

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 23 March, 1982

Time — 8:00 p.m.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY - NATURAL RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Harry M. Harapiak (The Pas): The Committee will come to order. We're on No. 12. Natural Resources. Items 12.(a)(1) to 12.(f)(2) were all read and passed. 12.(g)(1) Salaries—pass; 12.(g)(2) Other Expenditures.

The Member for Emerson.

MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER (Emerson): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I hate to be repetitive. I just want to make a little comment here on the — I think I mentioned it before under Forestry — the establishment of the offices in Piney and Sprague, that I would hope that there would be no reduction in staff. We've been looking at this from time to time and I think there is need for this kind of staff, never mind looking at the possibility of reducing, but maybe having additional staff in there. We'll be hopefully getting consideration from the Minister in that respect.

HON. ALVIN H. MACKLING (St. James): Mr. Chairman, in answer to that, we are going to run a lean and hungry operation but I have no recommendation at this stage to cut any staff.

MR. DRIEDGER: I'll address that in my remarks later.

MR. MACKLING: Very well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 12.(g)(2) Other Expenditures—pass; 12.(h)(1) Salaries—pass; 12.(h)(2) Other Expenditures—pass; 12.(j)(1) Salaries—pass; 12.(j)(2) Other Expenditures—pass.

The Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): I won't repeat what's already on the record but I would like to indicate the presence of the director for this particular division, the continuing support of the Opposition for the putting together that professional group of firefighters that I spoke about when we were dealing with the Forestry Estimates, Mr. Minister, namely the Fire Attack crews and to encourage the Minister and the Director to carry on what I believe to be a very worthwhile effort in this direction, in this important area of this department's activities.

MR. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'd just like to indicate to the honourable members that the initiatives in respect to fire suppression are a very important aspect of the department's activities, and the director of this section of the department indicates to me we are more than pleased with the initiatives and the efforts of the Native workers that are employed, the Indian people, who perform the really vital component in this whole operation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 12.(k)(1) Salaries Salaries—pass;

12.(k)(2) Other Expenditures—pass; 12.(m)(1) Salaries.

The Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, on this item, does the Minister have a summary of last year's Firefighting Suppression costs? We note a substantial increase in the printed Estimates in this instance. I appreciate that this has always been a nominal kind of amount that has been put in from time to time but are there any even preliminary, final or close to final figures available to the department as to what last year's firefighting activities cost us; they were substantial, I know.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, we don't have the final particulars for 1981 but the total costs for 1980 were \$12,000,268 and it's estimated that the 1981 program is just a little bit worse at \$12.6 million.

MR. ENNS: Well, I think any cursory examination of past firefighting costs would indicate that these are abnormally high figures for the last two years and so, Mr. Chairman, without making an issue of it, I do take this opportunity to place on the public record that, despite what honourable members opposite may want to think of the past administration, the past administration was faced with, not just their opposition but the gods chose not to shine all that kindly on Manitoba during our four years. We fought floods of 1950 proportions, droughts and forest fires and if the honourable members opposite would like to suggest that we were the cause of it, well then they are, of course, free to do so. But, the point that I'm placing on the public record is that an administration that members opposite took pleasure in painting as being obsessed with acute restraint, when it came to worrying about those very fundamental issues of importance to Manitobans, the firefighting, drought protection, flood protection, whether it involved the purchase of \$4 million or \$5 million aircraft, whether it involved the establishment of elite firefighters, I'm very pleased to have been part of an administration that didn't shy from that responsibility.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the average Fire Suppression costs for the last years since 1976 were \$6.8 million, and this reflects the fact that we are in a drought cycle; we're getting more serious forest fires at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 12.(m)(1) Salaries—pass—; 12.(m)(2) Other Expenditures—pass.

Resolution 112.

RESOLVED THAT there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$17,592,600 for Natural Resources for Regional Services for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1983.

MR. DAVID R. (Dave) BLAKE (Minnedosa). Mr. Chairman, it just took me a minute to find my spot here, I've got one short question, I know we've passed the item but there's a problem in Wildlife Control, another item there. Is that a special control item, I

know there is some recoverable from the Government of Canada so it strikes me it might have to do with the parks problem of the beaver. There was other money voted under another appropriation for that. Was that part of the same thing?

MR. MACKLING: Just a minute. What item was that?

MR. BLAKE: 12.(a)(3), Problem Wildlife Control, \$205,000.00.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, it involves problem wildlife which includes bear, coyote, wolf, beaver and to the extent that the beaver damage was involved in the national park area, Riding Mountain Park area, that \$30,000 there reflects the recoverable from the Federal Government.

MR. BLAKE: Yes, this is in addition to the funds that we discussed earlier on wildlife damage.

MR. MACKLING: Yes that's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would ask the members to give me time to recognize you so we can record for Hansard.

MR. BLAKE: It's interesting that the parks people so often claim that it has nothing to do with them; that it's not their beaver. The damage is caused when the beaver are out of their control and yet they're providing some assistance. So, that's interesting. I just wanted to note that.

MR. MACKLING: No comment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, we'll move onto Section 13 on Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets. 13.(a) Canada-Manitoba Northern Development Agreement. The Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I suppose maybe this might be as good a time as any to raise the question of the Canada-Manitoba Northern Development Agreement. You'll have noted, Mr. Chairman, that although the item has come in various departments with no particular funds attached to the vote — in some instances information has been volunteered — but what is the status of the Northern Development Agreement that involves this department under this appropriation as it does throughout its Estimates? Do we have a northern agreement signed with the Federal Government, and if so, in roughly comparable terms, where does it stand as to the last agreement that we operated under?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the Department of Northern Affairs has been negotiating this agreement with the Federal Government and negotiations are ongoing. They've been ongoing too long. However, the Minister is still hopeful that the Federal Government will agree to an extension of this agreement on terms that are reasonably favourable.

The problem seems to be that the Federal Government is intent to reduce its commitments wherever and anywhere and whenever it can. That includes the commitments that they had been making in respect to

construction and development items in the north. The agreement has not been completed. However, the negotiations are continuing and the Minister who is responsible advised myself and my colleagues that he is hopeful that they will still conclude an agreement.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I hope this Minister succeeds, the Minister of Northern Affairs succeeds somewhat better than their colleague, the Minister of Finance who just had to acknowledge despite the reassuring words that now that me and nasty fellows like Sterling Lyon weren't there to get under the nettle of the Right Honourable Pierre Elliot Trudeau, and that the present First Minister enjoys a cup of tea with the Prime Minister before important conferences in the federal capital and we find out that Manitoba is being treated the harshest of all provinces in Canada.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that this is not the Committee to bring that all into it, but I'm hoping that this Minister will recognize the importance of at least sustaining levels of support that some of these programs call for or else, of course, the programs that we're talking about are going to be very serious disturbed.

Mr. Chairman, I'm going to make one other comment about the Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets appropriation in general, and I know that many of my colleagues have, of course, specific concerns that they will raise with you Mr. Minister through the Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, that is the question. I don't want to dwell on it at length. We have been abiding, Mr. Chairman, I think by and large, by the rules that we set down for ourselves in the manner in which we conduct ourselves in the Committee by not abusing the privilege of having covered certain grounds once and not holding you to the specific line. I'm referring specifically to the amounts of dollars that you have shown in these capital Estimates for the upgrading of the valley diking systems. There are substantial amounts of money in these Estimates ranging from \$20,000 at St. Adolphe to \$320,000 at Brunkhild; another \$20,000 at Rosenort; \$100,000 for Morris town-diking system; \$200,000 for St. Jean Baptiste diking system; another 20,000 for Dominion City; another 20,000 for Letteulier; another \$200,000 for Emerson.

My question to you, Mr. Minister, through the Chairman is that I can't help but ask the department whether or not you have any contingency plans for the expenditures of these capital amounts in the event that a satisfactory arrangement cannot be worked out with the municipalities involved. I'm aware, Mr. Chairman, that you have, subsequent to the question being raised at this Committee, had meetings with the responsible municipal officials. I'm not aware of course, not having been privy to that meeting nor has the Minister made any announcement as a result of that meeting other than that he is prepared to review the matter and perhaps take it back to Cabinet; but my specific question is, is a substantial amount of the capital dollars that are being listed in this expropriation — at least the possibility is certainly there that you may not have an opportunity of spending them failing agreement by the municipalities to have this work done, does the department have any contin-

gency plans where this money will go, or will you let it lapse into the hands of the very attractive Minister of Education or the more voluminous and money-gobbling colleague of his, the Minister of Health where most monies go?

What I'm trying to say, Mr. Minister, I ask you to at least have some contingency plans available to you for the completion or for the acceleration of certain projects, whether they are in the parks development, whether they are in drainage projects, or whether they are in conservaton projects, to have them available to you for possible use.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I welcome the honourable member's remarks and his concerns. They're justified in respect to the importance of the works involved. I might say that I don't share the same degree unease about monies being provided because as the honourable member knows the monies were available the previous year and neither of his colleagues swallowed up the money. It just wasn't spent, that was all, because agreements weren't reached.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I tend to think that when there is money available it's looked at by government. But in this case there is no question about the importance of this work. We have a responsibility to dialogue and consult; it was unfortunate that consultation didn't occur before a letter went out. But we have met with the municipal and town people now. We are making a further study of the matter, looking not merely at the costing in respect to the flood-prevention measures for these communities, but we have to address the principle of funding in respect to flood-prevention costs throughout the province and try to place these things in a perspective that is fair and reasonable. We will be doing that and I gave assurance to representatives of these communities, that prior to any further formal decision being conveyed to them I would want to meet with them again and dialogue with them, and that we will be doing.

I'm not in a position to say much more than what I've indicated except that we are reviewing the matter and we will be consulting again with them after we've completed our review.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Arthur.

MR. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Chairman, I think it's certainly fairly obvious by the map that was handed out, it would appear by looking at the major construction works that are going to be carried on by the Department of Natural Resources, that the areas that are pretty much represented by members of the Opposition have pretty much of a drought situation. Now, I wouldn't know whether that was directly a political move or whether it was just by accident, Mr. Chairman, there is, of course — (Interjection) — he's going to get me later, he says. — (Interjection) — Well, I don't know whether it's an oversight or directly. As I remember, one of the Ministers that are now in the government when he was in Opposition picked up the highway map one time — if I had his debate here I could read it back to the Minister of Natural Resources.

However, Mr. Chairman, I think there are certain major projects that should be looked at and I know that in the past there were some ongoing plans to

develop certain projects in the western region of the province. I'm not against the work that is being done in some of the drainage projects; in fact, I was pleased that we were able to put together a Manitoba Federal-Provincial agreement that enabled a lot of work to be done in specific areas for the value-added crop production. However, even in that one particular area — and I'll just touch on it briefly and I'm sure the member will touch on it as well — I cannot see any proposal or is there any plans to put in place funds for the La Salle River Diversion? I'll just touch briefly on them and I think they're fairly important to that member.

There's been an ongoing problem during the Schreyer administration and during our term of office and we're working on resolving it. That was the remodelling of the Hartney Dam on the Souris River, some rechannelization that was felt to be necessary. As well, Mr. Chairman, I understood that there was one-time funds in place through the Department of Natural Resources to do some corrective work on the Maple Lake drain that is draining underground water into the Souris River on a year-round basis in an area that is drought prone and needing all the water that is essential to the province. I wonder if those funds are in the department or if there are any plans to look at it?

I know that requests have come in on the development of the Cromer Dam which would be an added supply of water to the Oak Lake area, where there is an ongoing problem with the levels of Oak Lake but the fact that a dam at Cromer may be of some assistance to maintaining the levels. On the same issue, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister if they have finally worked out an agreement with the Province of Saskatchewan. The Province of Manitoba and the Province of Saskatchewan worked out an agreement on the amount of water that should be released from the Moosomin Dam. Last fall we had some 25 farmers who were dependent upon the Pipestone Creek for water that were unable to get the Saskatchewan Government to release water. I felt that because it was an interprovincial waterway that should be certainly the responsibility of the government to have an ongoing agreement that would assure us of the supply. Now I understand that there is an agreement where the Province of Manitoba gets half the water out of that watershed. Well, that isn't much comfort, Mr. Chairman, when in the spring of the year half the water goes down the Pipestone Creek and through the Oak Lake into Plum Lake and then into the Souris River. When in fact it comes to the fall of the year, the river is dry and the farm people or any of the towns, Cromer or whatever, need a supply of water to give them their winter supplies or to replenish Oak Lake.

So, I do feel that a serious look at the Cromer Dam, an agreement that is meaningful to the Province of Saskatchewan or to Manitoba worked out with Saskatchewan to assure us of water supplies. The fact that there has been for years, discussions taking place on the development of several major reservoirs in the southwest corner of the province and I'll name one in particular, one that I have certainly no problem in supporting. However, I think that there are some larger projects that could be looked at first. I know the towns in that area and the people in that area. It's an issue that has to be resolved as far as the overall benefit of it is concerned in that area. I know that the

department have a cost benefit on it or a benefit cost and it appeared to be on the positive side.

I would hate to think because of my owning of land in that particular area that someone would immediately jump and say because I'm interested in this project I'd have an immediate conflict of interest. That is not the case. This dam has been planned for many years, far before my entry onto the scene so I want to make it very clear that it's strictly an area concern, not a personal one, that's the Patterson Dam. They say the Patterson Dam had been planned long before I had any involvement in that particular area and as far as I'm concerned that isn't really my number one priority. However, it's one of those projects that local officials, municipal people, have been supporting.

We've just come through a series of dry years in the southwest corner in the western region of the province. We have seen, as I've said, the people of Oak Lake who depend upon the Pipestone Creek and the Oak Lake area for ground water, for surface water and for both agriculture and recreational use. It also flows through into the Souris River at the Plum Lakes and into the Souris River to help replenish the Souris, which eventually flows into the Assiniboine.

The development and the work on the Souris River, I'm sure, should be an ongoing project which would support the water supplies in the Assiniboine and, as well, into the Red, that if we don't start to address the problem of water shortages and periodical droughts coming more often and, I can tell you at this particular time, many many rural people who are finding their wells have gone dry because of certain, maybe excessive drainage, but lack of overall water management program, that we will continually have a series of problems.

I think the strategy of the Department of Water Resources, Mr. Chairman, in all fairness to them, have to change their thinking when they leave the region which is identified in the Red River Valley as an area that is prone to flood and prone to poor drainage, and have a different philosophy when it comes to the water resource area of Western Manitoba, one of which should be towards conservation, one which should be towards the conserving of one of our most valuable resources, not only for domestic, industrial, agricultural or any other human purposes, but to also support the wildlife.

Although it may not be very large, Mr. Chairman, but also some of these reservoirs may, and I say may, some day add to in a small way to the water which powers the turbines in the Nelson River project. As I say, they aren't of the magnitude that would store any great amount of water, but still as the saying goes, every little bit helps in certain places.

I know, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister or his Deputy has agreed to meet with some of the people from North Dakota and from the municipal jurisdictions in the southwest, to discuss possibly some of the work that may be done on the Rafferty Dam on the Souris River in Saskatchewan. I think part of the problem could be alleviated or resolved by the establishment of the Rafferty Dam which would store water in Saskatchewan, closer to the head water of the Souris; that it could be let out on a basis of proper allocation and flowed evenly through the Souris and give us the kinds of water that is needed. I support that, Mr.

Chairman. I support the Rafferty Dam concept as well as I support the construction of some of the major holding facilities right in the Province of Manitoba.

Again there is certainly a tremendous need, and there has been for many many years, a tremendous need to, No. 1, change the attitude towards the western part of the province so we can, on an ongoing basis, be assured that there are water resources or reserves for all needs. There is another major project which I'm sure again one of my colleagues will be asking about and that, of course, is the Holland Dam and I'll leave it up to them to question but I'll get right down to the question.

Are there any plans by the department, by the Minister, to spend in any meaningful way, monies which would work towards the goals of conserving and developing of ponding of water in the western region of Manitoba?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, let me indicate that I sincerely welcome the honourable member's concerns for a greater emphasis on conservation of water supplies rather than the heavy emphasis on drainage.

When I made the comments that I did in the Throne Speech Debate I wondered if my words were going to be welcomed or not, and I'm finding that there is a fairly broad acceptance of the view that we now must start to concern ourselves more and more with water conservation, and I'm delighted to hear that. I'll try to respond in reverse order, Mr. Chairman, because that perhaps will make it more simple.

In respect to the concerns about the possible development of ponding in Saskatchewan of Souris River water behind a dam there, the Rafferty Dam that was mentioned, although that was mentioned in the Souris River Basin study, apparently there was no recommendation made in respect to it. The ponding, of course, would have to take place in Saskatchewan and Saskatchewan is a key player there. I haven't had an opportunity to discuss any of those issues with my colleagues, my counterparts I should say, in Saskatchewan. I, hopefully, at one time in the near future will be able to discuss with them areas of mutual concerns and I certainly could take that opportunity to discuss it with them. If they were of a mood, or if they decided that they certainly would want to look at that, then certainly we would be interested in it.

In respect to the problem in southwestern Manitoba, it reflects upon the cyclical weather pattern we've been involved in in the last number of years, and there has been a marked reduction in precipitation in Southern Manitoba over the last three years. That's had the consequent effect of reduced ground water, reduced surface water in the area and it's obvious that we must prepare for periods like we're in right now by ensuring that there is adequate ponding of water wherever that is possible.

In respect to the Oak Lake ground water question, that matter is under study now with the Federal Government and the study of the Oak Lake aquifer is part of those studies.

In respect to the other concerns regarding a dam in Saskatchewan, the Moosomin Dam, that is as I understand it, the only portion right now that's under study is the Cromer Dam on the Pipestone Creek. Now the understandings with provinces is that the provinces

must leave 50 percent of the natural flow, but the qualifier was that some equitable basis had to be worked out and the department has been trying to establish, or delineate what an equitable basis really amounts to, to ensure that 50 percent or certainly better is left in the stream.

In respect to the concern about the Oak Lake and Plum Lake, the concerns about levels there, the conflicting interests of people for recreation, for agriculture and so on, we are referring those questions to the Water Commission and I assume that the Water Commission will be meeting with all of the interested parties receiving submissions on it and then making recommendations to government.

In respect to the Maple Lake drain, that area is under review at the present time.

In respect to the Patterson Dam, it's proposed to be on a tributary to Souris. That is presently under review as part of the hopefully agreed program between the Provincial Government and the Federal Government. When Mr. Herb Grey was in the province recently, that was one of the areas we indicated to him that we thought we could include or ought to be included in a study.

When the honourable member says that there might be some conflict or something because he owns some land, I don't care how much land he owns there. Quite frankly, I couldn't give a damn. If the project is worthwhile, then development —(Interjection)— Well, I don't know whether people down there would welcome that or not.

In respect to the La Salle River diversion, that is not included on these capital items, but a report is expected on that next month and then we'll have an opportunity to look at those recommendations of that report.

MR. DOWNEY: I did cover a large waterfront there I know for the Minister to respond to but I wanted to put it on the record why I felt it was important. I'll be more specific, Mr. Chairman.

There was one particular question that has been in the minds of a lot of the towns and villages in that area in the last few years and that of course has been a controversial issue. Are there any plans by the department to remodel the Hartney Dam to probably restructure it to something along the same lines as the Souris Dam, one without high mounds of dirt affecting the flood plane, but allowing the flood waters to cross it and then retain a certain amount of water for local use?

MR. MACKLING: I'm given to understand there are no proposals to reconstruct the Hartney Dam.

MR. DOWNEY: Are there any programs or thoughts to remove it again — I'm saying this at the request of a lot of the local jurisdictions south of that particular structure — just not personal individuals but certainly elected local municipal people that have felt this way?

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, the advice that I'm getting from Mr. Weber is that there is a good deal of different opinion on this dam. At the time of high water flow and some degree of flooding, if that takes place, people want it out. When we get into a dry

cycle, people want it rebuilt or built higher to retain more water. It's one of those things obviously that where there's divided opinion, I'll certainly want to hear both sides of the question and we'd welcome input on anything like that because what we do has got to be not only sound from an engineering point of view, but understood by the people involved, and that's an important factor.

I might say just by way of a general comment and not making any highlight of it, that in respect to the map, these projects do not reflect political prioritization at all. They are things that were in the work by the former administration and if there is any political bias, then —(Interjection)— That's right. The southwest region here doesn't have a lot of big black circles on it because that's an area where perhaps we have to look at the reverse, where we have to look more and more at retention rather than major drainage.

MR. DOWNEY: I'm pleased to hear, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister is agreeable — if he's serious — to listen to both sides of the argument on this controversial Souris, on the Hartney Dam because what I am saying that a dam like Souris that's established at Souris, that type of a dam would maintain a certain level of water for the dry period and when it was flooding it would remove the high banks that are plugging the flood plane, argument is made, and allow the flood water to move a lot more freely through that area. That is the argument that has been put to me as well as some rechannelization immediately west of the dam which I think could help both the local community and the people downstream. So I am pleased to hear the Minister would listen to both sides of it.

The other specific one which he referred to and that is being under review, I want the Minister to know that the Maple Lake drain is draining a tremendous amount of valuable groundwater year round from underneath the sandhills at Lauder from a porous sandbase or from a sandbase and in fact is deteriorating the area. I think there has been plans. I know that in talking to some of my colleagues prior to your taking over, that there had been some plans or work being done to put in some small checkdams to help stop the removal of that groundwater and I do think it's critical to take an urgent look at that particular drain and implement those programs. You've indicated to me you're reviewing it. I hope you don't take too many years to do it.

MR. MACKLING: Okay. Mr. Chairman, on that, that is under review and that's the kind of thing that we'll be looking at. Again I indicate to you that notwithstanding the political differences and the fact that this area seems to have too long perhaps, a blue tinge to it on the election maps, that won't forestall my concern to ensure proper development conservation of water in the province.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, on one other area and I want to be very clear on this one because I think that we as a province have got a mechanism to protect ourselves and to accomplish two or three other things and that is, the development of the Cromer Dam which, number one, gives us an ability to pond water

in Manitoba that we now can't get control of from Saskatchewan. It's fine to have an agreement with Saskatchewan that we get 50 percent of the water that comes from Saskatchewan, but when it all comes in six weeks in the spring of the year, we can go pretty short of water in that area for the remainder of the year and I would hope that every effort would be put forward, when you're discussing the Rafferty Dam which I think is a good project, when you're discussing those kinds of things, that there is an agreement put in place that would give you the ability as a Minister this fall when the people in the southwest on the Pipestone Creek want water, that we don't have to have farmers or local people going out to having confrontation on the Moosamin Dam where in fact they want to let the water through.

So the building of the Cromer Dam would pond water in Manitoba; it would provide water for all those people along the Pipestone Creek. Remember that Oak Lake is fed by the Pipestone Creek. It's a matter of providing water to whether it be fish, whether it be people who want to use it for recreation, but it also feeds the groundwater aquifer in the Plum Lake area. So it has a fairly major impact on the whole of that community. So I would hope that it's actively under review and plans could be put so that we could have some answers on the cost benefit of it and the whole assessment in the next few weeks.

One other concern that the Minister was written on, and I know that there were three Ministers contacted and he may not be quite aware of it, but I want to put on the record, Mr. Chairman, the fact that there is a small public beach area in the Turtle Mountain at Lake Metigoshe which is a lake right on the U.S.-Canadian boundary.

Mr. Chairman, the Municipality and the Town of Deloraine have had some difficulty in financing and maintaining the public beach area. I would request the Minister, because I have seen a copy of a letter from his colleague, the Minister of Tourism, who is anxious to see something happen in that area, I would, Mr. Chairman, request that the Minister request his department to do a cost-estimate of what it would take to upgrade that local beach area, - it's only the width of a road allowance and it runs lengthways of the road allowance - at the same time use the maintenance crew, Mr. Chairman, from the Turtle Mountain Park area which is a provincial park just immediately east of there, to maintain on an ongoing basis that particular beach area. I'm sure that the Department of Health had an opportunity to drop in and see the way in which it has been kept, that there is a responsibility of the province to put some funds in and upgrade it.

Mr. Chairman, I'm somewhat reluctant to stop at this particular time because there are many issues that have to be resolved. I had a feeling that there were some good works in the mill, and I do appreciate that you can't immediately move on major projects in a short period of time, but I would have to say that I think if the Minister proceeds along the lines that he has indicated that I would be hopeful we could see some basic planning put in place and possibly some work started this coming year. I would be interested to hear of the outcome of the meeting which is being proposed to be held later on this month with the people from the southwest area as well as people from

North Dakota discussing the Rafferty Dam Proposal and Management Programs on the Souris River.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't think that I want to comment at any length on those remarks because I don't have any great problem with them at all. I continue to indicate that these projects, if they make sense if they're good conservation and providing, of course we can work out the funding for them because of the demands on government for dollars, certainly we will want to look at them. How quickly we can move, of course, is contingent upon the monies available at any given time. In respect to this specific that the honourable member mentioned about Lake Metigoshe, it's my understanding through the department, although this Estimates have nothing to do with that particular area of concern. That's a park issue, it's not a Provincial Park it's primarily used by the local people and God bless them there we want to see them use it but we can't see a particular local usage receiving any substantial input if any of tax dollars at this time.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I'll have the Minister know through you that that area is certainly used by people from a long ways away because how many other lakes are there in the whole of that country. There is certainly a draw from the City of Winnipeg, the people from Brandon, certainly the Member for Brandon West must be aware of it, or Brandon East, and it really, when you're looking at an international water you can cross the border to the State of North Dakota and they have a pretty nice beach area. It's a shame that we can't put some funds into it as a province to give them the equal kind of service on this side. As I've indicated the Minister of Tourism is interested in having one of her department staff look at it, I would hope your department would be supportive of spending some provincial money to upgrade the public beach of are at Lake Metigoshe.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, we've only got so many tax dollars, of course, to share but this lake is not too far from a provincial park, the Turtle Mountain Provincial Park where we spend a good deal of money on beaches and other facilities and if we were to spend any money in a place like that, of course, we'd have to pave the highway and put lots of signs, we'd get so many people down there that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, first of all, I know it's not my area but and I'm very familiar with Dead Horse Creek but just to start off on the map Dog Hung Creek Diversion —(Interjection)— I know where it is but could somebody are you sure that's correctly spelled it's Dog Hung it's not Hung —(Interjection)—

MR. MACKLING: Well, you could call it Hung Dog but it's Dog Hung.

MR. BLAKE: That's intriguing, well there's \$90,000 going in there and I just thought — I'm not too good on spelling I thought maybe they missed a letter or something but, Mr. Chairman, I, as you know, the area

in Southwestern Manitoba hasn't been blessed with too many black dots with numbers on them but for the benefit of former colleagues and the new member for the area who maybe not be familiar with the Big Grass Marsh Area. There has been a tremendous amount of work done in that area by the Whitemud Watershed Conservation District and I notice there is no work going on in there at all. And I just wondered if the Minister or some of his member's deputies might bring me up to date on what is happening in the Big Grass Marsh Area. There is, I know a fairly massive draining project has been recommended and semi-undertaken and stopped and started, if he could bring me up to date on that for the benefit of the Member for Gladstone and myself who spend a bit of time in that area at the proper season of the year.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I was contemplating talking about the lack of big dogs in the area but, never mind. I'm advised that in the Big Grassy Drainage Area this is contained within the Whitemud Conservation District, and the works that are ongoing, or involved there, involve that conservation district and the department doesn't have any particular programs ongoing there now, and if it did I'd be a bit concerned because if it involved more drainage reducing the size of that marsh I'd be concerned.

MR. BLAKE: Well, there's a great program there as you know, Mr. Minister, the White Grass Marsh Area is a tremendous waterfowl area and I think the program is designed to maintain a level of water that is going to be beneficial from a wildfowl management area and also to prevent some of the excessive flooding that occurs on the Whitemud from time to time because, and I hope that the Whitemud Watershed District is able to — I know they have funds and they have some programs — but you know it's very difficult to tell the housewife down in that area when she's up to her knees in water when her house is flooding, that really the government is taking a look at it and sometimes the water gets higher.

I gather from some of the conversations that I hear out in that area that there's a bit of a problem between the government and the Whitemud Conservation District. There may be a lawsuit progressing there and I don't want them to discuss it if that's going to be sub judice or anything like that. But as long as the Minister can assure me that the Whitemud Watershed Conservation District is operating and they're getting the co-operation of his department, that will satisfy me for the time being.

MR. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BLAKE: I wanted to inquire about the Riding Mountain Park area. I notice under Lands, Drainage or Restruction Program, there's \$2.8 million. How much of that is going to be spent in the south portion of the park or is that all pertaining to the numbers that are numbered?

MR. MACKLING: It's all pertaining to the numbers marked there.

MR. BLAKE: Okay, if I haven't got a number I'm not in

the ball game. That's fine, I'll accept that for this year, Mr. Chairman, because it's too late.

Under the other items here I notice there's a \$300,000 item for Hecla Provincial Park, Outstanding Land Aquisition. I wonder if he might tell the Committee, where did we miss some land up there and what is the up-to-date picture there, Hecla Island Land Acquisition?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, these are hopefully the last of the settlements in respect to the Land Acquisitions that were commenced seven years ago.

MR. BLAKE: These are some areas of land that's been under litigation or expropriation proceedings or whatever.

MR. MACKLING: Yes, that's right.

MR. BLAKE: That's fine, Mr. Chairman, we'll progress onto further discussion on the hung dog or whatever.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. CLAYTON MANNES (Morris): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't know where to really begin, Mr. Chairman. I want to compliment the Minister and at the same time I want to kick him in the shins. Already one of my colleagues has pointed out that aid to these projects seem to be in the constituency of Morris and I think the slur goes, not bad for a new boy, this note says. I think it points out two things, obviously, No. 1, many of these projects were in the works and had started. But secondly, it also points out for the benefit of the Member for Arthur where the drainage problems in this province really lie.

So, starting that I'd like to move into a little more serious area and it's again into the area of the flooding agreements as far as the costing related to the valley dykes and again, I have to offer a compliment. My officials that came into town the other day to meet with you went home encouraged that you were prepared to take back the whole consideration of this new funding back to Cabinet.

The first question I would have in this whole regard is, when will you present this whole item again to Cabinet and how soon can we expect a decision?

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, let me indicate that I once again said we're going to look at the issue in its entirety. I didn't make any commitment that the 10 percent base would be reversed. I said we'd look at the whole thing.

Insofar as timing is concerned, with our Estimates of this department being under review, it does provide some difficulty for me to deal with. However, I'm hopeful that notwithstanding next Wednesday being the Brandon trip, that I'll be able to get sometime with my colleagues on this question and contingent on that, I hope to be able to get back to the people.

I indicated that in 7 to 10 days I hoped I'd be able to give some response to them. The department still has work to do for me before I go to Cabinet. Now, if it takes another week regardless I will meet with the representatives from that area first before any

decision is made.

MR. MANNESS: Well, thank you, Mr. Minister for that assurance. When you say that you want your department to prepare certain items for you, is one of those items an attempt to determine what the citizens of Winnipeg have paid in their flooding costs as far as maintaining secondary dykes? I think you've used this as part of your argument and I know representatives of the southern districts in fact are checking that out to attempt to determine on their own behalf what the cost has been to the citizens of Winnipeg in maintaining those secondary dykes. Are you doing this internally also?

MR. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I didn't raise the question but some of the spokesmen indicated they felt that the City of Winnipeg had been protected by view of the floodway and really hadn't faced the kind of flood-fighting expenses they had in their communities they were being asked to face in respect to this 10 percent of the cost.

I indicated I'd been advised that the City of Winnipeg had expended considerable amounts of money on secondary dyking and pumping facilities and so on. I have asked my department to confirm what if any — and I'm saying that it was hearsay with me at the time — that the City of Winnipeg has spent in respect to flood protection, devices including dykes or pumps and I will make that information available to the representatives from the communities.

MR. MANNESS: Thank you. Well, with that assurance again I can then leave that whole area behind because I take it from your answer that part of your decision again no doubt may be based — or Cabinet's decision — may be based upon the per capita cost to the citizens of Winnipeg in relation to the whole decision regarding the valley dykes. Is that a fair comment to make?

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I won't concur or disagree on what basis an evaluation is going to be made by my colleagues in Cabinet. I think that would be presumptuous of me to do that.

MR. MANNESS: I notice and as you indicated I believe last week, the La Salle River Diversion at this particular Estimate sitting would not in fact find itself included for funding. I think you went on further to state that another study is being commenced. Could you give us more detail into this study?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I didn't indicate that another study was being commenced. I indicated that the study that had been initiated sometime ago would be reported next month and that following the receipt of that report, we'll be getting further advice from the department in respect to it.

MR. MANNESS: Mr. Minister, I guess I don't quite understand that because I have a study in my hand that says that "Discussion Pay for Permanent Facilities to Augment Stream Flows in the LaSalle River Basin." Is this the study to which you are referring, and what is your intention to do with this?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'm given to understand that what the honourable member probably has a copy of is an engineering study; and then the department has to look at all of the aspects, including the engineering study, to develop a comprehensive report as to this proposal. And then, I suppose, Mr. Chairman, in addition to that, I don't know whether that includes an environmental study at this point. Subsequent to the receipt of the report that we expect to get in April, which will embody the engineering study and a number of other factors, an environmental study will have to follow as well.

MR. MANNESS: My curiosity is aroused, Mr. Minister. You say "other factors"; could you be a little bit more definitive?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government, with whom we have, thus far, and the previous administration certainly is aware of this, there are certain parameters that must be pursued in respect to evaluation of these projects before the Federal Government will confirm whether or not it is willing to participate. These are cost-benefit studies, engineering is only one component.

MR. MANNESS: Well, I take it then that the only way this particular project will proceed at this time is if it becomes eligible for a cost-shared program.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, it's part of the package, or a number of items that is included in a cost-sharing base with the Federal Government, and that's our expectation. If it does proceed it would be cost shared.

MR. MANNESS: Are you then indicating that, in fact, if Ottawa is not prepared to share the costs of this particular project, under your understanding at this time, without being able to see the final report, that it will not proceed with sole provincial financing?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'm not say that nor I'm not disagreeing with that, I am indicating to you that, thus far, the major drainage or impounding of water provisions, whether they be dams or other structures, have been based on cost sharing because they're extremely expensive and, given our financial circumstances, there's no way we would want to depart from what seemed to be prudent in the past and go it alone where we can get federal participation.

MR. MANNESS: Well, part of the cost sharing, would any consideration, or has any consideration, been given to talking over sharing with municipalities in this specific issue, not that I'm indicating that should be the case at all?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, no. Maybe if the honourable member recommends it we'll want to look at it, if he thinks those communities would be interested in it.

MR. MANNESS: At this particular point in time, what would be the estimated cost of 100 cfs diversion, in today's dollars?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'd rather pass on that. The department can't give me those figures.

MR. MANNESS: I would like to move a little bit more specifically into some of the items as listed, and I will deal only with those in the Constituency of Morris, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to begin - well I'll leave the dyking systems out at this particular time, which are 10, 11 and 12, and move more specifically to item No. 21 - the Domain Drain Demonstration Project. I suppose the numbers showing are strictly the provincial contributions all the way through, the next four items I'll be asking specifically, or are they the total amount?

MR. MACKLING: No, that's the total cost of this year's expenditure to be cost shared.

MR. MANNESS: Are there varying percentages as to the provincial contribution in items 21, 22, 23, 24 or, in fact, are they all the same percentage breakdowns?

MR. MACKLING: 60 federal and 40 provincial on all of these items.

MR. MANNESS: Thank you. Specifically, item No. 21. In reading it there is one particular area there and it's the same in all of them, it says it is proposed to reconstruct most of the main tributary drains in '82-83, and I'm a little concerned about the term '82-83. Is that general or, in fact, is there some opportunity to move building over to another year, or is that the general way it's placed or is it just the fiscal payment for the year is the reason it's called '82-83?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the item that's provided for is this year's expenditures and the project is anticipated to be completed in '83-84, it is an ongoing development.

MR. MANNESS: Can the Minister tell me what the amount is budgeted to be expended then in '83-84, at this particular point in time?

MR. MACKLING: It's the same amount. It's a lot of money in that area, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MANNESS: Yes, I'm well aware of it. I've seen the results and there has been a tremendous amount of dirt moved. I'd like, then, to move on to item No. 22, the Roberts-McTavish Drain and question whether, in fact, this is the first year that expenditures will be made on this particular drain or, in fact, was some made last year?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, this is the first year of this project and it has one other year to go.

MR. MANNESS: Could the Minister tell me how much is to be expended the following year?

MR. MACKLING: I will have that in a moment, Mr. Chairman. I could come back to that, perhaps. If we've got we'll give it to you.

MR. MANNESS: Fine. The only specific question I have on this particular drain is on the last word, really,

the last number, and it talks about installing a new structure through Provincial Highway No. 75, and I know when people in the Domain area one time when they were talking about the Domain drain, were very concerned that, they thought maybe the water should go more directly to the Red and one of the reasons given that it should not go that way, was the fact that you had to cross Highway 75 and with a four-lane highway pending, that there were potentially very major problems. My concern is to how you're going to cross Highway 75 at this time; and secondly, what provision are you leaving for the four laning of that highway?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, first of all, in respect to the expenditures the following year on that item, Item 22, it looks like it's \$300,000 the following year.

As to how we're going under Highway 75, well I guess it'll be by whatever the highways standards require and certainly if a divided highway is provided there, certainly that'll have to be accommodated.

MR. MANNESS: Probably that's the reason why the value is so high.

Item 23, the Mills-Wheatland drain. Again, is this the first expenditure on this particular drain and, secondly, how long will the project last, and what will be additional expenditures in this area?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, this will essentially complete the work in that improvement of that drain. This is a one-year expenditure.

MR. MANNESS: Similarly with Item 24, the Upper Bryson drain, again is this a one-year expenditure or will there be further expenditures?

MR. MACKLING: The last line confirms that there will be improvements continued in '83-84.

MR. MANNESS: And what will that cost, total?

MR. MACKLING: I haven't got an amount on that, but that will be a cleanup of what's left after the work done this year.

MR. MANNESS: Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering where under this particular Resolution, or maybe I missed it in the preceding resolutions, where are the maintenance and the expansion of existing provincial drains? Under what item would that fall? If we've passed it, fine.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, it's under 12.(4), Ongoing Maintenance.

MR. MANNESS: The other day, one of the items that you read out was the Almasippi Wet Sands Project. I do not detect at least where any money will be spent in that particular project. Can you enlighten me somewhat on that?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, that was reviewed and the expenditures involved there are under current, not under capital. It's a study that was provided for under Current Expenditures, which we've passed.

MR. MANNES: So there is obviously no capital project envisaged?

MR. MACKLING: No.

MR. MANNES: One other question and it doesn't fall under here and, Mr. Chairman, you may want to rule me out of order. Fine, I can bring it up probably on the last item, but it's again the La Salle River and the La Salle River outlet, it's not the diversion. There's some concern in our area that in fact, that outlet as it crosses under Highway 75 in St. Norbert and that there are at that particular point three 12 by 12 box culverts and at peak flows that they are not at all sufficient to allow the discharge of that particular river. I'm wondering if the water resources people at all have looked at this particular problem and if they have is there a report available to the Municipality of Macdonald?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the bridge or the crossing there is now under the jurisdiction of the City of Winnipeg and it's a matter that now does not lie with this department. It involves the City of Winnipeg and the Highways Department.

MR. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

MR. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, initially when I looked at the map I almost felt elated to some degree, I suppose. It looked as if a lot of the action was taking place especially in my constituency there. However, it was not. On perusing the projects that were involved I have three of them that involve the diking programs for communities in there and three that involve the Value Added Crops Production Agreement with the Federal Government, so six projects basically involve my constituency and I have to say I am pleased in respect to the projects of the drains. While you added crop drains, there are three of them that affect the municipalities and I'm pleased that they will be on the program for this year. I have a series of comments and questions, Mr. Chairman, just so I don't get myself all confused, did I understand correctly that under the Value Added Crop Agreements, the AgroMan Agreements, that they shared 60 federal and 40 provincial?

MR. MACKLING: That's correct.

MR. DRIEDGER: The figures show here again, just to clarify this, illustrate the total project cost between the two governments, am I right?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, in respect to the projects that the honourable member is most concerned about, since they are projects that are just commencing, although it's a 60-40 split in cost, there are some costs that are 100-percent cost to the province. The initial costs. The right-of-way costs.

MR. DRIEDGER: Is it the understanding, though, that these projects, because they're listed as capital projects in this year's Estimates that the projects will be undertaken this year and completed this year like under this appropriation?

MR. MACKLING: No, Mr. Chairman, in most cases these projects go for more than one year and this is the first-year cost. In other words, we're locking ourselves in now for next year as well. Once we get started, we're kind of stuck with this for another year.

MR. DRIEDGER: Right, I understand. So, for this year, that would be the appropriation of the project initiated in these three drainage projects. That is not the full cost of the total project and there would be a continuation of that program next year and until that agreement is terminated with the Federal Government.

MR. MACKLING: Until the agreement is completed, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DRIEDGER: Would I be wrong then in assuming that the figure that's actually shown here under Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets, that 13,255,000, that includes the federal portion, the portion that they would be contributing to the projects?

MR. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the amount shown is the gross cost and there is a recovery back from Canada. If you'd look at the item there is a recovery back at \$1,449,600.00.

MR. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I indicated before I'm pleased that the three projects under the Value-Added Crop Agreements are proceeding. The concern that, I think, we hashed through to some degree already previously, was the fact that there is \$900,000 total appropriated for upgrading the dyking system in the Red River Valley, of that \$240,000 would be within my constituency, so to speak, and of which 10 percent, at the present time, may or may not be charged towards the municipalities. We'll be watching that very closely and we hope that the Minister, after his meeting with the municipalities, will be able to convince Cabinet. I am assuming that he is totally in favour of the province accepting the total costs of that instead of charging the 10 percent to the province (sic). Would I be correct in my assumption, Mr. Chairman?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to comment further on that, I have commented extensively on that question.

MR. DRIEDGER: Fine, Mr. Chairman, then I'd like to indicate a few general comments before we get into the Parks Area. I'm sure everybody would like to have their certain pet projects on the program and realizing full well that there is only so many funds available, I'd still like to draw to the Minister's attention certain concerns in the general area. I think some of the agreements that have been worked out between the feds and the Provincial Governments, in terms of cost-sharing, I fully support that kind of concept. I hope that just because these projects are enroute right now and terminate maybe within the next two, three or four years, that the Minister is not going to be sitting back and saying well we have programs enroute. I'd like to have some idea what the new thrust is in the future aside from these programs, because these are all programs that were initiated, or ongoing

programs, the agreements were signed one or two years ago, I'd like to see some new thrust and direction from this present administration.

I'd like to give him some suggestion, as well, as I indicated previously already, sort of a major drainage plan developed for the southeast; I'd also like to encourage the Minister if possibly the municipalities, in certain areas that have rivers flowing through it, are faced with the substantial costs of bridge replacements. These are things that are getting to be more and more of a concern, the cost of replacement is high. I would hope that the Minister could see fit to maybe negotiate with the feds, I think it should be a joint - I'm just throwing this out as a suggestion - at the present the municipalities have the total responsibility financially for these projects. I would hope that maybe the Minister could encourage some kind of negotiations between the feds, province and municipalities to have a cost-shared type of program because I would just like to refer the Minister to the bridges across the Rousseau River, which were built at one time when the costs were not that substantial, at the present time many of these bridges are on the verge of being condemned, and understandably so, and replacement value is such that the municipalities cannot afford that kind of cost and will be looking at closing bridges, creating all kinds of inconveniences for the people in the area.

I wonder whether the Minister is considering this kind of activity in terms of cost-sharing on replacement of bridges. I refer to my specific area but I know that it is a common thing throughout the province, this is not unique in my area, and I think this is going to be a major financial undertaking in the future for somebody and I hope it would be able to be rationalized in some degree as we have some of these agreements. The Value-Added Crop Agreement, the diking agreements, that these kind of agreements could possibly be initiated for building of bridges over rivers.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I think that on an earlier occasion we did discuss this when we were dealing with the Estimates of the Water Resources Section, however, I wish to reiterate that what we're doing is the staffs of the two departments, Highways and Natural Resources, are looking at this question. It's a very expensive line item no matter what we decide there and when we get the recommendations, of course, we'll have to deal with it, but I'm not going to give the honourable member any false hope that we're going to be able to do what wasn't fiscally possible before.

MR. DRIEDGER: Well, I would just want to encourage the Minister to be very diligent in his attempts at negotiating some kind of situation there. I have one area in the Parks where I want to be a little bit more specific and then I have a general comment that I'd like to close with.

Referring to the appropriation in the Sprague area, there is I think \$21,000 for electrical work at Moose Lake and Moose Lake Roads. Certain monies were expended and appropriated last year for the Moose Lake area as well as the Birch Point area. This \$21,000 is that the money that is intended to be expended for

this coming year or is that part of the ongoing project?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that last year there was electrification of 25 campsites at Moose Lake and the installation of some playground equipment was funded. This year the \$21,000 covers completion of the campground electrification and some further money on Moose Lake Roads.

MR. DRIEDGER: I think there was some planning done last year, I might be wrong, but there was an intention to establish some playground equipment and I see that a little further down there's \$6,000 appropriated for playground equipment. Would it be the intention to establish some of this equipment in the Moose Lake Recreation Area?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, no, the \$6,000 that's indicated there is playground equipment for some other park area in the southeast region. The playground equipment that we referred to as having been budgeted for and expended last year is on-site, it hasn't been installed but it's there.

MR. DRIEDGER: Thank you, I'm pleased to hear that. I just have sort of a general comment that I'd like to make, as we have been dealing with the Estimates of Natural Resources, I have to express regret and concern about the fact that we do not have an increased budget under Physical Assets for the aspects of drainage and park, the physical portion of it. The concern I have is that in certain portions when we consider the increase in the spending of the government that the increase here when we take down the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Let's have order here, gentlemen.

MR. DRIEDGER: I'd like to echo my thank you to that, Mr. Chairman, it blows my train of thought here. Mr. Chairman, if we take the federal portion off the Physical Assets here then actually we end up possibly with a decrease in the Physical Assets at a time when costs of drainage projects, of park installations, the physical things that we are considering here are substantially higher. I don't know whether the Minister necessarily was responsible for agreeing to this kind of reduction; if he has then I'd be very critical of it, although I don't think that necessarily that would be the case but I would encourage him to go back to his colleagues, especially for the future, to make sure that the people in the rural part of the province get their fair share of the take that's there. We have substantial increases, Mr. Minister, and I've noticed this when I compare with some of the other departments as well, it seems as if the rural areas are being discriminated against. We're getting cutbacks in areas — yes we are — the Minister is holding his head down this way but we're falling behind. It is other programs that are getting priorities and the Minister — if that is his attitude, shaking his head saying no, no — I'd be very concerned. Then we're going to come down pretty hard on this Minister if he's going to . . . —(Interjection)—

We want to encourage the support of the Minister,

that he go back and fight for more money; that next year we can look at more physical assets and more money to be expended in terms of developing of parks and drainage projects. I would think that possibly some of his own colleagues would feel the same way that more money should be expended. I think there is many requirements there.

This country has been developed on the basis of building up these kind of things. We have very few basic major projects. The costs are definitely much higher. But when we consider the dams that were built at one time — cost shared federally-provincially — many of the projects undertaken even things like the floodway. These are all things that cost a tremendous amount of money at that time but they were major building projects. Now we're down to the point where we're squeezing the feds for as much money as we can but we don't have the physical projections anymore of projects under hand. I want to encourage the Minister and tell him we will support him if he comes up with more money in these departments.

If the Minister insists on saying big deal, this type of thing, we will come down pretty hard on this Minister. We understand your problems, Mr. Minister, but next year we'll be watching very closely because there's a lot of work to be done out there. These are the people that are paying the shot. These are the people that are paying the taxes and, Mr. Minister, with that I'll close for now. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Don Scott (Inkster): The Member for The Pas.

MR. HARRY M. HARAPIAK (The Pas): Mr. Chairman, when the Member for Arthur spoke he spoke to —(Interjection)—

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Point of order for the Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the Chairman was maintaining a list of speakers whilst he was Chairman. I distinctly recall him putting me on the list and my colleague, the MLA for Lakeside whilst he was Chairman. Does this mean that he put himself as Chairman ahead of members of the Committee?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, the Member for Pembina's point I don't think is that well taken. This has been down for quite some time. I would suggest that he put his name down. It's not scratched off. It was put down in regular order. His name was put down. He went over and sat down not long after his name was down because the other member went on for such a long period of time. I think the Chairman has an opportunity to remove himself from the Chair and sit and ask questions as well.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order.

I believe that on diligent scrutiny of the records you will find that there is a blank, an erasure in the tape and that this Chairman has . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No point of order. Can we carry on please?

The Member for The Pas.
The Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. HYDE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order please. Would you read out the list of names as they are on there, please?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: As they are down, I'll start right from the top. First one was Lakeside, second one Arthur, third Minnedosa, fourth Morris, fifth Emerson, sixth The Pas, seventh Portage la Prairie, eighth Pembina, ninth River East, tenth Inkster and eleven Lakeside.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The Chairman has got his name on the list now.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: My name was put on the list prior to my taking the Chair.

MR. ORCHARD: But that's the same Chairman that put his name on the list before the rest of us. I really think there is something fishy in this Committee. I do not think that we are on fish resources right now.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No point.
Member for The Pas.

MR. HARAPIAK: Mr. Minister when the Member for Arthur spoke he picked up the map and he seemed to think there was political patronage involved here and I think there is. Either his party or his government drew up the program or else I belong to the wrong party. The Member for Morris has \$2.5 million to his constituency and the constituency I represent has \$150,000.00. The Polder III was completely ignored. This is an area that was promised 30 years ago to be brought into agricultural production. Polder I and II has got \$150,000 designated to it. Earlier this year the farmers in the area were told that they would have \$300,000 to complete that project, to turn it over to LGD and it is half finished. That means it is going to be another year before it can be turned over to LGD.

There was a study carried out recently by your department which said that area should be brought into agricultural production and I would remind the Minister that the Saskeram is a big issue in The Pas area. It has been designated as a wildlife area and the agriculture, if this area at a Polder III can be brought into agricultural production, it would take the pressure off the Saskeram area.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that the honourable member's concerns in respect to the Polder drain have some validity. The Polder III drain was under review and sidetracked but certainly will be picked up.

MR. HARAPIAK: It was sidetracked for the past four years. I can't see it being sidetracked for this year.

I wonder if the Minister is aware of a study that is supposed to have been carried out by PFRA which would dig a drainage ditch in the area of Turnberry which would reverse the flow of water in The Pas River; would reverse the water to the overflow and into Lake Winnipegosis which is presently the level of —

Lake Winnipegosis is low — so they could use the water.

As well, the Saskatchewan Government is apparently interested in participating in this drainage because they can drain the hell diver area and which they're interested in bringing into agricultural production as well. I'm wondering if you're aware of this study.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, we understand a study was made by PFRA and we're asking PFRA to send us a copy of the study. Now it may have arrived. Mr. Weber had requested that, now he's on holidays. It may have already arrived.

MR. HARAPIAK: Melfort has also drained approximately 40,000 acres which the water also is coming into The Pas area. There's going to be a danger of a flooding if there's additional waters coming in. So if this water is diverted to Lake Winnipegosis it would also take away the danger of a flood in The Pas area. So I think that should be looked at as well. They presently have drained 40,000 acres that is being drained via the Saskatchewan River.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the honourable member has brought to my attention matters that I heretofore was not aware. Certainly we'll want to look at those things and reflect the concerns of people throughout the province where there is legitimacy to the need for conservation of water, control of water and where the cost benefits are there in respect to programs, certainly we're going to look at them. However, the emphasis as I've indicated earlier is hopefully not going to be drain, drain, drain, but to conserve.

MR. HARAPIAK: I would suggest, Mr. Minister, that we aren't draining completely. We're also bringing up the level of Lake Winnipegosis and this water is being drained from Saskatchewan at the present time. So this water could be utilized in that direction as well.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I understand or at least I have some conception of what the honourable member is talking about and certainly we will want to look at that. If the benefits are as he indicates, I can't see any reason why we wouldn't want to be favourably disposed towards it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. LLOYD HYDE (Portage la Prairie): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just have a few questions I'd like to put to the Minister, if I may. First of all, the Delta Channel improvements that were started in this past year, and I notice there is \$20,000 expenditures for a total for '82-'83. I'm wondering, would this be \$20,000 over and above what has been expended on the job up to date?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the \$20,000 item there on Delta Channel improvement is a cleanup item for this year.

MR. HYDE: On the work that has presently been done

up to now?

MR. MACKLING: That's right.

MR. HYDE: I'm wondering if there is consideration being made on this cleanup improvements. The concern of the people who have lived there all their lives is that the work that has been done up to this point is going to be lost in a matter of possibly months, or even years. If we should have a heavy downpour of rain, it's going to wash a great deal of that sludge or sand or whatever you might call it, back into the canal, and therefore the work that has been done up to now will just be for nought. It has been suggested to me that there might be a possible solution to that problem by sodding the banks in order to stabilize them in some way, because I can see, after being out there and seeing what has happened, I can see where their concern is rightfully so.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, in respect to drainage projects generally, I think the practise is to seed, so there is some root life or plant life that will prevent erosion. But sodding is such an expensive project that I don't know whether it has ever been contemplated by the department because of the expense involved. Seeding is commonplace and that's probably what would take place.

MR. HYDE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure if you were there to see and witness what has transpired up to this point, I would wonder but what you would have to give some thought to some stabilization program other than the seeding of grass seeds, because I can see it would just be washed right down into the present channel.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'm being apprised of the extent of what the honourable member is talking about and if he were talking about a short stretch of channel that was subject to bank erosion at a bend or a flow or something, something like that, but I gather that we're talking about in terms of maybe a mile or a mile in a half.

MR. HYDE: No, Mr. Chairman, it's a matter of 200 or 300 feet.

MR. MACKLING: It's a particular section that will be seeded.

MR. HYDE: Well, there again, Mr. Minister, I wonder whether this be folly in putting the in seed.

MR. MACKLING: That we'll have to determine.

MR. HYDE: Yes, I can see, now that you've made that point, but, to me, it will be money down the drain because I think it will be lost.

Mr. Chairman, also I would like to speak about the Clandeboye Dam. I see you have \$207,000 expenditures for 1982-83. I wonder, could you explain to the Committee what is contemplated in your construction program there?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the item there for

the Clandeboye Dam makes provision for that work, and the Wildlife Branch wants the money provided in the capital Estimate, but they do have to review that, because they have to satisfy themselves as to the project. But this does make provision for it if the assessment that is made is favorable.

MR. HYDE: Mr. Minister, again I'd like to refer to our local engineer, and when I say our local engineers, I mean people who have lived there all their lives, people who were born and raised and all that. They would like to see a free-flow system, like what has been constructed at the canal today, in this past season. If they could get the free-flow system and replacing the Clandeboye Dam, they could foresee going back to the flow that used to be there many, many years back, and this what has been suggested would be an improvement for that area.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I don't think I can improve upon the honourable member's comments.

MR. HYDE: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I have noticed that you do have a few thousand dollars for the Norquay Provincial Recreational Park. I had to make an enquiry as to what silviculture meant, but I do understand now that it is the cleaning out of undergrowth and improving the site with proper foliage.

MR. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HYDE: And that applies, I notice, to the St. Ambrose Provincial Recreational Park as well.

MR. MACKLING: Planting there.

MR. HYDE: Planting of trees, yes. Lynch's Point, Mr. Minister. It has been brought to my attention by senior citizens who have been using that park for the last number of years. They would like to suggest an improvement to that park. First of all, I appreciate your \$23,000 pump house and water pressure system; that will improve the lot there. But they have a suggestion to make and it is something along this line that their biggest concern is that when they move their trailers on site for a few days of the week and wish to return to that site for the next week, they find themselves having to haul their trailers off that campsite and return at the first of the week. I believe presently you do have a percentage of lots made available for senior citizens so they are not required to move their trailers off site. It has been suggested that this percentage could be increased even up to 40 percent and not be out of the way.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, admittedly there would be convenience for people who wanted to leave their trailer equipment at a park site, but that involves further problems because during the week transient campers, therefore, would be foreclosed the opportunity to use the site. If the trailers were parked in another area then you've got a concern about the security and it's not simple. It's not something that we would look at either in isolation for one camping facility, park facility, in isolation from all the rest of the parks and camping facilities.

MR. HYDE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wonder Mr. Minister if you would consider enlarging that site to where you could give the senior citizens more parking facilities than what they have. I can understand their concern because they probably have to have their units hauled in there onto a site by whatever it might be, and have to have them taken out, as I said earlier, by the end of the week and then wanting to return back the first night. If it could be enlarged somewhat and give them more of a serviced area for their particular needs.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, that kind of suggestion I couldn't make any commitment on, we'd certainly have to make some further examination of it. The senior citizens, I am advised, do that free camping now during the week.

MR. HYDE: Yes, Mr. Minister, I may not have been able to get my point across to you but the concern, on the part of these people, is that they have to hire someone to take their units off-site and then have to bring them back on-site at the first of next week.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I do understand that.

MR. HYDE: Well, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, I'm wondering if you could take and give some consideration to improving this lot for the senior citizens of that area.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I certainly won't say no to that request, we will look at this, we will look at the general problem that the honourable member raises; whether or not we can come up with something that satisfies all of our interests, in respect to camping, I don't know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. At the onset I want to apologize for accusing you of cooking the list, I know you didn't do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Apology accepted.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, we have a number of projects that are on the books here, and I note with a great deal of satisfaction that the Minister has left the South and North Shannons in the reconstruction project, and I want to tell the Minister just why these projects are important and I'm glad he left them in the construction program. We have had —(Interjection)— well that possibility always exists as long as I'm getting money. Now, Mr. Chairman, the Shannon Drains were two drains that were constructed over the past, I suspect, about 12 years, and they are of the nature that they approach the Pembina escarpment. And in approaching the Pembina escarpment the construction was very efficient, very useful and worked well with the exception of the last approximate mile-and-a-half in each case, in which it seems as if there were a couple of runoff years. It hasn't been a problem in the last two springs but in the spring of 1980 and in the spring of 1979 both

those drains, in the fact that they weren't completed as they are going to be completed in this Capital Estimate, allowed the confluence of water to miss the drain. The drain was reconstructed up to a certain point, there was a fairly substantial runoff up to that point, which was already going across country and, because the last portion of those two drains wasn't constructed, that excessive runoff water proceeded across country and did substantial damage and, if you want to get realistic about it, removed the effectiveness of the former investment downstream in both those drains. So, I want to thank the Minister for not removing either the North or the South Shannon from his Capital Construction Projects this year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I might, and I know the Minister is extremely interested in this project, I have mentioned it to him briefly, it's the final reconstruction on Provincial Road 240, south of PTH 23. It is on the upper reaches of the Tobacco Creek, it's a project that my colleague the MLA for Lakeside and former Minister of Natural Resources had taken a look at — (Interjection) — personally inspected is quite correct because we were both out there last summer. Now, Mr. Chairman, I had some concern in the process of the Estimates discussion about one week ago, when I briefly mentioned this PR 240 and the intention of the project, and my concern emanated from the fact that the MLA for Springfield, who has affectionately become known to all of us as the "Springfield Shadow," the person who follows the Attorney-General around as House Leader and who tends to leave all of you new backbenchers as being terribly knowledgeable in all of the activities in the House, and has quite frankly led you slightly astray on a couple of occasions because, Mr. Chairman, I have been a member of government for six sessions now and never before, Mr. Chairman, have I seen a . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Point of Order, I believe we're getting off the topic here.

MR. ORCHARD: No, Mr. Chairman, not at all, if you bear with me you will find this is very much in order and I beg your indulgence. But the MLA for Springfield, as I said affectionately know as the Springfield Shadow is the one who provides advice to the newly arrived backbenchers of the ND Party and under his guidance in this Committee, approximately a week ago, Mr. Chairman, you . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you getting to the point?

MR. ORCHARD: I am getting very much to the point Mr. Chairman. You had the unfortunate record, like Gretzky scores 80 goals, but, Mr. Chairman, you have the unfortunate cross to bear as being the only Chairman in recent memory to be defeated in Committee, and it was because of the Springfield Shadow that that happened. Had saner minds and more knowledgeable people prevailed that would not have happened, Mr. Chairman, and I don't fault you, Mr. Chairman, you are a decent and an honourable gentleman, but the Springfield Shadow did it to you, Mr. Chairman.

Now, the reason for my mentioning the Springfield Shadow with such affection and admiration was the

fact that the Springfield Shadow when I brought up this subject of Provincial Road 240 said, and it is recorded in Hansard, that first we should determine whether Provincial Road 240 is going to be built. Now, that's the kind of political statement that we would expect from the Springfield shadow, one who has no concept of the operation of this Committee, of the advice provided to the Minister in Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina, I think you are off the subject.

MR. ORCHARD: Oh, Mr. Chairman, I am not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're discussing . . .

MR. ORCHARD: . . . the Construction Estimates and that's exactly what I'm discussing right now, Mr. Chairman. I'm discussing the Construction Estimates of the Department of Natural Resources because integral to that was a road-construction project which was contemplated to be a joint-funding project between the Department of Natural Resources and the Department of Highways as envisioned by my colleague, the predecessor Minister of Natural Resources, the MLA for Lakeside and myself. And this is very much in order, Mr. Chairman, and I beg your indulgence. I beg your indulgence on this matter, because Mr. Chairman, this is of critical importance because the Springfield shadow did directly indicate that project didn't have and the insinuation was, and I will paraphrase it, that project didn't have the hope of surviving as a snowball in hell, to put it bluntly. He said that the road-construction project would not proceed, hence, this very valuable conservation project would not proceed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I only mention that, because in taking — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, did I do something wrong?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are we going to discuss Construction and Physical Assets or are we going to continue talking?

It's 10 o'clock. Committee rise

SUPPLY — NORTHERN AFFAIRS, ENVIRONMENT AND WORKPLACE SAFETY AND HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN, Jerry T. Storie (Flin Flon): Committee will come to order.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we begin the proceedings, I have an announcement. I would direct the members' attention to the gallery on my right; we have the 183rd cub pack from the Niakwa constituency. They're under the direction of Mr. G. Kitchen and are represented by the Honourable Member for Niakwa. On behalf of all the members, we welcome all these visitors to the gallery.

If the Honourable Minister is ready, we are continuing with Item 5 Environmental Management. It's Resolution 118, subsection (a)(1) Salaries.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. A. BRIAN RANSOM (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Chairman, I listened to the Honourable Minister for four years when he was the Member for Churchill in the backbench in the opposition and I know that the Minister expressed a very deep concern for environmental matters. I know that he was very aware of some of the problems that are facing not only this province but the country and, indeed, the entire world from the point of view of trying to balance the economic structure, the economic system with our ecosystems or our life-support systems of the world and that it really isn't much point of having one of those systems functioning without the other functioning as well. And I know that, having listened to the Minister for that period of time when he was a backbencher, that he must have come into this job with some feeling for what he was going to try and accomplish in the time that he was here. I have a feeling that he is not content just to deal with individual situations and react to problems as they arise, but I expect rather that he has some feeling for what he wants to be remembered for maybe when he's finished four years from now, or at least, if not what he wants to be remembered for, that he does really want to accomplish something and he's probably set some goals for himself and for his government on what he's going to accomplish in the area of Environmental Management; that somehow the management of the department and Environmental Management efforts in this government are going to be different under his stewardship than they were going to be under anyone else's.

Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister, if he can, to give us some indication of what his long-term goals are; not just talk about the numbers of staff man years and the extra dollars that he has for this year, and so on, but where does he want to see the department going in this area over the next three or four years

MR. COWAN: Mr. Chairperson, if I wanted to be remembered for any one specific thing, I would have to say I would want to be remembered for having done everything so exquisitely perfect. However, I know that is not going to be the case. I would want to be remembered for having done everything exactly the way in which it should have been done, and I know that won't be the case either. So if I have to try to prophesy, and it's always a dangerous game for a politician to enter in to, I would have to tell the Member for Turtle Mountain that there are a number of things which I would like to accomplish during this term, and if I am remembered for them in a positive way, so much the better, but I am certainly not attempting to accomplish them for remembrance sake. I'm attempting to accomplish them through my activities and through the activities of my government because I, in fact, think they are the proper things to do and very necessary to the long-term dealing with environmental concerns.

There are a number of specific thrusts which were outlined in the presentation I made when introducing these Estimates, some of which were contained in the Throne Speech as well. But what I want to talk about is not the specific thrusts, having been given this opportunity to discuss, in some general terms, what I would

like to see happen. I want to talk about the process, because I believe when it comes to Environmental Management, and when it comes to protection of the environment, that the process is, indeed, as important in many instances as our specific actions. I would like to, in some way, ensure that people who are not privy to joining us in these Chambers, know more about their environment. I would like to be able to reflect upon my term in this position and suggest that I was part of that opening-up process and part of that process of providing for increased public awareness. For if we do not have their support we will not be able to accomplish that which we all know needs to be accomplished. And we will not have their support if we do not have their understanding. So we must, in fact, provide the mechanisms to them which will ensure that they understand not only what we are attempting to do, but why we are attempting to do it and why it is necessary that we attempt to do it.

That's a process, a procedure, which I believe very strongly in, so when we talk about a specific problem such as acid rain, we talk about it from a series of different perspectives. The first is more testing; why more testing and more monitoring? I would suggest that is necessary to expand our own knowledge on it; but that knowledge, if it sits within the confines of government, is not being as effectively and as efficiently used as it would be if it were given to the general public-at-large and that is why you see a booklet such as the one which the previous Minister had a large part in producing, come forward. And you will see more booklets such as that come forward, and you will see more information dissemination such as that come forward under this office, while I have it, and I would suggest while any individual has it, because we are all learning that is one of the more important roles that a Minister of Environment can play and an Environmental Management Division or department or group can play, that is the compiling of information and a dissemination of information.

So that is why you see that sort of process in hand; the same when it comes to hazardous waste management, we know that we are going to have to deal with that very serious problem, we know that others before us have had to deal with that very serious problem, we know that others behind us will have to deal with that very serious problem. And so if we can leave those who will follow us a legacy, let us leave them an informed public that understand and know why it is we have these problems, and why it is we intend to deal with them in the way in which we do. I could go on and mention each of the individual thrusts or programs which were outlined in the opening of these Estimates as well as in the Throne Speech and will be outlined from time to time. But I think it's important to put them in that general context, more important than to at this point, discuss the details, we'll have time to do that. The Member for Turtle Mountain asked me what I wanted to be remembered for. Well, it's not that I want to be remembered in specific, but I think it is so important that it is my primary objective.

MR. RANSOM: I'm a little bit disappointed. In fact, I'm quite a bit disappointed in that response from the Minister, because in listening to the Minister over the

past few years, I sensed that he had some sort of overall understanding of what forests looked like and not just what the individual trees looked like. Now I hear him say, Mr. Chairman, that he's talking about using phrases like, "That's what we all know needs to be accomplished." Well, that's what I want to know about because I'm from Missouri and I don't know that which we all know needs to be accomplished. He talks about individual thrusts; I don't see the environment being something that one deals with in individual thrusts because the ecosystems of the world are structured in such a way that one can't deal with them in individual thrusts. One must have some understanding of the overall structure of any system that you're dealing with. So, you can't just talk about dealing with chemicals, controlling the release of chemicals into the environment; you can't just talk about the control of hazardous wastes and having disposal sites; you can't just talk about environmental impact assessments or having another 7.26 staff man years. I think there must be some sort of understanding of where the Minister wants to go. The process I don't think is the product. I gather from listening to the Minister's brief response that he is really saying that the process is to a very great extent, the product; that he wants to make sure that people know the information that he has. He wants to do more monitoring and if the people only understand that, then we all will know that which we all know should be accomplished.

Well, Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, that sort of position might have been adequate in Opposition but the Minister now, after four years, is in a position of responsibility, and I think one of the most important positions of responsibility within the government, because how we deal with our environment is something that, well, it's on some people's minds, it isn't universally accepted as something that we really need to deal with; in many people's minds it's something that's almost bordering on being faddish, and I think that it's the Minister's responsibility to try and do more than that; to let his colleagues understand that it's more important than that, and the public to understand that, and to give some leadership, not just to monitor and disseminate information and get a better system in place for dealing with a train wreck when it happens, or find a place to dispose of hazardous waste.

But what kind of general direction does he envisage? Where does he want to be in terms of environmental quality four years from now? How is he going to know? How is the public going to know whether four years from now, their environment is any better or any worse than it was now? Perhaps the Minister just didn't understand the question. What I was hoping I would hear from him, and I'm not trying to pin him down to any sort of concrete commitments that we'd expect to show up in dollars and cents here, but I just would like to know, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister has some broader concept of where he wants to take the department.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Chairperson, I have taken a fair amount of criticism for having changed the way in which I address this issue since having assumed the position where I don't need to speak so loudly and so long to accomplish much, much more. I would only

suggest that the Member for Turtle Mountain has somewhat changed the way in which he addresses this issue, and I would like to have heard him stand up when he was in government, and address the issue in the way in which he has this evening, and he never did. So I guess we all have new roles to play and we will determine, over a period of time, how best to play them.

There is a contradiction in what the Member for Turtle Mountain has just suggested. First, he said that my approach is not the proper approach, or the implication was that it was, at least, not nearly enough a comprehensive and complete approach, and he talked about a number of things, but then in the course of his conversation he gave himself away. Let's think about what I talked about for one minute — I talked about education, I talked about people understanding a problem, I talked about developing the information which allows us the opportunity to more fully explain the problem and to develop the types of control remedies that we know are necessary. I talked about all of that, but throughout my contribution I kept coming back to one theme, that is making the public understand the necessity for that information and the necessity for action. Then when the Member for Turtle Mountain criticizes that approach, what does he say in the middle of his speech, he says and these are his words, that peoples' impression of the environment are "bordering on faddish."

In other words, he isolated the very problem which I addressed my remarks to, that there is not a complete enough understanding and that's what I think is necessary. And he did it for me, he suggested that's a problem and I agree with him, for once; maybe in other things I agree with him as well, but on this I certainly do agree with him.

What we are trying to do is to ensure that they have the type of knowledge and information which is available to them so that they don't consider it to be faddish, so that they take it seriously, so that we have to do some very important projects and programs that they are able to work along with us, because they understand where we're coming from and where we are going to.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, once again though I hear the Minister talk about the problem and I presume that the problem is the same thing as that which we all know needs to be accomplished. Am I to understand then, from what the Minister says, that he sees the role of the department as being primarily one of education, that he wants to inform the people of the results of his monitoring, for instance. Is that a misunderstanding of what the Minister has said, and perhaps if he would elaborate a little bit on what he sees as the problem and that which we all know should be accomplished.

MR. COWAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain a few moments ago suggested that I didn't understand his question. I would now suggest to him that he didn't understand his question. His question to me was, what would I like to be remembered for, in respect to my tenure as Minister responsible for the Environment? That was his question, and that is the answer that I gave him. Now if he asks me what is the depart-

ment going to do over the next couple of years or over the next year, which is the framework to which I can address specific remarks this evening and I can talk in generalities over what I would hope to see accomplished over the next few years, then that is a different question. I would suggest to him it is an entirely different question but one which I am willing to address as well, and what do we hope to accomplish? Well, we have outlined a series of projects which are not all inclusive nor all comprehensive. They are the new programs, as the Member for Tuxedo said last night some are newer than others, some are continuations of new programs which were being devised over the last year, some are not. However, we have put to the record those specific programs and we can discuss those specific programs in more detail if the member wishes.

If you ask, what is the role of the department, and I believe that's what he is now asking as a second and entirely different question than his first question. I think the role of the department would be to insure that the environmental integrity of this province is protected as much as is possible. We hope to accomplish that through a number of ways.

The first is to address our attention to the specific environmental problems which we confront right at the present time. We talked about some of those. I'll give the member an example so that he has some better awareness of what I mean by this. We have in respect to a very important problem, one which does in fact have a great deal of public awareness about it, that is, acid rain, set up for increased personnel to assist the department in its monitoring program. We have asked for increased money to provide three additional new stations for monitoring, which will increase the number of stations from six stations at present to nine stations once those stations are in place. I must clarify that those are provincial stations. There are also federal stations in place as well.

As a matter of fact, I'm going to have to clarify that a bit more because my Assistant Deputy Minister has informed me that the six which I'm talking about are in fact four federal stations, two provincial stations and we are now adding three provincial stations to that system so that's a significant increase. Not as much as I would have liked to have put in place, and I know not as much as the Member for Tuxedo would have like to have put in place as well, but it is a significant increase. It is more than doubling those stations which are already in place. We have added personnel, we have also addressed some of our financial resources to upgrading our equipment in this area. That's the monitoring aspect of it.

At the same time, we have built upon and will continue to build upon the public awareness campaign which was started by the previous government in respect to acid rain and which we will continue.

I have just recently met with the four provincial Environmental Ministers in Saskatoon to discuss ways by which the four provincial provinces could address this issue co-operatively to insure that the type of data which we are bringing forward is done so in a co-operative and complementary way to ensure that the type of control measures which we will be discussing with both public sector and private sector emitters is done so in a co-operative and complemen-

tive way and to increase our general level of awareness of the problem so that we can begin to develop strategies which may not be available to us if we did not have that information at hand.

I've also had conversations with the Federal Minister responsible for the Environment on this very serious concern and pledged to him our co-operation on the federal program to deal with sulphur-dioxide emissions and resultant acid rain. So we have done that as well.

We make presentations to the Clean Environment Commission when they in fact have hearings respecting acid rain and we try to provide the Clean Environment Commission with the benefit of our expertise and our recommendations. I have suggested that we must do so bearing in mind the full effect of acid rain, that we just can't isolate the effect in Manitoba but that we in fact do take into consideration the effect throughout the country and throughout in fact the continent because it is a transboundary type of pollution.

I've also suggested that when we address those issues, we have to address those issues from the perspective of what will happen in the future if we don't put in place the type of control mechanisms and procedures which are necessary to prevent degradation of the environment. That's the type of thrust which I am providing to the department. Is it different? You can ask the Member for Tuxedo if it's different. I believe that there are some differences, although I believe we are both sincerely motivated in what we believe to be the proper course of action and we will disagree from time to time on the specifics.

That's one specific area which I feel highlights and is illustrative of our general thrust and I think that is what the member has been asking in his second question, what is the role of the department and I think rather than go through all the individual and varied activities of the department, which are many, and I'm prepared to do so if the member so desires to do that and I think we can probably best do that as we go through it line-by-line, although we could attempt to do it here as well. I can provide by way of this one example an illustrative picture.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps we're getting closer to an answer and I'm really not, it doesn't really matter to me whether the Minister interprets it as one question or two questions or three questions. I was simply opening up the opportunity for him to give us some insight into his thinking about these problems.

I still must say that in listening to his answers that I still hear phrases there that I'm afraid I don't understand. I don't know what they mean. Now, maybe the Member for Dauphin understands what they mean and sometime if he gets to be on the Treasury Bench I'll ask him what they mean, but at the moment I don't have that opportunity. Mr. Chairman, but the Minister said that he thought that environmental integrity — one of the things he wanted to see happen is that, and I believe this was a quotation, "environmental integrity is protected as much as possible" and he further then, later on used a phrase "prevent degradation of

the environment." Now, "to protect environmental integrity as much as possible" sounds fine at first glance, but as much as possible might be not at all. It might not be possible to protect it, and that to "prevent degradation of the environment," on the one hand the statement says, we'll protect it as much as possible, which under some circumstances could be not at all. The other phrase says "to prevent degradation" which could be interpreted as meaning no change whatsoever. I don't think that those two things are compatible. Perhaps the Minister again would like to elaborate on that a little bit, because I have the feeling that if he pursues those kinds of objectives that he might well be subject eventually to the tyranny of small decisions, where he makes individual decisions along the way and he says that in this case, well I'm protecting it as much as possible in that case, but still I've lost a lot of ground. In the next one, well I've protected that one as much as possible but I've lost a lot of ground there. Eventually that series of small decisions is going to get the Minister into problems and he may arrive somewhere where he doesn't want to be. I'm not sure that he can be where he said he might be in that he's going to prevent degradation of the environment because that means totally prevent any change.

I know these are difficult questions and I know that there's no pat answer to it, but I just ask one last time and then I'll move onto some more specific ones, Mr. Chairman; would the Minister care to address that what I see as a contradiction in those two phrases and how he really intends to deal with the situation? How he's going to measure how successful or unsuccessful that he's been and how good or how poor, to use subjective judgments, the environment is that we all live in today and that we're going to live in hopefully four or five years from now.

MR. COWAN: I will attempt to explain one more time to the Member for Turtle Mountain. I'm not certain whether the lack of understanding on his part is because of an inability of myself to communicate or the inability of himself to understand that which is being communicated to him. I will take upon myself the responsibility for being unable to provide to him a picture which he wants to see provided to him at this time.

I, in fact, have said in quite explicit terms that which I would like to accomplish and I've used not only a general statement, but at the same time I have tried to provide a specific example. I can do little more than that but to suggest to the Member for Turtle Mountain that he watch very carefully the way in which we undertake that goal of ensuring that the least possible environmental disruption takes place in this province.

If I did in fact say that I was going to *carte blanche* without any exemption prevent total and entire degradation of the environment, then I apologize to the Member for Turtle Mountain for having inadvertently told him that I would do something that I know I can't accomplish. I will only have to look at the Estimates to see if I did not provide him with the qualifier on that. If I did not, please let me put it into the record at this time because it certainly should have been there.

As he well pointed out, if that indeed was my statement taken in relationship to the other statement,

there is a contradiction. As he well pointed out, there may be times that it might not be possible to protect the environment at all. He said that, and he said what am I going to do then, as if I was a magician and had a wand. I am not a magician and neither do I have a wand. What am I going to do then? I'm going to shake my head. I'm going to say *mea culpa*. I'm going to say, I wish it were different and if only I had the power to be more than I am and to do more than I can accomplish. But I will realize the realities and I will deal with realities.

He suggested I may become captured by my own lack — or what he terms — lack of overall thrust. I suggest to him that will not happen; that we have provided him with a general overview and that we do have an overall thrust, and that in fact I will take his advice and well heeded, that I do not become the victim of tyranny of small decisions or as others have stated that I don't inframurally wash away the environment while trying to do what I think is best but at the same time not fully realizing all that I could do.

I will count upon him and his colleagues for their advice and their very strong criticism when they suggest that I'm doing so, because each of us become trapped in our own philosophies; trapped in our own experiences and lead much by our past as well as by our hopes for the future. So, from time to time it is necessary to be jolted out of that state. I hope they will provide me with that sort of rude awakening if and when it becomes necessary.

But to suggest that I am now not going into this office with an idea of where it is, I would like to be, and to suggest that I am now not giving proper thought to the overall and the general picture is to suggest, unfairly so, that I have not given very strong thought to that which we feel needs to be done. —(Interjection) — Well, now the Member for Pembina, who I don't think will speak any differently in any office than he speaks at every occasion and making no comment upon that, says that I gave this story in Opposition and yet the Member for Turtle Mountain and the Member for Tuxedo say that I talk differently now than I did in Opposition. Well, I'll be darned if I do and darned if I don't, I guess. But the member asked me for a specific statement, I gave him a specific statement. I gave it my best shot.

He says, how are we going to know if we are in fact accomplishing the protection of the environment? One of the projects which we are now working on — and it's not listed in these Estimates because it's not a specific dollar figure right at the moment — is a state of the environment report on an annual basis. We've had a rough draft of that. The Member for Tuxedo is aware that was in place, because I would assume that he may have seen a rough draft of it. If he had not seen a rough draft of it, I assume that he would have at least known that it was being prepared. It's a good idea. It was not his idea, so please don't let him take credit for it onto himself. What he should take credit for and justifiably so, is that he saw a good idea and he knew it was a good idea and he acted upon that good idea. That's the credit for which he should be deserving tonight.

I believe — and he can correct me if I'm wrong because he's far more intimately aware of the details of that particular project than am I — that it was an

idea that came out of a meeting of Ministers of the Environment and that he seized upon it, as did other Ministers of the Environment, to ensure that we had that sort of statement in front of us when we did try to determine if in fact we were proceeding in the proper way.

Now I am not entirely satisfied that State of the Environment Report on an annual basis will provide us with all the information which we need and with the checks and balances which the Member for Turtle Mountain so accurately suggests are necessary. But it is part and parcel of that process.

We are also developing baseline data which allow us the capability to determine how far we are straying from that baseline data. That, too, is important, to understand where we are going by understanding where it is we have been; that is important.

We are also going to, and this is where fall victim to a tyranny of small decisions, address those specific issues as they come forward, but we are going to address them, not only in a specific way, but we are going to address them from a global context in perspective as well. We are going to say, this is the overall problem with which we must deal; these are the options which are available to us and what do we do in this particular instance to accomplish the goals which we would like to accomplish, and that is, as much as possible, the protection of the environment. The goal, by the way, may in fact be, total non-degradation of the environment and it may be a goal and objective which we cannot accomplish but for which we should always strive. But the fact is that we will try to take into consideration in those small decisions, but important decisions, the global impact of that decision.

I told the member opposite that when we address the issue of sulphur dioxide, I have asked the department not only to address it from the perspective of what is happening right here in this locale at this time, but to address it as well from the perspective of what is happening in other areas as a result of this, how is the total burden on the environment being affected by our decisions and what do we think will happen in the future because of our decision. How much more can we do except be honest and attempt to provide leadership by our very actions.

I would suggest to the Member for Turtle Mountain that, perhaps, we have struck out goals which are a bit too Utopian, but they are goals which are important and goals which we should strive to seek, and when we fall by the wayside from time to time, as all Ministers do and as all governments do, I know he will be there to pick us up, to dust us off, to slap us a couple of times across the face and say, "You fools, look what you have done," and I will say, as exactly the Member for Tuxedo, "Thanks." If I didn't need that, I probably deserved it.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to learn that the Minister recognizes that the Member for Tuxedo was not the one who should take any credit for having initiated the stage here for the State of the Environment Report that is being worked upon. I should advise the Minister that when he said that when I was Minister I had no vision for the future; that I wasn't addressing these kinds of problems.

Mr. Chairman, I simply would like to advise the

Minister, for the historical record, that it was at the meeting of Resource and Environment Ministers which was held, I believe, in Kelowna, B.C. in 1979, just a few days after the Federal Election that returned the Conservative Government, that the suggestion was put forward at that meeting that all of the provinces should consider addressing that very question of what is happening to the quality of our environment, because everytime we got together at that meeting we talked about specific, individual problems. We might have been able to deal with those problems to our satisfaction, and maybe not, but everyone got the feeling that the world was passing us by as we were dealing with these individual problems, and I take credit for it if there's any credit to be given, that I made the suggestion to the Ministers at that meeting, that we should look at the possibility of establishing a State of the Environment Report for the country that would give the Ministers of Environment some better understanding of what was happening and that they could take that to their respective governments, because I found that in the very short space of about two meetings of the Resource and Environment Ministers that, all of a sudden, I was the senior Minister, or very close to it, at those meetings, and there obviously was not the sort of continuity there that would allow the Ministers and their respective departments to ever really address the problems of the environment in a comprehensive way.

I was very pleased to see that they did, in fact, pick up on the suggestion, because I ceased to be a Minister of the Environment for the province and wasn't back at another meeting dealing with that question afterwards, but it was taken up. Perhaps the Minister could give us a little more indication of what is actually happening to it; when there might be a report available for the Ministers of Environment, and I would tell the Minister that we also were pursuing that a little further, and that I'm sure that if he speaks with his senior staff people in the department, he'll know that we had begun to address the question of environmental quality in Manitoba in terms of the various components of it, of the various ecosystems in the province, and we began to look at how we might outline those systems. I think that when the Minister used the term, "too Utopian," that, perhaps, we in the collective sense were establishing goals that were too Utopian, then, maybe he's right. I think it is too Utopian to be able to think that we're simply going to continue to resist change; that we're going to try and prevent degradation, because I think we'll find that we get pushed farther and farther and farther back as we attempt to resist it and we don't know where we want to draw the line. Mr. Chairman, I think that, eventually, the decisions might best be made on the basis of some understanding of how our ecosystems work, and ecosystems are simply the life-support systems of the province, or the country, or the world.

Some understanding of those systems, coupled with the tremendous capacity that's available today for data processing through the use of computers, perhaps gives us some understanding or will begin to give us some understanding of how the systems work and how energy flows through those systems, and that then we don't look at it from the point of view of let's resist any change in this system, let's rather try

and understand the system and understand how we might manage it to achieve some of the ends that we want. We know the system's going to change; there aren't any systems that remain unchanged in the world today, because the effects of man as a geologic force are so all pervasive that there are no systems that exist in their original form. So what we need to do is have an understanding of how they work and understand how we might manage them, how far they might be stressed without destroying the functioning of the system, that's all I was hoping, that by asking the Minister for some of his views that naturally I was hoping that he might have some of those same general concepts in mind because I happen to think that they will eventually be accepted and that governments will work towards that. So, Mr. Chairman, with those few words I would ask the Minister then, how the work of the Resource and Environment Ministers with respect to the state of the environment report is progressing, whether he's had an opportunity to look at it himself at this point, whether he thinks it's meaningful and useful and when the report might be made available so that the public would have an opportunity to look at it.

MR. COWAN: I do apologize to both the Member for Tuxedo for being much too kind to him in this regard and the Member for Turtle Mountain for not recognizing what was so obviously an innovative approach on his part, and I should have done that, so I'm glad that he had the opportunity to set the records straight in this regard. I am pleased that not only did he have the opportunity to set the records straight tonight, but that he had the opportunity in 1979 in a small town to discuss this program with other Ministers Responsible for Natural Resources and Environment, who I understand were not overly receptive to the suggestion at first, but who were won over by the persuasiveness and the logic of the argument of the Member for Turtle Mountain. —(Interjection)— And as the Member for Tuxedo says the Member for Turtle Mountain has something that I shall never have, but would always seek and yearn and that's good looks.

So seriously I am pleased that he did win them over, I am pleased that we have the work already in progress on the state of the environment report, I have had an opportunity to look over the report very briefly. To be more specific I think I've had an opportunity to read the first two or three pages of it, just having had the report provided to me a couple of days ago and having not found time to address it in detail. I intend to address it in detail over this weekend when I'll be travelling by train to Churchill and I always find that I a fair amount of time on that train to sit back and watch the northern countryside roll by and to read and reflect upon that which I am reading at the time, there being no phones and no interruptions. So I want to give this report my undivided attention and can assure the Member for Turtle Mountain that I am going to attempt to do that this weekend and would hope to be able to report back to him as to my general comments on the report at the earliest opportunity after that. Having looked at the format of the report I can tell him right now that I have some concerns about the length of it and the way in which it is put together. For this reason only. I want that report to be

out there in the public for people to read and to understand and therefore it has to be in a fairly concise and presentable format and when I say that I have some concerns about the format at this point I am not casting any negative reflection upon those who have prepared it because they have provided us with an example and an outline and now it's up to us to look at that and to incorporate the best parts of it into a report which is easily readable and easily understandable and which is of great value to those people who want to take the time to read it. Because not everybody has an opportunity to travel the train between Thompson and Churchill and to take the type of time which I think is going to be necessary to read that report in its mimeographed form.

What I would like to do and I will have to check with my staff on this is provide a copy of that report in its draft form to the Member for Turtle Mountain if he is interested for his recommendations and his suggestions, him having been instrumental in bringing that report to fruition. So I would be most concerned to see if, in fact, what we have before us now is that which he had anticipated it being at the time he brought the suggestion forward and won over the hearts and minds of the other CREF Ministers. So, I would ask him if he would like me to do that and I will attempt to do that in the very near future. I hope to be able to have a chance to read it myself and perhaps we can discuss together our suggestions. I would expect that it would be in the public's hands sometime over the next year, I would hope that it would be in the public's hands within a-half-a-year and it maybe in the public's hands sooner than that depending upon the type of comments which he wants to provide and others want to provide. It's going to be a fairly important document, this will be the first publication of the document so it is important that it be received as well as is possible by the public so I will be seeking input from other individuals as well in order to benefit by their expertise in this area as to the way in which that document should come forward.

So, I don't want to rush it, on the other hand, I think, as did the Member for Turtle Mountain, think at the time he suggested it that it is an important document and should come forward at the first opportunity in the best possible public form.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I would certainly thank the Minister for his offer to make a draft of the report available. I would be pleased to look at it and give him the benefit of any comments that I might have. Just, very briefly, I would say to the Minister that when the idea was put forward and first discussed it was recognized that it is very easy to put together a report which is critical and could be sensationalized to attract all sorts of attention to individual items that, by themselves, are, no doubt, important but by concentrating on them they would lose sight of the overall significance of what is happening and I believe that's one of the suggestions that I had given was that the report must attempt to avoid that type of thing. It has to be simple enough to be meaningful to senior people in government, politicians that gives them enough information to be able to make general decisions upon and that there is no point in cursing the darkness in such a report.

The changes are taking place, there are things happening in the environment and we must learn how to deal with them not simply to try and close our eyes and pretend that they're not going to happen or that they shouldn't happen. So I really look forward to seeing that report and I hope that it does play some useful part in increasing the awareness of decision-makers especially concerning environmental problems that we face and helping to establish some kind of concept of where governments might aim to go in their decision-making under management — the environment.

MR. COWAN: I can then give the Member for Turtle Mountain that commitment that I will provide him with that report and we'll look forward to his suggestions and criticisms on the specific report as it is in its present form and, hopefully, we can put together the type of report which he suggests is necessary for not only decision-makers but for the general public as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for La Verendrye.

MR. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal just very briefly with a problem which I know there's no easy solution to. I think the Minister has spoken about public awareness and a few other things with regard to a number of things that affect the environment, whether it be of a pollution nature or other. But being an outdoorsman and being an avid fisherman and a hunter, one of the things that has caused me considerable concern over the last number of years is what I call the cans and bottles and garbage barrage that we're faced with in our rivers, lakes and streams in the Province of Manitoba. I realize, as I said at the outset, that there is no easy solution to trying to curb that and I believe that the only way we're going to try and alleviate some of the problems that we have with regard to this is by continued public awareness with regard to that.

Mr. Chairman, I remember a number of years ago going up to Thompson and going out fishing with a few people at Paint Lake and they took me up to the mouth of the river up there. Of course, I was always told that fishing at Paint Lake was really really good so I went up there — as I mentioned they took me out — we started jigging for pickerel and after about half-an-hour of jigging, we hadn't had any luck till suddenly I snagged something. I started pulling it up; I thought I had a pickerel. I reeled it up and here it was a pop can that had been in the water for about five years. That's the only thing we caught that day. They tell me, of course, and the Member for Thompson can confirm this that the fishing usually is much better than that. But I think it illustrates the particular problem that I think I find particularly frustrating.

Having over the years also flown out with a number of people that run fly in fishing camps and things like that, I notice that many of the operators are now going ahead and making very sure that the people they bring in are supplied adequately with garbage bags and are very concerned. When you come out, they do a check to make sure that the garbage comes back out with you and then they dispose of it back home. But I

think that one of the areas we're really going to have to work on is this particular area. We want to make sure that we preserve our natural heritage and I think that's one of the biggest pluses of living in Manitoba is being able to just motor a short 60 minutes from wherever you live and be able to enjoy the Manitoba outdoors. One of the things that really will in the future make that less enjoyable is to go out to different places and find all kinds of garbage, bottles and cans lying around.

I know that there have been resolutions presented in this House dealing with bottle returns, dealing with can returns such as Alberta has adopted. Maybe further on in the Session, we can discuss that type of resolution during Private Members' Hour again. But I note that when you do provide a proper return — I know in talking to some of the brewery companies — beer bottles, for instance, have a very high return of something like 96 to 97 percent, I believe, which means that there's very little problem with those. But it is the cans, it is the excess bottles and the garbage, especially things like tin foil and that, that really causes a lot of problems.

So as I said at the outset, this is a concern. I realize that it's not something that can happen overnight but I would urge the Minister to continue public awareness, to make sure that our children can enjoy the same type of blue water and uncluttered lake bottoms that we enjoy and can once again go out there and have a good time in our outdoors and, hopefully, enjoy the same type of things that I have. I hope my son will be able to enjoy those very same things.

MR. COWAN: I thank the member for those comments. There are a couple issues at hand here. One is bottles and the other is general litter.

In respect to general litter, the type of programs which he suggested are important are in fact programs of public awareness where we have an opportunity to convince those individuals who are using the lakes and the parks that they should be leaving the area in which they are visiting in the way in which it was when they first came to that area. So that's an important process as well.

The other is in respect to bottles and the member's specific example revolved around fishing in Paint Lake and catching a bottle instead of pickerel and that is a problem as well. As the member may be aware, there is a voluntary agreement with the beverage distributors in the City of Winnipeg and the southern part of the province that they will not use nonreturnable bottles and they will not promote cans. We have had difficulty in Northern Manitoba convincing the beverage distributors of the benefits of that program. I shouldn't say that we had trouble convincing them of the benefits of the program because they know full well the benefits of the program, but because of the high transportation cost, there is another factor thrown in. So it has been a somewhat more difficult situation in Northern Manitoba. We are presently discussing it with the beverage distributor in the north at the staff level and in Thompson, and we are also discussing at the staff level and I believe I have a meeting very shortly with an individual who has a proposal which is worthy of consideration that could apply to Thompson and the bottles in that area and also could apply to

the general recycling of glass products in the province. So I hope to be able to report back in more specific detail on those two subjects. In the future, however, we will continue to use the mechanisms which we have available to increase public awareness of the problem and also of the solutions that are available to them.

At the same time, we will be meeting with individuals who are coming forward with proposals which may in fact diminish some of the problems in respect to glass containers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. GARY FILMON (Tuxedo): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to return to a topic that we broached last evening, but the Minister didn't really give us a very direct response to when I mentioned the emphasis that his government is giving to environmental matters at the present time. We spoke in terms of budget allotment and the Minister acknowledged that the budget allotment for the Environmental Management Division was less than the average of the expenditure increases throughout the Estimates. He indicated that if he had been spending more than that perhaps he would have been subject to criticism for spending too much and, on the other hand, in spending less he acknowledges the pitfalls of some of that. But, in terms of his Ministry and in terms of his devotion and commitment to the protection of the environment that he has said over and over again that he has repeated in very glowing terms, I must say that I was more than a little troubled at the Throne Speech and the very little attention that was paid to environmental matters given this Minister's presumed commitment to environmental issues.

I'll read from the Throne Speech because there are only two sentences that refer to environmental matters; it says, "Public hearings on hazardous waste site selection will be held" and we are familiar with that and that's in response to the Reid Crowther Study and it's a measure that's been in place that he's carrying out and he says, "the issue of acid rain will be addressed by increased monitoring and public information programs." You know, I have to say in paraphrasing a well-known statement — Is that all there is? Because if the issue of acid rain, which this Minister has is a very critical one only deserves increased monitoring and I've already complimented the Minister for the increased monitoring and the release of this publication that we had prepared and maybe some more public information, is that all there really is to the solution of the problem?

MR. COWAN: We addressed the issue in the Throne Speech from the perspective which the Member for Tuxedo has just provided, certainly, and during the Estimates we have as well discussed our options in respect to dealing with the acid precipitation and the problems it creates, we've talked about informational programs, we've talked about monitoring, we've talked about the meeting which was just held with the four Western Environmental Ministers to discuss a co-ordinated approach, development of baseline data and the development of appropriate control strate-

gies which would be complementary to each other and we have also discussed it with the Federal Minister in respect to his overtures and what he has been doing in that area.

I have to note as well that many of the industries are taking it upon themselves to deal with this problem in a significant way as well. We just had the announcement today that Shell Canada Limited will cut its sulphur dioxide emissions by more than half with the installation of a \$10 million sulphur recovery plant at its oil refinery in this city. So those sorts of proposals are coming forward from those groups as well, so put together I think we are dealing with the problem in a significant way and would hope that that sort of approach will provide the results which we would like it to provide.

MR. FILMON: I am pleased to hear that and, in fact, I was referring specifically to that sort of thing. This article indicates and I heard today an interview with an official from Shell Canada which confirmed that Shell is now carrying out a commitment which it took when it received its order in 1977 to achieve at least a 50-percent reduction in acid rain in the production of sulphur dioxide. They are, indeed, apparently going to be able to achieve a 60 percent reduction in sulphur dioxide emissions by virtue of the program that they have in place and it's that kind of thing that Clean Environment Commission orders and particularly Ministerially varied Clean Environment Commissions orders have, over the past while, sought to achieve as to put on the table an intended future action knowing that these industries would have some pretty difficult decisions and some rather costly measures to put in place to achieve some significant reductions in sulphur dioxide production.

Can the Minister indicate to us exactly what his projections would be, what his intentions would be in approaching industries that are coming up in the not-too-distant future? INCO is one, as I understand, will be before public hearings in March or April. What will his division be suggesting is achievable or is possible in terms of sulphur dioxide emissions by INCO or what is his division now going to be requiring of INCO in terms of future planning for the ultimate solution to the acid rain problem which is reduction of the emissions?

MR. COWAN: I am pleased to inform the Member for Tuxedo that the Clean Environment Commission on INCO will be held, as I understand it, from May 4th to 6th. So that hearing, in fact, is upcoming. The division will be making representation as a part of that hearing as is the normal course and we will be providing to the Clean Environment Commission hearing our thoughts and concerns respecting the specific problem which is faced in that area as well as the overall problem which we face and any future potential problems which we have been able to determine are worthy of further clarification. I can't at this time say specifically what the recommendation of the Environmental Management Division will be because I have not seen it. However, I have suggested to them as I said earlier, that we have to provide our representations from that perspective. The perspective of immediate potential for degradation, the perspective of effects outside of

the local area, and the perspective of future effects.

So, once we provide that information it will be done so in a public way and we will then be able to discuss in detail exactly what it was that was said at that time. I can't, at this time. However I can provide the member with the general outline which I have just provided to him. The Still Waters report which was done by the Federal Government highlighted a number of areas in Manitoba as being potential problem areas and suggested as well that the governments have to sit down and talk about ways by which they can assist as much as possible these industries when they have to make these major renovations to deal with acid precipitation problems. And when we were in Saskatoon that topic was brought forward by the Manitoba delegation and we do want to see those sorts of meetings begin because we know that the type of requirements which we believe will be necessary in the long-term are costly requirements and we want to see every way possible to ensure that they are undertaken and not prevented because they are too costly to accomplish.

MR. FILMON: Well, is the Minister then indicating that he might consider some sort of public funding of the measures that would be necessary to effect the kinds of emission reduction that he's talking about? Is he suggesting that the government ought to consider participating in the costs of this emission reduction?

MR. COWAN: I'm not suggesting that is a specific course of action, I'm saying that's one of the options which could be addressed and could be addressed from a greater to a lesser extent depending on the information which was brought forward at the time.

What we do have to do though is to participate in solving the problem. Let me be more specific. In this instance, one of the reasons, as the Member for Tuxedo well knows, Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting and INCO have some reservations about putting in scrubbers, and for that reason producing a fair amount of sulphuric acid, is that they have no market for the sulphuric acid in the area. So, it is hoped that the provincial governments and the Federal Governments by sitting down together can look for ways by which those markets can be developed. That reduces the financial implication of the action on the part of the private sector companies in attempting to curb their pollution problems.

So, is that the use of public monies to assist them? In a way it is, although I don't think it's the type of direct subsidy program which the Member for Tuxedo was suggesting we should look at. We are prepared to look at all the options because quite frankly I don't have the specific answer other than to know that there is a very serious problem and we have to take some very direct action to deal with that problem.

MR. FILMON: Well, what I was considering was a statement made by a fellow Minister of the Environment at a conference or a meeting about a month ago and it may well have been the one to which he refers in Regina. Mr. Bowerman, the Minister of the Environment in Saskatchewan, indicated that he felt that their government might consider participating in the costs of pollution controls; emission controls on facilities such as the Alsands Plant in Alberta for other extra-

provincial plants that might contribute to a potential acid rain problem in Saskatchewan. He said that it would not be beyond his consideration to look into that as a possibility because in his view it would be in Saskatchewan's interest to ensure that the emissions from the Alsands Plant or from coal fired hydro-electric steam generating facilities in Alberta or other things that might have a significant, adverse impact on Saskatchewan's environment; it might be in Saskatchewan's interest to sit down and discuss some direct funding from Saskatchewan to ensure that the problems were addressed properly. Does this Minister feel that's a fair approach?

MR. COWAN: Perhaps I can elaborate upon that statement and hopefully not put connotations into it which the Minister of the Environment for Saskatchewan, Mr. Ted Bowerman did not intend to be there. I was party to that meeting as the member suggested might be the case. During the meeting we discussed the Federal guidelines on thermal generating plants in respect to sulphur dioxide emissions. Saskatchewan is looking at constructing a number of, or at least at this point one or more, thermal generating plants in the southern part of their province. As the member is aware, the soils in the southern part of Saskatchewan are in fact not as susceptible to acid precipitation as are the soils in Northern Manitoba in the Precambrian Shield area, or in Northern Alberta in similar areas, or in Northern Saskatchewan as the case may be; anywhere where there's Precambrian Shield areas. So, what Mr. Bowerman was suggesting was, it would cost them millions of dollars and I don't recall the exact figure, although I think \$80 million was a figure that was used — I might have to stand corrected on that specific figure — to deal with the problem of acid precipitation and to meet Federal guidelines on their coal-generating plants in the southern part of the province. At the same time he suggested that the emission of sulphur dioxide particles in the area might even in fact deal somewhat with the natural alkalinity of the soil in the area. So, I don't think he went so far as to say it was a good thing but he certainly implied by that statement that it was not necessarily a negative impact.

So, he said if we have to spend — and let's use a figure of \$80 million and maybe stand corrected on that — to put coal scrubbers in those plants where there's not going to be any problem perhaps we would be better advised to take that \$80 million and spend it on control technology in areas where the problem is more significant and where there is going to be for certain degradation of the environment as a result of emissions in that area. It's an intriguing concept and one which has some very vague parallels in other areas as well. I would hate at this point to say that it is a route that they would follow, but I can assure the Member for Tuxedo that if they're interested in putting that kind of money into preventing sulphur dioxide emissions in areas that are susceptible, then perhaps we should be looking at that offer and try to determine if in fact there is a way to use that innovative approach. It would need a great deal of further consideration and review and investigation but I'd be prepared to undertake that.

MR. FILMON: The Minister has had quite some experience in dealing with or at least has read a great deal about the acid precipitation problem and has discussed it in this House on numerous occasions in the past and coming into his office as a Minister I would think that he has some rather broad general objectives in mind for future reductions in the emissions of sulphur dioxide and the oxides of nitrogen and so on. Just so that we have some background against which to perhaps judge this Minister's directions and objectives and goals, I wonder if he could indicate or share with us what he feels is possible and what he feels he'd like to work towards with respect to future reductions of sulphur dioxide emissions?

MR. COWAN: Just recently the Minister of the Environment of the Federal Government entered into some very specific negotiations with the Government of the United States in respect to a treaty which would commit both governments to specific levels of sulphur dioxide reductions in their respective countries. The suggestion was that by the end of the decade we reduce sulphur dioxide emissions by 50 percent.

That's a fairly specific objective and one which may or may not be able to be reached, but one which I support. The member asked how specifically would we reach that objective. I think we have to do it looking at our prime emissions sources and assisting where we can with our expertise to provide technology so that they can bring forward control measures which, in fact, will help them accomplish that. I don't have the specific answer right now and I know they don't have the specific answer right now, and there comes a point when you say to them that they have to find that specific answer; that it has become such a problem that it can no longer be allowed to continue at the rate to which it is presently occurring. I don't know if we've reached that stage right now but I know that if we haven't been able to reduce our emissions by 50 percent in 10 years, or even less than 10 years, at the present time, if we use the end of the decade as a benchmark, then we are going to have to assess that whole process and find ways to do that, because we know that degradation is occurring as a result of those emissions. We know that it will become more serious because it is a cumulative effect, rather than an isolated effect and we are going to have to put in place the type of control measures which will accomplish those magnitudes of reduction which are very high magnitudes of reduction.

So I agree with that 50 percent reduction by the end of the decade. What specific reduction would take place in Manitoba would have to remain to be seen. The suggestion was that it be 50 or 60 percent, I believe —(Interjection)— I'm sorry, I'm told that it would less than 60 percent from Manitoba; it would be 50 percent, or less, from Manitoba. It gets somewhat complex but I know the Member for Tuxedo will know very well that about which I am talking right now, and also, some of the new concepts, I would appreciate his comments upon, because they are new and I don't think they were addressed in his time as Minister responsible.

The Member for Tuxedo is probably aware that the Federal Government was suggesting that there be a bubble concept put in place for the reductions, and

that bubble be everything east of the Manitoba-Saskatchewan border, and that the overall 50 percent reduction take place in that bubble. There were negotiations between the different provinces in respect to the overall figure which would be presented to the United States as a part of the negotiations. Certain provinces suggested that it should be a higher reduction; certain provinces suggested that it be a lower reduction, and there was a consensus figure of 50 percent worked out. The Honourable John Roberts called me the day before he was going to Washington to begin the negotiations with the United States Government and asked if we would support that consensus. At that time I requested of him a commitment that, in fact, was a true consensus; that all of the provinces had agreed to it. He said that was the case, and upon that caveat, I provided him with our commitment to that reduction, so that's a matter of public record.

When we were in Saskatoon discussing this very problem with the four western Ministers responsible for the Environment, we talked about another concept, and that's a two-bubble concept. One bubble being everything east of the Manitoba-Saskatchewan border or everything east of the Manitoba-Ontario border; that could be one bubble, one of those two options, and the other bubble could be everything west of either the Manitoba-Saskatchewan border or everything west of the Ontario-Manitoba border.

There are suggestions that both bubbles would be appropriate and we are now in the process of discussing that among the four western provinces and I hope to discuss it with the Federal Government in the near future and get their feedback on, as the Member for Tuxedo says, and I don't want to steal his pun, the double-bubble concept.

So that's where that concept stands right at the moment. I would appreciate any comments he may have to provide to me in respect to that second concept which is one I don't believe was addressed previously. There is some reason to have a second bubble, a bubble that includes the four prairie provinces, or the four western provinces, excuse me. The Minister responsible for Environment in British Columbia got quite justifiably upset with me when I kept referring to them as the Prairie Provinces, so he put me in my place. The four western provinces' bubble is a concept which is, in my opinion, worthy of further consideration and one which I would appreciate any comments that the Member for Tuxedo might want to discuss here.

MR. FILMON: While the Minister is chewing on that concept for a bit I will ask him, in view of the fact that he suggests that he supports the 50 percent reduction in sulphur dioxide emissions as an objective for the near future, and in view of the fact that INCO is coming up for review for their order on their emissions later this year, and in view of the fact that a decision will have to be made with respect to HBM & S in September of next year, where does the Minister stand with respect to, assuming that there may be some problems in technology and process, and there may be some limitations due to the age of the facilities that are involved in these particular smelters, where does the Minister stand with respect to the potential

loss of jobs if it comes down to a decision that involves significant losses of jobs in those two communities as a result of his decision. How will he then approach that problem?

MR. COWAN: We will have to address the issue of that potential problem at that time but I can assure the Member for Tuxedo that will be a consideration and, hopefully, by that time, there will be technological advances made that will allow us to accomplish those reductions without significant loss of jobs. However, if that is not the case, then we're going to have to look at all the options that are available to us and that's the process which will have to unfold at that time.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I think that before we leave this item, the Member for Turtle Mountain had a couple of comments or questions he wanted to make with respect to acid rain.

MR. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A couple of questions. The pamphlet that the Minister distributed said that acid rain damage has not been identified in Manitoba. I would just like the Minister to confirm that, indeed, that still is the case, that's the latest information that's available. And could he inform the committee about the experiment which I believe INCO has under way at Thompson for the reduction of the sulphur problem?

MR. COWAN: The pamphlet is basically correct when it makes the statements which the member did, and it also suggests that the potential exists for damage and that's what we are addressing our attention to at the moment. I'm just getting some more specific information on the process at INCO which the member asked a question about and will provide that to him as soon as I have it in my possession.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, also in the past when the question had been discussed of what might be done to reduce the emission problem at Flin Flon or Thompson, the question of what to do with the sulphuric acid that would result was always a fairly major one and to my recollection there would be vast quantities of sulphuric acid that would have to be transported. If that was the case, I wonder how the Minister would assess that as a problem in itself. If you have trainloads of sulphuric acid being hauled across the country these days, given the frequency of train wrecks, how serious an environmental hazard would that be?

MR. COWAN: The problem with the by-products which result from the control strategies is one which we addressed very briefly previously when we talked about the recommendations of the Still Waters Report when they suggested that considerable attention has to be paid to that particular problem. The transportation of those types of by-products would be one which would be of concern, we would have to take a look at the entire transportation process and develop strategies to minimize any potential for environmental accidents resulting from those at the same time. It's obvious that we could not, in fact, totally ensure that they would be eliminated but that would be part

of our consideration deliberation, certainly.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move to a couple of other areas then that the Minister made some reference to earlier. He spoke about the possibility of introducing an Environmental Assessment and Review Act to the Legislature. I wonder if he'd care to elaborate at all on that possible thrust.

MR. COWAN: We've asked for an additional staff person year to be used to assist in that particular section of the department to review the Acts which are placed in the other jurisdictions and also to review the need for Acts in our jurisdiction, the need for changes in the Act in our own jurisdiction to ensure that we have in place assessment review legislation which provides for ample opportunity to assess any project which is being brought onstream or being seriously considered in a specific way.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, would this have application simply to government projects as is now done by matter of policy or is the Minister saying that this would apply to all projects in the province that might have an impact on the environment?

MR. COWAN: We are reviewing both options, although I think to say all projects in the province would be too all-inclusive, although we will take a look at that. I think what you want to look at is your major projects and when we are going through the review process we will be looking at both options certainly.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, earlier we talked about assessing environmental quality, I would draw to the Minister's attention that in The Wildlife Act which was passed by the legislature two years ago there was a provision within that Act which required the department to report upon the status of many different species of wildlife that are listed in Schedule A of that Act. The Act requires if that the status of the populations be outlined, that the management programs that have been undertaken during the previous five years be dealt with and evaluated in some way and that the advisability or how the government plans to manage the resource over the ensuing years, how adequate the populations are likely to be to meet the demands that might be placed upon them?

I wonder if the Minister is giving any consideration to putting that type of legislative reporting requirement into an Act of the Legislature as it relates to environmental quality in the province?

MR. COWAN: I haven't given it consideration as of yet, but I am prepared to take a look at the suggestion and to give it consideration, certainly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could turn to the topic earlier referred to of the establishment of a disposal facility in Manitoba. Could I ask, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister is currently working on the blueprint or the directions that were recommended

by the Reid Crowther Study?

I referred yesterday in my opening remarks to a desire to find out exactly what the position of Alberta is, the position of Saskatchewan, and whether or not this Minister is still considering the possibility of hazardous waste from Northwestern Ontario coming into this province? In other words, are we working on the possibility of a central facility in Alberta that could take care of some of the wastes, would a physical chemical treatment facility in Saskatchewan-Manitoba or are we looking at a incineration facility here or what exactly is the plan, and what is the status of the other provinces response to the Reid Crowther Study?

MR. COWAN: The first question I guess was that of what is happening in the other jurisdictions, and I have a brief status report of each of those jurisdictions which I can provide to the Member for Tuxedo. British Columbia is now seeking competitive proposals for the handling and management of special waste. They have put out calls for these proposals, asked for Letters of Intent which were sent January 26, 1982 and they have set a deadline of March 1, 1982 as a date for receipt of those Letters of Intent. From those Letters of Intent there will be one proposal, perhaps a couple of proposals selected for further review and asked to submit detailed proposals. Those detailed proposals are due on July 1, 1982. They have not done any site selection work as of yet in British Columbia in respect to sighting a site. They are intending, according to my information, to introduce a Waste Management Act in their Legislature this spring.

In Alberta, it is my understanding, that detailed site selection work has been under way for a year at the present time but they have yet to select a specific site. They have called for proposals for a hazardous waste management facility on February 2nd, 1982 and those proposals are due on March 15th, 1982. As it is anticipated now, a Crown agency will provide the framework for the Hazardous Waste Management System and private ownership and operation of the system is preferred in their case. Legislation will be introduced this spring again, I understand, and government-owned land will be used for the sighting of such a site. Saskatchewan has not done specific work to date to our knowledge on this and Ontario has abandoned the South Cayuga Site, which was previously chosen because of technical considerations and as well to address adverse public reaction.

This matter was discussed briefly in Saskatoon at the meeting of the four Ministers responsible for Environment in the four western provinces and at that time it was suggested to me that a centralized site and having feeder systems into that site as proposed for the Reid Crowther Report would probably not come to pass, that each of the provinces would be acting on their own. It was also suggested if we wanted to be that central location that they would consider that as well. But as the member knows there is a fair amount of adverse public reaction to that, some of it justified, some of it certainly feeding upon some misconceptions. The establishment of a definitive site selection process and implementation plan here in the province is called for in this year's Estimates. We are making a request for money to pursue that.

We also will be asking the public to be involved in

that process in a very open and comprehensive way. We're now investigating options for site selection, how we can proceed with actual site selection, and these options range from using an outside engineering firm as a consultant to the appointment of a full site selection board as has been done in other jurisdictions.

The department has also had discussions with the Federal Government and an agreement in principle has been arrived at concerning cost-sharing of the site selection process in Manitoba. Meetings are planned in the very near future to discuss with federal officials the specifics of cost-sharing Manitoba's site selection process. While it is not finalized at this time, we will be having that full sort of public participation, public consultation which we discussed earlier in regard to that site selection process. I'm not certain as to what the latest decision is in respect to waste materials from Northern Ontario, I'll find that information out and get back to the member on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Tuxedo.

MR. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Minister could indicate, there were some earlier media reports I'd say about a month ago, of a meeting between the Minister and representatives of Indian Band 40 with respect to their proposed 300 cottage lot development on Shoal Lake, and the media report indicated that the Minister was favourably disposed to the proposal, and I just wonder if he might clarify this because of the fact that of course the City of Winnipeg derives its water supply from Shoal Lake and I would think that there would be many people who would be interested in just what the Minister's position is with respect to this proposed development?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COWAN: Well, my comments at that meeting were that before such a road would be constructed that there would have to be a full environmental assessment of that road, and the effect of that road, undertaken. During the course of that assessment, there would have to be consideration given to the effect of any such construction of that road on the water supply for the City of Winnipeg. That consideration would include, as a matter of course, an analysis of the actual effect of the road itself and its influence on drainage in the area and its influence on other geographical conditions and environmental conditions in the area. That analysis would also have to take into consideration the potential for environmental degradation or degradation of the water quality of the City of Winnipeg water supply as a result of that road opening up areas for development, and that is a criteria which we will not bend away from. That is a criteria which must be in place and one which the Member for Tuxedo I am certain insisted on as well that there must be that sort of assessment review process before such a road is constructed.

MR. FILMON: Well, could the Minister indicate whether or not he sees any potential risk of degradation to the city's water supply from the possible introduction of say 300 private sewage disposal systems,

increased boating, swimming, recreational use of the watershed from which the city derives its water supply? Does he see any potential risk there?

MR. COWAN: Yes, I see the potential for risk in that instance and that's why we were insistent upon the full sort of assessment hearings which would allow us to assess that.

As well, as the member is aware, there's a FEARA Study ongoing on the area, which will come up with further information which we can assess as well, but the road itself cannot be constructed independent of the considerations for the potential degradation of that particular area as a result of increased usage such as the member has outlined, so that is instrumental and key in our decision making process. That environmental assessment review process must be undertaken and it must be undertaken in a meaningful way so as to attempt to determine not only the immediate impacts of any road construction in the area, which may or may not be significant, but also to take into consideration the way in which that construction would open up other opportunities for development which may or may not be considerable in respect to their impact on the water quality as well. We must ensure a safe water quality for the largest city in the province and in order to do so, we must ensure that we proceed safely in respect to analyzing and reviewing this particular subject and we will do so by taking into account all the potentialities which are brought to our attention. That potentiality is certainly one of them which has been brought to our attention.

MR. FILMON: Is the department going to be making a formal presentation to the FEARA Review on the Shoal Lake application for cottage lot development?

MR. COWAN: Once we have the environmental assessment so that we can analyze it and make comments upon it, we will be making an official representation to the FEARA review.

MR. FILMON: When is that assessment expected?

MR. COWAN: A while ago, and it has not been forthcoming, so I could not tell the Member for Tuxedo when the assessment is expected at this time. The assessment of course is a requirement of the proponent and the proponent in this instance is the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development on behalf of the Shoal Lake Band and it has not been forthcoming, so until it is forthcoming, we can't make our analysis; until we make our analysis, we can't provide our expert opinion but at the same time the FEARA Review can't conclude until it's forthcoming so because it is not here at this time, it does not mean that we are putting in danger our involvement or we are lessening or diminishing our involvement, I should say, in the process. We intend to be there and to make an official representation.

MR. FILMON: A couple of months ago the Minister, along with his department was faced with a chemical spill that occurred on the CN main line near Austin. I'd like to know if the Minister believes that the methods that were put in place to collect and dispose of the

materials that were contaminated; the soil and the material that was contaminated as a result of the spill, does he believe that the methods that were used were the proper methods and the best method of handling the consequences of the spill at that time?

MR. COWAN: As for the disposal process in the community of Lynn Lake and at the Sherritt-Gordon tailings, yes, I have I have been assured and I am convinced that is an appropriate way to dispose of those particular chemicals. What we have is chemicals which are alkaline in nature going to an area which is acidic in nature and going in a form which provides a great deal of good prairie soil to the mining company to assist them in the reclamation of their tailing fields which is something that they have to undertake as a result of environmental legislation. So, I believe that's the proper way to dispose of them. They are contained in an area where they would have to go through four diking systems in order to enter into the water system of the area. Even if they were to do that, the impacts would probably be overwhelmed by the impacts of the full tailings pond going into the diking area. In other words we'd have a major catastrophe rather than the minor catastrophe which would be presented by the introduction of those chemicals into the water supply in that way.

The transportation of them, I had some concerns about. I made some suggestions; some of which were followed through by CNR; some of which weren't followed through by CNR. At the time I made it known that I had some concerns about the way in which they were transported. I have some concerns about the way in which I handled that. I had a letter from The Pas Council; the Mayor of The Pas who was quite upset because we had not provided him with the type of information which I know is so necessary to him to be able to make an informed decision. I regret that we did not do that. It was not part of the plan; it was not followed through with. I didn't think far enough in advance to make certain that it happened and I take responsibility for that mistake, that oversight on my part. As a matter of fact, I've just sent a letter off to the Mayor of The Pas today or it will be going out in tomorrow's mail telling him that I regret very much that he was caused inconvenience and was caused some difficulty as a result of my failing to see that very necessary part of the process was followed through with. So, I have concerns about the way in which I handled it.

I also have some concerns about the way in which the cars were covered. I am told that technically that is a perfectly acceptable way and that it is certainly not a problem based on the best available technical knowledge that I had at my disposal; I agreed with that. But I could be convinced that too was perhaps not the best course of action but I am assured that it is. It's a value judgement. It's a call shot. I had to go with the information which was provided to me and respect that. As it turned out, it appeared to be the proper information. So, my concerns while well-founded were not borne out in their entirety although I think it's better to be concerned and to be somewhat cautious and hesitant than not to be concerned and allow for things to happen which should not happen. So, I had concerns about that.

I also had a number of minor concerns about placarding of the cars and I discussed those with CNR and we came to a difference of opinion on that. So be it. I gave them the best advice I thought I could give them and they did not see it the way in which I saw it, so we agreed to disagree on that. As it turned out there was no great difficulty brought to my attention but I would have preferred to have seen the cars placarded differently. So that's another area.

These are all areas that we are going to sit down now that the cleanup has been fairly well completed, I understand that all the gondola cars have been unloaded and that they are now being steam cleaned and brought back into the system. So, we now have an opportunity to sit down with our own staff and staff of EMO and staff of Safety and Health and discuss this along with the staff of CNR. We may disagree again on certain things that we believe should be done but we're going to try to put in place the best possible mechanism to deal with those.

So, the question specifically was, did I have concerns? Yes, I did have concerns. Do I have concerns? I still have some concerns and we're trying to rectify those. Do I think we can do it better? Certainly, I think we can do it better but I think the final disposal method was one that was appropriate and one which was given a great deal of consideration previous to its implementation.

MR. FILMON: The Minister refers to having had advice and information provided to him with respect to the loading and transportation and the means of handling the transportation of the contaminated soil and so on and saying that he wasn't sure that it was the best advice but it turned out to be the proper advice under the circumstances. He also said that he felt that he followed the best advice with respect to the method of collection and ultimate disposal. May I ask whose advice he was following in these instances?

MR. COWAN: There was a team that was put together that included the environmental management division; the Clean Environment Section of the Federal Government, CNR and I, from time to time, discussed it with my staff and they provided me with that input as well. I also listened to anyone who wanted to provide me with specific advice as to the appropriateness of that particular disposal method.

MR. FILMON: May I ask the Minister then how is it that he's now satisfied to follow the advice of these very people in handling this so-called hazardous waste residue from a chemical spill when two years ago he found the advice coming from these same officials unsound in a similar train derailment in the MacGregor instance?

MR. COWAN: I would not accept that they are similar derailments. They dealt with two very different types of substances, however, I would suggest that we have all learned something over two years' time. That includes my staff and myself as well.

MR. FILMON: I would suggest that there's no question you were dealing with different chemicals and different elements but the fact of the matter is that the

technical advice was well aware of the difference as well and gave that information to the Minister at that time as they gave information to the Minister who was responsible two years ago, and I make the point that the advice, in the position of the Minister's office, he found to be worthy of consideration and worthy of following, was being given to him by exactly the same people whose advice he found unsound two years ago.

I'd like to switch to another topic, Mr. Chairman, but perhaps the Member for Turtle Mountain has a couple of items that he'd like to place at the present time.

MR. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Earlier this evening, when we spoke about the problem of trying to balance economic development with maintenance of the integrity, the functioning of ecological systems, and I know that we're all concerned presently about the prospects for economic development in Manitoba, and that prior to the election last November, there were a number of projects that were under consideration, one of those being the possibility of establishing an aluminum smelter northwest of the city, I have recently been looking through some of the resolutions that were presented to the New Democratic Party convention a few weeks ago. Two of them, for instance, that come to mind, one said that: Whereas, if the Alcan project poses a serious threat to the environment; Therefore be it resolved that it be rejected and another one that was calling for the establishment of an independent environment commission to be established with a mandate to hold public hearings covered by the media into the adverse effects of all levels of fluoride emissions from the aluminum production, and further: Be it resolved that no agreement to permit the establishment of an Alcan Plant in Manitoba shall be made until the findings of such a commission are published, it was my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that last fall there was a process getting under way that would have led to the rather detailed examination of that project from an environmental point of view and, indeed, from a socio-economic point of view as well. I wonder if the Minister could report to the committee on the progress of those evaluations and whether they will, in fact, meet with the concerns raised at the New Democratic Party convention?

MR. COWAN: Oh, those resolutions. The resolutions which the member read out, I'm not sure whether they were passed by the convention. They may have or they may not have been passed by the convention, so I don't want to address them from the perspective. However, I do wish to inform him that we have some concerns about the environmental assessment review process and the socioeconomic review process, in the way in which they mesh together, so we have been attempting to address those concerns and attempting to devise a way by which they can more fully work together to provide the type of overview to which they were developed to provide. So, from that perspective, I think our actions are, in fact, taking into account the thrust and the general strategy of our direction as provided by resolution. We want to ensure that we have an environmental assessment review process that is in place that takes into account, not only enviro-

onmental concerns, but socioeconomic concerns as well, and does so from the perspective of recognizing the inter-relatedness of those two different, but very complementary subject areas.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could elaborate then on his concerns that he has about how the two processes mesh and how the processes will differ now from processes that were in place and getting under way last November.

MR. COWAN: The difficulty, as I see it, is that you have one group doing a socio-economic impact analysis and you have another group doing an environmental impact analysis, and you had structured two bodies which would listen to representations from the general public on both of those subject areas, and there was the potential for confusion on the part of those individuals giving representations as to why they had to come back and forth and deal with the two bodies when, in fact, the final statement was going to be meshed into one analysis by which decision makers could address the issue. So I would like to see one body dealing with both of those subject areas and doing so at one set of public hearings so that we reduce the potential for that sort of confusion.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, it was my understanding that there really would only be one set of hearings, in any case; that people making presentations would be able to make their presentation and two different groups would listen to it, but that really isn't the important point, as far as I'm concerned. If the Minister chooses to set it up so that he has one body that is assessing them, then I don't particularly question that, but what I am interested in is the time scheduling that the process is following now. At what stage is it at now? Is work being done within the department? Is work being contracted out? When are hearings likely to begin? Could he tell us a little more about how the process is actually getting under way?

MR. COWAN: Due to the change in the pre-conditions or the way in which the negotiations were being undertaken, and the fact that there are no pre-conditions, those timetables that were put forward previously have, in fact, been reviewed, and we are now at the point that we are internally looking at the proposals which have been brought forward, and analyzing them internally. I could not tell him a specific date when public hearings will be held. I can assure him that public hearings will be held and that we will do everything in our power to ensure that they're held in a comprehensive way. We would, at this point, be unable to provide a specific date until those negotiations proceed further on than they are at the present time. It would not be to our benefit to undertake full public hearings at this stage, when we are not ready for those type of public hearings yet, but they will be part of that process.

Mr. Chairperson, seeing as how I've given some assurances to members opposite, and also to my own colleagues, that we would try to abide by the 10 o'clock hour, I would suggest, at this point, that it might be appropriate for committee to rise and we could discuss this same item seeing as how we're on

the same general line, tomorrow, during the Estimates. Committee rise?

MR. RANSOM: I have no great objection to the Minister wishing to have the committee rise now, and obviously if he moves the motion and has the numbers, the committee will rise, but his reference to observing the 10 o'clock deadline, or rule, part of the reason for having the committee and waiving the 10 o'clock adjournment hour was so that we could proceed and get business done a little more quickly. While I don't see that it's valuable to proceed to a late hour every night, I simply tell the Honourable Minister that from the point of view of procedure we have no great desire to quit every evening at 10 o'clock, that we'd be prepared to consider to move longer in the consideration of the Estimates but the Minister has moved that Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise