

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, 6 May, 1987.

Time — 1:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER, Hon. M. Phillips: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . .

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I have a non-political statement. I can give it now, or, if members insist, afterwards. (Agreed)

I thank honourable members.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, as members of this House are indeed aware, the YMCA's in Winnipeg and Brandon have announced their Women of the Year and . . .

HON. M. SMITH: YM-YWCA; men and women.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Oh, Young Men and Young Women?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes.

HON. H. PAWLEY: That's not the way I read it. Women of the Year distinction awards.

These awards are presented annually as a tribute to the contribution all Manitoba women have made to our province, to our country, to specifically honour those women who have been selected for special recognition in their particular field.

I had the pleasure of attending the Women of Distinction Awards held in Brandon, along with the Member for River Heights, last month, and at that time offered my congratulations, on behalf of the people of Manitoba, to this year's winners.

They were: Sandy McNabb for Agriculture; Peggy Sharpe for Arts; Gertrude Jasper for Community Affairs; Vivian Campbell in the professional category; Moira Bonar for Public Service; and Pat Farris and Debbie Arsenault for Sports and Health; and Gladys Worthington for business.

I'm sure all members of the House join me in congratulating these women and saying thank you for all that they have done to contribute to the life and vitality of the province.

Last night, in Winnipeg, the Winnipeg YM-YW - I hope you're right, that's not what my notes say - gave out their Women of the Year Awards, again honouring not only those winners, but all Manitoba women.

I would like to congratulate all those who were nominated, including the Honourable Member for River Heights.

In all, eight Manitoba women were recognized for their outstanding contributions to our province: Evelyn

Hart for her contribution to the Arts; Sheryl McDonald for Business; Lesley Hughes for Communications; Lydia Giles for Community Services; Pegi Hayes for Fitness, Recreation and Sport; Noralou Roos for the Professional category; in the area of Management/Labour, our own Deputy Minister of Labour, Mary Eady.

And, finally, Madam Speaker, allow me, on behalf of the Government of the Province of Manitoba, and I know all members of this Chamber, to congratulate you for being named Woman of the Year in the area of Public Affairs.

To you, to all the winners, the nominees and indeed to all the women of Manitoba, thank you for all that you've done to make this a better place to live and to work.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: I am pleased, on behalf of all of my colleagues, to join with the Premier in congratulating all of those women who have been so suitably honoured in these distinguished women awards that have been presented, particularly to you, Madam Speaker, and to the Member for River Heights for the acknowledgment of your capabilities and services to our province. I hope, Madam Speaker, that doesn't indicate an intention to grow a hedge around your Chair. Madam Speaker, we think that you should suitably be recognized for this achievement and certainly not try to hide from the public your understandable pride in this accomplishment.

Madam Speaker, we join the Premier in extending congratulations and best wishes to all of those who have been honoured by these distinguished awards.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, I have a Ministerial Statement and I have copies for distribution.

I would like to announce that this is Forest Week in Manitoba and throughout all Canada. The potted seedling before each of you is a Colorado Blue Spruce. While it is not an indigenous or commercial species, it is one of the most popular spruce used for ornamental yard planting.

The seedling is intended to represent the importance of our trees in our economic and recreation activities. It also serves to focus our attention on the role of all our vegetation in soil and water conservation.

A seedling such as this Blue Spruce indicates the emphasis government and industry have placed on forest renewal activities. In Manitoba, during the past several years, we have seen an increase of 150 percent in the area planted in trees.

Much of this work has been done through the Canada/Manitoba Forest Renewal Agreement and

through the Jobs Fund sectoral project in forestry. An important component of our forest renewal has been the dramatic increase in hectares reforested by both Abitibi Price at Pine Falls and Manfor at The Pas.

I indicated this is Forest Week in Manitoba. In addition to a display at the Garden City Mall, similar exhibits will be presented in Steinbach and Swan River this week, and in the next few weeks there will be displays in Brandon, Dauphin, The Pas and Thompson.

I would, as well, Madam Speaker, like to acknowledge the participation of the Manitoba Forestry Association in this effort and invite members to enjoy the material that is being distributed by the association which they will find on their desks.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, I would ask that all members plant this Blue Spruce at a suitable location where it will serve as a reminder of our need to be good stewards of all of our resources.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Minister for continuing with the time-honoured tradition of having each member of the Legislature receive a tree. It has been going on for many years and I, for one, have always, as I've indicated in the past, enjoyed that.

I also find it encouraging, according to the Minister's statements yesterday in Estimates, that under the federal/provincial agreement that our reforestation program has been moving along very well and that by 1990 we should get a break-even point of being able to plant as many trees as is being harvested. Possibly, according to the Minister, by the year 2000 we should be able to catch up, to some degree, in terms of reforestation which I think is very encouraging.

Madam Speaker, I just want to also indicate that I don't know whether tradition has had it that the Speaker should end up with that many trees, and I don't know whether the idea is that the Speaker necessarily will be able to keep them. I just want to indicate to the members of the House that I am prepared to take any extra trees, if somebody wants to get rid of them - before my colleague from Charleswood, who has moved into a new place and is looking for trees, so I hope this works on a seniority basis.

Once again, Madam Speaker, I want to thank the Minister for the trees and for his statement.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MADAM SPEAKER: Before moving to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery, where we have 27 students from Grade 11 from the Sisler High School under the direction of Mr. Richard Swain. The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Inkster; and we have 25 students from Grade 9 from the General Byng School under the direction of Miss Joanna West. The school

is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

On behalf of all the members, we welcome you to the Legislature this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Manitoba Properties Inc.- Cabinet Min. holding shares

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Madam Speaker, my question is for the Premier.

The topic of Manitoba Properties Incorporated, a scheme that was concocted by this administration to sell the buildings of the Province of Manitoba into a private corporation, and then sell preferred shares in that corporation to high income earners to give them tax savings, has again been brought to public attention.

So my question for the Premier is: Can he indicate whether or not any members of his Cabinet purchased shares in Manitoba Properties Inc.?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, to my knowledge no member of my Cabinet, or indeed, no member of my caucus owns shares insofar as MPI is concerned. It is my understanding that one member's spouse has, through the normal course, through the public declaration of interest, has in fact acquired some shares in MPI.

Manitoba Properties Inc.- senior gov't officials holding shares

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, given that the shares were only available for, as I understand it, approximately 48 hours on the initial offering before they were totally subscribed, I wonder if the Premier could indicate whether or not any senior officials in the departments of government, who might have had prior knowledge of this, took part in this purchase?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Let me first indicate, in response to the question with respect to the offering, that it was a public offering that was made available in the normal way that other such offerings are made available to the public, through the network that's in place for such things.

In regard to the specific question, I can inform the Leader of the Opposition that none of the senior employees involved in the Department of Finance, who were either directly or indirectly involved in that issue, have any shares with respect to MPI.

Manitoba Properties Inc.- legality of transfer of bldgs. to MPI

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, it has been suggested publicly that the government didn't have the

legal authority to transfer certain of the buildings into Manitoba Properties Inc., specifically, the Centennial Concert Hall.

I wonder if the Premier, or the Minister of Finance, have a legal opinion that would verify the authority of the government, to transfer all of these buildings that are listed in Manitoba Properties Inc. into that corporation?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: It seems to me that we are going over ground on this issue that has been discussed on many occasions in this Legislature. We discussed this at the time that The Financial Administration Act was amended and passed by this Legislature, which gave the government the legal authority to enter into those kind of arrangements, and that bill was passed in 1984 by this Manitoba Legislature.

This issue has also been of considerable discussion through the Estimate process of the Department of Finance, and on occasions when this issue has come up at Public Accounts, when staff of the Department of Finance and the Provincial Auditor are available for responses.

I can tell the member that, with respect to the legalities of this issue, we were provided legal advice by outside counsel of the firm, Tory, Tory, DesLauriers and Binnington of Toronto, who I understand are of significant note in regard to lawyers in these kind of matters, and they were the ones that provided legal advice to the government with respect to this issue.

MR. G. FILMON: Not only were there two Tory's, but I understand there was the Leader of the federal Liberal Party in that firm.

Manitoba Properties Inc.- shares principally to Man. residents

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, my further question to the Minister is: Did the government take any steps to ensure that shares would be sold principally, or at least at first chance, to Manitoba residents, as opposed to being sold broadly to major corporations and institutions and others who may have been from outside the province?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: As I indicated, Madam Speaker, in response to a previous question, this area has been discussed previously. The offering was done in the normal fashion through the normal network that is available for these kinds of offerings in the private sector, and I presume when it's happened previously in the private sector in the province of British Columbia.

I should also add, while I'm responding to the question to deal with one other misinformation that is being perpetuated with regard to this issue, and that is with respect to the control of the government buildings that were part of these offerings. The buildings are under the control and the ownership, through a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Government of Manitoba, and all the people of the Province of Manitoba; that has not changed as a result of this offering, it has not changed since 1984, and is still the case today that those buildings are under the control of the people of the Province of Manitoba.

Manitoba Properties Inc.- Curtis, Charles on Peter Warren Show

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Following up on the same subject. The Minister of Finance no longer denies the fact that the buildings have been sold. People that have listened to this discussion back and forth will remember well the Minister of Finance say the buildings have not been sold.

Madam Speaker, I ask the Minister of Finance, given the fact that, on the basis of the discussion of the issue on the Peter Warren show this morning; and given that Mr. Charlie Curtis seemed to want to reply - matter of fact, did call in and did respond to the issue - did he do so on his own volition or was he directed by the Minister of Finance to do so?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

It's rather an unfortunate question from the Member for Morris, but let me respond by commenting on the question and providing a response, and also what I understand was on the Peter Warren show. I understand that Mr. Warren claimed to have phoned my home and left a message which I did not respond to this morning in terms of coming on his show. Mr. Warren, himself, knows because he put it in a newspaper article that he writes that I'm not at home at 8:30, or whatever time he called in the morning, that I'm off having to do some exercising to get my weight under control; in fact, he wrote that himself, so it seems to be a bit deliberate by Mr. Peter Warren to suggest that he phoned and left a message on my answering service after eight o'clock in the morning when he knows that I leave my home prior to seven o'clock in the morning.

His office also called my office just before nine o'clock indicating that they wanted a response from me to deal with this issue on the show. I indicated that I was going into a Cabinet meeting and that my Deputy Minister would be willing to respond and deal with any of the technical details of this, which I understand he did, and he did so of his own volition, Madam Speaker.

Tax on net income - impact on charitable donations

MR. C. MANNES: A new question to the Minister of Finance, and I thank him for that clarification, Madam Speaker.

The new net income flat tax of 2 percent effective July 1 will be applied on income, before deductions will be allowed for medical costs and charitable donations; has the government in its haste to tax everything done an analysis to determine what impact that tax will have on givens. To what degree will Manitobans, individually, give less to charities within this province because of this new tax coming down?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I reject some of the assumptions that were made in the question by the member in response to this issue of net income tax, to somehow suggest that the government imposed taxes, in its haste for the sake of raising taxes, is simply not true.

As the member knows, we are looking after providing the necessary services for Manitobans in health, education, additional support for agriculture; and we brought about raises in taxation, in revenue, in order to provide for those services in the fairest and most balanced way possible and, at the same time, bringing about a reduction in the deficit.

If the member has some other ways or other suggestions how that can be accomplished, then I wish he would have made those suggestions public. All we can look at is the example of other Conservative Governments in this country that deal with those kind of problems, either by raising the deficits like they've done in the Maritimes, or reducing services like they are in the Provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan.

In terms of the net income tax, Madam Speaker, the experience with that tax in the Province of Saskatchewan is one that indicates that there is no major change in the attitude of people in that province with respect to charitable deductions, and I don't think that would be the case here in the Province of Manitoba; and I'm sure that was partially in the mind of the Leader of the Opposition when he, in December of last year, endorsed this particular tax.

Tax on net income - rationale between charities, and union and professional fees

MR. C. MANNES: A final supplementary, Madam Speaker.

Union and professional dues are totally deductible before this tax. Can the Minister of Finance tell us now the rationale as to why money that is directed toward charities has to be fully taxed under this tax, where money that is directed towards union and professional fees is deducted before the tax?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Madam Speaker, that question is really one that should not be directed at myself, as provincial Minister of Finance, but the Federal Minister of Finance who would only allow the addition of that tax to be put in the way that it has been put in. It's certainly our position that there should be a major overhaul of the income tax system; however the Federal Government would only allow that that additional tax be put on in the place and in the manner that it has been.

We would have much preferred to have it done in a different manner, Madam Speaker, but the reality and the situation that the Federal Government said was that it could only be put on in that place, allowing some deductions to be allowed before, and others to flow after. We would much prefer to have a total redraft and reform of the tax system to deal with some of the anomalies - more than anomalies - some of the loopholes that exist and should be corrected.

Chiropody - training of nurses

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Health.

It appears that the Minister's department has recently set up a pilot program which will allow nurses to take up the speciality of chiropody on a very ad hoc basis of training; in fact, it would appear that while chiropodists receive three years of training, these nurses who will be working in the field will, in fact, have as little as one day of training.

Would the Minister please tell the House what measures he is prepared to take to guarantee that these nurses will receive the appropriate training in chiropody before starting to practice in this discipline?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I must confess that this comes as a complete surprise to me. I haven't heard anything about that at all, so I'll have to inquire. I doubt very much that it's the department that is doing that. It might be with the nursing profession, but I'll try to find out and report to the members of the House.

AIDS - bisexual activity

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, while I'm on my feet I'd like to answer a question of the Member for River East, some information related to AIDS in Manitoba. There were 17 cases, of which 9 are still alive and 8 died. They were all homosexual, bisexual males; 3 also reported intravenous drug use; there were 5 between the ages of 20 and 29; 8 between 30 and 39, that's of the 17; 2 between the ages of 40 and 49; and 2 that were over 50. Fourteen of them were from Canada, and 3 from outside of Canada, I don't know from what country.

Chiropody Ass'n - discussions re nurses to practice

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: A supplementary question, Madam Speaker, to the Minister of Health.

Will the Minister of Health guarantee to the Professional Association of Chiropodists, that before nurses are allowed to practice in this area, there will be discussions with the Chiropody Association?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I think that I was quite fair in saying that I've never heard anything about that. I'm not about to make guarantees before I find out a little more about it.

Provincial social allowance recipients - increase in number

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: My question is to the Minister of Employment Services and Economic Security.

The Minister takes every opportunity to praise Manitoba's employment rate, while provincial social assistance cases continue to rise every year. Can the

Minister explain why there's a rise in provincial welfare cases, in excess of 3,600, from 1981 to 1986, and an increase of almost 1,650 municipal cases between 1983 and 1986?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Employment Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Madam Speaker, as the honourable member knows, probably the most appropriate place to discuss details of this nature are in the Estimates of the department. But I would like to remind the honourable member that the Provincial Social Allowance Program deals with people who are long-term disabled, the elderly and mother's allowances, and there's some structural matters occurring in our economy, in our society, that account for that; one of which is the fact that there are more and more people who are being deinstitutionalized, the Welcome Home Program, for instance. We do cover allowance for those people under this program. There are other people, who are requiring of our assistance -(Interjection)- Madam Speaker, the Honourable Member for Arthur keeps on interrupting me. I'm trying to give an explanation, if he would only be patient, I would explain to him that there's some major changes occurring in the society. Another phenomenon is the increasing number of single-parent families and, as a result, you have an increase in mother's allowances. So I'm suggesting, Madam Speaker, that those are the critical factors that account for any increase in social allowances cases in our province.

However, when we get to the Estimates we can do this in certainly a great more detail than we can during the question period.

MRS. C. OLESON: Can the Minister tell the House how many more cases are on the provincial and municipal welfare rolls in 1987?

HON. L. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I will have to take that question as notice and advise the member subsequently.

Provincial social allowance recipients - number employed as result of training program

MRS. C. OLESON: Can the Minister tell the House how many welfare recipients who have taken advantage of the training programs have found permanent jobs?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, again, Madam Speaker, I'll be glad to discuss this with the member in our Estimates. However, I want to remind the honourable member that more and more, and with the cooperation of the Federal Government, are we zeroing in on people who should be helped, who can be helped to get off of welfare, to get off of social assistance and to become independent and live richer lives. And I will be making a statement in the near future, Madam Speaker, about this very matter, another initiative, which we are taking jointly with the Federal Government.

Rendez-vous Canada - number participating

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: I'd like to direct a couple of questions to the Minister responsible for Tourism.

Can the Honourable Minister inform this House and the people of Manitoba about the level of attendance in terms of the number of people participating in Rendez-vous Canada Conference?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I'm sure that all the members of the Chamber and all of the people in Manitoba are delighted to know that Manitoba is hosting the largest national and international travel marketplace fair in the country.

Madam Speaker, we have 1000 delegates here from 28 countries and six nations in Manitoba, and they're raving about Manitoba. They love Manitoba, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, we have a record number of sellers and a record number of buyers. In the first day of activity they did more business in Manitoba than they did in the whole session, in the whole three days, in the last Rendez-vous Canada. It looks like we have a smashing success on our hands. We're going to gain \$1 million in direct sales from the delegates being here and we're hoping to double the amount of money we make from Rendez-vous as a result of being able to show them Manitoba first-hand.

MR. C. SANTOS: Can the Honourable Minister also tell this House what other organizations are participating in this conference?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Madam Speaker, in terms of the representation, we have all of the provinces participating, and what we are doing is selling Manitoba and Canada as one of the playgrounds of the world to come to for holidays, Madam Speaker. Apart from the provincial representation, we have industry representation and we're doing a number of things, Madam Speaker. I'm sure that the members opposite, particularly the Member for Portage la Prairie, who is interested in what we're doing to promote Manitoba to the international market, would like to hear what we are doing in this regard.

Before Rendez-vous Canada began, Madam Speaker, we had 12 representatives from the travel industry in Hong Kong coming to tour and to visit Manitoba. They're going to go back to Hong Kong and promote Manitoba as one of the best places to come, Madam Speaker.

We have also arranged, Madam Speaker, for tours which I'm sure the members opposite will be glad to hear about because their post-conference tour is out into the rural area of our province, so that we are not just promoting the city, but we are also showing everything that we have to offer through the north and in the country, and that's very important. But you know, Madam Speaker, the most important thing that we did? The delegates are raving about the hospitality, about the organization, and about the service provided by Manitoba. They've never seen anything like it and they all want to come back.

MPIC - registration of salvage vehicles

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. G. DUCHARME: Thank you, Madam Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for MPIC.

In response to previous questions from the Member for Minnedosa on April 6, the Minister in charge mentioned that, in regard to the write-off vehicles of Autopac, that he has initiated five steps to solve this particular situation.

Could the Minister at this time tell the Chamber what steps and give us an update on what has happened and what has processed since then?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for MPIC.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker.

I did announce a few weeks ago steps that the corporation would be taking to deal with the issue of salvaged vehicles being sold to Manitobans without knowledge of their previous history. My understanding is that the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation now does have a phone number one can contact to find out whether or not the vehicle that is being offered for sale has been a write-off.

In terms of the legislative requirements there will be an amendment brought in by my colleague, the Minister of Consumer Affairs - that should be coming in shortly - and other steps are being undertaken. As I indicated it would take about three months to implement the first phase.

MPIC - safety certificate re salvage vehicles

MR. G. DUCHARME: Madam Speaker, a new question to the same Minister.

In consideration that, as of April 1, '87, safety programs, including the Light Truck-Passenger Car Safety Inspection Program were transferred from the division of Driver Vehicle Licencing to the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, and in light of a recent untimely death of a youngster on April 23, 1987, and by the police report of that accident it was a newly purchased vehicle, purchased privately, and in the same report it was assumed that the wheel of the vehicle had fallen off, has this Minister's department also considered legislation on all purchases, including private, dealers, etc. be subject to a safety certificate being supplied when purchasing at all Autopac outlets?

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: In fact, there has always been a requirement of any salvaged vehicle that has been sold by MPIC and rehabilitated, to have a safety certificate prior to that vehicle being registered. The problems was that some of the salvaged vehicles were extensively sold as privately-owned vehicles and, in a way, getting around the requirement by MPIC. The requirement that all vehicles have a safety certificate is something that is under consideration.

Sugar beet industry - tripartite agreement

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. C. BAKER: Thank you, Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry Trade and Technology.

Can he inform us as to the progress made insofar as the sugar beet agreement is concerned?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry Trade and Technology.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

There are currently negotiations ongoing in Ottawa between representatives of the Provincial Government and the Federal Government and certainly we're hopeful that something can be announced fairly quickly.

Sugar beet industry - immediate notification re agreement

MR. C. BAKER: A supplementary question, Madam Speaker.

Could we be assured that there will be some immediate notification to the farmers of Manitoba, insofar as the agreement is concerned, so they can get out there and do their planting, this being the eleventh hour?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, immediately upon the conclusion of the discussions, our representatives are going to be getting back to us, and we can make sure that the farmers and everyone else involved, the working people involved, will be made aware of these results.

Pornography - prov. support of federal legislation

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, I have a question, Madam Speaker, for the Attorney-General. Does the Attorney-General and the present government, will they be supporting the new federal bill on pornography?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Well, Madam Speaker, I have some concern about the question, in the sense that it asked me to comment with respect to a federal piece of legislation that has just been introduced.

If I may, and I think this would answer the question for the honourable member, certainly Manitoba has been one of the lead provinces in urging the Federal Government to strengthen the obscenity provisions of the Criminal Code, with particular respect to sexual violence, degradation and kiddy porn and we welcome those particular provisions of the bill.

I'm not prepared to do a complete analysis of all of the other provisions of the bill, but that is the main thrust of the bill and, to that extent, we certainly support it. That has been our policy and continues to be our policy and certainly, with respect to prosecution, that's where we zero in on prosecution.

What I have said, and I think I need go no further than this, the only concern I have with the bill, from a governmental point of view, from a law enforcement point of view, is that it seems to me that it is very convoluted and may create problems for law enforcement. But I have asked senior officials in my department to do an analysis of the bill from the law enforcement point of view.

Cellular telephone service - availability of

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is for the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System.

Madam Speaker, can the Minister indicate when Manitobans might be able to avail themselves of cellular telephone service?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for MTS.

HON. G. DOER: Madam Speaker, the cellular telephone issue is one which I've commented briefly on, in the public before. We have asked the Federal Minister of Communications, the Honourable Flora MacDonald, for a meeting to discuss the whole issue of the precedent in other provinces of CanTel or other companies having a six-month head start over the Manitoba Telephone System.

In addition to that, Madam Speaker, I've asked for a business plan to be outlined in terms of the cellular telephone, and that business plan is also being evaluated by Coopers and Lybrand, as well as the other projects, as the honourable member is aware of; and I hope to be able to proceed very shortly with the introduction of that technology, with a good, sound operating business plan in the Telephone System in that area.

Cellular telephones - competitive supply market

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister.

Will there be a competitive supply market in cellular telephones, MTS and other companies making that service available in the province?

HON. G. DOER: Madam Speaker, that will depend, first of all, on the competition, other companies. I understand that one company CanTel has competed in other provinces and indicated it wants to compete in Manitoba, so that I would anticipate there will be competition in that area. Our concern, Madam Speaker, is that the rules that were established by the former Liberal Government, Francis Fox, and carried out by Marcel Masse and the present Federal Minister of Communication, to give a private firm a six-month head start does not make sense in a small province like Manitoba. I understand the Province of Saskatchewan

has some of the similar concerns, being a small province. And we understand even Alberta has taken counter measures through their Public Utilities Board to try to establish an equal starting time for the competitive company and the public telephone system. And that's what we would certainly prefer and that's why I've written the Federal Minister and asked that this be considered.

MTS - provision for cellular telephones

MR. D. ORCHARD: My final supplementary to the Minister, Madam Speaker.

Is the technical capability presently in place and capable of full operation in the Manitoba Telephone System for the provision of cellular telephone service right now?

HON. G. DOER: Madam Speaker, some time ago, the Telephone System had ordered equipment for cellular telephone. It does require an O/C in terms of interconnect permission. It also requires regulations being established by the Public Utilities Board. Madam Speaker, I believe that we should have a business plan in place and part of that business plan, must include, in my opinion, the whole issue of whether we're going to start at the same period of time for competition in the cellular market, or whether we are going to start with the preferential treatment to the private company that's been established as a precedent by the Federal Government.

So that obviously affects the numbers in a small province, in a small market, in relative terms, like Manitoba. So those are very important factors, I believe, but I do want to bring this to a head because there is a situation in this province where there's no further surplus of mobile lines and there are people that want to have that kind of technological capacity.

MTS - purchase of equipment for cellular telephone system

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, a new question to the Minister responsible for the Telephone System.

Given that the Minister is indicating that he is anxious to see a business plan developed for MTS's entry into the cellular telephone system, can the Minister indicate when, and upon what business plan, this government allowed the purchase of equipment and the installation of a cellular telephone system by MTS to take place, obviously without a business plan, which he now says he wishes to see.

HON. G. DOER: Madam Speaker, as I indicated to the member when he asked the question of whether they had the equipment, there has been a purchase, on a preliminary basis - quite an extensive purchase, as probably the member knows - of some of the equipment necessary for the cellular telephone business in this province. And, Madam Speaker, I felt, prior to going the next step, that we should resolve two issues. One is a business plan for purposes of the cellular telephone issue in this province; and, secondly, Madam Speaker, and legitimately so, getting a fair starting line for both the private and public companies to compete in the mobile industry.

Madam Speaker, we will not see a private company go up and give mobile ship-to-shore service on Lake Winnipeg for the fishermen like what the public telephone system will be required to do in this province.

Native Affairs - job description of secretary to Comm. of Cabinet

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I have a question to the Minister responsible for Native Affairs. Madam Speaker, the Minister of Native Affairs, on the 13th of April hired a secretary to the Native Affairs Committee of Cabinet for some \$53,448 a year. Would the Minister of Native Affairs provide the Assembly with a job description for that individual who's being paid that amount of money?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. E. HARPER: Yes, I'll be pleased to write that information.

Native Affairs - selection process for secretary

MR. J. DOWNEY: Madam Speaker, was there a competition or how was the individual selected?

HON. E. HARPER: Yes, there was a competition. I don't know how many applicants there were, but we did go through the competition.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Madam Speaker, how many hours a week would be involved in such a job as the secretary to the Native Affairs Committee of Cabinet, and what other benefits are there besides the \$53,400-and-some?

HON. E. HARPER: He's also the Senior Native Affairs Advisor and is also responsible to the Native Affairs Committee of Cabinet, as secretary, so it's a full-time position. I might add that the job and the person that's in that position is providing long hours of work.

MR. J. DOWNEY: For clarification to the Minister, would that not fit in the same category as Terry Sargeant and Phil Eyler, individuals who hired for the same job as what he's telling us that this individual is? Is that not the same job that he's now hiring another individual for? Terry Sargeant has the same kind of a job; Phil Eyler, former members of the House of Commons, New Democrat and former member of the Manitoba Legislative . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, order please.
The question is argumentative.

Riverbank stabilization - proposal to Fed. Gov't

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Madam Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Natural Resources.

Constituents of mine along Red River Drive, in the R.M. of Ritchot, have experienced and been troubled by a slide of that particular road, formerly Highway 75, partly down the riverbank.

Last year, I wrote the Minister requesting that he help prepare four of my constituents a case that they may take to the Federal Government, to relieve them of this particular problem. The Minister offered the engineering staff of the Water Resources Branch.

My question to the Minister, Madam Speaker: Will he be prepared, as per my request last fall, to help them document their case, so as they may apply to the Federal Government for some type or relief to bring again together that community?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Yes, I am aware of that issue and it was brought to my attention by the member opposite, and indeed people from the municipality. The problem did relate to the position of a road, and the subsequent slumping of the riverbank. We did indicate our willingness to participate with them in providing technical advice. As the member opposite indicates in his comments, the responsibility rests with the Federal Government, but if we can be of assistance, we've always looked to work cooperatively, not only with different levels of government, but with individuals and, if that has not already taken place, we'd be prepared to do so in the future.

MR. C. MANNES: A final supplementary, Madam Speaker.

The Provincial Government has participated in riverbank stabilization programs before, such as, the ARC Program with the Federal Government. Is it the intention of this government, is it the intention at all, to help my constituents in this case deal with this problem in any meaningful fashion.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, before I could make a commitment on that matter, I would want to have a clear understanding of the magnitude of the problem and where the responsibility rests in terms of resolving the problem.

Clearly, in some of the other projects the member has referenced, in terms of the ARC Program, there was a shared responsibility to resolve particular riverbank problems. When the report is in on this particular issue, if there is room to develop a program of joint responsibility, but clearly recognizing that the responsibility at this time is with the Federal Government, but there are agreements that are entered into to resolve wide-ranging problems. It may be possible to address this one.

Riverbank stabilization - time frame

MR. C. MANNES: Could the Minister indicate what time frame we're looking at before that report will be completed and he'll be able to tell us whether or not

he is prepared to enter into at least discussions to help relieve this problem?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, I can check with the department staff to determine whether in fact some of the discussions on the technical problems have taken place and determine a time frame for that. But in terms of developing any programs of shared responsibility as there have been in other jurisdictions, and there are throughout the province many issues related to water that we have sought participation of the Federal Government. I certainly could not commit myself, or the federal counterpart, to a time frame on that. I could only indicate that we are interested and we would be willing to enter into those discussions.

MADAM SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: Committee changes, Madam Speaker. I move, seconded by the Member for Elmwood, that the composition on the Standing Committee on Economic Development be amended as follows: Hon. E. Kostyra for Hon. E. Harper; Hon. A. Mackling for M. Dolin.

ORDERS OF THE DAY HOUSE BUSINESS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Madam Speaker. In terms of House Business, it's our intention to call bills this afternoon. Madam Speaker, if time permits, however, we will be moving into Committee of Supply. I believe there is a willingness on the part of members to waive Private Members' Hour should we proceed into Committee of Supply.

With respect to Standing Committees, Madam Speaker, the Standing Committee on Economic Development will be meeting tomorrow morning at 10:00 a.m. to deal with the Manitoba Development Corporation Annual Report, with the exception of McKenzie Seeds. The committee has agreed to meet later on in the Session to conclude its review of McKenzie Seeds.

Madam Speaker, would you please call Debate on Second Reading, Bills 4 proceeding through Bill 22.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READING

BILL NO. 4 - THE RE-ENACTMENT STATUTES OF MANITOBA, 1987 Act

MADAM SPEAKER: Debate on Second Reading on the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, we're prepared to pass this bill on to committee.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, perhaps, if I can take just a few minutes, Madam Speaker, in closing debate to respond to questions raised by the Member for Gladstone, I think that the Member for St. Norbert would want my response. In any event, we may be dealing with this matter during Estimates.

Prior to the Manitoba Language Reference case, the previous administration had begun to translate and publish the laws of this province in both languages in what is called an opposite page . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

If honourable members have private conversations, could they please carry them on elsewhere.

The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: . . . in an opposite page bilingual format, and the decision at that time appears to have been to put the new laws out together in both languages. In fact, that was the system in effect when this government assumed office and we continued the practice for a time. What was happening is that slowly, as the laws were replaced or amended, the continuing consolidation was being sent to subscribers in a bilingual format.

In the reference case, the Supreme Court held, quite clearly, of course, that the legislative process of the province was fundamentally flawed from a constitutional point of view, and that the validity of the laws - past, present, future - depended on efforts of the province to bring the laws into compliance, and members will recall that the Supreme Court provided a period of temporary validity which it was prepared to define more clearly if the parties came back to the Supreme Court for an order, and that was done at the insistence of, in fact, several of the parties.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. Could we please have order.

If honourable members want to visit they can do so elsewhere.

The Honourable Attorney-General has the floor.

HON. R. PENNER: We might consider setting aside a room for trading trees. Madam Speaker, as you know I've got my eye on several of your trees and I don't want that misconstrued.

In any event, Madam Speaker, a validation plan was developed and it was this plan which was considered and commented upon by all of the parties to the initial action, not just any one of them. The plan which we presented, one of our key concerns in presenting a validation plan to the Supreme Court was to ensure that we had the time which we felt was required to be able to do the re-enactment of the laws, of the regulations, of the past statutes, of the rules of court, and so on, and not press us to the wall, both from the point of view of time, the allocation of resources. And there were some parties to the action who were arguing for a shorter time and we were able to maintain our

time schedule in the order obtained from the Supreme Court.

We were concerned, of course, with the question of publication because, members will recall that the decision of the Supreme Court was that the laws of the province had to be enacted and published in both languages. So we had to comply fully with the order of the court.

The way in which we did it had to be practical in a legal sense so that, where in fact our matters were being argued in either one of the languages used, since both languages are equally official, questions of comparison which are often raised in legal argument could be made easily and handily, and the cost, of course, of the plan had to be reasonable. The Supreme Court ruling required that all laws, as I say, not only be enacted, but printed and published in both languages. So we had to consider some basic questions relating to how we would go about doing this.

This led us to consider, as part of the plan, the format for the legislation. Initially, it was thought best to continue with the then current format of opposite pages, which had been started by the former administration, with French on one page and English on the other. This allowed for fairly easy reference and was in a format that had been used for some time.

The experience, however, of the Province of New Brunswick with the Federal Government led us to consider the dual-column format which has advantages at the front end, that is, in the drafting and presentation of bills in the House. More recently, incidentally, the Province of Ontario which is moving to a bilingual format for its Statutes, which will be distributed in both languages for all new laws and current laws by 1990, is going to be using that same format.

The matter of the cost - and here I come closer to questions addressed by the Member for Gladstone - of printing was referred to the Queen's Printer who in turn referred the matter to an outside printer. Of the three formats considered, opposite page, dual column small page, dual column large page, the least expensive by far was the dual column in a large page format, the way we see the bills coming into the House in this Session.

The overall cost, of course, depends on the number of subscriptions and the extent to which we are able to consolidate laws and regulations. The actual cost saving of moving to the larger format, the one we're using, would be about 15 percent over the opposite-page format.

Another question that is raised, but it's really related to what I've been saying, is well why don't we consider separate volumes, one in English and one in French, sent to subscribers as requested. This format was not considered, nor apparently was it considered by the previous administration when it began the bilingual publication of the CCSM.

Madam Speaker, it was not considered for several reasons. We were advised that the practice of completely separate volumes brought with it definite legal and practical risks. As I pointed out a few moments ago, every jurisdiction to adopt bilingual legislation recently, other than in the Province of Quebec, has come to the same conclusion.

I would like to refer honourable members to a recent case in Manitoba, the Wade case where Mr. Justice

Dureault of the Manitoba Queen's Bench in his judgment in that case said, specifically, "if the series is to provide ready access to the laws in an updated format, it necessarily has to be a bilingual version."

Now, once it has to be a bilingual version, and I'll go on with the rest of his statement in a moment, then we get back to the question, opposite page or dual column, and I've already indicated that, of those two, dual column is the cheaper.

He goes on to say: "In the future, the Crown officer responsible for the printing and publishing of the CCSM should keep in mind that unilingual versions of laws enacted since June 13 have no official status, and that unilingual publication is not constitutionally permissible; it is an exercise in futility." I don't think anybody in this House, and I don't think any Manitoban, would want us to go through that reference to the Supreme Court again on something of that kind. That is why, Madam Speaker, not to put too fine a point on it, we ended up with a decision for the dual column, a bilingual format.

I should also point out, finally, Madam Speaker, that the technology that we're now using allows us to move directly from the bill to the final act and legislative counsel is now able to produce for the printer photo-ready copy, and that is saving us a lot of time and a lot of money. This has removed the need for costly typesetting and reproofing of the bills. These savings would be lost if it were necessary to reformat into two separate versions for the purposes of distribution.

I should point out, and I'm coming to the conclusion here, that the subscribers to the CCSM are not going to be charged for the revised statutes. We would have had to revise the statutes in any event and the incremental cost of doing it in this format is rather small, but it is not the intention to charge the subscribers to the CCSM for the new CCSM which will come out later in the year. That is a cost to be shared between the government and the Federal Government with the lion's share being borne by the Federal Government.

So this bill, as it moves to committee, takes us a significant step forward towards full compliance so necessary to ensure that our laws are in conformity with constitutional obligations.

Finally, a question that concerns the former Attorney-General, that has been raised once or twice in the House - once, I think, by the Leader of the Opposition - as to cost contribution, because different figures have been mentioned, it is true that in response to a question some many months ago, it was said that we expected a contribution from the Federal Government for this last fiscal year of \$300,000.00. That was an estimate because we were negotiating on very specific questions. Subsequently, that was raised, in our view, to \$400,000.00.

I'm happy to be able to advise the House that about a week-and-a-half ago we in fact received the cheque - it wasn't lost in the mail - for the last fiscal year and it was \$500,000.00. I want to pay tribute to my deputy who is actually doing the negotiations with Ottawa officials. We are looking forward in this fiscal year to \$600,000, but that would have to be an estimate and it may end up by being more. Certainly, there will be both a contribution from the Secretary of State with respect to the cost of translation, and what we're looking for is a significant contribution with respect to the publication.

So with those words of explanation, I want to thank the Member for Gladstone for raising these concerns. I hope I've dealt with them, and we look forward to the matter going through committee speedily so that we can get on with the job of publishing the re-enacted statutes.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried

BILL NO. 5 - AN ACT TO REPEAL CERTAIN STATUTES RELATING TO EDUCATION AND OTHER MATTERS

MADAM SPEAKER: On the motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 5, standing in name of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: Madam Speaker, we've had a chance to review the bill and are prepared to let it proceed to committee.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Government Services, Bill No. 6, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Stand.

BILL NO. 12 - THE HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT ACT

MADAM SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation, Bill No. 12, the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, I can indicate on behalf of the Member for Minnedosa that he is prepared to see the bill pass, subject to any brief comments that may be made by others on this side of the House.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I wish to place a few comments on the record on Bill No. 12. Madam Speaker, Bill No. 12, from the surface, appears to be, as the Minister described it, an innocuous sort of housecleaning type of bill and shouldn't possibly need too much scrutiny.

Madam Speaker, I guess there's one area that needs to be touched up on this bill before we pass it, and that is the final section that the Minister commented on in terms of a new subsection proposed to facilitate payment of grants, etc. Now, part of it is for the Rural Handicap Transit System Program which my predecessor, the Member for Lakeside, as Highways Minister started working on and was brought in in 1980-81 when I was Minister responsible, and carried on by the New Democrats, and will now be expanded presumably to rural Manitoba. That's not of concern.

But the section, in general, that contains that provision or contains that ability, enabling ability, also

allows this Minister of Highways and any New Democrat Minister of Highways to dramatically alter the fees charged by Order-in-Council without debate in this Legislature.

Madam Speaker, I took the liberty before coming to the House today to take a look at the last Estimates Book of Expenditures passed by another administration, one that I was proud to serve, and that being the Estimates of 1981-82 fiscal year.

Madam Speaker, just as a figure of interest, the motor carrier fees and automobile and drivers' licence fees that were collected in 1981-82 amounted to some \$29 million. We substantially have not changed a great deal in the population in the Province of Manitoba; and as a result now of five successive New Democratic Party administrations, we now see in this year's Estimates of Revenue that drivers' licences, automobile and motor carrier licences and fees will total \$48.5 million this year, an increase of \$19.5 million over five years - \$4 million a year - that this Minister and his government have gleaned from the driving public.

Now, one might say that that collection of fees and revenues is necessary if we're going to have a well-maintained and rebuilt highway system, but the driving public in Manitoba, under this weak-kneed Minister, have neither, Madam Speaker. We have the driving public paying incredibly more money for the privilege of driving on increasingly worsening highways in the Province of Manitoba while this Minister and the New Democrats gouge the driver for more money.

As a small example, Madam Speaker, I used the automobile licence fees as part of the comparison, but I also want to do one other comparison in here. In 1981-82, it was estimated that gasoline tax would raise some \$74.5 million from the driving public of Manitoba. That figure is now up to \$115 million, and bear in mind, Madam Speaker, this is with vehicles that are much more fuel efficient today than what they were in '81-82; hence the consumption of gasoline certainly hasn't been increasing but the revenues are up by more than almost 50 percent.

In that year of 1981-82, for this Minister's edification, because obviously this Minister of Highways has not been paying attention to his department, the Highways Department for construction in that year spent \$85 million on highway construction while they collected less than \$75 million in gasoline taxes.

Now I want to contrast that this year, Madam Speaker, where the Highways Department will be seeing the collection - not the Highways Department - but the people of Manitoba will pay \$115 million in gasoline taxes, and this year the total construction program projected to be spent is less than \$88 million. It's gone from more than what we collected in gasoline taxes to \$30 million less than we collect in gasoline taxes under the administration of the Department of Highways by five successive years of a New Democratic Party Government which doesn't have any emphasis, care or consideration for anything beyond the concrete curtain, the Perimeter Highway.

If it isn't urban or Northern Manitoba, they don't care; and with this Minister of Highways, if it isn't in his constituency, he doesn't care. It's got to be built in the constituency of Dauphin or the highway project simply doesn't go ahead. Southern Manitoba, where a vast bulk of that \$115 million is collected, does not

receive any highway construction, none from this Minister and from this New Democratic Party Government.

So, Madam Speaker, when we're asked to pass bills in this House which allow, by Order-in-Council regulation, without debate in this House, the collection of ever-higher fees, that concerns me because this Minister of Highways is a lightweight. He does not have clout in Cabinet in order to spend any portion of the monies that he is responsible for collecting in the Highways Department.

Well, you know, my honourable friends over there in the back row, two of them in particular - one is just smiling sillily, he isn't saying anything, quite to his credit - but my other two friends over there are moaning and groaning. Now, Madam Speaker, those two gentlemen probably have never driven outside of the Perimeter Highway to know the despicable shape that Manitoba highways are getting at.

MR. D. SCOTT: We know your riding well.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, the one member said he knows my riding well. I don't know when he was down there last. Maybe it was when he was librarian out at the school there, I don't know, but that was many years ago when money was being spent on highways and the roads were good at that time; now they're not, Madam Speaker.

You know I can appreciate a New Democratic Party Government not wanting to spend money on roads in rural Manitoba. Why should they? It's the same sort of scenario that we get into with the sugar beet industry, wherein the editorial comment in the Valley Leader has indicated that the reason the sugar beet agreement has not gone through, according to the Industry, Trade and Technology Minister, is that the growers don't represent a great political force for the New Democratic Party, and if the politics aren't there, they don't go ahead and sign agreements unless there's political benefit to the New Democrats.

And Southern Manitoba, where the sugar beets are grown, doesn't have any political credit for this party; hence, this agreement is not a priority, and neither are highways. - (Interjection)- Pardon?

HON. R. PENNER: The Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology made no such statement.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, then, I suggest if the Attorney-General is so intelligent as to know what his Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology has said, then possibly he should read the editorial in the Valley Leader. It might help to enlighten the Attorney-General.

But, Madam Speaker, this Minister is now asking for authority in The Highway and Transportation Department Act to collect further fees by Order-in-Council set by regulation. And, Madam Speaker, I don't need to dwell too much longer in the Estimates of Revenues to show you that when this government collects more money from the driving public, they spend less money on the highways. The highway system goes down, down, down. We have now gone from having one of the best highway systems in Western Canada to having the worse highway system in Western Canada.

Today we had the Minister of Tourism stand up from a planted question in the back row and give forth in a theatrical way about the advantages of tourism in Manitoba.

Well, the tourists from the United States and from our neighbouring provinces who come to Manitoba simply aren't very happy when they drive on Manitoba's alleged highways. It's because, Madam Speaker, as I've said for the last three to four years, and unfortunately I missed the opportunity to help the Minister through his Estimates this year. I really missed being there and asking him again about the \$29 million bridge to nowhere north of Selkirk, because that is the funding priority of this government; a \$29 million bridge and access roads, which have no useful purpose and should have been built south of Selkirk, which even his departmental staff will tell him. But, Madam Speaker, that is another issue of the misappropriated spending. They don't know where to spend the money when they do have some to spend.

But, Madam Speaker, most of the tourism in Manitoba comes to this province by highway, by vehicle, by car. The highway system in this province is in wretched shape, just absolutely wretched shape, and it's going downhill very rapidly. TRIP Canada, this year, put out their report once again and it showed the Manitoba highway system to be deteriorating even more rapidly than before, and this Minister doesn't have the understanding as to what's happening in his department. And if he does understand what's happening, he doesn't have the respect of his Cabinet colleagues and the Finance Minister to allow him to spend even a portion of the revenues that accrue to the Department of Highways on reconstruction of our roads, because this Minister has seen the Department of Highways construction budget not even increased by the rate of inflation, not even the rate of inflation over the past five years, while the revenues that are accumulating to that department have doubled.

Now, Madam Speaker, in any other analysis one would make of the effectiveness of this Minister, you would give him failing marks. The people of Manitoba, the driving public, the Manitoba Trucking Association and all those who deal with him, give him failing marks because he has not been able to hold up his end of his portfolio, the Department of Highways, around the Cabinet table. The robber-baron types and the Attorney-General have made sure that his department is stripped of money, and no money is available to spend on highways unless of course it's in the Dauphin constituency where paving is even done to the access road to the Minister's own cabin.

Now that's the kind of priorities this Minister has seen fit to place before the people of Manitoba, pavement to his cabin while the rest of Southern Manitoba does without even patching of potholes. That's the kind of spending priorities that we see from this Minister, and then he also was the Minister again who's responsible for the \$29 million Selkirk bridge to nowhere. The bridge the engineers didn't want, the bridge even some of the municipal councillors didn't want, and this is the Minister that put it in at a \$10 million estimate and now it's up to \$29 million, Madam Speaker. So we have no confidence in him, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, Madam Speaker, the point of order is that the member has totally disregarded the facts of so many instances. But the facts are expressed in the Estimates - which he admitted he didn't attend - are that the bridge is coming in at budget, at \$19 million; it's not 29, and it should not be left on the record.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, order please.

A dispute over the facts is not a point of order.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, as I said earlier on, the Minister's estimate is now doubled from slightly over 10 million to slightly under 20 million. Now that's a doubling of the estimate; he's admitted himself. Then you add in the access roads and that's exactly where we come into.

So, Madam Speaker, the Minister not only has just confirmed that he is incompetent; he's admitted that he hasn't even necessarily known what his department is doing.

Madam Speaker, I just want to make just a few more comments, and these are for the residents of Northern Manitoba, because these are the people who are going to be rolled in, to charge us that this Minister may be able to levy, by Order-in-Council, regulations without any debate in this Chamber. The residents of Northern Manitoba, by this legislation, will now become privy to the same kind of maltreatment by this New Democratic Party Government in the Department of Highways as the rest of Southern Manitoba has enjoyed, or not enjoyed shall I say, over the last five years, a doubling of the revenues in the Department of Highways. While this Minister has spent less and less money, he hasn't even kept up with inflation on maintenance and/or construction, and the highway system is in terrible shape because of his inability, his complete inability and lack of influence in the NDP Government to get highways as a priority.

MADAM SPEAKER: The question before the House is Second Reading on Bill No. 12.

The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, Madam Speaker.

I'd like to close debate if no further members wish to speak on this Bill No. 12, and to clarify a few points for the record that the Member for Pembina has left on the record.

Unfortunately, as I've stated many times in the past, he has very little regard for the facts as they apply. In this particular instance, Madam Speaker, he has confused two sections of the bill and tied them together and distorted their meaning. The fact is that the section referring to Northern Affairs is for grant purposes, or the Mobility Disadvantaged Program, as well as for airports, and grant purposes being quite different than fees being levied.

So Northern Affairs areas are not going to be hit by fees from this bill. They will be eligible for grants.

Now the section dealing with the fees, is dealing with those fees now that can be put in place, can be collected for the work that is done by the Highway Traffic Board.

The Highway Traffic Board considers applications for many different kinds of structures adjacent to the highway system, whether they be access roads or signs, those kinds of things. These are made by municipalities, in many instances, or by individuals. The fee that we are establishing is \$50 as I've indicated. In order to do that, to help pay for the work of the Highway Traffic Board, which is very important work in the Province of Manitoba, to collect some revenue from their work for the service they provide, we are collecting, through this section of the Act.

Madam Speaker, it's unfortunate that the Member for Pembina was not present in the House during the Estimates so that he could have had a discussion on the issues, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The presence or absence of a member is not to be referred to.

The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Madam Speaker, I wasn't referring to the member's presence or absence at this particular time. I was just talking about the Estimates process where the member admitted in his speech, Madam Speaker, that he was not present for the Estimates. He just said that.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

I would prefer if honourable members did not refer to the presence or absence of members even if they themselves choose to refer to it.

The Honourable Minister.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Okay, Madam Speaker, it's unfortunate that the Member for Pembina was out of order on his comments and I will not make reference to his comments with regard to his presence or absence.

Madam Speaker, the fact is that the Mobility Disadvantaged Program was established in 1981 with \$40,000 budgeted for four communities. During the New Democratic administration we have seen that program expand to \$400,000 this coming year and servicing over 30 communities in rural Manitoba, over 40 percent of the rural residents of this province. So the tremendous expansion has taken place during the New Democratic Government.

I want to point out as well for the record, Madam Speaker, that insofar as fees are concerned, the fact is that the Manitoba Government collects fees for registration, licences and fuel in this province, but the Manitoba Government still spends more on highway-related expenditures than it takes in, in those highway-related fees and taxes - unlike the Federal Government which takes about \$117 million out of this province for fuel taxes and doesn't return anything to the highway system, or very little, in the case of this year with the Yellowhead Agreement. So we do have an inequitable situation there. If the Member for Pembina wants to make that kind of comparison, he should look at what the Federal Government takes out of Manitoba and does not return, if he's going to blame the Provincial Government for collecting revenues in that area because we do spend all of those revenues on highway-related expenditures.

And when we look at tourists coming into the province, Madam Speaker, the fact is that I-29, the Interstate Highway in the States has been funded 90 percent by the Federal U.S. Treasury, not by the State of North Dakota. So it's unfair to make that kind of a comparison with our major routes here in this province.

I think, Madam Speaker, I want to leave it at that. Certainly, I believe this bill before the House is going to facilitate the payment of grants to individuals and organizations representing airport commissions. The payments will not have to be made strictly to the municipalities and this is appropriate since many of those airport commissions are made up of indeed a number of municipalities and, in the same way, the Mobility for the Disadvantaged Program in rural Manitoba will be served by this bill; and as I said earlier, there is justification for some fee being established by the Highway Traffic Board for the service that they provide and that is now enabled by this bill.

I am pleased to see the general willingness of the Opposition members to pass this bill and move it on to committee.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 18 - THE SECURITIES ACT

MADAM SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Bill No. 18, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. G. DUCHARME: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I won't mention the absence of some members. I'll just mention, maybe I should mention the Member for Dauphin wasn't here when we had our picture taken.

I will take this opportunity to pass on the . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, on a matter of privilege, Madam Speaker.

The speaker is well aware of my concerns about the fact that I was not able to be present during that period of time since I was paired and at a very important conference that had been set up some time earlier than the time for that photograph had been established.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The honourable member does not have a point of privilege.

The Honourable for Riel.

MR. G. DUCHARME: Madam Speaker, it's unfortunate some people cannot chuckle in this Assembly. We're prepared to pass this bill onto committee.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 19 - THE LIMITATION OF ACTIONS ACT AND THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT AND TO REPEAL THE UNSATISFIED JUDGMENT FUND ACT

MADAM SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 19, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: We're prepared to pass this bill on to committee.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 20 - THE CRIME PREVENTION FOUNDATION ACT

MADAM SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 20, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Just very briefly, this of course is a bill that would be very difficult to oppose. In fact, it is certainly a proposal in principle that we have long supported in Opposition.

During the last provincial election, the Minister and I have had numerous discussions during Estimates on this concept and, for the record, I certainly indicated to him at the last Session of the Legislature, in discussing the whole area of crime prevention, that if there is anything that community organizations needed - and they are a very important part of crime prevention solutions - they need some assistance in the way of a meeting room, in the way of helping them perhaps with secretarial work, in helping them communicate with the residents of their community.

Hopefully this bill will provide that assistance to those community organizations, some of which have been very active and been very successful to date.

Hopefully other community crime prevention groups will be encouraged to develop in the city, particularly I'm thinking of some of the very large increases that we've seen, for example, in this area that's been discussed numerous times in this Legislature, and that's of breaking and entering, which is a very traumatic experience for homeowners, particularly women in the home or the elderly citizen in a home or apartment block. They are quite often very fearful of going out after that or of coming back and returning to their premises at night.

There have been numerous instances of break and enters on more than one occasion of certain premises. The numbers have increased so dramatically that it's something that simply has to be stopped, halted and reduced, and hopefully if the government is able to provide some assistance to community groups, that will help solve that problem. One of the difficulties no doubt will be that it's very easy to get a group going in a brief period of time and get them formed and organized, but in order to be able to maintain the enthusiasm is sometimes difficult.

We're all I think quite familiar with the formation of the Block Parent organizations, your Neighbourhood Watch organizations and I think the real challenge is not only to form them but to maintain them to be active. Hopefully, Madam Speaker, this bill will help community organizations reduce some of the crime that goes on in their communities.

I'm hopeful that the Minister, in appointing people to the board - and it's quite a large board, 15 people

- will rule out politics in this particular area and appoint people who are genuinely active in community crime prevention groups. I think it would be a shame, Madam Speaker, if it became a necessity for a person to either be an NDP member when this government is in power or to be a member of the Conservative Party when we assume office, because I think this should be clearly, if it's to be a successful program, comprised of people who are active in crime prevention community organizations because that is the problem. Frankly, I'd say to the Minister, if he does that, he will reap political benefits if he rules politics out of the appointment of members of this board because the hopes for success of the organization I think would be vastly improved if that were done, Madam Speaker.

We're prepared to pass this bill on to committee. We're prepared I might say, Madam Speaker, I hope that the bill has been or will be circulated to crime prevention organizations in the communities so that they will have an opportunity to read the bill and perhaps come to committee and make some suggestions or recommendations to the committee when the bill is under consideration. We'll look forward to receiving public representations on the bill.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. G. DUCHARME: Yes, Madam Speaker, I also rise and agree with this type of bill. It is one that is very dear to my heart as I was first involved in crime prevention in my former role when I helped form the Crime Prevention units in the City of Winnipeg and especially one that I was very involved with, the St. Boniface-St. Vital Crime Prevention Unit.

This particular unit - and I'll give you a little bit of history - was founded in September 1982, and the groundwork was initiated by the officer for the district, a Mr. Hugh Coburn. He approached many residents in the area with his proposal for a community crime prevention organization. When he did this, these people in the area were very receptive to the idea because of the problems with crime in all areas, but they felt particularly disturbed by the crime which was right close to home. The executive was formed and now the executive has been expanded to approximately 21 members.

The CFCA is a volunteer, it always has been a volunteer non-profit organization, working in cooperation with the Winnipeg Police Department to fight back against, as we all know, the rising rate of crime. Now, this objective is accomplished through a Crime Prevention Education Program, stressing citizen awareness in the particular areas. They take on the initiative to probably deter some of the crime right at home. They make people aware in the particular area of the crimes that are happening.

This particular unit serves a population of about 100,000 people with memberships rising as much as 40,000. This includes the Neighbourhood Watch Programs, etc. They're all concerned about the increase in crime and it's the reason for this particular bill.

Madam Speaker, during the first four years of the operation, CFCA conducted meetings locally, at the Norberry School mostly, for the general public. I can remember the first public meeting they held, they were

faced with an enormous storm that year, but they had it all set up and they weren't disheartened with what was going on.

They've met, they've brought in resource material, as I again mention, from the Winnipeg Police Department, the RCMP, the Manitoba Police Commission, the Manitoba Youth Centre, the Block Parents and security experts, and they have the various displays. They deal with home and business security. They deal with sexual assault, Neighbourhood Watch, and many more activities.

These programs, in conjunction with the taping, to tape and play back on a television playback to the entire city, and probably people in the whole city have benefited from much of the information that was carried on in these meetings.

Madam Speaker, an attempt has been probably made to better serve the community and provide programs and services most requested by the residents. They had meetings and they had people come forward with their concerns and these were answered.

Madam Speaker, due to the rapid growth in the community and the desire on the part of the residents - and that's a very expanding type of area - St. Vital and South St. Vital and Island Lakes - when people are moving into a new area, they're very concerned about the crime prevention, and this CFCA has probably brought people together and brought an awareness of people getting together and helping to meet their neighbours so that they know what's going on in there. Madam Speaker, I think this goal was accomplished.

A further goal that they did - they worked very hard after starting in 1982 - was a goal of opening up a Community Crime Prevention Office in that particular area. This facility is staffed by area volunteers, coordinated by an office manager, Mrs. Mislan. She conducts and manages the office for the CFCA executive. Volunteers work on updating stats, charts, mailing newsletters, etc., and many other duties relating onto home and business security.

They bring forward and meet with manufacturers of the locks and the window bars, security systems, alarm systems, who bring this forward. As well, they provide the printed material that is available to help these people who probably have been broken into and are very concerned and have already been affected by the crime and it passes onto the neighbours that also are facing the same problem.

Madam Speaker, I think the stats that were produced in June of '86 probably show that as a result of the hard work of this particular community committee, this crime prevention unit, that generally across the board - and that's not usual for Canada and it's not usual for Winnipeg - crime has decreased by over 15 percent, with a general 23 percent decrease in residential break-ins. This isn't just by fluke. I believe it's by the hard work of this particular group, along with the Winnipeg Police Department and many other people that have worked.

I guess all this work was very, very well-received and they were honoured just recently. They have been honoured by the Winnipeg Police-Southland Corporation Crime Prevention Award for 1986 and the Solicitor-General of Canada Award for Crime Prevention for 1986. So they are really the forerunners in this particular crime prevention.

Madam Speaker, there have been other units that have come on, Chapter 2, the East Kildonan-Transcona Unit, and the Chapter 3 Unit, which is St. James-Assiniboia, with the same main objectives that have been established by the front runner, St. Boniface-St. Vital.

Madam Speaker, the CFCA is always conscious of the needs of the community and is constantly working to implement new programs to meet these needs for crime prevention education and a way of life in their particular area and are going along helping the new units that have been established. Madam Speaker, not to go on, we're sure we're going to get another go at it at committee and maybe hear from some of these particular people.

Just to put on the record, in District 5, that I obtained from the Police Department just recently:

Break and Enters in 1983 in the St. Boniface-St. Vital area were 1,458; and they go down in 1984 to 1,282; 1985 was 1,140. So it shows a large decrease of almost one-quarter or 25 percent.

Frauds in the area, we pulled them with the businesses in the area, and they were 431 in 1983; in 1984, they were 410; and in 1985, they were 392; which again showed a decrease of about 10 percent.

Theft under \$200 - and we all know that there is an alarming rate of thefts in the particular areas of bicycles as the Member for Emerson is mentioning - 2,464 thefts in 1983; 2,167 in 1984; 2,160 in 1985; showing a decrease of 12 percent.

Theft over \$200 runs the same way. They show a decrease of 13 percent.

Crimes against property all together show a decrease of about 3 percent; the overall decrease from 1983-1984 of 12 percent and then the most remarkable is from 1984-1985 of 15 percent.

Madam Speaker, I'll list a couple of the concerns and maybe they could be answered by the Minister in charge. Some of the concerns of these particular groups, I'll read them out and I won't highlight on them: Question (1) For what purposes will proposed funds be allocated? Secondly, will any funds be allocated for full-time coordinators, rent in existing crime prevention facilities that are already set up in St. Boniface-St. Vital and East Kildonan-Transcona? For these people, it's been very aware that they do need that one person who translates all these particular programs and keeps the thing together and works between the police and the people in the area.

Already mentioned by the Member for St. Norbert to try and keep it very non-political, I guess we're all accused of that no matter what we're involved in; but maybe as a suggestion that maybe all the six crime prevention officers sit on the board of the Crime Prevention Foundation.

These officers change, they have no political hang-ups; and as these officers are the persons who have the most knowledge that goes on in the area and have been there and they have the most knowledge of all the specific problems and needs of each district on a continuous daily basis, they would be a very good contribution to this particular committee.

In closing, Madam Speaker, one particular area that bothers me and bothers some of the groups is how does the government anticipate one central facility will have any effect in bringing about a reduction in the

crime rate when each individual district has its own specific problems and needs?

This has been highlighted by concerns in each of the areas. It has been proven over the past three years, as I've tried to emphasize in my stats, that a grassroots community-based organization does have a very, very significant impact on reducing crime within its own area. Such a facility needs to be easily accessible to these particular people in the community it serves.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Just very briefly, Madam Speaker, indeed, a clear reading of the bill indicates our recognition that effective crime prevention must be done at the grassroots level and by the grassroots organization; and one of the reasons why we took pains to set it up as a foundation at arm's length is to ensure that it wasn't a question of the government trying to get into the field, but to assist those in the field and to encourage others who may want to organize a crime prevention community-based organization to do so.

But there can be, from a centre such as the Crime Prevention Foundation, a great deal of assistance given to the existing groups. The exact form of that assistance will be flushed out in the following ways: No. (1) There is the broad mandate within the bill itself; but, more importantly, when the first board of the foundation meets, one of its first jobs will be in fact to decide how it will spend the money which it will have - and it will have money.

Similarly, I might point out, when we established the Law Foundation about a year ago, and it's now in operation - it has a broad mandate - but it was the Law Foundation itself, one of its first tasks was: How are we going to spend the money?

A MEMBER: But you had decided that.

HON. R. PENNER: Well, no, in terms of a relatively small amount for a period of three years, but after three years those covered amounts disappear, and then there is, too, still the residual amounts for legal aid and for the legal education run by the Law Society, but the discretionary funds, which will be close to or in excess of \$1 million, depending on prime rates, will be decided by the foundation.

And finally, let me stress again, I agree that this should not be seen by any administration as a political instrument. That is why the bill stresses that at least 8 of the 15 - it could be 15 - but at least 8 will be from the existing crime prevention establishment - and let me use that term.

What I intend to do, and I can say so for the record, is to ask the existing groups to suggest names, and it's from that pool of names that the appointments of at least eight will be made. So I want to give that assurance to the House and, in doing so, again recognize the value of community-based initiatives.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 21 - THE FAMILY LAW AMENDMENT ACT

MADAM SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 21, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, just briefly, I would hope that maybe the Attorney-General could respond when closing debate, unless anyone else wishes to speak, but I would hope that he could confirm that the bill has been circulated to the Family Law Subsection of the Bar Association and perhaps could undertake, at least within a reasonable time, to get a response from them as to the contents of this bill. I don't think there's anything too significant in it, but it would be nice to know that that they'd had an opportunity to consider it and we had their response.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, that's a very good point, Madam Speaker, the point raised by the Member for St. Norbert. I can assure him that the bill has been reviewed with the Associate Chief Justice of the Family Division.

It's my impression, but I'll go beyond that, that it has also been reviewed by the head of the Family Law Department with the leading members of the Family Bar. But in the event that my impression is mistaken, I'll assure the member that prior to reaching committee that they're fully notified and invited to comment if they're unable to get to committee.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 22 - THE WATER RESOURCES ADMINISTRATION ACT AND THE REAL PROPERTY ACT

MADAM SPEAKER: On the proposed motion, Second Reading, Bill No. 22, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Madam Speaker, in making a few comments to Bill No. 22, I just want to indicate that we agree in principle to the concept of what the Minister is trying to do.

I just want to raise a few concerns possibly regarding this bill. It gives the Minister a fair amount of rights, and I'm not that concerned about the Minister himself, in terms of the authority that this bill will give him. I'm a little bit more concerned about the bureaucratic system that possibly could be in place to deal with that. I would hope that proper discretion and common sense prevails in some of these issues when we look at what the intent of the bill is. I'm not sure, maybe the Minister can indicate, I believe that the Red River Valley is the only one that has been designated as a flood-prone area.

Madam Speaker, invariably there's a lot of pressure on the municipalities, in terms of possible construction and development in some of the areas, because many people have a desire to reside close to a river. I certainly have no objection with that. The only thing is that I think at the present time the regulations after the flood, I think in '79 was the last one when we had a major flood taking place, certain of the regulations came into

place where construction was not going to be allowed if it was in that flood-prone area.

The regrettable thing is that after the last flood, Madam Speaker, when there was a federal-provincial agreement, in terms of flood proofing for people in the Red River Valley, many people made application. I think the majority of them tried, but one thing that happened is that the weather conditions and lack of equipment created some problem in terms of where some did not manage to get in under that program. As a result, we left money on the table federally, in terms of money that could have been used for further flood proofing for some of the people in the Red River Valley.

The other thing, of course, Madam Speaker, is that there's always within the authority of the government to designate any area a flood-prone area. I would want to make very sure, and the Minister can probably make that comment in his closing statements that there's a grandfather clause, to some degree, that individuals who have an existing situation with buildings and residences, outbuildings, machine sheds, etc., that these would not be affected by this regulation.

Because one section in here, Madam Speaker, gives the Minister the authority that, if he so wishes, individuals who have not complied with his regulations will not be compensated for flood damage. That's why I think sort of a grandfather clause in there has to be - maybe the Minister can explain whether this would be just for new buildings at the present time or whether this would also affect existing situations, because that is the one area of concern that I want to highlight with the Minister, the compensation factor if there is not a proper grandfathering clause in there. The other thing, according to the bill, if somebody puts up a smaller structure, let's say, even a granary or something of that nature, if the area happens to get flooded, then these individuals would not qualify for compensation; that is my interpretation of the bill.

So, aside from the point, realizing full well that if they have to apply for a permit, they have to flood-proof it properly - I'm talking of residential homes which maybe cost anywhere up to \$100,000, \$200,000 - I can fully appreciate that. But there is some concern I want to just bring forward to the Minister in terms of lesser buildings, because we have a lot of farms in the flood-prone area that we're talking about.

For example, a farmer wants to build a granary, to some degree, on his property and - I'm just raising these concerns with the Minister - that invariably the bureaucratic system could take and have him duke this granary at considerable more cost than it would to actually construct the building.

So, that's an area I just wanted to raise with the Minister, the grandfathering clause of the new area as being designated as a flood-prone area, and the fact that lesser buildings - I'm not talking about dwellings, I'm talking of lesser farm buildings - that could be affected by this kind of a regulation, and I'd like to - incidentally, Madam Speaker, I've sent copies of the bill to the municipalities along the Red River Valley, which is a flood-prone area and I haven't had too much response to date. I'm sure that if they have any concerns that they will be presenting that hopefully at committee level, and I just want to raise some of these concerns with the Minister, that maybe when we get to committee stage and go clause-by-clause, that we can maybe have a clarification on that. Aside from that, Madam Speaker, we're prepared to let the bill go to committee.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, I would want to close debate on this with just a few brief comments.

As the Member for Emerson has indicated, the only existing designated flood area at this time is within the Red River Valley. It is the intention of this legislation to provide for variance orders. Even without this legislation, there is the requirement for permits so that the structures are built to a level wherein they will be adequately protected against flooding. But, within that area, as opposed to the City of Winnipeg where within the City of Winnipeg there is a provision for variance orders in the flood-prone areas, there is not a provision for variance orders. This new legislation would provide for variance orders where it was not possible to meet that flood-proofing condition.

In addition, Madam Speaker, there is a provision for registering the variance orders and registering, on titles, those situations in which individuals have chosen to build, not in compliance with the flood-proofing regulations. I think that is a wise approach to take in that it insures that future purchasers of that property would be aware that either there was a variance order in place, and somebody may not be complying with an order.

In terms of the new areas that might be designated, these would be designated under the provisions of the agreement with the Federal Government for designating flood areas. We want to insure that those people have adequate flood proofing and, where there is damage to structures and individuals have attempted to flood-proof it, that there would be eligibility for compensation. But where individuals chose to ignore or defy the regulations for flood proofing, it seems to me then that it is not unreasonable that those individuals should not be eligible for compensation. I look forward to discussing this in committee stage and we can, at that time, get further clarification on the matter of grandfathering in those areas that might be designated as flood areas in the future.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. J. STORIE: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Radisson, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair for the Department of Natural Resources; and the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet in the Chair for the Department of Education.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Baker: The committee will come to order. We are now on page 52, Statutory Boards and Commissions, Section 2.(a).

Mr. Minister.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, there were a couple of questions raised yesterday in committee for which we did not have a ready response, and I would like to provide that information now.

The first question was with respect to the annual report. The information that I have, in terms of the cost and the copies, there were 700 copies printed. The total cost was \$5,885.76. The cost per copy was \$8.40 - I think we provided the information in terms of the distribution - somewhat more than the \$1.50 estimated for Fort Garry, based on the somewhat erroneous information provided in the off-the-cuff fashion in which it was provided.

The former Communication's director . . .

A MEMBER: He just doesn't know.

HON. J. STORIE: We don't know, yes.

The second area was in an explanation that we tried to provide to the member in response to his questions about the reductions in Other Expenditures for the Research and Planning area. The reductions are noted and the explanation is noted at the bottom of page 27 in the Supplementary Estimates. The explanation is, the reductions refer to reductions in surveys, such as the Teachers' Attitude Survey, which was conducted last year, and that kind of thing will not be occurring this year.

In addition, there has been reduced support to the French language research for the Bureau d'Education Français. The research and evaluation capacity in the division has just been foreshortened, I guess, because of that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: Has there been a result or a tabulation on the Teachers' Attitude Survey and, if so, is it available?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, I don't believe that has been finalized. I think most of the information that the Planning and Research Branch puts together is eventually tabled or is available through the library. I don't believe I have seen any final report on that.

MR. C. BIRT: Thank you.

Did we then go to the Teachers' Retirement Allowances Fund Board?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, just as an aside, the member had requested a copy of the curriculum material that had been prepared for the Family Life option. I have that information available. I'll simply provide it to the member.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, I have a series of questions relating to the report, and it compares the date of June 26, 1986, and it relates to the year-end December 31,

1985. Firstly, some general questions, if we go to - the page isn't marked but . . .

HON. J. STORIE: Is that the annual report?

MR. C. BIRT: Yes.

HON. J. STORIE: I don't have a copy of that, go ahead. I'm sure staff will be able to answer any questions.

MR. C. BIRT: It's the graph that says, "Teachers Retirement Allowance Fund Board, Comparative Stats, 1925 through to 1985." It shows contributions, one column for teachers, the other column for province, and then it shows a column for school districts which, I presume, are school divisions now, initially starting quite substantial contributions, now running down to zero, if you look at I guess from '81 through to '85. Do school divisions contribute towards the Teachers' Pension Fund, or is it solely a matter between the teachers and the Province of Manitoba?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, school divisions do not contribute. It's a matter between the teachers and the province.

MR. C. BIRT: So the monies that we see showed contributed by the teachers, it would represent their appropriate pension contribution paid into this fund, which is administered by the board?

HON. J. STORIE: Correct.

MR. C. BIRT: So when it shows at about 1980 - it would appear to be the last year - was there legislated change at that time, or was the matter just phased out?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, there was a legislative change.

MR. C. BIRT: Thank you.

Through the initial several pages of the report, they talk about - we're dealing now here with investments. There's Equity Investments, and I'm looking now, in particular, at page 2. It says, real estate, direct natural resources and then Venture Capital.

Could someone provide me with an explanation as to what these equity investments are, in other words, what type of investments? We have the amount of money and the percentage it represents, but a little more clarification than the general phrases that are there.

HON. J. STORIE: Well, Mr. Chairperson, I certainly am not a pensions expert, but I'd assume most pension funds distribute their plan contributions into different areas to provide some level of security and a reasonable level of return to the fund. I don't think staff have at hand all of the different areas and the dollars that are put into each area, but we can certainly undertake to provide that. I assume that that is public or can be public information.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, the two areas I'm generally interested in, because now these are permitted

investments, I imagine, by the particular legislation. I'm not trying to challenge it from that point of view; it's just that I'm curious because there's a liability that attaches and I'm just wondering what these represent. I'm more particularly interested in the Natural Resources and the Venture Capital because there's references throughout the report, for example at the bottom of page 2 it says, "Investment in real estate mortgage Venture Capital and direct acquisition of natural resource assets require advance commitment of funds which are paid out during, or on completion of construction."

Now that would make more sense to perhaps the real estate type of investment, so are we buying, is the fund buying real estate assets per se or is this relating to the natural resources field, maybe it's Venture Capital, I don't know, and we're talking about \$22 million here of unfunded commitments.

I want to know what the \$22 million of unfunded commitments are and what are we getting into? It says were paid out during or on completion of construction, and we're talking here, if I'm just looking at the equity investment section, it looks like about 20, maybe \$22 million if that's what we're doing.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairman, page 3 shows the list of commitments, bonds, mortgages, real estate equity, and the Natural Resources Venture Capital, the total of \$22 million. This member can see the yield, particularly with the real estate, has been more than acceptable I think, in terms of the fund.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, that gets me into another area of questioning because, by looking at that area that the Minister has just referred to, there are yields on bonds and mortgages but there are no yields for the real estate equity, the natural resource or the Venture Capital. Now there's an explanatory note later on, it's in Note No. 2 at the end of the report that I want some explanation on too.

But another area of questions I would like answered is, are these purely speculative investments, such as buying shares in the stock market, and you will ride them either up or down, or is it expected that they will start returning some yield in the future? There's a financial statement at the end saying that, I believe, some method of financial accounting was taken into place to reflect something, and I'm not quite sure what it is and I'd like an explanation of it when we get to it. But coming back to my basic question is, what is it that we're getting into, or at least the fund is getting into, that final paragraph on 2, what does it mean in relation to . . . I'm presuming it's just the equity investment area.

HON. J. STORIE: I think maybe we should be clear that the province does not make any contribution to the fund, that the money that is being invested comes as contributions from the teachers. So, I think the royal "we" in this case may not be appropriate. However, I think the other investment, the ones that the member referenced, of course, is yet to be determined what kind of return there is on those, I presume, real estate.

Mr. Chairperson, the average yield, of course, is yet to be determined on these. I presume it would be

possible to provide partial figures or something, but when there is an established average yield, that would be reflected in the numbers.

MR. C. BIRT: Would it be easier if I just asked my questions and then, perhaps at a later time you could come back with the answers? I can appreciate that it is not Government of Manitoba monies, but there is a commitment here of certain funds provided by the province on a matching grant basis when the pension benefits are paid out, so there is a provincial input.

I want to get into another area of future liability. When one looks at this type of portfolio dealing with the amount of liability or profit it may, or may not, determine the amount of the liability or commitments that the province has to meet at some future time. So I would like to try and get an explanation of just what these are. No doubt they're in someone's file and they can be readily brought out, and I just want some explanation as to what they are and what these phrases refer to because, quite frankly, they are meaningless unless you are either the chairman of the board or, perhaps, the one who did the audit for this.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairman, I would be more than happy to take the questions and any that can't be answered directly to make sure that the member does get a response.

I should also point out that not only are there no government funds, in terms of the investments, but the guarantees that were in place were removed as a result of legislation in 1985. So, the obligation for the province, the financial commitment, in the first instance at least, is substantially less than what it was.

MR. C. BIRT: Well, let me just put it this way. I've posed a number of questions so far and throughout - I guess it's the first eight or nine pages of the report, some of them deal with legislative change - but it's an explanation I would really like of what are we into, what's involved, and a better explanation as to what is at the bottom of page 2 when they make those general references that I refer to. And then, at the end, on page 3 of the Notes at the very end, it says "Teachers Retirement Allowance Fund" gives an explanation of some sort of funding change. Perhaps that could be explained as well because it shows a different method of calculation as to income or return on investment, I'm not quite sure. It shows a figure, so perhaps an explanation of that area as well.

HON. J. STORIE: That's on page 3 . . .

MR. C. BIRT: It's on page 3 of the explanatory notes I presume that have been prepared either by the Auditor or someone who has worked on the fund.

Okay, I'll leave those particular areas and come to the question, as I understand the responsibility of the government generally speaking, that the liability of the government is only to provide funds when a teacher retires. In other words, they put in some sort of matching funds or percentage of funds so that when we look at the figures in here, I guess it's \$23 million for this year, \$23.5 million, that is really flowing directly out as pension benefits to those teachers who have retired. Knowing

that it would appear that a number of teachers are taking some earlier retirement, do we have any figures as to what the future commitments will be? I mean last year we were at \$22 million approximately, or \$21.5 million, this year it was under \$23.5 million. Is there a future projection as to retirements and what the provincial liability will be for, because I presume it's going to be a growing amount? Do we know what it's going to be, say, in 1995 or the year 2000?

HON. J. STORIE: Well, obviously that depends to some extent on the number of teachers who retire, the number of teachers who are deceased, the number of new or . . .

MR. C. BIRT: If I may interrupt, some will retire at 65, they have to, or generally speaking the bulk will retire at 65. Some may opt for the earlier retirement without penalty and that may be a variable, I can appreciate that. But I think if you look at your population you can expect that those who are 65, 80 or 90 percent are going to retire. We must have some sort of liabilities that we know we're going to have to be needing in the next five or ten years, whatever the case might be. If so, if you've got that, can I see something like that?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairman, I don't have anything in front of me that would lead me to be able to give you anything definitive. I think maybe past experience is a guide, other than the 1985 year, '86 year, in which the retirement window was open for teachers. The average increase in expenditures from the province to pensions has been about 8 or 9 percent for the last six or seven years. So if you project that into the future, that may be a good guess. At some point, of course, we're going to reach a peak and we'll probably see some decline.

MR. C. BIRT: The 6 or 9 percent, is that in bodies or in money?

HON. J. STORIE: That's in percent of dollars expended.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, we have, I would think, an aging teaching population. I mean at one time it was probably a much younger population, but with static student body and I don't think they're hiring as many young people as they used to, so I would think the age curve would be skewing more towards the end, to the 65 range, than say 35 or 40. So would this then be accelerating say in the next years, or do we have any information on it as to what the government liability will be in a 10-, 15- or 5-year period?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, no, I don't think I can give the member any reading into the future. I think a good guess would be in the 6 to 9 percent increase in payout. How that is reflected in numbers of people retiring, additional numbers of people retiring, because of the aging work force is difficult to say, because they don't just retire at one age any more. There is a 10-year range where they may or may not retire. I think the member is quite right, that we do have an aging teaching force. At some point we will have reached the peak. I don't expect that's going to happen probably for another five to ten years.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, a 6 to 9 percent growth rate per year, I think the amount of the liability or payout from the government point of view would probably double within, I don't know whether it would be seven or nine years, something like that. So we're looking at fairly significant sums of money within the not too distant future. I guess the question I have is, is the obligation of the province, is it a matching grant? Now there may be different formulas, but if a teacher is entitled to say \$30,000 on retirement, does \$15,000 come from the fund and \$15,000 comes from the Provincial Government, or is it a different formula whereas the province pays perhaps a lesser portion because there is a lot of earned income within the fund and, you know, he gets his \$15,000, plus perhaps some earned income? The province isn't paying 50 percent of the retirement commitment, maybe it's 30 percent or 40 percent?

HON. J. STORIE: The earned income, of course, is income earned by the fund and of course that is where the fund gets the money to pay the other 50 percent of the pension. So it is a 50-50 split essentially and there is no additional money accruing to the teacher because of their investment. Their investment is in fact the payout from TRAF to the teacher.

MR. C. BIRT: Well, Mr. Chairman, if the interest rates stay low, say, for the next decade and the amount of earned income by the fund reduces, will that then force the provincial commitment to go higher? What I'm trying to find is that we have a liability line here because of commitments to teachers. We're going to put in so much money for a certain pension formula that's been negotiated or agreed upon over a long period of time. If we look at just the normal aging curve that the Minister talked about at the 69 percent, we know in maybe 12 or 13 years that liability will increase. But if the income earned by the fund, say, drops because of low interest rates or a low rate of return, will that then have a corresponding effect of increasing the amount of liability that the government will be exposed to?

HON. J. STORIE: Well, the answer is no. I think maybe the member has missed the point that I raised earlier, that the guarantee that once was attached to the fund is no longer there. In other words, the fund and the maintenance of the fund is the responsibility of the teachers themselves.

What might happen in the kind of scenario that the member for Fort Garry develops is that in fact their contributions would have to go up. Their percentage of contributions would have to go up. There is no further obligation on the province, other than to pay 50 percent of the pensions as they are paid out. So the answer is no, and I think that was one of the benefits of the 1985 amendments that we've talked about previously.

MR. C. BIRT: Well, that brings me to my next point. There's reference in here about the change in legislation and the removal of the guarantee that the Minister just referred to. I've been advised - now I think it's only rumour or hearsay - that issue of the removal of the liability or what the government is exempt from is perhaps being debated or argued at the moment by the Teachers' Society. Now, is there an issue as to what

that guarantee is, or is there any issue being challenged by the Teachers' Society as to, you know, did the government get out what they thought they were getting or in fact that area is now under negotiations and perhaps dispute.

HON. J. STORIE: There are certainly no negotiations to change any of the understandings or the details of the amendment, and I do not believe that the Teachers' Society has, in any formal way, requested any changes or raised any questions of interpretation.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Maybe the question I'm about to ask has been answered previously but, when we were debating the amendment to the bill in 1985, the point was made that the average age of teachers - and I'm pulling this from memory - was somewhere around 39 years, if you looked over the whole profile of ages. I know this is only 1987. We're only a year or two beyond that. Can the Minister indicate to me whether this average age of people employed within the teaching profession has dropped at all?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, the answer to that question is being sought. If there has been any change up or down, it has been extremely marginal.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, that was of course used as one of the major arguing points at the time by those in support of the bill, that there was an unwanted skew at the higher level of people. When I say the higher level, I'm saying the older age groups of people who wanted to retire earlier and it would, therefore, allow an opportunity for a larger number of young people to come in and to teach. I suppose that therefore then should be reflected in the average age of the profile of the 12,000 or so teachers within the profession. I'm wondering then if the Minister will undertake to provide that when he has it available to him.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, the increase that we have seen in the number of teachers that are retiring in the last couple of years have all been in the under-60 category. So, in fact, early retirement is having an impact. I said that, if there was any change, it would be marginal, I would expect, because the last increase of retiring teachers has been fairly substantial, probably 100 percent more in 1985-86 than perhaps '83-84.

But in terms of, because you have 12,000 or 13,000 practising teachers, it has a marginal effect on the average age, as you can appreciate. That doesn't mean that it's not having a real impact in terms of the ability of divisions to bring in new teachers into the teaching force and so forth, but it's average. If you averaged it out, it's probably not a large number, but I'll try and get you the exact number.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: On the question of early retirement, looking at some of the figures that have been provided, it would appear that a fair number of teachers are taking advantage of the early retirement. I'm looking now at some statistics that were provided by the Teacher Retirement Annuity Fund up to the end of 1986, and it shows an increasing number of people taking retirement from '84 which was 194 up to '86 being 264. The Supplementary Information of the Legislature indicates though for the coming year '87-88, it shows 185, which would seem to be just reversing the trend. Has the trend reversed? What's causing it to change, or perhaps is the number of 185 in error? In fact, it's going to be a higher number.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, the member is using the correct figures. There is another facet to this that the member should be aware of. That is net of deaths. In fact, there will be something like 270 retirements again in 1986. So there is still a fairly major increase in retirements if you net out the number of deaths.

MR. C. BIRT: Did I hear the Minister right that they're expecting about 270 for 1987?

HON. J. STORIE: That's the estimate, yes.

MR. C. BIRT: And is the bulk of it -(Interjection)- the figures being provided show substantial increases from 55 to 60, the numbers year over year growing. Is that trend continuing on that 270 number that was given?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is the estimate.

MR. C. BIRT: Do the Minister or the representatives looking after this particular area have any indication? Is the trend going to keep continuing or are they near to leveling off? Is there any indication just what sort of impact? I mean, has it reached its plateau, or are we looking at still future growth in this area?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairman, I would expect, and I believe the fund is predicting, that the level we are currently at is probably going to remain fairly constant for a few years. I think probably what you're going to see - this is my own opinion I suppose - is that the trend in teaching generally is going to be early retirement, that in fact the retirement pre-60 will in fact be the norm in not too many years. It is a difficult profession, and someone who began teaching at the age of 23 or 24 will already have served 30-plus years in the profession. I would expect that there will be significant numbers of teachers pre-60 taking advantage over the foreseeable future.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, when the legislation was brought in, one of the reasons for supporting it, along with some of the things that the Minister mentioned, was that it would create openings where younger teachers could be hired, therefore creating employment in a field that was very tight; and secondly, that cost savings would flow through to the divisions.

Now granted, if you're going to hire people at a lower rate, there are going to be some savings. The question

I have is: Has this really translated into employment for young ones because, even using last year's figure of 264, did that in effect create new openings or did the school divisions just tighten up because of the declining enrolment? Now I can appreciate there are probably just two or three divisions where there's been some growth, mostly in Winnipeg, but on balance most of the school divisions would be static or reducing. So in effect, it would be an easy way just to solve an employment situation by someone retiring and then that job is removed. Now has it manifested itself, or are the divisions in fact using it as a way of, you know, cutting back on their staffing component?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, just so the record is clear, not all of the members of the Opposition were nearly as supportive of this amendment when it was introduced as the Member for Fort Garry, who is obviously a very enlightened individual.

The fact is that it's difficult to say with any certainty which divisions, in fact, are taking advantage of an opportunity to shut down or to remove staff years from the division payrolls and which are using it as an opportunity to hire new teachers. The fact that 278 teachers or 270 teachers are retiring, and the fact that overall the teaching force in the province has actually increased marginally in the last few years would lead me to believe that, yes, it is creating the desired effect in terms of bringing young teachers into our schools. Some divisions, obviously, have seen their staff reduced. The majority have held stable or increased, but certainly for those divisions where there's a stable number of teachers in the work force or increasing numbers, retirements means opportunity. So I think it's fairly safe to conclude that it's been beneficial.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, the concept, I believe, was a good one. It would appear to be working to everyone's satisfaction and probably meeting most of the parameters that were set out when it was initially introduced. I'm curious to know, is anyone else looking at this principle in a general early retirement concept, and are they coming to the department or the board or whoever is responsible for this, and have there been inquiries in other areas, whether it be the Civil Service Commission or it be other employers in the province, in Manitoba or outside of Manitoba?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, I think, as the member knows, that the Provincial Government did offer an early retirement window to civil servants in the not too distant past. Interestingly enough, a number of divisions, some had implemented their own early retirement package, incentive packages previously, but many others have since implemented or are considering implementing support packages to encourage early retirement.

The member, I think, recognized earlier that there are potential savings for the divisions and, if you assume that someone retires at 55 when they normally wouldn't retire until 65 and assume that the difference between a starting teacher at Class 1 and the exiting teacher at maximum is \$10,000 roughly a year, now that 10 years represents a tremendous cost. It's not all in savings, because the teacher gaining experience is

increasing his salary or her salary as well, but there are substantial savings to be had in that exercise. So with that and the perceived need for young teachers - new blood, if you will - divisions are certainly interested in it.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, the area of supplementary retirement or inducements to take the early retirement that I think some of the school divisions had, I think particularly Winnipeg No. 1, but I've been advised that at least two or three other divisions are now considering it, in offering it, is it something for - you know, like some companies, when they want to streamline, will retire people early and give a package or an incentive package to cut costs. It's another way, instead of laying them off. Is there a general thrust within the teaching industry to sort of go that route to help some of these teachers who, perhaps, can't quite retire on their own because of financial costs, but the school divisions are taking this sort of early inducement to take advantage of it?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, I'm not aware of a division where that is policy. It may, in fact, be happening in individual circumstances.

Mr. Chairperson, I'm informed that there are divisions, particularly those with declining enrolments such as St. James, where that has been implemented as a policy. I'm not sure that it was used in exactly the same context that the member raised it, but it has been available for teachers and, I presume, if the right circumstances existed, a pressure would be applied to have individuals assume that or take on that option.

MR. C. BIRT: That concludes my questions in this area. I have another question on one of the other boards that fall in with this area, unless someone else has some other questions on this teacher retirement?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, the Provincial Auditor, in his . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're too close to the mike.

MR. C. MANNES: Too close?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Too close, yes.

MR. C. MANNES: That's unusual. Still too close?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just about another four inches away.

MR. D. SCOTT: You're not in a rock band now.

MR. C. MANNES: And I never have been, for the Member for Inkster.

The Provincial Auditor, in his last report, indicated his concern with respect to the unfunded liability associated with the teachers' retirement - not the fund, not its own fund, but indeed the matching share the Provincial Government has to put forward.

I would ask the Minister of Education whether he has had any dialogue with the Minister of Finance or

the Provincial Auditor, for that matter, as to how this appropriation figure may be handled in the future, given the fact that there is not an accounting for the unfunded liability as unfunded liability associated with the matching of teachers' pensions as they come due.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, no I'm not aware of any specific conversations, discussions around that issue. I think the procedures that have been followed over the past 10 years or more perhaps, are those that are still being followed, and the costs to the province of our obligations, in terms of retiring teachers, are noted every year in the Estimates.

I can't see any way of removing ourselves or do we want to remove ourselves from that obligation? So I'm not sure that it's much more than a - I was going to say semantic, but it's not a semantic point but it's certainly perhaps an accounting point. I'm not sure that the member would have it presented in some other way. Of course, it's an estimate of what the government's obligations might be into the future. We take them a year at a time; that's been the practice. Whether in fact it should be reported in some other way, I'm certainly open to suggestions. I don't think there's been any suggestion, and I don't take that from the member's comments that this has been other than well understood, that that obligation exists.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, nobody is questioning the obligation and nobody is certainly saying that the government at this point in time, some 20 years later, after the advent of this agreed-upon policy of matching the allowances that teachers have brought forward through their own fund, that that should be changed. I'm not saying it should be.

But the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that this number is continuing to grow at an exponential rate, will continue to do so into the future, slowly expedientially at this point in time, but will become a much more rapid increase over the years.

I'm curious as to whether the Minister of Education sees any role in government now beginning to set aside funds through Cabinet decision, to begin to meet the requirement, the pension requirements of teachers in future years, such that there won't be major shocks in the area, as I indicated in debate in 1985, of \$50, \$70, \$80 million soon into the new century that will have to be met on a yearly basis.

I'm questioning the Minister, whether he feels it might be wise to begin to set aside some type of funds as a province, and hopefully invest them as well as the Teachers' Retirement Allowances Fund has done, and therefore minimize the shock that will be coming forward in years hence.

HON. J. STORIE: The Member for Morris likes to engage in these economic speculative ventures. The fact is that we have an unfunded liability in health care. We have an obligation to meet in terms of providing health care services to the Province of Manitoba next year, the year after and for the foreseeable future. The member is not suggesting that we start to set aside some sort of reserve to meet that obligation. I recognize the point the member is making. There is an obligation to the province to pay 50 percent of the pensions that

have accrued to teachers in the province. We will have to do that into the future.

We could certainly establish a reserve fund or sinking fund - I forget the other accounting terms I was thinking of - to ensure that there isn't a shock. I don't think that any figures I've seen lead me to believe that there is going to be a shock. If we look back to 1982 into the foreseeable future, we see a fairly steadily increasing obligation on the part of the province to some point. Whether in fact that will continue to increase, is going to be determined by the number of teachers that we have in the year 2000. If we see the birth rate in the province and across Canada continuing to drop, we, in fact, may not see increases into the future. In fact, we may start seeing a lessening obligation in the province.

I don't really see much difference in the requirements that we have here and what the member calls an unfunded liability - than are obligations in many, many other areas. Now there may be legally or whatever, but I think morally and practically, the governments are going to continue to provide for those needs.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, the Minister should know better than I do that he is totally wrong in his analogy. He sits around Cabinet, he's been through the process many times. He likes to use the analogy of health, where there's an unfunded liability. He knows, for instance, when Cabinet sits around and makes hard decisions - that's one of the areas that they can discretionarily move back spending - indeed, they've done it.

Mr. Chairman, we have 100 closed beds in the province as a direct result of that decision made by Cabinet. He also knows around Cabinet when it comes to determining the amount of money that will come into appropriation - I'm sorry I don't have the book in front of me - but the one that applies specifically to the Teachers' Allowances Retirement Fund, that there is no leeway, there is no discretion, indeed, Mr. Chairman, absolutely none. It's a statutory figure that has to be met.

I say to the Minister, it's an obligation under policy set by governments past that it be met. I therefore beg to differ with him when he says that there is no difference between an unfunded liability in health, and in one requiring the government under Resolution No. 48 to come forward with \$23.5 million, and this year using an example.

Now the Minister says it's no large problem. I just have to remind him that he can go through his Estimates and in this non-discretionary area there's a 10 percent increase in spending, roughly, not quite 10 - but 9 percent roughly of an increase. The point I'm trying to make, in years to come, that is going to continue to increase at a rate, in my view, beyond 9 or 10 percent. He has no opportunity to vary that.

So it is my view, Mr. Chairman, firstly that the situation certainly is different from a statutory standpoint, than the amount of funds that are directed in toward health. Secondly, I still go back to the point that it might be wise for this government to consider to set aside funds at this point in time to begin to meet these obligations in the future; because let's remember, Mr. Chairman, the services that have been rendered by the teaching

profession, and rendered well to a whole generation of Manitobans have been over a period of times, and yet the requirements to meet their retirement needs will be forthcoming in the future.

HON. J. STORIE: I obviously share the concern of the Member for Morris, in terms of the obligation that the province has, and I agree that it is highly unlikely that the province would change the pattern of its obligation, but it's certainly within the purview of the government to do so. The member referenced the fact that we have a statutory obligation. By definition, the statutory obligations can be changed which would mean that some point down the road perhaps the government wouldn't provide 50 percent support. Who knows what may happen? Certainly it's not the intent of this government, as evidenced by its commitment to pension reform and pension improvement, to do that. But it certainly is within our power to change the course of events. The fact that there is also the additional possibility I guess that at some point down the road there will be fewer teachers in Manitoba and that also is determined to a large extent by funding available and provided by the province; so that in fact we may see a decrease in the number of teachers and hence somewhere down the road a decreasing obligation in terms of money provided through this appropriation.

I'm not expecting any dramatic change one way or the other in that, but it's certainly possible. I respect the fact that we're facing, I said 6 to 9 percent increases over the last few years and I see that continuing for several more years. I think that the dollar increases that we're talking about at this point, \$2 million to \$2.5 million dollars, are certainly within reason and not unduly taxing in terms of our ability to provide that support to retiring teachers.

MR. C. MANNES: Two questions, Mr. Chairman.

Has the Minister had provided for him an Estimate which includes the projections for a series of years and what would be required under this resolution, given the fact that 50 percent sharing stays as a policy?

And secondly, has the government done any analysis whatsoever in an attempt to forecast the total number of teachers in 10 or 15 years time, and the impact upon any changes of the sharing formula, in other words backing away in some fashion from the 50-50 formula? Have they done any internal study, analysis with respect to these issues?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, there's certainly no study or discussion at the current time or in the foreseeable future for backing away from that obligation, that undertaking. The other areas, the question of unfunded liability in terms of the pension contribution from the province, I think I've indicated that we have not done anything definitive. There are a whole bunch of factors that determine what ultimately our financial obligation is. But we certainly anticipate an increase in the costs for the next several years, but I don't think astronomical, perhaps in the range of 6 percent to 9 percent.

The actuary, I understand, is also working on a five-year projection. The member also asked about the number of teachers. I think the latest that I've seen

that, you can't always say with any certainty that because you have X number of pupils, you're going to have X number of teachers, but the Estimates are that pupil population in the province is going to remain fairly static for the next five years.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister a question dealing with the Board of Reference. In the past year, has there been any matter referred to the Board of Reference?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, are we finished with TRAF?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)—pass, 2.(b)—pass.

Resolution No. 48: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$23,488,000 for Education, Statutory Board Commissions for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March - sorry?

MR. C. BIRT: We just finished (a).

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, the member asked about the referral to the Board of Reference. There have been several over the past year. I understand from staff that 14 is the correct number of referrals.

MR. C. BIRT: Could the Minister advise the nature of them? Can they be broken down into sort of rough categories?

HON. J. STORIE: There are basically two different types of referrals. One is a request for either increase or decrease in the number of trustees per ward because of population shifts. The second type is a request for boundary changes because of proximity to schools, proximity to programming or whatever. So those are essentially the two major categories. And there was one in one division I requested to actually split the division and form two separate divisions.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, dealing with the question of boundary changes, with most of the school divisions either static or declining, is the government contemplating a review of the existing boundaries with the idea of perhaps coming up with new ones?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, the possibility of a thorough review of boundary revisions has been contemplated. As a matter of fact I have indicated that I will be meeting with the Board of Reference in the very near future to discuss I guess their feelings and their observations as a result of the hearings that they've held throughout the province on this matter. As well, individual school divisions who have been faced with rapidly declining populations have raised the issue for practical reasons. So I think that it's quite likely that there will be some sort of review. How extensive, will be decided I guess, at a future date.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, I guess the question is, when? Is it within the next year, would this be sort of

coming to fruition where a decision would be made on it?

HON. J. STORIE: Well, Mr. Chairperson, I expect that a decision will be made certainly this year on (a) whether to proceed with a review and (b) what kind of review that might be?

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, a question dealing with the collective agreement board. I note in the February 25th issue of the MTS update there's an article written by the President Mr. Barker, and it relates to the reference either by the MTS or MTS's association dealing with the Pine Creek School Division Board because they were complaining about their failure to bargain in good faith; and they wrote to the Minister asking him to exercise his discretion and to have it referred to the board. It's indicated that you refused to exercise your discretion and referred to the board. What was the reason for not referring it to the board?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, the application if I recall preceded conciliation and that was somewhat unusual. The thought there was to proceed with conciliation prior to any formal review. Subsequent to that, I did refer one to the Collective Agreement Board on the basis of the information that was provided.

MR. C. BIRT: Is it the policy then, if the parties can't seem to be coming to any conclusion, or a stalemate ensues, that conciliation kicks in and then, and only then, would it go to the Collective Bargaining Board, or is it a discretionary matter as to when it can be referred?

Because I was looking at the act again today and it seems rather vague as to whether or not, quite frankly, it should be referred. It almost deals with, the way I read it, if you've never had a collective bargaining agreement in existence and it's the creation of that first agreement, it almost doesn't read as if it should be a tool to facilitate a resolution of a negotiating problem.

I'm wondering; is my interpretation correct or is it in fact something that it is used in the collective bargaining process?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairman, it is not used very often in the collective bargaining process. I believe it was reused once in 1986. There have been two requests this year, the one the member referenced and the one I referenced, and there is considerable confusion, uncertainty, about the powers, the responsiveness of that body in any event.

As the member knows, the Manitoba Teachers' Society has been asking for substantial changes to The Public Schools Act to bring it in line with The Labour Relations Act.

I think this is an example of where there needs to be some review and I've indicated to the Teachers Society that we will certainly be reviewing it because I'm not satisfied that the power that's there, the structure of the Collective Agreement Board itself, lends itself to an arbitrary mediator's role or any real satisfactory role in that respect.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, I'll get into this general area a little later on in the Estimates, but when you

review that whole section, when you deal with conciliation and arbitration, and plunked in there someplace is this Collective Agreement Board, it does seem to be a little confusing and, in fact, it almost would be counter-productive because if you need something perhaps after arbitration, well, arbitration is the final binding step. Whether it's another step in the process or it's a side-step, to me, it probably has lived beyond it's usefulness because I suspect every division has a collective agreement in place.

Some would probably question whether the agreement is of any substance, but at least that initial process is over and we're now into the collective bargaining process and it doesn't seem to add anything, and in fact involving them in it and involving yourself in it only compounds the problems of trying to negotiate or arrive at a solution. So I'm pleased to hear that this whole area is going to be reviewed.

Mr. Chairman, we could pass this section.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 48: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$23,488,000 for Education, Statutory Boards and Commissions, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1988—pass.

We are now on 3. Financial Support - Schools.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Chairman, with the agreement of the Minister and hopefully with this committee, we agreed to move that over to perhaps Monday of next week and that we would go down to No. 4.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Program Development Support Services, (a) Division Administration: Salaries - the Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, just a question. Have there been any changes in the division administration in this department?

HON. J. STORIE: No, I don't believe. There have been a couple of appointments confirmed.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Did the Minister say there were a couple of appointments? What were they?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, there's some confusion here as to what the member means by administration. Do you mean senior personnel?

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, I'm just going on the line on Division Administration.

HON. J. STORIE: On what page - 51?

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Page 52. We're in Program Development Support Services.

HON. J. STORIE: Okay. I was back on Administration, that's why the . . . okay.

Mr. Chairperson, just so we can move perhaps in an orderly fashion, does the member have any questions on appropriation 4.(a) on the Administration, on the preceding page, page 51, in the supplementary material, for the Member for Kirkfield Park? Because we're playing musical chairs up here.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I really didn't intend much to get into that area at all except to just question that in the Program Development Support Services, I see that there has been just a small increase in the area but there's been a lot of juggling of figures in the Division Administration, the Curriculum Development and Native Education.

Where has the majority of the funds gone? There's been quite a big increase in the Child Care and Development. What was that for?

HON. J. STORIE: I'll just track that down. It's obviously a good question.

Mr. Chairperson, despite the fact that there looks to be a substantial change, the majority of the change comes about as a result of general salary increases, salary cost increases. That's the majority of it, Mr. Chairperson. Out of the 4.2 percent that's probably 4 percent of it.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to deal particularly with the money and I would just like to get into some questions on the curriculum, the development. How are the curricula being monitored in the divisions? I'm talking about probably the language arts but, in general, how are they being monitored?

HON. J. STORIE: Well, Mr. Chairperson, as the member knows, the department monitored the curriculum I guess and the development implementation of the curriculum in several ways. The Curriculum Assessment Program which was started back in 1979 is the major vehicle that we use as a department, to make sure that the curriculum is being implemented and we have some way of assessing the progress of curriculum implementation.

There is a schedule of assessments and I'm trying to find that. The schedule began in 1979 with the writing assessment and proceeded in successive years to assess, test the different area of the curriculum. In 1986 the assessment was done on the science curriculum. That's the first time in which we have something by which we can compare the progress of the science curriculum because the science curriculum had previously been assessed in November of 1980. So we've got a six-year spread. We have an assessment. We have a follow-up assessment and we can say how are we progressing? In the areas that we feel that are critical, can we say, yes, we're making progress? In 1987 mathematics is being assessed. That assessment will be ongoing shortly and the assessment is being done in the 3, 6, 9, and 12 levels.

The reports that flow from this assessment are available to school divisions; and individual schools, teachers, can have access to the information as well.

The other area, I guess the complementary area, is the curriculum Policy Review Committee in which material is assessed for its suitability and its fitting with the scope and sequence and the curriculum generally, and those committees are formed by bringing together people from education teachers, trustees, professionals in the area and they provide direction to the department, in terms of adding materials, taking materials out of the curriculum, making sure that the goals that are set out in the curriculum are achievable by making sure that the material that we use is suitable.

Those complementary processes go on all the time. Every year there is another series of Curriculum Policy Review Committee meetings and subcommittee meetings, so it's virtually a continual process. It's like continual progress in terms of student placement and student promotion. It's a continuing process and there are always several different areas within the curriculum being reviewed at any given time.

I don't know if the member wanted more specific information but . . .

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Now, the new Language Arts Curriculum for high school, the combining of - what do we call it - the 100 and the 01 programs, I realize that it's probably just going to be finalized, is it, this fall? But has there been any assessment ongoing while it's being put into place?

HON. J. STORIE: I believe that we discussed this last year at some point. The course, the language arts, the English program that the member is talking about has been in place now for three - Mr. Chairperson, the Grade 10 will have been in for two years. We're just getting into the Grade 12 level at this time and to my knowledge it has worked quite satisfactorily and without a lot of discomfort or concern being expressed by schools, school divisions or individual teachers.

Maybe the member has some further questions.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: In the combined English, what divisions are keeping the classes separate, are keeping the 00 and the 01 separate, and what divisions may be combining them in one room?

HON. J. STORIE: Well, Mr. Chairperson, even within divisions it varies, it depends on the specific requirements, I guess, of the school. As the member may know, the decision to designate a particular course as 00 or 01 is the responsibility of the school division's school principal. That designation takes place before the course is offered. So it varies pretty widely from school to school and division to division.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Has the Minister considered asking the divisions - I talk about final exams again which we're always at odds about - but has the department considered asking divisions to set their own final exams in the 100 courses, say to maybe approximately 25 percent of the year's grade?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, I have never, nor am I now opposed to final exams. What I am opposed to, and I've said so many times, is provincial exams.

I certainly in fact would encourage schools to use exams for certain purposes, certainly at the high school level, and I believe that most schools, if not all, do use exams.

The practices across divisions in terms of what percentage the exams represent in terms of a final grade for a student is again up to them. It varies in the province, I'm sure, from perhaps close to 100 percent to less than 25 percent. I'm not sure that I can say as a teacher, or as Minister of Education, that any one percentage in terms of assessing a final grade is better than another. What's more important is, I guess,

the structure of the test and the importance that the students place on the exam.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: If the Minister is in favour of final exams, would he consider then asking the divisions or making sure that divisions, that every division set that final exam in the 100 courses, and we'll say a minimum of 25 percent of the year's grade.

HON. J. STORIE: As I've said already, I believe that most divisions do use exams, examinations currently. What I would certainly be willing to do, is to undertake a review of that practice. I've said that I am not opposed to the use of examinations, and that's absolutely true. On the other hand, there is a substantial body of research, which would also say that they are not the be-all and end-all in terms of education.

So I'm reluctant at this point to commit myself to saying yes, you as a school division shall do this or that, in terms of student assessment. Student assessment has been, for a considerable period of time, the responsibility of school divisions.

In fact, I would be very interested to find out what the current practice is across the province, in terms of the use of exams, particularly at the senior high level.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, I find it strange that the Minister wouldn't know what is happening in the different divisions, because I think that parents certainly are making it very well known that they are looking for some sort of way that they can see what the kids have been doing.

Does the Minister know if the universities plan university entrance exams?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, I'm not aware at the present time of any plans on the part of our universities to utilize entrance exams.

I do want to raise with the member that I did not say that I was not aware of what some school divisions or the majority of school divisions were doing in terms of the use of exams. I do know that many use exams. I don't think I could sit here and say that I know the practices of every school in the province.

As I said before, it has not been the practice of the department to dictate to school divisions how they shall assess their students at any level. But I believe that it is a fairly common practice to use exams at the current time. I have never declared any opposition to that.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: The reason I asked about the university entrance exams is that when I was talking to different people in education, that there is some feeling that this may well come about. The reason I was into exams at the school level, at the division level, is that it seems to me it makes more sense that a university entrance come at the high school level, then be imposed when someone is trying to get into university. Then they find out that they're not up to the standards that the university is looking for.

It was also mentioned that there are far too many students who waste a couple of years at university because they're not qualified. It's both a waste of their time and money on both the student's money and certainly the system's money.

So I think that's why today, when jobs are hard to come by, when people are, and parents in particular are concerned that their children get some kind of an education that's going to allow them to get a job, and to get something that they'll be able to live with well. It may not be the highest money but something that they can have a fairly decent standard of living, and this is most important to parents in the area.

I'd like to ask a question about the math and ask the Minister if there has been a consideration - are they thinking of combining the Math 300 and the 01 program?

HON. J. STORIE: No, Mr. Chairperson.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I understand that the Math Steering Committee for the province passed a motion that the Math 300 be two credits, as in English, and that there was a definite desire for a stronger curriculum. Has the department or the Minister made any decision on that motion, or has he received it yet?

HON. J. STORIE: I have not received that recommendation. Mr. Chairperson, I think that the fact is that if there was going to be any strengthening, I guess, of the math curriculum, it would come in the form of offering as a second half of the final year of math, a 305 or a calculus course.

That course has already been developed and is available in some schools in the province. In fact, there are some innovative things happening in delivering that advanced math course really to other parts of the province using a telecourse. It's making it available to students who, because of the size of their school or their geographic location would not normally have access to it.

In terms of the math curriculum generally, I suppose all of the areas can always use improving and upgrading. But there have not been many expressions of concern, I think, from the university community in the recent past over the math curriculum. There have been some, but certainly my contact with the university community has not led me to believe that there's any fundamental problem. I think access to the 305, the calculus course, would be an asset, particularly for the mathematics, physics, chemistry areas. It is available in some areas but not in all areas.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I believe that the reason given for wanting the stronger curriculum was that the fear that possibly math may go the same way as English, and there would be a combination of the two. Certainly, the educators that felt that way are not feeling the same way as the Minister, that the 300, the combined English and probably Social Studies for that matter, were going to enhance the 301 students but make the course more mediocre. But we went through that last year.

When the Minister mentioned, Mr. Chairman, the 305, the calculus, has that not been offered everywhere?

HON. J. STORIE: No, Mr. Chairperson, obviously the size of school, the range of options in different schools varies considerably. There are too many schools in the province, small schools in particular, where options like

calculus are simply not available. The same is true of many other courses in fact, that there are some schools who, because of their size, their staffing can offer very few options. One of the reasons why I think there is such interest in many parts of Manitoba for our initiatives in terms of small schools and distance education is because it offers them an opportunity to have more courses available for their students. I should say as well that many of the questions that the member is raising, and good questions, I think will also come under the purview of the High School Review Committee. I think good questions, questions that have been raised by people and individuals as we tour the province; and I think that some of the concerns raised here really parallel the concerns that are raised by parents, students and teachers in other parts of Manitoba and hopefully the High School Review will be able to come to grips with solutions for some of the problems that the members raised.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, I'd like to move on to the Health curriculum if I may, Mr. Chairman. The optional Family Life Program, how many divisions have opted into the optional portion of that?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, I understand that four or five have made a definite commitment to date.

Mr. Chairperson, perhaps I could add that there are approximately 35 divisions currently considering implementing the Family Life Program for the coming year. So there has been considerable interest in offering the program.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, have there been any changes recommended by teachers who have started teaching the program?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, the revisions . . . there are revisions, revisions can happen to the curriculum and the revisions can be implemented on a local level. So we wouldn't necessarily know whether in fact there have been revisions to the material or the suggested activities that were provided. I should indicate as well that there are several divisions who offer their own Family Life Programs independently of the optional program that's provided through the department. So I would expect that there will still be divisions offering their own program, perhaps a more extensive program in some cases, or many cases, than the current Family Life Option Program.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman, in the Optional Family Life, it goes from Grade 5 to Grade 7, to Grade 9. What happens to students who are transferred into a division at the Grade 6 level, or the Grade 8 level, and then when they take it in Grade 7 it's assumed that they will have taken the first year of the program. Why was there that gap in the program? And is there not a chance for a review or something at the different grade levels?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, the scope in sequence of the Family Life units are repeated in many respects over the three years of the program. So that you deal with family crisis, you deal with sexuality, you

deal with family life, whatever, in all three grades in some respects, so that missing one level wouldn't necessarily mean that the person wouldn't be exposed to the ideas or the concepts that are important. In fact what, I suppose good curriculum builds on are ideas and concepts as children's ability to explore those ideas and understand those concepts develop. So it wouldn't be necessary.

I should point out as well that we are looking at making modifications to the Health curriculum, particularly with respect to adding information relatives to AIDS and that will be through the 7, 8 and 9 years, so there won't be any gaps. That may address perhaps some of the problems that I'm anticipating from the Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, what was the thinking that went into leaving the gap, that there wouldn't be that curriculum at each grade level once it started in the optional portion?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, the gaps are covered I guess from one perspective by curriculum information on drugs and alcohol in the 6 and 8 levels. So it's, I guess, simply part of the whole package of special treatment of special issues, if you will.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, I guess that begs the question then, are the same divisions that are taking the optional family life taking the drug and alcohol?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, yes, that's I think an accurate statement. I think most divisions, perhaps not all, but most do the drug and alcohol units.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: The Minister mentioned the education, the AIDS portion that was going to be added. At least I believe I heard him say that. I just pulled out a little part of the paper that indicated that I guess the superintendent of the St. Boniface School Board has indicated that the department has not offered any guidelines for approaching the subject of AIDS. Is there something that is planned for the immediate future?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, I think I've announced this publicly on a number of occasions. In addition to the information, some of which I provided to your colleague, dealing with AIDS as one of the sexually transmitted diseases in the Family Life Curriculum.

The department is working on additions to the health curriculum, Grade 7 to 9, a package of materials for delivery at the high school level, as well as providing information pamphlets at our universities and colleges. Much of that is being done in conjunction with the Department of Health and their announced initiative on AIDS education. So hopefully those curriculum additions will be in place by the fall. That's our intention.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask some questions on the low incidence funding. Am I jumping around too much here? I've just got a few things basically on curriculum and this was one of the areas. Would you prefer to deal with it at another spot?

HON. J. STORIE: I won't say the member is jumping around, but I have a pogo stick if you need one. The

member may go ahead if she wishes to ask her questions and we will try and address them as best as we can. We may need, in fact, to refer the questions to staff who aren't here at the present time.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I can certainly wait if you're planning to have staff here tomorrow. I can leave those questions then for another time.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, just so the member is aware, the Member for Fort Garry had requested that 16(3)(a), the funding issues, be left until Monday of next week. That's where most of those questions would be appropriate.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Well, maybe possibly I will deal with it. I wanted to deal with the area of how it's done also. So I will leave it until Monday then, if that's fine.

I had a question that I noticed in the annual report, and it was talking about the Curriculum Policy Review Council and it said they held two joint workshops with the Program Review Committees, and "Continuous Progress" was one of the topics. Is Continuous Progress still being carried on at the elementary level in some of the divisions?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, in some divisions, primarily in the Kindergarten, Grade 1-2 area, where I guess there is more flexibility in terms of providing necessary remedial work to allow the student to adapt. It still is a practice, yes.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Is that as far as it's going? I want to be assured here, because I personally had something happen to one of my children in Continuous Progress and when I see it, it was just like ringing a bell and it was an alarm. I want to be assured that it's only going to go up to Grade 3 and that it's not being carried any further.

HON. J. STORIE: Well, Mr. Chairperson, as far as staff know and as far as I know, I think I can give that assurance that the formal practice of Continuous Progress is only occurring through K to 2.

However, the whole issue of promotion really doesn't lend itself to nice neat concepts. There are, I guess, students at every grade level, particularly elementary where you don't have other curriculum options like general courses or occupational courses or business education courses where students progress for more than just competency reasons. There are still, in effect, social passes that there does not seem to be any legitimate reason for retaining a student at an individual grade. That's not called, I guess, Continuous Progress.

But on the other hand, the teacher taking on that responsibility for someone who is promoted for other than academic reasons, nevertheless takes that student on at where he's at. That's what we say in the jargon. You have to take a student where he's at and you have to move him to another point. Really, in effect, what you have is Continuous Progress.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Or no progress.

HON. J. STORIE: Well, you hopefully have progress, but maybe not at the speed you like.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I want to caution on Continuous Progress. I've seen it at work. One of my children got caught up in it and I couldn't find out - like right through, he was going along fine because he was passing from grade to grade. It wasn't until we were moving that the teacher said they are a year behind in math and language arts. Now that was a good time to find out.

Luckily, I was the parent that could go in the school and be a volunteer and work with 10 students who I thought must be real dummies, my own along with it, not one of them, but Continuous Progress to these children meant at their own speed which was like "yesterday" and, you know, everybody must have children like that; and to be caught up in this kind of a process, this same child has gone through university, he's got a degree, nothing wrong with him, nothing wrong with any of them, except they went at their own progress.

I will tell you there is such a danger in a program like this where you're not dealing with what might be considered slow learners, but just that kids who are social and don't want to do anything more than continually be slow. Like they'd rather do it yesterday than today, or they'd rather do it tomorrow always.

HON. J. STORIE: I couldn't agree more, and I don't think that what the member is describing is Continuous Progress.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: That's what they called it.

HON. J. STORIE: That's maybe what they called it. Unfortunately, education is not without its jargon.

Continuous Progress is supposed to mean that an individual is encouraged to do his absolute best and achieve it as absolute best and that when he has mastered a given concept, he moves on.

I think that the kind of situation you describe, it's really self-progress, it's not continuous progress, and obviously, the teacher is the prime motivator in terms of having a student achieve at their optimal level.

I think that the idea of continuous progress still exists and, as I've said, it's practised in the early elementary years. I think, in fact, the principle of continuous progress exists throughout the school system because teachers do take students from where they're at and continue their progress.

I think the member is also aware that all school divisions and all schools have a variety of ways of marking student progress.

Many, if not all school report cards identify different programs that students are in, so you have your student in language arts, he's in the expressways program or he's in some other program, all of which mean that the student is achieving well or exceptionally well or poorly at a level.

The alternative to doing that is say well, we have one set of standards for all students in every grade, and if they don't achieve, well then he'll sit there in Grade 6 until his socks fall off. We don't do that, so the principle of continuous progress still exists, in the sense that you take the students with the abilities they have, and you see them continuously progress through school. I think that's a legitimate approach to education.

Where it falls down, I guess, is in the implementation. If you have an individual teacher or administrator who

has a less regular rigorous notion of what's achievable, you can have problems. I don't think the concept of continuous progress is talked about or practiced, in the way the member describes, very often in Manitoba any more.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Well I don't want to dwell on the subject too long. I just found, when I saw those two words, that it alarmed me. Because what the Minister was saying was very fine in theory, but when you have children and you go to the school - because there is really no measure that you can take - and yet the teachers are saying they are doing fine, from year to year to year. Luckily, I was in an area that when you were moving, they were able to assess and tell me what would happen when he had moved somewhere else, when we were moving into the city, that this kid was going to be behind. Luckily for the others that were in this class, we were able to do something for all of them.

But I think that the idea of continuous progress, the way the Minister describes it and what may actually be happening in a classroom where you start segregating and they fall further and further behind; when they come to the junior high level where does it end, what happens then? These are the kids that are your drop-outs, and there's no necessity for any of them, or they go through school and then end up at the bottom of the ladder instead of doing what they're actually capable of. So, as I say, I won't continue on with that one, it just scares the be-jeebers out of me when I see it.

HON. J. STORIE: I think what the member is getting at is making sure that we don't make assumptions about students' abilities - we have to make assumptions - but how we attempt to make sure that they achieve beyond what we hope for and that we don't settle for something second best. I hope that's the principle that's shared by all the teachers in the province.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, last year during the Estimates I was inquiring about the kindergarten assessment, and if there were any changes recommended. The report hadn't come out; possibly the Minister could give me some indication what happened with the assessment.

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, I'm told that the report has been completed and that staff expect it to be mailed out within the next couple of weeks, and I will make sure that the member gets a copy.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman, I can't help laughing. I'm looking at July '86 and the Minister said they'd be ready in a month.

HON. J. STORIE: Did I say that?

MRS. G. HAMMOND: That's what you said.

HON. J. STORIE: I must have been wrong.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Another question, and I don't think I received the material, but I stand to be corrected here. I asked about the peace education, and the

Minister indicated that there was resource material that was being collected and that they would send me a current list of the resources that have been identified. I was wondering if I had received them and have forgotten, or I think, more than likely, I don't think I got them. Could I receive them now please?

HON. J. STORIE: I was just looking down past the Member for Kirkfield Park. I've got an indication that we actually did get that information to you.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Do you? Okay, well then I'll . . .

HON. J. STORIE: We have more.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: No, I'll have it.

HON. J. STORIE: We'll keep sending it till you're swamped . . .

MRS. G. HAMMOND: No, I'll have it if it's there, Mr. Chairman.

There was another area that we dealt with last year and I'm going over last year's Estimates. I asked about financial planning in the home economics course at the high school level, and the Minister had indicated that he thought it was a good idea and I'm wondering if there had been anything done to include that in the curriculum?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, the human ecology course that is offered does include the kind of approach the Member for Kirkfield Park referred to, and the curriculum there, as well, and material related to it are being revised, I think to increase the importance of financial management, budgeting, and I'm told, as well, that a draft of the curricula can be made available to you, if you would like to have a look at it.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I would.

HON. J. STORIE: I hope it will reflect your concerns.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm delighted that that change has been made and I would love to have a copy of the draft. I have some questions - I've got the booklet in front of me. I don't know if the Minister would have it, "In the Name of Our Children." I want to state right at the beginning that I'm not making any judgments on the material in the book that was presented to the Minister, but I do have some questions in regard to some of the material that they have put out, and I'd like to ask, if I may, some of the areas that possibly the Minister maybe couldn't answer at this time, but if I could get some answers at some future time. It's to do with - they were talking about - and I'll go page 28 of the book, the environment and the excellence and that we need the top scientific minds so that they can do something about the environment and that we need technological engineers with a deep understanding of the environment. I'm just basically touching on that area.

I want to further go to page 59 where they're dealing with the science program. They referred to J. Macek, the Manitoba Education System and its current impact

issued in April 1985. It said the validity of the report's data, methods and conclusion were never questioned or challenged by Manitoba Education. Is this correct?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, I believe that the individual who wrote that report has had innumerable meetings and discussions with the staff about the suggestions that were made and his interpretation of what the Manitoba curriculum, particularly the science curriculum, was all about. I can only reiterate what I have said to him, to the individual being referenced on a number of occasions that obviously the individual feels very strongly about it, but the fact is that the curriculum has been developed over a number of years by individuals equally as competent and capable and knowledgeable in the area of scientific education as that individual. There are always going to be differing points of view on the relative strengths or weaknesses of the curriculum.

Obviously, we have to provide a curriculum that is both challenging and representative of the facts, but also understandable to the students. I think some of the suggestions that have been by Mr. Macek are worthy of further investigation and study. I think some of the perspectives that he brings to Manitoba Education are not in keeping with - in my view, and I'm only expressing a personal point of view and not as a scientist - the ever-increasing knowledge that is available to our students in the scientific areas, suggestions that we have one standard curriculum or one standard book that's available across the province, really limits the scope of knowledge that you can provide to students.

In an expanding area, it would mean requiring the province to republish - something first of all that we don't do - textbooks on a monthly basis. To keep current, the textbook would have to be 7,000 volumes to deal with the tremendous array of scientific areas that are under research right now. It's not practical.

The second question is how much can we expect, what kind of expertise can we expect our students to have at a high school level? So I think in all fairness, we have to conclude that our curriculum is similar to most other curriculums across the country. The results that we achieve by our students in the scientific areas are better than average. The Ontario Government just commissioned the study of the achievement of their Grade 13 science students and to their dismay found that Manitoba students and other western students studying sciences achieved at higher levels than their own Grade 13 students.

So I think it's fair to say that the science curriculum, despite its shortcomings, is adequate, appropriate and meeting the needs of our students and generally meeting the needs of the post-secondary institutions to which many of them go after high school.

No one is denying that we can't improve it and we're working in the science curriculum area as much as any other area to make sure that it's as strong as it can be, but the major shortcomings that are seen by some individuals simply aren't there.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman, when I'm dealing with this particular book, I know the kind of thought and input that went into it. I say again I'm not agreeing or particularly disagreeing because I don't have the

expertise in these matters to judge whether they may be right or wrong and some of the statements that they make. I recognize that some of the statements are rather harsh to say the least in different areas, but I think that comes probably from looking for excellence and out of frustration with some of the comments that I read in the book.

I'd just like to ask a question, on page 62, it deals with fossil fuels and then goes on to deal with - on page 67 - motion and collisions. I'm putting this on the record. I'm not going to read in any of the things that are there except on page 70 where it says, "these and similar errors abound in the primary reference of the Manitoba Science 100, motion and collisions module." Has anyone checked this material out to find out if what is said about this particular module, are they correct in their assumptions and, if so, then will the department be recommending changes to that particular module?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, I have indicated that some of the concerns that were expressed in terms of the material have been reviewed and where there have been shortcomings we have agreed and there are changes contemplated to that particular piece of material. I don't know whether the member has had a chance to look at that particular section.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, I have.

HON. J. STORIE: I have reviewed it and, not being a scientist, said that they are trying to do here makes sense to me. The question is, how do you present the underlying scientific principles that relate to those facts. Therein lies the problem. You can talk about abstract things to some students - if their level of intellectual maturity is such that they can't grab the abstract, you can try as you will, you won't succeed. Whereas the concrete, sometimes is more understandable. So that's the mix. That particular section doesn't reflect the quality or the applicability of the rest of the science curriculum. It is only one of many materials that are available, approved materials that are available for use, and teachers add and supplement as they see fit from other materials as well.

So one example has been chosen at which there may have been shortcomings, and we're certainly prepared to move in any area where there are shortcomings. The shortcomings exist not necessarily because of, I guess, the material or the way it's presented, but perhaps in the sequencing or the lack of additional material, supporting material. Changes certainly can be made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just while the Member for Kirkfield Park is on this, Mr. Macek, as the Minister knows, is a resident of my constituency and a neighbour of mine. I certainly appreciate the amount of time and effort that he's put in over the last several years in developing this paper. I encouraged him to get something down on paper at the time when he was first coming to me, and he went far beyond my wildest expectations of what he would

present to the department. It shows a tremendous amount of dedication by this individual towards what he sees as an issue.

I'm wondering, one of the problems we have within our whole society is that we're not having sufficient number of people following science career paths, and I think that's a problem of any society as we move towards the end of the 20th Century and into the 21st Century. As economies are more and more technologically oriented, we're going to be left behind if we don't have science graduates who are up to par and have the same kind of drive and excitement about them as other countries are developing.

I don't see us doing that in Canada. I think we're falling behind in the whole country. I'm not trying to blame something in the Manitoba Department of Education by any stretch of the imagination, but I do think that we probably do have to try and address how science is presented in our schools from the earlier grades right through high school, to try and present that challenge, show people the opportunities that are there, and to encourage more students to do more, to stretch their minds and to challenge themselves and get into the exciting area of science.

I'm wondering what sort of efforts the department is doing or taking in this area to try and develop a greater interest of students in science in particular. You can only deal with, through universities, so many arts graduates, business graduates, commerce graduates, the philosophy and that sort of thing. We also need the science corps through engineering, agricultural sciences, the whole kit and caboodle, physics and chemistry and all that.

So, it's kind of a general question here, if the Minister would - I'd be pleased to hear the kind of response he has. Thanks to the Member for Kirkfield Park for allowing me to intercede in her line of questioning.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you.

First, I'd like to say that the work that Mr. Macek has done, I think, will be valuable, has been valuable to the department. While we're not going to, neither I nor people in the Curriculum Branch or on the Science Curriculum Review Committees, necessarily agree with all aspects of it, there is much to commend itself in that study.

The fact is that teaching science is different from being a scientist, and you always have to remember that there are differences. What should be possible always isn't going to be possible in terms of encouraging and implementing science curriculum.

The Member for Inkster raised a number of, I think, legitimate points. Although there's a perception and I will admit to sharing the perception that we weren't keeping up in terms of science grads, the fact is that I attended the graduation ceremonies at the University of Manitoba and asked the Dean of Science whether in fact we were losing, whether there were proportionately fewer science grads now than there were in the past. He said no, it's actually increasing. So it's always been the case that there has been a disproportionate number of students taking other professional degrees, arts degrees, but we are seeing an increasing number of scientists.

The fact of the matter is - and I have an example in my own family - that the rewards, the obvious link

between education and employment isn't there when it comes to science. My brother has an honours science degree and considerably looked for a year-and-a-half for a job, ended up in a related field. He's a salesperson for a pharmaceutical manufacturing company.

But the fact is that there are not a significant number of high-paying research-oriented jobs in Canada, certainly not in Manitoba, for science graduates, and so the incentive which is there in many other fields isn't there in science. That's a Canadian shortcoming, and that's a lamentable fact when you consider the importance of research and development generally to our economy and our future, something that I don't think can be addressed just through the teaching of science in the schools.

There has to be another motivator, and that of course is the opportunity for a career and career advancement. I'm not sure that exists or it's perceived to exist for many students as they enter high school and start making choices or, for that matter, as they enter university and start making choices about their careers. So there are problems out there that aren't related strictly to the teaching of science.

Having said all that, in defence of what I'm now going to deny I said, the fact is that we need to improve, I think, our teaching of science. The Faculty of Education, I think, would say that we have difficulty in attracting science students into the Faculty of Education to teach science. There are too many teachers. I think I'm safe in saying there are probably too many teachers out there now teaching science who do not have the appropriate science background, and I know that the Faculty of Education is working on that as well.

There's one other area of concern, and that of course is the continuation of women in science and math areas. The schools, school divisions and the department have been working to, I guess, heighten the awareness of the opportunity and the need for women to pursue careers in science and math as well.

Hopefully, those things collectively will make a difference and will help us to improve the success of our science students and graduate more science students over the next few years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Following on the Member for Inkster, when he was talking about Mr. Macek, he's just done an absolutely fabulous amount of work. When we asked, I think, the Minister last year when we were in Estimates to consider putting him on the High School Review I wonder if, now that the Minister has had a chance to see the kind of work he has done and to recognize the value of some of the things that Mr. Macek has recommended, if he would consider or maybe he has already considered putting him on to Curriculum Committee dealing with science.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, I have already indicated to Mr. Macek that I would consider doing that when there was a vacancy on one of the Science Curriculum Committees, or certainly provide him with an opportunity to present information and provide feedback. Having said that, I want to indicate fairly clearly that Mr. Macek's view is fairly rigid. While there

are individual ideas within his paper that I think can be utilized to improve our curriculum, the approach that he's taken is one that I personally don't agree with in terms of an overall formula for improving the curriculum and for making scientists in 1987 and beyond.

So the ideas that he's generating are useful. They serve as I think a means of testing our assumptions and in that respect his contribution has been valuable. If an opportunity comes about where I can use his skills, I certainly am more than prepared to do so.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I thank the Minister for that answer.

I'll continue on page 70 where the book makes a statement that Manitoba's children are introduced to reading most frequently through some variant of the look-and-say method. I was under the impression that children are learning to read through phonics, or am I wrong? Are the divisions that aren't, or schools that are not using phonics at all, and it is just a sight reading?

HON. J. STORIE: No, I think many divisions, many teachers still use phonics as part of the reading development process. It isn't used as extensively, or as single-mindedly perhaps, as it was 20 years ago. But it's certainly one of the methods that is used to develop reading skills.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Would the Minister then say that every teacher who's teaching children to read would be using phonics in some method?

HON. J. STORIE: I would say, yes.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: On page 71, and this is referring to mathematics, it refers to the academic mathematics 300, no longer qualifies a Manitoba high school graduate for freshman admission into several Ontario university programs. Is that true? Would that be a true statement that some of our students can't get into Ontario universities because of the math?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, I understand that there is one university, Waterloo, that requires advanced math, above Math 300 for their computer science program but not university generally.

I think if one was to go across the country, you could find individual programs that have specialized requirements which would exclude students from this province and every other province.

The fact is that this is one of the areas that we've already touched on in terms of perhaps the necessity of providing a broader range of Manitoba students with advanced math, the calculus, because I think that's the ingredient that's missing. But it is available in Manitoba in some schools depending on their ability to offer, which would mean that they could get into even that program.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Just dealing briefly with the 305 math and calculus, is that something that's going to be more and more required by universities, even possibly in Manitoba, that it may be a prerequisite to get into certain courses?

HON. J. STORIE: Of course, that is determined by the university themselves who set the prerequisites. To my knowledge there is not one currently in existence, but that doesn't mean that the computer sciences or some other specialized engineering program won't at some time require that option.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: It's just one of the things that makes me hope that the department will keep ahead of and keep an eye on that sort of thing, so that students are alerted when they're in high school that this is something that they need and very often that's something that happens. They get out of high school and then they find out they need this and it could have been something that they had time to take.

On page 76, and now we're into the social studies area, I just want to deal briefly in this area. It's the cultural and moral relativism which permeates the curriculum and makes it impossible to make moral judgments about despicable regimes. In Grade 12 - and then it goes on - for instance, the Soviet regime is depicted as struggling for quality of life of its citizens. They're saying that there is nothing in the Curriculum Guide about totalitarianism. The word never appears and there's no word of sympathy for the hundreds of millions who labour under Communist tyrannies, and I ask if that's an accurate assessment of the curriculum as it is set up now.

HON. J. STORIE: Well, you may and you may not find the word "totalitarianism," but you probably won't find "capitalist imperialism" either.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I guess that I wasn't looking at that particular word as the key phrase in the whole thing. What I was just wondering is that is there nothing that deals with people who are under the Communist countries, say like as in Poland, where they had the struggle just a few years back and that people are not just as happy with these governments as some would let you believe. Like is there something that tells a student actually the way it is living in these countries, that everything isn't great? They can't leave when they like, that they can't do exactly as they can, such as they do in Canada, that it isn't just a happy-go-lucky existence under some governments.

HON. J. STORIE: Well, I guess the world issues, the current issues deals with topics, such as the one the member raises. I think that the curriculum generally has tried to avoid making value judgments or extreme - is perhaps a better word - value judgments about the regimes, the organization of other nations and making extreme value judgments about other cultures or other cultural religious whatever values.

I think they do try and I hope they try to portray a realistic perspective of the strength and weaknesses of other regimes. I don't think, I certainly hope, I've not heard that they're trying to sugar-coat any of the realities that exist, whether they be Canadian realities or USSR realities or the realities in Nicaragua.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: When I read this particular paragraph, it brought to mind somebody who I know, a student who was in Poland and was arrested for

taking a picture of a parade. So it's just as well that some of our students are aware that these things can happen in another country. I would hope that the curriculum would be clear in areas like this that you cannot go into another country such as Poland and some of the communist countries which restrict their people from moving about, that it is easy to end up in jail, that they have to mind their "p"s and "q"s and that things are not as they are here.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairperson, I feel fairly confident in saying that those kinds of comparisons are being made. I don't believe there is a teacher in Manitoba, I certainly hope there isn't one, who isn't proud to be a Canadian and living in Canada. We have our warts as Canadians as well. The fact is that there are many different countries in the world, not only communist regimes, where freedom is certainly something that can't be taken for granted. We could talk about Argentina or we could talk about South Africa, supposedly a Commonwealth democracy.

Those are tough issues and there are realities out there that are much different from our own and I think that's what we need to expose our students to. I hope that all of those issues are viewed in the context of our relative good fortune in living in Canada.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour now being six o'clock, committee rise.

SUPPLY - NATURAL RESOURCES

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

We are considering Item No. 8, Fisheries. 8.(a)(1) Administration: Salaries; 8.(a)(2) Other Expenditures. The Honourable Minister.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, just before we begin, I'd like to table for members opposite some of the information that they requested yesterday with respect to the fishermen employed in a commercial fishery over a three-year period. We have the information from 1983-84 through to '85-86, and it is broken down by lake regions.

Mr. Chairman, one additional item, there was a question from the Member for Springfield with respect to the authority for setting fees on private lands within parks. I have that particular document here. It's an excerpt from the Provincial Parklands.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, I suppose we could spend a lot more time on the commercial fishing aspect of it and raise some concerns about the Freshwater Fish Marketing Board, but I might maybe leave that area to some degree with a few comments.

I just want to ask the Minister, in view of the information that he just presented regarding comparisons of licences for the period of the last three years, the comparisons, I'd appreciate that information.

The Member for Gladstone indicated that, according to the information she had received, it was anywhere

around between 90 and 100 active commercial fishermen, and the licences show substantially more than that. I wonder if the Minister somewhere along the line could maybe establish exactly how many active commercial fishermen there are in Manitoba, because it is deceptive if we look at what's happened. The figures show that we have 2,479, I believe, annual licence holders, is the information based on what the Minister has given me. Certainly I know for a fact that there are not anywhere near that amount who are active.

I would suggest to the Minister that maybe some policy could be developed in terms of what happens to those who are not active because I could foresee, as I indicated I think the other day, that if all of a sudden the fish prices escalated to some degree I could anticipate a lot of activity with the licences that are being held right now and not being used at the present time. So I think the Minister should develop a format or a policy in terms of when is the licence finally terminated or is it a lifetime licence and is it always transferable to the next of kin and things of this nature. I think there has to be a policy direction established in that, and I hope the Minister could give us some indication whether he is prepared to look in that direction.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: The member is correct in that the number of licences held does not necessarily indicate the number of active fishermen. I think, in our conversation yesterday, we indicated that on Lake Manitoba out of the number of licences, which is in excess of 600, there are approximately 400 who harvest fish to some extent. Even within that number there is a variation.

It should be pointed out though that Lake Manitoba is unique amongst the lakes, wherein it has historically had that kind of a pattern wherein many of the people who live adjacent to the lake have held licences, and they would harvest fish for the purpose of supplementing their income or in fact use it as a domestic fishery.

So if those figures for Lake Manitoba alarm the member, it should not be taken to mean that that same ratio between the licences and active fishermen exists elsewhere. In fact, on a number of the other lakes, there are already performance standards, if you like, that if a licence is not utilized sufficiently, the licence is not renewed.

All of the licences are annual licences and, in terms of Lake Manitoba, we have indicated that we would not be issuing any more licences. We are in discussion with the fishermen on the lake to look at some mechanism for reducing that licence, and I mentioned yesterday that for those who are treating it more as a domestic fishery, we would perhaps allow those rather than terminating them, which I think would not be received well by many people, but that they would look to make those available to those individuals until they chose not to use them in that way any longer. Once those licences were out of the way, I think that we could look at others in terms of a performance standard and, if they weren't producing, they would have to surrender those.

The one exception that I would want to point out is that we want to make and have made provisions for illness where, in a given year, if somebody, due to

reasons of health, has not been able to fulfill his or her commitment in terms of the harvest, I think those kinds of situations we want to treat in a little different way.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Just one further question.

Can the Minister indicate whether there is a fair amount of abuse of these licences and these quotas from the people who are really not active and other fishermen use them? Is that an occurrence that happens? I'm sure from time to time it must. How prevalent is it? How often does this happen? Is it a matter of concern?

That is why I raised the question about the many idle licences that we have because I can see myself, if I had my quota finished, I could probably visualize using somebody else's to enhance my own income. I don't know whether this is happening, but the opportunity certainly is there, and I'm wondering if this is actually an ongoing practice.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, this is a problem only in those areas where there is an individual quota, and that's one of the risks attached to the system that the Member for Emerson was supportive of yesterday.

Where there is a lake quota and the individuals have a licence to operate on that, there is no need for the individual to try to access the licence or the quota of someone else. But on a lake such as Lake Winnipeg, where there are individual quotas, there is that risk out there where somebody could be holding a quota, but in fact somebody could be harvesting and delivering on that quota.

I don't suppose it's much different than the situation that would arise in the farming industry where somebody might choose to deliver grain on somebody else's quota. Fishermen don't like that anymore than the farmers do, because there are some benefits that are lost to the individual if you deliver on somebody else's quota and the product is priced and delivered and any future benefits that would flow, would flow to the person holding the quota rather than the one who produced it.

So I wouldn't say that it doesn't happen, but I think fishermen, for the most part, would police that themselves. It would be a problem only in those lakes where there are individual quotas rather than lake quotas.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to go on to the aspect of the sport fishing end of it, if I could, at this stage of the game.

The Minister indicated yesterday that the fish hatcheries were very successful this year and there was almost an overabundance of spawn that was available for stocking and the fish hatcheries that we have are basically underutilized to some degree.

In the sport fishing aspect of it, I would certainly encourage full utilization of our fish hatcheries, because I'm sure that one of the main concerns that sport fishermen have is the fact that seemingly some of the more popular lakes are not yielding very much fish in terms of sport fishing.

I think that is reflected to some degree when I look at the annual report under Sport Fishing, Angling

Licence Sales and Revenue, where we have an increase in licences again, of course, in '85-'86. I'm not sure, I believe they're increased again this year by a dollar? They were \$6 last year, but there was a decrease in the number of licences.

Resident Licences have been remaining sort of constant since '76-'77 but, when we look at Non-Resident Licences, it is the lowest number that we've had since '76-'77. We're down to 22,239 non-resident licence applicants. I suppose the fact that the fee is up to \$30 maybe has some bearing on it, but I think the other concern that is expressed by many lodge operators, etc., is that in many cases the fish are not there seemingly. I've met with people from the Whiteshell who raised major concerns about the lack of fishing results in that general area and all the lakes there.

I wonder if the Minister, if he indicates that there's such a good hatch this year in terms of the fish hatcheries, the amount of fish that are available, could the Minister indicate the distribution of the fry or spawn, whatever you want to call it? In which areas would they be going? Could the Minister maybe give us some numbers? Because on page 19 of the Annual Report of Natural Resources, it indicates the amount of fry that were distributed in '85-'86.

And if we have an increase for this year, I wonder if the Minister could indicate by what amount it has increased and where they would generally be distributed to, because there was criticism that there was a lot of fish being supplied in the western part of the province and a small fraction of it in the eastern part of the province where most of the pressure comes on.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Yes, I want to indicate that we are very pleased with what is happening with the taking of spawn. We've had just excellent success in terms of spawn taking for walleye.

From the hatcheries we are anticipating this number: in the Whiteshell, 3.5 million; the Swan Creek Hatchery, about 60 million; Winnipegosis, 18 million; and Grand Rapids, 14 million. So 93.5 million fry, it is estimated that we will have that.

I guess what I want to point out, Mr. Chairman, is that we do not look at the stocking program as the only factor in determining the level of harvest or the level of success that the sport fishermen or commercial fisherman will experience. Really, the key role is to have the good habitat and then, given certain other factors, the elements of chance that occur in nature. It is really the natural setting that will have to determine the stock of fish. We can supplement it somewhat by way of our fish stocking effort, but we do not see this as being the primary purpose. It is really supplementary to what will happen in the field.

The member wanted to get some sense of the distribution of these. I have the information here for trout distribution. In terms of the walleye, one of the major areas in the southeast will be the Lac du Bonnet area. They'll be stocking in that area, but they will be throughout the southeast. The southwest part of the province, as well, has been designated for stocking, but we can provide more specific information to the member, if he likes, in terms of the more specific sites.

In terms of the licence itself, I think the member indicated that there was a dollar increase in the licence

fee. If I heard the member correctly, he made that statement. If he did, in fact, that would not be correct. I think members should be aware that, in terms of setting the fee, we have to apply for an amendment to the regulations under the federal act and there is a considerable lead time on that.

We have indicated that we think the licence fee should be moving up but, because of the time involved, there has not been approval given, nor will there be a change in the licence fee for this year, but we are anticipating that there will be a licence fee increase for the next year.

We shared the information with the different groups, and I think it was in one of the publications from perhaps the Manitoba Lodge and Outfitters that it was printed in a way which suggested that rather than it being a point of discussion and information for a future year, it left the impression that it was there for the current year, but that increase is projected for the year after.

The point that the member made also about the level of participation, and he raised the question of whether or not the licence fee was a deterrent. I get a sense that most people really do not object to the licence fee. They see that as their contribution and, in fact, many have indicated to me if there was some provision for an increase - and I think the member himself indicated that in some of our earlier debate that he had heard from members - that if that increase could flow to the enhancement of that resource, they would be prepared to pay even more.

There are vehicles that I identified, the Habitat Heritage Corporation being one, wherein individuals could contribute and have that money flow for the support of the fishery industry. So those are there.

If I have heard anything, it has perhaps been a concern on the part of some people that they would like to see an increase in the licence fee for resident fishermen and perhaps some further increase in the non-resident fee.

I know that's a delicate question, because certainly we do not want to price our licences for non-residents to the point where we would discourage them from coming. On the other hand, we state very clearly that in terms of resource management, our allocation for residents of Manitoba ranks a higher priority for us than the non-resident fishermen.

So clearly, we would want to first address the interests of the resident Manitobans and then, to the extent possible, accommodate the interests of the non-resident Manitobans and give them the opportunity to enjoy the province; and the province, in turn - the business operators, the tourist operators - enjoy the economic spinoff that occurs from their coming.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, the Minister sort of treats the stocking aspect of it as if it's not that major a thing, but I would like to indicate to him that my information tells me that in North Dakota the stocking program has been very successful, and this is one of the other reasons why there are less people coming up from the States' side to fish here because they have extensively stocked out there and, as a result, the fish catches out there are possibly more appealing than they are in Manitoba at this stage of the game.

So I personally from my limited information, without having the professional people indicate, there is a general consensus out there that stocking is a worthwhile project and I hope the Minister does not treat that too lightly. We should, in my opinion, at least proceed as extensively as possible in terms of stocking lakes.

Just the fact that the effort is made, even if it isn't quite as effective maybe as I would anticipate that it would be, it will give the impression at least to a lot of people that an effort is being made to try and retain our fish supplies. I think at least some comfort would be gained by the people who are going out fishing. If they don't catch anything, at least they have the comfort to know that there's fish there because it has been stocked.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I guess what I want to point out and clarify for the record, I do view the stocking program as an important part of our fish management effort. On the other hand, I would not want to try to create the impression that we should ensure or try to convince people that it was through the fish stocking effort that we would have healthy fish stocks. It is a combination of dealing with a restocking program, dealing with the environment, the quality of water, the level of harvest and so on, combining all of those.

It should be pointed out that where the fish stocking efforts are most successful are those lakes wherein there is not an existing stock of fish because, if you stock into a lake where there is an existing stock of pike, for example, some of our success rates have been very, very disappointing. But clearly, in some of the lakes, and again we draw examples of Pelican Lake in Southwestern Manitoba, where you can plant into a lake where there is not an existing predator stock, there have been some very, very substantial benefits to the lake and to the fishermen of the area.

So clearly, the decisions that are made with respect to stocking have to take into account what we anticipate as the possible success rate of stocking in that particular area. Despite the demand in the area, you could stock into a lake where you would virtually be simply feeding the existing stock of predator fish and there would be no benefit to anyone. So, clearly, where the demand exists, it may not be possible to meet that demand by way of a stocking program.

I can think of a lake in the Duck Mountain area of Manitoba, the Swan River constituency, where Two Mile Lake was a very successful lake for brook trout, and it became infested with pike and virtually was eliminated. So to now stock that lake, to undertake any kind of a stocking effort without first dealing with the predator fish would be really not a useful effort at all. So those kinds of decisions have to be made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I was just wondering from the Minister, a few years ago there was a great deal of interest in rainbow trout farming, fishing. Is there still some activity in that area, and does this department supply the fingerlings for that?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I think what happened in terms of trout farming is that it has developed in this direction. There are a few people who yet pursue it as a commercial venture. For the majority of the people though, it appears to be what I would describe as a domestic fishery in the sense that they stock the lakes and they provide for some of their own needs; it is recreational. I think some of the potential that some individuals saw in through the Seventies has not materialized, but there is still a considerable interest in terms of individuals, for their own use, stocking lakes. The stock they purchase is from private hatcheries. There are private stocks available. They do purchase these. We do not provide the stock for them.

But clearly, we want to indicate that we see that there is potential for fish farming. There is some indication of interest in this at the federal level. We had the opportunity to visit some of the operations at the west coast where they would have salmon farms. But again, in those instances, there were some disappointments as well, venturing into a new industry where some diseases developed. So it is not an industry wherein there are quick opportunities for large dollars to be made.

We do feel that, when you look at it on a global basis, I think it's indicated now that some 10 percent of the world's fish product is raised in confinement. So about 10 percent of it would be raised in activities which would be thought of as fish farming. So it is a growth industry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could give us an indication as to the status of live bait within the province and the direction that he is going with that. I have a series of questions, and I hope we don't have to go through this biota transfer garbage that we've been getting every year on this thing.

I want to have the Minister give us an indication as to what direction he is taking, whether we will allow transfer of these licences of the producers, the commercial individuals who actually catch the live bait and sell it. Can the Minister give us an update where it's at?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, we are not proceeding with the issue of any new licences, and we are reviewing what should be happening in terms of the longer term. I personally have some concerns about the use of live bait and the problems associated with that. It is currently under review and I think that, within the summer months here, we will see it resolved for the coming year. But for the current year, there is no expansion or no approval for additional operators, and we will clarify that for future years. It is under review at this time.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, to the Minister then, if the issue of live bait is unreviewed, is the Minister considering information and the activities that have happened in Ontario in his review, or is he basing it strictly on a closed-mind attitude within the province, because the live-bait industry in Ontario has been a

very, very active one and a very successful one? I'm just wondering if the Minister would then look to what's happening with the live-bait industry in Ontario as well when he does the review.

I want to be more specific in terms of operators. I believe, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, that there are only three basic operators in the province at the present time. I wonder if the Minister could confirm that, three operator's licences?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I believe there are five operators in live bait at this time. Just on that matter of live bait, Mr. Chairman, I think it should be pointed out that the use of live bait is viewed differently. For example, Saskatchewan does not use live bait, and most of the mid-west states would not use live bait. It is in the area surrounding the Great Lakes where that tends to be a more accepted practice.

I guess, for me, there are two considerations, one being the risk attached to that particular activity for contamination or transfer of species, and that has to be a concern. The Member for Emerson may disagree, and I respect his right to disagree. But as well, we should look at this in terms of what is the impact on the level of harvest. Is the desire to use live bait based on wanting quicker results, more effective use of time in fishing?

Clearly, we recognize that live bait is an effective means of fishing. It does increase success rates but, in fact, that is happening and, if we are finding that our stocks are under pressure, should we not then be encouraging individuals to further take on the sport, enjoy being out there, participate in catch and release? Actually taking the fish is secondary to being out there and enjoying the outdoors. I would really appreciate further comment from the Member for Emerson and those who have a genuine desire to see the live-bait fishery continued as to whether it is simply a means of increasing the effectiveness in terms of catch.

Now, clearly what has happened in some areas, our fish stocks have been depleted to a fairly low level. Now in order to succeed, you have to use your most effective means of fishing, which is live bait. So if live bait were eliminated in those areas where the use of live bait has been responsible for the depletion of stocks, then clearly there would be some disappointment for those individuals as they adapt to this new means of fishing and as the stocks recover. But what do we do for the long term? It is the long term that we have to concern ourselves with, primarily.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, some of the concerns that the Minister has expressed about the long-term aspect of it, I agree with that to some degree. But the aspect of contamination of one lake to the next, I think he's been brainwashed just like the then Minister of Natural Resources. The Member for St. James came up with that contamination aspect of it. I would just tell the Minister, I mean then let's keep the ducks and geese and all the waterfowl that are flying up and down, let's keep them spotted down to lakes, and then you won't have any contamination. That logic doesn't carry at all, as far as I'm concerned, and it hasn't ever in my mind.

But the aspect of the amount of fish that is being taken, one would think, if the Minister follows through

in his rationale that he is the guardian of the natural resources, that there are limits in effect and any individual should not exceed those limits. So that part of it has some concern, I suppose.

The Minister indicated there are five operators at the present time or five licensed operators. I wasn't aware that there were five; I thought there were only three. I want to be much more specific. Is the Minister prepared to allow any one of these operators to transfer or sell his operation and transfer the licence to another individual?

I'm talking specifically about Mr. Hampshire from Lac du Bonnet, who is at retiring age, has made a considerable investment in equipment, etc., has built up this business to quite a degree, and is looking forward to retirement and would like to sell his business, if he could. I'm asking the Minister point-blank whether he would consider allowing Mr. Hampshire to sell his business and to allow the transfer of that licence?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, we recognize that, if there is going to be a change, it could pose some hardship for the individual involved. So we're not suggesting that, by way of dealing with this issue or considering it, it will not impact anyone. We have had representation from people of the area. I've had a number of letters from people from the area on this matter. There's been representation from the council of the area to the department.

But would it be responsible of us, if we were considering a change in policy, which we are, to allow a sale at this time? Then if we were to change the policy next year, what would our responsibility be to the person who bought it in this year? Clearly, there is an issue of that sort that has to be addressed. I recognize that, whenever you have a change in policy - and I'm sure that we will have an opportunity to discuss another later in the day - there are some issues that have to be resolved surrounding those changes of policy. But if the member's question, as he said, was point-blank to me - would we allow the sale or the transfer at this time? - I would have to be as direct in my answer, and that is to say no. But in saying no, I do not want to leave the impression that we're not sensitive to the needs of the individual involved.

I want to make one other comment. The Member for Emerson seemed to treat lightly my concern about the movement of undesirable fish species or new fish species into different areas. Let me just read from a memo within the department, dated May 4 of this year. It says: "Rainbow smelt have now, however, been found in large numbers in Red Lake, from which there is little doubt that they will find their way into Lake Winnipeg, either through the English and Winnipeg River system, or by bait-bucket transfer direct from Red Lake to the Bloodvein and Berens River systems. The presence of rainbow smelt in Lake Winnipeg, within 10 years, is almost a certainty."

So clearly, these fish species will move. I think one of the contributing factors that has to be assessed is the use of live bait.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, we'll be dealing in a little while in the Wildlife section with elk ranching and where an individual was allowed to elk ranch and,

when the government had a change in policy, they worked on the idea of compensation for this individual. I'm wondering if the Minister could give the assurance to the House that, if there's going to be a change in policy in terms of the use of live bait that live bait will be banned in the province, compensation could be considered as a factor in terms of compensating some of the operators - there's only a very few of them - but who have made a substantial investment. If it comes to that point where we're not going to be allowing live bait, these individuals' investment is totally shot. All the money they've put in there in this operation is all gone. I'm wondering if the Minister would consider compensating the few operators that we have if the decision should be, a policy change should be not to allow live bait.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I think to respond to that time would really be to prejudge the issue. I've indicated that the existing policy will carry on.

The policy is under review, and at such time if the decision were to go in the direction that the member suggested that it might - and clearly we have to consider that is a possibility - if it does go in that direction, then I think at that point the decision will have to be made in terms of what kind of a commitment was made to the individual when that opportunity was given. What length of time has the person been involved in that particular activity? What is the extent of the investment and what were the terms of termination? I think all of that would have to be considered if, in fact, a decision were made to terminate. But at this time, the existing policy stands.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering if the department has forwarded any concerns to the Minister in terms of selling Ontario fishing licences in Manitoba. I don't know whether we sell any Manitoba fishing licences in Ontario. I understand that it is at the present time, I know of one operator - not an operator but a storekeeper in Middlebro who is selling Ontario fishing licences - and I'm wondering if there's any way that other places, whether there's any discussion at the departmental level in terms of allowing Ontario licences to be sold in Manitoba and vice versa.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, we have had requests from Manitoba vendors to be able to sell Ontario licences. That request was made of Ontario but the request was rejected by Ontario. So it is Ontario that rejected it. I will do some checking.

I am not aware that we do have any of Manitoba licences sold in Ontario. But it should be pointed out that, in terms of the working relationship, we have identified border lakes on which either licence is acceptable. So we do have that working relationship with the Province of Ontario in terms of identifying those bodies of water wherein either one is acceptable.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate what is the - for somebody that sells a licence - what is the retainer or the commission that they get for selling a licence in Manitoba?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: It's 50 cents for all licences sold, that is applicable for fish licences, big game licences as well.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, it was my understanding that, in Ontario, I believe it is \$1 that they're getting, or is it even a percentage? I have had some requests from some people indicating - Mr. Chairman, I want to raise with the Minister the concern and this is the information that the Minister gave me last year where, in the community of Middlebro for example, non-resident sport fishing licences to the tune of 4,456 were sold with a revenue value of \$108,000 and the individual that sells the \$30 licences to non-residents gets 50 cents per licence, and there is some concern that maybe either do it on the basis of the amount of money raised on a percentage basis or maybe the Minister can see the vendors.

The sellers of the licence fully realize that the increase in the fees has gone up substantially over a period of time, and we're looking at another increase pending next year again, according to the Minister's own statement. And I wonder if the Minister would consider increasing the commission that is being paid to those people who sell the licences for the government.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised by staff that, some three or four years ago, it was 25 cents per licence. It has been increased to 50 cents per licence, which is a 100 percent increase.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Look at your fees, and tell us what happened there.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Our fees have not gone up by 100 percent, Mr. Chairman.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: . . . \$8.30 from \$6.00.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: I should point out that the member said that in Ontario they were perhaps on a percentage basis. Up until this year, if you were selling a licence in Ontario on a percentage basis, you would not be making a great deal because until this year there was not a charge for a licence in Ontario. But they are, this year, at a \$10 position, so I don't know what the level is. But if you look at the revenue that we have obtained for licence fees over that period from 1982, our total revenue for licences was \$1.905 million; in 1986, our total revenue for licences was \$2.1 million.

Yes, that includes all of . . .

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Just one final question in this area here, is the Minister considering an increase in the fee for vendors who sell licences?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I am not aware of a single representation from the vendors indicating that they feel that this is an unfair return or that they would refuse to sell the licences on that basis. And I'm not suggesting that we would want it to reach that stage where they would refuse to sell. But clearly, each year we would have to review these. There is not a change built into this year. We are not planning to change that this year but, if the member is indicating that there's wide-spread discontent on the part of the vendors in terms of what they've received for selling it, clearly we would want to be aware of that. But I spoke only last night to an individual who was involved

in one of these, at a community level providing licences; and there were other concerns with the question of - their share of it was not a point of discussion at all. Clearly if there are some concerns, we would want to hear about it.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I'll tell him to write you.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Surely, if they would write, we would want to hear about it and these would be reviewed on an annual basis, but in this year there is no provision made for an increase in that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Has the department done any evaluations with regard to tourism, which is declining in this province, and the relationship to sport fishing?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, the information that I have, that in terms of participation in the sport fishery, there was an increase of 1,500 over the previous year, and the increase for residents was 500. So in terms of sport fishing, we do not see that there has been a decreased level of participation.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Excuse me, I'm sorry, I want to interrupt. Could the Minister repeat the figures, please?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, the figures that I'm using are some of the staff figures from comparing '86-'87, so the previous year to the 1985. I think if the Member for Emerson is looking at a report, I think that report will have within it - the most recent figures would be for '85-'86. So when we compare '86 to the year previous to that, there is an increase of approximately 500 in the resident and 1,500 in the non-resident.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: So what we really are seeing is that the sport fishery is a major attraction for those who come to the Province of Manitoba in terms of the tourist wanting to find a new type of activity in the province. Is there any there for coordination between this department and the Tourism Department in the promotion of this type of activity as a saleable feature to attract the tourists to come to Manitoba?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there is joint participation in tourism. Promotions are undertaken south of the border with our American friends. The material related to sport fishing in Manitoba is provided as well.

I should point out that, as well, we do have a good working relationship with the lodge, lodge operators and outfitters as well. I had the opportunity to attend their meetings and of course the lodge and outfitters would be concerned with sport fishing along with other forms of outdoor recreation, consumptive and non-consumptive, big game hunting, waterfowl, skiing, and photography. So a number of these individuals have undertaken promotional tours to the U.S., aside or in conjunction with the Department of Tourism. Clearly, what we want to do is provide materials and we have done that - promotional materials - and we have a staff

expert to work with Tourism for the shows in the south, and that individual is George Nelson by name.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: As a result of increased numbers, obviously 1,500 more in the way of non-resident and in terms of the additional promotion that is going on, what kinds of new initiatives is the Minister looking at within his department to make sure that the fish stock for sport fishing remains at an extremely high level, so that that attraction will in fact remain stable and indeed increase?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Clearly, Mr. Chairman, having had approximately 24,000 non-resident fishermen in the area, it is a significant part of the tourist traffic in Manitoba. We are pleased with our stocking effort as I indicated earlier. We are going to be stocking at a higher level than we were in previous years. Walleye is one of the prime species. We have been taking spawn in record numbers, as I shared with the members opposite earlier. We hope the hatch goes well, and then we will look to place these in the lakes.

Of course, that does not address the interest for this year. It is our commitment to future years of successful fishing. We have established a Habitat Heritage Corporation. I referenced this earlier as well. Our funding to the Habitat Heritage Corporation last year was a .25 million. There's a board that sits independent of government and makes decisions with respect to habitat enhancement, and some of the enhancement programs that they have undertaken relate specifically to sport fishing.

We're very pleased with their effort and look for an expansion, and in fact we would hope that some of the leadership and interest that has been demonstrated by community groups, such as the Swan Valley Sport Fishing Enhancement Corporation, would serve as an example for others to support the efforts of the Habitat Heritage Corporation.

We in the department believe very strongly that it is not solely our responsibility to deal with that resource. It is something that we have to deal in cooperation with the users because we can benefit from their support, benefit from their advice and we should not overlook that.

The Member for Arthur indicated that we pass regulations making it difficult to catch, that we wouldn't allow that fish would have a hook on the end of the line. I think he is referring to going barbless. Clearly, that is an approach which is becoming increasingly popular and one which we would encourage, frankly, because it provides for an approach to the sport which moves it away from the consumption of fish, but really provides for the enjoyment of being in the outdoors and being more selective in the consumptive use of the resource. I think it provides for better management. It allows the fishermen themselves to participate in the management of the resource because, if you're going barbless, if the particular fish that they catch is not of a desirable size or not of the permitted size, it can be released with very little damage. And again, that is an approach that we would want to take and is in fact being encouraged by the different associations.

I want to point out as well that the Manitoba Wildlife Federation is another group that has been very

supportive of our efforts and, as an example, the Manitoba Wildlife Federation has been active in the Dauphin area as one example only. On Lake Dauphin, there is a particular class of fish - I believe it's a 1983 class of walleye that is coming up now - which is in very healthy state. But we are seeking their support, and in fact, they are out encouraging other groups as well to limit the harvest in this year. Though the limit is eight, they are suggesting that there should be a voluntary limit of two. They are themselves promoting that. I think with that kind of an approach there will be a benefit, not only to the resident fishermen but also to those who are tourists.

So clearly, we want to manage the resource. We value the tourists; we will encourage the presence of tourists. Our priority will be though, I will say, for resident sport fishermen. In addition to the sport fishery, we then have to take into account the commercial fishery and those who would use the fishery for subsistence purposes as well.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: This question may have been asked earlier and, if it was, then you can just refer me back to the Estimates. But is it still the contention of this department that it is not necessary to stock the Whiteshell Lakes and the Winnipeg River system with additional stocks of walleye fry?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised by the staff that we do, in fact, stock some lakes in the Whiteshell. I did mention earlier that we will be stocking Lac du Bonnet Lake, which I'm not sure that people would consider to be in the Whiteshell but it is in that region. In terms of stocking in the Winnipeg River, it is not judged to be an effective area to undertake stocking, in terms of success rates, so that would not be an area where we would stock.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I had yelled "pass" already at one stage of the game, but I don't think the Minister wants to leave the false impression here.

He indicated a little while ago that the total of licences, the revenue from licences sold from fishing and hunting was 2-something million. I wonder if the Minister would want to correct that because, just in the fishing in his report, just in the fishing end of it alone, the revenue is \$1.6 million and under the Wildlife licences that are being sold, it's over \$2 million there. So that figure would not jibe.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Clearly, Mr. Chairman, I would not want to try to mislead anyone, especially my honourable Opposition critic.

The information that I was quoting was exclusive of the fish licensing. So it was the licensing over and above the fisheries licence. So the \$2.1 million that I indicated for 1986 was for the revenue from licences other than fishing.

In terms of the non-resident anglers, I want to make a correction there. Where I indicated there were some 24,000; it is actually 34,000 non-resident anglers that we had. Again I'm talking about 1986, and the member may be looking at the annual report which is for '85-86.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister repeat the last information that he gave us, in terms of non-resident licences?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, perhaps to set the Member for Emerson somewhat more at ease, if he's looking at page 18 and we're looking at non-resident licences, you have to point out that there are two categories there. There are the non-resident licences and then the non-resident conservation licence as well. So the two columns have to be totalled. So if you look at 1985-86, there were 10,325, the conservation licence; and 22,000 of the non-residents. So if you combine those, that's about 32,000 and, for the most recent year, if you combine those two, it's approximately 34,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 8.(a)(1) to 8.(h), inclusive, were each read and passed.

Resolution 125: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,837,100 for Natural Resources, Fisheries, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1988—pass.

Item No. 9. Wildlife, (a)(1) Administration: Salaries; (a)(2) Other Expenditures - the Honourable Minister.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just before we start, I would like to introduce a staff member who is joining us, Art Hoole, who is the Director of the Wildlife Branch. He has replaced the former Director of the Wildlife Branch who was Rich Goulden, at the time that Rich Goulden went over to the Parks Branch. In fact, Art was in the Parks Branch and moved over and took over the position of the director.

I look forward to this section, Mr. Chairman, and I'm sure the Member for Emerson does as well. This is an area that has a lot of appeal and a wide range of interest, so I think I need not introduce the section, but I'll turn the floor over to the Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister, given the possible time element, we could spend an awful lot of time in this area, but we'll try and keep it within areas of concern. I know a number of my colleagues have concerns as well.

The first item I would like to deal with under this section is the elk ranching, and that has been a sore spot with people in Manitoba for a long time. When the Minister made his announcement that there would be no further elk ranching and then in his opening comments the other day and when I questioned him about Bill Watkins, he also indicated again, he left the illusion that there are some programs maybe going on in terms of game ranching. Maybe I misunderstood the Minister, but I got the impression that elk ranching had terminated, but there's still maybe the possibility of looking at game ranching.

Now maybe we can do this relatively fast in terms of the elk ranching. The one thing that concerned me all the time - and I've indicated that many times to the Minister and that's why I asked for Orders for Return on exactly what happened - is the fact that I have accused the Minister and his department many times that they did not make the information properly available to the people of Manitoba. Basically because of that

is why we built up that ground swell of negativism and opposition to the elk ranching.

Based on the Order for Return that I received the other day, I was looking at the figures and I'm still trying to justify exactly the amount of animals that have been involved, the fact that there has never been a proper - see, maybe I should go back a little bit for the record and indicate that it was during our government when we initiated the idea of experimental elk ranching. It was under our administration at the time when the idea came forward. Finally, the licence was issued in 1982; it was 1982 when the licence was issued, and it was for experimental reasons only at that time.

You would think that, with an experimental project of this nature which was a definite change in the direction and policy, obviously there was a lot of attention paid to it and, if the information had come forward all the time at a proper stage, I don't think there would have been that much difficulty with it maybe, at least not to the point we have it now.

What happened though is at the time when elk were imported from the States and there was the bluetongue episode developed, and then the Federal Government paid the individual \$3,000 per elk that had to be destroyed, and the Provincial Government turned around and gave the individual additional licences to catch elk out of the wild to offset that, which was a relatively rich compensation program. But ever since then, there's been some speculation and mistrust of how the whole thing was handled.

It is just like the elk that came in from Ontario without a licence, then were shoveled through, contacted the animals that had bluetongue, and were moved out to Saskatchewan. There's been nothing but confusion and lack of straight answers from the time that the whole bluetongue episode happened. Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate to the Minister, I'm not faulting the people who had the experimental farm because, in my contact when I was out in Swan - and it was a very split type of an emotion out there and opinions on that, and the Minister full knows that because he comes from there. But the fact is that I'm not faulting the people who ran the ranch because, when I was out there, they said, if you have any questions, come down and we'll open the books to you. So it's not that I'm criticizing the operators of the elk ranch.

I'm criticizing the Department of Natural Resources, the people who were responsible for not making the information public that was required so that all the wildlife associations and everybody knew what was going on. But what happened is, people started mistrusting what was going on. It seemed to be a cover-up to some degree. Information was not getting out and then, all of a sudden, it built up, you know, it started rolling. Everybody was getting concerned about what was happening with elk ranching.

I blame not this Minister necessarily, he came in in the middle of this whole fricassée. But to confuse the issue even further was that this Minister comes forward and indicates that he will allow elk ranching, make it official, and he's got 200 applications. He's taking it before his Cabinet and Cabinet says, well, maybe you should take it before caucus. He comes in with this recommendation and gets the ears knocked off him, and then he turns around the next day and, Mr. Chairman, I have to indicate to some degree that I

actually got caught by surprise because my information told me that the Minister was going to allow elk ranching. I was going to pin his ears back, because of the many things that have gone wrong. His caucus takes and knocks the dickens out of him, and then he turns around and says there is no elk ranching anymore. Then he has the dilemma of what to do with the present experimental elk ranch that's in existence.

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the Minister, right now I would like to have him put the facts on the table what is happening right now. You have stopped elk ranching. I want to know what's going to happen with the elk ranch, what compensation is going to be paid, if any. I want justification of the elk figures that are there. If we can get that all out in the open, then possibly we can move along relatively fast. If the Minister's going to start playing games with this thing and try and hold back, then we're going to be at this for a long time because I have the permission from my House Leader that, if the Minister doesn't want to cooperate in this aspect of it - and this is one the key things that we're dealing with in the Wildlife aspect of it.

It has been an emotional issue for a long time, and I think it's time that we clear the air, establish where this Minister and his caucus is going to go with elk ranching or game ranching. If he wants to maybe spend some time outlining, I've told him to be brief all the time. If he wants to maybe explain exactly where he's going with this whole thing, what's going to happen within the next 10 minutes, we can probably move along relatively quickly.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I think the presentation from the Member for Emerson indicates that this not only was an emotional issue but is yet an emotional issue. I was pleased to hear the Member for Emerson indicate that the issue of an experimental elk ranch really came to be during the previous administration. The licence . . .

A MEMBER: The idea.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Yes, clearly the idea was generated at that time. The licence was granted, I think, finally in 1982 at some stage, so it was after there had been a change of administration in 1981 that the licence had been granted. So when the Member for Emerson suggests that there was a problem for me as the Minister, clearly there was, but I think there was a greater problem for him and some of his colleagues in that the idea was born in that period of time when they were government. It moved forward to be an experimental elk ranch. We became aware of some of the problems associated with this, and it had to be resolved. There were several meetings in the area, so it is not as though it wasn't dealt with in the public forum. It was clearly in the public forum at all times.

When we went forward, when I went forward to caucus, clearly I wanted people to consider both the opportunities that existed with this and the risks attached to this, because I was never one in my approach to this - and I stated it publicly at the meetings I attended. Again I give credit to the Member for Ste. Rose who came to attend the meeting that we had at Neepawa. I stated clearly that, with this project, there were opportunities, but there were as well risks.

Clearly, as well, I wanted my caucus colleagues to consider both sides of the issue, because I think it would be irresponsible of me to take forward for discussion to them only one side of the issue. This is not a simple process that could be resolved in the course of one sitting. The members came to be in possession of that particular document, and I don't have any particular problem with that having come forward because, in fact, all of the points that were there for discussion were points that had been discussed at the public meetings that we had at Arborg. We had a meeting at Neepawa, and we had a meeting in Swan River as well. So clearly, there weren't any issues for discussion that weren't already part of that public debate.

But I think the real dilemma for the Member for Emerson, as he indicated here, he was ready to pin back my ears, as he said, for letting this go forward. There was some speculation in the newspaper that, in fact, a decision had been made to go forward. But after consideration at caucus, there was a decision made not to proceed with it. I'm part of a team, and I'm going forward with that decision.

That then posed the problem for the Member for Emerson. He had been hiding in the weeds, shall I say, for so long and he didn't know, and he now had to change his position. He had to come out on the other side, and he had to change his strategy. So clearly, I think there was a problem for me but there was as much a problem for him in knowing where to come.-(Interjection)- But that is one of the perks of being in Opposition. You can change, you can go from one side to the other.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Could I make a comment?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Sure.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, now that the Minister has explained his embarrassment, I wonder if he could explain what he's going to do with the project, because we both know the history of it. I wonder if he could explain where we're going with this thing now.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: It is important, Mr. Chairman, that we record history accurately, and I wanted to have the Member for Emerson's participation in that process recorded. In terms of recording inaccurately, I would want to indicate, Mr. Chairman, where earlier I said there was a meeting at Arborg; in fact, that meeting took place at Ashern rather than at Arborg.

Now there are a number of issues that were discussed but, as the Member for Emerson said - and I think all people are aware - there were, in fact, good solid arguments for proceeding with this project and there were concerns. The Member for Emerson has indicated that he would rather not get into the details on that, but would like to get into the resolution of the problem, so let us move forward with that.

I have a document here, Mr. Chairman, which outlines the record of animals in the Swan Valley Elk Ranch, and I also have the animals here for the Tent Town Game Farm, because the Member for Emerson has been in the area and I think he is aware that, in fact, there are two operations there. There was the game

farm which was in operation earlier, and the elk ranch was established subsequently.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: They don't interchange?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: No, and we have indicated here the numbers that we are aware of where animals have moved from one location to the other. So I would like to table for the record this particular item, Mr. Chairman. I can pass that over to the Member for Emerson.

In terms of our position, we've stated clearly that we will not be proceeding with game ranching, and the process is now under way. Meetings have taken place and discussion is ongoing in terms of the phasing out and the settlement with the principles of the Swan Valley Elk Ranch. So the member has asked me to state what compensation, if any, will be paid. I'm not in a position to make that statement at this time, because those discussions are under way, Mr. Chairman. So I cannot be any more specific than that.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to belabour the past either at this stage of the game. I want to know exactly what's going to happen. The Minister indicated that negotiations are going on with the individual, based on the decision by the government to close or to do away with elk ranching. Compensation definitely must be a factor with the individual involved. I'm wondering whether the operators who had the experimental licence, whether they're in a position to sue the government because of the decision that they made.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I think it would not be wise for me to be making suggestions as to the approach to the Swan Valley Elk Ranch participants, as to the approach they should be taking in resolving an issue which deals directly with the department for which I am Minister. There may be a legal challenge.

I think in any case where an individual is involved in a dispute, if discussion across the table cannot resolve that, either one of the parties could decide to have the process resolved in the courts. I would not suggest that as an approach - I think it can be resolved - but nor would I suggest that is an avenue that would be precluded as an option for them.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I want to try and assist the Minister as much as I can in terms of trying to get the right direction of this thing.

The confusion continues because from the time that the Minister announced that elk ranching would terminate in Manitoba, a lot of people are watching. There were people who had actually a commitment made to them in terms of getting licences. When that decision was made, rightfully or wrongfully, it doesn't matter, the Minister made a decision no more elk ranching.

Now there's concern about how will this termination take place, and I want to get into a few other issues a little later on, but the dispersal of the animals at this stage of the game, because right now, I believe within the month, elk will be calving again. Are these animals going to be turned back into the wild?

Somewhere along the line we are playing a soft game in this where no decisions are being made. There are

a lot of people who are anxiously watching this thing, and I think the best thing that the Minister could do is make some precise comments, statements, you know, have a press release and indicate exactly what's happening with the whole thing rather than drag it and sort of give the impression, well, we're dealing with it and we can't say this, we can't say that. That is where the problem started from to begin with.

I would encourage the Minister, you know, let's put it on the table, let's tell the people of Manitoba what's going on, because we have big organizations that are watching this very carefully and the Minister is losing some credibility by just hedging around us.

Tell us where it's at with this thing! Are you negotiating with individuals to release the animals? Are you negotiating compensation? Tell us where it's at. It's been a long time since the statement was made and people are waiting. It would make it a lot easier if he comes clean and tells us exactly where it's at.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I will say what I said at the time that the announcement was made, that we wanted to phase out the elk ranch in an orderly fashion and we want it to be fair to those people who are involved.

What is the member suggesting by way of his comments? That I would announce here in the House today a decision as to what I saw? What would we do? Would the Member for Emerson suggest that we open the gates today, with no consideration of the investment made by those individuals, and say just open the gates and let the animals run? -(Interjection)- No? Some would suggest that.

At the other extreme, there are some who would suggest that great sums of money should be paid to the individuals for their investment.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: What do you say?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: I am saying that I want to be fair, and I will not negotiate a settlement with the Member for Emerson. I have staff negotiating a settlement with the participants in the project, and this is not the forum for that discussion.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, this Minister has created his dilemma and he has got to be accountable for his dilemma.

He says its going to be a phasing-out type of thing. Why would it take two years to phase out an elk operation? If you terminate it, these animals are wild animals, supposedly - it's elk ranching - you can turn them loose and compensate the individual or you can allow them to sell them and work out some arrangement, but we are all over the ballpark again and there's a lot of pressure on this thing and the Minister knows that.

You know, I get the questions the same way he does and that's why I'm saying let's try and establish something, because if he's going to play around with this thing for two years, as it appears that he wants to do, and he likes to sort of move things around and shuffle around the whole ballpark, why not be precise about this and tell us what you're going to be doing with this?

Do you have a game plan in mind? Tell the people of Manitoba what your game plan is, because if it's going to be compensation that you're going to be paying the individual, tell us what you're going to do - tell us - and if you're going to turn the animals in the wild and compensate them, fine. If he can sell them, and the compensation factor, but we've got to establish this sooner than two years from now.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, what the Member for Emerson now seems to be overlooking is what he stated earlier, that the gates were opened, if you like, during that period of time when he and his colleagues were the government of this province.

So let him not suggest now that in order to close the gates on this particular project, that we are dealing with an issue of this government's creation. He and his colleagues planted the seeds. He said himself the idea was born in that period of time when they were in government.-(Interjection)- Now let me ask. He says the idea was screwed up. So is he suggesting; that we should not have terminated the ranch?

Clearly, he has never stated his position. He should come out clearly. If he's wanting me to state my position with respect to the settlement, let me ask him to clearly state his position. Is he for or against? Clearly, that's all that he need say.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I only indicate to the Minister that, if he gets out of his responsibility as Minister of Natural Resources, I'll look at it and I'll indicate my position, and I have no difficulty.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, the individuals involved were wanting to raise elk, and the value of the project to them was in the animals. There were some animals - we've indicated in the material that was passed over - that were sold, and their intention was to sell animals in the future. They did invest a considerable amount of time and effort and resources into the operation, and I think it's reasonable that they should be able to recover some of their investment.

Now it's differing opinions as to what their investment was and, in fact, some people would suggest that the original stock, which belonged to the province, they got for nothing. The commitment was only to turn animals back to the wild and that commitment has yet to be fulfilled.

So now in bringing this to an orderly close, as we said we want to do, there is a value to the animals there at a given point in time. There are different options that can be looked at. I suppose the gates could simply be opened and the animals could be turned into the wild and the benefit of that increased stock would accrue to the public. Then any question of the investment made by these individuals would have to be addressed by another means.

On the other hand, the individuals know the market and they are in a position to dispose of some of these animals. If they can recoup some of their investment by way of sale of these animals, clearly then that

changes the shape of any kind of a compensation package and that has to be determined. As well, if there is a certain number of animals there at this moment in time, the calves will soon be coming down and I think it's too late to be turning those animals out this year, so we can't turn them out. So the earliest possible date that we could turn the animals out or terminate the operation would be in the fall of this year. So we said that an additional consideration might be that there will be an increase from this year's calf crop. If it was kept for one more year, there would be additional animals to be sold.

I have indicated, for my part, that my preference would be to see this closed down this fall. That is my preference. But if in terms of bringing this to an orderly close down, shut down, there are benefits to both the province and to the individuals to extend it for one year, I would consider one year beyond that date, but I would not consider going beyond this fall.

The member disagrees, but I would want to indicate to him that at this point in time that is one of the options that I am keeping open. I have advised staff to keep that option open. That's as clear as I can be to the member.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, that is where part of the difficulty comes from. The Minister, from the time that he made the announcement until this fall some time, when it would be the latest time that you could turn the animals back in the wild, that is where he has to make a decision - he and his department have to make a decision whether we're going to go one route or the other route. But by and large, those animals either then get dispersed, the individual can sell them, or they get turned back into the wild.

The fact that the Minister says, well, I'm going to give them one more year, this is what's creating the confusion and problem in the public's eyes at this stage of the game because, based on the statement that the Minister made earlier, the people who are opposed to elk ranching in the Province of Manitoba are not sure that he is not looking for a back-door approach somewhere along the line.

In his opening remarks, the Minister somewhere along the line indicated that he was going to be employing certain staff to do an evaluation of not elk ranching but game farming, you know, to look at that aspect of it. That is why the opponents to elk ranching are concerned. This Minister is still trying to ride both sides of the fence, and that is why the opponents to elk ranching are very nervous.

If he says he wants one more year after this fall to liquidate this whole operation, that's where we have a problem. Either the Minister is totally opposed to it or he is going to allow a new approach to the whole concept of game farming. I'm not using elk ranching; I'm using game farming. I'm using his words because he used game farming.

So one thing, the Minister is trying to draw me into this thing and say, well, where do you stand? And then he can say, well, together with the critic, we have agreed.

A MEMBER: Let's get it over with. What's your stand?

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Uh-uh, not after all this time.

You are the government, you are the Minister, you make the decision. Now tell the people of Manitoba where you stand. If you're going to drag this thing from this coming fall, if you're going to say, well, you're prepared to accept another year's extension of this thing, I'll tell you something - and I'm trying to be kind to the Minister - you're buying yourself one mess of trouble if you're going to allow that thing to go another year from this fall because, based on the statements - and I'm going to go back to Hansard where you made statements about game farming - now it's a matter of how you want to play this thing. Lay it right on the line. Do you want to get into game farming? By allowing this to continue, the elk ranching to continue - (interjection)- Get out of here! You're always a troublemaker, and you started this whole mess.

But, Mr. Chairman, that is the difficulty we have right now, and there are many people out there who are sort of banking, based on departmental information that almost gave them the licence already - commitments were made to some degree - and that's what makes it so difficult and sensitive because people made investments.

You know, I want the Minister to indicate whether certain people who already bought equipment and material - not equipment but material - to fence, based on a letter that I have a copy of. I have a copy of that letter that was sent out which gave the people the impression that licences were going to be issued. They made investments, prematurely maybe, but they did.

Now that's what makes it so difficult. That's why the whole thing has been so emotional, because we have 200 people who want to get involved in this thing and we have the opposition from the groups who are opposed to it, and the Minister is still not clearing the air. He says we won't have elk ranching, but we might have game ranching, you see. Then let's clean up this issue once and for all, and then if we want to look at game farming let's start from scratch.

But I'll indicate to the Minister right now, a lot of PR will have to take place. We'll have to start right from the bottom in terms of doing anything at all, because the public sentiment has been aroused and there's a lot of opposition to that at this stage of the game. So if we can establish exactly where you want to go, it'll be a lot easier for everybody.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, having been advised earlier by the Member for Emerson that we should keep our statements brief and concise, after that rambling dissertation, I'm not sure if within that there was a question. He wanted to know, I think, where are we going.

Clearly I indicated earlier, Mr. Chairman, that we've made the decision that we will not be proceeding with the elk ranch, that it will be closed down, so that is clear. It seems to me that the only question that there is to address now is how will the existing ranching operation be closed down in an orderly fashion.

The member is suggesting that we should not be going beyond one year. Clearly, that would be my preference, to bring it to a close as quickly as possible. I indicated that when we made the announcement. But on the other hand I did say that, if in order to dispose of that stock in a responsible way and if there could

be benefit to the province and to the individuals by taking an additional year, would it not be responsible then to consider that option? The Member for Emerson seems to want to restrict the options that we would have in bringing this to a responsible close.

So I'm surprised that he would suggest that, in terms of dealing in the best interests of those who have an investment in the ranch and in dealing in the best interests of the people of Manitoba who are the owners of this resource, he would say close out your options. That, to me, seems to be irresponsible negotiation, because when you're negotiating you want to have as many options open to you as possible. - (Interjection)- No, clearly, Mr. Chairman, I am not playing games with it. I think the Member for Emerson recognizes, as he said in his comments, that he has an issue which lends itself to emotionalism and he may want to fan that to some extent. I want to see this closed down, but I will not avoid it. I think it was demonstrated in the course of dealing with this that we are not afraid to bring it to a resolution, and we did bring it to a resolution. It has been resolved.

Some of the details in terms of the existing operation have yet to be worked out, so I think our direction on this is clear. We've communicated clearly; to those who had expressed an interest, we did correspond with them indicating what our decision would be.

In response to the question that was raised about possible investment on the part of some of those who were expecting a licence to be approved, I'm not sure how you separate that from any other kind of business opportunity where someone - I can relate from my own experiences in farming. Would it be different than someone who bought a tractor in anticipation of a farm coming for sale? Now it seems to me that first you would acquire the property and then the equipment. If some chose to speculate and acquire the equipment before they acquired the opportunity, should the public of Manitoba be responsible for that. I would suggest to you not. So clearly on that point my position is known as well.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I think it's good that we talk about these things and get it out in the open. The Minister is indicating some individual bought a tractor before he bought the farm but, if I had received a letter from the department, the kind that was issued to some of the individuals, I would have gone and bought a tractor too. So the Minister is in a grey area there. However, we'll leave that for the time being.

What I want the Minister to do is define what he has in mind in terms of game farming, because we're walking a thin line here between elk ranching, game farming. What is the difference, whether you run buffalo, elk? That is where the confusion comes in right now.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Clearly, Mr. Chairman, there is need for clearer definition in these areas because we do have game farms and we do not want to see that, by way of game farms, it would be possible to do that which we said was not permissible by way of game ranching. But there is clearly, this is a new area in Manitoba. I have indicated that we will be undertaking a review of The Wildlife Act. That is a component of it. We are looking at our own regulations now, we can

deal with some of the regulations prior to a review of the act wherein we want to clearly establish that the purpose of game farms is for non-consumptive use. It is simply for viewing.

Now recognizing that you would establish certain limits of numbers of a particular species that you could have, then you would have to make some provision where, through the natural reproduction of these animals, there would have to be provision for dealing with the natural increases. So that would have to be addressed.

But clearly from our perspective, the purpose of game farms is for non-consumptive use, simply for viewing, and the regulations will be developed more concisely so that we do not get into the kind of problem that we are experiencing to some extent now. And I do not hide the fact that there is some awkwardness in dealing with these because they are new areas, but I think we have been perfectly aboveboard in dealing with this. We've had ample consultation with the public. We will continue to discuss this with the public. If we were dealing with these issues in the backrooms, I could accept that criticism, but anything that we have been doing has been totally aboveboard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Minister, in talking about game farming just now, I believe he said that we would have to prepare some regulations. Are there no regulations in place now for game farms because there are a few of them in the province?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: There are guidelines, Mr. Chairman, but no regulations as such. The game that is held is held not under permit of a game farm but under a licence for holding captive wildlife.

MRS. C. OLESON: Back to the elk ranch in the Swan River area and the disposition of the animals, it has been suggested to the Minister - and some people have told me about a suggestion that they gave the Minister on the disposition of the animals back into the wild. Their suggestion was - I haven't got it in front of me, so I'm going by memory - that these animals be put out into the wild with a monitoring device and put into different areas and carefully monitored to see what happened to them, their behaviour, if they thrived or if they didn't. Something could be salvaged out of this experiment, if you will, that has turned out to be rather a contentious issue, and has not turned out well. At least that information, a biological study of these animals that have been kept in captivity and then are placed into the wild, some information could be obtained and not all would be lost with the entire experiment.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I guess I am of the feeling not all was lost in this experiment. I think what happened - the experiment did demonstrate that the elk would reproduce effectively in captivity. So that part was borne out. It was shown as well that there was a market for elk. I think it also tested public opinion on this, and that was a lesson to be learned as well.

(Interjection)- That's right, and I think that we should always be open to that in terms of dealing with public resources because these are resources that belong to the public.

If we're going to allocate them in a particular way - and there will be ideas that'll come from time to time - I'm frankly very happy that there are ideas out there, that people are looking for different ways to utilize resources for both consumptive and non-consumptive purposes. But when those suggestions come forward because we are allocating a public resource, we do then have to test public opinion if we're going into some new areas.

So by way of this particular project - and I suppose the members opposite can share some of the credit that goes with having the experiment proceed, at least to the stage that it did - we learned that the public of Manitoba appears not to be ready for the allocation of a resource, this particular resource, the wildlife resource to this particular purpose. There are already existing allocations for recreational purposes, for non-consumptive purposes. They were not ready. I think that a responsible government does respond to public opinion. So I would not suggest that the experiment was a failure. We did learn; all Manitobans learned from this.

Now there is another component, the component that the member speaks of, in terms of using some of these animals, now turning back some of these animals to the wild because there are those that are, in fact, yet owing to the province, a decision has to be made there. I think that the group that the Member for Gladstone is referring is suggesting collaring the animals in some way and tracking their movement. That has to be kept open as a consideration.

There is an opinion on the other side that suggests that these animals, having been kept in captivity, should not now be returned to the wild. There is a concern, and I think the members opposite would be aware that there were some claims of depredation around the ranch. What would happen now if, in fact, we turned some of these animals to the wild and there happened to be a depredation problem in the years ensuing? Would it then be assumed to be as a result of those animals that were turned back to the wild? Perhaps rather than looking at putting some radio collars on these, there may be some other less expensive ways of tagging some of these animals so that we can track their movement, because there would be some benefit. There would be some benefit in knowing how these animals move, and where they would end up over the years. I think that's still open as a possibility. We haven't closed that out.

MRS. C. OLESON: I think one of the concerns of some of the people in the area with the operation now being wound down fairly soon is: What monitoring is being done to keep track of how many animals are in that ranch and, with the birth of new calves, who owns them? It's a question of ownership and how many there are, and is the department monitoring it carefully to be sure that it is being handled well?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: I can appreciate the concern that members have and the concerns that are being

expressed by the general public. But I would want to say for our part that we have had absolutely no reason to doubt the integrity of the operators of this operation, so that they have reported numbers to us, our departmental staff has been there. We do not feel that there has been any misrepresentation of numbers or disposition of livestock without getting the permission from the department. So clearly, though I am aware that there was considerable speculation in that area by some of the opponents to elk ranching for our park - and I say this as a compliment and a tribute to the operators of that ranch - that we have had absolutely no reason to question their integrity in terms of those animals. Yes, we are in close contact with them, they report the numbers to us. We have access to it, we can go there at any time that we want. I feel comfortable that the animals are well accounted for and they have been in the past and will continue to be accounted for.

MRS. C. OLESON: Now, I wasn't casting any doubt on the integrity of the people involved either. I was saying that some are concerned and of course, if anyone who's lived in a rural area, we all know that stories go around and speculations are made, and there is some concern. And I think the people would like to be assured that there is a good accountability. The Minister should be making people aware of that because, as I say, we all lived in small communities and we know the speculations that can arise.

There is also some concern about the game farm that is fairly adjacent, as I understand, to that and its expansion in recent times. There's may be some thought that some of those animals are being transferred from one place to another. Is that being accounted for?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is being accounted for and in fact some animals have been transferred. That's in the numbers that we have indicated to the member. So that clearly, when animals have been moved and relocated, we have been told about it, and we do have to -(Interjection)- No, I will repeat the point that I made earlier that, by way of the game farm, we do not want to allow to go on to the same activity that we are restricting in game ranching.

But I want to say that the game farm has been very well received by visitors to the area, by tourists to the area. Schools take their classes to the game farm, so the game farm provides a valuable attraction in terms of tourism to the area. So I wouldn't want to leave the impression that the game farm was not a kind of a facility or an attraction that we shouldn't encourage in the area. I think we do have to firm up those guidelines that we spoke of, develop the regulations so that the general public can be comfortable in knowing that it is well structured.

But again, the game farm provides an attraction to the Swan Valley area that I frankly would want to see continued but, while allowing it to continue, we should have in place those guidelines which would allow the general public to be comfortable.

I appreciate the comments from the Member for Gladstone in terms of what happens in some smaller communities in terms of speculation, and I think we have a role to play in terms of trying to ease people's concern. I would ask members opposite to join us in

that effort and in dealing with this very sensitive and emotional issue, as the Member for Emerson said, that we deal with in a way which will, rather than heighten emotions, will enable people to deal with this in a reasoned, responsible way.

MRS. C. OLESON: In the information that you circulated, Mr. Minister, this afternoon, it says, '86-87, your transfer to Tent Town, which is the game farm, of 50 animals. How does the Minister justify that number?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Just so I can seek clarification, we're looking at '86-87 with the five removed, and the balance being 50?

MR. A. DRIEDGER: It says: "To Tent Town, 50 animals."

HON. L. HARAPIAK: No, no, Tent Town, read it in the reverse order. Five went to Tent Town, leaving a balance of 50 on the ranch. So the comments which follow are the reasons for the removals. The extreme right-hand column is for the balance. So the five were removed from the ranch and taken to the Tent Town Game Farm.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I promise to be brief if the Minister's responses are brief. I know that the agreement is to try and move along, but I do have some major concerns and I'll try and be brief.

I want to go back to November of 1976, when the Minister then, Harvey Bostrom, put out a document dealing with the game ranching, and there's a couple of points in here which I want to make. This would lead the public to believe that it was a positive recommendation, that there should be encouragement to proceed with game ranching. It all didn't necessarily start under our term of office, because I'm sure the thoughts were within the department in that there was development under the former New Democratic Government to deal with it and to proceed with it.

Then, as the history shows, during our term of office there was an experimental program established. Then we go to the New Democratic Government, of which this Minister is now a member, but prior to his Ministry of Natural Resources, we had the then Honourable Sam Uskiw - I guess he's now not honourable anymore, because he's not in government and not a member of the Legislature - who clearly indicated in any statements, in any releases, in any communication, that he was fully supportive of it, in fact, would be proceeding with it.

I have a constituent - and I'm sure the department people are well aware of the name - Kelly Taylor and two of his boys on January 21, 1987, wrote to the Premier of the province, and as well a copy to the Minister responsible for Natural Resources, with their concerns.

I, first of all, want to make it very clear. Mr. Kelly Taylor and his boys are very responsible, respected, long-time pioneer people of my community. They're not people who would attempt to go into this to make a quick buck or to do something that would in any way harm or do anything at all to upset the natural balance

of nature or to upset any natural balance, but I'm sure extremely cooperative.

They have truly, Mr. Chairman, been misled by the actions of government, misled to the point where they have a substantial financial outlay for posts, for equipment, for all the things that were needed to develop an elk ranch. Mr. Chairman, equally as important financially to them was the sale of an excellent herd of pure-bred blond Aquitaine cattle in October of 1986. We all know what the livestock industry has done, and the price of those cattle today, I'm sure, is substantially higher, but they made a management decision which has cost them substantial money.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister just espoused how he feels how important it is to have a game ranch; the benefits of high school or school children coming to his constituency to see the activities that take place; nature, for example, closer to the average people, whether it be tourists - my request is, or my question is: Will he be providing some compensation to the Taylors because of the misleading that the whole exercise has taken them through in the decisions that they've made, or will he be proceeding to, in some way, compensate them financially, as well provide them a permit for a legitimate game ranch?

I would think that the Minister, the New Democratic Party Government, owes these people at least some kind of financial compensation if, in fact, there is financial compensation for his constituency and the individual that was part of the experiment. These people and many others in the province were, you might say, part of the philosophical experiment that the Minister has proceeded and has taken us through that's saying it clearly identified or pointed out that the public doesn't want elk ranching. Well, he cost quite a few people in the Province of Manitoba considerable amounts of money to find that out, because of the incompetent manner in which it was handled by this Minister and the government.

My colleague very capably points out that, don't throw the baby out with the bath water, or don't throw the elk out with the ranch. At least -(Interjection)- well, that was the point she was making. At least, Mr. Chairman, let's fully utilize all the information possible from what has so far been carried out.

One of the other things, if I may say, Mr. Chairman, in criticism of the Minister and the department, particularly the Minister, and that is you can't expect departmental people to work. Do they have two sets of minutes, two sets of books, two sets of everything so the Minister today has his mind made up and they're going in one direction, so tomorrow he makes a change, a complete reversal in his position, and now they have to find the next set of minutes or books to support him in that direction?

I mean he's not only losing publicly, Mr. Chairman. His credibility within the department is certainly on the line.-(Interjection)- Ah! department people, you can't expect them to say to Mr. Minister, please make up your mind, we'd like to know what way you're going. I can say that; they wouldn't.-(Interjection)- Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that they do at home when they're looking in the mirror, but I'm sure that they don't when they're talking to the Minister.

But the point is, they have really cost a lot of people in the province a lot of money. He's caused the

department no end of problems. For goodness' sake, you just don't play the game that way! You show leadership. He hasn't shown any leadership.

He says to me, well, what's my position on elk ranching? Well, I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, my position is fairly supportive of the people of the Province of Manitoba.- (Interjection)- Yes, I'm fully supportive of the people of the Province of Manitoba.- (Interjection)- I, Mr. Chairman, am squarely for fairness. I'm squarely for fairness, I can tell you that.

But this Minister hasn't treated the people fairly. That's why he has to be replaced, Mr. Chairman. That's why he clearly has to be replaced. I want to know, and I can tell you, that for those people - and this is one of the messages that I got out of some of the meetings that I've had on elk ranching. For those people who think there's a fast dollar in it, it's an immediate quick buck - pardon the pun - you actually aren't going to do it that way because some numbers were given to us and we know what the investments are to get into this business. It's not a big money deal when you put the capital forward.

I think you have to have a commitment like the Taylor's. You have to have a commitment like certain people who know husbandry, the husbandry of animals. So it's just not for everybody to get into, and there are some quite legitimate, experienced resource people who have serious reservations. I have to be honest, they have put some good points first. The unfortunate thing is the way in which this government has handled it; it is disastrous. They've put the whole thing, not only the elk ranching, physical elk ranching, the whole experiment of it, the whole operation of looking at it because it's a hot potato; it became a political hot potato.

On Wednesday, the Minister went to Cabinet; it was approved by Cabinet. He happened to read in the newspaper a day or two later that, oh, oh, trouble in the Swan River Valley. That's pretty close to home and that might just cause me some trouble. His colleagues, the Member for Inkster, and some of the - what would you call them? - extremists in the environmentalist field started to stir up some problems. So by the Monday night caucus meeting when they were having their pizza and cheese in the caucus room, the Minister of Natural Resources got very nervous because he read a newspaper article. He goes to the caucus meeting, and he's in trouble.

So now he has to redraft another position saying, here's what my position now is because I've got a political hot potato. He caused my colleague, Mr. Chairman, the critic for Natural Resources, no end of problems. He caused him no end of problems. He had his position taken, Mr. Chairman, and had to make him reverse his thinking and, my goodness, I have to - but my colleague, the critic for Natural Resources, able to deal with all situations at all times was quite able to cope, and I compliment him for it.

The problem is that the farmers who have invested money can't cope that well, and it has cost them money. So I want the Minister to commit to my constituents and other people either a financial program which will help them out of their costly endeavours, or proceed to give them the kind of licence that would endeavour to give them the opportunity to responsibly do what he says are benefits for his constituency. That's what

I'm requesting on behalf of people who have been misled by this government.

Mr. Chairman, I have one more particular area of concern here, and that deals with the total numbers of elk in the province. What is the history of the elk herd? What do we have in the province? Are we in a diminishing position of elk? Some of the numbers that I have would indicate that we are, that we've gone from, say, a herd of 12,000 several years ago into the 20 some-hundred numbers, and I think that's not good. I would like to see, for those people who love to see nature in it's natural state and environment, that we've got to maintain it and in fact encourage it to increase, not at the expense of farmers who are losing crops because of them, but we have to make sure the herd is managed in a proper way, so the numbers that are taking place, the reduction of or increase of on a historical pattern for, say, the last 10 years, I think would be extremely important.

I fully support my colleague from Gladstone in her recommendations to make sure that there is full consideration given to how the wind-up of the experimental program is, so that there is information from it. I think that, for the benefit of society, if the Minister would take his role of leadership and carry on with the experimental program in an area that doesn't impact on the wild herds, for example, I'm sure that if he had gone completely out of the elk area in the province, into the Arthur constituency in the community of Oak Lake, it wouldn't have had any impact on what happens in the natural state.

Now I'm sure that this debate on the pros and cons of elk ranching will continue to go on. I haven't heard the Minister of Agriculture open his mouth. It had a major impact on some of the farmers, but he never said a word. For some reason, he finds it easy to disappear on issues that get a little tough. Of course, my colleague from Pembina says, if he ever has an original thought, he should call a press conference.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to know the numbers and I'd like to know what he's going to do for those people who truly have sincerely put money out and got caught in what, I would say, is another misguided government decision, or the approach in which they put it forward, is what I should say.

I kept mine short, Leonard, I'd expect yours to be short.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I will be brief, unlike the previous speaker.

I think his comments demonstrate that there still is that division amongst the members on the side opposite about the issue of elk ranching. The Member for Arthur was just indicating to me that we should give consideration to extending the experimental period somewhere in the province. The Member for Emerson scolded me for considering a two-year phase-down. He insisted that it be phased out in one year, so clearly a difference of opinion right within the caucus.

How long is this going to take?

MR. J. DOWNEY: Not very long.

The point I was making, Mr. Chairman, is I said, I didn't make it very clear that a compensation to Mr. Taylor in some form or another is really what I'm after,

for a licence to carry out a form of game farming which may in fact help provide information. There is no split in our caucus as far as our position is concerned. It's the game playing of the Minister we'd like to shut down.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: I think a review of the record will show that was not in fact a clarification, that it reaffirms what I said. There is a difference of opinion on that side with respect to whether or not the experiment - we have made the decision that the experiment should be terminated.

The Member for Arthur said that we should give consideration to having it relocated in another part of the province. The Member for Emerson said earlier, I should not consider a two-year period for the phase out. It was imperative that we phase it out in one year. But what now the Member for Emerson is saying is that particular operation, but look at something somewhere else.

We have said what we want to do is provide a clear indication to the public and we have, by way of this decision - and I will admit that there was anxiety, uncertainty, in that period of time when the experiment was under way and they were waiting for a decision. But clearly, we have given our direction at this time.

On the matter of Mr. Taylor and others who made an investment in anticipation of a licence, we have not had representation from the individuals, but I would want to say that I don't think we have a responsibility for covering off some their speculative activity.

But what we have said, in response to the Member for Gladstone, is that there is need to clarify the future of game farms and, once those regulations have been drafted and we have a clear direction on that matter, I think there will be an opportunity to look at establishing other game farms clearly for non-consumptive purposes. I want to emphasize that. Once we have developed the regulations, we will be prepared to look at those.

I respect what the members says regarding Mr. Taylor and his family. We've had the opportunity to meet with Mr. Taylor and many of the others who had an interest in this issue, Mr. Krawchuk being another one, all very responsible people. I would not want to suggest that, because there was a difference of opinion in terms of what their objectives were and what ours were, there was any doubt about what their motives were. They were, I think, very respectable, responsible people who wanted to undertake a particular initiative. So I would want the record to show that.

A couple of points, Mr. Chairman, we will provide specific information on elk herd numbers. Just generally, the indication is that the Duck Mountain herd has been declining over a period of years. We see the problem there being deterioration of habitat primarily. We are undertaking in this year some Habitat Enhancement Programs, along with the Habitat Heritage Corporation and others, to improve the habitat and we will provide more specific information. I think the information will also show that the Riding Mountain herd is in fairly good shape. The Spruce Woods herd is in the range of 300 to 400 animals, and there's some indication that is moving upward in terms of numbers. But we will provide specific information and pass that on to the member.

We do have information as well for the Member for Emerson who was asking information on numbers of hunters for different species and the success rates. I don't know if he wants to take the time to have it read into the record. I can pass that information on. It would indicate the success rate for moose in the province is about 23 percent, deer 55 percent, elk 26 percent, and then we can indicate the specific number of participants in that sport, but we can pass that information on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, to conclude the elk ranching aspect of it, I just want to try and assist the Minister to some degree that, if he's going to try and make the information public to all the people who are involved on both sides of the issue and explain exactly what's happening without trying to keep things under the hat, I think it's going to make it a lot easier for the Minister. We need that kind of stuff, because the thing came up to quite a boil, and the Minister can make his life easier by giving all this information.

Mr. Chairman, with that I think we'll leave this with the understanding that, as this thing moves along, the Minister announces what's happening and there can be response from the various sides further on the issue.

Mr. Chairman, I want to now move into a few other areas. Time is always moving so fast in this department here. I want to first of all indicate, it is my understanding - I raised last year the participation of the government under the Wildlife Toxicology Association, a grant which was a research grant. I think there were monies expended last year, to some degree. That is my understanding and, if that is the case, because I think it is an important aspect of research, and my understanding is that certain monies were expended in that area. If that is the case, I want to congratulate the Minister, and I want to encourage him to continue with that program. I wonder if he could just give us a short update as to where it's at with the position of the government because, when I raised it last year, it was just sort of in limbo and I understand money was handed to that organization.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, the individual involved from our staff was Dr. Merlin Shoesmith, who is involved with this project jointly with the World Wildlife fund. We're looking . . . - (Interjection)-

A MEMBER: Cost-shared?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: That's correct. It was cost-shared and, in fact, Environment Canada was involved and there were some private sector involvement. One particular firm was Noranda Incorporated. The summary that I have for the project costs for 1985-86, there was a cost-sharing of \$12,500 from the Government of Manitoba and the Wildlife Toxicology Fund of a similar amount. The projected costs for this year - and now these include the STEP student salaries and support costs within the Wildlife Branch. Our estimated contribution is \$28,793, and the similar amount for the Toxicology Fund. So for '86-87, it was \$28,000; in the previous year, it was about \$12,500.00.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the Minister on that participation. I want to encourage

a continuation in that direction. I think it's a worthwhile project.

The next item, Mr. Chairman, that I want to deal with is the Turtle Mountain area and the moose numbers in that area and whether the Minister is considering opening a limited season for moose in the Turtle Mountain area.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, before I go on to that matter of the moose hunt in Turtle Mountain, I just wanted to point out that I quoted the figures for '85-86, '86-87. For the current year, the projected level is \$29,000, I believe, so we're going to be maintaining it at about that level.

Yes, there is consideration being given for a moose hunt but, again, on this matter we have a division of opinion. We have representation being made to us indicating that we should not be having moose hunt. In fact, there was an organized mailing, cards were printed, being sent into the Minister, lobbying against having a moose hunt. On the other side, we've heard from people who said, yes, there should be a moose hunt.

So we, at this time, are going to be undertaking a process of public consultation in the area, presenting to people the facts as we see them. After that public consultation, a final decision will be made. But yes, we are considering a moose hunt for the area, but no final decision will be made until that public consultation takes place.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I just want to indicate to the Minister that the previous Minister of Natural Resources, the Member for Turtle Mountain at that time, Mr. Brian Ransom - who was I think one of the most conscientious individuals who we've had as a Minister, including everybody - feels quite strongly that the number of game of moose in the Turtle Mountain area has increased dramatically, and they're certainly encouraging the possibility of a limited draw-type of basis of a hunt out there. I don't know the lobby group that was opposing a moose hunt, and probably it was instigated by the Member for St. James who would do away with hunting if he could, period. So if the Minister is indicating that there will be consultation, I want him to keep that in mind properly, so that people can have a proper input into the matter.

I want to go on to a different area, unless the Minister has a comment to make on that.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Just a very brief comment, I just wanted to indicate for the member that this past winter the staff actually counted 250 moose in the area compared to 150 in 1986. There's a very high calf crop, there's a very high survival rate, in fact, 105 calves from 100 cows. There will be, if this trend continues, 450 to 500 moose in a 160 square mile area this coming September. So clearly, I think from our perspective in the department, there is a very good basis on which to consider a hunt of some nature. Now it may be that we should be going forward with a specialized hunt such as an archery season only if there are concerns, but I want to say for my part that I think hunting can be a management tool as well as a recreation opportunity.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I believe that.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to draw to the Minister's attention and raise one concern. I've always been an avid hunter, and I enjoyed tremendously the opportunity to hunt turkey a few years ago when there was a season, and then the season was closed down because of lack of numbers. Then this year, all of a sudden - and when I raised the question last year about the turkey season, obviously, there were not enough numbers. This year, the department saw fit to open a season and have it wide-open where anybody could apply for a licence and it's open for two weeks. The previous seasons that we enjoyed in our area for the turkey season was on a draw basis for two days at a time. You got a permit and you got a ticket and you had to go and check in your bird, and it was very controlled.

Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, the way it was set up this year, there's a lot of speculation and doubt in people's minds that there is an intention to try and shoot out the turkeys and then nobody has to be bothered with them anymore, because the impression that is left - I picked up a licence, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, and I got my turkey and I enjoyed the hunt; I always do. But the fact is, I didn't have to have a tag or anything like that. I could have gone out day for day and shot a turkey and nobody would have been the wiser, because I didn't have to notch my licence or anything like that. I got a little square that was pasted on my game certificate. Other than that, there was no record of what was going on.

That leaves a bad impression, Mr. Minister. I would hope that it is not the intention to do away with the turkey population in Southeast Manitoba, but certainly the way it has been handled it leaves a lot of doubt in there because I feel concern should have been expressed. I think there should have at least been a ticket the day that you shot it so that your permit, once it is filled, it is invalidated. This way, there was nothing.

I just want to raise that with the Minister. I think a different approach should have been taken, and I feel disappointed in the way it was handled.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I am frankly somewhat disappointed that the Member for Emerson would even suggest that what we would do as a department is manage a resource in a way which would see elimination. Very frankly, that is distressing to me that he would even read a statement of that sort into the record which would be interpreted by people on the outside that the department was so irresponsible in its approach.

Let me point out, Mr. Chairman, not all the turkeys are out in the southeast part of the province.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I know, I know.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: I want to point out that in the last year - in the previous year, we had set a maximum of 425 licences, but I'm speaking of these in global figures, and 150 were taken last year. So this year, we said that there would not be a draw; people could simply come and buy their licences. April 29, to that date there were 307 licences purchased. So clearly, at that stage, we were still below the target that was set for the previous year. So for the member to suggest that,

because there was no draw, the herd was put at risk, I think is not painting an accurate picture.

We have had communication from the Wild Gobblers, the group that is responsible, and they encouraged us to move in this direction. We had encouragement. We have not had a negative reaction from anyone in terms of this kind of an approach.

I can read for the member what has happened with the population for the southern part. The South Manitoba area is considered to be 1,000 to 1,500 birds; the Pembina Valley area is 185; St. Malo area, 325 - up 97 percent since 1983; and the Hartney area, 185. So clearly the stock is in good shape.

We have been encouraged by the organization which works hard to develop the stock to go to an open system, rather than to a draw system. So I reject categorically the notion put forward by the Member for Emerson that what we have done here is taken an approach which would see the eradication of the turkey population. That is not our approach at all.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I don't even want to start to try and explain to the Minister the turkey situation in Southeast Manitoba because, first of all, when he talks of a target of 450 last year, there was no season last year. There hasn't been a season for a long time and I won't even start on that, but I hope that his staff possibly can take some of the concerns I mentioned into consideration.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I would want the member to clarify when he is saying that there was no season there. There are certain areas in which there was no season, and it may be that in his area there was not. But clearly, there was a turkey season last year in Manitoba.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Precisely what I was trying to say, Mr. Chairman. I don't want to explain the turkey situation to the Minister. I realize he can't keep on top of everything, but I just want to draw to the attention of his staff that the way it was handled has not been a proper way of handling in view of the many hunters who I've been in contact with, and I just ask him to keep that in mind for the future.

Mr. Chairman, I want to go on to a different area now. I'd like to deal with the habitat end of it for just a brief moment. Habitat is one of the key issues that is always talked about in terms of wildlife. The Minister even talks about it with the fish population. I'm wondering whether the Minister is considering programs.

I just want to throw out a suggestion in terms of maybe grants in lieu of taxes for farmers who have sloughs, who have marginal land, that maybe we can work out a system whereby, if they get some kind of compensation - maybe it can be done in conjunction with the wildlife associations, maybe it can be done in conjunction with the Federal Government, because we've had a trend that has been there for many years in terms of breaking land, trying to make more land arable, and a lot of that land really isn't suited for cropping.

Under the circumstances with grain prices the way they are, I would suggest that maybe a joint program

could be worked out with the Manitoba Wildlife Federation, the Canadian Wildlife Federation and various wildlife associations in terms of maybe compensating farmers for at least the tax end of it so that they would leave land for wildlife habitat, because it isn't worth breaking it. It isn't even worth pasture in many cases. I would like to encourage the Minister to maybe come up with some new ideas and move in that kind of a direction to try and enhance the wildlife aspect of it on lands that are worth basically very little for the agricultural community.

Even in conjunction with the agricultural community, when you consider that the Americans are paying their farmers not to seed land, possibly we can work out some kind of a joint program together with the Federal Government, with the various organizations, in terms of leaving some of this land dormant to basically enhance the wildlife habitat, which is I think very important.

I think it has to be worked hand in hand; it is not an isolated situation. It has to be done on a much broader scale, and I think the support would be there from the general public.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, this is an issue that I could speak to for hours in terms of the different projects that we have under way. I'm really delighted with the kind of cooperation we've had from various organizations, including the Manitoba Wildlife Federation, Ducks Unlimited, many organizations. So there's just a multitude of information that we have here on that kind of a cooperative approach to deal with the habitat which is the key, as the member has said, to healthy populations of wildlife in the future.

I want to reference very quickly the Habitat Heritage Corporation that I mentioned earlier in the day where we provide funding of a .25 million annually. We do have the Habitat Enhancement Land Use Program, which is a new initiative this year that we're very proud of, a combined effort of the Government of Manitoba, Ducks Unlimited and the Wildlife Habitat Canada. There's a commitment to a project in the Shoal Lake area, and it will involve the R.M. of Shoal Lake, Manitoba Agriculture, landowners and the Manitoba Wildlife Federation. Indeed, one of the components of that program will provide for the incentives to farmers to have the habitat return to its natural state, and there will be incentives in terms of tax reduction or offsets for taxes, other elements of that nature. So I would be pleased to share with the member in the House this information at another time.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, with your indulgence, just one final comment.

It is unfortunate that we are working under a time element in our Estimates generally, and we can't maybe spend the kind of time that would be beneficial for Manitobans to bring all this information forward. Maybe I can work out some system with the Minister where at least some of this information gets to the wildlife associations, etc.

I want to indicate to the Minister that basically we have two areas that we'd like to cover under wildlife yet. One is basically a beaver problem, and the other is trapline allocation. Maybe we can deal with those

tomorrow and then move into - just for the record, Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate that we have a sort of general understanding with the Minister that we will be covering engineering and construction, as well as water resources and the capital program sort of on a total basis.- (Interjection)- No, no, we haven't finished this yet.

I just wonder if the Minister could confirm that is sort of the understanding.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise.
Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

The Committee of Supply adopted a certain resolution, reported same and asked leave to sit again.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that the Report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The hour being 6:00 p.m., the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow. (Thursday)