



Fourth Session - Thirty-Fifth Legislature

of the

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

**STANDING COMMITTEE
on
PUBLIC UTILITIES
and
NATURAL RESOURCES**

42 Elizabeth II

*Chairperson
Mr. Marcel Laurendeau
Constituency of St. Norbert*



VOL. XLII No. 13 - 7 p.m., WEDNESDAY, JULY 21, 1993

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Thirty-Fifth Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PARTY
ALCOCK, Reg	Osborne	Liberal
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BARRETT, Becky	Wellington	NDP
CARSTAIRS, Sharon	River Heights	Liberal
CERILLI, Marianne	Radisson	NDP
CHOMIAK, Dave	Kildonan	NDP
CUMMINGS, Glen, Hon.	Ste. Rose	PC
DACQUAY, Louise	Seine River	PC
DERKACH, Leonard, Hon.	Roblin-Russell	PC
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	NDP
DOER, Gary	Concordia	NDP
DOWNEY, James, Hon.	Arthur-Virden	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert, Hon.	Steinbach	PC
DUCHARME, Gerry, Hon.	Riel	PC
EDWARDS, Paul	St. James	Liberal
ENNS, Harry, Hon.	Lakeside	PC
ERNST, Jim, Hon.	Charleswood	PC
EVANS, Clif	Interlake	NDP
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
FILMON, Gary, Hon.	Tuxedo	PC
FINDLAY, Glen, Hon.	Springfield	PC
FRIESEN, Jean	Wolseley	NDP
GAUDRY, Neil	St. Boniface	Liberal
GILLESHAMMER, Harold, Hon.	Minnedosa	PC
GRAY, Avis	Crescentwood	Liberal
HELWER, Edward R.	Gimli	PC
HICKES, George	Point Douglas	NDP
LAMOUREUX, Kevin	Inkster	Liberal
LATHLIN, Oscar	The Pas	NDP
LAURENDEAU, Marcel	St. Norbert	PC
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MANNESS, Clayton, Hon.	Morris	PC
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	NDP
McALPINE, Gerry	Sturgeon Creek	PC
MCCRAE, James, Hon.	Brandon West	PC
MCINTOSH, Linda, Hon.	Assiniboia	PC
MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.	River East	PC
ORCHARD, Donald, Hon.	Pembina	PC
PALLISTER, Brian	Portage la Prairie	PC
PENNER, Jack	Emerson	PC
PLOHMAN, John	Dauphin	NDP
PRAZNIK, Darren, Hon.	Lac du Bonnet	PC
REID, Daryl	Transcona	NDP
REIMER, Jack	Niakwa	PC
RENDER, Shirley	St. Vital	PC
ROCAN, Denis, Hon.	Gladstone	PC
ROSE, Bob	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Broadway	NDP
STEFANSON, Eric, Hon.	Kirkfield Park	PC
STORIE, Jerry	Flin Flon	NDP
SVEINSON, Ben	La Verendrye	PC
VODREY, Rosemary, Hon.	Fort Garry	PC
WASYLYCIA-LEIS, Judy	St. Johns	NDP
WOWCHUK, Rosann	Swan River	NDP
Vacant	Rossmere	
Vacant	Rupertsland	
Vacant	The Maples	

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON
PUBLIC UTILITIES AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Wednesday, July 21, 1993

TIME — 7 p.m.

LOCATION — Winnipeg, Manitoba

CHAIRPERSON — Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (St. Norbert)

ATTENDANCE - 10 — QUORUM - 6

Members of the Committee present:

Hon. Messrs. Ducharme, Enns, Praznik, Stefanson

Mr. Ashton, Mrs. Carstairs, Mrs. Dacquay, Messrs. Laurendeau, Penner, Ms. Wowchuk

APPEARING:

Jerry Storie, MLA for Flin Flon

Marianne Cerilli, MLA for Radisson

WITNESSES:

Walter Kucharczyk, Private Citizen

Walter Burdeny, Private Citizen

Glen Pinnell, Abitibi-Price

Vincent Keenan, Private Citizen

Kelly Sharpe, Private Citizen

Jack Coote, Private Citizen

Sharon Coote, Private Citizen

Gordon Hanson, Private Citizen

Henry Ostrowski, Mayor, Village of Powerview

Dave Nickarz, Private Citizen

Nick Carter, Private Citizen

Joe Melnick, Private Citizen

Alison Elliott, Private Citizen

Paul Nagerl, on behalf of D. James Robertson, Falconbridge Limited

Bruce Samson, Whiteshell District Association Inc.

William Pruitt, Private Citizen

Christine Singh, Coalition to Save the Elms

Margaret Pilloud, Private Citizen

Don Sullivan, Choices

John Jacobson, Private Citizen

Diane Cox, on behalf of Duncan Stewart

Gord Pazerniuk, Private Citizen

Leonard Lewandoski, Private Citizens

Hendrik Herfst, The Defenders of Nopiming

Joseph Kelly, Private Citizen

Jean-Philippe Sourisseau, Private Citizen

MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION:

Bill 41—The Provincial Parks and Consequential Amendments Act

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: I would like to ask the committee's advice on something. I have a number of presenters—there are three or four of them—one who has to be out of town on family business and it is urgent. He is going to be leaving at nine o'clock. The other ones, I would rather not get into their personal reasons why they have to be heard but there are three others who would like to have been heard as well. I am wondering if it is the will of the committee that we might hear from these four presenters.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): I do not think there is any problem. In fact, we have been accommodating people from out of town, but actually one of the other traditions is we also do accommodate people who have specific circumstances as to why they cannot come back another time. I would agree to it.

Mrs. Louise Dacquay (Selina River): My only question is, are they out-of-town people or are there still people from out of town here this evening who would be moved up the list as well?

Mr. Chairperson: There are still some out-of-town presenters as well.

At this time, would the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources please come to order. When the committee last sat, it was hearing public presentations on Bill 41, The

Provincial Parks and Consequential Amendments Act. The committee tonight will continue hearing public presentations.

Before I get underway, I would like to inform the committee members that the committee has received additional written submissions and that these have been distributed to the committee members with the updated lists of the written submissions. At this time, before me is an updated list of persons names registered to speak on Bill 41. For the committee's benefit, a copy of the list has been distributed to each member.

Point of Order

Hon. Darren Praznik (Minster of Labour): Just a point of order, Mr. Chairperson, if I may.

I was just in the back of the room, and I do not know if it is the sound system, the nature of the sound system or perhaps the way we are using our microphones, but it is virtually impossible to hear what is going on at the committee from the back of the room. Perhaps if we could make sure we are closer to our microphones, et cetera, so that the presenters are able to hear our comments.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Praznik.

* * *

Mr. Ashton: Just while we are dealing with preliminary matters, I am just wondering if we have the same understanding as yesterday in terms of timing of the committee. I would suggest that we, once again, assess where we are at eleven o'clock and proceed as we did last night. It seemed to work quite well.

Mr. Chairperson: Is that agreed with the committee then? Agreed.

If there is anyone else in the audience who is not registered to speak to Bill 41 and would like to do so, please let the staff at the back of the room know and they will add your name to the Zst.

As a reminder for the committee members and members of the public, the committee has agreed at previous meetings to hear from out-of-town presenters first. If there is anyone today to speak to Bill 41 from out of town, could they inform the Clerk and we will call those names right after we have dealt with the four special circumstances that have been brought to our attention as agreed to by the committee.

I would like to now call on Walter Kucharczyk.

Mr. Walter Kucharczyk (Private Citizen): My apologies to cause you difficulties with that last name. Walter is good enough.

Mr. Chairperson: Walter is good enough.

Mr. Kucharczyk: Please. [interjection] You are a real politician. You know how to interpret, hey.

Mr. Chairperson: Carry on. Do you have a written presentation, Walter?

Mr. Kucharczyk: No, Mr. Chairperson, I will be very brief. I will not use 20 minutes. I want to say to you first of all that my medical condition calls for lots to be desired. In other words, I am pretty sick under medication. However, I could not help but get off my chest something that I have been aware of probably before some of you here were born.

Your Bill 41 is similar to the mining bill in the second part you just recently completed, Bill 3. The issue that you have in Bill 41 to my knowledge existed but no action had been taken by the D.L. Campbell administration—do not give me a dirty look—subsequently, Mr. Roblin at the time had inherited, I believe, the Department of Natural Resources jointly with the Department of Mines.

There is an honourable minister classified as endangered species and has been over 25 years in that position. He can say if I am right or wrong. Most of the time I am wrong according to my enemies, of course.

Now the matter was raised at the time of Mr. Roblin's administration by Honourable Mr. Gurney Evans, may he rest in peace, but not with his ideas. He was good. One obstacle was their tying in the private lands in designated areas of the parks with some daydreamers at the time to have a Torrens title to the property the way Ontario had. So the brains in the department reviewed, to my knowledge, what would be a benefit of the title or rather to be administered by the Crown. More or less, as I recall, the conclusion was, Mr. Chairperson, that if the Torrens title practice would be implemented, then you would have a Hungarian goulash that you never would separate. It would be just a mess.

So the powers to be decided at the time, just let it stay for awhile. Besides, there was no recession then, and besides, the Crown lease was somewhere around \$30 a year where the cottages

were. Today, of course, it is slightly over \$600. I am not beefing, the service improved.

When I heard about the objections subsequently by—I hope I will identify the organization correctly—private land owners association in the park, I believe they stated that they are willing to pay a certain amount of money under Bill 41, and the rest naturally to the government of Manitoba, the honourable minister, the head of the department. With his staff, they know better what they should give the Crown.

Of course, in those cases, intentional amnesia occurred. They forgot altogether what the Crown did for them. To my knowledge, whenever there was a privately owned lot with a cottage, when a grader would be fixing the road, it would not by-pass that place by raising the blade and keep on going. The road was looked after just as well by the privately owned lots as by the Crown-owned lots, garbage pickup—I do not mean political, I mean the refuse.

There was also police protection provided, medical protection provided in the form of doctors being in the area, plus ambulances, et cetera. But they never bothered to pay a penny, of course. Maybe bureaucracy is a little bit to blame. They keep the things so secret, just like Bush and Mulroney kept during the Iraqi War, except that they had to blush as hell afterwards.

Secrets do not pay. They only temporarily delay certain knowledge. Usually the one who keeps something very secret eats the crow, and it is shocking as heck if there is no ketchup involved.

* (1910)

I appeal to Mr. Minister, if he listens to me, in fairness to all those that have Crown leases where their cottages are, to take a look, use your own discretion. Just off the cuff, the last 10 or so years, what ordinarily Crown-owned leases, owners of the cottages paid per season, multiply it by 10 and make it retroactive. After all, those people are not broke. They are usually quite wealthy. They foresaw a way to beat the Crown and the taxpayer and demand some more service, because they take the attitude they are God-given gifts to humanity, crying up here, the way they talk.

I heard some statements, so I appeal through you, Mr. Chairperson, to Mr. Minister, at least consider the retroactivity. Give the public opportunity to express, other than owners—nobody wants to pay money—but the public at large, get

their opinion. As far as the retroactivity is concerned, you, sir, will not be inventing the wheel.

The Right Honourable Mr. Edward Schreyer, I do not know how right he is, he never was left to start with, but on April 1, 1974, he implemented, with the support of his friends at the time, Cherniack, Green and Miller, incremental tax on old oil. So all of a sudden it became new oil, too. I think you would lose many nights sleep counting how old that oil was or how new. They came to the conclusion that the operators made enough money until '74, so they passed in the late fall, towards the end of the year, the law retroactively. Some poor suckers had to borrow money to pay it, because oil people usually live from hand to mouth.

The principle of retroactivity, sir, you will not be inventing. It is only logical. Let us be realistic. For one reason or another, the administrations made a mistake for not looking after collecting what belongs to the taxpayers.

The last item that I want to mention, I did hear submission by the mining people pertaining to the wilderness. When I heard the wilderness, I thought they were talking about Ottawa, but they said no, wrong, Flin Flon.

When it comes to the logic of mining, what would happen to Mr. Minister of Natural Resources today if he would cause that Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting would close the mine? I suggest he will be known as Jesus Christ No. 2 by the people of that area. It is not a renewable resource. Those people need the commodity. Would that be income? They need their ore. Would that be Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting, et cetera?

The fever develops all of a sudden, without realizing that before anything will be done on the ground, they still have airplanes that they fly and they equip them with magnetometers. That is one the simplest ways. They start with a big circle and come smaller and smaller and pinpoint the heaviest magnetic rays. That takes a while.

The fever develops about protecting the wilderness. I suggest they take their initiative first, pertaining to wilderness, to City Hall. That would do much more good for all concerned. All the energy spent on that, I bet you anything, if you would put that to the farmers they would say, was that an April fool they told you about.

In conclusion, I only want to say one thing. It is your good luck of the committee on that Bill 41 that

I am sick. I have a record behind me of seven and a half pages of a subject I knew, and Willie Parasiuk questioned me 15 minutes on top of that. The committee was in the afternoon, between sessions. I had the privilege to have the committee to myself. Now, smile, you are not subject to it. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Walter. One moment, Walter. I believe there might be a question.

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (River Heights): Mr. Kucharczyk, can you tell me if you are in fact still a cottage owner yourself? You are making these comments, and I know that you have been a cottage owner in the past.

Mr. Kucharczyk: No, my wife, daughter, Chinese chow chow dog and Walter, the whole family.

Mrs. Carstairs: All right, the whole family owned a cottage.

Mr. Kucharczyk: But not myself alone.

Mrs. Carstairs: Mr. Kucharczyk, my question, though, is that the comments you make are being made as someone who has in fact owned property within a provincial park.

Mr. Kucharczyk: I do not own. We have a lease, 21 years.

Mr. Chairperson: Walter, could you speak into the microphone?

Mr. Kucharczyk: Sorry, maybe it is better that somebody does not hear.

Since 1957, I believe, the family had the cottage, including myself, in the Whiteshell.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Walter.

Mr. Kucharczyk: Thank you very kindly. I want to congratulate Mrs. Carstairs that she did not bite her tongue pronouncing my name.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Walter Burdeny, please, No. 154, for the committee. Mr. Burdeny, do you have a written presentation?

Mr. Walter Burdeny (Private Citizen): Yes, I put it in last night.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, you can go ahead. It is being distributed at this time.

Mr. Burdeny: Honourable members of the House and Mr. Chairperson, I am Walter Burdeny. I am representing myself as a private landowner.

I, Walter Burdeny, purchased the property from Fred Gerylo in 1969. The Parks Branch was laughing at us paying such a high price for this property. We could have leased the land from the government for \$90, in which all services would be put in at that time. When we bought the land, we had no culverts, ditches and no gravel roads. I had to haul rock and gravel with Mr. Fred Gerylo, his wife and myself, Saturdays and Sundays.

My property was flooded every spring because there were no ditches. The garage was flooded from every spring thaw, heavy rains, with no service or help from the Parks Branch or government. So three of us from the road got together and formed an association: Mr. William Stewart, Mr. Otto Schultz, and myself. Mr. Stewart became president, Otto Schultz was vice-president, and I was the secretary and treasurer.

From there on, we built up the road. Improvements were made every year by the association budget, and all the cottage owners helped. We are all volunteers and put in many, many hours of labour all through the year. The grass is cut in the ditches along the highway, road allowance, beach and front property, which is also government property, and once again, no help or compensation from them.

On September 15, 1987, Jol Johannesson, park patrol captain, Badge No. 116, and Bryan Stephaniuk, who called himself a lot inspector for Steep Rock Road, van licence number was 739 AEC—my wife Elsie Burdeny and I were sitting on the deck with Mr. and Mrs. J. Black. They saw that the gate was locked, and we had signs posted on the gate behind the cottage and garage which read "Private Property, No Trespassing." When they stepped over the gate, I said to them they were trespassing and not obeying the rules.

* (1920)

These gentlemen ignored what I said to them. My wife was sitting in the wheelchair on the deck when they pulled out their measuring tape. They did not excuse themselves while they put the tape behind her back and continued on measuring the cottage. They ignored us and our privacy on our own private property.

When there is a problem with the campers coming onto the private road to camp at the lakefront, we have no protection or help from Parks

Branch to get them off the property at any time. The association of the road must do this together again. Once again, if there is a rowdy party or a problem, the Parks officers ignore the private roads. But if we were in the campground and it happened, they would get rid of the party or parties involved.

The Parks Branch supplies cottages and campers with wells, beaches, garbage cages, collection, maintenance of roads, summer and winter, boat launching facilities, fish-cleaning houses, parking lots, which are maintained by them. Private landowners receive nothing. We must pay out of our pockets for everything.

Will they come to cut the grass, maintain our beach, docks, ramps, roads and supply us with garbage collection? What kind of service will they give us for the taxes they want to charge us? As of now, I will stick to the old Land Titles rules of the old Land Titles act.

Levies not related to services: 13(l.1) There is no free lunch for anyone in the association. I am against Bill 41 because it provides for property taxation without a vote. It takes away our most basic property rights. As a private property owner, I do not want to see eastern Europe transplanted into Manitoba.

There are a few privately owned properties in the park and privately owned properties outside the park which are not subject to the property tax and Bill 41 which will not affect them.

I therefore refuse to recognize the legislation unless I have a vote. I am also prepared to pay a negotiable fee by agreement of the association.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Burdeny. There might be some questions, if you do not mind.

Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River): Just for clarification, in your second last paragraph, you say there are a few private property owners in the park and more private owners outside the park who are not subject to property tax or Bill 41.

I do not quite understand how there are some who are not going to be affected by Bill 41.

Mr. Burdeny: I do not think they are. There are more people outside of the park on Crown land than there is in the park.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much, Mr. Burdeny, for your presentation.

Out-of-town presenter, No. 13, Mr. Glen Pinnell. You can go ahead, Mr. Pinnell.

Mr. Glen Pinnell (Abitibi-Price): Honourable members, Mr. Chairperson, I am making this presentation tonight on behalf of Abitibi-Price. I am an employee of Abitibi-Price.

On the one hand, we appreciate the opportunity to comment and give our input on Bill 41, the parks act, but on the other hand, we also find it inconvenient. We should be using our energies to manage our operation and help create a better Manitoba, not always having to take action to defend it from some who want to destroy it.

Because our business is in the forest industry, most of our comments and examples pertain to the forest resource, so it should be recognized if the values and principles were applied to all resource users, then the values would be increased multifold.

We are pleased the province has adopted a sustainable development philosophy, as has the country and many nations throughout the world. Sustainable development provides a focus and direction for all of us to work together so everyone's efforts can be in the same direction. Since the Bill 41 parks act has used sustainable development for the basis, then we applaud the act.

One definition of sustainable development is, it meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of the future generation to meet their own needs, a definition we wholeheartedly support. In this presentation, we would like to emphasize the importance and value of sound environmental economic development in our province and nation and make the following points in regard to what the parks act should do.

Present commitment for the use of the natural resource must be honoured. Existing legal rights and commitments must be recognized in all areas and particularly in parks that were multiuse parks. Anything otherwise will have extremely negative impacts on the local and provincial economy.

The necessity to be certain that new protected areas are not placed on areas that have high potential for future commercial use.

Third, environmentally sound economic management of our resources should be promoted, explained and demonstrated to the general public, and this can be done in parks as well as other parts of the forest.

Four, we must ensure that protected areas designated under the Endangered Spaces

Program do not impact other surrounding valuable resources due to spread of fire, insects and disease.

Five, in all cases decisions should result from facts and using common sense in order to not negatively impact the local and provincial economy but improve the economy, and this act should help ensure that.

I would like to explain some values at risk. The importance of just the forest resource to Canada and Manitoba cannot be underemphasized. In Manitoba alone it provides one in every 45 jobs. Many of our local communities are heavily dependent upon the natural resource, be it forestry, mining or other commercial resource use. A brief outline of just the Pine Falls operation shows the values at risk and opportunities available if we make certain the operation is sustainable.

The Pine Falls operation started up in 1927 and today has the following capacity and outputs. By world standards it is considered a small operation. It produces 175,000 tonnes of newsprint annually. It employs 500 full-time and 700 seasonal people. It generates \$80 million annually into the Manitoba economy, 70 percent of the production shipped to the U.S. This contributes to the balance of trade and a harvest wood throughout Manitoba. Seeing you have a written presentation, I will just leave you with the numbers there. You will see that 38 percent are on forest management licence, 19 percent are in the wood supply area, 19 percent on southern Manitoba and 24 percent come from the western part of the province.

The Pine Falls operation has been in the forefront of sustainable development and can demonstrate that some harvesting is taking place today in some of the same areas we have operated in 65 years ago.

The newsprint industry in Canada and the United States is facing the worst financial crisis experienced in its history. Our mill is no exception. Closure of several machines and paper mills have occurred throughout Canada over the years and more will result before balance occurs between supply and demand. Abitibi-Price's long-term strategic plan does not include the Pine Falls operation and has therefore been receptive to financial offers by the management group and employees to purchase the mill. This acquisition

must also include government assistance and support.

The total capital expenditure program to environmentally upgrade the mill and meet recycle requirements will cost the new group approximately \$60 million over the next five years. Additional capital expenditures for a new wood room and other technological upgrades will increase this total to approximately \$130 million. We have also entered into an exclusive agreement with a separate group to study the feasibility of installing a 340 megawatt cogeneration power plant at an approximate cost of \$300 million. In essence, the total potential investment in our area would be approximately \$430 million or \$450 million. How many opportunities are there in one's lifetime to see a \$450-million investment over a five-year period?

Investment is a key component of sustainable development and in order to ensure investment in a mill such as ours the resource must be protected from fire and disease and be available for commercial use. Would you invest your money in anything if you were uncertain of the resources availability?

* (1930)

Some of the major impacts—at Pine Falls during the 1980s, six times as much forest area was lost to fires as was harvested. If you would refer in the presentation to the attachment No. 1, the coloured area shows in red all of the area lost to fires. This, along with the creation of the Atikaki wilderness park, reduced the annual allowable cut available to the Pine Falls operation by 30 percent. That is referring to our forest management licence area. Any further reduction in the forest resource jeopardizes the viability of the Pine Falls operation.

Our major issue is to have the forest resource that is already committed to be protected from forest fires and to be available for commercial use.

As you are aware, there are some people advocating no commercial use of resources in multiuse parks, areas which the local communities have been dependent upon for decades. This does not make sense, and it will not only reduce the dollars created by the commercial use of the resource, but it will result in a tax burden to the people of Manitoba and have a negative impact on both the environment and the economy.

The following points will support the previous statement:

1. Just considering three of the five major multiuse parks, Ducks, Nopiming and Whiteshell, the annual allowable cut for softwoods is 217,850 cubic metres and for hardwoods 104,520 cubic metres. The resource taken from these parks is used throughout Manitoba, but in order to place a potential value of just the softwoods, the 217,850 cubic metres, assume it was converted to newsprint. It would generate \$39 million annually. That is not considering the value of the hardwoods, the forest resource of the other parks nor the value of the other natural resources in any of the parks. That is explained in more detail on attachment No. 2.

2. The forested areas east of Lake Winnipeg around Pine Falls, Manigotagan, Bissett, as well as the Duck and Porcupine Mountains and Whiteshell have been used by either or both forestry and mining since the early 1900s. Over the years, an infrastructure of roads, buildings, equipment and communities have been built. This infrastructure resulted because of the jobs created by the commercial use of the resource, spin-off jobs and taxes collected.

The attached map shows the development of the provincial highways in the Duck Mountains, Nopiming Park and Whiteshell, not to mention the forest resource roads. How and why did these communities become established? What is the value of these roads now to the provincial economy, not only for commercial use but use for tourism? And if you would refer to the Nos. 3 and 4 attachments, you will see the road infrastructure I referred to.

3. Thirteen of the parks in Manitoba were created mainly in the 1960s, while one was created in the 1930s, another in 1976 and the other in 1985. The parks where resource extraction continues are those designated as multiuse. At the time they were created, vast amounts of land was designated as parks with the philosophy that they would be multiple use, and the commercial resource use would continue in the majority of the park. This philosophy respected the commercial use since the road infrastructure had been developed, and the local communities and mills were dependent upon it, while at the same time took advantage of the access for tourism, et cetera.

It takes dollars to operate a park and develop roads, and the revenue generated from the commercial use of the resources helps pay for the

parks, and the roads are usually developed by the forest industry which are open to recreation use by others.

A recent survey taken in B.C. and reported by Liz Osborn of the Outdoor Recreation Council of B.C. found that twice as many people were using the provincial forests for recreation compared to the developed parks. Could it be the multiuse parks in our province with vast lands and roads and trails throughout are more attractive to Manitobans and other users? Could it be Manitoba's philosophy of multiuse is correct? I believe most certainly it is and therefore support the Bill 41 park act.

There are many benefits of harvesting the mature forest, rather than leaving it to be attacked by insects and disease and then destroyed by fire. In 1989 and 1990 alone, the amount of area harvested on the FML that was salvaged from either blow-down, spruce budworm or fire was 29 percent and 40 percent respectively. Utilizing this wood created a revenue and generated dollars in our economy while at the same time helped to stop the spread of insect and disease and reduced the forest fire hazard.

Here I refer to a few photos, and I understand there are only six presentations that have them. I was on vacation and just got back so maybe you will want to share that at some point. I will refer to it anyway.

Here are a few photos to show the type of wood harvested when salvaging, and you will see how spruce budworm and blow-down adds to the spread of insects and increases the fire hazard. Another photo shows the FML taken from the satellite and a photo of a fire area typical of the precambrian boreal forest. Notice how the soil has been burnt completely off the rocks, and it will take years for the soil to build up and trees to grow.

Also imagine the amount of carbon dioxide being released into the air from forest fires. In my opinion, forest fires in Manitoba have the biggest negative impact on the environment as well as threatening the economy of the forest industry and communities that depend upon it.

Another point is there are certain parts of the country that have banned harvesting of the forest resource in some areas. Not only are these areas missing the dollars that could be generated, but they are allowing a buildup of fuel that will eventually result in a catastrophic fire. In order to

reduce that fuel, buildup mechanical means—in other words, it might be you could say logging—are being taken to reduce the fuel load, and I am sure it is not too cost-effective and will impact on our taxes.

One of the areas I am referring to is Banff National Park. I am not saying that we should log in Banff National Park, but they already have realized the impact that has built up around their area and are taking means to reduce the hazards that are in that park now.

5. In many cases in our province, and in particular in the areas close to the Duck Mountains, Nopiming and Whiteshell Parks, there is a direct conflict for the resources if these areas are designated as part of the Endangered Spaces Program. To have preservation in these areas and exclude mining, forestry and other commercial uses does not make sense and will destroy the surrounding communities and the local and provincial economy.

As depicted by the ecological zone map of Manitoba—and I would like you to refer to that one now, please. That is attachment No. 5. It shows the Pine Falls area is surrounded by parks. In the past, these parks were established, and each one restricted certain use of the natural resources.

Along with the parks and the fires, it has come to the point where the mill's viability becomes questionable, while at the same time all of the protection of the precambrian boreal forest is in the lower portion of the zone. Already 11.4 percent of the FML, forest management licence area, is closed to logging.

At the northern and eastern edge of the forest management licence area where the Atikaki Park and the Woodland Caribou Park are closed to logging, it equals at least the size of the forest management licence area. If you would refer to attachment No. 6, I would like to really emphasize that one. You can see the area that is in pink. Already no logging is allowed in those areas, although the Woodland Caribou Park is in Ontario. If we did not allow logging in our multiuse parks, Nopiming and the Whiteshell, you can just see the amount of area right around Pine Falls that would be excluded from logging.

Looking at No. 5, if you would refer back to No. 5, it shows it there. What I am saying in that number is in our ecological zone No. 4, which is the

precambrian boreal forest, you notice that all of the parks are in the lower part of that zone. It does not make sense to have that conflict. If we are talking about conflict, we really have a conflict for resource right there when we try to do things like that.

Does it make sense to add the Whiteshell Nopiming Park? Of course it does not, particularly when it destroys the viability of the mill and the surrounding communities. The same goes for the Duck Mountain Park with Riding Mountain Park being in the western upland zone giving ample representation to that zone. The solution is to allow the commercial use of the resources in these areas and designate the protected areas in the northern part of the precambrian boreal forest and other zones where development has not taken place and in areas where the potential for commercial use is low.

Other issues. There are people who are academically astute but appear to lack good common sense and practicality and continue to push for the preservation of the natural resources beyond reason. These people continue to be embroiled in issues concerning our environment and the use of it without fail, not to obtain the truth I am certain, but to forward their own agenda and draw attention to themselves.

* (1940)

We Manitobans who truly care for our province do not have time these days to pay attention to them. Some of these people and groups appear to obtain more satisfaction out of confrontation than trying to reach consensus. Those people should be identified and their opinions and positions dealt with accordingly and, I contend, ignored, but if not ignored at least ensure that what they are saying is factual and the truth.

In order to make our province strong and reach its full potential, we must build partnerships and trust amongst all stakeholders. We need builders and not destroyers. We must remember the forest industry is made up of people and communities who are trying to do a good job. We work with a product that is renewable, recyclable, reusable, biodegradable, and then convert it into a higher value product in order to maintain or raise our standard of living. It is the backbone of our nation. Why destroy it? Why not join forces with us and work with us?

Criticism of the act. We have maybe one criticism of the act and that is the use of "natural" in the classification of parks. I would suggest that name might be changed to "multiuse."

In summary, sustainable development must be the focus for our province with sound environmental economic development. Forest resources must be protected from fires, be made available to use commercially in areas of traditional use. Two, we must be builders and not destroyers and ensure we are following the philosophy of building our province, not destroying it. Three, whenever a decision is made to preserve an area, this must be well thought through in all aspects and in particular its impact on the local communities and provincial economy must be considered.

(Mrs. Louise Dacquay, Acting Chairperson, in the Chair)

Where would our economy and environment be without a strong manufacturing base? It is our belief that the parks act will provide the mechanism to ensure our province's environment and economy are sustainable and for that reason we request you pass this act. Thank you, Madam Acting Chairperson.

The Acting Chairperson (Mrs. Dacquay): Thank you. Would you be prepared to answer questions if committee members so desire?

Mr. Pinnell: Yes.

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): Thank you, Mr. Pinnell. I wish to express my appreciation for your presence and taking your time. I could not help but agree with you on your opening statement or among your opening statements about the time that we expend, both yourselves as people involved in the industry and, quite frankly, myself as the minister responsible for the department, in trying to mitigate the conflict between the different demands on the same resource base.

In your reading of Bill 41, of course, dependent on government action and subsequent action in the processes line set up in Bill 41, in the manner and way we set up the systems plan, categorization of parks, would that lead to a kind of—you know, I appreciate that some things never end, but it should settle, and that is surely what I am looking for in Bill 41, the question of access to resources by a firm such as yours.

Mr. Pinnell: Yes, we believe it should. There will always be certain conflict amongst us, but I believe the bill will lead to establishing a resource base that the industry and others should be able to be satisfied with and get some assurance that they have it, and investment would be able to proceed.

I am of the belief, and our company is strongly of the belief that we have to sit down with people and talk openly and honestly with each other and resolve conflict. I believe this bill will help us do that.

Ms. Wowchuk: Thank you, Mr. Pinnell, for your presentation. I listened to your comments to the minister, and it is part of the question I wanted to ask you, particularly since we had a presentation last night where that presenter was objecting to this bill and said that it would lead to more confrontation between environmentalists and people in the logging industry and make it more difficult for these groups to work together.

I was going to ask you for your comments on that. What is your opinion on it? Do you feel, and I think you partly answered it through the minister's question, that this bill will make it more difficult or easier for you to work along with those groups who are opposed to logging and those groups who want to preserve the forests in their natural state?

Mr. Pinnell: We believe that harvesting—I guess maybe it alters the natural state. I have to admit that. We believe we can work with environmental groups. The people who are truly looking to protect the environment, we have been working with those people all along. We support the endangered spaces act. We agree that 12 percent of our province should be set aside.

I guess I have to refer back to the attachments—well, you could say all of them, but particularly five and six, where all of the parks basically are in the southern parts of the province, the same places where the mills are located in the province, the same place where all the people are located, or the majority of them are located.

We have to ensure that those communities still exist, and why would we take areas like that for the endangered spaces? I am not saying we do not alter some of it, but why would we basically take all of those parks and not have them as multiuse?

I again refer back to some other people in other provinces who are finding that the forest industry roads and areas, provincial forests, are being

utilized more than the parks are. We can work together, if people want to work together.

Ms. Wowchuk: I thank you for that answer. I can understand what you are saying, because I recognize the economic value to our communities and the need for these activities. If all of this activity leaves our communities, they are certainly going to suffer.

But from what you have said about where the population is and where the mills are, do you think there are ways that we could look at establishing new parks? Are you suggesting that we look at establishing new parks in areas where there is not as much activity in the forest, or as much development? Is that what you are suggesting?

Mr. Pinnell: Yes, that is true.

Ms. Wowchuk: You mentioned the Duck Mountain and the Porcupine mountain areas as areas of high activity. Do you believe areas should be set aside? I know there is work being done in areas that have been identified by local people in those parts of the province which they feel should not be logged. They feel those areas could be set aside to meet a portion of the 12 percent that we should be setting aside.

I am sure you are familiar with the Roaring River and the Bell River areas that have been identified. Do you think those areas should be protected, or is it of your opinion that there should be access to logging for all of them?

Mr. Pinnell: I think those areas should be looked at and a common-sense approach used to determine if they should still be open to harvest or if some of them should be preserved.

Again, we have 11.4 percent of our forest management licence area already closed to logging in our forest management licence area and an equal amount, Atikaki and Woodland Caribou Park, closed to logging, equal to our forest management licence area.

I think everything has to be looked at before we make a decision like that. The local people have to be involved. Really, we have to look too at our economy, what is happening there, and the impacts we are going to have on the economy if we set aside those areas.

I do not know those two areas in detail, so I would not want to really give any more than just a general comment.

Ms. Wowchuk: One of the concerns that people have when they live in mountainous areas is the concern about clear cutting. That concern has certainly arisen in the Swan River area in the last few weeks, since we had the tremendous flood, which I am sure you are aware of. It has been suggested that a better way to harvest in those areas would be by selective cutting, and then you could protect more of the area.

Would you be in favour of selective cutting in those kinds of areas where there are steep escarpments, and there is a danger of quick runoff if too much of it becomes clear-cut?

* (1950)

Mr. Pinnell: We do not feel that the clear-cut areas should be very large. We believe in clear cutting. I know we would be very popular if we said we did not, but it is good for the forest if we do clear cut in areas. The spruce and the jack pine stands are usually created after a catastrophe such as fire or something like that. They are all even-aged stands. If you go in and you selectively cut those areas, you are not opening them up for good regeneration.

One thing, in some ways, we are not fortunate, but in other ways, we are fortunate. In our province, there are no major clear-cuts. Our terrain does not allow that we are able to clear cut vast amounts of areas.

We have looked at it, and our clear cuts, if you want to call them clear cuts—then I will go up and I will show you a lot of trees in them, but we refer to them as clear cuts—are not as big as the area of the Polo Park mall. All of this has been blown out of context.

The Acting Chairperson (Mrs. Dacquay): Excuse me, I would just like to remind committee members, we do have a time limit. We are well beyond exceeding that time limit.

I thank you for your presentation, Mr. Pinnell.

Mr. Pinnell: I brought one thing. I only have 12, though. There is an insert that we put in a paper about a year ago. There is a lot of good valuable information in that, if I could leave it for distribution.

The Acting Chairperson (Mrs. Dacquay): Thank you very much. We will ensure that they are distributed to the committee members.

Mr. Pinnell: Thank you.

The Acting Chairperson (Mrs. Dacquay): Mr. Vincent Keenan. Copies of your presentation are

currently being distributed. You may proceed, Mr. Keenan.

Mr. Vincent Keenan (Private Citizen): Thank you. Madam Acting Chairperson, committee members, I would like to thank the cabinet committee for this opportunity to provide some of my personal feelings regarding Bill 41. I would first like to congratulate the province on their effort to solicit public input to Bill 41 through the Natural Lands and Special Places workshops held in the fall of 1992.

I would now like to address how Bill 41 will assist the Province of Manitoba in eventually reaching its goal of preserving 12 percent of the province for the Endangered Spaces Program.

I am a cottage owner at Beresford Lake in Nopiming Park. I am also a forester responsible for forest management in and around Nopiming Park. I will attempt to use my expertise as a forester and my concern as a cottage owner to explain why some of our present parks may not be suitable candidates to assist in meeting the goals of the Endangered Spaces Program and how Bill 41 will address this issue.

Classification of provincial parks, specified in subsection 7(2), will enable the Parks Branch to classify parks which are suitable candidates for the Endangered Spaces Program and which parks are not.

(Mr. Chairperson in the Chair)

You may ask why all of our parks cannot be included in the Endangered Spaces Program, and just forget about the different categories. Let us examine our present multiple-use parks that now include areas ranging from wilderness preservation to commercial mining and forestry.

We must begin by looking at the natural cycles that maintain the boreal forest if it is left to manage itself. Many of the tree species in the boreal forest require full sunlight in order to grow. Therefore, they cannot regenerate themselves under a mature forest. These species have adapted to regenerating themselves after a disturbance.

The most common disturbance in the boreal forest is fire. If left unmanaged, large fires can be expected to occur every 50 to 100 years. After a fire occurs, these pioneer species quickly reclaim the site. The different plant communities that are formed will mature in 60 to 100 years. At this time, the strength and vigour of the trees decline and they become susceptible to insects, disease and

wind damage. As the stand continues to decline, it becomes ideally suited for the spread of fire, and the cycle begins all over again.

As I mentioned, the boreal forest has developed as a fire ecosystem. Many of the plant communities are not capable of regenerating themselves under a mature forest. Therefore, if fire is suppressed, these species would not be able to regenerate themselves. The Endangered Spaces Program realizes this and for that reason does not support fire suppression in protected areas.

Now we have to consider just what our multiple-use parks are. These parks are not just large tracts of forested land with rivers and lakes and the diversity of wildlife you would expect to find there. These parks have become sources of recreation and relaxation for hundreds of thousands of Manitobans. Wherever you find large numbers of people like that, you will find development.

Let us take Nopiming Park and go beyond its lakes, rivers and forests and look at the investments Manitobans have made. There are six cottage subdivisions and four remote access lakes with 444 recreational cottages. That would represent about \$25 million on the real estate market. These cottages range from small weekend getaways to the sole Canadian residences of some retired Manitobans who travel south for the winter. These are not cottages but homes with all the amenities, including some with self-contained solar and propane systems that would support your average urban home.

Another area of private development would be in tourist and outfitter lodges. There are three commercial lodges in Nopiming Park. These lodges attract Manitoba residents as well as American tourists, hunters and fishermen who are looking for a more economical alternative to fly-in outcamps. I will not even attempt to guess at their economic value, but they represent the homes and livelihoods of Manitoba families.

The final area of development is the five private and provincial campgrounds. Four of these are operated by Parks Branch with a total of 188 campsites. Any economic value placed on these areas would probably be too low if you asked the over 8,000 people who use these campgrounds annually.

Now let us consider the boreal forest ecosystem and the development in our multiple use parks in conjunction with the Endangered Spaces Program. To truly preserve this ecosystem, forest fires should be allowed to burn unchecked. This would create a conflict because the Department of Natural Resources is mandated to protect people and property as a first priority in fire protection.

Let us assume for a moment that fires were allowed to burn unchecked. In all likelihood, most of the 79 cottages at Beresford Lake would have burnt in the last 10 years. Aggressive firefighting in 1983 stopped the Long Lake fire at our doorstep. Even still, two or three cottages were lost to the fire. In 1987, the Wallace Lake fire attacked from the opposite direction. The fire hit the lakeshore at midnight, sending burning embers across the lake into the heart of the subdivision. Fire crews were established overnight and were fighting the three fires burning within the subdivision by dawn. If these crews and the accompanying air support were not present, my cottage and most of the others would have been destroyed.

In all likelihood, the province will continue to suppress forest fires in our parks even if they are classed as endangered spaces. The people of Manitoba would not allow their parks to burn indiscriminately.

What would the long-term effect of combining preservation and fire suppression do to our parks? Eventually the forest would become old with very few young stands of trees. These areas would then be extremely susceptible to insects and disease. Many of the over mature forest stands would be incapable of regenerating themselves because of their adaption to fire and would become prime sources for fire ignition.

Because of the protected status, forest management around developed areas would not be allowed. The trees blown down by the 1989 wind storm at Flanders and Booster Lake would not have been salvaged to reduce the fire hazard. The areas south of Long Lake and north of Bird Lake, which have been devastated by spruce budworm infestations would have been left as dry tinderboxes waiting for the next lightning storm to cross Lake Winnipeg. In all likelihood, more cottages would burn when the fire broke out in these areas. Eventually, the fuel loading in an old forest would become so high that no amount of fire suppression would be able to prevent the spread of

fire. With the right weather conditions and the volatility of a continuous old forest, Nopiming Park could be transformed from an outdoor wonderland to a charred landscape with everything in its path destroyed in a matter of a few days.

* (2000)

Even if we were able to suppress forest fires long into the future, we would then have removed mother nature's prime tool in maintaining the biodiversity of the boreal forest we are trying to preserve and forest management would not be an option in an area classified as wilderness.

Our multiple-use parks do not meet the criteria of the Endangered Spaces Program, nor are they worthy of a wilderness park classification. These parks have been developed for recreation and industry for over 100 years in some cases. It only makes sense to have some mechanism, as detailed in Bill 41, to differentiate these areas from wilderness areas that truly represent unique natural landscapes in an undisturbed state. Our present multiple-use parks form the economic base for some rural Manitoba communities through mining and timber resource extraction. They also provide an escape from the pressures of everyday lives for thousands of Manitobans through camping and cottaging.

The investment the people in the province of Manitoba have made in our multiple-use parks is too high to risk. The present forest management system should be maintained to ensure a healthy diverse forest in which fires are more easily controlled.

(Mrs. Louise Dacquay, Acting Chairperson, in the Chair)

Wilderness parks should be located in undeveloped portions of the province, where nature can be allowed to manage naturally with minimal risk to the lives and investments of Manitobans. As it stands, Bill 41 will provide Manitoba with the means to set aside 12 percent of the province which can truly be preserved as wilderness.

The only change I would suggest to Bill 41, would be to remove the words "natural park" from subsection 7(2)(b) and replace it with the words "multiple-use park." The name "multiple use" will better reflect the diverse uses of this type of park.

Please support Bill 41, because it will allow the Province of Manitoba the means of preserving the

rural Manitoba economy, as well as areas worthy of being called wilderness. Thank you.

The Acting Chairperson (Mrs. Dacquay): Thank you, Mr. Keenan. Would you be prepared to accept questions, if there are any from the committee members?

Mr. Keenan: Yes, I will.

Mr. Enns: Allow me to thank the presenter for an excellent presentation. One always learns something else virtually from every presentation that we hear. Thank you very much.

Mr. Keenan: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

The Acting Chairperson (Mrs. Dacquay): Thank you, Mr. Keenan.

Kelly Sharpe? You may proceed, Mr. Sharpe. Copies are being distributed to the committee members.

Mr. Kelly Sharpe (Private Citizen): My family has been an integral part of the landscape of Manitoba for well over 100 years. I shudder to think what my ancestors, and most probably yours, would think of this entire process.

Never in my wildest dreams would I have thought that I would someday have to stand before elected officials and my fellow citizens to defend the community in which I live, the work I am fortunate to have, the livelihoods of so many of my fellow Manitobans.

Bill 41 is an opportunity for the government of Manitoba to show people of the province that the government stands for the concept of multiuse parks and sustainable development. In so saying, the legislation should reflect the interests of the many stakeholders.

I would like to take a moment to discuss the subject of the interests of the stakeholders, the stakeholders, in my mind, being the economy, the environment and the people. Let us face facts, the decision before you will not please everyone. Very seldom will policy of significance delight all those with an interest in the subject.

Allow me to remind the government and members of all political stripes that they have an obligation to the people of Manitoba to make decisions that can be controversial and upsetting to special interest groups. Politicians seem to thrive on the pursuit of pleasing everyone and have the habit of taking opposite positions on issues

depending on what side of the political fence you happen to sit.

It is time for you to grow up and get in touch with a Manitoban who enjoys the beauty and diversity of our parks, while at the same time picks up his lunch bucket and goes to work to support his family. This is the same person who pays taxes, supports his community and generally only wants the opportunity to raise his children so that they, too, will be productive members of society with respect for property and people.

Provincial parks are wonderful places. The parks I am familiar with in my part of the province are relatively new in terms of their presence. I do not believe there were any parks in the area when the mill in Pine Falls first began. Now that these parks are in existence, there are those who profess our traditional areas of harvest should be taken away from us.

If these people get their way, I suppose some new jobs would be created, most notably for social workers to deal with all the new welfare cases that would follow the closing of the mill.

Common sense seems to be the rarest of commodities these days. There is room in our provincial parks for a multitude of uses if things are managed properly. Rather than sit here and listen, why do you not go out and have a look at what is happening in the area around Pine Falls? Come and see how our people make every effort to ensure that the forest is maintained and enhanced. I can assure you that it looks a hell of a lot better than after a long weekend at Grand Beach.

People who make their livelihood from an area do not dump in their own backyard. They nurture and protect the forest so that it will sustain the generation to follow. This dog-and-pony show may help you make an informed decision, but I suspect that the course of action you must take would be just as well taken if you use your common sense. Thank you.

The Acting Chairperson (Mrs. Dacquay): Thank you, Mr. Sharpe. Would you be prepared to answer questions from committee members if indeed there are any?

Mr. Sharpe: Yes.

The Acting Chairperson (Mrs. Dacquay): Thank you, Mr. Sharpe.

Mr. Enns: Mr. Sharpe, I appreciate very much your presentation and for the time in coming to bring it to this committee.

We heard some excellent presentations last night. I recall particularly the presentation of one Dr. Rajotte. The problem really is with the word "parks." I take this opportunity to ask you, as a Manitoban who was raised and has grown up in our province, what is your definition of the word "park"?

Mr. Sharpe: I could not really answer that. I do not know. It is a place where people can go and enjoy themselves. There would not be any parks in the area where I am if it was not for the people like myself and those who came before me. We are the ones who put the roads in there so the rest of Manitobans could go there and enjoy and see the things that are out there. These areas that they talk about clear-cut, you cannot see those from the roads.

You know, as I invited you people, please come out and have a look. We have got nothing to hide.

Mr. Enns: Madam Acting Chairperson, to Mr. Sharpe, it is a genuinely hard question to answer. I appreciate that, particularly in the professional community of park watchers and as expressed by Dr. Rajotte last night, parks means a very specific thing. Parks means the protection of undisturbed wilderness, period. Any people activity is incidental and, of course, any resource extraction is absolutely prohibited. So in Dr. Rajotte's opinion, as expressed before this committee, Duck Mountain Provincial Park would not qualify for the word "park" because it has been logged for a hundred years and it has been disturbed.

Under Dr. Rajotte's opinion, Nopiming would not qualify as a provincial park under the term "park" because the environment has been disturbed. The Whiteshell has a disturbed environment by people activity, by a very little bit of mining and by some selective logging. So that is the crux and the core of the issue here.

* (2010)

I suspect it is not all that difficult for government to resolve or indeed for this minister to resolve if I accept what I believe to be a growing attachment to the word "park," which is somewhat different than what I have grown up with and what you expressed just a few moments ago. But sometimes you just cannot stand against the wind. The wind is blowing, and you have to go with it.

So maybe I should do that and severely redefine and accept Dr. Rajotte's opinion and definition of parks and so create the boundaries for those parks and call what we normal human beings or average human beings have, an old-fashioned definition of the word "park," that is, that we perhaps want to take our families there to enjoy it, that we may perhaps let some people make their livelihoods out of it, let us call them resource reserves, as has been suggested. Let us call them recreational areas. Let us call them anything but parks and maybe we could learn to live with each other in a little bit more peace and harmony. Thank you, Madam Acting Chairperson.

The Acting Chairperson (Mrs. Dacquay): Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Sharpe.

Sharon and Jack Coote. You may proceed when you are ready. The Clerk is distributing copies of your presentation.

Mr. Jack Coote (Private Citizen): Thank you very much. I am the Jack of the team. Sharon stands beside me. We are from Pine Falls and proud of it, where I have worked for thirty-eight and a half years.

I would like to thank you for the opportunity to address the committee regarding Bill 41. My wife and I find it strange that we have a need to address this committee in an effort to support something that has been accepted as our way of life for so many years.

We are pleased the government has introduced Bill 41 which will assure the continuation of our industry, and at the same time, we are appalled that it is necessary for us to defend our existence in this area after approximately 65 years of successful operation.

We believe that parklands should be set aside so that all of us in Manitoba can enjoy the wilderness and outdoors the same way we have over the years and our future generations have the same opportunities to earn their livelihood in industries such as ours. We have a very difficult time understanding the viewpoint of those who would see such severe restrictions put on our operation so we would no longer be a viable business here in Manitoba.

We are proud of the fact that we can contribute millions of dollars annually to the Manitoba economy, especially in today's climate. We hope to

be in a position to continue to do so for many years in the future.

Pine Falls is a close-knit community made up of many different cultures who are used to working together for the betterment of all. We can see no reason why all of us cannot work together regarding these very important issues we face today, with the end result being that we are all able to enjoy our lands and forests in a manner we can all be proud of. The parks have become a place where many hundreds of Manitobans have enjoyed their recreation and have also supported hundreds of families over the years not only in our industry, but also in mining and tourism. These parks are now developed as multiuse areas and to think of changing the rules at this stage of the game seems unreal and a backward step which would have a damning effect on the Manitoba economy.

The concept of preserving 12 percent of the province for an Endangered Spaces Program is a good one, but to suggest this be accomplished by changing the existing parkland area is not acceptable and should not be a consideration.

Mrs. Sharon Coote (Private Citizen): I am Sharon of the party here. I am third generation in this part of the country. My grandfather helped in the building of the Pine Falls town site, also delivered mail by dog team between Pine Falls and Bissett. My father worked in the gold mine in Bissett and also in the newsprint mill in Pine Falls.

My husband is second generation. We have lived and raised our family in Pine Falls. Our families have learned to love and to respect our surrounding forests and lakes. We know that the forests are our livelihood and if not properly managed we would not exist. We have trapped, hunted, fished and cottaged in this area for three generations. Ours has been a multiuse area for these same three generations long before there were any parks, I might add. The forestry and the mining that has existed in our area over these generations have not had near the devastating effects as forest fires have done.

We believe the concept of multiuse parklands as outlined in Bill 41 is an acceptable strategy. As there were no designated parks in our area years ago, we are concerned that the establishment of more and more parklands will restrict our operations to such an extent that we will no longer be able to operate. My husband and I believe that

the adoption of the parks act will ensure that our future generations can look forward to many years of continued operation. Thank you.

The Acting Chairperson (Mrs. Dacquay): Thank you, Mr. and Mrs. Coote. Would you be prepared to respond to questions of committee members?

Mr. Coote: Yes, we would.

Ms. Wowchuk: I want to thank Mr. and Mrs. Coote for their presentation. I want to tell you that I know many people who have made their living as you say you have, and I know the people who live off these resources also respect the resources and want them there for their future generations.

I just have a question on one line here. You said: "We are pleased that the government has introduced Bill 41 which will assure the continuance of our industry." I want to ask you then, if Bill 41 is not passed, why do you feel that your industry will not continue, or what are the risks if Bill 41 is not passed?

Mr. Coote: I do not think that is what it says. Certainly, that is not what it was intended to say. I believe that Bill 41 will, in fact, provide some assurance that our operation in Pine Falls will continue for quite a long time. I think that with the failure to accept or adopt Bill 41, you will just hear a hell of a lot more commotion from the people in Pine Falls. We ain't going down without a fight. I can tell you that right now.

Ms. Wowchuk: If you will bear with me, I am not familiar with the area of Pine Falls. That was why I just wanted clarification. Is it your feeling then that if Bill 41 is not passed that you will see the Pine Falls operation closed down?

Mr. Coote: I think it would make it very difficult because, as Mr. Pinnell pointed out, the whole industry, certainly our division, is in dire needs right now and any extra costs which would be attached to logging further from our plant, for example, certainly would not make us a viable operation, in my opinion. We see that Bill 41 provides multiuse and hopefully will be adopted by this committee and by the government.

Mr. Przniak: Madam Chairperson, I just wanted to thank Mr. and Mrs. Coote for coming in tonight. It is always good to hear from people who live, work and have spent their lives and their families have spent their lives in the area that is so affected by this piece of legislation. So often we have those who take an interest in it from time to time who do

not live and work and have long histories in that area that go back over many generations.

Your comments that you bring to the committee tonight, I think, are most useful in enlightening many of the members as to the long history of sustainable forestry in northeastern Manitoba and what can be done. Thank you for coming in to make the presentation.

The Acting Chairperson (Mrs. Dacquay): Gordon Hanson.

(Mr. Chairperson in the Chair)

Mr. Chairperson: Do you have a written presentation, Mr. Hanson?

Mr. Gordon Hanson (Private Citizen): No, I have not.

Mr. Chairperson: In that case, just go ahead.

* (2020)

Mr. Hanson: Okay. My name is Gordon Hanson, and I am speaking on behalf of the seniors of the Golden Leisure Club of Pine Falls.

Forests are an important resource for commerce and for recreation and should be preserved for this generation and future generations. This can best be accomplished with the co-operation of those most interested in maintaining the forests, the people whose livelihoods depend on the continuing of harvesting.

Selective logging and recreation can and do complement one another. Roads provided for harvesting can be used for cottages, fishermen, hiking, et cetera. The people harvesting whose livelihoods depend on a healthy forest will devote whatever energies are necessary to combat fires, disease and insects and keep our forests green for the use of this and future generations.

Abitibi has been harvesting in the Pine Falls area for 67-plus years and are still harvesting in the same locale, proof that care and responsibility have been exercised over the years. With the use of modern technology, past performance can be improved so that parks and logging can continue for many generations to come. Countries in Europe have learned how to utilize forests for commerce and recreation, and we can do the same.

In listening to the comments last evening, I am concerned by the intolerance of the urban people for the rural population. We see and read of the intolerance on the news from the Balkan States and Middle East, and I find the amount of

intolerance voiced by the present discussions disturbing.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Legislature, please legislate on the side of tolerance, allowing us all to enjoy the benefits from our forests and to encourage and respect one another. We support Bill 41.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much, Mr. Hanson. If you do not mind, there might be a question.

Mr. Praznik: Mr. Hanson, I just wanted again to take the opportunity to thank you for coming in. I know, you and I, from time to time on some of the partisan political issues, find ourselves on other sides of the fence. I think your presence here tonight attests to the fact that the effort of the people who live in that area goes beyond partisan politics, and is certainly one that is widespread and an understanding of people who have lived in the area for many, many years and have seen the cycle of forests and the sustainability.

Thank you for bringing that very broad view to the committee.

Mr. Ashton: I also want to add a comment. I appreciate your comment in terms of tolerance and understanding, particularly of the situation outside of the city of Winnipeg, coming as I do from Thompson which, of course, is a considerable distance from the city of Winnipeg. One thing we often wish is that people understood the situation in our own community, so I can certainly respect your views before the committee tonight. I think you spoke very ably on the people whom you are representing tonight.

Ms. Wowchuk: Mr. Hanson, thank you for your presentation and I want to ask you a question. I want to ask whether you were involved in the logging industry, in the harvesting of the resources in your younger days, and whether you can assure us that the forests that were harvested many years ago have replenished themselves and are being reharvested again or will be reharvested in a few years.

Mr. Hanson: This has been our experience at Pine Falls. I have only been there for 26 years. I grew up in northern Saskatchewan in the bush and the homestead country and did a lot of harvesting in that time, but the experience of Abitibi indicates that they have been harvesting in that area for 60-some years, and they are still harvesting in the same

area, so they must have exercised some proper management.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Hanson. No. 128, Mayor Henry Ostrowski from the village of Powerview. It is His Honour this evening. Do you have a written presentation this evening?

Mr. Henry Ostrowski (Mayor, Village of Powerview): No.

Mr. Chairperson: No, then we will begin.

Mr. Ostrowski: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, honoured guests and members of the committee. My name is Henry Ostrowski Jr. I am the mayor for the village of Powerview. Before I start my presentation, I would like to remind the members of the committee as well as everyone else concerned, that you might have heard and more than likely will hear, a vast number of issues brought before you, but the main issue that is to be dealt with at this point in time is, in general, will the new Park Lands Act be beneficial to all parties concerned.

Now, from a brief but to-the-point presentation, we the people of the village of Powerview support the new Park Lands Act concept. We also feel that with the proper administration and proper regulations put in place through the act, the act will most definitely be beneficial to everyone concerned and that is by way of the one and most important common goal, environmentally and economically sound sustainable development.

An added note, if all parks become designated and/or zoned for specific uses and all people concerned together strive to achieve the aforesaid common goal instead of going out after individual or personal goals of glory grabbing or whatever, we would probably be able to stand tall and proud looking over our accomplishments. Therefore, in closing, we the people of Powerview urge the members of the committee to give their unanimous support to the new Park Lands Act. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Ostrowski. Would you take some questions?

Mr. Ostrowski: Sure.

Mr. Enns: Mr. Chairperson, again, just on behalf of myself and the committee, I appreciate your taking the time to make this brief but important presentation to this committee. Thank you very much.

Mr. Ostrowski: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, sir. That completes the people who have identified as out-of-town presenters. If there are any more, please identify yourselves to the staff at the back of the room. Otherwise, we will continue through the list starting at the top of the list. No. 1, Vira and Dr. Russ Evans. No. 2, Doreen Ander. Alex Spinak. Ronald Down. Dave Nickarz.

Do you have a written presentation, Mr. Nickarz?

Mr. Dave Nickarz (Private Citizen): Yes, I do, but I did not get any copies made because you guys do not have recycled, unbleached paper.

Mr. Chairperson: Go ahead, sir.

Mr. Nickarz: Yes, I just want to start out by saying this is my first public hearing I have ever attended, so do not mind if I am a bit nervous talking to you guys, because I have pretty intense things to say, so just bear with me.

Greeting, committee members. My name is David Nickarz. I am twenty-one years old.

Mr. Chairperson: Could I ask you to just speak up into the mike a little bit more? They are having trouble hearing at the back of the room, and Hansard has to pick you up so they can record it.

Mr. Nickarz: Greetings, committee members. My name is David Nickarz, I am twenty-one years old. I am an engineering student at the University of Manitoba.

While I speak, Bill 41 is about to go into its third reading. I find the fact that you are holding public hearings at this time very offensive. It is kind of like shooting someone twice and asking if they would like to be shot a third time. It is very easy to be cynical about these processes, so I will do my best to present a different mood to you, although I doubt if I will keep from being cynical.

* (2030)

I could go on about the implications of this bill, how the parks act is going to be perverted, or how you Tories are only doing this for your friends in big business. I could whine about my favourite fishing lake or my canoe route that will be polluted by bridges and runoff, but I will not. Other people are going to do that for me.

I am here to represent a different special interest group. They can be called by many names, but I choose nonhuman life forms. They include caribou, foxes, deer, owls, birds, snakes, and fish, as well

as trees, plants, mosses, fungi and insects. I am even here to represent lakes, rivers, rocks, soil, forest fires and air.

I guess none of you would expect that rocks are life forms, but I speak in a spiritual sense. I consider myself a deep ecologist. I believe all life forms have inherent value, value other than that which humans place on them, other than what they contribute to the gross national product.

We live in an industrial civilization, high energy and centralized control. So much energy and resources are wasted in the production of even the simplest things. I have an example of this from Jeremy Rifkin's book called *Entropy*, published in 1980.

Mr. Chairperson: I am going to have to ask you to speak a little bit louder into the microphones though.

Mr. Nickarz: They cannot be lengthened or anything?

Mr. Chairperson: No, it is as close as they can get.

Mr. Nickarz: Okay, sorry.

Mr. Chairperson: If you could just speak up, it will be fine. They usually pick you up.

Mr. Nickarz: Okay.

Take, for example, your morning English muffin. As we will show in the next chapter—blah, blah, blah—but once grown and harvested, the folly is compounded manyfold thanks to our national mania for processed food.

Here are just some of the energy steps that go into making your English muffin. The wheat is taken by a fossil-fuel-driven truck made of nonrenewable resources to a large centralized baking house, housing numerous machines that very inefficiently refine, enrich, bake and package English muffins.

At the bakery, the wheat is refined and often bleached. These processes make for a nice white bread but rob the wheat of vital nutrients, so the flour is then enriched with niacin, iron, thiamine and riboflavin. Next, to ensure that the English muffins will be able to withstand long truck journeys to stores, where they will be kept on shelves for many days or even weeks, preservatives, calcium propionate, is added along with dough conditioners such as—oh, a bunch of chemical names here. The bread is then baked and placed in a cardboard box which has been printed in several colours to catch your eye on the shelf. The box and muffins are

placed within a plastic bag made of petrochemicals which is then sealed with a plastic tie made of petrochemicals.

The packages of English muffins are then loaded into a truck which hauls them to the air-conditioned, fluorescent-lit, Muzak-filled grocery store. Finally, you drive two tons of metal to the store and back and pop the muffins in the toaster. Eventually you will throw away the cardboard and plastic packaging which will then have to be disposed of as solid waste. All of this for just 130 calories per serving of muffin.

Not only have tens of thousands of energy calories gone into the entire process, but medical evidence suggests that both additives and lack of fibre in refined breads may pose a serious hazard to your health. In the end, the energy that was added to the muffins at each step of the process was insignificant compared to the energy that was dissipated at each step of the process.

This is industrial civilization, like I said before, high energy and centralized control. You may think that industrial civilization has given us more freedoms. I do not think so. This is wrong.

I have written letters to Gary Filmon before and the honourable minister Harry Enns. They have told me that most of my economic well-being is based on resource extraction. I am not too proud of that, since a lot of it is really destructive.

I have another quote from the book *Entropy*: We moderns take pride in the fact that we only have to work 40 hours a week and that we can take off two or more weeks each year for vacation. Most hunter-gatherer societies would find such conditions intolerable. The fact is, contemporary hunter-gatherers would work no more than 12 to 20 hours per week and for weeks and months each year they do not work at all. Instead their time is filled with leisure pursuits including games, sporting events, art, music, dance, ceremonies and visiting with neighbours.

Contrary to popular opinion, studies of the few remaining hunter-gatherer societies show that some are among the healthiest people in the world. Their diets are nutritious and many, like the bushmen in Africa, live well into their sixties without the aid of modern medicine. Many hunter-gatherer societies place a premium on co-operation and sharing and show little inclination for warring and aggression against each other or outside groups.

I have been an activist for over three years now. I have read books on how the natural world is being destroyed by government and large corporations in the name of money and power. I have seen how this happens locally.

The Filmon government changed the wildlife management act so that Ducks Unlimited, a corporation whose very name demonstrates their disrespect for life, so they could build an office complex in a U.N.-recognized marsh. A recent study shows that rare species of songbirds have been extirpated from the area of the building site.

The wildlife management act process, the bill, made me very angry to say the least. To this day, Friends of Oak Hammock Marsh is in court on the issue, in federal court. The reality of the issue is that the building is up. You guys won. We should have put ourselves in front of the bulldozers. This is my only regret that we did not.

The time has come to take matters into our own hands. We can no longer rely on government, industry or even Greenpeace to stop industrial civilization from taking the wild places. Each individual must act in defence of all life.

In the summer of 1992, four activists and myself travelled to Churchill to stop the Shedd Aquarium from capturing four beluga whales from the Churchill River estuary. We did not prevent the capture due to many reasons, such as not getting our boat out in time and getting money together and getting people together. We got international press coverage of the issue, so people in the United States know about the abuse of the whales up north.

A month later, back in their prison in Chicago, two of them were murdered after a vet, not even licensed to practise in the state, killed them after they gave them antibiotics for a parasite. Those whales did not ask to be violently separated from their families, jumped on, tied up and thrown into a holding tank and then packed into crates like common cargo.

We were there on behalf of those whales, and the courts agreed with us. They said that the whale capture was legal but recognized us as representing the animals' interest.

We, along with many other people working on this issue, stopped the capture of whales for export. John Crosbie announced, later that year, that no whales would be caught for export. That would

exclude the Japan aquarium, aquariums in Germany and in the United States from getting whales from our waters.

This is a partial victory since whales may still be captured for aquariums inside Canada. There is also no law on exporting whales from aquariums inside Canada. So they could be caught, sent inside Canada and then sent outside of Canada from the aquariums. The Montreal Biodome intends to kidnap 12 whales in 1994. We intend to stop this.

I would like to warn you, when you have laws changed to suit your friends in industry, when political processes like this one are stacked against us, when at Bill 38 hearings for the wildlife management act, I believe it was Harry Enns, the honourable minister, said that he will listen to the public presentations but he will not change a thing, you leave people no choice. What will you do when your sons and daughters are standing in front of the bulldozers alongside us? People are going to take the law into their own hands.

I will give you a few examples of such people. A man named Paul Watson helped start Greenpeace but got kicked out for being too violent, or supposedly too violent. The supposedly violent act that he committed was to grab a spiked club from a seal murderer and throw it in the water. I have a piece I can read from.

By 1977, Watson was on the Greenpeace board of directors and was entrusted with an expedition to protest the killing of baby harp seals, the defenceless, doe-eyed, white furballs that have become almost synonymous with Greenpeace as whales. The protest took place on the treacherous Labrador front ice floes off Newfoundland.

* (2040)

At one point, Watson took a wooden club used to kill seals out of a sealer's grasp and threw it into the icy water. Watson then moved several harp seal pelts from one floe to another to make it harder for the sealers to do their job. His intent was to interfere as much as possible with the slaughter without hurting anybody. When he spied a cable used to haul pelts into the nearby sealing ship, Watson, who had a pair of handcuffs attached to his belt, ran to the cable and cuffed himself to it. He was certain that this move would shut down the sealing.

I could not find the other quote in here, but there was also a time when he went out and he sprayed

the seals with green paint to stop them from being slaughtered. This move was criticized by environmentalists saying that polar bears could spot them easier and they could eat them. I would rather have my chance with the polar bear than being clubbed on the head and skinned alive.

Since then, he and his conservation group, the Sea Shepherd Conservation Society, have had nine whaling ships sunk, three drift netters rammed, one tuna boat rammed, three seal hunts ended, a sealing fleet blockaded, a Japanese dolphin slaughter shut down, illegal whaling activities exposed, drift nets confiscated, wolf hunts disrupted and ended, and on and on. All this, without hurting anybody. No one was hurt when they sunk the ships, so all it was was a destruction of property.

People like him are dedicating their lives to preserve and protect the natural world. There are people all over the world and also right here in the city who risk their lives, who choose to not only represent but act for nonhuman life.

There has been talk of sustainable development here. This is a buzzword used by many in industry to make their Earth raping look good.

The very author of sustainable development has no respect for nonhuman life. Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland is angry. For years she was known as the great environmentalist. She has been lauded as the green queen and the mother of environmental concern. The author of Our Common Future has unfortunately sold out. No longer the U.N.'s ecological sweetheart, she has cast aside her Earth mother image to become the equivalent of a trusted mother turned child molester, just another opportunistic politician.

Brundtland has pointed her finger at Brazil and criticized them for logging. She has been critical of the United States on the issue of biodiversity. She is the author of a judgmental report in which she condemned cultural practices in a score of nations because of their negative impact on the ecosystems.

In 1991, she addressed Harvard University graduates with a strong message that the U.S. should use sanctions to enforce international conservation agreements, but now that Norwegian whaling policy is criticized, Brundtland is crying foul. She has even appealed to Vice President Al Gore to have Norway exempted from the same

sanctions she urged to be enforced on other nations. Her real message to Third World nations in Our Common Future was, do what we tell you and ignore our actions.

Gro wants it both ways. She wants to be known as the champion of conservation and she wants to kill whales. At first, she thought she could appease the whalers and not be caught betraying the whales. Now, with international condemnation directed at her and Norway, she wants revenge.

Brundtland's pride has removed any practical concern for Norway's economic interests and reputation. To defend an insignificant industry like whaling, she is willing to sacrifice both Norway's considerable conservation reputation and the economic welfare of her people.

The Norwegian Prime Minister does, however, have a major problem with her defence of whaling. Whaling is illegal by order of the International Whaling Commission. The United States is duty bound to enforce the economic sanctions against Norway. Former President George Bush notified Norway in December 1992 that sanctions would be invoked. President Bill Clinton is obliged by law to follow through. The European Economic Community will not allow entry to Norwegian products unless Gro abandons her anachronistic policies of killing whales.

So it is hard to view the sustainable development as useful. I do not like to criticize people too much personally, but what is sustainable about killing whales? Sure, there are lots of them, but what they are going for is delicacy meats for Japanese restaurants and other restaurants all over the world. So if that is viewed as sustainable development, then I do not like sustainable development.

When two members of Friends of Oak Hammock Marsh went to Toronto for a conference—I think it was last year, and maybe it was not Toronto, but I have not checked up on this because I have not had much time to prepare my brief—a prominent politician came up to them and said, sustainable development means sustained development. Sounds like it to me, but since the Filmon government has signed onto this agreement, I will hold you to it.

This is a pamphlet put out by the federal-provincial parks council of ministers. I believe your office signed onto this. Here is the

Manitoba seal right here saying you guys did that. Our parks showcase for sustainable development. Principles to guide park management. The following principles are intended to guide park management philosophy and to provide a basis for integrating parks into regional and national strategies for achieving sustainable development. They have been approved by the ministers responsible for national, provincial and territorial parks. By putting these principles into action, Canada's park system can respond to rising environmental awareness and fulfill the special role envisioned for parks in promoting sustainable development.

It goes through a list of different sections like preservation, conservation, public information and education, public participation, adjacent land use, and the one I want to mention here is economic development. Parklands provide an economic benefit by encouraging tourism and meeting the demand of outdoor recreation. Appropriate economic opportunities will be explored wherever possible as a means of incorporating parks into regional economic diversification initiatives.

Do you, Harry Enns, consider logging and mining appropriate economic opportunities for parks? Yes? Let the record show that he agreed.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Nickarz, this is not a time for you to be putting questions to the committee. When you are finished your presentation, the committee may want to ask you some questions, but if you want to put your questions on the record, that is fine. I just wanted to advise you that you have approximately two minutes left.

Mr. Nickarz: Well, I will do my best to get done.

He agreed that appropriate economic opportunities are logging and mining in parks. If so, what is not appropriate for parks, nuclear bomb testing? You, sir, have a very distorted view of what preservation is. [interjection] Oh well, that will not be happening in parks.

Mr. Chairperson: Order, please. Could I ask the committee to—[interjection] You are out of order, Mr. Minister. Could I ask the members of the committee to refrain from the debate at this time? Mr. Nickarz, to continue, please.

Mr. Nickarz: I do not think you have the means under law of preserving areas. You mentioned a couple last night, I believe, that 90 percent or 80 percent of Manitoba would be preserved under this

act. I do not see that. I think that was just kind of silliness on your part.

Like the logger who spoke yesterday said and also people who spoke today who were from Pine Falls and were interested in this area, these economic opportunities, do not call it a park if you are going to log in it. Call it a multiuse area. That is something I can agree to with them. We might not agree on a lot of things, but at least I can find common ground on that. So if you are going to change that, that is probably a good thing, but then, of course, there is the problem of preserving the natural areas that are there. So there is something we can agree on.

I guess I cannot ask questions again. I can just pose them, and maybe you can answer them after I have my say. [interjection] Yeah, that is what I mentioned before. Explain to me, like you said the other night, how 80 to 90 percent of Manitoba will be preserved under this new bill. If that was just talking, just say so and I will ignore it, but if you are really serious about that, please explain to me how that will be preserved.

I am with a group called the Defenders of Nopiming, but I speak as a private citizen. We have been holding demonstrations to try to bring this issue to the public. Every single person whom I have talked to believes there should not be logging in parks. Most did not even know that logging was there in the first place. I guess it pays to keep the public ignorant. I wish we had the resources and the money to inform people, as you do, or to have—

* (2050)

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Nickarz, you are beyond the 20 minutes at this time, but I will allow you another minute to wrap up.

Mr. Nickarz: I found a perfect definition of a park. It is by a conservation biologist, Dave Foreman. You might recognize his name from other places, but this is his definition of a park—needless to say, there would not be any economic activity inside the park, no industrial activity:

Not all wilderness areas should be managed for the gentle, back country experience. Not all parts of individual wilderness areas should be managed to provide equal ease of travel or safety. What is needed is a range of management options from good trails and all the trimmings in places like Yosemite and the Sandina Mountains to something approximating pre-European America in more

remote and less frequented areas. The wild end of the spectrum would be true wilderness where a hiker is utterly on his or her own.

A management scheme for these primeval areas would include several bold rules. No new trails would be constructed. No signs, no facilities, like no docks or boat launches, no maps and the agency responsible for maps would not make maps for the area, no guides, hunting should be abolished from the parks—I do not see how you can hunt unless you have a knife and kill the animal yourself; otherwise, it is just a game, a sport—no modern equipment. Obviously there should be no ATVs, all-terrain vehicles, or anything of the sort.

That should be what a park is, a primeval wilderness area. That should be addressed somewhere in the legislation if at all possible, because as far as I am concerned, the wilderness area designation in the news parks act would still allow access such as roads and stuff like that. I believe, I am not too sure because I have not had time, forgive me again for being possibly ignorant of this, the only things excluded from a wilderness area would be logging, mining and hydro. So you could put in roads, you could graze some cattle there, build lodges wherever you want, put in an airstrip for airplanes or something like that or whatever is allowed under that.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Nickarz, your time has expired. Thank you very much for your presentation. We appreciate it here.

Mr. Nickarz: I still have lots to go. It is not too much, four pages.

Mr. Chairperson: We have established a 20-minute time limit, Mr. Nickarz, and we have already gone well beyond that for your presentation. I appreciate your presentation.

Mr. Nickarz: The people from out of town have finished, and I do not think I would be holding anyone up too much if I just finished my presentation.

Mr. Chairperson: I do believe that your time has expired, Mr. Nickarz. Thank you very much for your presentation.

Mr. Nickarz: I still have more to say.

Mr. Chairperson: If you want you can make copies and we will have it in our—

Mr. Nickarz: This is not possible to put into copies. I would like to continue if you let me.

There are many ways that government and industry destroy natural areas—

Mr. Chairperson: Order, please. Mr. Nickarz, the committee had previously agreed that we would have a 20-minute time limit. [interjection] The mike is off. A five-minute recess.

The committee recessed at 8:56 p.m.

After Recess

The committee resumed at 9:01 p.m.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Roy Vickery, Willi Freund, Frank Reimer, Sheri Reimer, Doreen Kessler, Gary Swaffer, Alan Black, Brigitte Hebert, Joyce S. Clarke, Carol Stevens, Nick Carter. Yes, Nick is here. He has a presentation.

If you will just give us a minute, Mr. Carter, to get your written presentation. Go ahead.

Mr. Nick Carter (Private Citizen): Mr. Chairperson, my brief is quite short. I wonder if I could give five minutes of my time to the previous speaker and let him finish. I noticed yesterday that you allowed on one occasion 15 minutes overtime, and I think it might be reasonable for the previous speaker to finish.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Carter, it is your 20 minutes, and if that is what you would like to do, that is fine, after your presentation is complete.

Mr. Carter: After my presentation, okay. Very good then.

Mr. Chairperson: Carry on, Mr. Carter.

Mr. Carter: Gentlepersons, this is a short presentation, and I hope you will allow me a couple of remarks and introduction. You will not find this in the text you have before you. I will get to that in a few minutes.

You will see in the brief that my central concern is that Manitoba is not leading the country in the protection of endangered spaces. If the world does not get at this problem, individuals far more knowledgeable than myself project that the consequences of lost biodiversity will be devastating for humankind.

To my mind it is much easier for a sparsely populated province like this one, but relatively rich, like Manitoba is, to lead the field than it is for a heavily populated underdeveloped country.

I think that there is a growing notion that the technosphere can take over the biosphere. We are inclined to have the faith that biotechnology, the manipulation of genes both within and between species, under the presumption that we can control its output, can substitute for and improve the products of normal evolution. This faith has been enhanced by enormous success in plant and animal breeding and seen in the rapid expansion of its successful gene therapy in humans.

We also seem to believe that new technologies will offset all that we do not know nor have yet to discover. I will not quote again what taxonomists tell us about the lack of information about the life forms which sustain us or from which we can obtain products to heal us or to entertain us.

Very selfishly, the failure to find out what we have got in Manitoba and the blind wrecking of our ecosystems destroy opportunities directly related to human health in the future. So all is not positive. All is not fine and bright, and there is great danger. On the one hand we are barely scratching the surface of the task of regulating the products of genetic engineering.

Commercial interests looking for profitable products have caught the ball, so we have tomatoes with flounder genes—until flounders run out, of course—pigs with human genes, cows under the improvement produced by bovine growth hormone and so on. I can ask the minister how he feels that a 15 percent increase in dairy milk production, what it will do for the market in Manitoba or anywhere else in this country for that matter.

At the present time there is great risk that new life forms will be released—and this is the central point—into the environment without an evaluation of the ecological consequences. On the other hand, with great arrogance, we are busy tearing down the life support systems which sustain us and which have been in place up until the moment.

So we ask ourselves, what can a small province do about this risk? There are two things, one of which is wholly relevant to this parks act. On the matter of genetic engineering and direct intervention into the cells of living organisms, Manitoba must make the best case it can in support of regulations now being developed under the Canadian Environmental Protection Act. We have no difficulty rationalizing very tight government

control of nuclear experimentation. Similar control in biotechnology could prove equally important.

On the matter of this parks act, we must make a much better attempt to hold onto and indeed restore if possible our representative ecosystems. I might also add that we need much greater effort on the part of the province to understand what we have in Manitoba. If you look at the data, you will find that we are something like 70 percent short of knowing what our own stock of life forms are. This means that commercial development, exploitation if you will, must be scrutinized with great care. When the chips are down as they might be for our successors, short-term financial gain for the fashionable present will be nothing against systems of life which are lost to us forever.

I will now go on to the brief. This brief repeats some of the points made already, particularly in the commentary made by the Canadian Bar Association, the general comment that follows.

The first one. If the provincial parks cannot be relied upon to assist in meeting Manitoba's contribution to the Endangered Spaces Campaign, we have little chance of defining sufficient areas to meet, by the year 2000, the 12 percent of our land surface that is representative of the province's natural regions protected from logging, mining and hydro development and other activities which adversely affect habitat.

The second point. This bill seems to retreat, to ease development which is foreign to the traditional purposes of parks. We do this in the face of the principles of sustainable development, specifically those dealing with care taking, No. 2, and No. 5, which we say will maintain ecosystem processes and diversity to which the province is committed.

I might say as a comment on the bill: it could do a much better job on defining sustainable development and either stating the principles that you are referring to or referring to where they are in fact stated. All you do is talk about the principles of sustainable development, and they are lost in the breeze in the bill.

Third point. Government is not always bound to listen to the loudest noises and seek the quickest financial returns. The public could be led, Mr. Minister, in this revision of the parks act towards a greater recognition that our scarce natural resources include endemic life forms. Their future commercial value to Manitobans cannot be

projected, but at least we can ensure that some are left for our children.

Compared with other jurisdictions, we are least protective of biodiversity in Manitoba. A major purpose of this bill seems to be the rationalization of mining and the anticipation of mining demands. It is hard to believe that the viability of either the pulp and paper industry or the mining industry depends upon the use of this small percentage of land designated for parks purposes. Sometimes, I might add, I think that if it were a little more difficult to abstract primary resources in Canada, we would be more adept and more efficient in making more of what we have. We would convert more and waste less.

Now some specific comments on the bill. In the preamble to the bill—I suppose you have this in front of you—delete “and appropriate economic opportunities are provided.” I will read these off, and you can note them as we go along. The second point, define “appropriate economic opportunities” if they are retained in the bill and add definitions of “biodiversity” and “ecosystem.” Define the “principles of sustainable development” or refer to their source, as I have mentioned before.

* (2110)

Under Section 2(b) remove “other than provincial roads and provincial trunk highways.” Control of the land space in parks should be by the Parks authority. There has always been good or reasonable co-operation between Parks and the Department of Highways. However, when the chips are down, I am quite certain the Parks people should be running the show, not Department of Highways.

Under Section 5, remove item 5(d) and add 5(d) “to promote understanding of sustainable development and the importance to human well-being of protecting adequate areas of Manitoba which are unique or representative of the province’s ecosystems.”

No. 5(e), add this one too: “To ensure that protective management of provincial park lands takes priority over all resource uses and that supportive development (including roads, utilities, resort services, resource harvesting, et cetera) is compatible with park use and values as described under this act.”

Under Section 6, provide for consultation on the system’s plan. If, as the minister mentioned earlier

today, he is perhaps contemplating changing the nature of parks, the boundaries of parks, and abstracting perhaps from them those places which are logged and so on, then in-depth consultation is very necessary.

Under Sections 7(2)(a) and 7(3)(a), sharpen up the definition of wilderness to come close to the definition under the U.S. wilderness act of 1964, which is repeated in many documents.

Under 7(2)(b), elaborate resource uses such that they are not large scale commercial and they are compatible with and do not compromise the values in the park.

Under 7(3)(f), after “category”, add, unless wilderness is designated under 7(2)(a) and 7(3)(a). Those generally deal with access, and to have a category which is absolutely specific to access seems to me to be self-defeating.

Under 9, see the note under 5 above.

Under 9(2), after the words “this act,” add “and the assessment includes the proposed regulation.” I believe that if you are going to do the form of consultation which is contemplated under this section in which you are in effect substituting environmental impact assessment process for the regulation review process—and you could put the regulation right in with the assessment documents and do the two things together. Why not do it that way? It saves one round, and the regulation then is well known to the public.

Under 11, the requirement to develop a management plan has no time frame. I believe the parks people should lay on a time frame of some sort for their management plans. Provisions should be made for public consultation with management plans, and management plans should have the force of regulation, and any major changes should be done by regulation after public consultation. I believe that if major changes are contemplated for a park, automatically this should be a class 2 under the environmental impact assessment act. Without any reference, the public can say, do you think we should go to public hearings? No, there should be a law laid down that if, indeed, you are going to make a major change in a park, then you classify it as a 2 and go to consultation, automatically, without reference to anybody.

Last note, at the very end of this, is on cottages. I have always believed this. Cottaging in provincial parks is a privilege. I have realized that as a

privilege coming from way back in many cases. There are no shortages of opportunity outside park boundaries for cottage development. While the effect of inhibiting further cottage development within the park is to raise prices and inhibit entry to the market of less wealthy Manitobans, such a ban should be clearly stated in the act. This will be consistent with purposes under the act and help to ensure perpetual access of the public at large to recreational amenities. Thank you, gentlemen and ladies.

Mr. Enns: Mr. Chairperson, I appreciate Mr. Carter's remarks. I, of course, recognize Mr. Carter has many, many years of service to both the federal government and the provincial government and, indeed, as a former deputy minister, I believe, of the department I now have the privilege of being minister for.

I ask you this simple question, Mr. Carter. You have attended a good portion of the hearings since they have started. I submit to you and I suggest to you that—and I am referring specifically to your concern about the province's ability to achieve the 12 percent—and that is not a magic figure, hopefully; it could be more—a 12 percent figure of a land mass of the province in its different ecological zones to meet the Endangered Spaces Program.

Has it not struck you as encouraging to have throughout these hearings people representing the forestry industry, big commercial firms representing the mining industry, ordinary people from Pine Falls and other places, all of them? I do not think I have heard anybody take issue with the concept of setting aside 12 percent of Manitoba's land mass for the preservation of what we all recognize, have come to recognize, have not always recognized, to be important.

I submit to you, sir, that not so long ago, 10 and 15 years ago, that would not have occurred at a meeting like this, so do you not take some encouragement from what you have heard during the course of these meetings from these very different types of presenters?

Mr. Carter: I am delighted, frankly. Up to that point, I agree with you. I do not think the concept is very well understood, and I do not think it is understood that we need representation of each natural region of Manitoba.

What I have heard a number of occasions today is you take a blob of somewhere in the North where very few people are present, and you say, okay, knock out 12 percent, and then you have met the Endangered Spaces Campaign. That is nonsense and that was the kind of tone which I caught from many people.

However, I will go halfway with you, Mr. Minister. I am pleased that there is a consciousness there. I do not think people have thought the consciousness through, and I believe Alison Elliott will elaborate it much further after me. I am not an expert in this field. I am not trying to get off the hook though.

Mr. Enns: Mr. Chairperson, I appreciate Mr. Carter's remarks. I tend to agree that that may well be a fuzzy concept on the part of some, but certainly not on the part of the government that has committed itself to meeting that objective.

We fully appreciate and understand that it is from the different zones of Manitoba that the 12 percent has to indeed come. Of course, that will be more difficult to do, particularly in some of the southern regions of the province where the room to maneuver on the part of government, that is on private lands and so forth, is considerably more difficult.

Again, Mr. Carter, I am calling upon your intimate background and knowledge of the Manitoba system and particularly the Department of Natural Resources and the Parks Branch. You surely are aware that the parks system, as presently constituted, can make a significant contribution to reaching that endangered spaces goal target but only a contribution.

* (2120)

I believe maybe, if we so use Bill 41 to put all of the 3.5 million acres of provincial parklands into a mode that would meet the criteria for the World Wildlife Fund, that would add, I am told, I think I used the figure earlier in the morning, perhaps 1.3 or 1.5 percent, 2 percent, 1 percent, 2 percent. I see Elliott is shaking her head, so I will wait for her to get up on the stand.

The point I am making is it will need, obviously in my mind and I assume in your mind, other moves and other tools, if you like, of government, if we are supposed to reach that goal. In other words, the amount of acreage simply is not available nor necessarily in the appropriate zones to meet the

targets simply by using The Park Lands Act or Bill 41 to do that.

Mr. Carter: What astonishes me, I think, is that despite Mr. Filmon's agreement to the 12 percent figure, we have nothing in the public eye yet which shows a sense of urgency to get on with this job. If I have done anything in this brief, I should surely have tried to show the urgency of doing something about things.

Where are the demonstrations of the 12 percent figure, the acquisitions, the negotiations and so on? I know that we may well be relying upon a new national park, Churchill, coming on and so on. That is not Manitoba. It is part of the 12 percent, and I will agree to it, but it does not equate with the federal thrust. I want to see you tomorrow finding out what you have, pushing the Parks Branch like hell, pushing the people to understand and the universities to identify these places and get at them tomorrow or yesterday, whatever you have done.

Mr. Chairperson: I would just like to advise the committee, there are only a couple of minutes left.

Mr. Enns: Mr. Chairperson, I will defer to members of the opposition to have some further questions.

I just indicate to you, I need to get on with the passing of Bill 41 so I can demonstrate that to you, Mr. Carter.

Mr. Carter: Okay.

Mr. Ashton: Mr. Chairperson, my question actually is also on the 12 percent. I was rather surprised by the minister's last comments.

I just note from the brief that you mentioned the fact that only 0.6 percent meets the campaign criteria, the campaign meaning the Endangered Spaces Campaign. Of course, it was also an election campaign promise. I find the use of the campaign criteria to be sort of an interesting double-edged sword.

I know you are saying you are not an expert on that level, but I know your expertise generally and your concern in this area. You are saying this government really has not moved beyond the verbal commitment in any significant shape yet to reach the 12 percent. I note we are dealing with a commitment that was supposed to be put in place by the end of this decade.

You are saying there has not been the move yet beyond the verbal move?

Mr. Carter: In fairness, Mr. Ashton, I am not up to snuff. I have not had a conversation with Gordon, for example, about this matter. He may have about 15 new places and proposals for the minister in his back pocket. I do not know this. I can only tell you what I perceive externally, so to speak.

Mrs. Carstairs: Mr. Carter, I am on the record as saying that I do not believe there should be any resource extraction in our parks.

Certainly, there should be no new resource extraction in any of our parks, but we know there is resource extraction going on now by a number of industries. How would you deal with those?

Mr. Carter: This is strange for me to say, but I like the idea of taking a rather careful look at our present park boundaries, finding out what should be given a very high level of preservation and absolutely made sacrosanct for the purposes of ecosystem preservation.

Let us examine the parks as they are utilized at the moment and find out if we have enough and what other space we require in order to meet the criteria for representation of each of our regions. In other words, it needs a re-examination of the parks system. Some things can be tucked away into logging, into other uses, recreational components, providing multiple use, what have you, but what I want out of it in the end is a substantial contribution to the Endangered Spaces Campaign.

Mrs. Carstairs: Very briefly, and I do not want to put words in your mouth, but are you saying that it might be possible to take the present configuration of parks and take some of the land out of that park, add other lands to that park, end up with your 12 percent and honour commitments that have been long-term?

Mr. Carter: Or create ecological reserves or other parks altogether, yes.

Ms. Marianne Cerlili (Radisson): I want to thank Mr. Carter for his presentation and use the opportunity to ask him a question because of his experience within the department.

The question I want to ask Mr. Carter is: When the existing parks configurations that we have in the province—I would not call it a system, but the parks, the way that we have them now in the province, how do they fare in protecting significant areas that are representative of endangered habitat or significant habitat?

Some people have suggested to me that there was no thought to that when these parks were put in place, that they were sort of just plunked down. I wonder if you could clarify that.

Mr. Carter: I was part of the drive, you will probably recall, in the late '50s, '60s, to create parks in Saskatchewan. Manitoba was doing the same thing under Walter Danyluk at that time. The minister would know Walter very well.

We had one prime and absolute purpose. We wanted recreation opportunity, and recreation was the big sign. People wanted outdoor recreation and camping, whatever, and they needed it or they thought they needed it near water. In very harsh terms, we went for water and recreational opportunity and places to camp beside the water and places to sort of get onto hiking trails, wherever. We gave relatively little thought to ecology in its purest sense. We gave a great deal of thought to the impressions which park planners at the time had about landscape and what would make a nice setting for having a park.

Those were the kinds of things. They were generally located in forest reserves. We abstracted the parks then in Manitoba from the forest reserves. I hope that answers your question.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Carter. I know there were a number of other questions the members would have liked to have asked you, but seeing as you did go beyond the time, we just did not have the opportunity this evening.

Mr. Nickarz: Could I make a point of order?

Mr. Chairperson: No, there is no point of order, Mr. Nickarz.

Mr. Nickarz: I must say that the honourable minister can filibuster much—

Mr. Chairperson: Order, please.

At this time, I would like to inform the committee that it has been brought to my attention that Mr. Melnick will not be able to attend. He has been here for all the meetings up to date, No. 152, and he has to leave very shortly before ten o'clock. He has work commitments. We were wondering—we made an exception to the other one—if Mr. Melnick could make the presentation at this time.

An Honourable Member: Agreed.

Mr. Chairperson: Agreed.

Mr. Joe Melnick. Mr. Melnick, your written presentation is being handed out. You can go ahead.

Mr. Joe Melnick (Private Citizen): I kind of scribbled this down on a piece of paper in my handwriting so I hope that—well, if you cannot read it, I guess you will not be much better off than I am, because sometimes I cannot read it.

* (2130)

Ladies and gentlemen of the committee, my name is Joe Melnick, and I would like to express my concern on Bill 41.

In September 1989, I purchased a cottage and the property at Lot 12 Steep Rock Road at Nutimik Lake. The reason being I am a born and raised Manitoban, so is my wife, Estelle. We are nearing middle age and wanted a place in Manitoba parks to relax, enjoy our province's nature. Lot 12 Steep Rock Road was the perfect type of place.

In 1990 we paid the fee of \$145. We did not think it was exactly exorbitant, thinking that it was a legal cost to own the property in the park. After researching and inquiring, we discovered that this was not quite so. After consulting with our attorney, we were advised that we should not pay this fee until such time that there is a legal and binding law to do so. So we followed the attorney's advice and said okay, and we have not paid the fee since 1990. We kind of suggest that maybe we are owed \$145 and should be refunded.

Since Bill 41 suggests that the fee is to be retroactive, that concerns us and suggests that the government can introduce law and then wants the citizens to come back and pay before the law is actually in effect. This does not sound very democratic to these Canadians. We therefore say and ask that this part of Bill 41 should actually be dropped.

There is another reason for the request. There are people who owned private land in the previous years and have since sold these lands, sold these properties. They have never paid the fee, and these people probably never will pay the fee. Mr. Minister, I suggest to you that there should be some sense of fairness here since the other folks who actually walked away with their money jingling in their pockets, they are not going to be required to pay this fee. In fact, I do not see how you could force them. So I would suggest that you drop the retroactive and give us all the same kind of a

fairness and say, start from wherever you are starting now. A retroactive fee to me would just feel like an extra tax grab, if you will. That is the first concern on this.

The next concern is we do not disagree with service fee taxes or taxes. We have paid taxes all our lives. I have anyhow. Nobody has given me anything in my lifetime, and I have been working since I was 16 years old. We agree that we have paid taxes all our lives, and we do not dispute the fact that taxes are very necessary. We do dispute the fact that we should pay taxes without being represented in some way. We also dispute paying taxes for services that we might not want, per se.

In fact, I will ad lib a bit again. We like our little spot in the park. We like the uniqueness. We like to groom it, and we do not want any more service fees at all really. We want the wilderness part of it. If we wanted streets and lights and sidewalks, as it suggests in part of this bill, well, we could just stay in the city. We could get the squealing tires and the smog and the swearing out in the street at the same time.

We have a beautiful little community on Steep Rock Road. We work together. We do our own work. In fact, I understand that the road is actually Crown property, but we have no problem looking after that road. We have done it for years according to the people that I have talked to there and even the old gentleman that I bought the cottage from. They have no problem at all. We do not want to burden any Manitoba taxpayer with our road. We would just as soon look after it ourselves, thank you very much.

To have the minister of the Crown impose a form of tax without consultation with the people who pay the tax, and the example is, do the people want the particular service. Does this particular service benefit one park or another park? We, therefore, would prefer the fee would be related to the needs of the park area that the services are required. The park that does not require the particular services should not be required to pay these type of fees.

So, in other words, if you are going to blanket a fee across the province for all parks, you would think Hecla Island probably is a plush resort and they would probably be more expensive to look after than, say, Nutimik Lake. I cannot see why people like us in Nutimik Lake who love wilderness and not plush places should have to pay for

something that is plush someplace else. I am just taking parts of this letter as you well know. I can tell you that because I guess you lost everything here, but I am just taking parts and explaining each part, and I hope you can bear with me.

We still believe that parts of the park should have a representative in each area of the park where they can assess the needs of each area and then maybe assess fees accordingly to each area's needs. A good example is Steep Rock Road, Houk's [phonetic] Point, all four roads—I am trying to remember. Birch Bay, there never was a garbage bin there as long as I have been there in the four years I have owned the property. In fact, when I paid my \$145 I requested in a letter to the Parks board wondering where was our garbage bin? I never even got an answer. I guess that is what you call service fees. They did not even answer my letter.

I do not mind paying for a service fee. In fact, Mr. Minister, I would sooner see you say it is a tax simply because taxes are not GST'd and service fees definitely are, so your cousins in Ottawa probably can grab some more money off of us, and that I do not really like. As far as I know, anything that is called fees is GST taxed. I do not know if I am right or not, but I think I am. So maybe if you charge us something, maybe you should call it a tax and save us the GST.

Private land owners are proud people. We look after our property, we groom it. In fact, Mr. Minister, if you go to this particular part of the park, you will even find the highway grass is groomed by us at no cost to the Manitoba taxpayer of course, but it is groomed by us. If you look down the highway at some of the leased properties, you will see grass as tall as—you cannot even see the deer in it. They run out in front of you in the dark. You are liable to run into them. You will not find deer running out of our roadside. It is groomed, it is beautiful.

So the reason I am presenting this is because I realize there are costs in the park. My idea of costs where we are, we are using the garbage dump, and I agree maybe we should be paying for something. I guess they do throw some gas on the pile of rubble and burn it, so that costs money.

We do use the highway to get to our property, but Mr. Minister, I know I pay gas tax. My car runs on about 15 miles to a gallon, and if you times that by the time I get to the park and back, I have paid quite

a bit to get to that park already. I also pay a registration fee on my car, and I believe as a Manitoban I am entitled to drive down any highway in this province on my gas taxes and my vehicle taxes, and that includes 307.

* (2140)

I do not know what else I am going to get from the parks act besides—no, we do not even get the patrols. I have been there since September of '89. I have seen the parks patrol three times. One time they went to a cottage believing the man was fishing illegally. The next time an elderly lady died just below the rock at the cottage, and I guess she was entitled to Park's attention there. Everybody that dies has to have attention.

(Mrs. Louise Dacquay, Acting Chairperson, in the Chair)

The third time, I think it was a complaint about somebody complaining about me trapping woodchucks on my property, which was a vendetta thing. That is the only time, but they never actually come down the park road to see if somebody was breaking into it, which gives me another reason why should I pay for that service fee? I never see the guys. They do not care if my property was carried away next week. They would not even know it was gone.

But we at Steep Rock Road look after each other's property. We come down, we look at each other's property, and it is a community thing. We make sure that each other's property is well protected, and we like it that way, Mr. Minister, because it does not cost the taxpayers any money that way.

We do not want the Parks people. They can look after the parks up there on the hill where they throw garbage everywhere and let the bears come into their campsite and eat all their food and haul it all over the park and then cause trouble, so the Parks people can run all over the place catching bears, costing money to taxpayers. We do not have that problem on Steep Rock Road. So I will not bore you with any of those details any more. But in other words, do not give us fees that we do not really want, but charge us a nominal rate and we will gladly pay it.

The last concern. Bill 41 gives the Minister of Natural Resources unlimited powers whereas the minister has the power to sign a certificate to support a lien on any individual's property. Well,

going through the due course that is required to execute liens, this suggests to us that the minister in charge leapfrogged the process of law which is not available to ordinary Manitobans. This lien against properties, that is, fees were imposed that the courts have already declared illegal, as government apparently does not recognize court rulings.

In trying to end this—and I am going to try to end it as soon as possible—I would like to say to the minister that I think the government should follow the same rules as us ordinary Manitobans have to follow. I cannot go and walk onto somebody's property and say, I can take that, or I can take this. I have to go to court to find out if I am legally entitled, and I think the government should do the same.

Another thing, Mr. Minister, I would request that the open-endedness of park fees should not be. There should be some kind of a consultation with the people who are going to pay the fees, because open-end fees will only chase people like me, who are pretty decent Manitobans who look after things in the park, or try to, and do not cause the parks people any grief, to not own property in the park because we will not afford it. I do not even make half the money you make, so obviously I would not afford it.

In ending it appears—this is the way I will end this story or this thing—the government forgot that they were elected by the people of this province, and we are going to vote again. If this is the way the province is going to be governed, if you guys get re-elected, I guess, well, retirement is not too far, Mr. Minister, and British Columbia is getting to look better every day. I have retirement funds that I have to spend someplace, and I am likely not going to spend it in my own province if I manage to get kicked out of my own little park.

I thank you for your attention, and that is all I have to say. Thank you very much.

The Acting Chairperson (Mrs. Dacquay): Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Melnick.

John Buchanan? Alison Elliott?

Ms. Alison Elliott (Private Citizen): Good evening, Madam Chairperson, honourable members.

I have to admit, over the last day or so, I have wondered if I have been in the right room, whether I have been debating or waiting to present a brief

on The Provincial Parks and Consequential Amendments Act or the endangered spaces act. I wish to point out that there is a separation between the two, that endangered spaces, the criteria, the goal of endangered spaces can be met through a number of tools, Parks being one of those tools.

My comments will address the parks act, and I will throw a little endangered spaces stuff in there too.

Although I chair the Manitoba Wilderness Caucus, which co-ordinates the Endangered Spaces Campaign in Manitoba, I am presenting this brief as a private citizen, not because the caucus did not reach a collective position regarding Bill 41, but because holiday schedules did not permit the vetting of this brief and formal endorsement by caucus members. Various caucus member organizations and individuals will be and have made presentations at these hearings, so their views will be made known to you.

Unlike many of the presenters ahead of me, I am not all that pleased to be here to make this presentation, because I believe this bill has been introduced prematurely—prematurely because I believe that given the opportunity for honest, open discussion of the issues raised by the groups that have made representation to this committee hearing thus far, the consensus may have been reached on many of these issues, and we could be here celebrating the results of that consensus process rather than confronting one another and trying to press our points of view onto the committee members.

In my opinion, it would have been preferable for the government to have produced a white paper for wide-scale consultation and discussion prior to the drafting of this legislation.

Two probable reactions to these statements are that we are too far apart to reach consensus, and consultation on parks already took place during the Natural Lands and Special Places workshops. I would like to take some time to respond to these expected reactions.

In the committee hearings last evening and again this evening, I heard many misconceptions and misunderstandings about the Endangered Spaces Campaign that had there been the opportunity to clarify, may have resulted in greater support for the campaign objectives and therefore greater support

for changes to be made to this bill, specifically with respect to resource extraction.

More importantly, I heard many things that the Endangered Spaces Campaign could endorse, things like a balanced approach to land use planning in Manitoba that includes both resource extraction and protection, public consultation respecting areas that are nominated for protection, avoidance of conflicting areas wherever possible.

A white paper which thoroughly examined the issues and which was open to real change and not merely superficial amendments could have been the focus of a productive dialogue involving people from all parts of Manitoba, not just those who had the time and resources to attend the hearings in Winnipeg, to gain an understanding of the positions of one another, determine areas where there are differences and perhaps, more importantly, determine where there is agreement and opportunity to begin to build bridges connecting the divergent groups.

The second reaction might be that the consultation process has already occurred by virtue of the Natural Lands and Special Places Strategy workshops. I attended one of these workshops and if I recall correctly, the section on The Park Lands Act was either not dealt with at all or was given such brief mention that it was treated as insignificant. There was no substantive discussion on what parks should be, what activities should be allowed within their boundaries, what the various classifications should be, how many there should be of each classification, et cetera. Now we are confronted with a new bill without any of this preliminary discussion and consultation amongst the interest groups.

I understood the Minister of Natural Resources, Mr. Enns, to say at the committee hearing last evening that the rush to introduce this legislation was precipitated at least in part by the Endangered Spaces Campaign and the need to meet the criteria set by the World Wildlife Fund in order to have parks in Manitoba able to count as protected spaces.

While the minister is to be commended for striving to meet the criteria of the Endangered Spaces Campaign, a delay of a few months would have been preferable to introducing legislation that could be interpreted to not meet the criteria at all. Furthermore, the present act could have been used

in the interim to sufficiently protect any specific park in Manitoba to meet the criteria of the Endangered Spaces Campaign through regulation under the present act.

The minister has demonstrated this through the recent passing by cabinet of a regulation under The Wildlife Act, a far more permissive act than the present Park Lands Act, which gives sufficient protection to the Cape Churchill Wildlife Management Area to meet the Endangered Spaces Campaign criteria.

* (2150)

My first recommendation to this committee is that Bill 41 be put aside to allow a round of consultations and information sharing which provides a common information base from which discussion about the role of parks in Manitoba can proceed. How many Manitobans have read Our Common Future? How many understand the significance of biodiversity to the survival of our planet Earth? How many understand the potential impact of climate change on wildlife and what we must do today to allow species migration in the future? How many know what percentage of Manitoba is already preserved, what percentage is already developed? How many know the contribution that forestry, tourism, wildlife viewing and mining make to the economy of this province? How many have a common understanding of the principles of sustainable development?

Devoid of the facts, Manitobans can only react to protect their own special interests, rather than making rational, logical decisions based on good information and the interests of all. It is in this context that we are being asked to make decisions about Bill 41.

I anticipated that the chances of this committee putting aside Bill 41 this evening were pretty slim, so I prepared an evaluation of the bill, just in case.

Bill 41 could be interpreted as the most protective legislation to preserve parks in Manitoba, or it could be interpreted at the other end of the spectrum as the most permissive legislation, opening parks to whole-scale commercial resource extraction. Therein lies the major weakness of this bill and one that should send it back to the drafting table. The legislation should be clear in its intent and not subject to interpretation, particularly when the interpretation can vary as widely in scope, as is the case with Bill 41.

In evaluating Bill 41, the following questions arose in my mind which I believe are valid criteria against which to measure this proposed act. Is the new legislation an improvement over existing legislation? Does the new legislation give clear direction and intent, or can it be interpreted in a variety of ways? Does it tighten up the existing legislation? Does the legislation reflect the urgent need to protect Manitoba's natural heritage, its wild lands, waters and wildlife, as voiced by every minister of environment, parks and wildlife in Canada, both at the provincial and federal levels and demonstrated by their signing in Alymer, Quebec, November 25, 1992, of a statement of commitment to complete Canada's networks of protected areas, a statement which was developed by these same ministers under the chairmanship of our own Minister of Natural Resources, the Honourable Harry Enns?

In my review of Bill 41, I came up with the following answers. No, this legislation is not an improvement over the existing legislation. I would rather keep the present Park Lands Act. No, this legislation does not give clear direction and intent. Yes, it can be interpreted at both ends of the spectrum. No, this bill does not reflect the urgent need to protect Manitoba's natural heritage. In fact, it does the opposite.

My brief will demonstrate why I reached these conclusions and will provide suggestions on how Bill 41 could be altered so the answers to the questions I have asked could be a resounding yes.

(Mr. Chairperson in the Chair)

Let us begin on page one of Bill 41 with the WHEREASes. This preamble should define explicitly what parks are for. It should encompass a vision statement that would inspire present and future generations to cherish and protect their natural heritage, a vision statement which reflects the meaning and importance of wilderness and wildlife to Canadians, Manitobans and visitors to our province. It should include a statement of the contribution that parks in Manitoba make and will make to the preservation of the Earth's biodiversity, particularly if this bill has been drafted to respond to the criteria of the Endangered Spaces Campaign.

Aside from lacking in vision and inspiration, the difficulty with the preamble as it now stands is that neither sustainable development nor the term "appropriate economic opportunities" are defined

anywhere in the bill. The role of parks is therefore unclear, whereas No. 1 states that parks play an important role in the protection of natural lands, but that role is not defined.

In the document signed by the ministers responsible for national, provincial and territorial parks in Canada, including Mr. Enns, the traditional role of Canada's park systems, conservation, preservation, tourism, outdoor recreation and environmental and cultural education is said to embody the essence of sustainability. This statement, together with the Principles to Guide Park Management also contained in this document, is explicit about the role of parks. This statement is in accordance with the World Commission on Environment and Development Report, which states that the prerequisite to sustainable development is the preservation of species and their ecosystems.

My recommendation No. 2 then is to develop a clear definition of the role of parks in Manitoba against which the balance of the proposed act could be referenced. If the role of parks is to preserve biodiversity in Manitoba, it must be made very clear to all other interest groups that preservation of biodiversity is a prerequisite to sustainable development.

Preservation of biodiversity is accomplished through the selection of the best representative areas of an ecosystem based on sound scientific criteria, not on common sense, as I have heard this evening. This means that we cannot take the approach of preserving only those lands that are no good to the miners or the loggers or the farmers. The lands that should be preserved are those that best represent the ecosystem and the species found within it and provide for the continuing survival of these species. Dr. Harvey Williams' paper clearly enunciated these principles last evening, and I will not dwell further on them today.

We run into the problem of clarity and intent again in Section 5, Purposes of provincial parks. The fourth purpose is again subject to interpretation. Nowhere in the proposed act is there a definition of conforming and nonconforming economic opportunities for each of the park classifications and land use categories. They can be implied, but it depends upon which end of the spectrum you fall into.

For example, the definition of natural park allows for resource uses. The minister who leans toward preservation may interpret this to mean sport fishing, whereas a more permissive minister may interpret resource uses to mean commercial fishing. Which economic opportunity is intended under the proposed legislation? The legislation should be clear in its intent and purpose and define appropriate activities that are allowed in each park classification.

This fourth purpose has, no doubt, been included to reflect the principles of sustainable development as interpreted by this government. How is the performance of any particular park to be measured to determine that it meets this purpose? What if no economic opportunities can be provided by, for example, a heritage park because the need to protect the contents of that park is so great that visitors are not allowed? This park would not fulfill one of its primary purposes.

Recommendation No. 3 is to delete the provision of economic opportunities as a purpose of parks, Section 5(d), economic benefits will certainly accrue from parks but should be incidental and not a primary purpose. Parks should not have to defend themselves from development because they are mandated to provide economic opportunities. State clearly that parks are special places and should be treated as such.

Skip over Section 6 for now and move onto Section 7. In the present legislation there are several categories of parks which are fairly explicit in their purpose and intent. Bill 41 lists four classifications plus an other category. The listing in the present act is preferable.

We still have a problem with the definition of the various classifications of parks. In the regulations under the present Provincial Park Lands Act the definition of a wilderness park, for example, is very clear, concise and to the point. Wilderness parks are defined as areas which, through their management and use, will be perpetuated in a primitive state, free of development and accessible only by nonmechanized means.

To really understand what wilderness parks are in Bill 41, one must look in three places: the classification section, the land use category section, and the land use categories in wilderness parks section. Even after looking in these three

places, the definition of a wilderness park could be interpreted in at least two ways.

Wilderness parks could end up being large areas of a natural region, crisscrossed with roads and accessible by all manner of motorized traffic. On the other hand, they could end up being highly protected areas, encompassing representative landscapes of a natural region in a pristine state. It all depends on the interpretation of the characteristics describing the wilderness park, characteristics such as large. What does large mean? What is the definition of recreational opportunities that depend on a pristine environment? Some would say wilderness fishing in a motorboat, whereas others would say canoeing without the prospect of hearing, seeing or smelling a motorized vehicle of any sort.

Where can access land use categories be established in wilderness parks, and in what proportion must a wilderness park be comprised by the wilderness land use category? All other park classifications in Bill 41 are faced with a comparable wide range of interpretations.

Recommendation No. 4 is that all park classifications be clearly defined and that conforming and nonconforming uses be listed. Furthermore, if parks are to contribute to the preservation of biodiversity in Manitoba, the appropriate park classifications should reflect this.

To prevent the fragmentation of wilderness parks and to maintain their integrity as wilderness parks, Section 7(4) should be deleted.

* (2200)

Some have said that the natural park classification be renamed a resource reserve or a multiuse park. If land within a park is managed in the same manner as land outside the park boundaries, why create a park in the first place? The Clean Environment Commission wrestled with this in its review of the Abitibi-Price Inc. FML No. 1 Forest Resource Management Plan and concluded that activities within a park should be consistent with the public image of parks as protected areas, free from resource extraction and managed differently than the land outside their boundaries.

A resource use or multiuse park is a contradiction in terms. Carried to its logical end, we should also create industrial parks, car parks, air parks under this legislation. We do not because

parks legislation is meant to protect the land within its boundaries not advocate its destruction.

Section 7(3) lists a resource management category as a land use category in parks. Aside from the comments in the preceding paragraph, even when read in the context of this bill, this category is contrary to the fourth purpose of provincial parks, which is to provide economic opportunities in accordance with park classifications.

Commercial resource development or extraction cannot be done in a manner that does not compromise the main purpose of any of the park classifications listed in this bill. Therefore, this clause should be deleted. Similarly, Section 33(t) should be deleted.

Public consultation should be more extensive than reflected in Bill 41. I, too, share the concerns expressed by many last evening that public consultation is restricted to the establishment of regulations. The system planning process, the management planning process and the classification of the various parks should all be subject to public consultation.

The proposed act should also indicate time frames governing the development of the system plans and management plans for each park. If the bill is redrafted, it makes sense to put all of these processes together in one section as they all relate to one another.

The establishment of park reserves is a welcome addition to legislation governing provincial parklands. This is a valuable tool which can place restrictions on land use in a park candidate area without foreclosing future land use options. It provides time to study the candidate area and ensure that the best possible site is chosen for park status.

Legislation that is introduced to replace an existing act should improve upon that act, should tighten the wording and clearly communicate the intent. Bill 41 does not do any of these things. The way in which Bill 41 is written creates an environment for the government of the day to exercise royal dispensing power in favour of choice. Today power may be exercised in favour of protection, tomorrow in favour of commercial resource development or extraction.

Bill 41 does not reflect the good intentions of this government, as indicated by its various

commitments and the documents signed by the very minister that has introduced this legislation, commitments such as the endorsement of the Endangered Spaces Campaign and the principles of sustainable development defined in Our Common Future, and documents such as the Statement of Commitment to Complete Canada's Networks of Protected Areas, the Wildlife Policy for Canada, Sustainable Development - A Special Role for National, Provincial and Territorial Parks.

In my opinion, Bill 41 leaves too much to the discretion or the whim of whoever holds the power at any particular time and does not clearly enunciate the principles that are so well presented in the documents referred to.

Before I close, I wish to read from a study of the Ontario Provincial Parks Act prepared by Paul Eagles of the University of Waterloo in 1984 for consideration by the Ontario government in revising its Provincial Parks Act. The study lists six principles which the University of Waterloo felt should underlie any revisions to the Ontario Provincial Parks Act. I wish to read them because they so aptly summarize my comments with respect to Bill 41 and I believe they will assist in revising this bill.

The principles to which the managers of parkland are committed must be clearly articulated and available to the public.

To be effective in creating effective countervailing pressure to destructive pressures, these principles must be reduced to a form which will have a high degree of moral persuasion and permanence.

Decisions affecting the planning and management of parkland or its loss must be subjected as a matter of right to public participation and scrutiny.

The onus of proving the necessity of their actions must be shifted from those who wish to preserve parkland to those who wish to destroy it.

Those public bodies charged with holding and managing parkland must have a duty to preserve it.

This duty must be enforceable by any member of the public.

I will not read, but I will leave you with 28 recommendations contained in this same study which were submitted for consideration in the revision of the Ontario Provincial Parks Act and

which I have appended as Appendix A to this brief. I believe the committee members will find these recommendations extremely valuable as they review the merits of Bill 41.

Now, to conclude, in 1981, at a public forum sponsored by the Manitoba Environmental Council, the then Parks Director, Mr. H. Dennis Moffat, said that, and I quote: "It's unlikely that those responsible for setting aside of reserves in Manitoba at the turn of the century fully appreciated the service they were doing for us and for future generations. We can only hope that we have the foresight and the dedication to stewardship of our resources to ensure that generations yet to come will have the same opportunities we do."

Let us stop for a moment and imagine what it would be like if our forefathers and mothers had not set aside the reserves of which Mr. Moffat speaks. Let us also imagine what our province would look like if the generations before us had considered the grasslands and marshes as worthy of protection as they did our lakes and forested areas. If they had, we would not today be faced with the immense challenge of preserving representative areas in six of our 12 natural regions where wilderness is already extinct.

Let us hope that our efforts respecting our provincial parks garner the same sentiments from future generations as those expressed by Mr. Moffat and that we have the leadership and fortitude to ensure that they do.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much, Ms. Elliott, for your presentation.

Ron Hayes.

Ms. Elliott: You do not want to ask me any questions?

Mr. Chairperson: I am sorry, you were beyond the 20 minutes.

Ms. Elliott: Oh, sorry. Did I take that long? I apologize.

Mr. Chairperson: Twenty-three minutes.

Ron Hayes. Fern Pitre. Paul Nagerl. Do you have a written presentation?

Mr. Paul Nagerl (on behalf of D. James Robertson, Falconbridge Limited): Yes, I do.

Mr. Chairperson: The Clerk will distribute it. Go ahead.

Mr. Nagerl: Good evening. My name is Paul Nagerl. I am a Falconbridge geologist and have been working in Manitoba for the past five years. I am presenting this brief on behalf of Jamie Robertson, our regional exploration manager for western Canada, who was unable to be here today. We wish to thank you for this opportunity to present our comments regarding Bill 41.

First, I would like to tell you what we like about the proposed new parks act. We are pleased that it incorporates the concept of sustainable development, that one of the purposes of the park is to provide economic opportunities, that the public will be consulted and advice sought from other authorities such as Manitoba Energy and Mines before Crown lands are designated a park and classified under various categories and there is sufficient time to assess this input and that an area within a park can be designated a resource management category.

What we do not like about Bill 41 is that it proposes that mining will be banned in wilderness parks and in areas of parks designated wilderness category, back-country category and heritage category.

We are concerned that once parks are designated in these categories, it will be very difficult or impossible to change its classification in the future. We are most concerned with the possible application of this act. We understand the need to protect some rare and endangered places, providing that these are unique and kept to minimal size. However, it does not make sense to close off large areas of our province to mining. An undiscovered world-class mineral deposit may be located in a provincial park. If you prohibit mining, no exploration will be conducted, the deposit will never be found and the province will lose substantial economic benefits and local employment.

For the concept of sustainable development to be viable in the mining industry, there needs to be a high level of continual exploration and mine development. On a regional scale, one can consider mineral deposits to be a renewable resource so long as sufficient exploration leads to the discovery of new deposits. The average cost today to discover a new economic mineral deposit is \$80 million, a high-risk investment for the mineral industry that needs to be encouraged. If investment in exploration is discouraged, new deposits will not

be discovered and mineral resources will become exhausted as mines are depleted.

Canada is losing its dominance as a world leader in mining because of insufficient investment in exploration and development. Our base metal reserves have dropped rapidly in the past 10 years and this trend will continue unless new mines are developed. The Canadian mineral industry is not spending enough on exploration to replace those reserves. This is especially true in Manitoba where exploration expenditures have steadily declined over the past six years to a level of only \$25 million in 1991. Instead of encouraging the mineral industry to carry out more exploration, governments across Canada are putting up more and more hurdles. Restrictions on access to land for exploration is becoming a major deterrent and this could seriously impede the discovery of new mines.

* (2210)

Exploration needs as wide a land base as possible to be successful in discovering new orebodies. Typically, only one claim in 25,000 becomes a mine. Increasing the area of exploration increases our chances to discover new mines. As the available land base in Canada becomes more and more restricted, the chance of finding new mines becomes smaller and smaller. This in turn increases risk for investors to the point where they will no longer commit the necessary funds to make exploration successful.

We do not need to exclude mining and exploration from our provincial parks. The Mining Association of Canada has adopted a very strict environmental policy for exploration and mining. Our exploration group has developed strict environmental guidelines and procedures that are followed in all our field programs. Exploration can be carried out without leaving any lasting trace.

Any geologist knows how difficult it is to find drill hole set-ups and survey lines more than 10 years old because they are overgrown. Advances in airborne geophysical techniques allow us to do minimal ground geophysics before drilling targets, which means fewer grid lines need to be prepared for ground surveys. Exploration does not have an impact on the environment and should not be excluded from parks.

Technological advances in exploration are allowing us to explore deeper and deeper in areas

not previously explored. For example, the Thompson nickel belt extends from Thompson at least as far as Lake Winnipegosis and probably into the U.S., but south of Ponter it is covered by limestone and other sedimentary rocks of Paleozoic age. Very little exploration was done in the past in this part of the belt underlying the limestone cover.

New airborne geophysical technology developed in the last 10 years has allowed us to better detect mineral targets under the limestone cover. As a result, Falconbridge and other exploration groups are now exploring the Thompson nickel belt as far south as Lake Winnipegosis under up to 220 metres of limestone, and a number of new nickel prospects have been recently discovered.

Further technological advances should open up new areas in the future. Canada is the world leader in the development of new technology for exploration and mining.

New exploration models and ideas also open up new areas that have not been explored in the past. An example of this is the current diamond rush in the Northwest Territories where at least two very promising diamond discoveries have been made. It is quite likely that Canada will soon be one of the significant diamond producers in the world. Many areas in Canada previously considered low in mineral potential have now been staked for diamonds, and this activity has now spread to Manitoba.

It has been suggested that geologists prepare a map of Manitoba showing areas of high and low mineral potential so that new parks do not coincide with potential mineral resources. We can show areas that are known to be of high mineral potential such as the Thompson nickel belt or the Flin Flon and Snow Lake greenstone belts, but we cannot say other areas have low mineral potential.

Foresters can see and count their trees, but our future mineral resources cannot be quantified until we explore and/or discover them. New technologies and new ideas will change our targets every decade in the future, and those areas may be in parks.

Mining occupies very little land, yet generates considerable wealth for the province. A total of \$1 billion in minerals were produced in Manitoba last year on only 34 square kilometres, about 6 percent of the land used by the city of Winnipeg. As an

example, the Namew Lake mine covers only one square kilometre.

The chance of actually discovering a minable deposit in any given area is very small, but if it is discovered in a park it is to Manitoba's benefit to allow it to be developed. Mines can be operated in parks with only minimal impact on the environment. The resource management category can be designated to accommodate the small area around a mine.

We are concerned that a park reserve, as per clause 8(1)(a) in Bill 41, can be designated for six months without prior consultation. Advice should be sought first from Manitoba Energy and Mines. The bill should include a definition of a park reserve, and state that its only purpose is to study its suitability for a provincial park. We are also concerned that a park reserve may be renewed over and over again for successive five-year periods.

One of the keys to achieve a goal of sustainable development is co-existence. It is possible to protect our park lands through managed land use without prohibiting exploration and mining. We believe there is ample room in Manitoba for both the protection of natural lands and the sensible development of new mines. We should not need to choose between parks and the wealth generated by mines. We can have both.

To summarize, exploration can be carried out in parks without impact to the environment. Mining requires only small amounts of land and so does not threaten the extensive wilderness areas of northern Manitoba. If deposits are discovered in parks, these areas can be designated under the resource management category.

Mining generates considerable wealth for Manitoba and will continue to do so in the future as long as there is sufficient exploration encouraged to replace our reserves.

To attract sufficient investment and be successful in discovering new orebodies, the mineral industry needs as wide a land base as possible in which to explore.

In conclusion, we support the basic concept of Bill 41, but ask you to consider the impact of Clause 7(5)(a) which bans mining in wilderness parks and other parks designated wilderness, backcountry and heritage categories. We request that you change this clause to allow mining in these

categories, subject to appropriate environmental approvals.

To acknowledge that mining is allowed in parks, Section 5 of the bill should state that the purpose of provincial parks include, to provide economic opportunities including mining.

Thank you very much for the opportunity of presenting our concerns to you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much, Mr. Nagerl. Can you answer a few questions?

Mr. Nagerl: Sure.

Ms. Cerlili: Thank you for your presentation. I have listened to a number of presentations over the last couple of days from mining industry representatives and associations, and I am concerned by some of the statements that you are making.

I am wondering if you or if you know if anyone from your company has ever had anyone from the provincial government or federal government or World Wildlife Federation explain the principles of sustainable development to you as outlined in the UN Convention, or has explained the purpose and the idea of the Endangered Spaces Campaign.

Mr. Nagerl: I cannot answer that. I do not know what other people have listened to. For myself, no one has specifically explained anything to me. I have attended some of the sustainable development meetings. That is all I can say.

Obviously, you think I do not have a clear understanding of what sustainable development means to you. I have an understanding of what it means to me.

Ms. Cerlili: Can you explain what kinds of forums you have been to when you say that you have been to some meetings? Is that something that the government of Manitoba has sponsored?

Mr. Nagerl: In conjunction with the booklets that came out, we have had meetings at the Fort Garry Hotel two years.

Ms. Cerlili: I am assuming that you have been listening to other presentations this evening. Is that correct?

Mr. Nagerl: That is correct.

Ms. Cerlili: I have been listening, and it is a concern to me that members of industry and members representing different organizations, Sierra Club, World Wildlife Fund, whatever

organizations, are so far apart on these issues. I am wondering if that concerns you and if you have discussed this in your industry or you have some ideas of how we are going to start bringing these interests together.

Mr. Nagerl: Yes, it concerns me. Personally, the reason I think we are far apart is because there is a misunderstanding of the facts or not all the facts are on the table. Certainly we have different interests. My viewpoint is consistent with Falconbridge's and that is that we can work together. I, personally, have a problem with the way the areas are chosen. I think there should be more scientific method applied. I do not think there has been any diligence. I am talking about specific areas. We have a problem ourselves with a specific area around William Lake.

Ms. Cerlili: Just to clarify that, more scientific expertise involved in choosing areas for parks designation and wilderness designation.

Mr. Nagerl: Park boundaries.

* (2220)

Mrs. Carstals: Mr. Nagerl, I realize the brief was not yours, that you are actually presenting it on behalf of somebody else. One of the areas that concerns me is that I keep hearing from the mining industry that they do not have enough land. Since we only have 2 percent of the entire land mass of Manitoba in parks, I would have thought 98 percent was adequate.

Mr. Nagerl: Parks is not the only thing that restricts mining from exploration. For instance, Indian land hold, reserves, all kinds of concerns and of the 98 percent, currently we cannot explore 98 percent at once. There are some areas that are more favourable, as I mentioned, but who is to say in the future, and that is our concern. Things like the rush in the Northwest Territories is an example of an area that had low potential according to some ratings that other people had developed. The Hemlo gold mine is the same case, a very low potential, but we can turn around and tell you that in the future, with new ideas, those areas that we set aside as parks today could become areas of high potential.

Mrs. Carstals: Well, just to follow that up. If we took that to the logical conclusion, then it would seem to me that if it was discovered that mining under the Health Sciences Centre was valuable, we should tear down the Health Sciences Centre

and mine. I just do not think that is valid. So if it is not valid for the Health Sciences Centre, why is it valid for a park?

Mr. Nagerl: I do not think you understand the concept of exploration. The concept of exploration is something that a lot of people do not understand. You need a large land base. That is implicit because very little of the work we do is successful in finding a mine. It is a numbers game. That is why it is so expensive to find a mine, and the return is not that great these days either. It requires a lot of guts.

You have to come to a specific example. If you were to create a park in an area, for instance, and the logical extension of some belt or nearby that has not been defined, because all of Manitoba has not been mapped adequately, we are concerned that once a park has been designated, there is no way that you can do exploration, therefore, no way you can find a mine.

We think, since mines take very little land area, that the impact is very local and that therefore mining and parks can work together. We can have both.

Mrs. Carstairs: Well, I really do not want to argue with you because I do not think it is entirely fair, but the reality is surely that you have already excluded certain land masses in the province from even examination, such as the Health Sciences Centre. I mean you are not looking there because it is not realistic for you to look there.

What is so difficult about achieving a mindset in the mining industry that parkland should have the same designation?

Mr. Nagerl: First off, if you were to consult mining to see which areas we would want to exclude from our exploration, that would be the first step.

Secondly, and we realize that has to be done, but why not have multiuse, if the impact is very local? Why not? In my mind, when people think of parks and they think of mining, they think of the entire park and mining taking over the entire park. One square kilometre in Namew Lake mine, that is fact. That is today. I believe it is not in the park, but the situation is the same for many areas that we are exploring today.

If you pull away, the impact is, you miss out. It becomes a smaller area in a very large area. That will be an example of the category that allows exploration. Granted, there are cases where

endangered species will require that there is absolutely no exploration. I am happy with that. I think Falconbridge is happy with that. Our concern is that there will be too many of the one and not enough of the other.

Mr. Storie: Mister—is it Nagerl?

I had asked this of other representatives of mining companies, and the question is: Was Falconbridge seeking changes to The Park Lands Act? Are there existing concerns that you felt should have been addressed that either were or were not addressed in this act?

Mr. Nagerl: I do not know what Falconbridge is doing with respect to anything else but what I have presented here. We are looking towards—we spent a lot of time locally on a feasibility study of a particular area. That is what I am most familiar with, so I cannot answer that.

Mr. Storie: Perhaps a more general question: Was or is Falconbridge satisfied with the current level of exploration and the requirements, the regulations governing exploration and mining development in the province as it exists?

Mr. Nagerl: Can you be more clear?

Mr. Storie: Are you satisfied with the existing regime?

Mr. Nagerl: The Mines Act or the incentives provided?

Mr. Storie: The Mines Act and The Park Lands Act.

Mr. Nagerl: Yes, I am.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Nagerl.

Mr. Charles Norman, Laird Crawford, Kevin Allan, Susan Bosecke, Harvey Ander, J. Weldon, S. Jenks, Charles L. Watts, Edna Leeper, Lawrence Ogrodnick, Gene Hrabarchuk, Clifford and Muriel Anderson, Mr. and Mrs. George Leeper, Adrienne Hrabarchuk, Larry and Joan Dick, Tom Crowhurst, William Ferreira, Dwight Lysak, J.E. Atkins, Bruce Samson.

Just one minute, Mr. Samson. We are just going to pass the brief around. Go ahead, Mr. Samson.

Mr. Bruce Samson (Whiteshell District Association Inc.): Mr. Chairperson, committee members, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Bruce Samson. I am the government liaison representative for the Whiteshell District

Association. As an association, we made a presentation to the round table, but we strongly feel that when the summary was made for all the presentations, the correct weight was not placed on our presentation. Our presentation represented 2,274 cottage owners, but was only given the weight of one.

In our presentation tonight, I would like to cover some of the most important items that are paramount with our 2,274 members. I will now go on to the presentation being passed out. I will not cover it in total, but only highlight parts of it.

* (2230)

The Whiteshell District Association's aims are to carry on, without pecuniary gain, objects of a national, patriotic, religious, philanthropic, charitable, professional, scientific, artistic, social or sporting character or the like.

On page one, the Whiteshell District Association was formed in 1951 by a dedicated group of individuals interested in encouraging the development of the Whiteshell forest reserve as a vacation and recreational area. Ours is a nonprofit organization whose constitution requires all income to be spent in the promotion of our aims and objectives.

When our association was founded, the Whiteshell forest reserve was little more than virgin wilderness traversed by a two-lane asphalt road known as Highway No. 1 now No. 44. There was no hydro, no telephone lines in the region and little in the way of other services to assist those hardy Manitoba people who wanted to build a vacation retreat for their families in this beautiful spot provided by nature.

In 1992, the membership of our association was 2,274 cottage owners and is growing. These are all paid-up members. Management of the association projects is provided by the board of directors of 40 men and women with a six-member executive committee.

The Whiteshell District Association undertakes several new projects each year and, as well, activities on an ongoing basis. Some of the accomplishments are, we have established two recycling depots in the Whiteshell Park with plans for four more. Truckloads of recyclables are picked up. This is one of the concrete examples of our contribution to sustainable development.

We sponsor a program in the park which teaches an average of 600 children per year to swim and canoe and practise water safety.

We publish a membership-subsidized newspaper "The Echo" six times a year to inform the members of park plans and information: the Whiteshell District Association upcoming events, RCMP reports. It is a vehicle for local businesses to advertise in.

We work with Crime Stoppers group to provide an effective anticrime program.

We work with the fire prevention people to establish local firefighting capabilities and help subsidize their training.

We provide volunteers who gather weekly water specimens as part of a long-term water quality sampling program on nine Whiteshell lakes to the Department of Environment. This is to be expanded to 20 lakes in 1993.

We meet regularly with the Parks Branch to provide and exchange information.

We provide encouragement and donations of membership funds to assist activities in the Whiteshell to benefit all park users.

We assist in placing hundreds of bird houses on the telephone buried cable marker cans, just a little item that we did last year.

We provide jobs for Manitobans through many projects such as our water safety and recycling programs.

A new program we are currently looking at would be to employ retired people to man the entrance gates to the park when not manned by park staff, to provide incoming visitors with helpful information and a welcome to the Whiteshell.

Basically the role of the cottage owner, by virtue of there being 3,408 summer cottages in the Whiteshell, we feel that our presence has made it more feasible for the province to create accessory regional recreational developments for those people who spend their leisure in this and other areas.

The traffic created by cottage owners, not only automobile but traffic in goods and services to the area, almost alone support their existence.

Without the more than 3,000 cottage subscribers, it is doubtful that Manitoba Hydro would have electrified the Whiteshell and adjacent areas as early as they did. Our members are

long-time owners of their cottages and many have visited the same location for 40, 50 or 60 years.

We go on to talk about jobs and taxes.

On page 4, we talk about holiday dollars, a very important point. Further to the preceding section, we would like to point out that the majority of cottages in the Whiteshell are used not only on weekends, but also for the annual family vacation. The money that many people spend on out-of-province vacations is often spent by our people on their cottage and in Manitoba.

The corresponding dollars that their neighbours have spent on a trip to Hawaii or Mexico often meant a septic field or a badly needed bedroom addition to the cottage owner. The majority of recreation and vacation dollars of the cottage owners are spent at home, in Manitoba, for the benefit of Manitobans. As the cottage owner has long discovered, "Friendly Manitoba" and, of course, the cottage is a family gathering point for many people returning each year to their cottage in Manitoba.

We talk about the construction process, that the cottages were built with a lot of sweat equity.

We go on, on page 5, as the cost of servicing the Whiteshell Provincial Park has risen over the past few years in our inflationary society, we summer residents in the park have experienced a curtailment of services, no doubt in an effort to keep costs down. We believe the majority of residents understand this situation, and while they would like to have the service level restored to what it was, have by and large accepted the cutbacks as a method of keeping their lease fees at a reasonable level.

We suspect that if the lease fees are raised any further, there will be a great cry for increased services and demands, for these services could well consume a large portion of any increase in lease fees.

We go on then to page 9 and talk briefly by stating: We are not in favour of the Manitoba government selling the lots in the provincial park. We are not in favour of removing or preventing sustainable commercial development, such as forestry, mining, hydro development, et cetera, in the parks, providing the activities are based on sound sustainable development principles and properly regulated and managed. The development of additional cottage lots should be undertaken,

and where demand exists these lots should be made available to the citizens of Manitoba at a reasonable price, but only on lakes where cottage lot development is suitable.

We go on to page 10: The Whiteshell District Association questions the 12 percent figure for protected spaces, as we have been told at a recent workshop that this figure is actually 4 percent. That is the goal, and a fudge factor of three times has been used to arrive at 12 percent.

We also question the definition of protected spaces as being large areas with minor activity, versus, as we would like to see, many smaller areas making up the required 4 percent. Are we interested in amassing land or are we interested in sustainable development?

As stated earlier, as a group, we are against discontinuing limited and controlled commercial logging, mining and hydrodevelopment from parks. We know that the WDA members are already participating and are contributing now to the protected area goals, as established in the 1981 Whiteshell Master Plan.

We disagree with setting large uninhabited areas aside to obtain these goals.

We are against the sale of Crown lands in parks.

In this policy area, we see no reference to establishing more areas for cottaging in Manitoba, so that the quality of life for Manitoba citizens will be improved.

We move on to page 13, please: This area seems to parallel all the work that has been done in the 1981 Master Plan. Many of our members feel that the current status of multiple use is working well and that the present Park Lands is satisfactory. We seriously question the need for major changes as is being put forward.

We would also like to add that much has to be done to complete the goals of the 1981 Master Plan, however the higher fees goal has not only been reached but surpassed.

In 1930, the Province of Manitoba public brochure on the development of Whiteshell Park emphasizes what emphasis was placed on keeping Manitobans in Manitoba for the recreational visits to Canadian Shield country. This park was the result of a concentrated effort to stop Manitobans from going to lakes in northwestern Ontario and sending

their presence and tourist dollars out of Manitoba and it, of course, has worked.

Let us not forget that today there are thousands of cottage lots available in northwestern Ontario and our highways have improved to the point where many of them are only a 30-minute drive beyond the Whiteshell Park.

In summary, on page 14: The Whiteshell District Association members feel that the Crown lands in the park should not be sold, that the lot rental fees be maintained at a reasonable level, that suitable commercial development in the parks should continue and could be expanded following good sustainable development guidelines, that cottage development should be maintained and expanded to encourage and provide Manitobans with opportunities to experience natural lands and special places, that continuous direct association between the Parks Branch and our group provides the best possible and mutual direction in planning and servicing the park; that other park associations can serve a similar purpose in the other areas of the park; and the last item which is not in your summary, that the proposed Bill 41 puts too much power in the hands of the cabinet who can act by way of regulation rather than having the act be more specific.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Samson. Would you mind taking a couple of questions?

Mr. Samson: Certainly, Mr. Chair.

Mrs. Dacquay: Mr. Chairperson, just for clarification, on page 10 you say, we are against the sale of Crown lands in parks. For a point of clarification, are you referring to new lots in parks, or are you also referring to lots on which existing cottages currently are situated?

Mr. Samson: In both cases, yes.

Mrs. Dacquay: In both cases?

Mr. Samson: Yes.

Mr. Storie: I thank Mr. Samson for his presentation. Mr. Samson, you will not be surprised to learn that you are one of many presenters both from those concerned with the Endangered Spaces Program and the preservation of our parks, mining companies and cottagers who all have said that in one way or another this bill does not do what it is supposed to do or it says, essentially, that what is

in place has been a workable compromise in many respects.

* (2240)

I am wondering whether you have any concerns about, other than general concerns, the power that is left in the cabinet's hand to set regulations, to establish fees and levies on their own, about the criteria the government is going to use to establish these fees, particularly Section 18(3) where it talks about park district costs. I am wondering if your association has any views on that.

Mr. Samson: Yes, we have, and I think we have covered it sort of briefly, Mr. Storie, in our presentation. We have found through past work with the department that we have been able to arrive at many mutual goals. We hope that this relationship will continue, and we feel that it will. We have, certainly, some concerns about the solidarity of the act. We feel that the act leaves too much power in the hands of the cabinet.

Mr. Storie: One further question. I mean, there are two aspects to this. One deals with the service fees for cottagers, and the other deals with permanent residence. I am wondering how or what in your view should be done with any levy that is placed on permanent residence. Should that go into government general revenue, or should the government find a way to transfer that to adjacent municipalities if there is a logical municipality to transfer the funds to?

Mr. Samson: You have asked me for a simple answer to a very complicated question.

Mr. Storie: In the Whiteshell it is.

Mr. Samson: Yes, and it is also becoming and growing more complicated because more and more people are using their cottages as permanent residence as they retire. Because the program started back in 1940 or in that range, as some of the other presenters have said, we are now getting a lot of people at the retired age, and you will find more and more people declaring, not only because they want to but because of some of the federal tax laws, their cottages as a permanent residence. I cannot answer the distribution of funds.

Mr. Storie: I appreciate that it is much more difficult in the case of the Whiteshell. I think it is much plainer and more straightforward in areas like The Pas and Flin Flon where in fact the municipalities have been the ones who have been arguing that there should be some application of some levy. In

fact, most cottagers in Flin Flon and in our provincial parks and our Crown lands acknowledge that they are prepared to pay a levy, providing that it goes to the municipality and does not turn into a tax grab by the provincial government which is what appears to be happening in this legislation.

An Honourable Member: Never.

An Honourable Member: Never. Yes, we will believe that too.

Mr. Samson: Our minister has answered that question for me. Again, as I pointed out in our presentation, we are concerned about the levy fees—absolutely. We would certainly like to see them remain at a reasonable level. We do not want to see it become a tax grab. That is absolutely true.

Mr. Enns: Mr. Chairperson, just one question to Mr. Samson. I appreciate his presence in discussing this bill, and I appreciate the association may not have had adequate time to meet and to discuss it, but I would hope that the association, representing the largest single group of cottagers within a park system, would look at Sections 18 through 20 of the act as in fact reaching out even more so to the cottage owners.

I hasten to add, we have had a good relationship I think over the years with the association and with the administration of the Parks Branch. I would, of course, like to extend that to all cottagers, including the cottagers on private lands, that we can really bring about, even improve on, that relationship and satisfy ourselves that we are providing the kind of service at an appropriate cost that satisfies the needs of the department and comes closer to fulfilling the needs of your clients, of your cottagers, Mr. Samson.

With the commitment in the bill, not just at the whim of whoever the current parks director is, or parks manager is, or of the minister, that my senior people, the parks managers of the different parks, would have to sit down on a regular basis with your association members and go over the costs of doing business the last year—was it an appropriate level—and agree to a reasonable level of services and costs attached thereto for the coming year, which hopefully would keep a lid and some further control in fact by the cottagers, is, I submit to you, the closest thing that we thought we could come up to with providing you with a direct say in the assessing of a tax, if you like, or a fee.

We have heard a great deal about the question of taxation without representation at these hearings, particularly from those parties on private land holdings. I know that I will not be able to demonstrate this unless we actually have a year under our belt where I can demonstrate my commitment and my senior parks administration's commitment to making this a very real consultative process in arriving at the kind of fees that you will be paying and in arriving at the kind of fee structure that will be required to recover some of the costs involved.

Mr. Samson: If I could give two answers to your question, sir, and perhaps a bit of an answer to Mr. Storie, we as an association have always been in favour of a fee for service. In fact, we have on many occasions been in opposition to people who have not paid the service fees and feel that they should, and we have so stated on many occasions that all people using the parks, who have cottages and are using land, whether they be private land holders or renters, should be paying a service fee. Both myself and my predecessor have brought this up on many occasions.

To answer your question specifically, sir, we feel that the negotiation process certainly is a good one. We have had success in the past, and we think probably we can have success in the future.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Samson.

Doug Fahlgren, Glen Ridings, Beth Ridings, Laura Reeves, Laura Reeves, Gayle Stilkowski, Lorrie Hutton, Mrs. and Mrs. Louis LaFontaine, Jorma Hannila, George Harbottle, William Pruitt.

Dr. William Pruitt (Private Citizen): Yes. Professor Pruitt.

Mr. Chairperson: Professor Pruitt, you have a written presentation, I believe. We will distribute it. Just give me one minute. You can go ahead, Professor.

Mr. Pruitt: My name is William Pruitt. I am Professor of Zoology at the University of Manitoba. From 1973 until 1993 I served on the Wildlife Committee of Manitoba Environmental Council, that is from its beginning until its recent death at the hands of the present provincial government. I present the following comments on the proposed Bill 41 as a private citizen.

In addition to the following comments I refer you to my more detailed analysis of the Provincial

Parks and Natural Lands Workbook which I presented to the public hearings in Winnipeg.

The Provincial Parks Act of 1972 which Bill 41 will replace states, "Provincial park lands shall be developed and maintained (a) for the conservation and management of flora and fauna therein; (b) for the preservation of specified areas and objects therein that are of geological, cultural, ecological, or other scientific interest, and (c) to facilitate the use and enjoyment of outdoor recreation therein."

This admirable statement of purpose was eroded by a later Tory minister, A. Brian Ransom on 30 July 1979 in his Provincial Parks Lands Policy, in which is stated: Park lands will: (i) Respond firstly to provincial interest for rare, scarce or special forms of recreation, and secondly to regional demands and priorities. Then he went on to section (iii) Provide opportunities for outdoor recreation in terms of consumptive uses, such as hunting and fishing, and nonconsumptive uses, both of which are considered equally legitimate; (iv) To accommodate commercial utilization of resources where it does not lessen future recreational use potential or unduly compromise the primary purpose of the parkland. Notice that even this rabid Tory exploiter recognized that the "primary purpose of parkland" took precedence over commercial exploitation.

During the past year or so we have been bombarded with a series of public statements and letters in the daily press from a group with personal financial interests in reducing and fragmenting the already weak environmental protection afforded by The Provincial Parks Act. Opposed to these pressure tactics you should know that there are only four scientifically valid surveys of the opinions of Manitobans as to how they want their provincial parks to be run. I know of no other valid sources of opinion. One is a survey by Nickels, in 1982, and out of 99 criteria rated the least preferred were areas for hunting birds, areas for hunting animals and areas for snowmobiling.

The survey by Wang, in 1979, Whiteshell Cottagers Association rejected hunting in Whiteshell Provincial Park 79.9 percent to 15 percent. A later survey by Wang in 1979 queried, should hunting be permitted on parklands? The answer was no, 76.3 percent to yes, 6.2 percent. Wang also queried, should Nopiming Park have development of cottages or commercial operations? The answer was no, 85.9 percent to

yes, 11 percent. Remember, this was at a time when a minister had unilaterally opened two lakes in the park to cottage exploitation before any study had been done to determine if the two lakes could support such exploitation and before a master plan had been approved or even discussed.

Wang also queried, should logging be permitted in provincial parks? The answer was no, 75.8 percent to yes, 4 percent. He also queried, should mining be permitted in provincial parks? The answer was no, 81.4 percent to yes, 3.9 percent. He also queried, should trapping be permitted in provincial parks? The answer was no, 67.9 percent to yes, 8.3 percent.

Pirt in 1976 queried, should hunting be permitted in provincial parks? The answer was no, 63.3 percent to yes, 16.7 percent.

Manitobans are not unique in emphatically rejecting logging, mining, trapping or hunting in their provincial parks. In British Columbia Thorsell in 1976 queried, should selective logging be permitted in provincial parks? The answer was no, 85.8 percent to yes, 11 percent. In Ontario, Gallup opinion poll in 1980 queried, should logging be permitted in provincial parks? The answer was no, 66 percent to yes, 18 percent. Gallup opinion poll in Ontario also queried, should mining be allowed in provincial parks? The answer was no, 73 percent to yes, 12 percent. Ontario Gallup opinion poll also queried, should hunting be permitted in provincial parks? The answer was no, 86 percent to yes, 8 percent.

(Mrs. Louise Dacquay, Acting Chairperson, in the Chair)

I know of no valid survey that contradicts these findings. There is a rich scientific literature on parks and other types of protected areas, their size, shape, orientation, function, classification, and other attributes. Briefly, parks should be as large as possible, large enough to encompass habitat for about 500 individuals of the species requiring the largest home range size, (Newmark, 1986; Shaffer, 1981). They should also have the simplest boundaries possible, that is no irregular extensions or inversions of boundaries, (Pickett and Thompson, 1978), and no enclosed nonconforming enclaves, that is no parcels of private land or nonparkland within the park boundaries.

Land use should be zoned and prioritized according to sensitivity or production or use from

the most sensitive to the least sensitive, that is from nonconsumptive, nondestructive use by all Manitobans down to destructive, consumptive use for personal benefit of an individual or company. Such destructive, consumptive, personal or company exploitation should never take place within a park. These are some of the criteria governing provincial and national parks throughout the world, (Cowan, 1970; Fuller, 1970).

Therefore, the Manitoba workbook on Natural Lands and Special Places, the Natural Lands and Special Places Park Lands Act review and the present proposed Bill 41 all fly in the face of theoretical and practical actions by other provincial and national governments.

In Bill 41, the statement that representative examples of diverse natural and cultural heritage are conserved is downgraded to a status equal to appropriate economic opportunities are provided. This circumvention of park values is reiterated in Section 5(d) where to provide economic opportunities in accordance with park classifications and land use categories is given status equal to such things as ecosystem conservation, maintenance of biodiversity, preservation of natural, cultural and heritage resources and provision of outdoor recreation and educational opportunities.

Such distortion and obfuscation of park values continues in Section 7(2)(b) in the definition of a natural park as one to preserve areas of a natural region and to accommodate a diversity of recreational opportunities and resource uses. This is a real perversion of the English language. It is also a perversion of the concept of sustainable development. Moreover, Sections 7(3) (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g) and 7(4) are garbled, make no sense and require severe editing to be comprehensible.

The bulk of Bill 41 consists of busywork and housekeeping directions such as what to do if someone fails to stop their vehicle if caught speeding, or if someone does not keep their cottage in good repair. Such minor material does not belong in an enabling act but in the day-to-day regulations pertaining to running the park. In all this mass of verbiage, nowhere are there statements of vision or lofty ideals about preservation of ecosystems or biodiversity or maintenance of habitat sufficient to protect large carnivores.

Bill 41 is an appalling caricature of a provincial parks act. It may have been suitable at the beginning of the 20th Century, but it has no place when considering the imminent 21st Century. I not only urge but I demand that it be scrapped.

I also furnish you with the literature cited where you may look these items up.

The Acting Chairperson (Mrs. Louise Dacquay): Thank you, Mr. Pruitt. There may be questions from members of the committee. Would you be prepared to respond to questions?

Mr. Pruitt: Of course.

The Acting Chairperson (Mrs. Louise Dacquay): No further questions. Thank you for your presentation.

I am not certain but someone representing the Coalition to Save the Elms, is it Christine Singh? You may proceed, Ms. Singh.

Ms. Christine Singh (Coalition to Save the Elms): Madam Chair, Mr. Minister and members of the committee, I wish to commend this committee for the exhaustive task that you are enduring so well here. I do not know how you are standing up so well, because I feel rattled myself having listened to all the information overload that is going on over here.

This piece of legislation is, from the global perspective, the most important piece of legislation that you will be dealing with during this session. Down the line somewhere it has the potential to affect our planet for better or for worse. The ball is in the your court and the responsibility is awesome. I will proceed with my presentation which you all have a copy of.

This brief is presented on behalf of Coalition to Save the Elms, a coalition of 28 community groups who are concerned about urban forestry and urban environments throughout Manitoba. Consistent with views put forward at the First Canadian Urban Forest Conference, we espouse the concept of the urban forest as an integrated ecosystem interdependent upon other systems. It follows, therefore, that consideration and management of urban forests must take place systemically in order to be truly effective. This must include factors outside towns and cities, extending to controls such as laws and public policies.

Every year we witness accumulating losses of our environmental heritage, our natural lands and

special places, as development and resource extraction take priority over the principles of sustainable development as identified in Our Common Future, otherwise known as the Brundtland Commission. Biodiversity was identified as one of the major policy areas to be addressed. Development tends to simplify ecosystems—this is a quote—and to reduce their diversity of species, and species once extinct are not renewable. The loss of plant and animal species can greatly limit the options of future generations, so sustainable development requires the conservation of plant and animal species.

* (2300)

In spite of this, lack of real concern about conservation and stewardship continues to allow for inappropriate losses of important environmental resources. It happens in our cities and is pervasive in our rural lands, and each time it happens it incrementally increases the threat of collapse of Earth's biological life support system. It mocks any commitment to think globally and act locally.

The coalition expresses dismay that the government of Manitoba received an F grade from the Sierra Club of Canada for allowing resource extraction within provincial park boundaries. The World Wildlife Fund gave our government a D for not fulfilling its commitment to protecting natural areas. As Manitobans we feel demeaned, and I would like to say that I think part of this is historically rooted in the resource extraction that has preceded park designation. So I am not totally faulting anybody here.

We must strive hard to do better and we can if we all pull together to amend a bill which has potential, provided some badly needed amendments are made. Without these amendments, we remain at great risk of increased disastrous losses of our essential environmental heritage and escalating confrontation.

It is out of deep concern and commitment to such environmental concerns that we are here today to propose that Bill 41 weakens park protection in Manitoba and allows for a perversion of the sustainable development principle to which this government has committed itself. It is also out of deep concern that the coalition has embarked upon a three-year forest education and action program entitled "Tree For All." We have been awarded an Environmental Partners Fund grant from the

federal government's Green Plan to carry out a project which should serve to heighten public awareness of many of the issues which bring us here today.

I think, further to that, the public does not understand a lot about what we are dialoguing here tonight. A lot of people do not understand what sustainable development really is. There are a lot of mixed of ideas going on out in the community about what it really means. I think the act should address that deficiency.

In order to demonstrate that critique of our record of environmental stewardship and conservation in Manitoba and Canada is not limited merely to national and provincial criticism, we wish to draw attention to an editorial in Wild Earth magazine, written by prominent American environmentalist David Foreman after a trip to Canada in 1991. He is a conservation biologist who was doing some lecturing. Foreman writes that Canada more than any other nation, with the possible exception of Russia, has the opportunity to preserve true ecological wilderness with all native species and natural processes intact.

Then he proceeds to describe why he refers to Canada as "Brazil North." "Nowhere else on earth today is wilderness, biodiversity and integrity being ripped apart, shredded and hammered into the tawdry articles of international commerce as quickly and intensely as in Canada. Yes, it is happening elsewhere, but what is going on at the end of the road in British Columbia, Alberta, Manitoba and Quebec is unmatched for its sheer magnitude and stupidity.

It is time that international pressure be brought on the national and provincial governments and on the business leaders of Canada as pressure has been applied in the Third World nations. It is time that conservationists around the world raise such a hue and cry that, when Canada is mentioned, images of forests falling and native people being driven from their homes spring to mind just as they do when we hear the word 'Amazon'."

These are very strong words from an American environmentalist. But he then wisely proceeds to offer us a process of redemption. "Yet Canada remains the paramount hope for significant wilderness preservation on this planet. Canada has some of the most visionary, effective, committed and intransigent conservationists in the world. The

ecological fabric of the bulk of the country remains intact. If the destruction can be stopped, if the boreal forests of Alberta and Manitoba can be saved, if the nightmarish James Bay Project can be terminated, if the last great coastal forests of British Columbia can be spared the chain saw, if the mining threat to the Tat is thwarted, . . . if self-conscious restraint can come to Canada, Canada can bless the world's true wilderness."

Here is a call to the government of Manitoba to take up a challenge which can begin with an amended Bill 41. Foreman issues a stinging condemnation of what is happening in Canada and Manitoba, and then he reveals a window of opportunity for enlightened self-interest through principles of sustainable development.

The coalition implores the government of Manitoba to play a lead role in establishing the problem of disappearing ecosystems on political agendas as a major economic and resource issue. It is no longer an issue of human needs being sacrificed to protect nature. The sacrifices called for in the protection of biodiversity are now a matter of human survival on the planet.

Bill 41 is not a strong and effective response to the concerns of the Brundtland Commission. It fails to carry forward the enlightened policy positions published by the provincial government in the past three years toward a sustainable development strategy for Manitobans. These policy positions are excellent, and I think that they have only been carried through in some measure but not in full measure in this Bill 41.

In the Preamble and in Section 5(d) and Section 7, the bill entrenches the right to log, mine, et cetera, in provincial parks. This contradicts the United Nations Commission goal of preserving 12 percent of representative natural lands. The most effective way that parks can serve the cause of sustainable development is by being increased in number, expanse and level of protection and not by providing appropriate economic opportunities as suggested in the Preamble and 5(d). Principles of sustainable development would never classify the pursuit of economic opportunity as a purpose of parks.

In Section 6, the system plan makes no provision for a public consultation or input. We certainly support the concept of a system plan for parks which will take into consideration the needs of

future generations. However, we are concerned that without full public consultation input, short-term economic development will tend to eclipse long-term economic benefits for society.

Section 7 dealing with classification of parks seems to remove protection from provincial parks and is a mandate for logging in Manitoba's Nopiming, Whiteshell and Grass River. In our opinion, this section is unclear and inadequate in its definition. It needs to be tightened up. It is bound to lead to conflict and confrontation unless needed amendments are made to it, and that is clarification and tightening up. Section 9 and Section 10(1)(b) will allow economic activity to dictate land use in parks. Section 9(2) would allow an economic development proposal to supersede park interests by using the environmental assessment process.

Another concern of the coalition is that there is no provision made for the First Nation peoples. There is nothing in the bill to enable just treatment of aboriginal peoples with respect to outstanding land claims, nor is there any reference to traditional land use within provincial parks. No bill in parks is complete without addressing these issues.

There are some very good measures in the act, such as provision for stronger enforcement of violations in parks and requirements that management plans be reviewed in public, but these are overshadowed by the government insisting that the purpose of parks entails resource extraction. The philosophy of government is that parks should be put to multiple use and that disallowing resource extraction is wasteful. It means that virtually no place should be left alone. This contradicts principles of sustainable development and makes highly improbable the laying aside of 12 percent of our land mass for preservation biodiversity. To date, Manitoba has set aside more land in parks than other provinces, but less than 1 percent is protected as wilderness.

* (2310)

In closing, the coalition commends government for undertaking the difficult task of updating the legislation that governs Manitoba's provincial parklands. Legislating the environment is one of the most difficult tasks facing all of us today, and I am well aware of that. I hope I am not seeming over critical, and any of the information that I have brought you from the other side of the border is to highlight what other people are feeling about what

is going on all over our country, not specifically in this legislation.

It should be done with a great deal of thought and never rushed through. Inadequate legislation will result in ongoing conflict and controversy. Before this bill is passed into law in this Legislature, there is much work to be done on it if we are to avoid such conflict. With amendments, a revised bill has the potential to give Manitobans a new enlightened image of environmental conservation and stewardship in the national and international stage. Our record to date is distressing to thousands of Manitobans.

On behalf of the coalition, I most urgently request that this bill be sent back for amendments. There are some excellent suggestions that have come forward at this hearing process. The recommendations of Professor Harvey Williams in his brief, and in that put forward by the coalition's legal counsel, Mr. Brian Pannell, there lies much to offer in enrichment and clarification of Bill 41.

We also heard other papers tonight, and I think the one that was put forward by—who was it last night that gave such a good paper? Dr. Rajotte, right. She had some very good suggestions in her paper.

Manitobans deserve a better bill, one that truly contributes to sustainable development rather than favouring commercial development, a bill that puts us on the forefront of environmental enlightenment and facilitates the processes that will allow for the continued existence of human beings on planet Earth.

Thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak.

The Acting Chairperson (Mrs. Dacquay): Thank you for your presentation, Ms. Singh. I believe there could be questions from some of the committee members.

Mr. Enns: Ms. Singh, I wish to thank you for your presentation. You have been listening to much of the presentations here today, so you have heard me comment on some features, aspects of the bill, and I just have the one question.

On the top of page 8 of your brief, you come to the automatic conclusion that the philosophy of government is that parks should continue as some multiuse use, and that automatically means, in your own words, that virtually no place shall be left

alone. I wonder why you would come to that conclusion.

Ms. Singh: Mr. Minister, I think that I understand where your uncertainties about that comment are coming from. I think it flows from lack of clear definitions in the bill. When we were discussing this as a group, this was the feeling of most people. We could not come to a real conclusion on this, but we felt that possibly what the bill was putting forward was the possibility of allowing the point that resource extraction is wasteful and that no land—there did not seem to be any clarification of land being set aside totally as wilderness in any of the classifications.

Mr. Enns: Well, Madam Acting Chair, through you to Ms. Singh, as you have noted, I have had—and I appreciate that senior Parks officials have been with us throughout these hearings. I think it is extremely important that the administration also has an opportunity to hear first-hand some of the concerns and some of the recommendations, quite frankly, that are coming forward.

I have asked them specifically to look at some of the specific recommendations, some of the specific recommendations that were presented in particularly some briefs, some that you have referred to. I acknowledge that in some cases just the right word or how it is placed or where it is placed has a meaning that perhaps we in government are not always particularly sensitive but means more in the community that are particularly critical and watchful over what we do in this sense.

I want to indicate to you, through you, Madam Acting Chair, that it is precisely because the current provincial legislation as currently structured does not allow me to enter into a higher level of protection, legislative protection, that is called for by organizations such as the World Wildlife Fund and Endangered Spaces Program that moves me to move this bill forward at this time, that I do see it, despite the raised eyebrows that I solicit from some members in the broader community, that I view this bill as a protectionist bill.

I view this bill as enabling me to put—not just it means that virtually no places shall be left alone, that indeed a majority, and I cannot quantify that at this time. I am told by my Parks director that 50 to 60 percent of the 3.5 million acres can be and will be, I want to inform honourable members of this

committee, probably will be placed under that protection very quickly upon passage of the bill.

I leave you with that question. Surely that would be a desirable result no matter what your opinions are of the bill in its total. If within a reasonable time significant acreage of those 3.5 million acres of the parks were to achieve that protected status, would you not consider that to be a worthwhile step, no matter how small the step or how large the step, but a step in the right direction?

Ms. Singh: I certainly would, Mr. Minister. Any step to that end is a worthwhile step.

The Acting Chairperson (Mrs. Dacquay): Thank you for your presentation.

Mrs. Carstairs: Well, I do not have any questions, but I have a question to you.

The Acting Chairperson (Mrs. Dacquay): No questions of our presenter?

Mrs. Carstairs: No.

The Acting Chairperson (Mrs. Dacquay): Okay. Thank you.

* * *

Mrs. Carstairs: Yes, Madam Acting Chair, we had made the decision when we sat down tonight at seven o'clock that we would revisit how long we were going to sit this evening at eleven o'clock. It is now 11:15.

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Government Services): Let us call about two or three.

Mrs. Carstairs: The Minister for Government Services has suggested we hear three more. I think that is reasonable. That would take us till—

Mr. Ducharme: Let us go till two or three.

Mrs. Carstairs: Till two or three in the morning? Since we are going to sit again at nine o'clock tomorrow morning, I hardly think there is much point to that.

An Honourable Member: We are not sitting at nine o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mrs. Carstairs: Yes, it is. This committee is sitting at nine o'clock tomorrow morning. Is it not?

An Honourable Member: No, we are not. That is why I am saying, let us get as many as we can.

The Acting Chairperson (Mrs. Dacquay): I have been informed there is one been scheduled for 9 a.m. and 7 p.m. if necessary. However, I have

already had indication that there are two, if not more, individuals present this evening that have explicitly requested to be heard. With the will of the committee, I would like to read through a few more names and see where we arrive at, and how many are here, and then, perhaps, canvass the members of the public that are still here this evening who have been waiting patiently and see if it is at all possible to hear them as we did last evening. Is that the will of committee? Agreed?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

The Acting Chairperson (Mrs. Dacquay): Agreed.

David Sheppard, Stan Martin, Peter Marchenski, M. Reid, Barry Christie, Ida Grant, Barbara McLeod and Tim Williams, Michael S.E. Dickens, Susan Lorden, Walter and Lesia Whyte, Frank Rogowy, Leo and Pat Langlors, Terence A. Kane, Arnold Watts, Margaret Pilloud.

Ms. Pilloud, do you have copies of your presentation for members of the committee?

Ms. Margaret Pilloud (Private Citizen): Yes, I do.

The Acting Chairperson (Mrs. Dacquay): Would you please, just for the record, correct me if I mispronounced your name?

Ms. Pilloud: It is Pilloud.

The Acting Chairperson (Mrs. Dacquay): Pilloud. Thank you. You may proceed, Ms. Pilloud.

(Mr. Chairperson in the Chair)

Ms. Pilloud: Okay. I own a cottage at Lot 4 Eagle Bay Road, Nutimik Lake in the Whiteshell Provincial Park. I oppose Bill 41 for the following reasons.

* (2320)

Service fees are charged, and there are no services given. Our road maintenance is paid by the people who own property on Eagle Bay Road. The service fee that I pay to the Eagle Bay Road Association—I can see how my money is being used.

Secondly, I would like to see a municipality formed so we can elect our own officials who would answer to us. Taxes or service fees charged under this program would be more acceptable to me as a private citizen.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation, Ms. Pilloud. Would you mind putting up a couple of questions?

Ms. Pilloud: Sure.

Mr. Storie: Thanks to Ms. Pilloud for her presentation.

The legislation, apart from the fact that it gives the government a great deal of freedom to charge whatever basically that it wants, does provide for, No. 1, an opening of the books, so that within a park district, before they decide their fees, residents would be able to get a look at what the government says it is spending in a park district. Is that sufficient consultation?

Ms. Pilloud: I would really have to think about that.

Mr. Storie: Mr. Chairperson, I appreciate that until you actually see how it works, it is very difficult to say whether it is going to work or not.

Ms. Pilloud: Right.

Mr. Storie: The government is presenting a simple opening of the books. Never mind that it determines what the costs will be and how the costs will be portioned, administrative costs and all the rest of it, the government is at least attempting to say to cottagers that that is consultation. In my view, unless you have some say in what goes into assigning the costs, it does not really mean very much. I guess it is unfortunate, but if the government proceeds with this bill, you will only find out after the fact what that means.

Ms. Pilloud: Yes.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation.

Angela Wadelius, Kevin Wadelius, Ray Mackie, Jim Campbell, Chris Christensen, Alex Pylypowich, Don Sullivan. Don is here.

We are just going to get your presentation passed out, Mr. Sullivan. Just give us 10 seconds. Thank you very much. Go ahead when you are ready, Mr. Sullivan.

Mr. Don Sullivan (Choices, a Coalition for Social Justice): Good evening. It is nice to be back here. I am here presenting on behalf of Choices, a Coalition for Social Justice. I appear today before the committee to speak in opposition to Bill 41, The Provincial Parks and Consequential Amendments Act.

We are a group of individuals dedicated to ensuring, through alternative policies, that the economic and social infrastructures that make our province a special place to live are maintained and enhanced for the benefit of all Manitoba. Choices

has been increasingly alarmed at the impact that this government's agenda is having on the quality of our lives in Manitoba. We feel it is important that this agenda does not extend to our provincial parks, natural lands and special places.

The government of Manitoba has publicly committed itself to the objectives of the World Wildlife Fund's Endangered Spaces Campaign and indeed was one of the first provinces to do so. This campaign sets a goal of protecting at least 12 percent of Manitoba's ecosystem from commercial logging, mining, oil or natural gas exploration, and hydro development.

At present, the Manitoba government only protects 1 percent of its land mass from resource extraction activities, a far cry from its stated objectives. Time and time again this government has been publicly criticized for its lack of foresight in attaining 12 percent protection for our ecosystems.

On June 1, 1993, the Sierra Club of Canada released its much awaited report card. In it the government of Manitoba received an F grade for allowing resource extraction within provincial park boundaries.

(Mrs. Louise Dacquay, Acting Chairperson, in the Chair)

In September of 1992 the World Wildlife Fund gave this government a D for not fulfilling its commitment to protecting our natural areas.

Indeed, this government's own recommending body, the Clean Environment Commission, recognized the need to protect provincial parks from resource activities. In response to this criticism, the government held hearings conducted by the Manitoba Round Table on Environment and Economy: Natural Lands and Special Places, The Park Lands Act review. Hopes ran high that this government would finally address the inequities with the park act, and put into place real legislative protection for our parks.

The lack of seriousness and commitment of this government towards their stated objectives is evident by its proposed amendments to the park act. Given the proposed amendments to the park act before this committee, these hopes have been clear-cut. Once again this government has ignored the wishes of many Manitobans and has succumbed to the parochial interests of the resource-extracting industries.

Bill 41 affords Manitobans no more protection of our parks from resource extraction than the present act. In fact, it even offers us less. What this bill does is create a perception that this government is acting responsibly by adding land use categories within a classification of any given park. This, in effect, will do no more than provide us with a checkerboard approach to park classification. Thus, it incrementalizes park designations and renders the intent of the park act to that of a preamble status which is nonjudicial. In other words, it sounds good but means nothing. This, however, is in keeping with this government's consistent rhetorical approach of not practising what they profess to preach.

Section 9(1) of this bill states: ". . .the minister shall provide an opportunity for public consultation and shall seek advice about proposed regulations" before a regulation is made under Section 7 or subsection 8(2).

(Mr. Chairperson in the Chair)

Our question to the minister responsible for the act: What is this consultation mechanism? Is it the Clean Environment Commission?

Is it the Manitoba Environmental Council, which has been rendered ineffective by this government's slash-and-cut mentality to groups or organizations which may differ from government policies? Or will this be a new advisory body, and if so, how will it be appointed? What powers will this body have? Who will be represented on this body?

Section 29(1) allows the minister, at his or her discretion, to appoint an advisory committee, but the wording is not in keeping with Section 9(1) of this act. Section 29(1) should be amended to read as follows: Pursuant to Section 9(1), the minister shall appoint an advisory committee to provide advice and recommendations to the minister concerning the administration and regulation of one or more provincial parks.

Section 11 of this bill makes provisions for the establishment of a management plan for each provincial park, but no mention of time frames for the implementation of the management plan. How long are we to wait, five years, perhaps 10? Could the minister responsible tell us?

Sections 18 and 21 of this act deal with taxation matters as they pertain to owners and occupiers of land within provincial park boundaries. We are not opposed to such a tax policy, but we are opposed

to the circumventing of a long-standing democratic principle of no taxation without representation. If this government is going to tax cottage owners, then cottage owners should have some form of representation. The act as written does not allow for this.

Another concern Choices has with regard to this act is that there is no provision made for First Nations people. There is no mechanism within this bill to deal with outstanding land claims within park boundaries, nor is there any mention of traditional land uses within provincial parks. Once again, the Crown has trampled on the rights of the First Nations.

* (2330)

These are just a few of our concerns that we have with respect to this bill. All in all, Bill 41 is an ill-conceived piece of legislation that does not in any way address the fundamental reality of protecting our parks from resource extraction activities so that future generations may benefit from their use in a sustainable way. What then should a bill dealing with protection of our parks contain as an alternative to this bad piece of legislation? We do not profess to have all the answers, but we do have some suggestions which no doubt will be ignored, but nonetheless we will outline them here.

Any policy or legislation dealing with our provincial parks should reflect the changing perceptions and relationships we have about what a park is. This changing relationship can be defined by a set of principles which must be embedded in any legislation that deals with provincial parks, natural lands and special places. Fundamentally, parks are perceived as a sanctuary from the modern urban industrial life. Any encroachment of industrial life upon these sanctuaries is unacceptable. Thus the extraction of resources by large industrial corporations is not only a desecration of these sanctuaries but also an assault on one's peace of mind.

Contrary to this government's view, not everything is for sale. Clearly, society believes that our natural places are not subject to the Darwinian marketplace. Therefore, the principle that must guide park policies now and into the future are ones based on the commitment by governments to protect and promote biodiversity, ecosystem integrity, species preservation and the

nonconsumptive use of our unique places, rather than ones putting the emphasis on the consumptive values and benefits derived from our provincial parks, natural lands and special places.

In closing, Choices believes that this government should make the tough choices. This bill offers Manitobans the status quo and affords us less protection of our natural areas than the existing bill. It is high time that this government sees the forest from the trees. We can no longer afford to have our parks at the disposal of resource-extracting industries. The value derived from protection of our natural places far exceed that which would be derived from any short-term economic benefits gained by stumpage fees. This government should use foresight to protect our parks rather than have to deal with their destruction in hindsight.

I would also like to make a comment for people who are skeptical about just what the forest industry is doing in Canada overall. I am going to read this into the record. Industry and government critics of the Brazil of the North campaign argue that Canada's deforestation is different because the wood is utilized and forests are replanted. There is also massive wood waste in clear-cutting of Canada's forests, but there are many other similarities.

Consider the following. The size of Canada, 9.9 million square kilometres; the size of Brazil, 8.5 million kilometres. Percent of Canada covered by forests, 45 percent; percent of Brazil covered by Amazon rain forest, 41 percent. Hectares of forest cleared in Canada in 1988, 1,021,619; amount of Brazilian rain forest that has been cleared or burned in 1990, 1,382,000. Amount of productive Canadian forest that is now either barren or not sufficiently restocked after clear-cutting, 10.3 percent; the amount of Brazilian rain forest that has disappeared, 12 percent. Estimated number of Indians and Metis in Canada's boreal forest, 100,000; estimated number of Indians in the Amazon forest, 170,000. Amount of forest officially protected in Canada, 2.6 percent. This is what is very interesting: the amount of forest officially protected in Brazil, 9.4 percent. They have a better track record. On that note, I am finished my presentation.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much, Mr. Sullivan. Would you mind taking a question?

Mr. Sullivan: No.

Mr. Chairperson: Are there any questions?

Ms. Cerilli: Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Sullivan.

Mr. Sullivan: You are welcome.

Mr. Chairperson: Garry Halstead, Maureen Monczka, Don and Judy Parkinson, Eleanor J. Douglas, Ken Dunsmore, Nancy Lamb, Adam Sus, Marguerite Smith, Dan Taylor, Lionel Vincent, Shelley Chetyrbuk, Dave Belza, Archie Cinq-mars, Bev Nicol, F. Ellis, Armand and Florence Dupas, Dave Low, Ken Lesosky, Roman Osadchuk, Gordon McIlroy, Bev and Harvey Richardson, Judith Hutton, Dave Fetter, Angie Fetter, George Scham, Arthur Kvern, Lorraine Kvern, Wayne Neily, Edward and Donna-Mae Burgener, John Jacobson. John is here. I had you ticked off as being here. We have your written presentation, Mr. Jacobson?

Mr. John Jacobson (Private Citizen): No, I have no written presentation on purpose.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Jacobson. You could present any time you are ready.

Mr. Jacobson: Thank you very much.

This in itself has been a trying experience, just listening to the number of people that have not been able to present. I do not know if this is very democratic or not. I have a great sense that it is sad when men can vote themselves a raise, but it is a sadder thing when people cannot raise themselves to vote, and if you do vote sometimes, you vote for the wrong party. And if you vote, sometimes your party betrays you, and if you vote and if you are sure of the way things are going, then you are kind of lucky to have a feeling that you are putting your confidence in a group of people to try to run the country and the province.

I find it really lamentable, personally, that the media are not here now. They showed up for the Ritz cookies and the Cheese Whiz, and then they have already got their minds made up. They are not here to hear some of the things, and sometimes the truth will live and die on one word. In an issue like this, it is very important that people speak their hearts about what they feel about a certain thing that is happening.

In my case, I have tried to go to places like Meadow Lake and live with blockaders and live with native elders and see the effects of clear-cut forestry for myself. I have made an audio-visual. I

have it available. I would like to present it to you sometime. I find it a little bit lamentable that you cannot see that. I would not want to do it while I talk now, but I would certainly like somebody to see it because it brings home to Manitoba some of the concerns that I see happening that are very important to talk about, to change maybe just an attitude towards our resources.

The things that we inherit, that are expressly held for us, written in stone, that we have parks—that is a sacred trust. I can see why native people are very nervous about us because we sometimes want to change some kinds of sacred trust that we have. I think personally there is nothing wrong with taking a certain area, making a park; and, if it is uranium or whatever is under the ground, I find nothing wrong with saving that for the future. Some time if that is all gone, maybe we have it in one of our provincial parks, and maybe we need it to save the world.

I do not know, I find something very sick, too, about people who log and people who mine and want to go to provincial parks just because there are roads there. It is very easy. It is lazy to do that.

Exploration is also paid for by the Canadian taxpayer. It is. Development grants. There are very few people lose money. Even in British Columbia, with those people that said they spent all that money, the government is going to have to pay them some sort of money; there are some kinds of agreements with people to do business, to look and do business in Canada. Everybody does business, and very few people, if they try hard, lose money. Some people go broke because they mismanage, perhaps, their money, but there are exploration costs, development grants, and tax write-offs that allow these things to happen.

We are very generous with people who want to do business in resource management. We are not a stingy people. We do not hide our resources. It is very open. You can see 2.6 percent. We do not protect that. It looks like we are fools, and sometimes I think we might be.

* (2340)

In taking to amend, even the name of this bill is somewhat offensive, because it has to do with the future. Someone handed us these parks for the future, and we are amending that future. You cannot amend the future, but you can try and work on the future and make the future not so catastrophic. There are lots of signs and signals

available to all of you in the governments and all political parties and all walks of life to say we should watch what we are doing with what we have. Try and make it work; try and make it do. If we just say we have to consume it as fast as we can or else we are going to be poor people, I think you will find we are going to be poor people. That is a poor decision. We have to manage resources.

We are all environmentalists; even Conrad Black is an environmentalist. His environment is money. He has to protect his money; he does it very well. I would not be surprised if he is buying out a lot of things, a lot of companies in the northern states so that when they move up and move into our shopping malls, all the Toronto people who go bankrupt, he will be there with his—he is a good environmentalist.

I do not know if that world really should happen that way. I hope there are more diligent people and more aware politicians and more people who live up to their name. If you are Conservative, you should conserve something. If you are Progressive, you should think of the future.

I have a real problem with Crown land and how people can log and mine and "disneyize" things that are there for people to enjoy. It is something people go to to get away from the crush of our consuming society. It is something very important. Not enough women, not enough children, not enough elders of our society or culture go to these places or can go to these places.

I have no sympathy with cottage owners who have to pay a little bit extra. I am sorry. I cannot afford to live in a cabin. I do not really want to. I feel sorry that they are crushed out on some kinds of things.

I would recommend to you to look to Landsat evaluation of our forests right now. There is a satellite going over our heads every certain amount of time doing evaluation. I have come from Saskatchewan; I have come from clear cut; and I have seen how devastating it is: 300-acre bites. From the Legislature to the Hudson's Bay to Main Street to what used to be the CNR station in one single day, it is levelled, levelled, gone. Just imagine that. It can be done. Feller bunches can grab three trees at a time and just work. They do like 16 men out of work.

Those people in British Columbia are torn between how they are going to log; they have

logged it so fast. I urge you in the control of this natural resource: it takes seven generations to grow a tree that is ready for harvesting. The Cree have seven generations built into their concept of what you do. If you cannot create something that will last seven generations, you do not do it.

Seven generations is a really good starting point for something that you want to look at because seven generations ago, it was a really old world, an old world, and we have gone very, very fast. We have to be very prudent right now with ozone, with everything that affects the total of humanity. This is no joke.

This is an environmentalist talking about human life and the quality of human life. I think personally for every tree that you take and turn into toilet paper, I think that there is another signature on the cancer ward very, very soon down the road. I have heard for every person there is a tree. The native people say that as well. It is very important to look at other cultures and how they have handled what they have had in order to live to the future.

Again, I would like to really stress that you look at Landsat evaluation of all our forest in Manitoba. I do not know how expensive that would be, but I think if we could take a look at what we have and look at how to manage that, I am certain that any government can handle that. Any political majority can take a look at that and work with it.

I am not saying that logging is a heinous crime. There are a lot of us that are here because our mothers and fathers were in that kind of industry. I come from a town called Flin Flon. I was born in Flin Flon. In '41 they had a son, and I came from a place that I—my father is buried in that town. He died when I was nine, and I really have a memory of northern life, and I really am grateful for that. The largest open pit zinc mine in the world is now finite, in my lifetime. My father died at an early age because of just maybe lifestyle, heredity, smoking and living in the northern wilds.

But in my lifetime, in my half century on this Earth, I have seen things run dry up North. I am hearing now that logging companies, mining companies—there is no more room for them to look for things than in our parks? Are they really asking for this? Can you not see that perhaps we need to take a look at what is available and how we manage it?

These are dangerous times, and the economy is very, very tight. I am speaking to you because I am unemployed as well. I do not make enough money to own a cottage, and I am glad I do not own one because I would be torn apart by that decision of trying to amend the bill for a few dollars and cents when people all over the place are out of work.

So I understand how your government is being torn apart on this. If you listen to the numbers that you have not heard, I would stress that in the future you are going to see more of this, more than 180 people the first night, a big list, 160 the next night, and most of them falling away because they see the government's hands are tied. They have made their decision, and they want to run with that decision.

If you take a look at the number of people who do vote, we are being left out, and when people who do not vote then feel that they have not a voice, it is going to be a sad day for people who do not connect with their government and connect with majorities and do the right thing with the resources that we have.

I would like to answer questions, too, about clear-cut forestry. I would like to answer about a mill where they put \$300 million of taxpayers' money, and this is not a friendly government, the Conservatives, this is an NDP government. They took \$300 million of public money, put it into a mill and made less than 300 jobs. I suggest to you that you could have taken \$1 million and given it to every one of the wood lot people, made millionaires overnight of 300 people, and they might have just managed that resource, but as it is, it is being stripped, literally.

* (2350)

So ask me questions, please, about clear-cut, about myself, and about the future.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much, Mr. Jacobson. Does the committee have any questions of Mr. Jacobson? No? Thank you very much.

Mr. Jacobson: Can I make one joke because I do not like to be so heavy.

Mr. Chairperson: Go ahead, Mr. Jacobson.

Mr. Jacobson: This is in the paper today with Herfst getting his hair cut. I suggest that Mr. Laurendeau—and I hope you do not get mad at me—has a better idea of clear-cut forestry than Herfst does.

Mr. Chairperson: And mine will not grow back.

Mr. Jacobson: Yes, that is right. That is what I mean. I am going to run now because—

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Jacobson. I will enjoy our conversations in the hall later.

Mr. George Holland. Duncan Stewart.

Ms. Diane Cox (on behalf of Duncan Stewart): Mr. Chairperson?

Mr. Chairperson: Yes.

Ms. Cox: My name is Diane Cox, and I would like to read Duncan Stewart's presentation. He is unable to be here tonight.

Mr. Chairperson: Are you on the list, Ms. Cox?

Ms. Cox: No.

Mr. Chairperson: No? So you will be presenting for Mr. Stewart. Is it the will of the committee that we hear—

An Honourable Member: Agreed.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, go ahead. Your name was?

Ms. Cox: Diane Cox.

Mr. Chairperson: Diane Cox. Okay, we will just pass the presentation. You had a written presentation, I believe.

Ms. Cox: Yes, it was submitted last evening.

Mr. Chairperson: When did he hand it in?

Ms. Cox: Last evening, at the beginning of the evening, seven o'clock or so. This would be Duncan Stewart as a private citizen.

Mr. Chairperson: You can just carry on with the presentation. We will have some copies made after, and we will distribute them.

Ms. Cox: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Carry on, Ms. Cox.

Ms. Cox: First, I would want to thank our Manitoba government for making these hearings possible and for giving me the opportunity to comment on Bill 41, the proposed new parks act for our province. This is, of course, the essence of democracy, giving each citizen who wants to the chance to comment on legislation which will have a significant effect on his or her life.

Each of us, no doubt, wonders what effect, if any, our comments will have on the deliberations of the Legislature and on the final structure of this act.

I suggest the best we can all hope for, all of us making presentations and those responsible for a final outcome, would be that good common sense will prevail and that this act will be designed to allow Manitobans to care for their parks as parks should be cared for. I will admit this is an ambiguous suggestion open to many subjective interpretations, but I doubt if there are many people in this room or in this city or in this country who would not agree there are some things you just do not do in parks or you must give them another name. You must call them something else. You cannot call them parks.

I believe Bill 41 came within one short phrase of being an excellent parks act. There is no doubt a tremendous amount of work went into the preparation of this bill, and real efforts were made to correct past mistakes and to prevent future ones. This act would have management plans put in place for each of our provincial parks by law, and these plans would need a process of public hearings in order for them to be changed. It would spell out a set of land use categories for four different types of parks and, once designated, each park would be always defined according to its category. There is a great deal of care evident in the wording of this act to ameliorate some situations of past abuse, but one unfortunate phrase negates it all.

These few words, which I am sure you have all heard condemned ad infinitum, are so out of place in a bill setting forth principles of park management, I, at first, could not believe they were there, but sure enough, when I got my copy of Bill 41, there it is, in the second paragraph, "and appropriate economic opportunities are provided." In the statement of purpose, "to provide economic opportunities in accordance with park classifications and land use categories."

I have since found out by economic opportunities they do not mean hot dog stands in the first group of trees inside the park. No, they mean making it possible to cut down the grove and all the trees. They do not mean those opportunities for employment inherent in parks now, things like the chance to guide people through some of our wilderness scenery which need take second place to nowhere else on Earth. No, they mean making it possible to clear cut and to mine and to search for oil in the middle of the scenery.

Such activities are very far outside the parameters of those acceptable in a real park. You will find few places on Earth which allow them to this extent, and you will find nowhere on Earth where they are mandated by law, as this act would do. It calls for a sad kind of redefinition of the word "park," a redefinition which will be, if this act becomes law, ours alone in Manitoba. I might add, as a personal aside, he may be thinking of Polo Park or Tyndall Park or some other such untree-like park.

Henry David Thoreau had some advice which the writers of this act could have profited from. He said: "Our life is frittered away by detail . . . Simplify, simplify." Good advice for us all, even writers of presentations to legislative committees, but just think of how great an improvement the application of this dictum could have made to Bill 41. If this offending reference to economic opportunity were discarded, we would not need so many management plans and land use categories and classifications and designations and restrictions. We would just need to worry about caring for our parks as places for plant and animal protection and preservation, as places for the protection of distinctive habitat and land forms, as places for human recreation.

Those who believe, as I do, that we should set some land aside inviolate are frequently condemned as antijob, as pro-wildlife and against people. This is, of course, not true as anything but a cursory short-term analysis of our principles would soon show. This is certainly the case if one examines our position on the logging issue. This position, stated very briefly, is this. We need certain significant areas set aside from all commerce, logging included, but forestry is of course a valuable and necessary industry and must be allowed to continue to prosper.

We know from the examples set in other countries that proper forestry methods can result in an industry sustainable indefinitely. Surely, it is in the best interests of Manitoba loggers that such practices be instituted here. It is not in the best short-term interest of multinational forestry companies that this take place, however. Such methods are more labour intensive and require more capital and more management skills. With the right kind of government support, both environmentalists and those who work in the

forests, a constituency not mutually exclusive, could peacefully and co-operatively exist.

Another attack often made on people like me is this. Our opponents, almost always out of a lack of knowledge or with an agenda they prefer unknown, accuse us of always being negative, of being against everything and of having no constructive criticisms to offer. We are called, as I have said, antijob as well as antidevelopment, antihunting, always in opposition to everything. This is also false, as we are for clean air, for an Earth unaffected as possible by our activities. We are for a new parks act, but not this one.

I have already offered one improvement, delete the reference to economic opportunity. Now I will offer another one. There are certain areas inside present provincial park boundaries which have been so impacted by industry, they can be said to no longer hold the values necessary for a meaningful park. Two such areas can be found in Nopiming Provincial Park and in Duck Mountain.

Why could we not remove these areas from park designation and trade them for wilder lands so far relatively untouched? Such places as the Roaring River and Shell River watersheds in the Duck Mountains and the Bell River and Steeprock River canyons in the Porcupines would meet this description and would be much better suited for park status than logged-over lands.

If the kind of sustainable forestry I have spoken of is practised in the lands traded from parks, we could have the best of both worlds. The only thing preventing such workable compromise is the intransigence of the environmental community and the determination of the provincial government to remain rooted in the past.

* (0000)

Just as an aside, but a relevant one I think, we all know about the recent flooding in the Mississippi and Missouri river basins and the terrible trauma this has caused the Earth as well as the awful toll in human suffering and property damage. Is there anyone who doubts this flooding would not have been so calamitous if the upper Mississippi basin in Minnesota still had its cover of dense forest and if the tall grass prairie in Iowa and southeastern North Dakota had not been so decimated? The forest and the prairie are remarkably efficient blotters of heavy rainfall.

What about our own flooding in west-central Manitoba? Would it have been so severe if more careful attention had been paid to leaving a protective cover in the numerous river valleys involved in this disaster? Land left idle is never unproductive land. Careful, strategic preservation of wilderness areas is always beneficial to the Earth and to its inhabitants.

In my work with the Sierra Club I have travelled over much of the United States, and I think I have seen what can happen if you ever allow the dollar to become the governing factor in your decision. Their wild lands are gone except for isolated islands. There are very few places you can go in the lower 48 and see no evidence of our industry.

While this is too bad for the Earth and for the Americans, it does provide Manitobans with an opportunity, an opportunity we have been abysmally slow in recognizing. There is a great and growing hunger in the U.S. and around the world for wild places, for the chance to get away from their appalling cities and seek the serenity and silence of the wilderness. We can, so far at least, provide them this in spades, but not if they do not know we exist, and they do not. I have been asked what coast Manitoba is on. I have been asked what state it is the capital of, and when I tell them we have in Manitoba a huge freshwater inland sea the size of Denmark, I doubt if they believe me.

We are missing a boat that could carry many dollars to our province and do it with minimal harm to the Earth. We are making sure everyone knows about our hydroelectricity and our lumber and our pulpwood. It is at least arguable to say we are supporting industry fast becoming anachronistic in a rapidly changing world and neglecting, indeed working against, an industry perfectly suited for tomorrow.

So who or what is to blame for all this? How can it be that any government can be so shortsighted as to offer something as counterproductive, as oxymoronic as a parks act mandating economic development in parks? Well, I think the answer is threefold: an apathetic citizenry, a myopic bureaucracy and a seriously flawed system of parks management.

Public unconcern with environmental matters not related to their immediate back yards is a frustration I have never learned to deal with. My only defence against it is to persistently hammer

away at my objectives every chance I get. Bureaucratic shortsightedness is, I admit, a subjective phenomenon; those in agreement with a bureaucracy's goals will think it is seeing very well indeed. But I think a strong case can be made for the position that our government structure, as pertains to parks, is badly out of alignment with globally accepted principles of park management.

Our parks are, as we all know, at present managed by the Department of Natural Resources. They are a twig on a department tree consisting of a forestry branch, a mining branch and a wildlife branch. I believe the Parks Branch is regularly overwhelmed and intimidated by these other larger, more powerful bodies. I believe these other more influential branches necessarily have a mandate to generate economic activity which parks by definition should not have. I believe as a result decisions are made regarding our parks which are politically motivated and therefore nearly always wrong.

The closest analogy I can find to all this is that of a certain fairy tale. Our Parks department reminds me of an orphan Cinderella abused by not two, but three, ugly sisters. And this is not their fault. The "ugly sisters" are doing what they should be doing. I think they could be doing it better, but it is their job to develop our forestry and our mining and "manage" our wildlife. But it is not our Parks department's job to make money from our parks, but rather to protect them. It is certainly not their job to be apologists for industry as they are now too often required to be.

So is this an insoluble dilemma? Well, I do not think so. I think there is an obvious solution better for all concerned and surely better for our provincial parks. I believe our parks should be cared for by a Crown corporation whose only purpose is to bring our Manitoba parks into the 20th Century before the 21st begins.

What a difference this change would make. Free from the control of a minister who, because of the realities inherent in his cabinet charge, could not adequately protect our parks even if he wanted to, free from the influence of more powerful bureaucracies whose every action is antithetical to those necessary for park protection, free from the pernicious influence of the office of sustainable development our parks could be, as they should be, a standard for the country instead of a

laughingstock. It all comes down to personal choices as it usually does.

I have spent a great deal of my life, man and boy, walking around in the Turtle Mountains. If it is possible to love a piece of land, and I am sure this committee will agree that it is, I love those hills. They are a part of me. It was a threat to the integrity of the Turtle Mountain Provincial Park, which is a beautiful exemplar of the unique quality of the Turtles, which first got me involved in environmental advocacy and evangelism. But there has never been such a threat to this little park as I see in this proposed new act.

Because of its size and location, Turtle Mountain can never be thought of as a wilderness park. It would, under the terms of this act, be no doubt designated a natural park, and this designation leaves it vulnerable to its assured destruction.

This park is 72 square miles. There are presently seven oil wells pumping away inside its boundaries, and there are, or were until recently, at least two applications for logging permits on hold, awaiting categorization of the park.

It does not take much imagination to see where this would leave a 72 square mile park, and I would ask the members of this committee to think about a special place I am sure they must have—what will become of it if this act becomes law? Then transpose this hurt to every Manitoban, and it soon becomes clear the immense harm this Bill 41 could do to our province.

So to sum up, I would respectfully ask this committee to seriously consider deleting from this bill any reference to mandated economic opportunity inside our provincial parks. There is no doubt, I believe, that such enshrining of this principle in a parks act would effectively destroy many of our parks. It would certainly place in jeopardy all but a few.

Please consider inclusion in our new act a restructuring of our Parks Branch to allow it to operate free from the uncertainties and frustrations of the political arena. Please remind our government that euphemism fools no one for long. Calling a clear-cut a natural park is a case in point. Please make clear that rhetoric is only a very short-term substitute for concrete action. We have had many statements in support of Manitoba's ecological integrity from this government but very, very little real action to back them up. A good,

strong parks act, which spelled out real park protection in unambiguous terms, would be a clear signal times have changed for the better. Please help to make that happen.

As a short postscriptum, I would like to add that the comment by Dr. Rajotte last night, I think, expressed what Duncan Stewart was trying to say about the importance of being unambiguous, that the ambiguity of the act is a recipe for future conflict, she said.

To make that point clear, tonight we heard from a mining company that, for instance, in response to Mrs. Carstairs' question about would they be looking for opportunities everywhere in the province—if they wasted their time looking under the Health Sciences Centre and then had to be told that they could not, but they had hoped all along that maybe they could convince somebody later to change the categorization if they found something valuable, you have just wasted that much of that company's time and their resources.

I think it is in the interests of all concerned to make the guidelines very clear. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Ms. Cox. Are there any questions? If not, thank you.

* (0010)

Mr. Storie: Mr. Chairperson, I want to thank Ms. Cox for her presentation and a very thoughtful one. Certainly I recall another presenter outlining the number of different parks we have, and I believe there were something like nine natural parks or seven natural parks in the province. Certainly, the reference in here to the Turtle Mountains is a good one. It references how difficult it will be for small parks to remain viable if we follow, I guess, the proposal in Bill 41.

What I wanted to ask you though was your ideas on how to trade off, and I think that is the word you used, or that was used in the paper, areas that are currently, for example, being logged in provincial parks with other areas. I have for a long time advocated, and it refers to your long-term, short-term kind of thinking, that we should actually be using currently marginal agricultural land for tree farming, that if we started now to take marginal agricultural land and plant trees on it, that 40 or 50 years from now we would not have to disturb our wilderness parks or areas that might be designated as parks, but it takes a 30 or a 40 or a 50-year time

frame to do it. I am wondering whether there is any sense or you are aware of any other areas, other jurisdictions that are doing that kind of thing.

Ms. Cox: Well, I am personally not. I am sure if Mr. Stewart were here tonight, he could probably answer that question better. Certainly, I think it is commendable to try and restore marginal agricultural lands to a purpose they once served better which might be wetlands, which might be forests. I do not think that impinges on the decision to protect what parks we have, but I am not aware of other jurisdictions, I am sorry.

Mr. Storle: What I see is a continuing battle, and you mentioned in your paper about the inconsistency between having economic development and now enshrining it in legislation, but of course, what happened, particularly with mining and forestry, is that it pre-dated our parks in some cases by decades, many, many decades. So it was sort of accommodating them to begin with, and the only way out of it is to find alternatives, and if they are long term, then they are long term.

If it takes us 40 years to get to a point where we can manage a logging industry completely outside of natural areas, then we should start now, because I do not think we are ever going to get past that conflict because of the economic necessities in some cases that seem to prevail over concern for the environment and preservation of ecological areas.

Ms. Cox: I know recently there have been a couple of examples—I believe one is in the Yukon—of forestry companies who have donated their rights to the lands that they had been given access to log. They get great coverage in the press for doing that, so I think there are payoffs. We perhaps need to approach those companies with a greater spirit in mind of future generations to perhaps give them that opportunity and, as I think you are suggesting, mark areas that they specifically can have access to.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Ms. Cox.

Stuart Jansson, Cherry White, Eileen Marvin, John Kith, Ross Framingham. Gordon Hanson has already been heard. Wes Wasylnuk, Diane Wasylnuk, George Harris, S. Olbrecht, Gord Pazerniuk. You can correct me on the pronunciation, I do not mind.

Mr. Gord Pazerniuk (Private Citizen): That was close enough, Mr. Chairperson.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, sir. You had a written presentation?

Mr. Pazerniuk: Yes.

Mr. Chairperson: Just go ahead, sir.

Mr. Pazerniuk: My name is Gord Pazerniuk. I am a cottage owner on private land in the Whiteshell. Just one point, if you would bear with me, I may make some just minor editorial changes due to the rushed typing earlier.

Good morning, Mr. Minister, members of the committee. I oppose certain sections in the proposed bill for several reasons, the chief of which are in the sections dealing with service fees, Sections 18(1) through to 22(4).

Firstly, I believe these sections are really not thorough nor are they clear, at least to me. Indeed, they appear to offer only a shallow justification for the imposition of a fee for various services including the cost of administering these services. Yet it offers no guarantees of say in what services are to be actually rendered or provided. We as landowners are given the opportunity for consultation and for review, but after today if we do not agree, to whom do we address our concerns? Do we phone the bureaucrats uptown? Whom or what department will listen? Once the machine is in place and operating it will be impossible to stop. Mr. Minister, these sections also mention some type of hierarchy to collect these fees. I oppose hiring more people to administrate at the expense of the people who are really at the grassroots, landowners and the field workers.

Secondly, Mr. Minister, the sections are silent in the procedure for appeal or for representation. Is the democratic process forgotten? In short, how is the private citizen who really foots the bill, who expects something for his shrinking dollar, who has been in most cases forced to cut back his or her wages, guaranteed a say? In this bill it is strikingly absent.

Thirdly, on analyzing the various sections again, I am stunned that my only rights are that I can review financial statements and review the level and cost of providing services and of the level of the fee, but what can I really do? Not much, Mr. Minister, and this is not right.

Fourthly, I have a great fear of Section 21(1) which states that fees do not have to be related to services. Mr. Minister, this is quite clear, pay but do not expect anything. How absurd. A fee by definition, and I quote Webster's, is a payment, service or homage due a superior, or a payment asked or given for professional services, admission, et cetera. It is clear the scholars understand the nature of a fee. I pray this committee understands it also.

Lastly, Mr. Minister, failure to pay these fees sets in motion a sinister procedure including registration of a debt and a lien and an interest charge to be determined by the government. I could actually leave these earthly bounds owing a huge debt for service fees and interest for services never received. Would that not be an irony.

In summary, Mr. Minister, I urge you to strike out, at least to amend, Sections 18(1) through to 22(4) to provide for fair and equitable treatment. To put it simply, no service, no fee, or simple service, small fee. Make that quite clear. And Mr. Minister, give those affected a democratic say in the matter. Do not leave it to be ironed out later by the bureaucrats. They do not often listen or are too remote from the scene. Tell me here that you will amend these sections.

Mr. Minister, members of the committee, I also offer your government something for nothing, my advice, free of charge, no charge. Just ask me or those people who are affected by the levies what they want and how much they would be willing to pay. Just ask. Do not force those who get nothing or very little into the stellar black hole from which there is no return or recourse. Tell us now that you will address these concerns. Are you listening, Mr. Minister? Respectfully submitted by myself, Gord Pazerniuk.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much, sir. Are there any questions of the presenter? If not, thank you very much for your presentation.

Chris Olbrecht, Garth Guttormson, C.K. Brook, Leonard and Verna Lewandoski?

Do you have a written presentation?

* (0020)

Mr. Leonard Lewandoski (Private Citizen): No, I do not have one.

Mr. Chairperson, members of the committee, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Leonard

Lewandoski, and my wife, Verna, and I are private land owners in Nutimik Lake in Whiteshell Provincial Park since 1968. In my presentation I want this committee to know that I agree there should be some kind of regulation governing the use of provincial parks and service fees, et cetera. What I am opposed to in Bill 41 is it gives this government a blank cheque to charge what they want like they are now doing with land-leased cottage owners. There is no consultation. The fees are set, a bill is sent to the leased cottage owners. To date there have been no discussions taking place with private land owners to set service fees.

Over the past number of years I have owned this property, not once has this government or the previous government sent the private land owners a letter asking if they would like to meet and discuss service fees. In 1984, the government sent the first yearly bill to private landowners for service fees. What service? To date, these services have never been defined.

Back in 1970, we formed an association on our road at Nutimik Lake at Howk's Point Road. We held regular meetings with all cottage owners and agreed to pay X number amount of dollars, as required, for road repairs, snow plowing, sand for our beaches and dock facilities, et cetera.

With the water level on the Winnipeg River constantly changing our shoreline, which was badly eroded, from 1968, '70 and '71, we probably lost 20 to 25 feet of our shoreline. We invited Parks Branch people to our meetings to discuss some of the concern due to the water level, et cetera. They attended one or two meetings. They said at that time, all you people have to do is pay for five loads of stone and the Parks Branch will provide the rest of the stones required to fix the shore. At that time, Bannock Point rehab in the Whiteshell would provide the manpower to place the stone, to protect the shoreline. Well, some 20, 30 loads later, and 20 years, we are still waiting for that service.

Mr. Chairperson, to this day, no one from the Parks or government has come back to consult or ask if we need any services. Over the years, our road association has spent thousands of dollars on shore repairs, roads, road maintenance, sand for our beaches. Yes, we all pay our share in provincial and federal taxes which go to maintaining our parks, roads, et cetera, whether we use the parks or not.

In Bill 41, you address service fees, Section 18(2), to review the level and the cost of providing services and what fee should be charged or provided. There is no indication that consultation would be meaningful as the minister would have the final decision on the fees. Mr. Chairperson and members of this committee, maybe you should be looking at increasing user fees in campgrounds and trailer parks. They are the ones who get the services, new washrooms, showers, new beaches, playgrounds, et cetera and extra summer staff, because leased cottage owners and private cottage owners have to provide their own services.

Section 22(1), 22(2), 22(3) of Bill 41 addresses certificates of debt and liens imposed on private landowners and how the government intends to collect these fees. Well, here again, I am not opposed to paying my fair share for services if they are provided by agreement or negotiations with private land owners. Mr. Chairperson and members of the committee, can I or any person in this province of Manitoba go to this government and say we want to collect from you and your members of the House back debts that were made in previous years? No, I cannot because there is no law holding any minister responsible for governments who make deficits.

I say to the minister, withdraw this section of Bill 41. Based on my past experience as a union president for over 25 years, to resolve an issue, it is better to negotiate it. I urge this government to sit down and discuss and negotiate an agreement with private landowners or private landowners' associations. That way, Mr. Minister, we will all be winners. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Lewandoski. We will now call on Mr. Hendrik Herfst. Do you have a written presentation, sir?

Mr. Hendrik Herfst (The Defenders of Nopiming): I left it with the—

Mr. Chairperson: Yes, it is being passed out now.

Mr. Herfst: Right. It is actually not a written brief, it is a series of points. I hope that the substance of them might be of some assistance. It certainly was intended that they crystallize some of the concerns that we had.

Mr. Chairperson: Go ahead, Mr. Herfst.

Mr. Herfst: I would just like to raise a small point of principle about having to pay for a copy of Bill 41.

We were asked to pay \$2.70 for the bill, and it is not really the money that is the issue. A number of us felt that when a bill is under discussion as part of the democratic process, it really should be freely available to the members of the public to encourage discussion.

The other item is that on the July 8, 1993, a letter was sent to Mr. Enns requesting clarification of Section 9(2). We have not yet received that clarification and look forward to hearing the minister provide a statement in response to this presentation perhaps.

To go to the substance of a very short brief then, The Defenders of Nopiming are a public interest group focusing on environmental issues, and the organization arises from a reaction to the logging licence issued to Abitibi-Price last year. We found public enthusiasm for our direct intervention in environmental issues to be very high.

The introduction of a park system plan, the call for park management plans, the orderly zoning of parks, except for nontourism economic development obviously, the provision of park reserves, including a five-year designation, all have in them the seeds of what could have been a really topnotch parks act. In addition, the reference to the principles of sustainable development in the Preamble is very welcome.

We point out, however, that the government's use of terms in various contexts, including this parks bill, is in our opinion incorrect. Unfortunately, the issue of economic development introduced in the bill is an overriding concern, and we call for the shelving of the total bill to allow re-examination of the circumstances.

Not including the only slightly obscured manipulation in the process of the round table discussion on Natural Lands and Special Places, the writing of the bill has been a very successful operation. Unfortunately, the patient died.

At the risk of sounding patronizing, which is not the intent, we would like to define our use of the terms natural and sustainable development. Webster's was at hand, and I am sure that Oxford is very similar. The definition of natural is satisfactory for us as (a) growing as a native and without cultivation; (b) living in or as if in a state of nature, untouched by the influence of civilization and society.

Sustainable development is defined in our common future as the assurance that development meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. It continues. The concept implies limitations imposed by technology, social organization and by the ability of the biosphere to absorb the effects of human activities. These limitations make the case for a limit to growth in contrast to industry's efforts to turn the concept into the growth of limits.

* (0030)

The general public has for a century perceived parks as natural places. Our common future now spells out a pragmatic purpose for parks as places to preserve ecosystems and maintain biodiversity. There are many painful choices to be made to achieve sustainable development, and the minister, if nothing else, has certainly shown courage.

Bill 41 seems to try to be all things to all people. It wants to give preservation a place and to give logging and mining the same place, to eat the cake and to have it, too. It wants to deal with the convoluted and contradictory issues of cottages and be fiscally responsible as well. In the end, it wants to be too many things and it fails. It has generated opposition, alienation and controversy. We feel the bill should be shelved and re-examined in a work-together atmosphere. Mr. Enns could do the province a great service by setting the tone for the resolution of the conflicts.

I have a number of letters. We have been in correspondence with a number of organizations internationally, but I think just the one is of substance. I might mention, one is from Canton, New York, Wild Earth, and the other one is from the American Ecological Research Institute in Fort Collins, Colorado. But it is a letter from Kaisa Junninen, who has just recently spent a year here in the province and who is a resident, recently returned, to Joensuu in Finland. The excerpts that I found relevant are similar to my experiences. You probably noticed from my name that I am not a native Canadian. I am a Canadian by choice and very proud of it. My experiences would be somewhat similar in a way, and I might make a comment on that afterwards.

She writes that her homeland is Finland, a country which is known for its vast boreal forest and

natural beauty. Many people in Canada, including foresters, biologists and even conservationists, talk about Finland as a country where no conflict between forest management and wildlife exists, but where sustainable forestry keeps everybody happy. Such harmony is a dream in Canada, too, and numerous times I have heard Finland referred to as the great example which Canada should follow and learn from. Unfortunately, all that Finland is a good example of is a big ecocatastrophe. Except for a few little patches, there is no virgin forest left in Finland.

A conservation plan was proposed. The plan included all the most valuable old-growth forest in the southern half of Finland which accounts for only .53 percent of the total area of forests. Even this minimal area has resulted in major complaints from logging companies and municipalities concerned, and the future of these last patches looks bleak.

Having lived in Canada for almost a year and travelled across the country, I have been very impressed by the immense relatively untouched wilderness areas that cover most of your country. Do not sell your unique natural heritage for short-term economical reasons. You are Canadians. You are Manitobans. This is your country and your province, both of which, you have good reasons to be proud of.

Do not be the kind of fools we have been in Finland. Learn from our errors. Do not repeat them. I hope you realize what long-term decisions you are facing. Make up your minds in favour of a great wilderness you are privileged to have. You can never get it back if you sell it.

Our discussions on the bill have, in large part, been fairly pragmatic, but I think that those of you who read my letter to the editor will recognize that I felt that one of the problems with the bill was that it lacked the vision of some of the sections of The Park Lands Act and lost some of the poetry.

I think it is important that, in addition to the issues that we have raised in resource management and in terms of bio-diversity and ecosystem preservation, we recognize that parks are also to feel spring, to consort briefly and feel the stirrings of life in the warm shelter of wooden ribs. We cannot be preoccupied only with the business and forget the subtle romance, the meaningful intimacy of a natural cradle. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much, Mr. Herfst, for your presentation this evening.

I will now call on Lea Scott, Denis Pereux, Prasad Gowdar, Kim Monson. These are second calls, by the way, now. Bill Kocay, Ed Johanson, Margaret Reid, Gloria Koch, Pamela Koch, Walter Fast, Mr. and Mrs. Atkins, R.A. Mitchell, Ray Knowles, Vallen and Irene Melnick, John M. Walker, Mary and Robin Carpenter, Peter Thiessen, Jack McMahon, Donald Robert Manych, Bernice Hilton, Mr. Joe Kelly.

We have the written presentation here. Mr. Kelly, we have your presentation handed out. You could start whenever you are ready.

Mr. Joseph Kelly (Private Citizen): I have sort of decided that I would like to thank the committee and the organization which it works under for allowing me to spend ten and a half hours sitting here waiting to give my little speech. I am not going to bother reading it. You have it in front of you; you can read it. I feel a little silly in the sense that it was a simple presentation that I was supposed to say because my grandmother has had this cottage for ages, and they are deciding to charge them money for services they do not receive.

My grandmother is well into her 80s, and she could not do this. There is no way she could spend 10 hours sitting here waiting for this. Other than that, thank you. I have learned a lot, and I can see why the government is in the situation it is in. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thanks, Mr. Kelly, for your presentation.

Stewart Corbett, Ruth Johnson, Donald Thompson, Gerald and Marlene Johnson, Marjorie V. Stevenson, Robert Henley, Ellen Carpenter, Horst Kaufuss, Robert Hutton.

Now, these two are Martin Toews—they are not on your list by the way. They just registered this evening. Martin Toews, and the next one is Jean-Philippe Sourisseau, and Mr. Sourisseau's presentation will be in French for the committee members' information.

Vous pouvez commencer, Monsieur Sourisseau.
[Translation]

You may begin, Mr. Sourisseau.

M. Jean-Philippe Sourisseau (Private Citizen): Afterwards I will just sort of recap it in English. It is not long.

L'esprit et la lettre de la loi.

Monsieur le ministre, Monsieur le président, Mesdames et Messieurs du comité, Mesdames et Messieurs du public, je vous remercie de me donner l'occasion de donner quelques réflexions quant au projet de loi 41.

En tant que membre du Club Sierra, je suis soucieux de toute loi qui pourrait toucher les espaces naturelles et les parcs qui existent pour conserver ces espaces. Et comme nous le savons tous, toute loi existe en deux parties: d'abord, il y a l'esprit dans lequel la loi est écrite et, ensuite, il y a la lettre de la loi, c'est-à-dire, un texte qui sera interprété pour donner une forme juridique à l'esprit de la loi.

L'esprit dans lequel le présent projet de loi est conçu semble, au premier abord, être tout à fait celui de la conservation et de la protection de la nature. Toutefois, c'est la lettre de la loi qui révèle le manque de volonté de vouloir en respecter l'esprit.

D'abord, il y a l'article 5, le rôle des parcs provinciaux: a) de conserver les écosystèmes; b) de sauvegarder des ressources naturelles; c) d'offrir des activités éducatives.

Mais, c'est l'alinéa d) qui jette tout par la fenêtre car le texte devient tout à coup caoutchouteux: "d'offrir des possibilités dans le domaine économique qui s'harmonisent avec la classification des parcs et des catégories d'utilisation des terres".

Si l'on poursuit la lecture du projet de loi. Au paragraphe 7(2) "Classification des parcs provinciaux", l'alinéa e) est encore une fois une clause échappatoire: "tout autre type de parc provincial que le règlement peut préciser". Donc, on pourrait passer un règlement pour le parc de pâtre et papier, ou le parc de développement durable par la coupe à blanc de forêts pour la création d'un produit destiné à la poubelle.

Le même but semble être visé par le paragraphe 7(3): "Catégories d'utilisation des terres", alinéa g) "toute autre catégorie que le règlement peut préciser". Et voilà un autre sapin qui passe. On précise n'importe quoi. La catégorie des terres réservées à l'exploitation des sociétés minières et forestières qui ne se soucient guère de la vie et l'avenir des gens sur place? Pourquoi pas?

Encore plus tard arrive-t-on aux règlements du ministre, que le ministre peut prendre des mesures

concernant les activités dans les parcs provinciaux, la délivrance de licences et de permis pour ces activités ainsi que les conditions, le renouvellement et l’annulation des licences et des permis.

Et si monsieur le ministre est un jour trop fatigué pour lire la demande d’ouvrir un abattoir de gibier, et si monsieur le ministre trouve qu’une forêt vierge est d’autant plus belle quand elle est plantée en lignes droites? Bon, d’accord, il semble peu probable qu’un ministre puisse faire un tel abus de la discréption que lui permettrait le texte de cette loi. Mais, parfois, il pourrait arriver que le ministre chargé des parcs et de leur designation soit plus préoccupé par les intérêts des gens qui ne voient dans la nature qu’une ressource à exploiter.

Certes, nous sommes aussi partie de la nature, mais trop souvent nous la sous-estimons. Nous oublions qu’elle nous permet de vivre non par son exploitation mais par son existence. Sans les arbres, pas d’air à respirer. Sans les réservoirs d’eau que sont les lacs et les rivières, pas d’eau à boire. Sans la pluie, pas de récoltes. Pour vraiment respecter l’esprit de la loi que l’on nous propose, il faudrait d’abord que l’on donne plus de précision à la lettre de la loi. Que l’on y insère des paragraphes stipulant le processus décisionnel par lequel les parcs seront désignés, les utilisations seront décidées et, enfin, que le ministre sera avisé avant qu’il ne fasse descendre un ukase.

Mesdames, Messieurs, je vous remercie de votre attention et je me tiens à votre disposition pour répondre à vos questions.

[Translation]

The spirit and the letter of the law.

Mr. Minister, Mr. Chairperson, members of the committee, ladies and gentlemen in the audience, I thank you for giving me the opportunity to share with you my thoughts on Bill 41.

As a member of the Sierra Club, I am concerned about any law that might affect natural spaces and the parks that exist to protect those spaces. As we all know, any law is divided into two parts: First, there is the spirit in which the law was drafted, and then there is the letter of the law, i.e. wording that will be interpreted to give a legal form to the spirit of the law.

At first sight, the spirit in which this bill was conceived appears to be precisely that of conserving and protecting nature. However, the

letter of the law reveals a lack of will to respect the spirit of the law.

To begin with, there is Section 5, “Purposes of provincial parks”: (a) to conserve ecosystems; (b) to preserve natural resources; (c) to provide educational opportunities.

But it is paragraph (d) that throws everything out of kilter because the wording suddenly grows murky: “(d) to provide economic opportunities in accordance with park classifications and land use categories.”

Let us continue on reading the bill. In subsection 7(2), “Classification of provincial parks”, paragraph (e) is another escape clause: “any other type of provincial park that may be specified in the regulation.” So that means a regulation could be made for a pulp and paper park or a sustainable development park by cutting down the forest to create a product that will end up in the garbage can.

The same objective seems to be contemplated in subsection 7(3), “Land use categories”, paragraph (g): “any other category that may be specified in the regulation.” And another fir tree bites the dust. Anything is stipulated. A category of lands set aside for exploitation by mining and forestry companies? Why not?

Further on we get to the regulations the minister can make, where he can take measures regarding activities in provincial parks, issue licences and permits for these activities, set conditions on and renew or cancel licences and permits.

What would happen if one day the minister were too tired to read an application for a game animal slaughterhouse, or if he found that a virgin forest is even more beautiful than usual when it is planted in straight lines? All right, okay, it would be unlikely that a minister would abuse the discretion the wording of the bill gives him in quite that way, but sometimes it could just happen that the minister responsible for parks and their designation might end up being more concerned about the interests of people who only view nature as an exploitable resource.

All of us, of course, are part of nature, but we often underestimate it. We forget that it allows us to live not by the way it is exploited but by the way it exists. Without trees, there would be no air to breathe. Without the water stored in lakes and rivers, there would be no water to drink. Without the rain, there would be no harvests. To truly respect

the spirit of the law we are being proposed, the letter of the law has to be made much clearer. Provisions on the decision-making process behind park designations, on how uses will be determined and how the minister is to be advised before he issues orders in council have to be incorporated into the bill.

Ladies and gentlemen, I thank you for your kind attention and am available to answer your questions.

[English]

Briefly, all I am saying is that if you are going to write a law, the spirit of the law as I read it, it is fine. It is when it gets down to the letter of the text—and I sit there going, well, it is great to talk about conservation, it is great to talk about this—it is not spelled out. How it works is not spelled out, how the parks will be designated and what the process is is not spelled out. How the input will be given from the public and all the parties concerned is not spelled out. Basically your bill will cause you nothing but grief and will cause nothing but grief to everyone who follows you.

It would be very simple to solve all those problems right now by redrafting it and just putting these things in. Once that is in place, then you have a system where we argue amongst ourselves and all you do is follow our recommendations. Do you not think that would be more sensible? We can sit there and hit each other over the head.

M. le président: C'est tout, Monsieur Sourisseau?

M. Sourisseau: C'est tout. Je vous remercie beaucoup. Any questions? No?

M. le président: Non. C'est correct. A la prochaine fois.

[Translation]

Mr. Chairperson: Is that all, Mr. Sourisseau?

Mr. Sourisseau: That is all. Thank you very much. Any questions? No?

Mr. Chairperson: No. Very well then. Until next time.

[English]

We are now back to No. 1, Vira and Dr. Russ Evans, second call. Doreen Ander, second call. These will all be second call, by the way. Alex Spinak—

Mrs. Carstairs: Mr. Chair.

Mr. Chairperson: Yes, Mrs. Carstairs.

Mrs. Carstairs: In that we have a session for tomorrow, would it not be more appropriate to call these people for a second time tomorrow morning at nine o'clock?

Mr. Chairperson: I would ask what the will of the committee is at this time? Is it the will of the committee.

Mrs. Carstairs: There is nobody else here.

Mr. Chairperson: In that case, is it the will of the committee? Committee will rise.

COMMITTEE ROSE AT: 12:44 a.m.

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS PRESENTED BUT NOT READ

I am representing myself as a private landowner. I, James Andrew Barabash, have a few things I would like to mention about the service fee. I belong to the Park Lands Private Association.

(1) Any maintenance that is done on our roads has been paid from our own association and volunteered work.

(2) We, the association, built up the riverbank by hauling the rocks to prevent further erosion.

(3) We maintain our own beach by hauling sand, cleaning up the weeds and cutting the grass.

(4) We have our own docks, which were paid and built by the association, which also maintains them.

(5) The Parks board comes and collects a fee for the docks and ramps on the private roads.

(6) All the years we have been here we pay for the seasonal passes for the park.

(1) Campers who pay the fee at the gate receive washroom facilities with hot and cold showers, toilet paper is supplied, plus park maintenance of washrooms, fire pits and wells. Also, there is the maintenance of roads in summer and winter, Parks Branch protection and garbage collection. Private cottage owners do not receive this luxury.

(2) We pay our provincial taxes through gasoline taxes on all gas motorized engines, examples: lawn mowers, chain saws and outboard motors, taxes on snowmobile licences, which we are not allowed to drive on the highway. If caught on the road, there is a heavy fine.

No matter where we go, we pay for an all-protection tax which was passed in April 1992.

Levies not related to services:

13(1.1) This is no free lunch for anyone in the association.

I am against Bill 41 because it provides for property taxation without a vote. It takes away our most basic property rights. As a private property owner, I do not want to see eastern Europe transplanted into Manitoba.

There are a few privately owned properties in the park and more privately owned properties outside the park, which are not subjected to the property tax and Bill 41, which will not affect them.

I therefore refuse to recognize this legislation unless I have a vote. I am also prepared to pay a negotiated fee by agreement of the association.

Yours sincerely,

James Barabash

* * *

Please tender my submission sent this day by fax to the above hearing. I would also request that a copy of this fax be placed in the hands of: Oscar Lathlin, NDP critic; Gary Doer, Leader of the opposition; Norman Prouse, Director of Parks; Paul Edwards, Leader of the Liberal Party; and Premier Gary Filmon.

The government of Manitoba has again failed to consider and acknowledge the residents of this province who live beyond the concrete pad known as the Perimeter Highway.

The government of Manitoba has again failed to listen to the people that have placed them in the hallowed chairs they sit in and dictate from.

The government of Manitoba has again failed to abide by the promises made to the people, that the people who live in the entire province of Manitoba, that is, between the 49th parallel and 60th parallel, shall have involvement in the decisions of this government.

How does the government of Manitoba expect people to attend a meeting 500 miles away with 22 hours notice, especially when the notice is received in the evening. The government of Manitoba has already cut our wages as employees of that government and expects us to take another day, unpaid holiday, to attend a very urgent and important meeting in Winnipeg. There was

absolutely no time allowed to make arrangements to leave jobs and families and travel to attend this meeting.

Has the government consulted the taxpayers and the people who use, live in, work in the provincial parks about Bill 41, or was it constructed by someone sitting at a desk? The closest some of that personnel probably was to a provincial park was to fly over them in a government jet.

I agree with Bill 41 but not in its entirety. A new parks act is required, and the usage of each park would have to differ, but these decisions should not only be made by the government of Manitoba, with offices in Winnipeg, of course, but also by the taxpayers of Manitoba and especially the people that use the park, and neighbours living around the park.

A park cannot be expected to pay for itself. It would appear that the government of Manitoba, by allowing itself to be the sole judge on what a park will be used for, seems to think that by allowing certain industry, exploration, mining and logging, it may accomplish this. Funds from other departments of the government, such as Tourism, should be allocated to the budget of provincial parks.

As a member of an association, we have continually asked for a breakdown of the provincial parks income and expenditures but to no avail. It has been very frustrating dealing with the Parks department and Natural Resources with the government of Manitoba. But I must compliment the employees dealing with Clearwater Lake Provincial Park. I do believe that most of them have the park in their best interest.

Thank you for accepting my written submission. I would very much like to have made this submission in person and listened to my fellow park residents and given them my support. If we had been advised that hearings would be taking place over a longer period of time, not just the evening of July 20, 1993, you can be sure that many more submissions would have been made in person.

Harvey Ander

The Pas, Manitoba