

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Friday, April 23rd, 1965.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, would you be good enough to call the Committee on Ways and Means.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition and the proposed sub-amendment by the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, could we have this motion stand?

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, then the next order of business.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Attorney-General. The Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, in the absence of the honourable member will this stand?

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, perhaps we could now call the Shared Services debate.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Education. The Honourable the Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, like the Honourable Minister who moved this motion, I speak on it with a continuing awareness of the responsibility of all of us who discuss the important issues involved, to do so in the most statesmanlike manner possible. With two exceptions, Madam Speaker, one which I would characterize as minor, and one which I believe to be major, I can compliment the Honourable the Minister on his presentation. I thought he was fair, as usual, and reasonable and made a good presentation, with those exceptions, of the government's point of view. The minor exception that I would wish to call the attention of the House, is on Page 1630 of Hansard, and I can read very briefly from approximately the middle of the page: "The Report before the House" (and I'm reading the Honourable Minister's words now, Madam Speaker, from Hansard) "The Report before the House recommends that on a voluntary and experimental basis school districts and divisions may continue present arrangements for experimental shared services to the students in attendance at private and parochial schools under the jurisdiction of the public school authority." Then the point that I want to mention: "And one of the interesting facts disclosed during the hearing was that three school districts or divisions had from time to time offered such shared services on a rather limited basis to students from private and parochial schools."

Madam Speaker, it's not a major point, but this, in my opinion, was not disclosed for the first time at the committee hearings, because certainly I had mentioned it during the discussion in the House. I believe that some other members did as well. So that as far as I was concerned, and I think other members of the committee, this was not something that was new.

The second exception to my general statement of appreciation for the Honourable Minister's statement is found on the last page and to have it in context I have to read quite a lengthy paragraph. It begins almost at the top of Page 1633 and reads as follows: "We are seeking consensus of the House in the belief that such a voluntary scheme will permit divisions and districts now offering such services to continue; that further experimentation will take place, that fuller opportunities will be made available to many children and that our people will enter into the spirit of further mutual respect and tolerance and that a minimum of government prescription be involved. We seek a broad consensus of the House." No objection to that part - I read it only to get the remainder in context. This is the part that I want to emphasize: "Let it be clear, however, that this matter of a consensus in the House cannot affect the principle of government responsibility. The government of course does and must accept responsibility for whatever action may be taken following the report, regardless of whether or not a reasonable consensus of the House is achieved. However, if no consensus can be found the government may very well feel that the report does not pass that test of public acceptability which is necessary to justify its being implemented in the particular circumstances of this particular province. The decision therefore with respect to action to be taken will be made in the light of the measure of support that the report receives in this House, bearing in mind the overriding necessity of keeping this issue removed from the arena of party politics. It is clearly understood, however, that with or without the consensus the government must and does accept responsibility for whatever action, if any, that may be taken following this report.

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd): Whatever that decision may be, the principle of government responsibility is preserved while at the same time the right of the government to base its policy on the achievement of a reasonable concensus is clear and unmistakable. "

Madam Speaker, I confess that I find it difficult to understand exactly what is meant by that statement. I think it is most unclear. I think it is contradictory and I would like to know exactly what it means. I think it is the First Minister's statement, rather than the statement of the Minister of Education, because the First Minister has been making some statement with regard to consensus. It seems to me that the lack of logic in this part of government responsibility, and yet perhaps no implementation of the report, is something that I find impossible to reconcile. If this statement means what I think it means - I'm going to give what I think it means - if it means what I think it means, it's an amazing statement, in my opinion. What I take it to mean is that even though this motion of concurrence is adopted by this House, that the government still may not implement the recommendation. That's what I think that statement is saying. That to me, Madam Speaker, is a completely irresponsible and also unconstitutional position for the government to take.

Agreement with this motion, Madam Speaker, means that the government obligates itself to implement the recommendations of that report. That's what concurrence means. If the government did not intend to do so, it should never have moved concurrence. The report could have been received, it could have been left at that stage, even under those conditions. I would have been prepared to argue that there was an obligation on the government to take some further action but at least that might have been arguable. But to move concurrence in the House and at the same time to appear to say that we're not bound even though concurrence passed to implement the program is to me completely unthinkable.

But, Madam Speaker, in addition to those considerations, is the government really telling us that it is asking the Opposition in the House to declare government policy? Because if it's saying that even though the government has a majority, that it's not going to implement the program unless it gets some, what it calls a reasonable amount of support from the other side, then to me this is a complete negation of governmental responsibility. If that's the case this violation of responsibility is even more serious, in my opinion, than the procedural one that I just referred to a minute ago.

Madam Speaker, I'm breaking no confidences to say, now that the committee has reported, that this matter received some discussion in the committee; the committee was open to the press and some reports have already been made on it. At that time both the Leader of the New Democratic Party and I took the position that I am taking now, that is that the government simply cannot and should not evade its responsibility by setting forth some such ultimatum as this. If that's what it means, Madam Speaker, I'm of exactly the same opinion that I was before. It's the government's job to decide policy and bring it in, and pass it. In my opinion, concurrence in this report, definitely obligates the government to do so.

Madam Speaker, as to the commission's work, I found this a most interesting committee though I must say that I was not impressed with all phases of it. The Honourable Minister who chaired it was ultra courteous and understanding. Certainly he did not try to hold those who made representations to the committee, and there were a good many of them, down to the terms of reference that had been prescribed by the House. I was glad that that freedom was accorded, I think it was advantageous that it should be. But at the first meeting of the committee, Madam Chairman, I made the suggestion - which was not a popular one with my honourable friend the First Minister - that I thought that the government's mind was already made up on this matter. I made that because from my experience in the House with government generally I have found it to be the rule, that on a matter as important as this one that the government is pretty certain of its position and its policy before it sets up such a committee as that, or indeed before it discusses the matter in the House. And so I made this suggestion. The Honourable the First Minister said that that was not the case, that the committee was intended and expected to perform a valid function, that we were not a formality, that we had a job to do, and I think all members of the committee, apart from those who belong to the Executive Council, took that position seriously and proceeded on that basis. But in my opinion, Madam Speaker, no consensus developed at those committee meetings, and I say with regret that I think it is true that the members of the Cabinet in general made no effort to see that a consensus developed. It's true that we held several meetings; it's true that the public took it seriously; it's true that we had many briefs - approximately 30 in number, good briefs. The public came forward and placed their views on record with us.

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd).....

I still regret that some of the most influential of those delegations who came to present briefs to us, felt that they could not or would not make a declaration on the matter of principle. Because I still maintain, Madam Speaker, that the main butt of that committee's instruction was the question of principle, and I read from the terms of reference, leaving out some of the earlier "whereases," I come to the last "whereas" - these are the instructions to the committee which were incorporated in the report that was presented here, Votes and Proceedings No. 33 - reading the last "whereas." "Whereas a program of Shared Services may entitle a child attending a private school to avail himself at a public school of such of its services as may be desired and which could be provided without detriment to the public school; now therefore be it resolved that a special committee of nine members of the Legislature be appointed to consider the advisability of introducing a program of Shared Services without detriment to the public school; and be it further resolved that in the consideration of the aforesaid the committee shall adhere to the principle set out in the preamble herein," and so on. I have maintained in the committee and I maintain here - I think it is correct - that the central theme of the instruction that this House gave to that committee was to consider the advisability of introducing a program of Shared Services without detriment to the public school. And I was sorry that some at least, of the influential and well-informed delegations that appeared before the committee, not only had failed to incorporate anything dealing with the principle of Shared Services in their brief but when asked the definite question as to where they stood on the question of principle, said either that they had no opinion or that their organization - for instance the Winnipeg School Board, the Manitoba Teachers' Society - said that they were not instructed to give an opinion on that question. And when I asked if they would return to their organizations and get an opinion on that, in a couple of cases, so far as the Chairman of the Winnipeg School Board was concerned, he did not undertake to do so, but another member said that he would. But we never got the opinion. I understood the President of the Manitoba Teachers' Society to say that she would discuss it further with the organization, but we heard nothing further. I think that this was the central theme of all. And of course some of the organizations that made representation, we didn't have to ask what their stand was on the principle because they incorporated that opinion very definitely into their brief.

I must say that it seemed to me that though the public did this committee the courtesy of thinking that we were not a formality and came forward with many and excellent briefs, the members of the government on the committee did not appear to me to take the interest in discussing the briefs with them that you would have expected if they were trying to advance a program with the groups and bodies that had shown that degree of interest in this question.

I must say that as far as the private members on the government side were concerned, I thought that they did take an intelligent and active interest and entered to some extent into the discussion. I know that the First Minister has said that he thinks it's not profitable to enter into an argument with people who are presenting briefs before a committee, and I can concede that; but I still think that if you're trying to get a program accepted by an interested public, that it's well to at least discuss their brief and the government proposal with them.

I have taken the position at all times on this committee, Madam Speaker, that its job was not as simple a one as just adding up on one side those who were in favour of this principle or program or both and on the other column adding up those who disagree with one or both. I don't think that's the basis on which we should approach a matter of that kind and I certainly do not urge that that is the basic test to be applied here. But on the other hand, I could not help but be interested in the fact that the vast majority of the approximately 30 briefs that were presented to us indicated to me that they were opposed to the principle. It's true, as the Minister stated in his speech here the other day, that the majority of them also said that if such a program were implemented that they would do their best to accommodate themselves to it and to work with it, and pointed out some things that they thought would be advantageous in the matter of administration and in that way I am sure made valuable suggestions. But so far as the principle was concerned, Madam Speaker, it seemed to me that there was anything but a concensus so far as the interested public was concerned, and there the matter was left.

The committee, Madam Speaker, never met again from the time of hearing the briefs until we met to consider the report. The report was presented by my honourable friend the Minister, a draft report, of course, a draft report for discussion by the committee members. And while I must say that those of us who did not belong to the government group were extended every courtesy and had all the opportunity in the world to make our position clear, there again,

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd),so far as I was aware, there was no effort made to try and secure a meeting of the minds in order to get concensus so far as the committee was concerned.

Madam Speaker, I am told that even the Denturists Committee that is meeting still while the House is in session, that even it has held two or three meetings since the public representations ended in order to try and arrive so far as possible at a, close to a unanimous report as possible. It seems to me that if, and I am not disparaging the importance of the committee on this matter, but if it's worthwhile for this committee to meet several times since the public's representations ended, it would seem to me to have been worthwhile to have held some discussions, first with the interested individuals and organizations who appeared before the committee and later with the committee members themselves to try and reach such a consensus.

So, Madam Speaker, I must report so far as I can judge the results of this committee that we did interest the public to the extent that we had many briefs, many good briefs. There was some discussion which I would feel was on the whole advantageous so that the public would be informed of one another's point of view, and certainly no limit was placed upon the scope of the representations that were made to us. A few of those who came before us were quite definitely in favour; as I judged them, many were opposed. In the great majority, I felt that the supporters of private schools were against the principle of shared services. Certain ones when asked didn't hesitate to mention their stand, and I tried, in practically all the cases where the brief didn't specifically mention it to find out the stand of the organization or individual on principle. As far as I can see, no real consensus developed on the committee because two of us were opposed -- I forget the number at the final meeting that were in favour, because we were two members short but what's much more important than that in my opinion, Madam Speaker, I am convinced that there is no concensus so far as the public is concerned, and it's the public that really counts in this matter in my opinion. Unless the public adopts the principle as well as being willing to work with the administrative problems involved, I think that we could not gain anything by proceeding along the lines suggested at the present time and so it is my regretful duty, Madam Speaker, to say that after all the length of time that has been taken by the government in arriving at even this measure of progress upon this question and the committee meetings that were held, and the ascertaining of the views of the public that came before us, my own conclusion is that the public acceptance of the principle has not been such that I feel that I can support the motion for concurrence.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that the debate be adjourned.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam, may we now proceed with the second readings that stand on the Order Paper immediately following?

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 102. The Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, I have only a few brief comments to make on the conclusion of this debate. The main point of interest expressed by Members of the Opposition was the principle relating to the proposal for sale of, or the proposal whereby meals at which wild game and waterfowl would be served, could now be made available under this provision of the Act, and I would call the attention of honourable members to the fact that this proposed amendment is merely one under the regulation making power of the Act and it authorizes the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to make regulations whereby this privilege can be extended. There is the old adage of course, there are none so blind as those who will not see and after listening to the debate, particularly from some of the members in the Opposition, Madam Speaker, I suppose it could be changed to be read, there are none so deaf as those who will not hear, because I made it quite clear at the outset in introducing the bill what the purpose of this section was, that it would be used for special occasions and I expect on a very limited basis for service organizations or other groups who from time to time at the present time for the information of such wildlife devotees as the Leader of the Opposition and others, for their information already use wild game but unfortunately they use it illegally, and this is really to correct a practice that has been going on for years and years under the administration of the present government and lo and behold illegally under the previous administration as well. So this is merely meant

(MR. LYON cont'd) to correct those, or to make legal the practice that has been going on for some considerable time and to allow the applications to be made to the department so that the director of wildlife will have some idea of where applications, or where these affairs are being conducted and can give or can refuse an application for special occasions.

I'll give my honourable friends an example of the type of thing that I'm talking about and this is a concrete - I won't mention the organization but it is an organization that is known and I would say respected by all members of the House but not to cause them embarrassment I will not mention their name. This particular organization was having a dinner not too many months ago in the City of Winnipeg with delegates from outside of the Metropolitan area, and some of the delegates from outside of the Metropolitan area thought it would be suitable if from their own stocks, their own private stocks of wildlife they were to provide one meal for this group, moose steak I think it was and enquiries were made as to whether or not this could be done and the group were told of course that there was no power under the Act for it to be done. It had been the intention may I say to have this section - we thought as a matter of fact this section was already in the new Wildlife Act it had been the intention to have the regulation made. Well we found that legally we couldn't give them the permission that they sought for this. No question of poaching involved, no question of wildlife stock being diminished or anything like that at all, this is a question of people from their own supplies of wildlife meat taken legally, being able to band together as chuch groups often do and have for instance a game pie.

I can give honourable members another instance, a church with which I have some familiarity used to have game pie dinners. They had them for years under this administration and under the previous administration and lo and behold all those years that little innocent affair where these ducks and geese, and in some cases venison pies were served, all of this from private stocks of the members, from the freezers of the members of the congregation, this was being done illegally. But it was still being done and this is very simply what this amendment is attempting to correct, a situation where an action is taking place, is going to take place in any case and we want to have some control over it so that applications can be made and granted.

There never was any suggestion that wild duck or wild goose or venison or moose steak would be appearing on menus; that was expressed in clear terms at the outset of the debate. As I say those who wanted to hear it, could hear it; and those who wanted to make inflammatory speeches to grab headlines, wouldn't hear it and would make the speeches in any case and that is what has happened. So I merely say, Madam Speaker, that when we do come to the committee stage there is one further thing I should add, to make certainty double sure, because this is what we were going to put in the regulation in any case, I will bring forward an amendment to the present section dealing with this matter which will say that these, this permission will be granted only upon application so that the regulation that is drafted up will say that special permission for this kind of a meal to be served will be given only on application being made to the Director of Wildlife for Manitoba. Now I can think of nothing that is simpler, nothing that is safer and nothing about which there has been so much, I would say almost useless talk in the course of this debate. I hope that that will finally put to rest some of the fears -- and I don't know if they were really fears or if they were just statements that were being made for the sake of making them -- some of the fears in any case that have been aroused because of these inflammatory statements among the general public as to what is really intended here. It's a very simple amendment and this is what is going to be done by it.

And I suggest, Madam Speaker, that at the second reading stage of the bill in law amendments, I'll bring this section up or bring this minor amendment in to make certainty double sure so that we can make sure that there will be no abuse of the section whatsoever. Certainly it is not the desire of the government, the department, anybody in the Wildlife Branch to be stimulating anything that would be adverse or prejudicial in any way to wildlife in Manitoba. I say it again, the reason why it was brought in to permit special menus, special dinners to be served on special occasions by special groups. It's very simple and that's the intention of the legislation. I don't believe any serious comment was raised about any of the other sections.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I could ask a question of the Minister who has just spoken? Is it his intention to leave in the Act or to remove from the Act the section that reads, "during the period of the year when the hunting and killing of the wild animal is permitted under this Act, or the regulation, for food in a restaurant or place where meals are served for remuneration or the hope or expectations thereof." Is this section to remain as is or is it to be deleted?

MR. LYON: told my honourable friend that there will be an amendment to that section.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I'm sorry I don't think that the statement of the Minister applies strictly to this. He said that he thinks it would be under regulations but is this section to be removed where it says that it can be served in a restaurant or place where meals are served for remuneration? Is this to remain in the Act or to come out?

MR. LYON: my honourable friend can wait and see the amendment when it's brought into law amendments. I've told him.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the Members. The question before the House, the second reading of Bill No. 102.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cherniack, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harris, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, Moeller, Paulley, Roblin, Seaborn, Shewman, Stanes, Steinkopf, Weir, Witney, Wright and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick and Vielfaure.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 31; Nays, 8.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 114. The Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Madam Speaker, may this matter be allowed to stand. The honourable member isn't feeling well.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 59, 3 (a) --

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, as we enter the Wildlife Branch I would just like to pay tribute to the work of the Game and Fish Associations in the federation in the Province of Manitoba. This group has been one of the outstanding ones who work with the department, I am sure in most occasions. I can't say that they always agree with the department but this is probably good in itself, but this is a good example of the community at large and people who are not directly involved in government activity participating in what is really good for the whole of the community.

On Wednesday night of this week for example I was fortunate enough to be able to go to Neepawa where the Neepawa club was presented with one of the trophies as one of the best clubs of the year, and I think it is notable that that club has done for the Province of Manitoba as a whole some very worthwhile work. Its work for example in the junior rifle league has been most valuable. It is the area that has pioneered the training of young boys in the handling of weapons and making sure that the tragic accidents which unfortunately mar our hunting season only too frequently are at least reduced by having the young people in our province trained on the proper handling of weapons, and this was started there in Neepawa by a volunteer group, the Game and Fish Association of that area and it has now spread across the province.

The government has now followed through true enough with its Hunter Safety Program and I think a good deal of it is based on the work that was done by this volunteer organization in the first place. I think it's extremely important in all phases of our activity here that we maintain and retain that close connection with the volunteer associations across the province in whatever field it may be and to keep them working with the government, with the civil service to improve whatever phase it is that they are particularly interested in and I can think of no more outstanding group than the Game and Fish Federation in this regard.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): I have chosen the occasion to speak under this particular heading with regard to wildlife. As you probably know, Sir, that in the Swan River Valley, the Duck Mountains and the Porcupines, it has been a happy hunting ground and there

(MR. BILTON cont'd). is a general feeling I am sorry to say, that throughout the North as well as in the Valley that our game population is being somewhat diminished. It would be true possibly that the experts will question my thoughts but there are many of us in Northern Manitoba are somewhat alarmed and concerned toward the preservation of the species of wild-life.

With this thought in mind I would recommend to the Minister for consideration that some thought be given to the development of a wildlife park or preservation in that particular country, a place where elk, deer, moose, woodland caribou, buffalo and other varieties, to say nothing of fox, beaver, otter, and marten, may roam at will and take to further themselves for the years to come. It is also a very important matter too, that is the geese, the ducks, swans, herons, pelicans and other winged game, and we have an abundance, Mr. Chairman, in that country at the present time but it may not always be so. I would remind the House that this to me is possibly the last frontier of our wildlife in its natural surroundings.

Having said this I would suggest a location where there are thousands of acres of Crown lands ideally located between Swan Lake and Pelican Lake. Swan Lake shoreline is some 75 miles, 20 miles long and 8 miles wide at its widest point. This area I am speaking of is a few miles northeast on No. 10 Highway of Swan River. Nearby is what is known as the Kettle Hills which could, if developed, become a tourist attraction, and if I may for a moment I would like to quote from a newspaper clipping of these Kettle Hills. "With recent draining and the opening of vast tracts of pasture land in the northeast area of Swan River Valley, it has also laid open a road through virgin countryside. Rising impressively to the east are the Kettle Hills which appear to stand guard on the expansive Swan Lake in the north. Reports are that the Kettle Hills, beautifully treed with pine, juniper and silver birch, received their name of the large rock formations where they stand on top of the hills. Most circular items are called kettles by the Indians. Just what these kettles are, and how they got there is not known, at least to the local archeologists some 350 kettles ranging from 18 inches to 15 feet in diameter appear to be growing like mushrooms in an area three or four hundred yards long. They are made up of very hard and brittle rock material, greenish black in colour and corroded from the many, many years of exposure and elements." This article, Mr. Chairman, finishes off with the thought that it would be a wonderful thing for this picturesque area to be opened up and developed. In the area I am speaking of, Mr. Chairman, there's located what they call the Lenswood Pasture which was developed and opened last year at a cost of some \$75,000.00.

The other day the Member for Ethelbert spoke of our wildlife as our heritage and that we should protect it. I would add, let us foster and preserve it. Preliminary enquiries, Mr. Chairman, revealed that in 1963 some 700 deer were killed by permit in the forest in the Duck Mountain and Porcupine regions. In 1964, 1,100 of these animals were killed. In 1963, 550 moose were killed and in 1964, 590 were killed. This I might say is a preliminary report but it is sufficient to indicate to you, Mr. Chairman, that all these animals have been legally killed by permit, and there are possibly others by the Indian population which are not recorded. I am sure it will indicate to you that there is a lot of animals being taken from this territory. Also my enquiries suggest that woodland caribou and elk were protected by a closed season in 1963 and 1964.

Another interesting thing I find, that otter - none were trapped and of course there was no fur value. Does that mean that otter are gone entirely? It suggests that something be done toward bringing them back in to where they were before. A number of foxes - 53 were killed last year. And beaver, some 2,325 were taken. Here again, Mr. Chairman, these were all taken legally and under trapping rights. I merely quote these figures to suggest to you that it won't take too long before that country will be denuded of this wildlife.

I would remind the House also, Mr. Chairman, that we had a forest fire in 1961 from Cowan north, covering hundreds of thousands of acres. What the wildlife loss in that disaster is anyone's guess. Added to this there was a radio report the other day indicating that a large number of moose were at a loss as to where to go from the Forebay at Grand Rapids. My honourable friend from Neepawa spoke of it the other evening. The area that I am speaking of with regard to the developing of a wildlife park is somewhat in that region. The people in my area, Mr. Chairman, are concerned with the depletion of the game. Almost every one are very fond of hunting and the young people I am happy to say have taken care of the fact that we've had no serious accidents in that area for some considerable time. My people complain, and rightly so, the increasing use of aircraft in the spotting of animals after they've been hunted, gone into the hinterland locating them, not only using aircraft to get close to them but

(MR. BILTON cont'd)..... coming down in close proximity of where they may be resting or browsing and using skidoos to help them to get close by for the kill.

We welcome visitors into that country; we're pleased to see them at all times. I'm bringing this matter to the attention of the House, Mr. Chairman, not with any thought of suggesting to you that there are any abuses, but rather in an appeal for the development of an area where these animals might find refuge after they have been well hunted season after season, and in order to see to it that some of these animals are preserved for the future. I have in mind, Mr. Chairman, Cougar Park in Africa, where they brought together many species of all the famous animals in that country. This was entirely necessary in order to preserve their future. In Edmonton, north of Edmonton, through the efforts of private citizens, a tremendous wild animal park has been developed to the joy of many many people. I would therefore again prevail upon the Minister to take note of the few remarks I've tried to make, and have this situation looked into and surveyed with the view to the possibility of making a haven for our animals in Northern Manitoba.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I might say and I'm inclined to agree heartily with the Member from Swan River in his fears that the game population and the wildlife of Manitoba are being rapidly depleted, and I would like to give some figures to substantiate his fears. Last year I put in an Order for Return, and asked three questions. The first question was to give the total number of persons charged with violations under The Game and Fisheries Act for the past ten years, that is, starting 1953 to 1963. The second question, the number of convictions with regard to the aforesaid violations - this again covering a period of ten years from 1953 to 1963. No. 3, the number of hunting licences issued in Manitoba under the above Act with respect to upland birds, waterfowl, deer, moose and elk for the past ten years.

Mr. Chairman, a very remarkable story comes out of the answers that were given, and I would suggest that the answers bear out the fact that each year there is less attention being paid to enforcement of our Game Acts, to policing and patrolling of the game preserves of our province, and the general repletion of the game and wildlife of Manitoba, and if the committee will bear with me while I give some of these figures. The year 1953, there were 481 informations laid. Out of the 481 informations laid, there were 424 convictions registered. From licences sold, there were 26,143 general bird licences sold; 30,231 deer licences sold; 669 moose; there were no elk that year - there was not a season that year. Roughly, there were 57,000 licences sold. 1954-55 season, there were 361 informations laid; 336 registered convictions - this from a total of 63,000 licences sold, that is general game bird, deer and moose. The 1955-56 season there were 334 informations laid; 341 convictions registered, out of a total of 49,500 licences sold. In 1956-57 there were 398 informations laid; 342 convictions registered, out of a total of 56,000 - this is rough figures, licences sold. In 1957-58 there were 410 informations laid; 372 convictions, out of 60,500 licences sold. In 1958-59 there were 525 informations laid; 463 convictions, out of 61,000 approximately licences sold. In 1959-60 there were 457 informations laid; there were 414 convictions registered, out of approximately 67,000 licences sold. In 1960-61 there were 496 informations laid; convictions 440 - this out of 97,000 licences sold. The 1961-62 year, there were 409 informations laid; convictions were 372 - this out of a total of 75,000 licences sold. The 62-63 year, there were 362 informations laid; 320 convictions registered, out of approximately 75,700 licences sold. The 63-64 year, there were 466 informations laid; convictions 402, and I do not have the total number of licences sold.

But upon examination of these figures, it is quite evident that policing and enforcement of our game laws have been falling off. It is quite noticeable in our area of Portage la Prairie and the sand hills where there is poaching going on. The Game and Fish people are quite concerned about it. The Delta Marshes in the preserves themselves and in the recently acquired Bain estate, there has been no evidence that I can see, or friends of mine have seen, that there is any patrolling or any protection given to the wildlife in that area. So I'm inclined to agree with my friend from Swan River that something should be done to give more protection, to enforce our laws, and to look after the diminishing resources that we have in this area, that we have in Manitoba.

Earlier in the day, before the Orders of the Day, I asked my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources if he was aware that there had been some burning of the marshes going on this spring at Delta, and I understand that he is checking and getting on to this information to see if something should be done about it or not. But I think he will recall last year a rather famous wildlife authority in Manitoba complained, and complained rightly

(MR. BILTON cont'd),.....that large areas of the Delta Marsh were being burned - perhaps they were part of someone's hay rights or Crown land rights, but that doesn't matter. Valuable nesting grounds were being burned and the fear is there that this is happening again this year. I myself last Sunday witnessed a large fire in the Delta Marsh and I hope that he will take note of this and act on it.

Further, to support my honourable friend from Swan River when he mentions the fact that certain species of our game are being rapidly hunted down and rapidly being depleted, I would like to tell the House about a happening in the Carberry Hills this past year, I believe it was in October. If my information is correct there was a closed season on elk, rather than was the intention of the department that there be no elk hunting in the province, I believe, especially in that area. However, the game regulations that are issued along with the hunting licence did not specify this, and a court case came in Portage, the RCMP brought in someone who had hunted elk, and according to their directions this was illegal, and these two people were prosecuted. It was found that the regulations were not sufficient to give proof and that two people got off -- they'd shot five elk. The Crown Prosecutor could not prove that elk were out of season and these people went scot-free. I hope he takes cognizance of this if he doesn't already know of it, and do something when the game licences are issued that the folder that goes with the licence spells out in detail whether there's an open or a closed season. It might interest him to know that one of these people who were involved in this episode was some type of a law enforcement officer from one of the reserves. I believe his position was largely official. He wasn't a police constable in the true sense of the word, but he was the one who was doing the shooting, and when the Crown Prosecutor pressed the case, the case could not be concluded to his satisfaction because he could not prove that elk were not in season.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, some few years ago under the former administration I heard quite an oration from a former Minister of Mines and Natural Resources wherein he announced to the House at that time that an experiment was going to be attempted in the province insofar as wildlife was concerned, by having pheasants brought into the province in an endeavour to establish a new sport for the hunters of Manitoba. I'm not going to accept the challenge that that particular Minister of Mines and Natural Resources was at the time, Mr. Chairman, it would -- it's too bad really though that the former government did not have a Hansard so that the contribution of the then Member for Portage la Prairie, Charlie Greenlay by name -- if we had had a Hansard at that particular time it would have been most interesting I am sure for the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources today, and also every other member of the House, to get the benefit of his very illustrative comments as to the habit and ways of life of pheasants. And as I say, Mr. Chairman, I am not going into detail such as the former Minister did.....

MR. GUTTORMSON: Could I ask the member to tell us how he recalls the debate.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, I recall it quite vividly, Mr. Chairman, and I think on that note I'll leave that aspect out of it. There was also a sort of a different complex in the House at that time with what we have at the present time. However, I would like to hear from my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources today whether there are any of the pheasants that were imported at that time still running around the hinterlands in Manitoba and whether he can give us any further information respecting this species of wildlife.

..... continued on next page

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I know only by reputation of the speech that was made by one of my predecessors in this office and I only wish that I had heard the speech or that there had been a Hansard so that it could be properly appreciated at this time. All I can tell him is that I won't attempt to duplicate that speech and I should say perhaps more fortunately we have no pheasant program under way at the present time which is probably a safe thing and a happy thing for all concerned, because I don't know if I could get around all of the gene of terms and so on that were applied. There is no program on pheasant at the present time as a result of these earlier programs. I am informed it was found that they were almost obliterated because of the winter conditions and I think as well because of some attacks by predators. Occasionally you will see one, a wild one in the odd part of the province, but certainly they are not being planted any more by government program.

I should like to go back to the opening remarks by the Leader of the Opposition and of course associate myself and the government, all members of the government, with his commendation of the Manitoba Federation of Game and Fish Association and each of the Game and Fish Associations that we have throughout Manitoba. This has been a salutary year for them because they have now passed the 10,000 mark in membership, and this is a tribute not only to conservation-minded Manitobans but it's a tribute as well to the work that they have been able to do in their various communities throughout the whole of the province; and a tribute as well I must say to the -- and I'm happy to say -- to the exceptionally good central organization they have and to the calibre of men that they have been able to attract to their executive. Their present president I'm happy to say comes from my constituency of Fort Garry, Mr. Don Muir, and he certainly is an outstanding conservationist and a man who's devoting many hours of his time, I think certainly as well at some considerable personal expense, to the job of conservation in Manitoba, and certainly I do wish to join with the Leader of the Opposition in paying this tribute.

I would not like to close the tribute without paying some respect to Paul Murphy, the Executive Director, who has certainly been one of the key men in the development of this province-wide organization. The spirit and the vitality that he gives to the organization is manifested in the increasing programs that it is able to carry on throughout the province. I think we would all join to a man, and to a lady, in wishing them well in their work and of course assuring them that they will continue to have that close degree of co-operation that has always been the case between this department, and I would hope all branches of government and their organization.

I was pleased to hear the comments from the Honourable Member from Swan River. I know of the interest that he has for wildlife particularly in his area and he has expressed his concern on this matter before. He has a very interesting suggestion about a possible reserve area in his constituency or nearby to it and certainly this can be looked at. The problem that he discusses concerning what we call loosely "mechanized hunting", that is spotting by aircraft and the use of autoboggers and other mechanized vehicles for hunting, is one that every jurisdiction has had to look at quite carefully.

The department has been looking at this subject quite thoroughly in recent months because with the tremendous influx, particularly I would say of the autobogger in the last two or three years, there have developed -- as always when there are new modes of travel, new modes of hunting develop around these new transportation modes and consideration has to be given as to what kind of new regulations, if any, should be developed in order to keep track of what the actual modes of hunting are as a result of this new form of mechanization. I would say that to date we have been relatively fortunate, from the reports that I get from the branch, relatively fortunate in controlling these various forms of mechanized hunting, but certainly we can't be lackadaisical about it and I know that everyone in the branch from the Director on down is looking at the problem and is concerned about it.

I understand that the Federation of Game and Fish will have this as one of their main items of discussion at their forthcoming convention in June at Clear Lake, and we hope at that time to join with them in discussion and to determine from that discussion what new legislation or new administrative practices or techniques should be looked at or developed in order to keep pace with these changing modes of transportation which do have an effect on hunting practices and ultimately then can have an effect upon the amount of wildlife that is caught by the hunters during the year.

I was interested to hear the comments of the member from Portage la Prairie. I should say to him first of all the case in the Carberry Hills - the elk case - I have no personal

(MR. LYON cont'd) knowledge of it but certainly we'll take a look at it and see what surrounded that case, and if there was any deficiency in information on the part of the branch, why of course they would be the first to want to correct it. But I undertake to look at the case now that he has brought it to our attention.

I wouldn't necessarily agree with the conclusion that he draws from the statistics that he has quoted that the degree of enforcement in Manitoba is necessarily less than it has been in other years. Enforcement of course is always one of the great bugbears in the Wildlife Branch because enforcement must be based upon a public understanding and a public knowledge and public education in the whole concept of conservation. You could have a conservation officer going out with every hunter in the field, but if that hunter hasn't got within him the idea that game limits, bag limits are set for a purpose, then all of the enforcement in the world really goes for naught, because you've got to implant that seed or that idea and build up within that person and from that person within his family a philosophy of conservation which is the only sure foundation upon which you can build in any jurisdiction a society which is conservation-minded, and as a result of being conservation-minded is also enforcement-minded and is a society which has not the same tendency to break the law.

I would point out to him however, looking at just the recent statistics that we have in the last annual report, Pages 36 and 37, if he will note the number of informations laid - 466 - I think it is significant to notice that 175 of these 466 informations related to the offence of carrying a loaded firearm in a vehicle. Now that is what might be referred to as a non-game offence in the sense that it doesn't relate to the taking illegally of game. It's a safety offence and of course it's one with which enforcement officers have had problems from the beginning of our original game and fish act and down through the years.

So I think we can draw some encouragement from the fact that by far the largest majority, by far the one offence that has the most infractions is one not related to illegal taking of game but rather to safety. I'm not saying that that's a happy circumstance because safety is very important as well, but the other offences in decreasing numbers are the ones that refer to illegal taking of game of various sorts. I can only tell him that we try to keep -- with the money that is voted to us, we try to keep the conservation officer staff up to strength and, where possible, to supplement the strength particularly by part-time people that we take on as special enforcement officers during the various big game or game bird hunting seasons. But it is a continuing problem and it's one that we haven't a complete answer to any more than any other jurisdiction and we have to keep a close eye on it at all times.

I'm somewhat familiar with the area that he speaks about, the Delta Marsh area, and I know of the patrols that are made in that area. As a matter of fact, I hunted in that area on the opening day and was stopped by a conservation officer and an RCMP officer, at least came into contact with them on patrol that day. Of course they gauge the heavy periods of use. They know pretty well from past experience when the large influx of hunters is going to be in the marsh, in that particular area to use it as only one example, and they put on special men for these especially heavy periods and then move these men from time to time to other areas where there is heavy hunter usage, and by this method I think they are able to keep relatively good track. Now I don't mean by that that they catch all of the offenders. They don't. I think it would be impossible to catch all of the offenders, but at the same time I think by and large that there has been no slackening of enforcement procedures by the branch. Knowing the members of the branch as well as I do, I'm sure that this is the case, and knowing the field staff that we have and certainly knowing the direction and the training that they receive, I am certain that it is the case that they are well versed in all of the enforcement procedures.

I don't believe that there are any other -- oh, the question of fires in the Delta Marsh. I checked on that item and I thank my honourable friend for bringing it to my attention. I am advised that there was one fire, I think about a half mile south on the Delta Road last Sunday evening which burned off a small piece of marsh. I'm told that there was no damage done, that the fire was going for part of Sunday and was put out Sunday night by rain that fell. No one really knows how it started. We are quite concerned about fire.

You know of the fringe marsh areas. I'm sure that my honourable friend from Lakeside could tell us more about this problem than anybody in the House because he has seen it from that area for very many years. One of the problems of course is fires that are started on private land. This is perhaps the most serious problem, fires that are started on private land, people who are burning off grass or burning off forms of old dried stubble or other vegetation which are caught by wind and they spread. Now it's legal for a man to burn on his own property.

(MR. LYON cont'd) It always has been, but to control this when it gets into your productive marsh area is the problem.

I'm able to tell my honourable friend that we have taken two steps this year that we think will be helpful in this regard. No. 1, we have written letters -- the department has sent out letters to all of the fringe landowners that they have record of surrounding the Delta Marsh area advising them of what problems are caused by run away fires; telling them of what the plans of the department are, that is to build a fireguard around this fringe area; and soliciting their co-operation in the avoidance of run away fires which could get into the marsh, particularly in the height of the nesting season where they can cause tremendous damage. So far, and it's difficult to judge reactions, the reactions I'm told that the branch have had have been favourable and that some of the people who have received these letters have indicated that they are glad to get this statement of what the government is going to be doing and are glad of the information that was contained in it.

In addition, as I mentioned, the department is burning controlled areas itself which will hopefully act as a fireguard on the fringe of the marsh. This back-burning will be started very very shortly - controlled burning to burn off an area so that if a south wind does come the fire will burn up in the vegetation to the edge of the burned-out area and then hopefully will stop there without jumping over. This is the program that will be started very shortly in that area. I thank him for bringing this matter to our attention however and hope that he is aware now of the actions that we are taking to mitigate against this type of fire.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, for the past number of years I have expressed grave concern over the game population, particularly that of the ducks and the upland game, and it's rather frightening when you think of the change of the populations in my short time as a hunter. I know last fall I didn't even bother to take out a licence. I didn't so much as take a gun out of the closet because the game situation just -- (Interjection) -- I'm afraid I can't agree with the Minister. They may have been found in some localities where it was good but the over-all situation isn't good. I know that in areas in the Interlake which have been prime duck hunting areas, people are not even going any more -- this is in the marsh -- because there aren't any birds any more. Unfortunately, this situation seems to be getting worse every year.

Now I make it abundantly clear that I am not blaming the government for the situation because it's a continental problem. I realize this but I feel that this government, or rather the Minister of this department when he attends these wildlife conventions, or members of his department, they could perhaps take steps to encourage other jurisdictions to try to take some steps to rectify the situation before it gets too bad.

I told the Minister on speaking on Bill 102, that I'm told in Mexico they hunt game for profit. They trap the birds and use whatever methods they can and then sell them at a profit. Of course as long as this situation is being carried out the game situation is going to worsen. I need only cite the case of the passenger pigeon which at one time roamed the continent in countless millions and now they are absolutely extinct, and this can happen to the duck as well as it did happen to the passenger pigeon.

I maintain of course that increased gun pressure combined with the lack of breeding grounds is the main reason for this depletion of our duck population. I know places in the Interlake where I used to go hunting don't exist any more. They have been drained dry and as a result of it game birds haven't got the same amount of breeding grounds and therefore the numbers are not increasing as rapidly as they might.

On the duck season, I would like to make a suggestion to the Minister that he not open the season until before October, I find that by opening the season in September too many young birds are destroyed, particularly in the southern part of the province around the grain fields, and I think that the real sportsmen would be quite anxious that this is quite fair to wait until October when those birds have filled out and are more mature before they are being taken.

I was interested to hear the Minister say that he was looking into the matter of the auto toboggans and the airplanes as a means of hunting game. This is becoming a rather serious problem. I've had a number of complaints where the deer, and particularly the moose, are being spotted by small aircraft and other members of the party are running these animals down with autoboggans. This is no more sport; it is a slaughter. I think that the Minister is on the right track when he says that this matter is being looked at, because if something isn't done and done real soon we are in real danger of having our big game wiped out.

(MR GUTTORMSON cont'd)

The matter of enforcement was brought up. It seems to me that we don't have enough game guardians. Now I realize the Minister I think made a valid point when he said that the real problem lies with the hunter himself in recognizing, that he should recognize the laws and realize the limits and the reasons these limits are set, but I know that maybe when you have one game guardian in an area of maybe 50 to 60 miles or more, there are those people who have no respect for the laws at all and it is pretty easy for them to escape the law when a situation like this exists.

Now I do know that the Minister or the department hires seasonal game wardens but I find that they aren't as satisfactory as they might be. I think the Minister will agree that it's rather difficult for a temporary game guardian to go after his neighbour so to speak and penalize him. I think he's more inclined to look the other way although he may not want to. I feel that he doesn't want to get in trouble with his community or his neighbour or friends and I don't think he does the job as well as he might be if he was working in an area where he didn't know the people. I would like to suggest to the Minister that he might give consideration to maybe rotating them or moving these people some distance from, not too far, maybe even 20 or 30 miles from their home locale so that they would be strangers to the people they are checking.

MR. LYON: I thank the honourable member for his comment and of course he has put his finger on one of the great problems facing all people interested in wildlife on the North American continent, and that is the moving forward of urbanization and the gradual moving forward thereby of the frontier and the contraction of the frontier within which wildlife propagation, particularly game bird propagation takes place.

He again has put his finger on it when he says that there are two problems. I would say the central problem is the acquisition, preservation and retention of proper breeding and development grounds for wild game, for waterfowl and for big game as well. Hunting pressure is also another factor but I would say not as important a factor as the propagation factor, and that is why this government, and that is why I think most of the governments right across Canada where there are particularly waterfowl populations are doing their utmost at the present time to acquire and to set aside marsh areas, pothole areas, where particularly waterfowl are able to breed and to rear their young still somewhere short of the Arctic Circle and to do it in these more or less southern frontiers that we are all familiar with.

That is why we move into projects such as Delta Marsh land acquisition, that is why we have the very large ARDA interlake study going on at the present time in which I am happy to tell him and I think he would be aware of this, the wildlife interests form a very important part because that is a tremendously important area for wildlife in our province. So I am happy to hear him mention these two things and I am sure that we will have his continuing support in these land acquisition programs and in the other measures that government takes from time to time to ensure that we have proper propagation grounds for wildlife.

The Government of Manitoba does not set the waterfowl season. That is set under The Migratory Birds Convention Act by the federal authorities. We are however consulted. The directors of game each year, the directors of wildlife are consulted and I attended the meeting this year at which this consultation took place and heard the various discussions that went on about seasons and about bag and so on.

There are a number of factors of course that my honourable friend will appreciate. If you have an early nesting season, then your birds are more mature earlier in the fall. If you have a late nesting season generally then your birds are less mature when the regular season time opens up and the job of the biologist and the experts in the field is to try to set that median point where mature birds generally speaking are being taken, except perhaps those birds that emanated from a late hatch. I can tell him that very serious consideration is given by these wildlife experts, and I was very pleased indeed by the careful studies that is contained in all of the background material that they had before them before they proceeded to make the determination of seasons, and I'm speaking now in the waterfowl area.

The other factor of course in this is - to look at it for a moment from the hunter's standpoint - if you have an early hatch, your birds maturing, then very often your southern migration will start before the season opens, and we find in some areas of course that where you have an early hatch the birds mature and have their flight plumage and away they go off into the States before the Manitoba season is open. Of course you've got some pressure there from various sources to have a season which will permit hunting within a time when your large flock,

(MR. LYON cont'd) your hatched flock from that summer is still present in the marsh or in the breeding area.

I think one of the great problems that is facing wildlife people at the national level and at provincial levels in Canada today is this question of marshland acquisition, and tied in with that is the question of pothole preservation. We see quite clearly in Manitoba the very great importance of the pothole area. I'm thinking of one of these districts, the area north of Minnedosa, the Sandy Lake area up to Clear Lake where a lot of tremendously good shooting takes place at the present time, and not too many of us realize that an area like Proven Marsh turns out the large numbers of waterfowl that it does. It's extremely important that these pothole areas be preserved.

The Federal Government - last year the Hon. Arthur Laing announced to us at the Wildlife Conference that the Federal Government would be voting more money for land acquisition and that there would be more federal involvement in land acquisition than there have been in the past, because certainly they realize the importance of this matter. This is very expensive business as well, because from surveys that have been made in the northern states where some pothole acquisitions have taken place, a few have taken place even in Manitoba under the aegis of the Federal Government. It's an expensive procedure and I think that generally speaking the public will support it because they will realize that it is extremely necessary in the long run that these areas be preserved.

I like to use this example when I look at - the statement is made occasionally, I know, that some people look at a pothole and they say, "wouldn't that be a wonderful area in which to grow grain or in which to grow hay if it were drained." I don't say for a moment that all farmers are like that. I look at that area with a somewhat different philosophy in mind and I say that you can grow hay and grain in many other parts of the province, but you can grow ducks only in that place and that that is a very important place then that should be preserved.

I think we have to get this philosophy better understood if we are to have the kind of public support that certainly is needed for the types of land acquisition, the types of pothole leasing programs that I am sure we're going to have in the future, that I'm sure we must have in the future if we are to continue to have sizeable populations, particularly again in the waterfowl field, sizeable populations, so that my honourable friend fifteen or twenty years from now can take out his sons with him into the Interlake area and they can enjoy some measure of hunting such as he enjoyed years ago when he was a youngster. His son won't be able to take the same number of birds, but the important thing is that he will be able to go out ten or fifteen years from now and take birds, whether it's only two, three, four or five. That's the important thing, because getting out and enjoying the outdoors and the sport of hunting is one of the greatest things I think that a youngster can engage in, and certainly I join with him in hoping that we in Manitoba and in all of the other jurisdictions in Canada, and certainly in United States, will do all that we can to insure that these pothole areas, these wet land areas, these browse areas for big game and so on are preserved in order that these populations may continue to profligate and hopefully will grow.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I've been trying for some time to get into this discussion, even though I have only a modest contribution to make. -- (Interjection) -- I'm rather concerned about the rapport that is beginning to exist between my Honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and my Honourable Colleague from St. Boniface. I had to look at each one of them in turn two or three times to be sure that they were the people that I thought they were. In case their disagreement goes any further I think I should get us back into our usual frame of mind here in the House.

I wanted to suggest to the Minister that in connection with the control of fires that he was talking about at the south end of Lake Manitoba, that it would be well for him to consider, I think, using local people to do whatever kind of work is envisaged there. I know that there are people there in the close areas that would be glad of some employment and who could do that type of work very, very well. Also, close by there are farmers with machinery of all kinds now, that if it was a case of discing or plowing fireguards that would have the equipment available to do it; and one of the things where I would like to be of assistance to my honourable friend is that he could operate efficiently and still at not as great cost. Sometimes there is a tendency in government departments to attempt to provide themselves with machinery to do all these sorts of things and with the personnel to do these things, when folks could be readily picked up in the area concerned. And I think that that would be the proper thing to do this. As my honourable friend has suggested, I am well acquainted with the south end of Lake

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) Manitoba and the famous Delta Marsh. It's one of the very best marshes in the province and while I do not pose as an expert myself, I have so many friends in that area who are experts, some of whom make their living in the actual trapping and fishing, and whose livelihood veritably depends on the maintenance of that marsh and the lake in good shape, and then others who are guiding, and still others who are directly concerned in the conservation features.

And in that connection, Mr. Chairman, I recall that less than a year ago, my honourable friend the Minister issued one of the bulletins from his colleague's department telling about studies that were planned for the Delta Marsh. It's quite an interesting statement and a very good one about the studies that will be carried on there. This one was issued on May 29, 1964, and it mentions that there will be co-operation between the Canadian Wildlife Service of the Federal Government, Ducks Unlimited, the Delta Waterfowl Research Station, the University of Manitoba, and some private landowners in the area. It tells of different things that are going to be done. But less than a month after that time, the head of one of these organizations that's mentioned, the Delta Waterfowl Research Station, is quoted in a news dispatch from Delta, Manitoba. This one is from the Free Press of June 26, 1964 - quite a caustic comment on the actions of the department. Dr. Hockbaum is the man that I am quoting, and he says: "We're very unhappy about the callousness of the government toward these marshes, etc., etc. etc.". I'm not going to take the time of the House to read it, but I would like to ask my honourable friend the Minister if he and Al Hockbaum have settled their differences because I have a good deal of regard for the work that Dr. Hockbaum and the sponsors are carrying on there. I think he is an expert in this line of work, and I am distressed when I see that he and the department seem to be considerably out of step in their approaches to these matters.

Then I have another great friend there who is related to the Honourable the Minister by marriage, who I also regard as a very well-informed man regarding the marshes and their care, and he too like Dr. Hockbaum is very concerned about the height right now of the water in the Delta Marsh. My suggestion through the years to the people who have been in a position to do something about it, is that in the case of Lake Manitoba and in the case of the Delta Marshes - I presume other marshes are in the same position -- that what we do not want is successions of high water and low water; what we want is a controlled level of the water. This is what I thought that the Fairford Dam was intended to accomplish and apparently it hasn't been getting the results that a lot of us hoped for. Now, would my honourable friend take a look at this situation. And incidentally the honourable gentleman's relative whom I mentioned, Dr. Hockbaum whom I mentioned -- by the way, if I mentioned Dr. Hockbaum's name I should mention the other one as well -- it's Brian Hextall -- and they are concerned. They tell me that the water level is low. What they want is a controlled level, and they both say by the way - and this ought to interrupt the conversation that's going on over there - because they both say by the way, that the Portage Diversion will be of no use to them. As a matter of fact, they don't even want that river water in there. They want the water that will be kept in by operating the Fairford Marsh properly. -- (Interjection) --

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): The Honourable Minister and the Member for St. George are really concerned about the disappearance of potholes in the overdeveloped parts of southern Manitoba. I would suggest that they possibly join the Golden Boy and look towards the north. I am sure that this great constituency of Churchill will provide them with all the potholes and reservations required to hide any game that's necessary to provide the hunters with good hunting for many, many years to come.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman . . . want something?

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, on the height of water, I presume that the conversations my honourable friend has had relate to the low level of Lake Manitoba. The latest reading that crossed my desk was in the vicinity of 811. Fairford Dam of course controls between 811 and 813. The lake was hovering around the 811 mark pretty well all last summer and the marsh was low. I too would like to see more water in the lake but this is not a process that I am going to try to get into, an engineering process. I have however, discussed this matter with the Water Control and Conservation people and they are aware as well of the desire to raise the level on the lake so that you can have that compatibility of interest between the hay farmer and the wildlife man that hopefully can be found in the fringe area. I would like to see the lake higher than it is at the present time and this can be accomplished through the Fairford Dam. I don't think we can say that the Fairford Dam isn't working, but we can say that the

(MR. LYON cont'd) level on Lake Manitoba at the present time is lower than we'd like to see it, particularly having wildlife interests in mind. The question of the height of water is certainly one we are watching carefully on Lake Manitoba.

I can tell him, however, that the level of the water in the West Marsh right now is relatively high, that is immediately adjacent to the Delta road, and we're hopeful that that level can be more or less maintained in the marsh area. We want as well to see what steps can be taken to insure that the level in the lake and thereby the level in the marsh is raised. Hopefully - I can't set any period, because these are engineering factors that have to be taken into account -- it can be raised. We're in a low water period at the present time. The lake has gone down in years when it was uncontrolled as low as 809; I think back in the thirties it was down to 809. So we are still maintaining it within the level of control set by Fairford but we'd like to see it above the minimum certainly.

MR. GUTTORMSON: In regard to the lake level in the fall of 1963 the water level was above 812 and the logs have not been removed since that time but as the Minister knows we had very little precipitation last summer; there's no water coming down the Waterhen from Lake Winnipegosis which is also dry and consequently the lake became low and has remained low and the dam isn't going to help that situation unless we get water into the lake. It'll help prevent water from flowing out but it won't bring water in.

One point I would like to ask the Minister, he said that the dates for the duck hunting season were set by the Federal Government. Did I understand him correctly? If this is what he said I would like him to explain to me the information as provided me about the situation at Delta a few years whereby I was told that the Saskatchewan Game Branch double-crossed the provincial government by setting their season ahead of the Manitoba season. Now this is the story that came to me. I was wondering how this could happen if it was set by the Federal Government.

MR. LYON: I must admit I'm going on recollection because we discussed seasons and bag limits and I'll have to just check my sources to make sure that they control both or if they don't control both I'll let my honourable friend know. These matters, season and bag limit are discussed at one and the same time and I may be misinterpreting the discussions we had at the time but I know the two were interwoven when the discussions were made. I'll get word for him on that.

MR. HILLHOUSE: National convention the duck season.

MR. LYON: That's what I thought but my honourable friend thinks differently. We'll check on it.

MR. FROESE: . . . in other years I think we've had in our report something in connection with the wild cobblers and I don't see anything in it this year. Is the project completely disbanded. Is there nothing being done any more or what is the situation in connection with that? -- (Interjection) --

MR. FROESE: The wild cobblers . . . the turkeys.

MR. LYON: project is one that is operated privately by a group in the Morden area, an offshoot of the Game and Fish Association down there. It's a very commendable little project that they have underway. They receive co-operation and advice from the department but no financial assistance that I'm aware of.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister if there's been any consideration given to duck farms in conjunction with the farmer and a government sponsored program. It seems to me that with the shortage of ducks that is present almost every fall, and it's no secret nor is it any difficult problem to raise young ducks on a farm and then let them go for the shooting season, and it seems to me that this would bear a great deal of merit and could certainly add tremendously to the number of ducks that we could raise in the province. What I'd like to find out from the Minister is, has this been tried and if it hasn't what seems to be the objection or what seems to be the stumbling block that we can't do this type of a project in this province.

MR. LYON: Judging by the figures used by my honourable friend last night about his flock of mallards I think we'll take some technical advice from him outside of the House and find out how he raises them so cheaply.

From time to time of course there are birds that are planted -- you know nesting pairs that are planted in marsh areas -- I'm thinking particularly of some of the projects that are undertaken by the Delta Waterfowl Station where they have a flock of geese that they've built up there and occasionally they're able to plant nesting pairs and get interesting results from it.

(MR. LYON cont'd) I really haven't any more information on this interesting subject for my friend at the present time.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to leave this thought with the Honourable Minister, and that's this, that it seems that there is a tendency to always think that it's either in the Delta of the southern part of Lake Manitoba or in the marshes of Lake Winnipeg that you can only raise ducks or encourage to have a larger population of ducks. Now as the Honourable Minister said it is no secret to raise ducks because for over two years we raised over 500 in captivity and I can tell the Honourable Minister that come fall there's about half of them are lost into the wild state and this is a good thing because somebody's going to have the benefit of the shooting. To me it would seem that if there is this attraction of the tourist, the attraction of the man that does want to go out and buy a license and hunt and the attraction of bringing more people into an area for hunting, it should be a relatively simple problem to encourage the farmers in the areas that are in the general duck nesting regions to raise these ducks in captivity initially and give them the freedom that they can enjoy just as they would in their wild state. Quite frankly I think that this should be of tremendous benefit to the province and to the people in the areas where they would raise these. This is no problem, and as I say I do not know why this has not been done on this basis because it would profit the local people in the province.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before we leave the Wildlife Branch the Minister a short time ago was speaking about the problem of potholes and how expensive it was to retain this type of land or to purchase it for government purposes. With this I agree completely. It seems to me that in general except perhaps for the duck population but for the other types of game, the upland game - and still let's face it a good number of our duck population and a good deal of our deer population - the majority of this is actually raised in the populated area of the province. I think it's true in the case of the white-tailed deer for example that it does do better in the vicinity of human population. This means in other words that the majority of this game is raised on private lands, on lands that are owned by farmers across the Province of Manitoba. I think our basic problem in many areas is the question of habitat and having the types of cover available. I don't think it will ever be possible for the government to do this on its own and to purchase enough of it to provide sufficient habitat. So I think that we should be looking at other means of ensuring that there is a continued source of cover for our wild game if we are going to have wild game in the Province of Manitoba.

I'd like to make a suggestion to the Minister to look at the possibility of arrangements with farmers in the Province of Manitoba, those farmers who are prepared to leave on their own land either standard cover for upland game or bush for deer or potholes for ducks and that we make some arrangements with these people whereby they do get a tax exemption for the type of land which the government would deem is proper as wildlife habitat land and that they not be taxed on this land as they normally are for farm land. I think this is of extreme importance if we are to maintain in the populated area of our province the game of various types that are important to us. I think to attempt to do it by buying will be beyond our ability and that we should really take a good look at this. I think it would work out in the interests of both parties involved, that is the farmer himself -- I think there's something to be gained from the over-all picture. The question of the beauty of our province, the question of probably conservation of moisture for farming operations itself and so on. So I think we could here have a combined program but there must be an incentive to the farmer himself to do this. The Minister said the farmer will look at a pothole and say what a good place to raise hay. So often that's true. And you can understand this. After all that farmer has to make his living off that piece of land and he's faced with ever increasing costs and if his taxes are going up he looks upon it as an unproductive asset as far as he's concerned and if he were to turn it into either crop land or hay land it brings him a revenue to him. So we have to take the step. I don't think that we can expect the farmer to do this. I think this is a step that must be taken by the government itself. So I would encourage the Minister to look into this possibility of a tax rebate arrangement or a tax free arrangement for land that owners voluntarily leave in the type of cover that would be useful for game habitat. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Chairman, one moment before you go on. My colleague the Member for Portage la Prairie mentioned the question of the enforcement of the game laws, and the Minister pointed out that there had been an improvement I think in the last year. It seems to me however that the report of the Minister himself brings up some rather disturbing information. The first one is a sentence on page 36 that says that nightlighters were very active during the year and 21 cases were investigated involving 45 individuals. It's obvious

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd) that this particular problem is still with us. I know how difficult it is to control. I had something to say about this on the Wildlife Act that was before us. In spite of the Minister's comments I still say to him don't give nightlighters an opportunity to sell their game and you'll be helping some of the problems. The problem is beyond that though and I think that here it must be in conjunction with another one of the departments which my honourable friend controls, and that's the air department. I don't think there's any possibility of controlling the nightlighters in many parts of this province with ground, that is strictly ground control. I don't think the conservation officers are in a position to do it. They will do their best but it's just too big a problem to handle from that basis and I think it must be a co-operation between the air services branch and ground control. I think if this were done and it was understood that this is a program that is in existence a lot of the nightlighters would cease and desist.

There's a further problem though, Mr. Chairman, and this is again in my honourable friend's report. The changes that he made in The Wildlife Act do not seem to have worked out insofar as enforcement is concerned if we are to consider that the size of fines are a deterrent, because when he introduced The Wildlife Act, as I recall it, he indicated that the minimum fines were being -- (interjection) -- no, your colleague the present Minister of Health, he has his back turned to me at the moment. Well I would suggest that the two of you get together -- but I think that the minimum fines were removed from the Act at that time and that the idea was that with no minimum fines the actual result would be that a magistrate or whoever it is that tries these instead of simply applying the minimum fine would apply a reasonable fine for the offence. Well it hasn't worked out quite obviously because in the report itself, and I quote from the report, "it will be noted that general violations increased in number by 104 over last year yet total fines and costs decreased by \$544.00." So there's been a substantial increase from 360, rather than 320 convictions to 402 convictions -- almost, well 104 as the Department says and I am not quite in agreement there but close -- and yet the fines go down. So there's a 25 percent increase in convictions and a decrease in fines. It's not working out and I would like to know from the Minister is it his intention to replace the minimum penalties into the Act or what does he propose to do insofar as the enforcement end.

MR. FROESE: I notice also on Page 36 here the various violations during the fiscal year 1963-64 and on the following page I see one named as "dangerous hunting." I don't know just what is included in dangerous hunting but a lot of our people in Manitoba, once the season opens, they have to live in constant fear because of hunters going out and using their high-powered rifles, and if these same people drink and cause injury to livestock -- and also we've seen in the past where we've had fatalities -- I think something should be done in this connection. Just what powers do the -- I take it the wardens are the ones that are in charge here -- what powers do they have? In case they find hunters with liquor, can they lay charges in that respect too or what is being done in those cases?

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, dangerous hunting is pretty much what my honourable friend has described. It's a self-explanatory term, somebody who is negligently handling a firearm or other dangerous equipment in his hunting activities. This is an offence that I think was taken pretty well from the Ontario Wildlife Act and is intended to cover those cases where negligent hunters in the field shoot at the first thing that moves. They find out that it's a hunter, and even if they miss him they can now be charged with the offence of dangerous hunting, and really it's a self explanatory term.

The conservation officers and the enforcement people in the field have the usual powers of arrest that are given in our provincial statutes and they are all enumerated in The Wildlife Act. I think my honourable friend should remember that in addition however to our own staff, enforcement is carried on by the RCMP who act as the provincial police in Manitoba, so that we have a large number of people who are able to move into this field at one time.

At the risk of surprising my honourable friend from Lakeside again, I'm going to establish an immediate consensus with the Leader of the Opposition and tell him that I think he is directly on beam when he talks about the question of incentives being offered to farmers in order to have them preserve potholes, and I am happy to be able to tell him that this is one avenue of approach to the pothole preservation program that we have been looking at and I think it's a very productive approach.

Another factor that is involved in it of course and that is particularly good is the fact that you then get an involvement by the farmer himself in the whole field of conservation and he begins to take an interest in the pothole, that once used to cost him a bit of money on the tax roll,

(MR. LYON cont'd) he takes an interest in that pothole which conceivably could be tax exempt as a rearing place for birds. So I think my honourable friend is right on beam and this is one of the avenues of approach that we are looking at.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before we leave the Game item I have one last matter I would like to check with the Minister and that's with regard to the Forebay area at Grand Rapids. It was reported to me earlier this week that the program that was in existence to get the moose population in particular herded out of the Forebay area was going to be stopped and that it had been decided by the department that this was too costly and was not producing results. My information also was that in the early part of the program it was indeed difficult and was not too successful but that techniques had been developed with the use of helicopters and noise-makers and so on and they were achieving results, and of course the critical time was right upon us because of the breakup in the Forebay area.

I'd like to know from the Minister will it definitely continue and will we do everything possible to preserve the game that is there; and secondly, what exactly are the arrangements so far as Manitoba Hydro and its contribution to the Forebay area? I believe that a fund was originally set up by the Hydro for assistance to whatever projects were required in the Forebay. I think some of this was used for example for the movement of the population from the Moose Lake area to Easterville. Does the Hydro also contribute insofar as the game preservation or any works that are required for game management in that area because of their particular flooding.

MR. LYON: The answer to the question is "yes". The moose herding project which has been under way now for some time by the department using helicopters has in large measure it's reported to me been successful. There has been difficulty however with about 20 moose that are still left in a precarious position on the ice and they are still continuing to try to herd them. The helicopter use has been paid for as a matter of fact out of this fund that is provided by Hydro for wildlife purposes and we are using money I am told from that fund at the present time. I think that answers my honourable friend's question. There was some misinformation about this program of herding having been discontinued. It wasn't discontinued.

. . . . continued on next page.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3 (a) -- passed; (b) -- passed; (c) -- passed; (d) -- passed; (e) -- passed; (f) -- passed. Resolution No. 59 -- passed. Resolution No. 60 - 4 (a) --

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, yesterday the Minister, the Leader of the NDP, my own leader, and I were invited to attend the Fishermen's Federation dinner and I was rather alarmed, as I am sure the other guests were, by the small number attending this meeting. Unfortunately, according to the fishermen the federation is in danger of folding unless they can get more interest -- or that is get some assistance from the government in maintaining this federation, because they tell me, and their reason seems very logical, that it's money. It seems to me the request that the federation has made to the government is quite a reasonable one, and that is that they would collect a dollar from every licence sold to the commercial fishermen during the course of the year and then turn that money back into the federation, perhaps plus a grant which the government is already making or with a small addition.

Well the government according to the fishermen have refused to do this, saying they can't do it. Now I can't understand this statement being made. There's nothing to stop this government from collecting a dollar from the fishermen's licences and then convert this money back to the federation so that they could operate. As the Minister knows, they used to have Mr. H. Tomasson working with the fishermen and now his services have been withdrawn and he's been placed in another field, and the support given the federation has grown less and less each year.

I'm told about four or five years ago the grant given to the Fishermen's Federation was about \$3,000, then there was \$2,000, then \$1,000, and then I am advised for one year there was no grant and then it was increased to \$1,000 and it remains at that figure. Well the Minister I am told attended them at dinner last year, and although he didn't quote a figure, the fishermen told me they got the impression that the government was prepared to give a grant of about \$8,000 a year so they could operate successfully. The secretary of the association, Mr. Thorgeirson, finds himself in a position now as the secretary of the association making payments out of his own pocket. Certainly no individual can be expected to make this kind of contribution to an organization which is so important to the fishing industry.

I think that it's time that the government took a firm grip on the situation and helped the federation organize with financial assistance, and as I said before they don't have to give so much money themselves. The fishermen are prepared to pay it themselves if the government will collect it on the licences, and I'm told with the various seasons there's about five to seven thousand licences sold in the course of a year. Surely this isn't an unreasonable request. As the Minister saw yesterday, the attendance was very poor yesterday, it's the poorest attendance I've ever seen. Now I think it's time that the government took action on this to meet with the resolution that made this request and allow the fishermen to have this money so they can operate in a successful manner.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal with the matter of the enforcement of the fishery regulations and I hope no one in this committee will construe my remarks as urging the government not to prosecute where there's a breach of the law. I don't suggest for one moment that any fisherman who does break the law should not be prosecuted but I do say this, that there were a number of prosecutions on Lake Winnipeg last year where I think that if the conservation officers had been less zealous and had used more common sense there wouldn't have been any need or necessity for prosecutions, because I am satisfied that some of the individuals who were prosecuted were absolutely unaware of the fact that they were committing any offence.

Now I refer to the charges that were laid against a number of fishermen on Lake Winnipeg last fall for fishing north of a certain imaginary line. Now I believe that the fishing season started early in September and this particular line roughly runs from Saskatchewan Point across to Pelican Island. I believe the distance between these two points is 22 miles. I am instructed that there was no markers or other navigational buoys placed in that channel to show the fishermen where the line was until some two weeks or more after the fishing season started. I am also advised that the only way that these fishermen could have taken a bearing between a beacon which was on Saskatchewan Point was by lining up the bow of the boat with another beacon which was on Pelican Island and that it would be impossible for them to do that on an ordinary whitefish skiff because there is only about two feet of freeboard on a whitefish skiff.

Now I am also instructed that even on a clear day that from a whitefish boat your extreme distance of vision is about four miles - and that is the extreme. Now even assuming that you

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd.) . . . have an extreme field of vision, four miles on your bow and four miles on your stern and you're in the middle of that channel, you still would not be able to line up the bow of your boat with the beacon on Pelican Island and the stern of your boat with the beacon on Saskatchewan Point.

Now I know that some of these fishermen were prosecuted because they were perhaps a half a mile north of that particular line, but I wish to assure the committee that I know these fishermen and I'm quite satisfied that they were absolutely ignorant of the fact that they were north of that line, because there was no way for them to determine where that line was. I am also instructed that in previous years another fishery officer would go out to that particular area and advise the fishermen whether or no in his opinion they were north or south of the line, and the fishermen if they were north of the line would move their nets.

Now as I say, I am not asking the government not to prosecute where there's a breach of the law, but I do say that there should be a modicum of common sense and discretion used in these prosecutions because these commercial fishermen do not deliberately set out to break the law. It means too much to them because a breach of the fishery regulations can also result in a confiscation of their property, and usually they have a considerable investment in the outfit which they are using. So I would ask the Minister to speak to his conservation officers and tell them to use their heads.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on the over-all fishing situation. The commercial fishing problem in Manitoba has been with us for some time and I'm afraid that it's not improving by any means. The COMEF Report had some very positive things to say about the fisheries problem in the Province of Manitoba.

A little over a year ago now I suppose, or maybe it was just within the past year, there was a good deal said in the province about one company taking over all of the fishing companies in the province and setting up one major fish company that would look after all of the processing and distribution for Manitoba. This was mooted in the newspapers at that time and there was some indication that the government was interested in this particular proposal. Since then we have heard nothing further about this. On the other hand, there has been some talk about a Fish Marketing Board, and I believe there have been consultations between the government of this province and the other prairie provinces who are also involved in inland fisheries and the Government of Canada, moving towards, or at least investigating this possibility, but so far the government has not come out with any policy whatever.

It is now some years since the COMEF Report has been published. We hear on one side that there may be this private company setting up monopoly in the fisheries industry; we hear on the other side that there may be a Marketing Board established to handle all of the marketing of the fish; but we don't hear what the government intends to do about it. Meanwhile the fisherman, who is the individual and whom we should be basically concerned with in this field, is continuing under the same problems that he has been doing for a number of years.

There seems to be no government policy on the subject and I think that the time has come when the Minister must declare to the House what it is that the government intends to do. Is it going to come out with a policy or is it going to continue waiting for, I don't know what, but not taking any positive steps in one direction or the other. It seems to me at this point that the government just doesn't seem to be able to make up its mind whether it should proceed in the field of having a private corporation take it over or whether it should be a Marketing Board take it over, but one way or the other, Mr. Chairman, a decision must be taken because the situation is not improving.

I think it's fair to say that the prices have improved somewhat. The fishermen are not as unhappy about prices as they were before, but the over-all fishing problem is not resolved. The situation where we are faced with the people who actually are concerned with fishing as a livelihood, the other question of those who are living along those lakes and who look upon that as a form of subsistence, the problems of welfare, the problems of our native population along our lakes, all this is still before us and the Minister has not announced any policy. I say that it's time for him to make up his mind what direction he is going and what it is that he will propose in this very important field for quite a few of the regions of this province.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I want to say, as the Honourable Member for St. George has said, that yesterday I along with the other gentlemen were pleased to attend the luncheon at the Marlborough Hotel which was given by the Fish Federation - the Federation of Fishermen. I was pleased to attend because it did give me an opportunity of talking to some of the fishermen of Manitoba and it gave me an opportunity of really facing to the problems

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) that they have.

I was rather intrigued by the guest speaker of the day who gave us a very interesting address; and the point just now raised by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition as to directing the question to the present Minister of Mines and Natural Resources as to what the government intends to do about it, I think was answered in part at least by the gentleman who gave his address at the luncheon.

I think, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of giving information to members of the committee, I might just reflect at least to one portion of the gentleman's address wherein he stated that one of the reasons that governments, both present and past, haven't looked into the question so far as it might be expected of a government was because of the fact of the relatively small number in the fishing industry in Manitoba, and he suggested that one of the reasons for the lack of emphasis on their problem was possibly due to -- it wasn't too politically expedient to consider the fishermen because of their relatively small numbers. I might say, Mr. Chairman, and reiterate, he didn't ascribe this to the present administration, but took pains to point out to us at that luncheon that the same situation prevailed as far as the former administration of Manitoba was concerned as well. So I say that I do agree with the Leader of the Opposition that this has been a problem that's been with the fishermen in Manitoba for some considerable period of years.

It seems to me that the problem is one of finance and return to the fishermen. If we look, Mr. Chairman, at the report of the Department of Mines and Natural Resources, as I look at the figures of the number of fishermen and divide that number into the value to the fishermen, the picture doesn't look very bright at all, providing I'm using the figures correctly when we talk of the value to the fishermen as being the total value for the period of time under review, for if we look on Page 13 in respect of Lake Winnipeg we find that there were 2,278 men employed, so the value to the fishermen is less than \$900 per man. If we turn over to Pages 16 and 17, we find even a less value or return to the fishermen in respect of Lake Winnipegosis, Lake Manitoba and the northern lakes. In these cases, some of the take or the values to the fishermen divided by the number of men employed, in some cases just borders on around about \$625.00. It is true insofar as Lake Manitoba, as stated in the report, that the lake is only fished commercially in the winter months.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, the situation definitely is not one that we should be proud of, or can be proud of. It seems to me that there's a possibility that one of the problems may be that there are too many engaged in commercial fishing, and some solution possibly to this problem is of paramount importance to the fishing industry itself. Having said that however, Mr. Chairman, I realize that it would be a problem for this government or any government to have to say to Joe Blow or Tom, Dick or Harry, well you can't fish any longer, you're the fellow that we're going to set aside as one of those who become an unemployed fisherman.

But I notice with interest, Mr. Chairman, in the report of the department, that considerable references are made in the report to inquiries and discussions between the representatives of the Federal Government and the ten provinces agreeing to co-operate in the formulation and implementation of a national development program founded on principles parallel to those in effect insofar as agriculture is concerned. Now I would like to hear from the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, has anything of a concrete nature been done in order to carry out the suggestions that were made at the conference which was held in January of 1964? As I understand it, Mr. Chairman, from reading the Minister's departmental report, arrangements were made for an early meeting between representatives of the three prairie provinces, Ontario and the Federal Government, to initiate a study of the feasibility of establishing a Fresh Water Fish Marketing Board. I would like to hear from the Minister whether such a conference has been held, and if so, what was the result of such a conference.

When I first became a member of this House back in 1953-54, Mr. Chairman, a committee of the House which had been considering the question of the fishermen's predicament made its report. If I recall at that time, there were about fifteen or twenty concrete recommendations for action that were contained in that report. I'm sure that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is aware of the report to which I am now referring, and I would like to know from him if he could indicate what recommendations of that committee have now been adopted.

One of my former colleagues, the now Alderman Donovan Swailes in the City of Winnipeg, was a member of that committee and we've had quite a few conversations as to what they did. The former member for Gimli, Dr. Thompson, I believe was also on that committee. They

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) spent a considerable amount of time, not only meeting in committee to hear representations but in addition to that they toured the fishing areas, particularly the Lake Winnipeg fishing areas to see what the problems were and to make recommendations.

So I say to the Minister I note the reference in the report of the Department to further studies; we've also read through the media of the press of the conference to which reference was made; and it does seem to me that over the period that I've been in this House, some twelve years now, that we have had a considerable number of reports as to what action should be taken in order to try and bolster the fishing industry of Manitoba.

I note that the Minister of Industry and Commerce is suggesting that we might be able to utilize the products of our waters as an export market, but as one reads the report regarding fisheries and the fishing industry, it doesn't appear that there's any tremendous surplus of fish. Then when one, Mr. Chairman, takes a look at the value of the take of the various species of fish and correlate them to what one has to pay on the market for them, one wonders of the large price spread between what is recorded in the report of the department as the value that is received by the fishermen, the value which is contained in the report of the market value and correlate that with the price that one has to pay for fish, I sometimes wonder where the escalation takes place in the price, because I was interested to note that one item on Page 18, Table 1 I believe it is, dealt with the value to the fisherman, value as marketed, and we look at the question of the good old Manitoba goldeye - there were about 52,000 pounds of goldeye - the value to the fishermen was 13,000, as marketed 18,000, and I don't know where you can get a goldeye at 33 cents a pound. So this is the figure approximately, Mr. Chairman, that's contained in the report. I know in my home at least the goldeye is a real rarity because I think they cost somewhere around about a dollar or a dollar and a quarter a piece or upwards of that.

However, aside from that, Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the Minister might be able to inform the committee as to what steps have been taken in respect of past reports and their recommendations and outline briefly to us if he can, or further elaborate on the conference that was held over a year ago at Ottawa, and indicate whether or not any progress is being made.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, just before the Minister answers, I was doing some mathematical research on the same problem that my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party was because I've been interested through the years in the situation with regard to the Lake Manitoba fishermen, and I've tried through the years to keep some track of this question of what they receive in total compared with what the value was as marketed. Then of course the next escalation, to use my honourable friend's term and it's a good one, is from the time that they are marketed to when the ultimate consumer gets them, and I would hazard a guess that those fish that he has figured out to be about 13 cents a pound here -- 33 cents a pound -- and he says that they cost him a dollar a piece, my guess would be that they don't weigh anything more than a quarter of a pound so they are probably \$4.00 a pound by the time they get to his plate.

But I've been interested through the years in checking how the returns here compare with those of the farmers, and the same situation seems to exist, the same price squeeze seems to be on, because I just compared here my Lake Manitoba fishermen, what they received compared to the value as marketed, and the situation seems to be getting worse rather than better. As I computed it, the value the fishermen got back five years ago - in the 1960 report they got 71 percent of the value as marketed; this last report they got 62 percent; so apparently they're in the same squeeze that the farmers are and it's going the wrong way. Now this is the kind of thing that my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce when he was the Minister was going to do something about, but apparently it hasn't worked out as yet.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman - very briefly I hope - the Leader of the Opposition seemed to lay at the foot of the present government all of the ills of the fishing industry, the inland fishing industry in Manitoba. He either has a short memory or a convenient one, I don't know which, because -- maybe it's both, I don't know -- because some of the questions that he asked today were answered rather succinctly and rather I think frankly by a speech that all of us heard yesterday, and to which reference has been made by the Leader of the New Democratic Party, by Dr. Baldur Kristjanson. If my honourable friend will recall, he said the question was often asked him, said the speaker, by fishermen, "What's the government going to do about this," and he said the answer is that there are some fields where the government can't

(MR. LYON cont'd.) do anything.

My honourable friend will be the first to appreciate that governments don't control whether or not private companies, profit-making companies, merge or don't merge. Governments don't control that - at least I'm not aware of it. He must have been trained in a different business atmosphere than I was because the government doesn't control that. My honourable friend will have to speak to those involved in the potential merger to find out why they didn't merge. One of the factors involved there was of course the question of a monopoly position that was being asked to be conferred upon, and that wasn't conferred upon. The government has an interest there but the government has no other great part to play in the rationalization of an industry where a number of competing companies operate. So without getting inflammatory about it, I hope, I merely want to tell him that a great deal has been done but a great deal more remains to be done as we all know in this basic and primary industry in Manitoba.

He mentioned the COMEF Report, and one of the prime recommendations in the COMEF Report of course was the number of fishermen in Manitoba had to be reduced by 70 percent. Now I didn't hear him suggest for a moment that the government should embark right away willy-nilly on that program of reducing the number of fishermen in Manitoba, and if he has any suggestion that we do that I'd like to hear him say it because this would be certainly a departure from the policy that was followed by his party when they were in office.

There are very serious problems here, problems that transcend I would say what little partisan advantage a person can try to take from the situation that we face. If my honourable friend will familiarize himself with the annual report of the department, first of all in the fisheries section and then if he will go back to the comments that I made last year on the introduction of estimates and again I believe during the discussion of this branch's estimates, he will see there a fairly full exposition of the role that Manitoba played in the first Federal-Provincial Fisheries Conference that has ever been held in Canada which took place in January of 1964. I'm happy to say that the Manitoba delegation, and I don't necessarily mean the Minister, I headed the delegation but all of the members of the Manitoba delegation played a leading role at that conference and I would say that much was accomplished. If all that the present Federal Government undertook to do at that conference had been done, then there would be less cause for concern about the state of that industry today.

He talked about the government's alleged failure of action in the marketing board deal. Need I remind him that Manitoba can't operate a marketing board in the fishery product any more than we can operate a Manitoba Wheat Board. This has to be a marketing board for the total inland fishery on the prairie provinces, and what was done at that conference was to set up a very important study committee composed of representatives of the Federal Government Department of Fisheries as well as the Department of Trade and Commerce who have now come into the discussion, plus representatives from Saskatchewan, Alberta, Manitoba, Northern Ontario and the Northwest Territories.

Now if my honourable friend can tell me how Manitoba can bring -- Manitoba is one of the participants in this group -- can speed up the deliberations of this group then I'll be happy to hear it. If he can tell me that he feels that Manitoba has been holding back the result of the discussions of this group, I will tell him that he's absolutely wrong. We've been pushing to get some consummation of the planning from this group, and right now without finding too much fault, I must say that the ball is in the court of the Federal Government and we're waiting to see how they intend to carry through the ideas and the proposed plan that to the best of my knowledge has been agreed upon in principle by the provinces. It's up to them now because they are the only level of government who can implement a federal fish marketing board. It's up to them to tell us what form of machinery can be utilized for a fish marketing board. This is a very important field and will be, as my honourable friend heard yesterday and as I said last year in the House, one of the great landmarks in progress I would say for the commercial fishing industry in Manitoba if it takes place and we are very anxious that it do take place.

I would say in response to the question by the Leader of the New Democratic Party that the negotiations have been proceeding at a high level. The Deputy Minister of Mines and Resources is the chief Manitoba representative now in the discussions that are proceeding, so you can see that they are proceeding at a high level and we are hopeful that there will be some consummation of these discussions which will result in a project that can be placed before the various legislatures and the Government of Canada -- or the Parliament of Canada -- which will result in this board being brought into existence. The need for it was outlined in COMEF;

(MR. LYON cont'd.) we have supported it in our brief to the Federal-Provincial conference in 1964; and certainly we are hopeful that it will be brought about and we are hopeful that the Federal Government will expedite their consideration of this matter and see that the problem is resolved.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Member would permit a question before he leaves the, if he was going to, the question of the marketing board. Is it not a fact that in the Province of Saskatchewan that there provisions were made, as a matter of fact laws passed permissive in character, whereby a fish marketing board was established in the Province of Saskatchewan. If memory serves me correctly there was a considerable area of co-operation with the fishermen insofar as the board or divisions of the marketing board took in fishermen on different lakes, they became different components; but I do, if memory serves me correctly, know that the field in the Province of Saskatchewan under the former government at least -- I don't know if there's any changes been made since the change in administration -- but there was a fish marketing board set up. I think there too, Mr. Chairman, again if memory serves me right, the information that I have read what with the fish marketing board there they also have some semblance of forward pricing insofar as the fish industry was concerned in order that the fishermen there had some money ahead of the actual return, something similar to what is in operation insofar as the farmer and his wheat is concerned.

MR. LYON: Board in Saskatchewan and I think the main lesson that was learned from that board was that a purely provincial board could do very little, that is in the control of the product and in the export and marketing of the product. This is where there was a good test case to indicate that you had to control, or this board that was set up had to be federal in nature, had to control the production from the total prairie area because otherwise it would fail, and without casting aspersions I don't think the experiment there was too successful. Not that the idea wasn't right but because they didn't control enough of the market. But that's hearsay to me and I'm not getting off down that trail. I merely say that the concept of a fish marketing board on a federal provincial basis is certainly now acknowledged by all of the provinces, that is the Western provinces to be a viable thing and we are hopeful that we can get it underway.

The Member for St. George made some reference to the alleged failure of the government to support the Manitoba Federation of Fishermen. Again I would remind him that the Federation of Fishermen was established under the auspices of this government just four or five years ago, and at that time the department, my predecessor, the former Minister took quite an active role in the formation of this federation of fishermen. Establishment grants were set for them, on a declining basis, at their request, because of course their feeling was, and it was reiterated to me again yesterday, that they wish to be free of government handouts as soon as they can. In fact the one year that my friend refers to when no grant was made, that was at the request of the Federation of Fishermen because they had money in hand and didn't wish to take the grant that year. I have heard of their suggestion that the check-off, that's what it is, on the licences be implemented and we're looking at that at the present time.

I would ascribe at least one of the reasons for the small turnout at the luncheon yesterday was much more mundane than my honourable friend suggests. They had one devil of a snowstorm north of Gimli and I was told by people I was talking to that this cut down the ability of a number of representatives that they expected to come in to be there because of poor travelling conditions and so on. But the Federation certainly has areas of weakness that they acknowledge themselves. Government's role is not to treat the Federation as an arm of government. Government's role is to give whatever support it can on an arm's length basis to this group; and that is what we have been doing. I mentioned to him, I mention again because I don't think he heard this, when the Federation was established under the auspices of this government it was established with a declining rate of support. This year their grant is \$1,000 and this was the agreement at the time because the fishermen wished of their own volition within their own Federation, quite naturally I think, to be self-supporting as soon as possible without government financial interest being too great. He mentions that Mr. Tomasson is not liaising with them in the same role that he was before. I would remind him that there are now two fisheries development officers in the department but they have merely been moved over to the Conservation Education Branch that we spoke of last night, so there are now actually more people doing this type of liaison work with the fishermen of Manitoba than has ever been the case before. I don't think there are any other points.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4 (a) --

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, what about the resolution of the Federation to collect this money on each licence -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? I'm sorry I didn't hear you.

MR. LYON: It's being considered.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Because this isn't going to cost the Treasury any money if they do this and yet it would be of considerable help to the Federation. I'm told that they're still waiting for an answer the government is prepared to do this.

The Minister says the interest at the meeting yesterday was due to the weather. I'm sure this might have been a part of it but the financial status of the Federation is also a large part of their problem and I think the Minister should make every effort to get this thing settled so that they know where they are going.

One other item I'd like to bring up at this time before we leave the department and that is the rough fish. One of the biggest problems we have on the lake is the amount of rough fish and I'd like to see the government step up the program of the rough fish removal program. I'm told by some fishermen they are applying for permission to remove rough fish in some of the creeks leading into the lake. They are only granted permission on certain creeks and they'd like to see this program stepped up and enlarged so that more rough fish could be removed than is being done at the present time.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Chairman, I have a brief question for the Minister. I notice on page 17 of the report that there has been a 14 percent decrease in the sale of resident angling licences and it also says here "probably due to the increase in the licence fee". This prompts me to ask the Minister as to the policy of issuing these permits to sell licences. What is the policy of the government in awarding the concession to sell licences in Manitoba, and how many. I am surprised that the annual report wouldn't mention a thing like that as to how many outlets there are in Manitoba where licences are sold.

MR. LYON: There are several hundred outlets. The general policy has been to limit these outlets to hardware stores. You can make quite an argument, Mr. Chairman, as to whether that limitation should apply or not, but there are several hundred outlets for licences in the province.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, the storekeeper I have in mind was told some year or so ago that his store didn't meet with the requirements in order to sell these licences. Since that time he has one of the finest little stores in Manitoba; he has re-applied, at my suggestion, to the department, and he hasn't as yet had the courtesy of a reply.

MR. LYON: If that is the same man to whom my honourable friend drew my attention some while ago, I'll undertake to look at that again. I had thought the converse was the case, that he had gotten the licence, but we'll take a look at that because.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, a few weeks ago the Minister of Public Works said that many hundreds of cars have passed this point in the last two years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4 (a)

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before we leave the Fisheries Branch, I'm not really satisfied with the answer that the Minister gave me insofar as the over-all fishing problem -- (Interjection) -- No. My friend uses the usual technique you know that when he doesn't have an answer he says, well why didn't you do it when. Well that isn't the question that's before us, Mr. Chairman. I admit that the fishing problems have been before us for a long time. The point is that the COMEF Report made some specific recommendations. I know that my honourable friend has had some other suggestions made to him since that time. Now he did admit one thing that he's not prepared to go along with the one major company idea which was proposed last year, because he won't go along with the monopoly aspects of it. That's fine. I have reason to believe that he has been approached by some other proposals by the fish companies whereby the government would take them over and eventually sell them back to the fishermen themselves.

What I would like to know from the Minister at this time is exactly what is the policy of the government. Don't tell me "why didn't you do it when." You're the man in charge. This is your department. You're the man responsible. What is your policy insofar as this major problem? I gather from the Minister that he doesn't have one. When he makes the sort of a reply that he made to me that's the sure proof that he has no policy. Now what is he going to do then. Is he going to sit and wait through the next year and come out next year and tell us again he has no policy; or is he going to set up a study committee or is he going to set up a commission or what is it that he is going to do? If he follows the normal actions of this

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) government then he'll set up a commission and then the problem will be shelved until the commission makes a report. That's usually the way they work. If that's what he intends to do well then let him tell the House, but as it stands now he has not told us what the policy of the government is. Is he going to accept the proposals made to him by the fish companies? Is he going to set up a government controlled operation with a view to selling it later on to the fishermen? Is he going to set up a co-operative enterprise? What is it that he intends to do?

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, there are a number of proposals that are made from time to time by many people concerning what should be done with the fishing industry in the province. I suppose I could best answer my honourable friend's question by asking him one in return, and I would ask him whether or not the philosophy of his party would allow him to support a program whereby government would move in and expropriate and purchase assets of private enterprise companies and then proceed to operate those companies in conjunction with a fish marketing board. Perhaps before I answer his question maybe I should get the answer from him to that very interesting question because that is one that is before us from time to time. It's not a new one. It's been suggested over the years, over many years as a matter of fact that this could be done. The government's policy -- if my honourable friend would take the time I suggest perhaps after the House is finished to inform himself a bit more about the fishing problem in Manitoba, and I've got lots of documents and papers I can give him on this subject, I think it would improve his outlook on the whole matter. He would see that that is only one aspect of it. The marketing is another aspect of it that we are working on at the present time.

Rationalization of the fishing industry itself was one of the recommendations of the COMEF Report, and if my honourable friend will take the trouble to look back on that report he will see that the recommendation said quite clearly that that rationalization should take place within private industry itself. So these are some of the problems that face the fishing industry, in some of which government can play a role and in other parts of which government can't play a role. It's quite simple. There is no easy solution to the problem. I'm the first to admit that.

I would think that if we can evolve the provinces working in concert with the Federal Government and achieve a Fish Marketing Board, this would help to solve one of the great problems in price that faces this primary industry today, because about 90 percent of our fish is not sold in Canada or in Manitoba. Ninety percent of it is sold in the United States markets and the prices down there, if he again reads COMEF he will find the price down there is controlled by a group that are sometimes called a cartel. I've heard them described by other ministers of the Crown from other provinces as pirates, and various other appellations have been applied to them. I merely say that there is a form of cartel in the United States which controls to a large extent the price that is offered to our fishing companies in Manitoba, and if he has any brilliant Liberal suggestions as to how the Province of Manitoba can move in against the United States base cartel, I would like to hear them because we admit quite frankly that as a province we can't control that problem. We admit however, and we have proceeded to push and move toward the establishing of a Marketing Board on a regional basis which would have we think some success in dealing with that kind of a marketing situation in the States.

So basically you have a number of problems facing the total fishing industry. No. 1, the number of people involved in it. COMEF said a 70 percent reduction. These figures are pretty steep and pretty extreme I think. No. 2, you have a rationalization within the industry itself, that is within the processing part of the industry that must take place. Whether it takes place by industry or whether it takes place by industry in co-operation with government is an open question at the present time. No. 3, you've got the marketing and price situation, the rationalization of which can only be met by the establishment of a Fish Marketing Board, and we are working very hard toward that end. No. 4, to try to sort out -- because there is a tremendous intermeshing between the social and the economic factors in this industry, to try to sort some of these out we have embarked on what I think is one of the most aggressive fisheries education programs that the province has ever seen.

My honourable friend, if he reads - I don't know if he receives the Fishing Bulletin that is turned out - but if he reads it he will see that regular broadcast, in fact he saw it in Room 200, where regular broadcasts are now made under the auspices of the Department of Fisheries, or the Conservation Education Branch, telling the fishermen on the lake for the first time ever in history what the prices, the current prices are for fish, so that if they don't wish to

(MR. LYON cont'd.) . . . deal with the one man that they customarily deal with, if they think they can get a better price at another station they can go there, and they are going there. The discussions I had with fishermen, not only yesterday but on different occasions, have indicated to me how greatly pleased they are with this new program, and there are many steps of that nature that have been taken. So I say to my honourable friend that much more is going on in the fishing industry than perhaps he is aware of, but we hope that his education will improve over the year.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the Minister proceeds with his usual manner when he doesn't have an answer. He presents the problems -- and sure I'm aware of the problems -- I may not be aware of all of them but I'm aware of quite a number of them and my honourable friend enumerates them all over again. But an answer - no answer whatever. He says to us, well what is your answer in the Liberal Party? My honourable friend is responsible - he's the Minister of the department - that's his job. We'll be prepared to provide answers when we have the responsibility.

What I'm asking my honourable friend right now is -- (Interjection) -- You're responsible. You're responsible. What is your policy? The fact is that he hasn't got any, Mr. Chairman, so I presume that what we can expect is an announcement within the next year that my honourable friend is going to have a study, but if he'd simply get up and tell us that he has no policy, then we'd have the answer which he refuses to give but which is the correct one.

MR. PAULLEY: It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the present administration is pretty well in the same boat as the former administration insofar as this aspect is concerned. I did ask the Honourable the Minister whether he had any knowledge or could indicate to us what steps if any were taken as the result of the recommendations of the commission -- or the committee that made its report to the former government. Now it seems to me, hearing the Minister and the Leader of the Opposition, that the answer could be forthcoming from both of them, and it would be equally valid that practically nothing has been done by either the Liberals or the Tories insofar as the fishing industry is concerned in Manitoba. I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, I need make no apologies for the statement that I have just made.

However, one question I would like to ask my friend the Minister is this. He mentioned the fact that he thought, or the consideration is that in order to be successful as far as Fish Marketing Boards are concerned, it's got to be regional in scope if not national. Now I appreciate the fact that the Minister was not in government under the former administration, but I wonder whether he could indicate -- I wonder could he indicate from past records of the former administration which may be available to him, or may have been available to him, whether or not the present administration have attempted to co-operate or to work in conjunction with the Fish Marketing Board as it was established in the Province of Saskatchewan, because it would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that if the thoughts of the Honourable Minister are correct, that is insofar as the regional marketing aspect is concerned, that notwithstanding whether the Fish Marketing Board in the Province of Saskatchewan is fully successful or only partially successful, it would seem to me that this could have been an area of co-operation or joint action between the Province of Manitoba and the Province of Saskatchewan insofar as fish marketing is concerned.

So I ask my honourable friend - he may not have it at his fingertips and I can appreciate this - whether or not to his knowledge there was any endeavours made previous to the present administration to co-operate or to have joint action with the Province of Saskatchewan, whether his government has made any approaches in this regard to overcome the effects of the cartel that he mentioned that controls the price here in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I must come to the defence of the government in this regard, because when my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party charges them with failing to implement the recommendations of the commission to which he referred a little while ago, we can not blame the present government for that failure because of the fact that we folks had implemented all of them that we considered to be worthwhile. There was a detailed answer given to my honourable friend - my honourable friend's former colleague who had been on that commission - there was a detailed answer given as to how many had been implemented, and it was the vast majority of them, and the ones that weren't implemented was because it was a matter of decision of policy that it was better not to implement them, so we can't at least put that at the door of the present government.

MR. PAULLEY: the remarks of the Member for Lakeside, the situation as far as the fisherman is concerned in Manitoba is just as bad today under the Tories as it was under the Liberals.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, the \$60,000 item under the ARDA agreement, what is it being spent on as far as the fishing industry is concerned?

MR. LYON: That's item 4 (d)--(Interjection)--No, I'll try to be accurate in the interests of, -- we'll leave the inaccuracies to the Opposition, Mr. Chairman, and I'll try to be accurate in my answers. The principal project is the experimental rough fish removal program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 60 -- passed; Resolution No. 61 -- passed; Resolution No. 62 -- passed; Resolution No. 63 --

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I may in connection with 63 - the Minister announced the new policy or this Pioneer Project over a three-year period, with an expenditure if I recall correctly of some \$300,000. I would imagine this is broken down so far as expenditures are concerned for each of the three years. In looking at the figures of the Mines Branch, and it may be in another appropriation, it doesn't seem to me that the appropriation indicates \$100,000 increase for that purpose.

MR. LYON: The monies that we have provided this year will be sufficient to look after the initiation of that project this summer within our existing estimates. The main forecasted amounts will be appropriated in the next two years for the finalization of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 63 -- passed; Resolution No. 64 -- passed; Resolution No. 65 --

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, under the Lands Branch, has the government given any consideration to a change in policy with regard to long-term leases? As I recall the policy when it was established, any of the lessees who took land and who proceeded to make improvements on that land, be they dug-outs or clearing of land and so on which is encouraged by the government, when they came up for their renewal of that particular lease at the end of the - I guess it would be the five-year or the ten-year period - the land was to be re-assessed and the value of the improvements that they had put on the land became part and parcel of the assessment, so that the new rate for the lease was based on the improvements that had been put on the land by the lessees themselves.

Now we discussed this last year and I encouraged the government at that time to look at the possibility of leaving aside the improvements put into the land by the renter, because surely it's in the interests of the government itself and in the interests of all of Manitoba to see to it that these lands are improved and that the carrying capacity of them is increased. Now if we accept that and I think that's a reasonable proposition, then we should not penalize the individual who is prepared to put some work on this Crown land, and as long as he retains, that is the original renter retains the land on a lease, then we should not be assessing him for any of the improvements he has made upon it. I would urge the Minister to have a second look at this because I think it is important that we encourage these people to improve their lands, and therefore that the original individual who has made the improvements, who has paid for them himself, should not have his rate of lease increased as a result of it.

MR. LYON: That principle, Mr. Chairman, is included in the present formula. We had quite a discussion about it last year, but the principle is there and I think that the basis of assessment is frozen for a longer period in relation to the improvements that are made on the land, so there is an incentive built in the formula. I don't have the formula in front of me but there is an incentive built in the formula at the present time to meet just exactly the situation my honourable friend speaks of. Now he may say it's not enough and I'd be quite willing to take a look at that, but certainly there is an incentive at the present time.

MR. MOLGAT: I would like to have the Minister bring in the exact information in that regard if he would, because my understanding is that if it's on the ten year lease, when you come along for the renewal at the end of ten years then it's re-assessed on the basis of the value of the land at that time including the tenant's improvements.

Now there's one further point, Mr. Chairman, on the leases -- or the permits. Is it correct that if an individual puts in a bid for a short-term period, that is the one year either grazing permit or hay permit with renewal rights, that if he puts in a bid for a certain amount of money and he's prepared to put in a higher bid the first year, if he is successful in getting that bid, that the following year after that it goes back to the standard rate charged by the department. I think that this is the policy and it is creating some problems I think in many parts of the province where rental is going on, because some of the people who are better off are able to make a very large bid for the first year and then after that go back to the standard bid basis. It seems to me that we would be better off to have the policy whereby if you put in a bid then that is the basis on which you operate for the length of term that you wish to retain the land.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 9 (a) -- passed; (b) -- passed; (c) -- passed; (d) -- passed; Resolution No. 65 -- passed. Resolution No. 66 --

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, under Resolution 66 there are several headings here. Could we have an itemized statement under the various headings? There's acquisition of land, land settlement projects, natural resources projects and recreational projects. Could we have it itemized in that respect?

MR. LYON: The appropriation here, Land Acquisition, ARDA -- I'm sorry I'm on the wrong -- Mr. Chairman, park development acquisition, \$1,850,000, and then with the recovery allocated to the department by capital supply bill, there's a net figure there of \$850,000. Acquisition of land for extension to existing recreational facilities and for lands needed for future recreational development, \$75,000; provision for Heritage Park wayside picnic site, purchase of abandoned railway right-of-way and provincial parks, etc. \$37,500; and there's an estimated recovery of \$465,000 so you get a net figure then of \$497,500. I'll just double check and see if there's any further breakdown that I can get for my honourable friend. I don't seem to find the right total that I'm looking for.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Member for Brokenhead indicated yesterday that he wished to particularly speak on this item. Is it the intention to leave the item open in view of the fact that the member is not here?

MR. LYON: I would hope, Mr. Chairman, we could conclude tonight if my honourable friend the Leader of the NDP now is agreeable.

MR. PAULLEY: I discussed this with one or two others and I feel that if my colleague from Brokenhead has any pertinent points to raise we may be able to raise these by other or more devious methods that would obviate the necessity of holding the item.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: In mentioning the parks of \$1,850,000, are these the three parks that the Honourable Provincial Secretary made reference to on about March 10th in his estimates? If it is, what percentage of federal grant was given to these parks that were included under this item?

MR. LYON: Federal sharing is not finally worked out on the land acquisition for the provincial parks. That's still under negotiation.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: \$1,850,000, is that the figure?

MR. LYON: Yes.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: And does that cover three parks?

MR. LYON: Birds Hill, Spruce Woods, Asessippi.

MR. FROESE: The portion that you mention is going to be spent on railway abandoned lines, is this city property or is this rural property? The rail abandonment lines that you're purchasing is that--(Interjection)--Oh.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 66 -- passed; Resolution No. 67 -- passed. Department of Public Utilities, Resolution No. 68.

MR. ROBLIN: I'm rebuked by your zeal, Mr. Chairman, but I really think that it would be appropriate to suggest the Committee rise.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before the Committee rises, I understood we would be going on to Public Utilities. Could the First Minister indicate after Public Utilities will we be following the normal sequence in the Public Works or will it be otherwise?

MR. ROBLIN: If there are any changes I'll notify the Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. CHAIRMAN: Madam Speaker, the Committee has adopted certain resolutions and requests leave to sit again.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, that the report of the Committee be received.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that the House do now adjourn.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 o'clock Monday afternoon.