prevent students from being segregated as to abilities, that we couldn't do that, and that was part of the reason. But I guess the bottom line has to come, have we benefited the student and have we benefited the system that he's part of?

I think we have to now start saying to ourselves that, no, we haven't, and what is the answer? There could be a number of answers, but certainly one of the answers is going to be a recognition of excellence in the system. We don't recognize excellence any more in the school system. We lump everybody together and everybody moves in sort of an amorphous blob from one grade to the next in pursuit of excellence that is not really there. We look after - and it's good that we do - we look after our disadvantaged students, but very few places in school divisions have courses to look after the extremely capable and brilliant students.

I guess in this world of equal opportunity and fairness, one has to ask themselves, are we being fair to those very bright students; I don't think we are. The whole thing becomes tied together and that's why you find some families making extreme financial sacrifices to place their children in other than the public school system. They're placing them in the private school systems, so that those students can pursue the excellence that they're capable of.

I have children in the public school system right now and I think, by and large, the system at Miami works fairly well, but there are some very obvious flaws in it, too. For instance, to date, my children have not been challenged to do as good as they can, because once again we're pursuing sort of the middle of the road, in terms of class development. Children, I don't care whether they're age five in Kindergarten through 15, 16, 17, 18, as they approach high school, they will not deliver their maximum potential unless they're challenged.

We have removed a lot of the ability to challenge students in the school system because we don't want to actually show that one may have a greater capability than another. I mean, this uniformity, this egalitarian, this socialist idea that we can't have too much superiority or too much excellence, or someone doing better than someone else, denies the pursuit of

excellence from our school system. Any time you remove excellence, from any walk of life, you downgrade it for everyone that's part of it.

Mr. Chairman, I was listening to my colleague, the MLA for Morris. I have been a personal supporter of provincial examinations because they provide to the students some goal, some objective, some challenge that they can put their teeth into, that demands excellence, provides them with a preparation for the university situation much better than what they have now, because there's a lot of hardship for those students that go cold turkey from the public high school system to university and are challenged with things that they have told me they weren't prepared for adequately.

It provides employers, for those students who don't go further, it provides an employer with some benchmark from which to start his interviewing for the purpose of hiring; and no employer goes by marks alone. They go on the extra curricular activity record, the community activity record, the recommendations of that student goes, and marks are a part of it. So the Minister's concerns about the marks becoming everything is just not so, but I believe that the marks provide an excellent reference point that employees are missing, that universities are missing.

But my colleague pointed out something that was even more important to the student who's graduating from the high school system and that being, is an A in Midland Division the same as an A in Morris-McDonald Division, is the same as an A in Winnipeg No. 1? You know that's a very legitimate concern. Because if you have a teacher who says and this teacher happens to be, say, my daughter's high school teacher when she reaches the Miami Collegiate, who says that I'm not going to let any student go out of here thinking that they've got the world by the tail. I'm going to mark tough because it's a real world out there that they're going to face, so my daughter comes out with a C-plus. But in another school division where they play the game, if you will, and C-pluses become B-pluses or A-minuses, that is a system which has every potential to discriminate against my daughter or anybody's child who comes from a division that marks severely to prepare the child for the real world.

Mr. Chairman, that's an argument that I never even considered because I have to admit that I go back to those medieval times where we all had the same sort of marking for the same exam for the same course material across the province — (Interjection) — She was from the pre-medieval times, knights in shining armour and all that.

But that was a very persuasive point that my colleague put on the record and one I think the Minister has to concern herself about, because the purpose of the education system is not to satisfy the individual components who make it up from the teachers to the trustees to the administrators to the superintendents or even to the parents. The real concern in the education system is the children who are within it and theoretically gaining from it. I think there are a lot of inadequacies in the system today.

I think that this administration and the previous New Democratic administration did a lot to take the pursuit of excellence out of the education system and introduce mediocrity. That certainly isn't what most parents want. Having that pursuit of excellence removed, then the

very problems that my colleague, the MLA for Morris, put on the record and some of them that I've put on the record today become a real concern to parents throughout this province and, as students realize what's happened to them, a real concern to the students themselves.

I'd like to hear whether the Minister has a way around the example of a division which marks in a very tough way to prepare the student for the real world versus one that's relatively generous in terms of the ability — (Interjection) — well, even between schools within a division, to indicate whether the Minister has some concerns as to whether that has the potential of being not uniform and being discriminatory in the admission chances of students from these different schools or different divisions.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Chairman, I appreciated the information and the thoughtful points that were raised by the Member for Pembina. Talking about education brings out a lot of deep thinking and philosophical thought because a lot of us are very interested in our own children's education and in the education system. So I want to comment on a few, I think, very good points that he made.

I said before that the information we have shows that there is not a lot of inconsistency between marking between schools, between school divisions. It doesn't mean to say that it's all perfect and they're all done and they've got some sort of criteria that they all use and apply directly, but the checking and the information we have suggests that there is more consistency there between teachers in a school and teachers in a school division and across school divisions than there is between teachers in, for instance, the public school system and those who are examining in the university system. So it's not a perfect system and we never have said it is. But we have said it's one of the better systems.

Out of all the six jurisdictions that are using provincial exams - and I've been trying to give a lot of arguments for not moving to that as a simplistic way of dealing with the complex problems you've outlined - I don't think any of them use them totally as the marker, or the predictor, or the determiner for students' success.

One of the most important issues, he talks about the medieval times and being educated in the old days. I suppose he was lucky. Maybe he was a little bit competent and able and knew how to work the system and maybe he applied himself and he got through. But those medieval — (Interjection) — but those medieval times that he was educated in really only served a small percentage of the students very well. So he said we were challenged. — (Interjection) — No, there were a lot of students then that were kept out of that education system. The education system then was serving a small percentage of the children. I mean, how can we say that it wasn't? In the 1970s, something like 33 percent of the kids that went to school graduated. So how can we possibly say that it was serving all of the students?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** So graduation is more important than what you've got when you graduate, in other words?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** I want to deal with the point that he made about excellence.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** The pursuit of excellence is gone.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** I want to deal with the point he made about excellence and, if he'll stop beating his gums over there so I can address the points that he raised, I'd like to do that.

First of all, I don't agree that excellence has been taken out. I think when we talked about the percentage of A's - and one thing we do know is that our best students and our top students are better than they were in previous years - and the percentage that we have that he named from the universities would be about the same percentage that would be getting A's from the high school programs. We've got lots of indicators that show our kids are more competent, more able and that excellence is there and I keep pointing it out. We've got Literature awards; we've got language or English awards; we've got students who are sweeping the country with Science awards; and we've got so many ways of measuring excellence. Nobody pays any attention to them. Nobody recognizes the excellent quality of those students.

Bringing in programs for disadvantaged high risk students and special needs students when there was no program doesn't mean that you're taking away from excellence, and there shouldn't be. In fact, one of the factors for students' achievement and whether students apply themselves is not just the school but it's the home. So the greatest influence on students, he says they're not being challenged and they're not achieving everything they could. Now some of that is up to the school and the teachers to try and get those kids to meet the challenge, but let's not forget that a lot of it is up to the parents because they are a greater influence on - and if he feels his kids aren't achieving I think he'd better look, not just at the school and the teachers, but he'd better look at the push and the challenge and the stimulation that he's — (Interjection) — okay, then we don't want that on the record. We'll take that off the record.

If there are students that are not achieving, he said that there were students who were not being challenged. That he did say. I am saying that it is not because we have brought in programs for disadvantaged kids or opened up the doors for high risk, disadvantaged kids, that's not the reason. There is no reason why those programs can't go hand in hand with programs of excellence for gifted children and very capable students, and it should.

My last point was that the responsibility for kids rising to their challenge and meeting their full potential is the schools and the teachers but also the home. Let's not forget that they're the major influence on a student.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. The hour is 4:30, time for Private Members' Hour. I am leaving the Chair and will return at 8:00 p.m. tonight.

## IN SESSION

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The time being 4:30 and Private Members' Hour, the first item on the Order Paper is Debate on Second Readings of Public Bills.



On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for River East, Bill No. 29, the Honourable Member for Virden.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Did you call Bill 29, Mr. Speaker?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill 29, the Honourable Member for Virden.

**MR. C. MANNES:** I'll stand on his behalf.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Stand.

## PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

### RES. NO. 9 - AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL

**MR. SPEAKER:** Under proposed resolution, Resolution No. 9, the Honourable Member for Ellice has 20 minutes.

**MR. B. CORRIN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It's my pleasure to address the Assembly with respect to what I consider to be a very important resolution. I for some number of years did, as a member of the legal profession, participate in a special lawyers' subsection under the auspices of Amnesty International and, during that time, had occasion to attend many meetings where matters such as those which are raised in the preparatory paragraphs and recitals of the proposed resolution were discussed.

I, over the course of the years, came to realize that the question of torture, as it goes on throughout the scope of the world, is a very substantial one indeed. Although it is obvious that it's not a subject matter that lies within the scope of the jurisdiction of this House, I think it should also be obvious that it's one of those issues that begs public discussion everywhere in the democratic and free world. So I'm very pleased that the Member for Thompson has taken the time and given the consideration to raising this important matter in our forum, the Manitoba Legislature.

I am disappointed in the amendment, frankly, that has been proposed by the Member for Lakeside. The reason I'm disappointed in this amendment is because it really misses the import and the essence of the resolution before us. What it does, is step back and essentially take a very partisan type of position vis-à-vis incidents of torture and abuse of people throughout the world.

**MR. C. MANNES:** It's pro-western.

**MR. B. CORRIN:** Yes. The Member for Morris says it's pro-western. I guess what I thought we were trying to do in this resolution as an Assembly was come to some sort of consensus again as to the philosophical position that we, as Manitobans, take with respect to torture, not try and act judgmentally and indict one side or the other side, the eastern bloc countries or the western countries, but rather suggest that we, as a province, could stand in support of the United Nations Convention on this important subject.

The amendment simply doesn't do that. The amendment, with all due respect to the Member for Lakeside, misses that point altogether. The amendment

says well - I'm presuming this is the way the breakdown is going to happen politically in the Legislature. The amendment seems to suggest that, if we on this side refuse to take a partisan "pro-western approach," they on that side will refuse to endorse the United Nations Convention.

Well if everybody who came to the United Nations to sit in Assembly took that position, if every member nation took the position that there had to be a recital to the effect that their side somehow was the repository of some higher virtue, and that their side had never contributed to the problem, then the question really is, as I see it, how do you ever come to a consensus? How do you ever come to a consensus?

The Member for Lakeside says our side supported freedom and liberty. I don't want to get into the debate on that subject of which side - you know, I've always presumed that there are good people and bad people throughout the world. One of the operational principles I've always operated by was that there are people of honour throughout the world, and there are people who do not have principles and who are less inclined to act virtuously throughout the world.

I do know that in my lifetime, and I'll speak homiletically, I've lived with people who have experienced the terror of torture, and I have lived in very close proximity to them.

I know, when I was a boy, I can still remember growing up in family circumstances where people talked colloquially about family members who were put in gas chambers, who were hung on meat hooks, and the involvement of family members and friends in all sorts of atrocities during the last war. This was colloquial parlour chat. Some of it was bitter, and some of it was just sort of everyday chatter.

Now that may seem hard for you to believe but I remember, when I was five or six years old, I honestly didn't believe that I would ever live to be as old as I am today, because I have heard stories from the time I grew up about how people lived in quiet harmony in small towns and villages in places where they had lived for hundreds of years and one night were trundled out into trucks, put on railway cars like cattle and taken away. They didn't expect it, and they couldn't believe that nobody helped them. So it can happen, and that was in a western nation.

**MR. H. ENNS:** It still happens.

**MR. B. CORRIN:** That was in one of the western democracies. As a matter of fact, it happened over the face of several western democracies. You know, it's a sad reality.

Last week, I was reading about the reported death of the war criminal, Mengele, and there was a discussion - it was in the Globe and Mail - that involved itself with the recollections of survivors of Auschwitz and their recollection of this individual. He certainly was, I suppose, the quintessential arch-torturer, seemingly a person without any sort of compunction about the physical abuse of anybody, regardless of whether it was a man, a woman, a child, an elderly person, or what have you, his propensity for evil knew no bounds. But you know, we shouldn't assume that any of us are really safe from that potentiality. In recent times, I know

that I've worked myself, I guess on three cases, through amnesty, and in each case it brought home to me the very fragile nature of our freedom and our liberty.

One case involved a Vietnamese lawyer. A friend of mine in the Vietnamese community came to me - this individual is also a lawyer, he's a refugee from - I might add he's south Vietnamese - a refugee from the Hanoi Government - he told me that a former colleague of his had been tried on charges of possession of a firearm, to wit a small revolver which had been found in his home by the North Vietnamese Government, and that he had been sentenced to a term of 20 years as a terrorist.

He told me that this person was 56 years old; that he had been a prominent lawyer in Saigon before the fall of that city and country; that he had always been involved in political activity - apparently virulently anti-Communist; and that there were no other reasons that could be established for his apprehension and the severe nature of the sentence that he received. He was the father of three children, and a husband as well.

That is what we're fighting. Amnesty, in that case, took up the case. They worked through a sponsorship program and volunteers in Winnipeg did start to correspond with authorities in Vietnam, indicating that they were aware of the apprehension of this individual and wanting to know about his safety, what was being done with respect to appeal processes which were being put in place, and there were tangible efforts produced through this small volunteer unit in Winnipeg to make the world aware that there was a prisoner of conscience in a jail in Saigon.

So I think that it's very important that, when we consider this amendment, we consider the work that these people do, the altruism which they reflect in their everyday activity. I don't think the amendment, Mr. Speaker, as I said with respect, does that.

I said I would use three examples. Another example is the case of Anatole Shcharansky; again, active units throughout Canada and the United States who have been corresponding with the Soviet Government now for several years, and who fought to liberate another prisoner of conscience in the Soviet Union - Shcharansky. Shcharansky, again, a person who didn't do anything as far as anyone knows, except to say I want to leave, I don't like it here. In that state it's not possible to leave, if you are of Jewish descent, without special permits and without paying special amounts of money. There is a tax on emigration from the Soviet Union if you are Jewish, and special quotas. That is another example of the import and the significance of this particular resolution.

A third example was a Chilean journalist who I had the privilege of representing as a lawyer, who related to me her imprisonment and the terror she experienced at the hands of the Allende Government in El Salvador and Chile. This was a woman in her late thirties, the mother of two children. She had taught journalism at the University of Santiago in Chile and was admittedly a member of the Socialist Party. I said the Allende Government - I wish to clarify the record - I meant the Pinochet Government. She was a supporter of the Allende Government and, after the coup in that country in the early 1970s, she was apprehended without warrant, without any particular justification, without any cause, and kept incommunicado in prison in Santiago,

she thinks, because she was never sure where she was because she was moved about, for some two years.

She was reported to Amnesty International, and amnesty groups throughout North America and, for that matter, in Europe and other parts of the world, kept her under surveillance, monitoring her whereabouts through continual communication with the junta government, the Pinochet Government of Chile. She was eventually released because of the embarrassment which that government was experiencing on a worldwide basis.

When she was released, she told me, and she reported it in an anonymous speech or article, I remember, in the Free Press - she wasn't identified, but there was a lengthy full-page interview with her. She reported the nature of the atrocity she had been experiencing during those two years in prison, which included beatings, electric tortures and numerous other things which included such tactics as telling her that her children had been killed because she refused to give information about the former activities of her political teammates and cohorts in the Allende Party. In fact, her children and her husband had escaped from Chile shortly after the coup and were safe. For two years she thought that they were all imprisoned and her children had been killed.

We are told that in Iran it has been a common custom, or was under the Shah of Iran, under the master tortures of the Shah, for children to be tortured in front of their parents in order to elicit information. I remember a Time magazine feature, it was four or five pages in length, some years ago, detailing that sort of interrogation methodology in that country.

We live in a very brittle and a very nasty world, I suppose, and the reality is that we have to do something about it, even on a small scale. It's really very difficult for any person of conscience, who proposes that he or she is a person who espouses human liberty, to rest when there are bestial activities such as those taking place in any part of the planet.

I can go on. I remember working with a lawyer who introduced me to his father who was from Uganda. I remember the father telling me that when he was 70 years old on the streets, I believe, of Kampala in Uganda, he had the terrifying experience of being pursued by a dozen military personnel with rifles for no particular reason, other than the fact that they were rounding up East Indians on the street that day, and he happened to be obviously different from the other people. They didn't catch him because he hid under a car, but he told me that the East Indian gentleman they caught was beaten to a pulp with rifle butts right there on the street in front of his eyes, and that's reality in the world, so that's what we're facing. Idi Amin actually had the Chief Justice of the Court of Appeal of Uganda executed and his body was found floating in the river in that country several weeks after his disappearance, severely beaten and tortured. That's reality.

So I say it is time for those of us who enjoy the freedom and liberties conferred upon us in this country and which have been hard fought for and gained through Marshall conflict and also through the process of political, not only compromise and consensus, but also political warrant. It is time for those of us who can enjoy such things as a Charter of Rights, a law

enforcement review agency in our own province. If somebody complains about abuses of police power there is now thanks to, I might add this government, a Law Enforcement Review Act which will refer such matters to a special agency which will operate independently of government and the police in order to investigate and establish whether there has been any wrongdoing perpetrated against such an individual.

We are privileged to live in a land where there are ombudsmen, law enforcement review agencies, charters of rights. We indeed are privileged. We have all sorts of enshrined rights and legislated rights which are foreign to most people on this planet, but I think it is all the more reason why we should take deliberate — (Interjection) — well, as I said earlier, the Member for Lakeview suggests that all the western democracies have some special stature and status in the world. That isn't what is at issue.

What is at issue is whether the nations of the world can establish consensus and whether they can all come together as good people and agree on a United Nations resolution which will take action, which will necessitate the investigation and public review of matters involving torture, and prosecute, on an international basis, offenders who perpetrate such actions. That's what is important. The Member for Thompson and government members are proposing that should be done on a worldwide basis and that members of this House should come together and support that particular concept.

If you vote against the proposal simply because — (Interjection) — well, we hope that you will support it on any basis. Whether we accept the amendment or not accept the amendment, we hope you'll still support the resolution. So we'll not only be supporting the cause of the volunteers in amnesty throughout the world, but we'll also be supporting those who have nothing to hope for but the good intentions and the good will of those who serve as volunteers in such organizations, and there are thousands of them throughout the world.

I can also say in closing that I have a friend who has dedicated his life to amnesty. He moved from Winnipeg to London some 12 years ago. He is now the Sino-Soviet expert in amnesty in the London head office. He trained himself to speak Russian in order to be able to correspond with political leaders in that country in order to deal with cases involving prisoners held in that country. I know on several occasions when I have had the privilege to visit with him, he has told me of the difficulties which are experienced in dealing with that government.

So I don't want you to think, in closing, that I have any partisan enthusiasm as I've said other times for that government, I do not; and there is no reason I know why anybody in this Chamber should. It is a horrible government. It is a vicious government. It is a cruel government. But I think we should put that aside for a few hours and come together and vote for something positive.

Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Member for Rupertsland.

**MR. E. HARPER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak on this timely issue the question of amnesty international and the elimination of torture throughout the world.

As a Treaty Indian who represents a largely Native constituency I have many times in aboriginal conferences in Manitoba and Ottawa heard and listened to impassioned statements by aboriginal people from other countries concerning torture and exploitation of their people in those countries.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that whenever accounts of torture in this hemisphere occur, it seems that almost all of the victims involved are aboriginal people, people in Chile, people in San Salvador, Columbia, Honduras, Haiti, Guatemala, Paraguay and other countries.

It seems that in most of Central and South America any opposition to the government, whether real or imaginary, results in torture and suppression by the authorities.

I am sure all the members of the House are most concerned about the escalation of tortures and murders during the last few years. Just last week the American government approved another \$27 million for the Contras, a loose coalition of mercenaries, bandits and terrorists who have murdered thousands of men, women and children in Nicaragua.

What is the motive for the suppression of aboriginal people in this region? Usually it is because people are asking for land and some control of their lives.

Two years ago, I was in Chile. I was invited by a friend who I had met in a World Assembly Conference in Regina a year before. He invited me to attend a conference in Chile and this person was a Mapuche Indian.

I might like to quote the Member for Charleswood, the former Premier of this Province, as to what he said about Chile and also the government that exists there and it's from Macleans magazine, November 10, 1980, and it is basically a profile on Sterling Lyon. It says here, "A Lyon in winter. The Tories' Tory bows down to his makers. He believes that generals who run Chile, one of their shortcomings are less dangerous to the world than the late Marxist Leader Salvador Allende because at least they are on our side." That is what he said. — (Interjection) — The dictatorship that exists there, the honourable member has said, they are on our side.

Since the three-year rule there, the beginnings, according to the estimates of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, 30,000 people were killed and about another 100,000 were imprisoned and tortured. Yet the former Premier said that these people are on their side.

**A MEMBER:** They're good people.

**MR. E. HARPER:** Hundreds of thousands of other people were expelled from that country and exiled.

I would like to quote from the Christian Science Monitor of July 7, 1975, in which Pinochet is adamant in insisting he will never return to the democratic rule. I quote from Pinochet, and he says: "I'm going to die, and the person who succeeds will also die, but there will be no elections." That's what he said. "There will be no elections." Yet, the Honourable Member for Charleswood says they're on our side.

Well let me say about another example of another person also. His name is Alonso Marquez de la Plata

- my Spanish is terrible - but he was the former president of the Agricultural National Society. He is the Minister of the Military Government there. He said: "In Chile there are no Indians; there are only Chileans." That's what he said.

I'd like to quote from a Mapuche Indian. He's also a leader of the Mapuche Indians. His name is Antonio Millape. He was living in exile from his homeland since 1973. A statement he made was: "We have the human right to exist. Our way of existing is to be Indian, and that is our only way. To live as Indians, we must have our own land." You know, that sounds similar when we look at our history in terms of what the Indian people have gone through.

You talk about the free democratic societies in this western country. What happened in Wounded Knee there? The FBI harassed the Indian people there on reservations. Even in Canada today, when the people were making treaties, they sent an infested blanket to the reserve with smallpox to wipe out Indian people, cultural genocide. Yet, we always proclaim about free societies and open democratic governments.

As a matter of fact, in 1979 a fact-finding trip was made to Chile to study the impact on the Indian law, they called it. The Indian law in Chile was No. 2568, and is always referred to as a death certificate. As a matter of fact, one of the members was George Manuel who was also a former president of the National Indian Brotherhood at that time. He was the leader of the Union of B.C. Chiefs and also the president of the World Conference of Indigenous People.

I would like to quote what he said when he came back from Chile. He said: "The thing that really worries me, as leader of the World Conference of Indigenous People is that Pinochet's new law is a threat to indigenous people everywhere. For the first time a government, the Chilean Government, has implemented a law which could be an example to other governments, even the Canadian Government, for the assimilation of Indian people."

You know, that's a typical history that aboriginal people have gone through. You look back, in 1969, when a White Policy Paper was introduced in which Indian people were to be assimilated and also treated as ordinary citizens. They had made treaties for these Indian people, set aside land. Yet, today we see federal cutbacks that have the markings of trying to re-establish the 1969 White Paper policy. The Indian people, the aboriginal people of the world have been suppressed and tortured, whether it be a communist country, whether it be a democratic country. They have always been put through those similar histories.

When I was in Chile, I met with the Mapuche people. Some of them came and spoke to me privately. Some of those people were tortured, thrown in jail, electrocuted, blindfolded, starved. Some of the horrible things that they mentioned, I can't even say in this House what was done to them. Even some of their relatives are still in jail. Some of them don't even know whether they're still alive or not.

Since 1973, the Mapuches, which are the Indian people in Chile, they've been tortured and murdered, and I spoke to many of them. As a matter of fact, one evening there I spoke, not to a Mapuche Indian, but the Chilean who was a lawyer. He knew of a situation just a couple days ago at that time. He told me a story.

There was 16-year-old kid who was stealing. The police took him behind the fields and tied him to a horse, and killed him. There were no questions asked at all - no justice.

The Mapuche, they were being tortured and also their land was being divided up into individual parcels and granted individual titles, so that these Mapuche people were subject to either bartering or, because they can't really grow any seeds or they have to have money and the credit wasn't available to them, in a long sense they lost their land. Maybe they say, I might buy some seeds and they couldn't afford it. Pretty soon, the rich merchant or the rich people took control of their land, and they lost their land in that way.

Many of the Mapuche people are living in exile today. I know a special friend that I have in Winnipeg who lives in exile from Chile and hopes to get back to see his family. When I left there, it really bothered me, because I see conditions and the people are being suppressed. At least, I felt lucky that I'm living in this country, but yet there are many shortfalls that Indian people have to face here in Canada. In Canada, we have suicide rates maybe six times higher than the general society, but we are beginning to see development taking place in these communities. Certainly the federal cutbacks that also were leaked in a document wouldn't help solve the problem, and some of the recommendations that were made to the government of closing down of some such schools and starting to use some deterrent fees and closing some Indian hospitals, reducing and some elimination of federal funding from most medical and housing and education and employment and including land claims.

When we talk about Indian people trying to gain control of their lives and also start determining their destiny and talk about self-government, that seems that the Federal Government is pulling the carpet from under our feet. We need the support and also some of the programs that we need desperately have to be maintained by the Federal Government. I, for one, would try to maintain and also try to force the Federal Government to abandon its report entirely. Many of my constituents while travelling in the constituency have indicated to me about some of the cutbacks, especially on the old age pensions.

I was just in Cross Lake this last weekend, and I had many calls from the old people concerning the cutbacks and also the de-indexation of the pensions. They were really quite worried, because there it means quite a bit because the dollars there don't buy very much groceries and the cost of living is very high.

I would like to mention that some of the things that are happening in Chile also are not just the imagination of myself or what happened there. I spoke to the people, and even the press have written editorials about the situation in Chile.

Even in the Free Press, there is an article, and I would like to quote from that. It's the Free Press on November 8, 1984. "General Pinochet has never been a legal president. He committed treason in 1973 by leading the armed forces in rebellion against the elected president, Salvador Allende. Having organized the assassination of the president, he eliminated the democratic politics and turned Chile into a graveyard for those not to espouse his ultra-Conservative views. Like Libyan dictator, Muammar Kadaffi, he sent killers

abroad to assassinate his exiled political opponents. He stained the formerly high reputation of the Chilean armed forces by associating it with the routine torture and contempt for human rights and disregard for the constitution that it supported for over a century. Then he displayed administrative and economic incompetence in applying the harsh, economic doctrines of Milton Friedman in such a ham-fisted way that Dr. Friedman repudiated his pupil."

When I was in Chile, I spoke in terms of what is there for them, because they wanted to ask me in terms of what they can do to help themselves. Basically, the issue was always the land, because in order to survive you have to have a land base. As a matter of fact, when I was there, one Mapuche killed his own brother over land issues. This is the kind of chaos and also the kind of conditions and environment that the government is creating there to turn people against their own people. Mr. Speaker, here in Canada we have our own problems to solve in respect to the aboriginal people.

Mr. Speaker, torture is a fundamental violation of human rights, and I condemn its use by many countries against political prisoners and aboriginal people. I also condemn those countries which finance and supply the tools of torture in Central and South America as well as the Soviet bloc.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I'll conclude my statements. Thank you very much.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Thompson to the amendment.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In rising to speak on the amendment, I must express my extreme disappointment at the reaction of members opposite to the resolution I have put forward in this House some weeks ago in regard to this matter, and also in regard to the specific amendment that they have moved and that we are debating at the present time.

In terms of my disappointment, I think there could be nothing more disappointing than my reaction to the speech made by the Member for Lakeside, because in that speech I think he showed that he had no understanding of this resolution, of its intent, and also perhaps, Mr. Speaker, even worse than that, a complete ignorance of a number of historical items that he referred to, an ignorance which I feel was an extreme insult to some of the people connected with at least one country that he made reference to.

To state that very clearly, Mr. Speaker, and state it for the record, that country was Chile. The remark I was referring to was his remark that there was a Marxist dictatorship in Chile under Salvador Allende, Mr. Speaker, which, as I pointed out on a point of order during the initial debate, was completely and utterly untrue.

Subsequent to that debate, Mr. Speaker, I understand that a variety of Chilean groups have written to the Member for Lakeside to educate him on exactly what happened in Chile during that period, and educate him on the fact that Salvador Allende was a democratically elected president; that there was a democratically

elected government; that there was no torture, as the Member for Lakeside seemed to imply; and that the Member for Lakeside owes a very real apology most definitely to the Chilean community of Manitoba and to other Chileans in Canada, but I think to Chileans in general for his ignorance and for his rather insulting comments.

So, as I said, Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak today, that is one of the first items I want to address. But you know, Mr. Speaker, the indication that we received from the Member for Lakeside on that particular item, I think, shows the fault of members opposite in regard, both to their general response to this resolution, and to their proposed amendment.

In the original resolution, Mr. Speaker, it made it very clear that the intent of this resolution was to work toward the elimination of torture in countries throughout this world, regardless of their ideological makeup; that was made very clear. But what the members opposite have attempted to do now is to turn this into a political resolution by a gratuitous, and unfortunately incorrect, reference to the western democracies and their record on torture.

You know, I must say that I am very very very disappointed that they didn't do a bit more research in regard to torture before proposing this amendment to the resolution. Because, if they had, they would have found that unfortunately, western democracies have not been without fault in this particular area. Not in terms of other jurisdictions, but within their own jurisdictions. If they would have checked into the situation, they would have found that there had been allegations of torture in western democracies.

I cite, Mr. Speaker, as a few examples of this, notations in a book called "Torture in the Eighties" an Amnesty International Report, which is prepared by Amnesty International and published in 1984. In this book, Mr. Speaker, they point out that there have been documented cases of torture in the United Kingdom; in Spain; in Turkey when it was a democracy; and in Italy. Mr. Speaker, I would agree with a statement that said that the record of western democracies has been far superior to the record of other countries, in general; I don't think there is any doubt about that. I agree with the statement that, because of the genuine freedom and openness in our societies, we are able to deal with problems such as torture more effectively. There is no doubt about that, Mr. Speaker, but unfortunately, it is not true to state that there have not been cases of torture in western democracies and, by implication, to suggest that there will be no further cases of torture in western democracies.

I don't think any country can assume that its state apparatus will not use torture. We always have to be on guard to prevent that. I think that has to be stated very clearly in any discussion on this particular amendment.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, apart from those examples I've mentioned, the obvious fact, the premise of the amendment is inaccurate. I think there's a more serious problem with the amendment, and it's a problem to do with omission, a very major omission from the amendment. The amendment states that western democracies should be basically congratulated for the elimination of torture in their jurisdictions. But when I spoke in debate, and introduced this resolution for

debate, I stated quite clearly that in my view, and in the view of many, we have to go beyond consideration of our own jurisdiction. I stated quite clearly then that Canada has had a good record in regard to this matter; that we have had a good record in regard to torture; and we are one of the countries which has issued a unilateral declaration against torture. In fact, we did it, Mr. Speaker, on December 18, 1982, so we're one of the leaders in this regard, internationally.

But that's not the point. The point is that there are many countries that we have dealings with, there are many countries that other western democracies have dealings with, which are conducting torture. And the point, very succinctly, Mr. Speaker, is that we, as western democracies, have to apply our condemnation of torture, not only to our own countries, but to all countries. It's not just a question of having dealings in terms of trade, or indirect dealings with other countries. There are, Mr. Speaker, very definite, direct dealings with countries which are, not only turning a blind eye to torture, but are assisting torture.

As an example, Mr. Speaker, I would refer perhaps to one of the most obvious examples where this occurs, and that is the United States Military Assistance Program. This is a program, Mr. Speaker, which has been developed, applied to a number of countries throughout the world - I'd like to list some of the countries and some of the figures that are involved with those countries.

Among the leading recipients of aid under this program are Taiwan, Indonesia, South Korea, the Philippines, Argentina, and Brazil. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to quote from "Torture in the Eighties," which documents reports of torture, and check the list of the countries, the major recipients of the Military Assistance Program, which is aimed directly at developing military and police capabilities in those countries, and quote some of the countries and compare it to that list.

Brazil, Mr. Speaker, appears in this book. It's a country where there have been documented cases of torture. Argentina, under the military government that was replaced only some two years ago, is listed. So is the Philippines; so is South Korea; so is Indonesia; so is Taiwan. Mr. Speaker, each and every one of the major recipients of aid under this military and police program is listed as having a multitude of complaints in regard to torture in those jurisdictions.

What is the Military Assistance Program? Where does it relate? What is it involved with? It's involved with developing military and paramilitary forces and police forces in terms of internal security purposes.

So, Mr. Speaker, what that program does is provide funds and training to the police forces and the paramilitary forces in those countries that have been committing the torture. When I look at a situation such as that, I say that we can't give ourselves much congratulations as western democracies, because what we are doing in those countries, unfortunately, is the same as is happening in other documented countries such as Afghanistan, for example, and a number of other countries which are receiving the same sort of aid, the same sort of training in torture that the western democracies, particularly the United States, is providing the countries I've just listed.

So when I look at that, Mr. Speaker, I say that we have a right, as people in an open society, a free society,

to stand up, not to pat ourselves on the back, but to criticize what is an obvious abuse on the part of nations in our own family of nations, family of western democracies. I think that's very important.

But there's an even broader problem that I see, apart from the obvious examples I've documented, of what has happened. I know that the Member for Lakeside and others will have a reaction to that, as did Sterling Lyon in his well-documented comment, that, well, there are the good guys and there are the bad guys and, in the case of Pinochet, for example, at least they're on our side, so we won't condemn them, we won't condemn their form of government, their abysmal record on human rights, that's really the sort of mentality that we hear so obviously from the Member for Lakeside's statements in regard to Chile. You know, he was wrong. I mean he was so ignorant of the facts that he wasn't aware that there was no dictatorship in Chile, but that didn't stop him from getting up and slandering the name of Allende, slandering the Chilean democracy, Mr. Speaker, that didn't prevent him from doing that, and I think I know why. It's because he took the label "Marxist" and he applied it to that country, and he assumed that if it was on the other side of the good-guy, bad-guy list of nations that he has, that somehow there were abuses of human rights and torture. That's what he assumed.

It was the same thing in terms of the us and the them, and the good guys and the bad guys, but when it comes to torture there are no easily defined dividing lines. There are documented cases of torture in governments of all stripes and we have to condemn, not just the governments for their political stripes when we're talking about torture, because when we do that, Mr. Speaker, are we not to condemn the western democracies when there is torture in their nations, because they have the same sort of government as us?

Well, that is the logical conclusion of the thinking of the Member for Lakeside and the members opposite. They will condemn torture if it's in a nation whose system of government they oppose, but when it comes to the western democracies, they'll ignore our indirect assistance to torture, and perhaps I think, even more disappointing they'll ignore documented cases of torture in those western democracies; all once again as part of their blinkered vision of the world which applies, unfortunately, to too many items of discussion that we see brought before us.

The solution to torture is to condemn it in and as of itself. The solution to torture has to begin with condemning it in our own jurisdiction, but it has to go further than that. I want to get back to my original comments, the original statement that I made in introducing this resolution, because I emphasized that then. I said that this resolution is about a specific U.N. proposal. It's a proposal, I think, we can all support, but it has to go further than that and we have to, all as individuals and all as countries, apply our condemnation of torture not to our own countries, but to other countries as well.

The way to do that, Mr. Speaker, the way to really show our outrage about torture is not to introduce amendments such as this, because amendments such as this based on a faulty premise, which turn a blind eye to the real problem, don't do any good.

The solution, Mr. Speaker -- (Interjection) — well, the Member for Pembina once again wants to label members on this side, and myself in particular, in terms of the comments. I will condemn any government, any government which condones and supports torture. I will condemn our friends, and I will condemn our adversaries as well, Mr. Speaker, because torture is the problem.

So as I said, Mr. Speaker, the bottom line has to be that we all have a part to play in seeing that torture is eradicated from the face of this earth in each and every country, because we're all human beings. The torture of just one person, Mr. Speaker, to me is such an affront to human dignity that I have to stand up and oppose it. I don't care who that person or why they're being tortured, I'm not interested in the politics. I don't care if they're right or they're left or they're centre, or if it's because of religious reasons, Mr. Speaker, I don't care, that's not my concern. I don't care why they're being persecuted and tortured. What I care about is that very fact that they're being tortured and persecuted.

I wish members opposite would join in that. I'm sure there must be at least a handful amongst their midst who don't resort to that blinkered vision of the world that we see from some members, such as the Member for Pembina and the Member for Lakeside. I'm sure there must be some there who are offended, as I am, by torture wherever it occurs. I'm sure there are some who will stand up and admit the fact that this amendment was a mistake, and that we should get back to discussing the real issue, which is torture, and get back to the real issue, Mr. Speaker, which is outlined in the original resolution, and that is that we all take a stand against torture no matter where it exists in this world.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour. Is it the pleasure of the House to call it 5:30? (Agreed) When this motion is next before the House, the Honourable Minister will have 20 minutes remaining.

The time being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair and the House will reconvene in committee this evening at 8:00 p.m.