

Name	Electoral Division	Address
ALEXANDER, Keith	Roblin	Roblin, Man.
BAIZLEY, Obie	Osborne	185 Maplewood Ave., Winnipeg 13
BJORNSON, Oscar F.	Lac du Bonnet	Lac du Bonnet, Man.
CAMPBELL, D. L.	Lakeside	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29
CARROLL, Hon. J.B.	The Pas	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
CHRISTIANSON, John Aaron	Portage la Prairie	86-9th St., N.W., Ptge. la Prairie, Man.
CORBETT, A. H.	Swan River	Swan River, Man.
COWAN, James, Q.C.	Winnipeg Centre	512 Avenue Bldg., Winnipeg 2
DESJARDINS, Laurent	St. Boniface	138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man.
DOW, E. I.	Turtle Mountain	Boissevain, Man.
EVANS, Hon. Gurney	Fort Rouge	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORBES, Mrs. Thelma	Cypress	Rathwell, Man.
FROESE, J. M.	Rhineland	Winkler, Man.
GRAY, Morris A.	Inkster	141 Cathedral Ave., Winnipeg 4
GROVES, Fred	St. Vital	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8
GUTTORMSON, Elman	St. George	Lundar, Man.
HAMILTON, William Homer	Dufferin	Sperling, Man.
HARRIS, Lemuel	Logan	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
HARRISON, Hon. Abram W.	Rock Lake	Holmfield, Man.
HAWRYLUK, J. M.	Burrows	84 Furby St., Winnipeg 1
HILLHOUSE, T.P., Q.C.	Selkirk	Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man.
HRZHORCZUK, M.N., Q.C.	Ethelbert Plains	Ethelbert, Man.
HUTTON, Hon. George	Rockwood-Iberville	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
INGEBRIGTSON, J. E.	Churchill	Churchill, Man.
JEANNOTTE, J. E.	Rupertsland	Meadow Portage, Man.
JOHNSON, Hon. George	Gimli	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg
JOHNSON, Geo. Wm.	Assiniboia	212 Oakdean Blvd., St. James, Wpg. 12
KLYM, Fred T.	Springfield	Beausejour, Man.
LISSAMAN, R. O.	Brandon	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
LYON, Hon. Sterling R., Q.C.	Fort Garry	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MARTIN, W. G.	St. Matthews	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
McKELLAR, M. E.	Souris-Lansdowne	Nesbitt, Man.
McLEAN, Hon. Stewart E., Q.C.	Dauphin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MOLGAT, Gildas	Ste. Rose	Ste. Rose du Lac, Man.
MORRISON, Mrs. Carolyne	Pembina	Manitou, Man.
ORLIKOW, David	St. John's	179 Montrose St., Winnipeg 9
PAULLEY, Russell	Radisson	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man.
PETERS, S.	Elmwood	225 Melrose Ave., Winnipeg 15
PREFONTAINE, Edmond	Carillon	St. Pierre, Man.
REID, A. J.	Kildonan	561 Trent Ave., E. Kild., Winnipeg 15
ROBERTS, Stan	La Verendrye	Niverville, Man.
ROBLIN, Hon. Duff	Wolseley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
SCARTH, W.B., Q.C.	River Heights	407 Queenston St., Winnipeg 9
SCHREYER, E. R.	Brokenhead	Beausejour, Man.
SEABORN, Richard	Wellington	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
SHEWMAN, Harry P.	Morris	Morris, Man.
SHOEMAKER, Nelson	Gladstone	Neepawa, Man.
SMELLIE, Robert Gordon	Birtle-Russell	Russell, Man.
STANES, D. M.	St. James	381 Guildford St., St. James, Wpg. 12
STRICKLAND, B. P.	Hamiota	Hamiota, Man.
TANCHAK, John P.	Emerson	Ridgeville, Man.
THOMPSON, Hon. John, Q.C.	Virden	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
WAGNER, Peter	Fisher	Fisher Branch, Man.
WATT, J. D.	Arthur	Reston, Man.
WEIR, Walter	Minnedosa	Minnedosa, Man.
WITNEY, Hon. Charles H.	Flin Flon	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
WRIGHT, Arthur E.	Seven Oaks	4 Lord Glenn Apts. 1944 Main St., Wpg. 17

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:30 o'clock, Monday, March 27th, 1961.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mines and Resources - 1. Administration. Item (a) - passed. Item (b) - passed. (a) (2) - passed. (b) (1) - passed.

MR. PAULLEY: Hold it, hold it, Mr. Chairman. Question on reading the results of a record of Hansard, my honourable friend the Member for Carillon referred to Hansard because it didn't record that a certain item had passed. Now I hope that by virtue of the fact of you saying passing on two or three items that Hansard does not reveal that these items have passed when in effect actually they have not. Now there were questions directed to the Minister prior to the supper recess under his salary, I'm sure that he's going to answer to that, and I do believe that there's one or two more questions on it, so I suggest rather than any item being passed that we revert back to salary.

MR. A. J. REID (Kildonan): Mr. Chairman, in the Throne Speech it was mentioned that funds will be sought to purchase Grand Beach property and also that certain improvements will be made to Winnipeg Beach property. Well I hope, Sir, that when the Minister brings down his estimate he'll give us a breakdown on these items because I have spoken to him about Winnipeg Beach properties and also he has had delegations, but nothing has been done lately on this project. Campers and local residents have paid taxes in these areas, especially the Winnipeg Beach area, for years. Firstly I have no objection to the purchasing of the Grand Beach properties, or in fact any areas for parks or recreational facilities, but I firmly believe that the old established facilities should definitely be given some consideration and not be allowed to revert into a dilapidated condition such as I understand the Winnipeg Beach site is becoming. In fact, when I vote for the estimates I want to know what is going to be done definitely with such sums of money.

Now, Sir, I understand that commercial fishing is at a very low ebb through such insignificant prices paid to fishermen and lack of markets. Well, Sir, here I have a booklet published by the Mines Department; here's what it says: "An ounce of whitefish. In recent nine-year period '49 to '58, commercial landings of commercial whitefish in Canada have averaged 24.6 million pounds. This figure is nearly one-quarter of the weight and almost one-third of the value of all Canadian commercial fresh-water fish. Convert the various dressed and fillet weights of whitefish and equivalent land or round weight, indicates that 93 percent of the above catch was exported. The domestic disappearance figures, fish which Canadians ate at home, amount to 1.8 million pounds. This would represent about half of ten percent of the catch not exported in terms of eatable weight. On the annual basis this works out around one-fifteenth of a pound per head of population, or just about an ounce of whitefish yearly." Well, Sir, the point I'm getting at is that in many countries the consumption of fish is far greater than it is over here. I don't know whether their standard of living is lower than ours, but I believe one of the main problems is the wide spread in the price that is paid to fishermen, and eventually what the consumer has to pay. I believe that the department should publicize more the food value of fish, and that in comparison it is not high in proportion to the price of other food products. Speaking of fishing, Mr. Chairman, I believe that special concession should be made when it comes to matter of fishing licenses, especially for a group of tourists from outside of the province who may possibly just be visiting us for a day or so. It's true -- I read a little article in the Wildlife of March '61 -- that now for angling you only have to have one license for the whole season, for summer and winter fishing; that is a little improvement for the local fishermen.

Also I notice a little news slip in the paper recently that the Department of Mines and Natural Resources had auctioned off seized cars and firearms, etcetera, and I was just wondering if this auction is publicized, and is it open to the public, and also if the former owners can bid on their former possessions?

Mr. Chairman, I was just wondering what happened that private shooting lodge and lake that the government bought a couple of years ago somewhere in the Netley Marshes. When I looked through the Annual Report of Mines and Natural Resources I could see nothing on it. I was just wondering what's so secretive about it, or maybe it's not open to the public and just a few officials have the opportunity to shoot there. I would appreciate if the Minister would inform us on that project.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q. C. (Ethelbert Plains): I've always taken a very keen interest in matters that come within the purview of this department, and, as I've said previously on other occasions, I feel that Manitobans have been blessed with a bounty beyond that of most people in this world, and I think that all the members of the House, as well as all Manitobans, realize that their heritage is one to be very carefully preserved and to be improved. Now there are matters in these particular estimates that I'll refer to as we come to them, but there's one thing that has struck me as rather odd. The Minister in his address mentioned the fact that he has reorganized the form of his estimates, and I've no objection to that, but one of the duties of the opposition is to check on the policies of the government, their expenditures and so forth, and I find it very difficult to compare this year's estimates with last year's, not only because of the change in the format, but the figures given on the left-hand side of this year's estimates, Mr. Chairman, which are supposed to correspond with the figures of the current year's estimates, do not correspond in many instances. The first one is under Administration, in (a)(1) Other Salaries; in this year's estimates we have the figure \$51,635 whereas the item in last year's, that is the current year's estimates, is \$65,990. Well, these two figures should be the same. And there are quite a number of these discrepancies right throughout these estimates and I intend to raise them as we come along. I do not see how we can check on this department properly unless the Minister is in a position to explain these discrepancies, and some of them are pretty heavy. I can understand one or two of them where he added another subdivision; under Field Operations, that may explain some of them, but like this one here, I can't see an explanation and I'd like to have it.

MR. HAWRYLUK: Mr. Chairman, we're all aware that there's a big project going up north. This is just a question regarding an article that appeared in the paper about the fact that certain significant historic sites were being destroyed by the construction crew in the building of this dam at Grand Rapids. It seems that a former factor of Hudson's Bay Company, Mr. William MacKay, made a statement to the press that he said much of the old Hudson's Bay tramline which was used to ferry the Old York factory boats had been wrecked by the construction crew. Now, there was some explanation given later on and I was just wondering whether there was any truth to that or if something had been done to safeguard some of these historic sites in that part of the country?

MR. A. E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on the Minister's salary. I'm very pleased to note that the various fish and game associations in Manitoba are so pleased with our Minister. I notice that he is very -- I think the word is ubiquitous -- he seems to be all over and everywhere at once, and I would like to ask him a question about fishing licenses. I notice that licenses are now \$1.00 for the whole year, but it says \$1.00 for all Canadian residents. Is that right, or is that for Manitoba? The Province of Ontario has a license for Ontario and another one for residents of Manitoba. I just wondered whether that was Also I notice that in flight operations in Manitoba -- I'm very concerned about the amount of area that is being covered by our Manitoba Government Air Service machines. I notice that nowhere in the report can I find the number of machines, but I believe there are nine -- putting two and two together I believe we have nine machines -- and these machines are used so many ways that it's amazing when you realize how much work they really do. And that concerns me with these emergency services that they're being called upon to help with, and I know that when an emergency arises everything else stops -- that the work of mercy, of course, comes first, but in the report I notice that much more time is being given to the Department of Health and Welfare, and it leaves me to wonder why some consideration is not being given to an ambulance air service similar to the one in Saskatchewan, now that we're developing the north, and I wonder whether these aircraft -- I believe they're small aircraft and I know they have low landing speeds -- but I'm just wondering whether they are equipped to take care of these emergencies which will arise more frequently now that we're developing the north country. I'm very doubtful as to whether they are equipped with oxygen; I'd like to know what qualifications the pilots have -- well, I know they're called upon to do so many different jobs, from dropping fingerlings into the lakes to taking survey parties in the north; I'm much concerned with that. I think that some thought should be given to properly train personnel, the plane should be properly equipped now in this business of these emergencies in the north.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, dealing with the items that have come up, I think I would

(Mr. Witney, cont'd.) like to start first of all with Grand Rapids which was brought up by the Leader of the CCF Party just before we adjourned. He asked many questions about the Grand Rapids development, and he had a brief which I have seen, which came out of Flnn Flon, and unfortunately the brief that he had contained many inaccuracies because the brief was based on the forebay of the Grand Rapids forebay being at 846 feet. Now the Manitoba Hydro Electric Board have a license for 844 feet, but for a good number of years they won't be using that footage, they will be operating only at 842 feet, and the brief that the member has, also refers to some 3,600 square miles which will be inundated by water. Actually the amount will be some 2,400 square miles. The brief also referred to the Hudson's Bay Railway being subjected to danger by the forebay flooding, and I can assure you that the CNR would never allow such a condition to happen, and that the operating levels of 842 or even at future operating levels of 844, the CNR railway will not be subjected to any danger from the forebay. At the figure of 842 and at 844 for years to come, the No. 10 highway will be miles away from the forebay flooding. In addition, he mentioned that The Pas would only be about six miles away. Under the operating conditions of 842, or in years to come of 844, The Pas will be much further from the forebay area than it is at the present time, and these figures in respect to The Pas and the damage that might be done up at The Pas and Opasquia Valley, and once again I can assure him that no decision would have been made on a higher forebay level with \$3 million having been spent on the experimental project in the Opasquia area. These figures neglect the fact that the Saskatchewan River is going to be very well controlled in compartments with the dam at Outlook in Saskatchewan being constructed at the present time, with another dam at Squaw Rapids in Saskatchewan being constructed on the Tortue River. All of these dams will have a tendency to put the rivers into compartments and thus control the flow of the river. In addition, another dam -- I can't recall the name of it -- but an irrigation scheme in Alberta, which in addition has a controlling factor on the Saskatchewan River and the forebay at Grand Rapids.

He mentioned many things in his speech this afternoon. He mentioned about the fact Cormorant may have the fishing in Cormorant Lake affected by the high forebay levels, and once again he was thinking in terms, or the brief was thinking in terms, of 846 feet. Actually the amount of water that will be pushed back up onto Cormorant Lake will not be very much; the Village of Cormorant will not be affected, and we do not anticipate that fishing on Cormorant Lake will be affected either.

With the matter of timber resources, I think it is to be remembered that the area that is going to be flooded is a wet lands area, and in the wet lands area we do not have any forest of any significant value. On some of the levies we may have forests but most of those are poplar stands which are not of a great deal of commercial value. And what is left in the coniferous forest in the forebay area at the present time in those wet lands, is all young growth. The major forest industry which could develop north of Grand Rapids will not be affected by the forebay flooding.

In fishing, the commercial fishing in the Cormorant and Cedar Lake areas amounts only to some 200,000 pounds at the present time, and we have every hope that with the forebay, when it is inundated, that we will be able to have an intensive and more controlled fisheries activity in the area of Cedar Lake or Chemahawin and Moose Lake. There is some concern for the commercial fishery on Lake Winnipeg, and with tagging which will be done this year in the Grand Rapids area, and with tagging that will be done in the north arm of Moose Lake area, we anticipate we will be able to find out more about the fish migrations of this area and add to the studies that have been made up to the present time, which have indicated on the surface that there is not such a great migration of fish up the Grand Rapids into Cedar Lake and into the Moose Lake areas. Now the whole forebay project has been under consideration by the Department of Mines and Natural Resources in the past because the department, when water conservation was with us, had to make these various hydraulic surveys.

Agricultural development will not be affected a great deal, and it is not true that there was no study made of it, because when the Grand Rapids project was looked upon many years ago, the PFRA and our own soil-testing resources of the Lands Branch were utilized in an area which was just north of the Summerberry Marsh, and it was found that the agricultural potential there would be too costly; the amount of diking and drainage which would be necessary would be too costly for the value that we received.

(Mr. Witney, cont'd.)

The study that was made on the Grand Rapids dam on the Saskatchewan River, the economic value of it, has been assessed to far outweigh the other values that might accrue from commercial fishing or from forestry or from cropping in that area. We do have, at the present time, a Forebay Committee with the Department of Mines and Natural Resources acting more or less as agents in the area for the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board, and that has one of our senior officials and one of the senior officials of the Hydro-Electric Board on it. They in turn have set up an Advisory Committee utilizing the game and fish resources of our department or at least the experts in our department and Ducks Unlimited and hydraulic men from the Department of Water Conservation. We have a Forebay Committee operating in The Pas which has a senior member of the Department of Health and Public Welfare on it and a senior member of the Department of Mines and Natural Resources. The Department of Mines and Natural Resources and the Hydro-Electric Board have a man operating in the area at the present time, looking into the various problems which will be set up by the Grand Rapids Forebay Development. The people of Chemahawin and Moose Lake have also got committees, particularly the people of Chemahawin. Three sites have been surveyed as possible sites for the subsequent or the moving of the Chemahawin site to come, and nothing will be done without the full consent of these people. They are being kept informed and we are seeking their advice. They know of the three areas involved and they will be able to make their choice. We are working very closely with the Department of Indian Affairs and with our own Department of Health and Public Welfare who are responsible for the Metis people, and taking every precaution possible to see that these people's rights are protected. I think the member is neglecting that with the people of Chemahawin and Moose Lake, that actually the Grand Rapids project may benefit. Because they are going to be moved, they will be paid some compensation, but generally speaking we want to move them into better conditions than they have been living in at the present time. He also forgets that the people of Grand Rapids as a result of the Grand Rapids Forebay Development and the Grand Rapids Hydro Development have had pretty well a new lease on life. Fishing on Lake Winnipeg has been deteriorating, particularly whitefish fishing over the past two years. Now they have a town-planning committee of their own. They have new industries that are going to move into Grand Rapids. No doubt there will be fish filleting plants. We anticipate that there will be a rough fish removal plant up in Grand Rapids in the future and they have a road which connects them with the southern part of the province.

For Grand Rapids and the people that live there, the Hydro-Electric Development in that area has been of immense value. And that value is also going to spread out toward the people of Chemahawin and the people of Moose Lake, for with power in the area, the possibilities of developing the forest resources there are much higher than they have ever been before, and I feel sure that it's right to say that the people of Chemahawin and Moose Lake will gain more from employment in the forest resources which we hope will be developed as a result of power being in the area than they would from trapping or from fishing. I think he forgets, too, that the power requirements in the province have apparently been increasing by about seven percent per year, and that we are going to need power if we are going to develop secondary industries in the Province of Manitoba and thus create employment. I wonder, when he is speaking about the muskrats and about the fish, if he is also thinking of the men who need jobs, and who can only be provided jobs by secondary industry and development of the province which requires power. I wonder too if the man who sent him the brief had thought of that angle, of men being put to work as a result of power through development in the Province of Manitoba. It seems strange to me that the man who wrote the brief is a labour man, a man who is charged with looking after the interests of labour. I can appreciate and understand his concern, and I admire the fact that he stood up to protect the moose and the fish and the muskrat and the duck. I am also interested in them, and I believe that in the past year I have shown this. But I think we also have a decision to make as to whether or not we are going to provide for expansion in this province, and for work for men, and I wonder if he were to face the same question as to whether you were going to develop for work for men through expansion of the province in relation to what you were going to lose in muskrats, moose and ducks and the few trees that we have there, what his decision would be, or what the decision would be of the man who wrote the brief and who represents labour in Flin Flon. We will take every precaution that we possibly

(Mr. Witney, cont'd.) can to see that the people of Chemahawin and Moose Lake are taken care of. I feel sure that with the control of the forebay area, that we will be able to do intensive resources management; we will be able to find areas where we can recreate muskrat habitat and at the same time increase habitat for the ducks. The Mawdesley area can be controlled and the Mawdesley area, if we wished, could be used for agriculture if it is deemed necessary, or it can be controlled and used as an area for muskrat and for ducks. There's certainly one significant factor about the Grand Rapids forebay, it will be a good duck nesting area although it may not be a good duck breeding area. And that will be important when the ducks are migrating back and forth across the country. We have had during this past year a United States Wildlife Report made on the area, in order to protect, and to make sure that we could have suggestions on what we could do to protect the resources in the forebay area, and that report has come down now with a few copies, and it is being studied by the officials of my department.

The Mineral Surveys -- we do know that there is some amber in the area but we have not experienced any great interest in mineral resources in that particular area, and myself, for my own thinking, if there was any money to spend in the development of mineral resources of the province, I think they could spend them quite well up in the areas around Flin Flon, Lynn Lake, Snow Lake and Thompson where we do know that there is mineral potential at the present time. At any rate, the mineral exploration is not denied by the forebay area, because the surveying for minerals is going on all the time through the ice; drilling is going on through the ice, geophysical work is done over ice, aero-magnetic work is done over ice at the same time. So I really feel, Mr. Chairman, that everything has been done at the present time to protect the wildlife resources in the area, and I do feel that while it is regrettable that we are going to cause difficulties for the various types of wildlife, that the big asset of the Grand Rapids, with its power for development and expansion and jobs in the Province of Manitoba, far supercedes the values of muskrat, fish and other wildlife. I feel also that with the land which we are acquiring around the Delta and in the Netley, the other game management areas that we have been able to establish, that we can nullify, to a certain extent, the damage which will be done by the flooding in the forebay area.

The Honourable Member for East Kildonan has mentioned the Grand Beach property. The Grand Beach property has now been bought and at Grand Beach we have begun our initial investigations and started work for this coming season. We are now preparing, up there, a parking lot in behind the sand dunes which we anticipate will handle about 800 to 1,000 cars. We will be providing in those areas picnic tables, fireplaces, toilet facilities, and we will be doing landscaping on the sand dunes in order to stop them from blowing. We will also be taking care of the present sanitary facilities that are there, and improving on them, and doing everything that we can to make better conditions for the increasing numbers of people that are going into the Grand Beach area. As we get our feet on the ground -- because we took it over just about the beginning of December of 1960 -- as we get our feet on the ground, we will develop it as solidly as we have developed other areas of the province.

In Winnipeg Beach, the Province of Manitoba will now, with the Town of Winnipeg Beach, build modern sanitary facilities and a change house, providing that the Town of Winnipeg Beach will negotiate with the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for a loan to establish sewage facilities in the Town of Winnipeg Beach, and our modern facilities will be tied on to those sewage facilities. The negotiations must commence now so that these facilities can be built this year in order to handle the summer crowd at Winnipeg Beach this year.

You mentioned also the auction of seized materials for jacklighting and the instructions were, and I believe they were carried out, that those auction sales were to be advertised in the daily newspapers, and that those who had materials seized were to be notified. Your remarks about the Plum Lake Marsh building, those buildings have been sold. I couldn't tell you what the return on them was at the present time, and the area was closed to hunting. These officials, that you speak of, shooting in the marsh, I'd appreciate it if you could give me more information, but I doubt that any officials -- and I know that as far as I am concerned, no officials of the Department of Mines and Natural Resources have been given any privileges over anyone for shooting in the Plum Lake Marsh area.

Reference was made to archaeological sites and we did have investigations made of the archaeological sites in the forebay area by an experienced man, and he found that there were

(Mr. Witney, cont'd.) not the large number of archaeological remains as had been reported in the newspapers; and he found that the damage that had been reported in the newspapers was not going to be as great as indicated. We have been keeping abreast of that, and money is set aside for further archaeological studies in the forebay area if they are found necessary.

The fishing licenses: we do have resident and we do have non-resident fishing licences. Our fishing licences for the residents are \$1.00 for winter and for summer, and, I think the non-resident fishing licenses are \$6.50 for the summer and winter. The matter of having a daily licence for non-resident people was considered last year, and we came up with the conclusion that it was too cumbersome to administrate, and came down to the decision that we would not carry it out in the department.

Mention was made of the air services for emergency. The Department of Public Health and Welfare have been using our air services to a greater degree than they had ever done before. And that is because the Department of Health and Public Welfare have been more active than ever before through their northern health services in the north country. We have found that we have been able to cope with all emergencies that may have arisen in the north country with our present facilities. I think the reason that there are more is simply that through the Department of Health and Public Welfare we have had more people in the area and the emergencies have been drawn to our attention to a greater degree than they had been done in past years. I believe that the Manitoba Government Air Service is quite well equipped to handle this type of operation, and I believe they have the proud boast that they have never had to leave anyone in an emergency yet in the north country, despite such matters as the darkness and some of the flying conditions. When you speak of the Government Air Service I think you must remember that Saskatchewan has about two-thirds in agricultural country, and the Saskatchewan Air Service, I believe, was started at a period when their road system was not as good as it is at the present time. In Manitoba here we have about two-thirds of our province covered by Precambrian and I don't feel, with the record at any rate that we have been able to meet all emergencies in the province, that there is any need for us to embark on any government air service.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I was very, very interested to hear the remarks of the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I did not, this afternoon, mention the fact that the brief that I had before me was written by a member of the Canadian Labour Congress stationed in Flin Flon. I first of all want to say to the Honourable the Minister, that I disagree with him when he attempts to raise the point that, because of the fact of the necessity for industrial power, electrical energy, here in the southern part of the province, that we should try to counter-balance and exhibit any surprise at all, because a representative of labour in Flin Flon suggested possibilities of looking after muskrats and wildlife, as against the industrial development of southern Manitoba and the availability of power. I think this pinpoints, Sir, if I may, the regrettable fact that all too often -- and apparently the Minister is one of those -- the regrettable fact that people think that representatives of labour are only interested in labour itself, because we're not. We are interested in the whole well-being of the Province of Manitoba and the Dominion of Canada, and one of the reasons that we raise these points, as I raised them this afternoon, is because of the fact that we are interested in the promotion of the best for all of the people of Manitoba.

I said this afternoon that we felt, or it was felt that there may have been other areas of potential electrical production that may not have had the adverse repercussion which apparently may result from the development at Grand Rapids. Now the Minister is perfectly correct when he states that the brief does make reference to an elevation of 846 feet, and the Minister, if I recall correctly what he said this evening, has said that the elevation will be more in the neighbourhood of 842 feet, four feet less, but I wonder, Sir, he tells me that he has read this brief, I wonder whether he did or he did not take into consideration some of the facts or suggested facts, and I must say in all fairness, Mr. Chairman, that these are suggested facts, because I am not too conversant myself with the area, but in the brief that was referred to both by myself, and the Minister tells me he has read it -- he told the committee here tonight -- whether or not he has taken into consideration the points raised in the brief as to the net effect of even raising the level to 842 feet, because in the brief we are informed that this flooded area, a reservoir, would make one huge lake out of such lakes as Moose Lake with an elevation of 838

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) feet above sea-level; Cedar Lake with an elevation of 833 feet; Cross Lake with an elevation of 819 feet; Drift Wood Lake, 839 feet; Kelsey Lake, 842 feet; Connolly Lake, Mud Lake, Red Rock Lake, Laundry Lake, Lamb Lake, Trader Lake, Head River, Little Fish, Poplar Lake, Mawdesley Lake, which the Minister referred to, of 842 feet; Little Cormorant Lake at 842 feet, and if it were not -- the brief says -- if it were not for the Canadian National Railway Line to Churchill, this lake would extend into Big Cormorant Lake itself, which has an elevation of 842 feet. The brief goes on -- dozens of other smaller lakes would be added to the above lakes that will eventually be one big lake. Then, Mr. Chairman, and I think this is very significant, the brief goes on to say that the above facts can be substantiated from the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board Grand Rapids Project key map of the power site and reservoir. However, standard maps show a much lower elevation, some of these three feet less than those shown on the Hydro map, so I think, Mr. Chairman, that there's more to it than using the opening sentences of the brief which refers to an elevation of 846 feet, and the elevation as suggested by the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources at 842 feet, because if the brief is correct, and I suggest -- (Interjection) -- I don't know. I don't know, and I'm asking the questions, and the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has told the committee tonight that the elevation is going to be at 842 feet. The brief that I have in front of me enumerates all of these lakes that I have referred to as being less than 842 feet, and also goes on to say, as I have just repeated, saying that there is a discrepancy between the Hydro Board's maps and standard maps of three feet. My honourable friend the Minister of Public Utilities says, "no". I wonder how much consideration he has given to this, because I am sure that the people who have looked into this are not irresponsible people. They must have received their facts from data that is available to them and also available to the Minister of Public Utilities, and I am sure that I would not have received this brief, indeed I don't think that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources would have received this brief, if there wasn't substantiation in large measure for the facts that are contained in here. My honourable friend shakes his head, but neither he nor the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has given sufficient evidence to this committee to refute what has been in this brief, and I welcome it and that was my purpose this afternoon when I raised the question on the introduction of the Minister's report.

Now then, the Minister also, Mr. Chairman, made reference -- I believe he made reference -- to the question of taking care of the Indian population in the area and alternative sites. I gathered that from the Minister. I want to ask, Sir, was there or was there not a representation made to the Department of Mines and Natural Resources of those concerned with these reservations? Did the Bishop of Brandon make representation to the Department? The reason I say the Bishop of Brandon, and I am speaking of the Bishop of Brandon of the Anglican Fraternity, Mr. Chairman, because I understand that his diocese extends into this whole area. I want to know whether or not representations and the fears and the apprehensions of this noted gentleman were made to the department in respect of the people on these reserves. Was there any satisfactory conclusion arrived at? My honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources told us a few moments ago that the conditions in respect of our Indian friends will be far better as a result of the development. He tells us that due to the fact of the industrialization, as the result of the development of Hydro power in around Grand Rapids, that there will be steady employment or employment created for the peoples on the reservations. But I say to my honourable friend, in all due respect to that, that many of the peoples on our reservations are perfectly happy and satisfied with carrying on the lifelong traditions of their great race and nation in trapping and other methods of a livelihood. Many of them do not want to go into industrial employment in pulp mills and the likes of that. So I ask my honourable friend -- are they going to be satisfied with the change in the modus operandi of their living? To come out of the wilds and go into industrial employment in pulp mills? I ask my honourable friend, what guarantee of a satisfactory and acceptable nature has been made to these people on the reservations who are going to be affected by this development. I think these are very, very pertinent questions. I think the author of this report, or this brief, that I have before me, and also that the Minister has considered, has to be given far more consideration than he has been given at the present time. And I say, Mr. Chairman, in all due deference to my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that when he raises the point, because

(Mr. Pauley, cont'd.) of the fact that this was written by a man who was associated with labour, that he is weighing up the question of muskrats and fishing and the likes of that as against the industrialization and furthering of the power requirements of southern Manitoba, I suggest that it is just a red herring over the whole issue. And I want to know from my friend the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, or from his colleague, the Minister of Public Utilities, who is responsible for this development.

I appreciate the fact that we do need power. Let there be no misunderstanding about this. I appreciate the fact that we do need additional power in southern Manitoba, that the resources on the Winnipeg River have just about, well, they have been used up. That we have had to go into thermo power for the generation of required electrical energy in the southern part of Manitoba. But I do say this, the other surveys have shown that there are alternative sites in northern Manitoba. Possibly, Mr. Chairman, they will be more expensive, and I appreciate that. But I'm wondering whether or not, in view of the information that I have before us, whether we're outweighing the short term benefits in reduced costs in the development at Grand Rapids with the overall and extended benefits that we will lose in this particular area if those factors that I raised of the benefits of income in trapping, income from our wildlife, our forests and our mines, are set aside for all time. Because it will be for all time. Whether we're weighing and prejudicing the future of this very productive area which I think has been established, against a lesser cost of the development at Grand Rapids today. I think this is very pertinent. That, coupled as I mentioned before, with the dislocation of so many of our Indian, Metis and white trappers who have become established in the area. I know, Mr. Chairman, sometimes there is a lot of criticism levied at some of us who happen to be of pale skin variety, of taking away the inherent rights, traditional rights and earned rights of our Indian and Metis friends from them. The reason that this question arises is that rather than carry on in this development to add more fuel to the fire of the loss of the privileges and rights of our ancient cousins and brothers in Canada, that we may yet have time before there is too great an expenditure in this particular area, to prevent hardship to these people.

Now I would like to ask my friend the Minister -- I'm not trying to raise this, Mr. Chairman, in any sense with a political viewpoint or a political attitude. I'm genuinely concerned, and I'm sure my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is, as to the possible consequences on this general area as a result of this development. There is a difference of opinion apparently insofar as the elevation levels of the lakes; my honourable friend the Minister of Public Utilities has nodded his head once or twice when I was making references to the elevation of the lakes which will be in the forebay area partly. These figures -- they're contained in the brief -- surely can be substantiated, and as I said, my honourable friend the Minister of Mines -- my friend is shaking his head again -- I say that these figures are not figures that were pulled out of a hat. I say that they have been established. The Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources told us that the elevation level in the forebay area will be 842 feet. The figures that I have illustrated and taken from this brief indicate many lakes that will be under the 842 elevation level and also establishes the fact on this brief that Big Cormorant Lake itself will be at the level of 842 feet and then goes on to say that there is a discrepancy between standard elevations and those of the Hydro Power map. And then again I say to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, I think that the committee would be most interested to know as to the question of representations that have been made to him, as I mentioned, or to the government by the Bishop of Brandon, who is charged with the responsibility of some measure of care, at least, to these people, because it is his diocese. Has the government, has the Hydro-Electric Board been able to give any answers that are acceptable to the Indian on reservations and the trapper and the hunter who must speak for themselves? I think, Mr. Chairman, this is most pertinent. I'm sorry to say to my honourable friend, whom I admire very, very much, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that the answers that he has given to me in reply to the points I raised just prior to the supper sitting, have not been satisfactory to me, and I would like to hear further from him as to these additional points which I now raise.

MR. SCARTH: Mr. Chairman, will the honourable gentleman permit a question? Has, to your knowledge, or has it ever been suggested, that any mineral discovery has ever been made in any of this area which will be inundated?

MR. PAULLEY: No, Mr. Chairman, I'm very glad that the question has been asked of me, because it was a point that I intended to touch on and forgot. And I think that it is a most pertinent question and requires an answer. My honourable friend the First Minister of the Province, according to Press reports today, on Saturday attended the opening of the smelter at Thompson. I was privileged as a member of the Legislature a few years ago to go on an excursion to northern Manitoba, as the results of the very benevolent Cherokee, of the present Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues, who were in office at the time, to have an opportunity to see something of the great north of this province. At that particular time we were shown Moak and Mystery Lakes as a potential for nickel development in northern Manitoba. We were informed at that time that the grade of ore was low grade in that area, and then subsequently Thompson was discovered. The point that I'm trying to make, Mr. Chairman, I thank my honourable friend. I agree that there hasn't been any development in this particular area, but surely to goodness he will agree with me that there wasn't any development in Thompson either. Discovered -- (Interjection) -- no, and there wasn't any discovery in Thompson. There wasn't any discovery so far as Chisel Lake was concerned until the last two or three years, of any magnitude. There wasn't any development of Lynn Lake for many years. So I say that the question, the question that my honourable friend raises is a very valid and pertinent one. And I'm suggesting to him that simply because of the fact that there hasn't been any discovery of mineral wealth in this particular area, shouldn't be any reason for inundating the area so that those discoveries should not be made. And again, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my honourable friend for asking me the question. I did have a note of it here, and would have overlooked it if he hadn't asked the question.

MR. SCARTH: on a prospecting trip, Sir.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, that may be, Mr. Chairman. Maybe my honourable friend won't take me on a prospecting trip because I might discover something. I think that in this particular case I have discovered something. I think that I have discovered that there hasn't been enough consideration given to the whole aspect of this question of the development in this particular area.

MR. A. H. CORBETT (Swan River): Excuse me, I can't keep out of this altogether. I just wish to tell the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that if he can discover minerals in that limestone area which extends for 50 miles probably north of that, he will be looked upon as a great Messiah in the north country because the places that he mentions where minerals have been discovered is the Precambrian Shield which is an entirely different formation; and so far as I know the only minerals of value we've discovered in the limestone area is the limestone that we're crushing -- the Saskatchewan Cement Company or the Cement Company is crushing up at Mafeking there. They've got acres of it and hundreds of feet of it there, but as far as I know there's been no mines in all the history of Canada discovered where the country is covered with several hundred feet of limestone, and that overlays all that country until you get to the break in the formation. He mentions the elevations at Cross Lake -- there's two Cross Lakes, one a Little Cross Lake and the Big Cross Lake -- and he mentions the Big Cross Lake elevation at 819. Well 819, would mean that if that is connected with that present system they'd never be able to hold any water in for the Grand Rapids Dam. That Cross Lake is down the Saskatchewan River about 30 or 40 miles or maybe more than that, I'm not just sure, it doesn't make any difference anyhow. It's not in that area at all, and as far as the power is concerned, the elevation, the ground elevation of The Pas is approximately 865 feet. The big flood they had there in 1948 had reached an elevation I believe of 850 from the Saskatchewan River but it didn't flood any of The Pas. And another thing, if that country was so good that is being inundated in there I'm quite sure the Indian population in that area would be greater than it is at the present time. The population of that area is confined to Moose Lake which has good high banks and well above the elevation of the lake and the Chemahawin where there was a bunch of Caribou poachers used to live there, used to shoot Caribou for their hides and they weren't a very desirable lot. We didn't think an awful lot of them, but the population in that area is very limited. I'm not so sure, maybe the Minister of Mines and Resources can give me the population; but around Grand Rapids there is a population on the higher ground. Around Chemahawin right close to Cedar Lake there were on a there too, but the general country all connected with that forebay if it was suitable for any settlement

(Mr. Corbett, cont'd.) it would have been settled long ago, but it has not been settled. Around Moose Lake there's some settlement, but Moose Lake has high banks and there's some high ground there but even in flood conditions from the river has been subject to flooding in the past.

MR. PAULLEY: If I may, Mr. Chairman, and I regret taking the time of the committee but I just thought -- (Interjection) -- well, all right then, I don't regret it because I think this is very vital to the future of Manitoba, and I don't think that we here in this House should laugh it off. I think it's very, very serious. After all, we're here in the year 1961 and after we're gone others will be following, and I think it is an obligation of those of us that are here today to draw these matters to the attention of governments who have the responsibility and who have the power to use up our resources to the detriment of future generations, and I want to say to my honourable friend I can appreciate the fact that he may be perfectly correct when he says that the development may have been tremendously larger in this particular area had there been anything found there, but I also want to say to my honourable friend that insofar as development of the whole province itself, we have not yet reached a million of population. We look to the future. The First Minister and those opposite had, as one of their planks in their platform, the fact that they were a forward-looking government, and that's all that I'm asking of them today. It might be perfectly true, as my honourable friend, the Member for Swan River has said, that there have been no discoveries in these areas but I want to point out to him, and that's the point that I'm trying to establish, what investigation has there been made, before these areas are lost, as assuredly it appears from the brief that we have before us? If it can be substantiated, and I make no apologies for using the word "if" in this case. All I'm asking is of this committee and of this Legislature and those responsible today -- are you sure, are you sure that the action you are taking today will not prejudice the development for the future? I've no political axe to grind and I've stated that. I'm sincerely approaching this just with that objective in view, and I can appreciate very much the remarks of my honourable friend the Member for Swan River. There haven't been a development there, but surely he will agree with me that there hasn't been the development in the whole of the Province of Manitoba which the resources of the province should be entitled to.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to deal with this same topic, so perhaps the Minister wouldn't mind. The Minister perhaps knows or will recall that when the United States Federal Government undertook the development generation of hydro-electricity in the Tennessee Valley in the early 1930s, they did so only upon the setting up of an authority which had the general power and authority to not only look at the generation and distribution of power, but also had the authority to decide upon matters relating to conservation and allied matters. Now, I think that the point that my leader is raising, with very valid reason, the fact that so far we have not been given adequate explanation as to whether or not we in this province did, in fact, have any department play in the role of the "devil's advocate" at the time when the decision was made to go ahead with Grand Rapids. The Minister should be able to assure us here that at the time that the Hydro-Electric Board and the government decided to go ahead with Grand Rapids that the Department of Mines and Resources did, in fact, evaluate and assess the natural life resources that might be lost as a result of this decision. We haven't really been advised of this to any appreciable extent, and I think we are entitled to some more full explanation as to who did play the role of the "devil's advocate"; what resources will be lost, and so on. I think that this is a good point.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm a little surprised that this subject of Grand Rapids comes up now, because if I recall correctly, it was a matter for the Throne Speech, not this year but the year before. It seems rather strange that after we have gone through a whole year and two legislative sessions, and we're in the second, that the matter of Grand Rapids should come up now. One would think that the matter would come up at the time the subject had been referred to in the Throne Speech back in 1959. I think that the whole matter should perhaps be fully clarified, because I apparently haven't been able to satisfy my honourable friends with the remarks that I made, but I was unfortunately unable to get hold of this memorandum which had been written in answer to the point that had been made by this brief from Flin Flon, and it had been filed away and during the supper hour I wasn't able to find it. I think maybe as a result of the interest and the result of the concern, that I had better enter back into the announcing

(Mr. Witney, cont'd.) ability, and to read, so that this will be on the records, and my honourable friend will be able to study the brief versus the answers, and it may take a little time with no commercials in between, Mr. Chairman.

Page 1, Paragraph 3 -- (Interjection) -- we'll do that -- (Interjection) -- I won't be controlling that one tonight. First attention to development at Grand Rapids for power purposes was given about 1912 when a series of low head plants were studied. The costs estimated at that time were naturally high and the distance from the load centres, plus the fact that more attractive sites on the Winnipeg River were available, made the development of Grand Rapids unattractive. Later on during the 1930's, attention was given to the Dauphin River power scheme which involved diversion of the Saskatchewan River into Lake Winnipegosis, thence to Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipeg via the Dauphin River where a single head development of approximately 90 feet was studied. The main advantage of this scheme was the fact that it brought the source of power closer to the southern part of the province and thereby reduced the estimated cost of transmission. The cost of power for this particular development was considerably above that which power could be developed for on the Winnipeg River and, in addition, excessive flooding around the shore of Lake Manitoba would be involved.

With the rapid development of soils mechanics after about 1940, it became practical to build much higher earth fill dykes. Considerable advancement in the techniques of long distance power transmission also took place about the same period. With this knowledge, in 1953 the Board again directed attention to the Grand Rapids power site thinking in terms of a single plant development. Investigations and studies were advanced during the period 1953 to 1956 and resumed again in 1959 and indicated that power could be developed at Grand Rapids and transmitted to the southern part of the province at considerably less cost than any of the previous schemes which utilized the flow of the Saskatchewan River.

Page 1, Paragraph 5 - The memorandum states that the upper limit of the reservoir will be at elevation 846. The Board's application for an interim licence requests the right to an upper limit of elevation 842 with permission to go to elevation 844 at a later date should operating conditions at elevation 842 warrant the higher level to be both practical and economical. No change in the major structures for the increase is anticipated, but some additional freeboard dykes would probably be required and seepage through the bedrock in areas that are not curtain grouted would be an important factor in the decision to increase head.

Page 2, Paragraph 1 - The reservoir created by the forebay is estimated at 2,400 square miles and not 3,100 square miles as indicated in the memorandum. Furthermore, it is quite likely that the upper portion of Moose Lake would be controlled at a lower level by a regulating dam at the Narrows. Surveys are underway on this structure, although no definite decision has been made. The Department of Mines and Natural Resources are quite interested in controlling the northern part of Moose Lake at a lower level and it would likely be required for the Board's purpose in the event that they raised the elevation to 844 to prevent flooding along the Hudson's Bay Railway adjacent to Cormorant Lake. At elevation 842, Cedar Lake and Moose Lake continue to be separated by a height of land, although connected through Moose Creek and the Dead River.

Page 2, Paragraph 3 - Again we would point out that the reservoir is estimated to be 2,400 square miles and certainly we cannot allow the reservoir to interfere with the Canadian National Railway line to Churchill. During the late fall, the Saskatchewan River will enter the reservoir at a point a few miles below the Town of The Pas as indicated but, during the spring and early summer conditions will be much the same as at present.

Page 3, Paragraph 2 - Creation of the Grand Rapids power reservoir will in no way affect flooding in the vicinity of the Town of The Pas. Furthermore, large reservoirs being created upstream including the South Saskatchewan, Squaw Rapids and the Brazeau River will tend to reduce flood flows and provide a more uniform flow in the river through The Pas area.

Page 3, Paragraph 3 - We see no concern in any delta forming downstream from The Pas. This would be similar to the present formation at the inlet to Cedar Lake which does not retard the river during periods of high flow, since the river quickly cuts its way through any sediments that are deposited.

Page 3, Paragraph 4 - We are of the opinion that the ultimate costs of the Grand Rapids project, as presently estimated, are realistic and quite adequate to do the job.

(Mr. Witney, cont'd.)

Page 4, Paragraph 2 - Cedar Lake and Bignell Indian Reserves will be extensively flooded, but the effect on Moose Lake Reservation is only marginal. The Bignell Reserve is presently uninhabited and negotiations are underway with the Indian Affairs Branch for exchange of lands to provide new Indian Reserves. We see no losses being incurred in the vicinity of the Cormorant Lake settlement other than the possible effect of trapping on the Summerberry fur-block.

Page 4, Paragraph 3 - Present plans, as developed by the Forebay Committee are designed to keep all affected settlers within the area. Some of these, particularly those at and in the vicinity of Chemahawin, will be moved to a new location probably east of Collins Island on the eastern shore of Cedar Lake. Planning and negotiations are advancing satisfactorily and the inhabitants are being kept fully informed and involved in the choice of any new location. At Moose Lake, only a re-arrangement of buildings is required to remove some of the dwellings that would be affected by flooding along the shoreline. Surveys of roads to both the new location for Chemahawin and to Moose Lake are presently underway.

Page 4, Paragraph 4 - Every effort is being made to provide adequate compensation and maintain, as near as possible, equivalent economic conditions.

Page 5, Paragraph 1 - Every effort is being made to co-operate with the Indian Affairs Branch and, in an exchange of letters between the Ministers of the Federal and Provincial Departments concerned, the intent is clearly spelled out. The only major move required is that for Chemahawin and, as mentioned above, it is likely that the new location will be on the eastern shore of Cedar Lake, but the exact location will only be decided upon after the settlers concerned are in agreement.

Page 5, Paragraph 2 - We appreciate the moral obligations of the Government towards the Indians and these will be observed in all negotiations.

Page 6, Paragraph 1 - The Fish and Wildlife Service of the United States Department of the Interior has completed an extensive survey of the area and their report should shortly be available. Certainly there will be loss in resources values, although this is not so in the case of every type. For instance, commercial fishing is considered to improve. These values are less than that which will be obtained from the development of power, and several programs are planned to offset the effects of forebay flooding. There should be little or no effect to any mineral resources due to flooding since access to these should not be affected too much, assuming, of course, that there are mineral values in existence, which we are inclined to doubt.

Page 6, Paragraph 2 - Available information does not indicate any extensive mineral resources in the area concerned. The limestone is approximately 500 to 600 feet thick in the area and is overlaid by the Precambrian Shield.

Page 6, Paragraph 3 - The prices mentioned in the memorandum for clearing at Grand Rapids are for hand clearing in the immediate forebay where care must be taken not to block or hide any sink holes that might exist near the proposed structures. Machine clearing, which is also in progress over a much wider area, is being done at prices of \$79.50 and \$89.50 per acre. We understand that the Forest Service is arranging to dispose of any merchantable timber that might be affected by flooding. Generally speaking, the forest cover affected by flooding in the immediate vicinity of the plant is of no merchantable value. It is not intended to clear the entire forebay other than that area immediately upstream from the project and areas which the Forest Service deem necessary, which would be carried out under a ten-year plan established for the purpose.

Page 7, Paragraph 1 - Commercial fishing, we understand is likely to improve in the area after raising the forebay. This is indicated by local Fisheries authorities, as well as Fish and Wildlife Service in the United States Department of the Interior.

Page 7, Paragraph 2 - We accept the statement that trapping of fur bearing animals will be adversely affected by the project.

Page 7, Paragraph 3 - The following figures may be of interest as compared to those quoted in the memorandum. During the term of the Summerberry Fur Farm project, 1940 to 1959 (20 years), a total of \$4,713,000 worth of fur has been removed involving a total of 10,115 trappers, an average of about \$250,000 per year for 500 trappers. In that time 2,612,000 muskrats were caught. The best crop was obtained in 1946 when a gross of

(Mr. Witney, cont'd.) \$813,240 was realized involving 1,048 trappers. The pelt price that year averaged \$2.48. From the foregoing, it will be noted that the crop value varies considerably from year to year, both due to production and to price.

Page 8, Paragraph 2 - With the possibility of a control dam at the Narrows in Moose Lake, the area north and west of Moose Lake would be available for agricultural development, if preferable to wildlife.

Page 8, Paragraph 3 - and here it refers to some personal people which I don't think we should mention right at this moment.

Page 8, Paragraph 4 - It is questionable to what extent the Grand Rapids forebay will affect water fowl. Also, there are numerous fringe areas which improvements can be effected to offset open water disadvantages.

Page 9, Paragraph 1 - Normally, in spring and early summer the reservoir will be at its lower level which is similar to that in the state of nature. It will be raised gradually through late summer and fall and lowered down again gradually during the winter months.

Page 9, Paragraph 2 - We doubt if anyone would object to an investigation but we are confident that the conclusions would favour power development.

Page 9, Paragraph 4 - The only adverse effect of the project on the Town of The Pas would be in trapping and hunting. There are several ways in which the project is a benefit to The Pas, including employment and the purchasing power created by a demand for supplies and aerial transportation.

Page 10 - This is generally a recap of previous statements. Certainly the cost of the development should not exceed \$143 million dollars and could be somewhat less.

Page 12, Paragraph 1 - The drop through Grand Rapids is 70 feet and not 100 feet as indicated, and any power development designed to avoid flooding on Cedar Lake would have inadequate storage capacity considering the fact that the flow in the Saskatchewan River varies from a high of about 100,000 cubic feet per second to a low of about 1,800 cubic feet per second. Such a development would be much more costly per unit of power produced than the scheme presently under construction.

There you are, Mr. Chairman, our answers with respect to this brief that has been received, and the honourable member will have the opportunity to study them at his leisure.

I should like to draw to your attention too, the Memorandum of Understanding between the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board and the Department of Mines and Natural Resources of the Province of Manitoba, which provides for an expenditure up to \$3 million over the next ten years. These studies will be initiated and are well underway, some of them at the present time.

A study to determine what timber salvage is possible and what other clearing would be required to the upper forebay area, and when and how much clearing will be undertaken, and other forestry problems associated with the Grand Rapids Hydro-Electric development.

A special study of the Mawdesley area to determine how it should be developed; whether it should be developed for agriculture in the future or for wildlife.

A study of the problems involved in moving and re-settling the Indian and half-breed settlements at Moose Lake and Chemahawin, including the method of payment of compensation for damage and inconvenience suffered by such Indians and half-breeds.

A study to determine the practicability of constructing works or developments which would substantially offset the adverse effects of the power development on wildlife.

Consideration will be given to the possible construction of auxiliary reservoirs along the borders of the lower forebay area in which water can be maintained during the time that the main reservoir is being filled, so that during the periods of drawdown in the main reservoir, water in the auxiliary reservoir can be maintained at a level suitable for wildlife purposes.

A study to determine what, if any, steps will be required to protect the fishery in the forebay area, the improvement of spawning beds, etcetera.

A study in respect of future zoning in the Grand Rapids area, including industrial, residential and recreational developments.

Then we have studies to affect the free traders in the area and two studies to affect the free traders in the area at Moose Lake and also the Lamb cattle ranch.

(Mr. Witney, cont'd.). . . I feel, Mr. Chairman that we have taken every precaution, that all the study that was necessary was given to this project before; that it has not been a rush decision, nor has it been a rash decision, and I feel also that in the economic welfare of the province that the Grand Rapids Power Development is necessary, and you will see from these studies and from what has been read, that we will be able to offset to a considerable degree, and in some degree we will be able to have more intensive management of the resources of that particular area and I should like to say that I think that the Indian people and the Metis people are ready to progress. I think that they have gone beyond that position of just wanting to stay on the reservation forever. With education, I think they want to have new opportunities. I think they want to learn a new trade such as forestry; I think they want to have these roads which we are going to investigate into Chemahawin and into Moose Lake, and I think, in general, that the Grand Rapids forebay for the people of Grand Rapids, for the people of Chemahawin who are going to be moved, for the people of Moose Lake, and even for those Indian people up in The Pas area, and that eventually over the period that it will be proven that the Grand Rapids Development will be of greater value to them. I even feel that with the care that we can take, that the wild life damage will be offset very considerably indeed.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the trouble that the Minister has taken to lay this information before the committee. First of all, I make no apologies for not having raised this particular question over the course of two -- the Throne speeches. I think the Minister will appreciate, as I'm sure most members of the committee will, that the mere fact of this question appearing in a throne speech a couple of years ago only gave impetus to investigation into the whole matter, and the reason I'm raising the questions this year, or at this particular time, is because of the fact that the information is only just now being placed in my hands. I think, and I would appreciate -- I don't think that the Minister answered my question in respect of the energies of the Bishop of Brandon on behalf of the Indian on the reserves. I asked him whether or not representations had been made, whether as a result of those representations any satisfactory conclusion had been reached between the parties concerned. Now, in the last document that the Minister referred to he indicated a number of studies will be made as to the net results of the creation of this reservoir in the forebay. The point that I raised I think has been substantiated by the Honourable the Minister with his last document. My question, and I think it was pertinent, I still think it's a very pertinent and not an impertinent question, and the Minister certainly hasn't indicated that it was -- but how much of this study was made prior to going in to the development at Grand Rapids? He tells us that these things are going to be done. He made reference there to expenditures of money. I believe one amount of money, as I recall it -- I didn't jot it down -- was somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$3 million. I'm not sure whether that was for compensation or otherwise, but there was this, that studies are going to be made as to the net effect on our fur-bearing animals; studies are going to be made insofar as the net results, possible results, in reference to our wildlife in the particular area; that studies are going to be made in respect of agricultural development in the particular area. And the point has been raised in the brief that I have referred to, and in the remarks that I am making, is the question that it does appear. It does appear that these studies were not made to any great conclusion prior to the development. And they're now being drawn to the attention of this committee as a result of thinking on this. And I appreciate the fact, Mr. Chairman, that sometimes hindsight is a lot better than foresight. And these questions may not have been contemplated or considered just by the announcement of the development at Grand Rapids at the time the announcement was made. So I think it is justifiable that these questions should be raised at this particular time. I think the Minister has substantiated just reasons as to why they should be raised now. And again, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to carry on this -- can't actually call it a debate because I think that it is very, very vital. The Minister has drawn to the attention of the committee the answers of the department in respect of many of the items that have been raised, and I appreciate that very, very much. And I thank him for it. These are very, very pertinent questions, I think, and require answers, some of which have been given, but as I mentioned a moment or two ago, Sir, that by the very fact that either the Hydro-Electric Board or whoever is responsible, that studies are now being made, or will be made, as to the net effect of this on the area is an indicator that they were not done before. Now the Minister mentioned the fact that I believe it was the United States, some

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.)... United States Department, was in, and possibly are working at the present time, to try to assess the damage that might result, or the displacement if you don't like the word damage, which might occur, as a result of this development. So I think it's very, very vital that these questions should be raised and should be considered by the committee.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I think that I may be the only one with whom the Bishop of Brandon had any conversation about this particular development, so perhaps I should respond to the request of my honourable friend for information on that point. I think a very suitable term was used by the Member for Brokenhead when he asked, "Who was the devil's advocate?" Because I think I can say that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources was certainly one of the "devil's advocates" in this particular matter. In fact, I think that you can say that the whole of the Cabinet has done his share in that role in this project. I think that it's necessary to understand how these things develop in order to come to some conclusions as to whether the right thing was done or not. The sequence of events is this: that in the first instance it is up to the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board to decide, or to recommend to the government, what in their view from a technical and economic point of view, as providers of hydro-electric power, what in their view is the proper sequence of development of the various possibilities that are open in respect of hydro electricity. That's the first thing. And members will know that for many years, as the Minister has said, they have been considering the correct sequence of development of various types of power supply, thermo and hydro-electric alike. And it is only when they come to the point that they are willing to recommend to the government that in their considered opinion a certain project is the best one from an economic and technical point of view, that the matter becomes one of which we take notice -- in notice in the sense in which I am going to elaborate on in a minute.

So that's exactly what happened. The first thing is that the Hydro-Electric Board tells us and convinces us and we endeavour to convince the House that a development at Grand Rapids is the next best step to take in Hydro-Electric development in the province. That, of course, is what happened. That, of course, is that set of decisions which come first and on which we have to decide whether we're going to recommend to the House that we proceed or not. That, of course, is just what happened. That piece of advice was tendered to us with pretty convincing evidence that this was the proper thing to do, and I don't think there's much dispute about that anywhere, that it is the proper thing to do from an economic point of view. Now it's at that stage that it becomes not only the responsibility of the Hydro-Electric Board, which it is in the first instance, but also the responsibility of the Administration to co-ordinate all the things that are going on in that area, and to make sure that a full account is taken of the problems which that economic development calls for.

Now, the first thing that you have to recognize is that no matter how sound and attractive a project of this sort is from the economic point of view, somebody else is going to think that it's not so good, because they are people perhaps who are immediately affected personally and individually by these developments, and one of the things that we have to watch very carefully is to see that the most full and sympathetic consideration is given to their situation. One must understand that when a vast project like this takes place and small individual people like the Indian and Metis settlers up there, and others, are affected, that they must look to the government for justice; they must look to the government for a sympathetic handling of the problem, and for a full consideration of their situation. Now we have tried to give that full and proper consideration of their situation in that respect. As a result, it becomes apparent that from the point of view of the natural resources in the area, which has been fully discussed, and I won't go into it again, in respect also of the people who are in that area, and any other factors that are germane, arrangements have to be made to take care of the problems that arise. So having made your decision, that it's a good thing to go ahead, you then do what you can to devise those relatives and reliefs which are obviously required for the problems it created, both human and material in the area.

That is exactly what we have tried to do and I wouldn't like the Leader of the CCF Party to think that it was only after we got considerably advanced, let us say, in the project of building the plant, that we started to think about these other things, because they all happened at about the same time. And over the course of the last two years we have been negotiating with the Hydro-Electric Board to put down in writing the best we can, all the things that need to be

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . taken care of and looked into in this respect, particularly with respect to the human beings concerned. Now the answers to these problems are not obvious. The answers to these problems require a good deal of consideration and study from all angles to try and get the best solution. And that is the reason why, in the agreement with the Hydro-Electric Board, we endeavoured to stipulate those things we thought should be looked into, knowing full well that they would not provide the answers overnight; knowing full well that there would have to be a study, but also knowing that it would be some three or four years from the time that we begin this thing that the water actually appears on the scene and the problems that we anticipate begin to become actual problems. So we have a little leeway of time to try and settle these difficult matters. I want to assure the committee, and may I say in parenthesis that I think it is quite proper that members should ask what we're doing about this, and believe me, there's no exception taken by my colleagues or myself to those questions. Because there's nothing the matter with those questions at all. All I'm trying to say is that I think we have, to the best of our ability, taken them into account. I listened very carefully to the different speeches that were made, and I really cannot think of any major matter which we did not also agree should be taken care of in these negotiations. So as a result, a committee was set up to administer the terms of the agreement that has been read and other matters which come up, because we don't think it's all-inclusive conclusive. There'll be problems we haven't thought of, because we're human. It will require some consideration, but we think we've got the major ones nailed down. A committee was set up in which the government was represented and in which the Hydro Board was represented, to review what the Hydro Board was doing to make sure that they were taking into account the human and natural problems involved and were arriving at the best solution. Some of the terms of reference of that committee, most of them I think, have been placed before the committee now so we know what they're trying to do.

Now in addition to that, this supervisory committee has underneath it a number of sub-committees, the most important ones of which are those that are dealing with the people. Their sub-committees have been set up on the spot in The Pas and in the neighborhood, to consider the problems on the spot with the Indians and Metis who are affected and other folks, to try and get answers which they will agree, so far as humanly possible, human nature being what it is, they will agree as being fair and just. Now to make sure that this was done, and to make sure that we were not inhibited for lack of funds or anything of that sort, it's been arranged that the Hydro-Electric Board will set aside a very substantial sum of money -- we hope it all won't be required, but at least it's taken into account in financial arrangements -- a substantial amount of money to see that these measures are carried out and that we have the resources and understanding right from the start that these things have to be done, that money will have to be spent and very considerable time and consideration will have to be given to the points that have been raised, so we have tried as a government to be that "devil's advocate" that has been referred to, and while I wouldn't say that we thought of everything, I do think we have thought of the major points that have been raised here tonight, and we have set up machinery and mechanism for settling them and for solving them; we did think of it when the whole project was first envisaged. Some of the proposals that were in the original terms of reference are well advanced. I think some of them are completed. I think the United States people have come and gone, although there may be further studies, reports yet to be heard from them. But I want to lay before the committee and to reinforce what the Minister said, that we have tried to consider all these things. We've set up the machinery to do it, and as far as we can tell on the basis of present results, it's going forward in a satisfactory manner, and that anyone that writes us a letter and expresses any fears on this matter, is taken seriously. We try to answer their objections or their observations in a reasonable way and to explain what we're trying to do, and I think that the discussion in the House will help perhaps to give a wider public knowledge and information of what's going on in this respect.

So I just intervened to make those few remarks because I had the excuse to do so when you talked about the Bishop of Brandon, because -- (Interjection) -- well, don't worry, I'll come to him. The Bishop of Brandon was in to see me and he expressed his fears for the future of the native peoples in Grand Rapids, and, I am working now in my memory, but my recollection is that I gave him a pretty full account along the lines of what the Minister said tonight, of the measures that were being taken, and I suggested to him furthermore, that if he

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.)... had any reservations about it or if he thought that there was anything we overlooked that should have been taken into account, I would very much welcome his visiting us again and giving us his views, and as a matter of fact he undertook to do that, and my present understanding is that I'm to have the pleasure of a visit from him some time in the fairly near future, at which time we will again review progress to date and see if we think that the matter is going all right, and he is going to be very helpful to us, I know, because he can give us in a rather unique way, some idea of the feelings and the fears and the troubles that will vex the minds of the Indians and Metis and other people up there who are concerned, and that is extremely important for us to have that kind of contact with the people concerned. And our great worry is that we wouldn't like to think of any grandiose public development moving in there and sort of riding rough-shod over the rights of the humans and the individuals whose way of life and whose homes are stake in this issue, and I must say that I'm grateful that the Bishop came to see us, and we're looking forward to seeing him again and will hear what he has to say. But our point of view is that we're willing and happy to hear the representations of any group that are interested in this project. There may be very good ideas that they can give us as to how we can do a better job and we're looking forward to the contributions that they can make. We're trying to consider as reasonable people what we ought to do here. We think we have the main points covered, but we're glad to hear any observations that might help us to do a better job.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, I might just add a word on the — to what the Premier has said here. I would like to assure my honourable friends that the Hydro-Electric Board is certainly aware of the costs with respect to the natural resources in the area that was to be affected, and in fact there was a great deal of interest in this matter in The Pas and I went up there last year and I happened to have the notes before me, on a speech that I made on April the 27th. It was a combined meeting of The Pas Chamber of Commerce and the Farmers' Association up there, at which time we discussed fully the loss in resources and potential resources of that area as the result of the Hydro-Electric development. That was at The Pas, and at the same time, of course, we had representatives there from Moose Lake and people who have interests in the actual flooded area. Now as I recall, Dr. Bell was with me on that occasion; we did discuss agriculture and potential agriculture in the same area, and since that meeting I've had no complaints coming from that area with respect to the presentation that was made at that time, but I would like to assure you that the costs of resources were studied very, very fully by the Board at that time. Now there was some suggestion, too, made with respect to other sources of power that might be developed without the adverse effects, and I presume that my friend is thinking of the Nelson River Power development as opposed to the Saskatchewan River. The only other alternative, of course, is additions to coal and steam. If that's what my honourable friend is thinking, I would like to read into the record some of the order of magnitude costs which were available and which were presented at the same meeting; and the costs are these: the Grand Rapids is being developed at a cost of \$350 per kilowatt, developing 330,000 kilowatts at that site. The cost of transmission from Grand Rapids is \$22,500,000. Whiskey Jack, which is a site on the Nelson River, we can develop at a cost of \$480 per kilowatt -- substantially higher. The size of that particular development would be 140,000 kilowatts. Now Whiskey Jack is 370 miles from Winnipeg. The cost of transmission -- they would have to use a different type of two-wire instead of three-wire transmission and the cost of transmission, estimated in order of magnitude, \$74 million from Whiskey Jack to the Winnipeg area. Now there are two other locations which must be developed one in conjunction with the other. There's Whitemud Falls at a cost of \$275 per kilowatt for 230,000 kilowatts; and Red Rock Falls at \$350 per kilowatt for 170,000 kilowatts; making a total development there of 400,000 kilowatts. It's a pretty substantial plant but the cost of transmission from that area, 400 miles, is approximately \$80 million; so you see the substantial difference in cost. The Nelson River power was considered as was Grand Rapids and, as I mentioned last week, Grand Rapids was only marginally preferable to further additions to coal steam, so I think that if we're thinking in terms of other capacity, we have developed the right one in terms of economics and power generation.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister tell us how many people will have to be moved out of the area? Give us a breakdown of how many Indian and Metis and how many white settlers?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, there'll be mostly Indian and Metis people -- about 750 of them. I think the breakdown is approximately 50-50 on Indian and 50% Metis. The white people are in very small numbers. There's only a matter of, I'd say, about under a dozen.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Was there much privately-owned land that had to be purchased, and how was it purchased? Was it expropriated, or what method was used with the land that is privately owned?

MR. WITNEY: There was no privately-owned land to my knowledge involved in the area. It was all Crown land or Indian Reserve land.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Where are the Indian and Metis being moved? Has it been decided where they're going to be taken?

MR. WITNEY: There are three sites that are being looked at at the present time. Three sites have been studied and the Indian people have been looking at them themselves, the Indian and the Metis people, and the sites that will be chosen will be chosen by the Indian and Metis themselves. There is one on the east and south side of Cedar Lake closer to Grand Rapids itself. I believe here is another on the south and the west and I'm not sure where the other one is, but there are three.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I was interested in the figures that the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities gave and, if I heard him correctly, he said that the only alternatives were going to the Nelson River or else to steam. I just wondered if he had the comparable figures and I'm sure it would be interesting to have them on the record at this same time with regard to the Dauphin River scheme. That one was considered, and I believe that the Dauphin River and the Saskatchewan and Grand Rapids are mutually exclusive -- it was a case of balancing one against the other -- and I'm just wondering if the Minister had those figures. It would be nice to have those at the same time.

MR. CAROLL: I'm afraid that I don't have the figures available at the moment. There were two problems with respect to the Dauphin River scheme as I recall it. They weren't able to develop as much head on the Dauphin River as they are able to develop at the present Grand Rapids site. Secondly, there will be of course much greater property damage as a result of maintaining the reservoir on Lake Manitoba, so there are these disadvantages. Presumably, the disadvantages are so substantial it rules it out as an economic proposition in relation to the other possibilities. This site was not even considered seriously to my knowledge and hasn't been since the 1930's.

MR. CAMPBELL: I think it was considered very seriously since then, but my understanding was that it had been found uneconomical as compared with Grand Rapids some-time ago, but I just wondered if the figures had been taken because I believe those two were direct alternatives to one another.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I'm also interested in the cost figures of -- once the Grand Rapids development is completed, what is the price going to be for power once it will be transmitted to southern Manitoba and being used here? What will they have to charge for that power?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, I think we're on the Department of Mines and Natural Resources estimates and I submit to you that that was a question that should have been asked under the Department of Public Utilities.

MR. DOW: We have talked pretty well of the north country in regards to this department, but I would like to add a few remarks to what I consider the forgotten south over the past number of years. One of the remarks made in the heading of the Mines and Natural Resources book, page 124, in regard to summer resorts and public camp sites, it says: "the enjoyment of outdoors beyond our urban centres has become increasingly a greater part of modern living." This I substantiate and believe. In the past year I had the pleasure of accompanying the Minister of Natural Resources on a n extensive tour in what I call the better part of Manitoba and the gateway of Manitoba for United States tourists, that is, through the Turtle Mountains. I think he will agree with me that in that one day we saw more activity from wild life than you sometimes see in the Assiniboine Park, and all in its natural state. I must commend the Minister that certain improvements have been made in the Turtle Mountains much to the pleasure of -- and here again, Sir, I'm not speaking of the Turtle Mountain constituency, because that area services at least eight or nine constituencies in the southwestern part of

(Mr. Dow, cont'd.).... Manitoba. It is one of the few natural summer recreation grounds undeveloped that we have within the province, particularly within the southwestern province.

Now, Sir, if you will consider that in 1959 that in the ports of entrance from United States, in the customs entrance that are adjacent to the Turtle Mountain Forest Reserve, that there were double the entries that there were in the Gretna port and there were half as many as there were in the Emerson port. I'm safe to say that a big part of the revenue for the Province of Manitoba from non-resident tourists for game and hunting licences came out of that area than it did from any other part of Manitoba. There is no question that the area that I'm talking about is one of the points that could be the delight of all the province if it was developed. We talk about the various landmarks and trademarks we might have to attract tourists, and we go to Bemidji and we see Paul Bunyon and his blue cow; we go to the north country and they have their Trapper's Festival; and I submit to you, Sir, that the old sleeping turtle that was the landmark through the commission trail of the old pioneers that came in to homestead southwestern Manitoba is something that we can develop, of interest to this generation and generations to come. The old sleeping turtle is a landmark on the horizon of a series of hills that are above the flood level. It is also the second highest elevated area that we have in the Province of Manitoba and, with the planning that can be developed through the Mines and Resources Branch, I am sure that we have an attraction here that will be attractive not only to the tourists from United States, but I submit to you that a lot of the people of urban Winnipeg would be delighted in having the opportunity of going back to nature in its rough, if it was developed as I think it can be.

I was interested in the Minister's remarks today in regards to certain events that have happened in regards to shooting of ducks, particularly redheads and canvasbacks. As you know, again in this particular area, we have a shooting area. The Whitewater Marsh is one of the outstanding shooting grounds in the province. It's one of the permanent migration areas from the birds in the north to the south and it does attract hundreds, I would say literally hundreds of hunters from all over Canada and United States. I can sympathize with him, that what he said about the hunters shooting redheads and canvasbacks and trapping them in the mud, is true. It's not what I'd like to say is true sportmanship but, nevertheless it's a fact, and just how we're going to get around it, whether we require more enforcement officers I don't know. But it is something that concerns me, that sportsmen, that will go out and take advantage of the laws of our country, will do those things.

One other point that I have mentioned, and the Minister is well acquainted with, is the flooding of the natural habitat of breeding grounds for the wild fowl in this same Whitewater area. I mentioned before that it is a control deal from the Water Conservation or the Mines and Resources Branch. I don't know who's responsibility it is but, in my opinion, it is not an expensive job. It's something that we should take advantage of what nature provided and in so doing, rather than have the disadvantage of the floods coming in the spring after the eggs have been laid and the flooding has destroyed the natural nesting ground of the wild fowl, that it could be controlled to preserve this and would have some bearing on increasing our duck population which the Minister is so concerned with and which I share his concern. I mention these few things in our particular area, Sir, and I do so in the belief that the Minister is acquainted with it. He has shown some improvements within the last year and I hope that in 1961-62 he will continue his endeavours to the best interests of Manitoba.

MR. TANCHAK: I think the Honourable Minister will recall that during the last session I had, on several occasions, spoken to him about summer resorts and/or a game and fish preserve south of Gardenton. Also he had a request from the Gardenton Chamber of Commerce to check into the advisability of establishing such a resort south of Gardenton. The Minister promised that he would check into this. He promised me, and I think the Chamber of Commerce got that answer too, and I wish to report that I think there was -- I know in fact that there was a biological and a topographical survey in that area this last summer. I would like the Minister to indicate what the result of this survey was. If he has it on hand now, if not, later. He could answer it later.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, I know that the biological surveys were made but I'm not familiar with what the results of them were, and I'll have to obtain that for the honourable member for a later date. I must comment on the remarks made by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain because I did have a very pleasant trip through the Turtle Mountain area

(Mr. Witney, cont'd.).... and will agree with him that it is a very fine area. We are, at the present time, delineating the area as a provincial park and we are completing our work so that the lake area up there, Lake William, will be in operation this year for the travelling public. We have been also around Whitewater Lake investigating the possibility of purchasing the private parcels of land so that we will be able to have a buffer zone of Crown land around the whole of the Whitewater Lake. We have been investigating also in the area some reports that Crown land had been cultivated instead of being used for hay cutting as it was supposed to have been. We recognize the Whitewater Marsh as a very valuable waterfowl area, and I can assure him that everything will be done to see that it is maintained in that position, because we are in the position where we must maintain all the waterfowl nesting areas that we have in the province to a maximum degree of efficiency.

To be continued on next page.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 53 - passed. Item 2 - Forestry Branch (a) - passed; (b)- passed; (c) - passed; (d) - passed; (e) - passed; (f) - passed. Resolution 54

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman there is one matter that I wish to raise in regard to Forest Management; perhaps there's some other item under which it could come but it seemed to me that this was the appropriate one. I'm told that the Pine Falls Paper Mill is now being pretty choosy about the wood that they take for their operations there; that they are taking only choice green wood, and that this has created a considerable hardship for people who have had wood on hand. As a matter of fact members of the committee will remember a discussion that we had a year ago last winter I guess it was when some of the members from this side of the House complained very emphatically, and I believe successfully in the end, about the restriction that had been placed on trucks hauling cordwood on certain roads up there. Those restrictions I believe were lifted or partially lifted, but I am informed that a large quantity of pulpwood, due to the time that those restrictions were on, was left in the bush. In fact I've been told that hundreds, if not thousands, of cords were left in the bush. It is now a very great loss to those people because the Pine Falls Mill is not taking that cured pulpwood. I'm told also -- and I don't pretend to be a specialist in these matters, I rely upon information from people in the district -- but I am told that because of the increase of beaver in that part of the country that many dams have been erected and that that is resulting in the water-killing of hundreds if not thousands of cords of good wood, and that that wood will not be able to be marketed to the pulp mill as it could be formerly because of this new policy. This I suppose could be raised equally appropriately under the Game Branch because I ask the dual question: Is there anything that can be done to persuade the mill in question to make use of this water-killed wood and/or alternatively, at the same time is it proposed to reduce the numbers of beaver in the area. I'm told that it is now amounting to a considerable hazard to the wood crop in some low-lying areas.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman I had hoped to visit the Pine Falls Pulp and Paper Mills prior to the estimates and I would possibly been able to answer this question much better, but I understand that it is quite true that the Pine Falls Pulp and Paper Mill have been demanding a better quality of timber. I believe they have been demanding that better quality of timber because due to competition from other mills throughout the North American continent they have had to produce a better quality of products. I think also that they have put in some new methods in their plant which call for a better quality wood in order to produce this quality product which is now needed. As far as the beaver damage is concerned if the residents in the area will report it to the conservation officer at Lac du Bonnet he will go out and see whether the possibilities are there for live trapping of these beaver and alleviating the problem.

MR. CAMPBELL: Does it have to be live trapping Mr. Chairman?

MR. WITNEY: Not necessarily. It doesn't have to be live trapping. I think they quite often do live trapping though and transport them to some other area; but it can be a straight kill if the conservation officer feels that that's warranted.

MR. CAMPBELL: This probably belongs in the Game Branch rather than under this particular item but inasmuch as we're on the discussion I gather that the beaver pelt is not worth very much money at the present time, but is it fact that even under those circumstances that the beaver is protected as well?

MR. WITNEY: No, the beaver is not protected, Mr. Chairman; they can trap it and get what value they can receive from the fur or the conservation officer can move in and alleviate the problem for them.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, the Minister mentioned the fact that there's been a cutback in production of pulp, ties and other forest products in the Duck Mountains. There may be good and sufficient reason for that, Mr. Chairman, but I think that the human element is being overlooked in this regard. We must bear in mind that the area lying between the Duck Mountains and Lake Winnipegosis was primarily settled because of the heavily timbered area in those parts. There is very heavy timber there and the people settled there because there were jobs available in the various saw mills that were set up and from the beginning of the century the settlers there have depended to a large extent on the timber resources as supplementary revenue to their farming. Now farming in large sections of the area is not sufficient to give the families the revenue they need to maintain themselves and give themselves a standard of living that they should have, and they have to depend on forest resources. Now the areas outside of the

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd.)....preserve or the reserve, the Duck Mountain Reserve, is now devoid of timber, but for, I would say for a good 25 to 30 years, all ties and pulpwood shipped out of either the area outside the reserve or in the reserve was shipped by the settlers on individual permits. It was only recently that we brought in the timber sales, and it so happens that timber sales have been gradually pushing the individual or settlers permits out of existence; where at one time we had no timber sales now we are getting to the stage where there are very few settlers permits. There may have been a cutback in production, but I think that instead of displacing the individual permit with a timber sales, what we should try and do is to give the individual settler as much an opportunity to take out pulp and ties as possible. I know there is a question of supervision here and so forth, but when it's a matter of very badly needed income I think the additional supervision that would be needed to look after settlers individual permits should be overlooked at least at a time such as we have right now where the economy is pretty strained. I would suggest that the Minister do his best to evolve some policy whereby the timber sales, the number of timber sales would be cut down and the settlers permits increased accordingly.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, I think the honourable member has mentioned one of the reasons why we have been cutting down on the permits and bringing in the sales. He mentions that the timber resources outside of the forest reserve have gradually been depleted. The reason we are putting the timber sales in is because the timber sale provides more than any other medium the means of conducting trapper forest management in these particular areas, because it calls upon, not only the use of just one or two species of timber, but it calls upon the use of all the species of timber that are available there, and it calls for such matters as the lopping of brush in order to create regeneration. The matter of permits and sales has been a very pressing one with the Department of Mines and Natural Resources, particularly forestry, and I think that we must recognize this principle; I think we must recognize that the resources, particularly the renewable resources, must be allowed and managed so that they can stand on their own feet, if we wish to have them as renewable resources for the future. I'm advised and I have become convinced, that the method of using the timber sales as against the permit is the method that is needed. The permit is in a way a form of high grading, because the people take out of the bush only what they need -- maybe the timber for the railway ties that you mentioned or maybe the timber for the jackpine pulpwood that you mentioned -- the poplar is left and the other material is left, and it is not utilized. As a result it takes up available space for the other types of trees that are merchantable which could grow and be utilized in the future. Now most of these timber sales, many of them at any rate, we don't feel are too small for two or three people to combine their resources to form a small business and to set some capital up and to move into the bush and to utilize it properly and give themselves an opportunity of making more money than they are at the present time. We feel that once this system of the timber sale has been accepted, once it has proved itself, that many of these people, the people that you are speaking about, providing they do get together and take out sales, and these sales are available to them, that they will be able to make more money and we will get better utilization and management of our forest reserves. I feel Mr. Chairman, that it is essential with the number of people who want to go into the bush, and we are having more all the time, that these larger units be utilized instead of the smaller units. We do have in administration a great deal of problem with the smaller unit, but that is not the reason why the timber permits are being replaced gradually with the timber sales. The reason is simply that the timber sale allows us to manage that resource better than we can under the timber permit and we feel we must have that opportunity to manage that resource if we are going to have it there for the people in years to come. We feel also that if these people will utilize their own initiative, band together, small businesses if you wish, put up capital and move into the bush in the more economic operation that they too will benefit in the long run.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the Minister insofar as management is concerned, but I don't agree with him on two counts. The suggestion that two or three band together in order to buy a timber sale has been tried out, but it hasn't proved satisfactory. The main reason is this; that there are certain interests who can outbid the settlers when they band together, when they are buying these sales, and this has happened again and again and again up in my area -- and not only that I understand it is the policy of the government that one

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd.)....person can only hold one sale. Well it is a know fact that although there are sales in the name of several persons, actually one timber interest has financed those various operations and had outbid the local settlers, and that is something that so far as I know no solution has been found for. I quite agree that for better management a larger unit is preferable, but when you have a situation where the settler, in spite of the fact that he is prepared to go along with his neighbours and take up a block which is manageable, is bid out of the market altogether because he can't stand up against these interests that are just too much for him.

MR. WITNEY:we have been experimenting with the sealed tender in order to prevent this bidding up in the auction sales and putting the small man out of business. We recognize that fact and we recognize that there are certain problems with it. We do feel as we are experimenting with the sealed tender that we will be able to eliminate some of the problems which you have mentioned. But we also feel that we must utilize the bigger unit if we are to preserve the forest for utilization for a long time to come, and we feel that to the extent that we think we had better utilize the bigger type of operation and solve our problem, the type of problem that you have mentioned, as best we can and as fast as we can in the future, and that is why we have over several areas of this province extended into the sealed tender. We have done so in the Whiteshell; we have done so in the southeast corner of Manitoba; but I stand to be corrected -- I don't think we have done it as yet in the Duck Mountains.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, I was a little late this evening and I wasn't here when the reforestation was reported by the Honourable Minister. My question is, to what extent are timber been used for different purposes and destroyed by fire against reforestation. In other words is the program of reforestation being matched by the amount of timber that is being destroyed by fire or being used by the paper companies or others?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman I don't think that the Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company deliberately destroy timber by fire; I don't really think that was what the honourable member meant. It is difficult to answer the question because we can't tell exactly when a fire year is going to be. We did have a very serious fire year last year, and we had a relatively light fire year the year before, but I would venture to say that from the reforestation plan that we have that we will be able to catch up on whatever loss is being experienced through means of forest fires. We are gradually and steadily expanding our forest fire protection system. We have installed four new towers in the Province of Manitoba this year, one in the southeast corner and one up on the Interlake road, the new road up to Gypsumville, and two in the north country, particularly up in the area of Sipiwesk and along the new Simonhouse road. With the expansion of these fire fighting facilities and with the constant experimentation in new equipment and with the plans that we have for reforestation, we feel that we can overcome the damage that is done by the forest fires alone.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman before we pass that item, the Minister overlooked my question under (1) as to an explanation of why the left hand column in this year's estimates doesn't compare with the current estimates, but I have the same question to ask in forestry. Probably there is a better answer in forestry than there was in that number one, but there are others that we can come to. Now if we look at salaries under Forestry, salaries are shown in the left hand column which is for the year ending March 31st, 1961 as \$141,255. If you look at the current estimates, that is those ending March 31st, 1961, the amount is \$488,245, a difference of \$340,000. When you come down to construction and maintenance, the item here is \$81,690 in the estimates we are now considering, whereas if you look back in the current estimates the amount is \$119,350. Well the reason I raise this Mr. Chairman, is that if you were only to look at the estimates we are now considering, the figures given there would be misleading, because they do not jibe or compare with the figures were actually established for the current year's estimates -- what I mean, the current year ending March 31st, 1961. A very good example of that would be back in Administration, other salaries. In the left hand side you show last year's appropriation as being \$51,635 whereas the appropriation actually was \$65,990.

MR. WITNEY: You mean in last year's estimate book the appropriation is shown as that figure that you gave me?

MR. HRYHORCZUK: I have the estimates for the year ending March 31st, 1961, before

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd.)....me. If you look under Administration, the appropriation under Other Salaries was \$65,990 and this appropriation in this book that we are now considering shows it to be \$51,635. Now that appears right throughout the whole estimates. I'll point them out to the Minister as we get to them, and I would like to have an explanation of it so if I'm asked, I'll be in a position to explain it.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member has stumped me for the moment because I haven't got the book for last year with me. If he would allow me, I will obtain that and the explanation can be given to him.

MR. HRYHORCZUK:under Forestry, (a) (b) (c) (e) and (f).

MR. WITNEY: Forestry, (a) (b) (c) (e) and (f).

MR. HRYHORCZUK: And under the Game Branch -- while we're on this, Mr. Chairman, I might as well give all the discrepancies and it will save us the trouble of stopping at every one of them. Under the Game Branch (a) (b) (c) and (d). Under Fisheries Branch (a) and (b). Under Surveys Branch (a); and under Lands Branch (a). That's where all the discrepancies appear between the figures given this year and the actual appropriations that were made during our estimates in 1960.

MR. WITNEY: Yes I'll have that information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (f) - passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: Did you call (f) ?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes (f).

MR. CAMPBELL: Under (f) I was wanting to ask the Minister what about the winter works program in this last two or three months compared to the winter works program of last year and the year before? My information is that there have been very few people at work in these recreational areas and that according to the program that was laid down a few years ago, that there still is lots of work to be done. Would the Minister tell us if this is a fact that there are a small number of people working cutting lines, brushing, clearing roads, etcetera, compared to last year and the year before. And why, if it's a fact, that there still is a lot of work to be done on that program; and what is to be done along that line in the Whiteshell area?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, part of the reason that we haven't got as many casual employees working on winter works at the present time is because of our completion, as mentioned, or bringing to near completion, most of the Trans-Canada camp and picnic ground agreements this year. As I mentioned in the opening remarks we have got early all of them, at least 95 percent, and at a minimum of 85 percent. So the capital construction has been done on these projects and consequently with that there's less need for part-time employees. Now we do have this year the camp and picnic site winter work agreement operating and we have the forest access-road agreement operating. With respect to the camp and picnic site winter works agreement, we have an agreement with Canada where they pay approximately 50 percent of the total cost. For the current fiscal year we are working on a program the total cost of which is \$100,000. With respect to the second one, the forest access-road agreement: It's a twelve-month agreement, operating from December 1st, 1960 through to November 30th, 1961, and we have operating under this one a total of \$134,000 before the end of this fiscal year. Now in the program that we have for the balance of the fiscal year we have work being done at William Lake; we have our Trans-Canada Highway sites being cleaned up; and we have miscellaneous works in our northern sites, southern sites and western sites, and in miscellaneous wayside developments. In the forest access roads for winter works up to the end of this fiscal year we have the Whitemouth Lake Road east being worked upon; the Dauphin Cabin south road; the Sandilands west fireguard road; the west fireguard road in the Whiteshell; and the Jackhead Road and Jackhead Harbour Road also. In the Public Works would be accounts that's administered -- capital account which is administered under this department and Public Works, we have the road location to Cedar Lake; the road location to Moose Lake; and the Woodridge Road West to P.T.H. No. 12 and the Caribou Lake Road. So altogether up until the end of this fiscal year in winter works programs we have \$100,000 -- at least the camp and picnic site winter work agreement ends on April 30th, 1961 -- for \$100,000, and the forest access-road agreement is a total of \$134,000 before the end of this fiscal year.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has told us of the amounts of money involved in these various projects. Can he translate that into terms of men employed, people

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.)....employed? And could he probably, not now but after he's had an opportunity to check on the information, could he get us the comparisons with last year and the year before as to the number of people employed.

MR. WITNEY: Yes, I haven't got the comparisons here now but they can be obtained.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, before we leave (f), I raised this particular question last year and I think I referred to it again this year somewhere along the line, but it'll bear repeating. In the Duck Mountains we have built in the past oh I don't know, five or six years, over a hundred miles of road to open up one of the finest recreational areas in Manitoba. During the past two years next to nothing has been done to complete a road which runs from Grandview on No. 5 to Minitonas on No. 10, a distance of approximately 80 miles. Right in the middle of this road there's eight miles uncompleted, probably nine miles uncompleted, which makes the road useless insofar as driving from Grandview to Minitonas or through that mountain is concerned. Now if I remember right we had an appropriation a year ago, two years ago, to complete that road. We had an appropriation last year to complete that road and nothing has been done. I would like to hear from the Minister whether he can assure the House that that work will be done this year and that we utilize the roads that we have already built there to their capacity.

MR. WITNEY: The road referred to by the honourable member will be completed this year and it will be under contract soon.

MR. PAULLEY: Do you want to pursue your point.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Did I understand the Minister to say that it's going to be under contract? Well my information is that if the Honourable Minister wants to have a lot of grief with that little piece of road, the way to find grief is to put it under contract, because it's in very rugged country; it's not the same as elsewhere. You get occasional rains there where you get them nowhere else, and anybody that undertakes that contract may be running into difficulties which generally spells grief for the department.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, just before you leave that. Is this item here the item under which we could discuss Grand Beach and the possibilities for Grand Beach. Thanks. I notice reference has been made, Mr. Chairman, to contemplate a development at Grand Beach and I understand that there has been a transaction whereby either this is, or will shortly be, the property of the Crown. That may not be entirely right. The Minister I am sure will give us that full information. But I want to make an appeal to the Minister in respect to the development of Grand Beach. Now Grand Beach of course is an old established summer resort. A lot of people have gone down, and they went on to the camp site.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Doesn't this item come under the Lands Branch?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if my honourable friend had noticed that the Minister in charge of the department had told me that this is the proper place to consider this.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, I might just mention that all recreational areas now with the changes that have been made in the department, and I'm sorry I neglected to mention this during my opening remarks, they have all been brought under the Forestry Branch under a Chief of Parks supervision, and that I think this will be the place to discuss Grand Beach.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the interjection of my honourable friend from St. George. I'm glad to note that now and again he at least tries to get people in proper order. What I was going to say Mr. Chairman, was to suggest to the Minister that because of the fact of the circumstances under which Grand Beach developed over the period of years that the people who have cottages there, particularly on the campsite -- I frankly agree or admit that a lot of them are sort of hemmed in or jammed in on the particular campsite -- but they have some apprehension at the present time. They fear that the possible development will adversely affect them if there is any attempt to develop Grand Beach on the same or similar grandiose scale as the development at Falcon Lake. I'm sure they would appreciate the installation of sewer and water, at least to some degree, but they have a fear -- now there's a lot of people -- I'm particularly concerned with this because a lot of them are former workmates of mine on the railroad, both at Transcona and Fort Rouge, who because of their association with the railroad went down to Grand Beach and erected summer cottages. They have a great fear, Mr. Chairman, that depending on the type of development that may take place at Grand Beach that the annual cost to them may go up considerably. I want to say that a lot of them are people who are

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . now retired and on pension. They have very modest, in many cases modest summer cottages that are just simply used for the purpose of going down weekends or in some cases they are staying there for the full summer season, and I'm sure that it would be detrimental to their interests if any large grandiose scale of development was taken at Grand Beach. I would like to hear from the Minister if he would be so kind as to give us an outline, if it's possible -- it may not be possible at this particular time -- to give us an outline of what is contemplated in respect of Grand Beach. Now it may be, Mr. Chairman, that the plans are not developed to a degree that that is possible with my friend the Minister, and if that is the case, may I respectfully suggest to him that at the very first opportunity that there is a revealing of the plans of the development at Grand Beach, and in particular how it might affect the campsite area and the areas which have been developed by the people that I speak of at the present time.

In order Mr. Chairman, that I don't hold up the committee any longer than necessary, another question I would ask of the Minister insofar as this particular item is concerned: I had an opportunity this summer of visiting a few of our recreational resorts and camps in various areas of the province and in conversation with some of the guardians in the areas, these mainly were reserves, it appeared to me while they had the full power under the department's regulations to bring to task any persons who were liable to cause fires who threw trash where they weren't supposed to, that in some of these areas due to the increase in interest in them that they did not have the power to control such things as rowdiness of any great degree; that they didn't have any power as guardians or guards in the reserves to control breaches of the Liquor Act and the likes of that; that they had to go to a detachment of either the municipal or Mounted Police whichever was the closer to them. My question directed to the Minister would be: is this an actual fact or circumstance; and if it is, I'm wondering whether or not, in the interests of all concerned, there may be real reason why it could not be done, but I'm wondering whether in the interests of all concerned the additional powers of control of the items of rowdiness and illegal use of liquor and the likes of that could not be vested, control vested in the guardians. In addition to those controls that they have in respect of preservation of our forests. I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, when I say this, it may be something that is not really desirable to have people who may not be fully trained in the law but the question has been raised to me and I now present it to the Minister.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, with respect to Grand Beach the government recognize there were many people there who were pensioners or people who were on a modest income and purchased the Grand Beach property -- it is now in the name of the Crown -- in order to prevent these people from speculation at the time that the CNR announced its intention to drop the Grand Beach project. These people have nothing to worry about. We are going to make no changes in the policy down at Grand Beach for this year that had been under the CNR, and I'm sure that in the years to come that we are not going to be unduly hard on them to start making it difficult for them to stay there. As a matter of fact we would like to see them have some place where they can enjoy and pass the latter years of their life. At Grand Beach we are hoping just to, or we will be making a solid development that will be clean; that will be attractive and that will meet the pressures of the public, particularly on the holidays. At the present time we have been surveying the various buildings that are there at Grand Beach by the provincial architect's office, and some of them in the interests of safety will have to be demolished, and others will be repaired for the time being until such time as we have been able to lay our definite plans. At the present time we have a parking lot being built for some 800 to 1000 cars behind the sand dunes; we are doing some landscaping on the sand dunes themselves in order to stop them from blowing, and we are spreading along that beach area picnic tables, toilet facilities and camp fires in order to handle the more people which we expect to have this year.

The Grand Beach development has been mainly around the railway station in the past; we intend to spread it out so that we will be able to control and have better parking and more facility for parking in the area. We are going to repair the sanitation facilities that they have at the present time, repair the floor at least, and make some repairs to the area where the sewage is discharged until such time as we can come up with a proper plan of what should be done, and we will have them I think it's safe to say, in much better condition than they have been in past years. Apart from that we are laying our plans and as the years go by we will

(Mr. Witney, cont'd.) develop them, and I'm sure that the people who are there now need not worry and they will find themselves with a very comfortable, clean and solid development -- not particularly grandiose as you mentioned, but something that they can enjoy, and the outside public.

With reference to the policing situation and trash. Since we passed the Parks Act last year, we do have control, not over policing, but we do have control over people not keeping their lots clean or leaving trash in an area where there might be a fire hazard. I have some very strong reservations about bringing our conservation officers into a policeman's role with the powers of a policeman. We do have excellent co-operation with the RCMP in the Whiteshell area and to my knowledge we have not had any difficulties this year as a result of that. The presence of the RCMP has been sufficient to keep rowdyism and trouble down, and we will be having -- at least negotiations are well in progress to have the RCMP policing in the Grand Beach area this year, so we hope to have the same favourable police activity that we have had in the Whiteshell, in Grand Beach for this year to come.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, before you leave that item, more and more people, especially in the low income groups, spend their weekends and holidays with their families at these various resources in tents, not being in a position to have cabins of their own or pay rentals on cabins that are provided, they use tents, and last year in the Duck Mountains I think that we had families in tents that would number about, oh I'd say easily four or five times what there was in the previous year, and this seems to be a trend, throughout that area anyhow. Now the reason I bring this up, Mr. Chairman, is that facilities for setting up tents are not available at these places, and when the recreational areas such as swimming beaches and so forth are put up, I would suggest that large areas be cleared in these forested parts of the country so that there'd be good tenting space. I'd also like to point out in most of these areas your parking lots are far too small to look after the present tourists that come in, especially over the weekends. I've seen times that you couldn't find a place to park at some of these beaches, and that's another thing I'd suggest the Minister keep in mind and make provision for sufficient public parking. In this particular area in the Duck Mountains, there is only the one main highway and if you don't provide areas there is no place where they can go and park and they'll come in and turn around and have to go out again.

MR. WITNEY: There has been a great increase in camping and tenting activities in the province; I was noticing that last year in camping attendance we had -- pardon me in 1959 we had 31,000. In 1960, we had 43,000. I think that with parking tents and trailer facilities we have been able to take care of the main traffic route now along No. 1 highway. We have recognized this need and its growth and we will be expanding our facilities out on the other highways now that we have taken care of its main artery east and west.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I'm speaking in particular about the recreational roads through the Duck Mountains because the facilities are not there.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, at Lundar, there's an excellent beach, a government beach established roughly 11 miles west of the town. There's a good parking lot for about 200 cars, it's got tenting facilities, facilities for trailers, and it's being used extensively every year by people from all parts of the province -- Winnipeg, up and down Interlake, even visitors from the United States. The big problem here is the road leading into this beach from the No. 6 highway. The road for most of the way is a market road; the last four miles has no classification at all. Now the municipality of Coldwell feel very strongly about this road that it should be taken over by the government because of the heavy traffic that is on this road. I think they're quite justified in feeling this way because the road just can't stand the traffic that it's getting. The road is adequate for the traffic from the local people but it wasn't designed for the heavy traffic coming from the visitors. Now they have no objection to people using it, but the road is deteriorating fast and they feel that the government, because it's a public beach, used for not only the people of the municipality of Coldwell but for the whole of Manitoba, the government should take over this road. The last four miles between the beach and the point where it ends as a market road is very narrow and a lot of people fear that unless something is done very soon we're going to have a serious accident with the heavy traffic on this road. The municipality of Coldwell just can't afford to spend the money on this particular road, it doesn't serve any of the local people, particularly the last four miles, and they feel that the government should

(Mr. Guttormson, cont'd.) . . . step in and take it over. Now if the Minister doesn't feel that he can take over the whole road this year they'd certainly like to see him take over the last four miles at least to start with, because that's the worst part of the road it goes through, a swamp area, it's narrow, and as I say unless we do something with that road we're going to have a serious traffic accident.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I am particularly happy to note that there is \$112,000 more under 2 (f) this year than there was last year. I am a little concerned though because of the fact that I don't think that in the entire Gladstone constituency is there one roadside picnic table or a provincial camping site of any nature and I think that we should be considered; if the Honourable the Minister has plans for a 100 or more sites this year that he should not overlook the Gladstone constituency. I was particularly interested in the answers given to my questions in the votes and proceedings number 19. I find on examining the answers that the Provincial Government spent \$26,180.85 on developing a picnic site adjacent to the PRFA dam at Rivers, Manitoba, and it is possible, Mr. Chairman, that we in Neepawa have not been putting enough pressure to bear on a project that we have in mind at Neepawa, because we too have a PRFA dam just within a mile or so of town that we would like to see developed. I notice that when I asked the question, the question is this: is this policy applicable to others similar areas such as Neepawa? The answer is "yes", provided the use of the reservoir for recreational purposes can be reconciled with other purposes which have a priority and provided the site is acceptable to the departments of the government concerned. Now I wonder if the Honourable Minister will proceed to reconcile this situation himself without us asking for it. Apparently it's a matter which they have to reconcile in the various departments among themselves, and I would ask him to proceed to reconcile this situation and see what he can do for us in that area, because we have a natural there if it could be developed. It seems to me that if we want to encourage tourists to Manitoba, and indeed we should, because I believe it is a fact that 18 million Canadians spend more in America now than do 180 million Americans spend in Canada -- I believe that is a fact, and it seems to me something that could be corrected if we go about it in the right manner. I think we should have more roadside picnic tables; we should have more camping grounds available for the tourists when they come here, and I think the Honourable Minister has suggested that that is so; that camping is becoming increasingly popular with the tourists. I believe that we should attempt to erect more historical markers. In the pamphlet that I have before me, The Manitoba Tourist Industry Report, reporting on what our tourists tell us what they think of us. They suggest what we should do to encourage them back here -- and one page is almost entirely devoted to it -- historic sites interest many visitors and it reports that several Americans made a special trip to Manitoba to see the historical items of interest here and they were completely disappointed. There were fifteen replies made here to questions put to them as regards what they think of us, and they say, "Develop more of your historic sites", and, "We came to Manitoba last year and spent our whole trip visiting historic sites and we did the same thing this year". They say they were impressed with the Legislative Buildings -- well that's understandable -- but they go on to say that they think we should develop more of these.

In the Gladstone area we have reason, I believe, a good reason to erect an historic marker, and incidentally I was told the other day by Mr. Bowsfield, I think he's the Director of the Historical Sites Council -- I don't know whether that's the correct term or not -- but it only costs about \$200.00 to erect one of these historical markers, about that, and it seems to me that they serve a very worthwhile purpose. In the Grant McEwan book, "The Sod Busters" -- I know most of you have read it, but he tells the story of some 12 or 15 of our early pioneers; he refers to them as "sod busters". The Number 2 sod buster in his book tells the story of old Adam McKenzie who settled in the Gladstone constituency at Arden prior to Manitoba becoming a province, and prior to the provincial land survey, at which time I think it was only necessary to establish your holdings to plow around all the lands that you could, that you were able to do from sunrise to sunset -- he did that twice in Manitoba. I think he did it north of MacDonald at Longburn, and when he came back to Manitoba after spending the winter in Ontario, found that someone had taken possession of the land that he claimed, and he said that Manitoba was altogether too big, he would go and establish a new holding, and he did, and it was just south of the village of Arden, and Adam McKenzie is referred to by Grant McEwan as the "bonanza farmer of Manitoba" the only one that Manitoba ever produced. The first crop of wheat that he grew in

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd.) . . . Manitoba, he transported it all by oxen to Gladstone, had it ground into flour, and then transported the flour to Edmonton by 32 ox-carts and 64 oxen, and he sold the flour in Edmonton for \$20.00 a hundredweight and it gave him \$12,800, I think it was.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I must remind the Honourable member we are on Item 2 (f).

MR. SHOEMAKER: That's right, that's what I am, and I'm suggesting that men like Adam McKenzie who should -- were certainly entitled to have an historic marker, and that comes under (f) -- Récreational Development, according to what the Minister told us. I thought, according to the report that we have before us, that I could discuss that under Lands Branch, but he tells us "no, that comes under Recreational Development", so I think we should take a little time to recognize some of these early pioneers who are responsible for us being here, Mr. Chairman, and we need more, more men like these fabulous Scots. However, I would be interested in hearing what the Honourable Minister has in store for us in 1961 and 1962 by way of more road-side picnic tables, more historic markers, more camping grounds, etcetera, etcetera.

MR. WITNEY: I am going to disappoint the honourable member because there will be no historic sites under this department. I'm afraid they come under the Department of the Provincial Treasurer -- the Provincial Treasurer. I felt like interrupting him, but I had also read the book about the Sod Busters and I was rather interested in his version of some of the paragraphs that I had read. I might mention to him that with the reservoirs, once again I must pass responsibility of reservoirs off to another department because the reservoirs are now under the Department of Agriculture and Water Conservation. The Rivers reservoir was the first one to be developed under the PFRA and any recreational development has to be approved by the Department of Agriculture through its Water Conservation Branch, as the reservoirs are mainly for agricultural and water conservation uses, and I would like to suggest to him that on his continued fight for recreational development at Neepawa that he take his activities and his energy to the Department of Agriculture. We do have, with our road-side parks, we do have the problem in some areas where there is a great deal of private land which abuts the highway, and of course we like to develop on Crown land wherever possible, but we are also developing our road-side parks on the basis of traffic patterns throughout the province. Where the traffic density is, that's where we try to develop the park. I think the honourable member will know that the Number 4 highway has been completed in just about the past year or so and the traffic pattern, I suppose, is being developed in there now.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, maybe the Minister has answered the question I raised about the road into the beaches.

MR. WITNEY: On the road to the beaches. Quite often we are asked for these beaches by the municipality and after the beaches have been built at a fair amount of money and then the beaches become quite popular, then the municipalities ask us to take over the access roads. The policy is at the present time that we will take over these roads providing the municipality makes representation to the Department of Public Works as recreation roads or market roads, and the same formula of 60 - 40, but we have no policy of taking over such roads as the Honourable Member mentioned, in their entirety.

MR. SCHREYER: I understand that the Crown has purchased a few acres of land along the east bank of the Red -- immediately north of Lockport Bridge. If it's convenient for the Minister at this point, I would ask him to outline the nature and the extent of this project, recreation. I understand it's a recreational project.

MR. WITNEY: We are looking into the possibilities of a recreational development in the Lockport area, Mr. Chairman, but we have only been under the negotiating for land. We have made no decisions as yet on that situation.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman does the Minister mean that purchase has not been made up to this time?

MR. WITNEY: That is right.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Could the Minister tell us what the value of the forestry products were for the last year?

MR. WITNEY: The forestry products. Yes, it's in the Departmental report. Just briefly though, I can give it to you. In 1959-60 it was \$20,100,000 as compared with \$19 million

(Mr. Witney, cont'd.)...the previous year.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Last year the Department sponsored a course which was a saw-milling course I believe. Was the response very good for this course?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman the course was sponsored in conjunction with the Federal Government and the attendance was good.

MR. CHAIRMAN:54 passed, Item 3 (a) passed.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, under this item I rise to express regret, and rather profound regret at that, with the decision made by the Minister in the course of the past few months. Now last fall a farmer living in my constituency had his tractor confiscated as a result of his two sons, adult sons, using it for hunting -- I suppose hunting illegally, night-lighting. This was brought to the attention of the Minister. At the time when the two boys were apprehended the tractor was confiscated along with a rifle with telescopic sights. Now there was no question about the rifle, but the tractor was owned by the father. He was unaware, but completely unaware of the fact that the tractor was being used for this purpose. When the department was asked to investigate this allegation they did so and found that, in fact, they were satisfied that the father was unaware the tractor was used for this purpose. Now we all know that the Minister has wide discretionary powers under the provisions of the Game and Fish Act, and the amendments thereto made last year. I realize that there might be facts which the Minister has at his fingertips, which the Minister is aware of, that I might not be aware of. However I am aware of this; and as I said the officials were satisfied the father was unaware, the confiscation of the rifle amounted to -- the value there is a couple of hundred dollars, I suppose. The tractor was a vital necessity to the father because he keeps 35 head of stock and the tractor was equipped with a stable cleaning front end loader. It was definitely a hardship, and while I can see the need for certain punishment as a means of deterring further violation, I cannot help but feel that in this particular instance it wasn't so much a case of deterrence as it was one of oppression. Now the only reason I raise this is to give the Minister an opportunity to justify his not having used discretionary power to rescind the confiscation action. I understand the tractor has been sold. It's been sold, and I wouldn't be surprised but that the department only got \$200 for it -- \$250 -- while it was certainly worth more than that to the farmer. I realize he had recourse to the courts, but people in my area aren't naturally litigious and they left it at that. I really was puzzled, and at the time I didn't want to be vindictive about it, but I would like to take this opportunity to demand of the Minister a more adequate explanation.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, I think the explanation was given at the time and was quite adequate. It was a case of jack-lighting and the people involved were convicted, and as a result of that the tractor was confiscated. Now apparently the tractor did belong to the father. This year we did not return any vehicles, or any equipment, under any circumstances, to anyone, at any time when jack-lighting of deer. It was felt by the department that when the Legislature put in the confiscation clause for jack-lighting -- we took them out for other items but jack-lighting -- it was felt that when the Legislature decided to put it back in that they felt we should exercise a hard line with respect to jack-lighting, and since this was a family matter, it was in the family, the boys were convicted, the tractor was taken away, and I felt at the time that the father could get retribution from the sons.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, if I understood the Minister correctly he intimated there was a possibility of the elk season being discontinued in the Duck Mountains this year because of the depletion in the herds. I know it's going to be very disappointing to many hunters in the Province of Manitoba, including myself. I've hunted in that area for, oh I'd say about 35 years, and I can say that during the past three or four years there's been more game in there than there was 35 years ago. Of course that was due to the fact that in the late '40s more conservation officers were put on the job in the Duck Mountains and the trappers with their blocks in there have also been of some assistance in creating a favourable atmosphere for these animals. But I am surprised that the information the Minister has is that the population has decreased to the point where they feel that they should stop hunting. This last year I came across more sign of elk and moose than I did in any other hunting season. It may have been only that particular portion of the mountain. This may not be true throughout the whole of the mountain, but in the area that we were in there was more sign this year than I've ever seen in there. I

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd.)...don't think that hunting is depleting the elk herds in the Duck Mountains. There may be several other reasons for this, I'm just presuming; I'm not sure of it, but nowhere in that mountain can you go outdoor in the hunting season or at any time during the winter, and not hear a power saw. The timber operations in there have just about blanketed that whole mountain. It wouldn't surprise me at all if the elk were being pushed out of the mountain, either back into the Riding Mountain where a great many of them came from, or north into the Porcupines. There is also the matter of timber wolves. I would like the Minister to tell us when was the last time that the professional hunter had been sent in to that mountain. My information is that the timber wolves are on the increase and there are many more in there this winter than have been for some time, and I would like to know the number of elk and moose that have been shot during the seasons in the past -- well ever since they started opening the season, for each season -- the number of game that was taken out of the mountain during the elk and moose shoot in the Duck Mountains. I think that these timber operations have also some effect on the population of elk in particular. Cover is being removed by these timber operations. All the trees that provided cover for them and large areas of trees have been absolutely taken out altogether, and they provided a natural habitat for the game which isn't there any more. I would suggest that the Minister take a good look at the inventory, and I am sure that no sportsman would want to press an open season if there's any danger of the population of the game animals being depressed to the level that there may be any danger of continuing the hunts in the future.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, I didn't mean to indicate that we may not have an elk hunting season this year, but the indications are that the elk population is declining in that area, and if it is necessary to cut off the hunting season then we will have to do so. I haven't got the statistics here for the number of elk and moose taken out of the Duck Mountains, but I'm sure that they can be obtained for you from the Game Branch. I have no information either as to when the professional hunter was last in the Duck Mountain area for the control of wolves, but I'll get that information for you too.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, a situation that's very serious in the area along the Grand Rapids road between Gypsumville and Grand Rapids, that's the hunting of moose by men using airplanes and bombardiers. Unless some drastic action is taken by the government the moose population of this area is going to be wiped out. Last fall, time and time again, airplanes were seen circling the area along the highways looking for moose, and then when they'd spot a moose they would dive at the animal in such a manner that they would drive it into the waiting guns of accomplices. This certainly isn't very sportsmanlike and it certainly is going to do a great deal of harm to the moose population unless action is taken to stop it. I know of one instance last year where a man was hunting moose legitimately on foot, tracking the animal, when a plane came overhead and frightened the animal that this man was in pursuit of, and drove it towards the men waiting in another area, and it's shocking to know, to realize the number of animals that were destroyed in this manner. I realize very fully that this is a difficult thing to stop, but I would suggest to the Minister now that he consider some action right away so that these illegal tactics can be stopped next fall when the season is on.

Now the Minister has been asked and spoke about the duck population decreasing, and I can certainly agree with him on this subject. Jimmy Robinson, the noted outdoor writer for "Sports Afield", is quoted as saying last fall that he had never seen the duck population so poor in the Delta in 40 years, and his remark was substantiated by a game warden by the name of Walter Reddick, I believe it is. And unless the government is prepared to spend money on the ducks, not only in this province but other provinces, the duck population is going to go extinct. I know in the interlake it was a wonderful breeding ground for the ducks and as time goes on, the drainages, the area where they can breed is gradually disappearing, and I think that the government should take steps now to purchase land which is not -- which may be sub-marginal as far as farming is concerned, but would be very productive as far as breeding of ducks, because this is one of the big problems with the ducks, this lack of breeding grounds, and reports from the south indicate that this same problem is prevalent in Minnedosa where the ducks used to breed to a large extent. The duck shooting season brings in thousands and thousands of dollars. I know a figure was kept in the Delta marshes, and it's astonishing the amount of money that was brought into that area by the duck hunters coming in from the United States and other

(Mr. Guttormson, cont'd.)...parts of the province. And to me, I don't think this government nor did the previous government spend the amount of money that is necessary to put back into this deal, because they're bringing a lot of money. I think that in order to keep this revenue up we've got to spend money back into the -- by creating breeding grounds and restoring the duck population which is rapidly diminishing, because figures on the Mississippi flyway indicate that the population of mallards is down 23 percent and redheads and canvasbacks roughly 50 percent. At this rate there just isn't going to be any hunting at all, unless this government and governments in the United States and other provinces of Canada take immediate action to restore the population of ducks.

To come back to big game hunting, I wonder if the Minister has given any consideration to the use of orange as a mandatory colour for hunters in the field. Experiments have been conducted by the army in Massachusetts and figures reveal that a bright orange was the safest colour experimented with. I know at the present time white is the recognized colour in Manitoba and some use red, but even then there's a lot of men being killed wearing white. I think the government should seriously consider the use of bright orange--to make it mandatory for hunters hunting big game to wear the orange tunic and trousers. When the Minister gets up to reply I'd like him to tell us how many part-time hunters he has -- or predator control. I understand we had a report sometime ago that he had three in the Interlake. Are they still there? Would he also outline to me what the area is north of -- around the Fairford area where there was an area -- a game reserve. I'd have to check my notes further to find out exactly where the information was, but I'll ask him after he's had a chance to reply.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): The Minister in his opening remarks today mentioned that they had sold quite a number more big game hunting licenses this year than they had the previous year, and the honourable member that just spoke mentioned the colour of clothing that hunters wear. I think there's something more important than the colour of clothing, and that's the safe handling of arms. How many people go out hunting that don't know how to handle them safely? I think that's a point that should be stressed and people, before they're issued a license to go out hunting, should have to pass a test in the safe handling of arms.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, the last time that the Honourable Member from Lundar -- St. George, pardon me -- spoke to me about the situation of moose along the Grand Rapids Road, I understand then that we had operating up and down the Grand Rapids Road a special conservation officer to check for the type of depredations that he is speaking of and, at that time, the report was that there weren't so many. The major populations of the moose in that country are over toward the west side of Lake Winnipegosis apparently, and they are there in fairly large concentrations. But we have certainly been having a great deal of difficulty with aircraft, and the matter of aircraft is one that is causing the Game Branch very great concern. It's been considered that the only way that you can handle it is through the Federal Government, and the matter of aircraft come under the Department of Transport. However, we've not been satisfied with that answer and we are now having the subject of illegal hunting from aircraft placed on the agenda of the Federal-Provincial Wildlife Conference which will be held in Toronto this coming June. It is hoped there, with the Dominion people present and all the provincial people present, that we will be able to find some means of controlling this nefarious practice. We are at the same time now investigating some regulations which have been experimented with or have been brought down in B.C., and I believe that Alberta have some similar regulations, and they are under study right at the present time. The Game Branch have been instructed to use private aircraft themselves in order to try to track down these people who are operating illegally, and I do know that some of our conservation men have spent very many hours in a marsh trying to waylay an aircraft that has been hunting geese illegally. It is a very difficult problem and I can only say to the honourable member that we are trying to do what we can about it and will bring it up at the Federal-Provincial Conference.

He mentioned the buying of habitat for ducks and that is what we have been doing during this past year. I might mention to him that in the Delta and in the Netley Marshes it is not an easy matter to obtain some of this valuable habitat that has been there. We recently, some months ago, negotiated a section of land that has been under negotiation by the Department of Lands, who were buying the land for the Game Branch, for a period of ten years. We were successful after ten years, but it is indicative of how valuable that land is. We have recently

(Mr. Witney, cont'd.)...been able to buy up some valuable quarter-sections in the Delta Marsh and we have bought land outside of the marsh for the planting of barley. We intend to continue that policy as long as land is available at reasonable costs, so that we can, we hope in time, to put a buffer around the Delta Marsh and a buffer around other marshes, such as the Whitewater Lake area, which is a valuable breeding ground for ducks. The number of part-time professional hunters that we have -- we had four, and one full-time operating this year, but right at this moment I cannot tell you where the part-time operators were working. I would imagine it was in the Interlake country and in the southeast corner.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, last fall the Department of Game opened up a special season along the Winnipeg River, I believe it was from October 7th to October 15th, and people wishing to hunt in that area could do so by purchasing a \$5.00 license. What was the purpose of this special season in this area?

MR. WITNEY: The season was an experimental one. It's been a matter of controversy for some time and the Game Branch have consistently been against it. But I felt that we could at least give it a try for a year to see whether the hunters who were bucking for it, shall we say, see whether or not they were right. Now I think the results, I haven't got the exact figures here but if I recall correctly, the results indicated that there were not a great number of deer killed in that area and the whole operation was very carefully watched by our conservation officers. Hunters maintained that the later season made it difficult for them to get up the Winnipeg River. They maintained that they should be allowed to get up the river and to take the deer and thus prevent the poachers from Ontario from coming into the area. I believe, and while it can't be substantiated, I believe that it did have that effect at any rate, of keeping a lot of the poachers out because the area was more closely watched this year.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Do you intend to allow hunting in this area again this year or has this decision been made?

MR. WITNEY: No decision has been made. It's still a matter of controversy.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, is this the item under which we would discuss duck feeding stations, or would that come under education or some other department? I noticed in a publication dated October 7th, 1960, issued from the Department of Propaganda, that the province buys Upland Game Bird Nest Area. The Honourable Leader of the CCF refers to it as that and it's better known as that perhaps. The Minister of Propaganda is issuing -- (Interjection) -- Well I'm wondering if the 3,000 acre bombing range at Langruth that was purchased in 1960 as a major breeding area for Upland game birds, now is it the intention to plant a certain number of acres of that down to barley to prevent the ducks in the area from eating the crops in that area, or will it still be necessary to establish the duck feeding stations as they have been in the past? I think the duck feeding stations -- there's no doubt that they have proved of great value in the past. I don't know what amount of grain that was fed to the ducks last year, but I would be interested to know, what was the cost of the grain fed at these duck feeding stations? Certain farmers in the Langruth area have suggested to me that the duck feeding stations were not as effective as they might have been because of the fact that not enough consideration was given to the location of them. I'm wondering if before establishing these duck feeding stations, is it the practice of the department to consult with the farmers in the area to decide on the best location for them? I know personally, from visits out there, that the farmers in and around the Langruth and Plumas areas over the years have suffered greatly from, not only the ducks but from the Sand Hill Cranes. I'm not suggesting that the Sand Hill Cranes should not be protected, but I am suggesting that it is hardly reasonable or fair to expect that the farmers in the area should support them entirely; and I suggest that that is what has happened in the past.

I wonder if the Honourable Minister is familiar with that page of an M.F.U. brief that was presented to the government recently. It's page 22 and it concerns this subject on which I now speak. I would like to read it because it supports what I think is a fact and supports what the farmers in and around Langruth and Plumas believe is a fact. It says: "Farmers living adjacent to wooded areas and lakes are becoming increasingly concerned over the heavy damage to which they are subjected each year from wild fowl and big game animals. Furthermore, the vast increase in the number of hunters issued with hunting licenses each year has increased the number of farm animals being crippled or killed during the hunting season. The

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd.)...farmers are prepared to assist the program of preservation of wild game and fowl, and are quite willing to do their share, but they find that they alone cannot bear the heavy financial losses that result, such as was experienced last year, especially when extensive damage was done to farmers' crops by ducks and big game". And they go on to emphasize their point.

I suggested last year that perhaps it would be a good idea to take a portion of the hunting license, and the fishing license if necessary, to compensate these farmers for their heavy losses. I also suggested that perhaps the Ducks Unlimited should make a contribution. It seems to me that Ducks Unlimited have a budget of something like half a million dollars or more to promulgate the duck industry, and it seems only fair that they should take a portion of their budget to compensate the farmers for the heavy losses that they suffer. Now it's true that we all welcome the American hunters and the American fishermen up here and certain businesses in the province benefit very much because of the hunters that come into our province, but the farmers who have suffered the loss do no benefit from the hunters that come up here. It's the motels, the hotels and the restaurants and the liquor outlets and so on that benefit the most. The farmer does not benefit from it, and I think it is most unfair that the farmer should have to bear the brunt of the loss. I believe a year or so ago it was suggested by your department that perhaps they should assess the municipalities to compensate the farmers for their losses. I don't think that is quite fair either because it would be pretty difficult to establish the boundaries, or where you would stop assessing and where you would start assessing. I know it's a fact that in the Langruth area, because of the fact that the ducks eat all of John Doe's grain, they're probably keeping the ducks off the crops for a hundred miles back. I would like to hear what the Honourable Minister has in mind for a duck feeding program in 1961, and also, does he envisage that the purchase of the 3,000 acre site at Langruth will, to some degree, result in less damage to the crops, providing of course that he intends to plant a thousand acres or so of this land down to grain.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I asked the Minister regarding the color of hunters' tunics. Has he given that matter any consideration?

MR. WITNEY: Yes. It has been given consideration and we have discussed it with several of the Game and Fish Associations. It was discussed at the Wasagaming convention and I've never heard of the orange before. I have heard of various shades of yellow, but I think when we bring The Game and Fish Act in, that we will have red eliminated, leave the white in and that we may provide, if we can, for some experimental operations on it. Right at the present time we are not prepared to bring the yellow or the orange in because we have found that they have too many variations of color. Experiments have apparently shown that there is a wide variation in yellow and a wide variation in orange.

MR. PETERS: Mr. Chairman, in regard to my comments about safe handling of arms, has the government given that any consideration before they issue licenses?

MR. WITNEY: No we haven't, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, do the men who have been studying the habits of the ducks feel that the diving duck, which is fast becoming extinct, could be preserved to a large extent if the season was opened later in the marshes? Right now we usually open around the 18th of September and they feel that if the season was extended to about October 1st that the diving duck, who doesn't go into the grain field, would be more mature and better able to escape the hunter. Has the department given any consideration to making the season later than it has in the past years, particularly in the marshes? I don't mean in the grain fields but in the marsh itself, to help preserve the diving duck.

MR. HARRY P. SHEWMAN (Morris): Mr. Chairman, could the Minister tell us what the expense or the cost would be to teach ducks to dive?

MR. WITNEY: I'm afraid the answer is "no". The matter of the duck hunting season has been discussed and considered, and it's always a difficult problem. We have no plans of changing the season as yet, although we may see what the situation will be after we return from the Provincial Wildlife Conference in Toronto.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): I notice it's after 12 o'clock already and I won't keep the honourable members very long -- (Interjection) -- a minute-orial. I would like to say a few words on the opportunities on game bird ranching, and I promise to be very short. I

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd.)... believe that game bird ranching is a sound business opportunity for many of our farm folks as well as others who would like to venture into this form of business. This business is relatively new in the United States, and in Canada I don't think it's even air-borne yet. It would offer a real challenge to those looking for a good sound business of their own in the Province of Manitoba. Now there are three fields of game bird ranching which offer very good opportunity. One of them is raising game birds for specialty meat products or purposes. We know that some housewives, they call them the discerning hostesses, who would like to serve something different. We also have our swank clubs and then also the gourmet dining room who would like to serve a different type of meat, different to any other places, and also some of our hotels would like to serve a delicacy. All these make very good customers for our packaged product, say for instance the pheasant, the quail and the chukers.

Now another opportunity is raising game birds for the purpose of stocking private shooting preserves and also for the conservation people to release these birds again in their wild life. Still another profitable business is that of the opportunity that centers around the raising of these birds for the selling of eggs and chicks. Now I've taken some time to study several game birds adaptable to this business, that is the quail, the chukers, the flighting mallards, geese, pheasants, but I'm particularly interested in the raising of the ring-necked pheasant because it seems to me that this game bird is most adaptable to our climate, and also the demand for this bird is far greater than any other bird. The ring-necked pheasant is a native of Asia and we know that some years back it was introduced in Europe and later on in the United States. We in Canada have been a little slower but we are following in the footsteps. Here the pheasant, in North America, has been able to adapt itself to fit the environment to some extent in wildlife. Now the domestication of this bird, rearing it and then liberating it into wildlife, has not proved too satisfactory because the bird has a tendency to wander off. It's impossible to domesticate it the way we do the turkey and some other birds. Some attempts I know have been made here in Manitoba to establish the pheasant in wildlife. In most areas I would say this has proved unsatisfactory, but pheasants could be raised artificially almost anywhere in Canada, excluding the north. Now of the five birds that I have mentioned, I believe that the pheasant should be the best choice of those who wish to attempt game bird ranching because it is the easiest to rear and the easiest to procure, and it also carries, for meat purposes, it carries better weight. I could tell you how much it costs and so on to rear those. I can outline all the different stuff and I can say that it costs around \$1.75 to raise the bird to maturity, in about anywhere from 14 to 16 weeks, and even here in Manitoba we have a market for them now in the City of Winnipeg. I have asked several and they said they would be willing to pay as much as \$3.50 a bird for meat purposes, just to be able to serve this delicacy.

Now as I've said before, this form of ranching offers a business opportunity for some of our folk who would be interested in it, therefore, I would recommend legislation permitting the raising of game birds in Manitoba. This may be one way of assuring continuity of many of our game bird species which may otherwise become extinct. You know that civilization is spreading in Canada and also in Manitoba, I hope, and as the civilization spreads it threatens extinction of some of these birds and I think this would be one way of replenishing them. We have a very good example here where some of our animals and birds have gone into extinction, that is the buffalo and also the passenger pigeon, and I believe that one method is by having this legislation passed to assure such continuation of life.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3 (a), (b), (c), (d), passed.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, before we leave 3(a), I would just like to say that I agree with the Minister insofar as his statements with regards to jack-lighting. I think this is a serious problem in the deer portions of the province and I think this hurts not only those who buy legitimate licenses, it also hurts our tourist industry, and I encourage him in his efforts to reduce it. I would like to suggest to him that he might make use of one of his other departments, and that's the Air Service Branch. I believe that by the time the hunting season comes along the Air Service Branch is not too busy. They are very busy during the summer, I realize, on their fire surveys and so on, but come along toward the hunting season, in the early season they're not too busy, and I suggest that in large parts of the province where it's very difficult for the conservation officers to make, from the ground, a proper check on

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.)...jack-lighting, that the Air Service Branch could do very much better work because they can control from the air and, by working with the conservation officers, could get this question under control.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 55 -- passed. Item 4 (a)

MR. ROBLIN: We have passed Resolution 55 and I'll say that out loud for the sake of the record and for any members who might have different views on it tomorrow. We've passed number 55. I think that's satisfactory progress and I am prepared to move that the committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions and have asked me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, that the report of the Committee be received.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, just before I put the motion for adjournment, I think I should tell the House that we propose to deal with Public Works after the Mines and Resources estimates are finished and the final department will then be the Department of Labour. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and following a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2.30 p.m. Tuesday afternoon.