

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Monday, May 31, 1971

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 55 students, Grades 5 and 6 standing, of the Harrow School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Holenski and Miss Lambert. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Osborne.

We also have 22 students of Grade 5 standing of the Strathcoma School. These students are under the direction of Miss Romanche. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

We have 7 students of the YWCA Central. These students are under the direction of Miss S. Esaruk.

And there are 65 students, Grade 9 standing, of the Ness Junior High School. These students are under the direction of Mesdames Sammons and Kellett. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you here today.

REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this for the Member for Swan River.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. I'm sure the perusal of this report, Mr. Speaker, will indicate that the Northern Task Force is continuing its efforts. It outlines that they have been addressed by many interesting people who are dedicated in the improvement of conditions in Northern Manitoba. It is necessary also to mention that the committee and individuals distributed throughout the several departments are presently developing material that points to the long term improvement of living conditions in Northern Manitoba. Over the weekend, Mr. Speaker, I am sure you've heard the news, as I have, and it's interesting to note that the medical profession as a whole are taking an interest in Northern Manitoba and I'm sure the government and the House look forward to the important proposals they'll have to make. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my party, I thank Hydro and Manitoba Telephone, the Health Units and the educational authorities, for the acceleration of their efforts during the last eighteen months which has been brought about by the activities of this Task Force. I therefore recommend the report to the House for adoption.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RON McBRYDE (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Member for Flin Flon, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona) introduced Bill No. 57, An Act to amend The Remembrance Day Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I would beg the indulgence of this House to permit the first reading of this bill to stand.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health & Social Development)(Springfield) introduced Bill No. 26, The Hearing Aid Act, and Bill No. 58, The Department of Health and Social Development Act. (Bill No. 58 recommended to the House by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.)

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Leader of the Opposition)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question before the Orders of the Day is to the First Minister. I wonder whether the First Minister can indicate to the House whether he would be prepared to use his office to act as the mediator between the opposing parties in the strike at Flin Flon if there is no meaningful negotiation between the negotiating committee for the trade unions and for Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting by this Wednesday.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm aware that the honourable gentleman has made such a suggestion to the public media but I must say to my honourable friend that the efforts of the Minister of Labour have been such that I really don't believe that any useful purpose would be served by way of intervention of the office of the First Minister. It is really tantamount to the same thing, and I can only report that the Minister of Labour has kept in a close and continuing communication with parties in the dispute.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): I'd like to ask a supplementary question to the First Minister. I wonder if he could advise the House of the consequences of this strike continuing past June 9th.

MR. SPEAKER: I would say the honourable member's question is hypothetical. The Honourable Minister could answer if he wishes. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. Is the First Minister suggesting that his office and the office of the Minister of Labour are the same for conciliating this dispute?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, unless the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's interpretation is much different than mine, I'm simply saying that the office of a Minister of the Crown and the office of the First Minister is tantamount to the same, since policy and desire of both offices is the same. Perhaps it would be just as well, Sir, to have the Minister of Labour reply further to the honourable gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce and ask him whether, in view of the widespread statements reported in the press during the weekend attributed to the federal Minister of Supply and Services, has that federal Minister communicated any further decision to him with respect to the future of the CAE base?

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could answer the question in this way: I have had communication from the Minister of Supply and Services, the Honourable James Richardson, over the weekend and I have an indication from him that either he or his Deputy Minister of Supply and Services will attend the Manitoba Air Policy Committee, which is scheduled to meet tomorrow evening at 8:00 p.m. at the Fort Garry Hotel. I welcome the honourable member's question because I wanted to take this opportunity anyway of reminding the members of the House that we had convened the Air Policy Committee and at that time I would trust that all members who are interested, as well as members of the committee, may question the federal Minister in this respect, but beyond that I don't think I should speak for the Honourable Minister of Supply and Services.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the Minister received from the federal Minister anything in the nature of an optimistic assurance of future work for the CAE base such as was attributed to the Minister in several statements reported over the weekend in the Press?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Federal Minister did indicate that his department was working on the matter and that he hoped that in a matter of weeks he would be able to announce some new contracts, but my concern is not just the signing of contracts or the negotiation of contracts, but rather when those contracts become effective in terms of jobs being created, in terms of man hours of work being made available; and it's one thing to sign a contract but it's another thing to put men to work, and I think this is the essence of the problem, that work be created; in accordance with federal commitments, both moral and legal, that this work be created in a matter of days, not a matter of weeks for the signing of negotiations or signing of contracts based on negotiations, but rather a matter of creating work as soon as possible.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister give the House an estimate of what he would consider to be the deadline for preserving the work force, the bulk of the work force, at the base as it exists now? How much time have we got to develop new contracts to hold the bulk of the force here?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I would, you know, I would really like to answer the question in an authoritative way. I am not in a position to answer the question with any great authority. I would say that I would hope, I would think that work, substantial work would have to be forthcoming. Work, not agreements of contracts, but work should be forthcoming within four to six weeks, of a substantial nature. But again I may be treading on very thin ice and I would add, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the previous reply with regard to the meeting tomorrow night that there will be representation from CAE Limited, Mr. Race, the President of the Company here, as well as union officials, so that some of these questions may be answered tomorrow night by the people directly involved.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry and Commerce with reference to the meeting tomorrow night. Has the Minister of Industry and Commerce invited the workers who have been laid off to be present at that meeting as well?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I was on the phone this morning to a senior union official at the base and I made that very invitation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to place my question to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if the Minister can advise us or indicate to the House what incentive grant will be lost to the CFI project because of the closing down of the James Bertram section of the complex.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I believe that question at the present time is sub judice. Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, my question again is to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if the Minister can confirm or deny that the government or MDF has an investment in Futronics Limited of Selkirk?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the former Manitoba Development Fund, as it was called, did make a loan to Futronics Limited so they do have a financial interest in that company.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister answer yes or no if Futronics have been placed in receivership by MDF?

MR. EVANS: It's very difficult to give a yes or no answer to anything, especially if you've been teaching at a university for a while. The company has had a very difficult time and I believe they are in the process of going into receivership. I can't say whether it was the Development Corporation or whether it was the creditors.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary. Would the Minister indicate to the House what loss of employment will result if the plant is closed?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I would like to say that the members are getting to hypothetical questions again. The honourable member asks "if" and naturally it's hypothetical at that moment. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): I'd like to address a question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if he could indicate how much grain has been sold via Churchill this year, and secondly, could he advise whether the terminal has been filled now?

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I know the honourable friend put the question to me last week. I expect there's an answer on my desk somewhere but I haven't had a chance to look it up this morning.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have leave to make a small announcement in regard to the item we have on our desks. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I give you tangible evidence of a small decentralized industry in the field of fabrication which is located in the Town of Roblin and, Mr. Speaker, the President has brought samples of the manufactured item to the Legislature today and, through the channels of the principal's export office and our connection with the Japanese wheat market, this President has created a situation - and his company - whereby a large importer

(MR. MCKENZIE, cont'd.) of wheat has become a large exporter of the raw material which we have on our desks this afternoon. And Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister of Industry and Commerce to greet the Japanese trade delegation with this sample of what Manitoba and Japan can produce through their joint efforts. The finished product has been manufactured in Manitoba and it's only one of many other evidences of what that trade connection can do to Manitoba and Japan. - Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and Environmental Management. Has Manitoba hired a former manager of the Saskatchewan Timber Board?

HON. SIDNEY GREEN (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, yes.

MR. SPIVAK: Would the Minister explain what his duties will be?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, my estimates are before the House now. It's a proper question for the estimates.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate. Second Reading. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, could you call Bill No. 32, please, and then the bills that follow seriatim.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Consumer, Corporate & Internal Services) (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, could I beg leave to have this matter stand? (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. (Bill 33)

MR. HANUSCHAK: Stand, please.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek. (Bill 37) Absent.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs. The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs. (Bill 27)

MR. HANUSCHAK: I beg leave to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance. The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs. (Bill 36)

MR. HANUSCHAK: Stand, please.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Youth and Education, that Mr. 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.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 68, (a) - The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: This is on the Minister's salary and I think it's appropriate. Mr. Speaker, the importance of this particular department of government has not always been recognized in the past, and before we deal with the item by item matters that are listed in the estimates . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder if we could have a bit of order. It's very difficult for me to hear the speaker. Proceed.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . and because we are dealing with the Minister's salary, I'd like to say a few words about what is really the unique importance of the Minister's position as the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and Environment, and about the unique and onerous responsibilities he has to his department.

I believe it is not misleading to compare the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources' responsibilities to that of a trusteeship - or as that of a trustee - for the Minister is our trustee for natural resources of uncounted value, a value that truly could be measured in money equivalent only if we spoke in trillions of dollars. Most of the lands in Manitoba, more than three-quarters of our total land area, remain in the public domain. The waters of our lakes

(MR. SPIVAK, cont'd.) and rivers and our forests and everything that grows in them, our wildlife, the esthetic values of our surface resources, the minerals counted and uncounted, our coastlines, all these are part of a trust which is held by the Minister, and so the Minister's responsibility is a trusteeship for all those who live in Manitoba today and a trusteeship for all those who will live here in the future.

It is a trusteeship on behalf of those who are employed either directly or indirectly in the harvest, in management, in development of our resource space, and on behalf of all the firms who in fact harvest our resources in Manitoba. Most of all, it is a trusteeship on behalf of the owners of our resources and that means every citizen in Manitoba for we are all truly owners of this vast resource space. The government and all the governments who have preceded it and all those governments who will succeed it, do not own the natural resources of Manitoba. Governments are merely trustees. Ownership is vested in the citizens of the province, the people of Manitoba, and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is a trustee for these owners. He's a trustee for all of us, for each of us; every citizen has equal rights or an equal share of this great birthright of ours, and the exercise of this trusteeship is a phenomenal responsibility, Mr. Chairman. To fulfil it the Minister must take into account the aims and the aspirations, the goals and objectives, the whims, the wishes and the serious views of every citizen, and he must temper these views with the knowledge of his responsibility to citizens as yet unborn.

So far as may be possible, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources must manage the resources of Manitoba as the people of this province would manage them if each individually could exercise that right, for that really is the nature of a responsible trustee. This implies that the Minister has a particular responsibility to allocate the resources of the Province fairly and equitably among competing users and among competing uses. Some of these uses are established already, some are being established, and some may be established in the future. The wealth with which the Minister deals and whose allocation he must supervise has a value several scores greater than the provincial budget. It is a wealth that each year yields total values in the form of employment, income and economic activity far in excess of our annual budget of \$500 million.

It is the Minister's responsibility and part of his trusteeship to ensure that this wealth is developed and controlled and managed in the interests of all of us in Manitoba. In short, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has a greater financial responsibility as trustee for these resources than do all of his Cabinet colleagues combined. He deals with values far greater than the Minister of Finance does. He deals with employment that is more significant than the employment generated by the Department of Industry and Commerce in a decade. He deals with esthetic values that affect the life of every Manitoban. In the field of pollution and environmental control, he deals with the matters that affect public health as significantly as the total operations of the Minister of Health and Social Development.

Now, it's fortunate for all of us and particularly fortunate for the health and survival of any Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that not all aspects of this vast trusteeship requires attention every day. The forests continue to grow; the birds continue to sing; the Minister does not need a watering can to irrigate spruce trees nor an alarm clock to wake up the robins. But each year a few critical problems emerge. Immediate action is needed; immediate decisions must be made; and when that happens there is a knock at the Minister's door. It may be a requirement for a solution to a resource allocation problem, which is a question of choosing among competing users and competing uses in a way that is satisfactory and parallel to the kind of choices that the owners would take if they were in a position to exercise this trust themselves. It may be an opportunity for development, an improvement in the interests of the entire community, or only one or two individuals within the community; or the urgent need may result from changes in the world around us, changes which force us to adapt our pattern of living or our technology to newly discovered phenomena. But the need for decision, Mr. Chairman, and the need for action will arise and the Minister will be called on to fulfil this trust that has been placed on him.

Well that very generally, Mr. Chairman, is the position which I would like to discuss, the performance of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, and I make it painfully clear, Mr. Chairman, lest there be any suggestion that my remarks today are another mere political foray, because they are not. I've defined my honourable friend's responsibility in an exacting way, I think. I've acknowledged their importance and their difficulty. I've described what I

(MR. SPIVAK, cont'd.) think is a generally acceptable objective for the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. For some 18 months, the Honourable Member from Inkster has held this great trusteeship. In that period, critically important decisions have been required; immediate action has been called for. I'd like to discuss two incidents, two of the most important, I think, and I'd like all the members to join me in assessing the performance of the Minister.

The first of these incidents has been discussed in the House already. I've asked about it; the Honourable Member for Rhineland, who is absent today, has asked about it; other members have asked about it. The Minister has replied heatedly, vehemently and generally peripherally. It concerns the fishermen on Lake Winnipeg and the Minister's gentle care and nurture of them.

In discussing the Minister's salary, I think we should describe in detail the background and the facts involved in this question. The crisis began to emerge for the fishermen a few weeks before the member accepted his present responsibilities. In October of 1969 a letter was received by his predecessor from a private citizen. That letter pointed out that the income of fishermen on Lake Winnipeg had dropped to 25 percent of their long-term average, that a major social and economic disaster was occurring, and there was mounting evidence of some form of serious ecological imbalance in the lake. The letter was received by the previous Minister - who is absent right now, Mr. Speaker - the present acting Minister, the present Minister of Industry and Commerce. It was never answered by the Honourable Member for Brandon East or has it ever been answered by the present Minister.

By December 1st of 1969, just a few days before the present Minister accepted his present responsibilities, the Government of Saskatchewan informed the Federal Government and the Government of Manitoba that mercury contamination had been found in fish on the Saskatchewan River. Within a week or two, further information was officially communicated to the Minister to the effect that fish in Cedar Lake was also contaminated. Within another week or two, it became evident that fish in Lake Winnipeg were also contaminated. The scientific evidence was amassed by the Fisheries Research Branch of Canada. The Manitoba Minister of Mines and Natural Resources was kept fully informed; he took no action.

Immediately that contamination was discovered in the fish of these waters, the federal Minister of Fisheries and Forests, the Honourable Jack Davis, ordered the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation to continue to purchase all fish produced from these waters at normal prices and to destroy them. One hundred percent of the cost of this program was met by the Federal Government and federal action was immediate. Obviously it was clear even from Ottawa that the social and economic conditions of the fishermen would not permit fiddling and fussing. An instant response came from the Federal Government and all costs of the program of compensation, which operated from December to the end of March, 1970, were met by the Federal Government. I repeat this for public information, Mr. Chairman, because recent statements by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources in this House and elsewhere have indicated that he alone attempted to solve the problems of the fishermen, that he wrestled mightily with Ottawa but to no avail. He has implied that Ottawa is not aware of the problem and unwilling to take action to aid the fishermen, but I ask him to repeat these statements in Easterville, in Gimli, in Victoria Beach or in Berens River. The fishermen of Manitoba know who has responded and who has not responded.

Throughout the first three months of 1970, the Minister and officers of his department were repeatedly approached by representatives of the fishermen asking for information concerning the nature and probable duration of the disaster and for information concerning action which the Provincial Government would take. Simultaneously some of these same representatives approached the federal Minister and were informed that the plan of compensation established in the emergency situation in December would be continued until March 31st but that the federal Minister was ready to meet one-half of the cost of any plan established after April 1st, 1970, to meet the needs of the fishermen and their families. There was no response from the Manitoba Minister.

On April -- Well, you're shaking your head; we'll have an opportunity to debate this and I have my correspondence and you have yours. On April 8, 1970, only weeks before the spring fishing season would commence, Manitoba fishermen still did not know whether commercial fishing was to be continued or suspended. Mr. Chairman, they wrote politely to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and asked for information. They begged for assistance

(MR. SPIVAK, cont'd.) and the Minister met with them. That was the beginning of a series of negotiations and meetings conducted at the expense of the Manitoba fishermen, Federation of Fishermen, which continued for almost two months. The discussions were heated and sometimes unpleasant. Several points were at issue. Records show that the value to the fishermen of Lake Winnipeg fishing resource had averaged approximately \$4 million per year. The Federal Government had announced it was prepared to meet 50 percent of the costs of a reasonable plan of compensation. The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources opened negotiations by striking a bargaining position. He said, in public and in the House, that the value of the resource to the fishermen was about \$1 million - one million per year, Mr. Chairman, to be divided among 1, 100 fishermen and their families living around Lake Winnipeg in areas where the cost of living is high; less than \$1, 000 per family on the average, Mr. Chairman, to be divided among people who, in general, have no other source of income.

Now, I wonder, Mr. Chairman, why anyone would think it was surprising that the fishermen were not pleased. Is this the way that the people of Manitoba want their trustee to act? Would the people of Manitoba believe that less than \$1, 000 per family was adequate compensation for the loss of livelihood derived from this disaster? Does the Minister seriously believe that he's fulfilling his trust, that he's responding in an acceptable way to a natural disaster by offering the fishermen compensation equal to only one-quarter of their ten year average income? Does he seriously suggest that these Manitobans should pay the cost of the mercury pollution that he's done nothing so far to correct?

There are other points at issue, Mr. Chairman. It was at first suggested by officers of the Minister's department that no immediate action would be taken because no plan of compensation could be designed which would be equitable. Mr. Chairman, the Manitoba Federation of Fishermen produced a plan and presented it to the Minister's department. I'm told that arguments continued for more than four hours and that finally the officers of the department reversed their original opinion and admitted that the plan presented by the Federation of Fishermen would work. That plan was taken over by the Department of Mines and Natural Resources, modified very slightly in minor detail, and put into effect. And, Mr. Chairman, within 10 months of that event, the present Minister of Mines and Natural Resources stood up in this House and stated in front of all of us that his department had designed the plan for compensation. His department. His department had accepted the Manitoba Federation of Fishermen's plan, modified very slightly.

Mr. Chairman, let him repeat these statements, not in this House but in the presence of the executive of the Manitoba Federation of Fishermen. Let him repeat those statements in Easterville or Dauphin River. Let him go to Victoria Beach and take credit for designing the compensation scheme which was in operation last summer; and while he's there, Mr. Chairman, let him explain why he instructed officers of his department to argue so vehemently for compensation limited to \$1 million per year, and let him explain to the men who discussed the matter with Mr. Davis on April 2nd of 1970 how he, the Manitoba Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, fought long and hard with the Federal Government to obtain assistance for the fishermen. Let him repeat that statement in the presence of Mr. Davis, who offered assistance months before the Manitoba Minister would admit the problem existed and who provided compensation at 100 percent federal cost for four months while the Manitoba Minister considered the implications of the problem.

Well, Mr. Chairman, after almost two months of negotiation, of arguments and pleading, the fishermen were able to persuade the Minister that \$1 million a year was not enough. They settled for a temporary solution. That solution was \$2 million in compensation to be paid over a five-month period ending October 31st. Their acceptance of this proposal was based on a clear statement on their part that the acceptance was conditional upon the understanding that compensation would not be discontinued on the 31st of October. Mr. Chairman, on the 31st of October, 1970, the compensation plan was discontinued. In December of 1970, the Minister in co-operation with his colleagues commenced a fumbling winter works program which yielded wages and salary incomes totalling \$380, 000 during four winter months ending about the 31st of March 1971, and that program has now been discontinued. The total of compensation and winter work programs for the 12-month period which has just ended has been \$2, 380, 000. Now this has been the response, a response reluctantly agreed to by the province, to an income short fall of about \$4 million. Mr. Chairman, with a 50-50 cost sharing from the Federal Government, the trustee for our resource has grudgingly provided about 55 percent of an

(MR. SPIVAK, cont'd.) income level which was far below the poverty line to some 1,100 families living around Lake Winnipeg, Cedar Lake and the Saskatchewan River, and that has been his response, his responses so far.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister has done a few peripheral things. He has ordered that some lawsuits be launched against alleged polluters. So far nothing has come of that. The Minister has repeatedly stated that he is seeking a long term solution; that he is preparing plans; that he is negotiating for assistance from the Federal Government. In 18 months his plans have not come to fruition. In fact, Mr. Chairman, in 18 months his plans have not come to life. He has ordered intensive work on the preparation of plans, only after he received a formal letter which all of us received from the Manitoba Federation of Fishermen in April of 1971. His plans have not been bread or beans or baloney on a single table in Berens River. They have not provided aid, comfort or cash to a single family in Dauphin River. And perhaps they have generated some employment in the Planning and Priorities Committee, but they have generated nothing on Lake Winnipeg.

Mr. Chairman, would the people of Manitoba believe that 18 months was an adequate time to prepare plans to meet the long term needs of the fishermen affected by mercury pollution? Would the people of Manitoba not say: "18 months! Nonsense. Three months is enough"? And what would the people of Manitoba say, Mr. Chairman, if they knew that the Manitoba Federation of Fishermen had repeatedly asked for a small amount of money, less than \$50,000, in order to themselves assist in the preparation of plans for their own future, and the Minister has refused this money? Would the people of Manitoba be pleased to hear that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources walked out of a meeting with the executive of the Manitoba Federation of Fishermen, telling them that he did not have time to listen to everyone in Manitoba who has a problem? Would they believe that it is a reasonable response from their trustee? Would they agree that this is the way in which they want their business in Manitoba conducted?

Mr. Chairman, in the estimates of the Department of Mines and Natural Resources, there is more than \$5 million allocated for the next fiscal year for reearch, planning and programming. Last year the people of Manitoba provided the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources with more than \$4 million for those same tasks - research, planning and programming. With more than \$4 million spent last year, he has produced not a single plan; there is no reason to hope that he will produce more in the next year. On what is the \$4,500,000 being spent? Why is there no plan? When, if ever, does the Minister intend to take action? When does the Minister intend to stop hiding behind what really is a deceitful attempt to create a false issue of federal-provincial negotiations, and really come forward himself to meet the problem which is his responsibility as trustee of our resources, as trustee for all the people?

Now perhaps the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources should consult with his colleague the Minister of Agriculture. The Minister has said that the incomes of Manitoba farmers are so low that they must be supplemented, and if the Federal Government will not agree to meeting half the costs of the necessary income supplements, the costs must be met 100 percent at provincial cost. Mr. Chairman, the average income of farmers in Manitoba is, I believe, four times higher than the average income of the fishermen around Cedar Lake and Lake Winnipeg and the other affected waters of Manitoba. Why does this set of principles, which applied so recently in the by-election of Ste. Rose du Lac, not apply in Gimli as well?

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has accused me of upsetting federal-provincial negotiations and damaging the position of his government in attempting to obtain aid and assistance from the Federal Government. Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not that stupid. The federal Minister has announced repeatedly his willingness to proceed with any reasonable plan and he's waited upon the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources in Manitoba. That offer has been available now for almost 18 months; nothing has been forthcoming from our Minister of Mines and Natural Resources; and now, Mr. Chairman, you will shortly see the federal Department of Fisheries and Forestry proceeding to implement partial solutions unilaterally because they have been unable to arrive at co-operation programs with the trustee for our resources, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

Mr. Chairman, there is more to be said on the matter of compensation and the matter of discovering solutions to the problems of fishermen on Lake Winnipeg. We can question how much money has been spent by the Manitoba government and by the Manitoba Minister to discover the sources of mercury pollution. We can question, Mr. Chairman, what action has been taken in this direction. We can ask how much of the \$5 million spent on research, planning

(MR. SPIVAK, cont'd.) and programming has been spent to discover ways and means of eliminating mercury pollution and mercury contamination in fish - and we are going to ask those questions, Mr. Chairman. We will ask what has been done to bring experts from Sweden or Japan or Russia, three countries which have had problems with mercury pollution. We will ask how much money has been spent on scientific research to discover the nature of this problem and how effectively this money has been spent, if any has been spent, Mr. Chairman.

But the main point at this time is surely the response of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, which has consisted of self-congratulation, highly misplaced statements of dubious accuracy concerning activities of the Provincial Government, statements of even more dubious accuracy concerning attitudes and responses of the Federal Government, and a persistent attempt to take credit for what others have done, even after he himself has agreed to co-operate only reluctantly. The issue before us, Mr. Chairman, is whether this man seriously can be considered as serving adequately as trustee for the people of Manitoba.

Now by coincidence, Mr. Chairman, the second major challenge confronting my honourable friend also concerns Lake Winnipeg. And may I say at the outset, Mr. Chairman, for the edification of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and for any of the others on the other side who may believe this, that Lake Winnipeg is not a bathtub. For the information of my honourable friend opposite, Mr. Chairman, Lake Winnipeg is a large and beautiful lake, some 300 miles long, in places more than 100 miles wide. It is one of the largest fresh water lakes in the world. It is a lake whose shorelines are characterized in many places by magnificent beaches, and on those beaches, Mr. Chairman, more than two million visitor days of recreation occur each summer. Generations of Manitobans have grown up enjoying the beaches of Winnipeg Beach, Ponemah and Gimli. At least one novel written in Manitoba centres around the excitement of a child who first visited those beach lines. It is a lake which long sustained many hundreds of families who lived commercially by fishing. It is a lake around which many millions of dollars of public money has been spent on park development. A much greater amount of money has been spent privately on cottages and grounds by the hundreds of thousands of Manitobans who visit it annually. And, Mr. Chairman, I repeat for the record and for the special edification of my friends opposite, it is not a bathtub.

Now some years ago, about five years ago I think, someone had the idea of using Lake Winnipeg as a storage basin for hydro power development. Further studies conducted prior to 1968 revealed that this was not very practical and that there might be serious dangers to the beaches and to the shoreline and the marshes, and to the cottages and parks and wharfs and docks of Lake Winnipeg if power were to be given priority and the water levels of the lake were to be raised.

Mr. Chairman, about six months ago the First Minister announced casually in the course of a press conference that Manitoba Hydro could have Lake Winnipeg if they wanted it - apparently the First Minister was acquiescing to a peculiar request from the chairman of Manitoba Hydro. The next morning, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources had a clear responsibility. He should have gone directly to the First Minister and shown him the error of his ways. After all, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has not been reluctant to state his opposition to the views of the First Minister on other occasions. If he had been acting as a good trustee for this, perhaps our most valuable single natural resource, he would surely have gone to the First Minister and pointed out that there was one or two or three complications about using Lake Winnipeg for a power reservoir.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, he might have pointed out to the First Minister that you really can't do these things like that. There is, after all, a board appointed, among other things, for the purpose of reviewing proposed changes in the regime of water control on Lake Winnipeg and other waters. No licence could be morally granted to Manitoba Hydro until the board had reviewed the proposed use of the lake and had filed for public scrutiny its report. No licence could be granted until the public had an opportunity to hear the plans of Manitoba Hydro and state their views, concerning the use of the lake. After all, Mr. Chairman, that lake belongs to all of us. We could not expect the First Minister to agree to such public reviews unless we placed him under duress. After all, he has stated unequivocally that he does not believe in consulting with vested interests, and the fishermen on Lake Winnipeg have vested interests in Lake Winnipeg - and Mr. Chairman, so do the cottage owners, so do the tens of thousands of Manitobans who visit Grand Beach annually; in fact, all of us have vested interests because we own it, so we can understand why the First Minister would object to

(MR. SPIVAK, cont'd.) consultation and public review of his plan. The only advice that we could expect the First Minister to accept would be the advice from a disinterested person, preferably an expert who has never lived in Manitoba, one who has no vested interest, one who doesn't give a damn what happens to Lake Winnipeg.

But, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources still had a responsibility. Not only did he have a responsibility to point out to the First Minister that there should be public hearings and that the plans of Manitoba Hydro should be made clear - if indeed that was possible - he should also have pointed out to the First Minister that a study of Manitoba Hydro System requirements was commissioned after the present government came into power in 1969. More than \$800,000 was spent on Manitoba Hydro on that study, and I have the first volume in front of me; and that study, Mr. Chairman, a complete and documented analysis of the power requirements of the province and of the alternate ways of meeting those requirements, shows clearly and unequivocally that the control structures on Lake Winnipeg for the purpose of Hydro plans and development should not be commenced before 1993 at the earliest.

Mr. Chairman, that is 22 years from now. Studies conducted at public expense, almost a million dollars, clearly show that the control of Lake Winnipeg is not advantageous to Manitoba Hydro. Consider this, Mr. Chairman. Past studies have indicated the possibility of serious damage to the recreational resources of Lake Winnipeg if the lake is to be controlled for Hydro purposes. The First Minister has ordered that the lake be controlled for Hydro purposes. Numerous engineering studies before 1969 show that the control of Lake Winnipeg would not be advantageous for Hydro purposes. A final review of the entire power system and generating requirements, commissioned by this government, has shown that under no circumstances should Lake Winnipeg be controlled for Hydro purposes before 1993.

The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is at least morally committed to public review by the appropriate body before any licence to control Lake Winnipeg is granted. No such hearing has been called. Manitoba Hydro has been granted an interim licence, and now the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is going to study the situation.

Mr. Chairman, where's our trustee? Why has he allowed this to happen? Leaving aside for the moment the question of the great financial loss to Manitobans which can derive from their foolish approach to power development on the part of the government, why has our trustee not insisted upon public hearings? Why has our trustee not pointed out to the First Minister that grave doubts have been raised by technical reports concerning the effect of the proposed flooding of Lake Winnipeg? Are we to conclude that our trustee, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, has also been deluded into believing that Lake Winnipeg is a bathtub? Well perhaps there is another explanation, Mr. Chairman.

The entire debate concerning the regulation of Lake Winnipeg and the effect of regulation for Hydro purposes on the beaches and shorelines, centres around the effect of wind and the wind tide and the waves set up by changing barometric pressure and wind. One side of this argument states that an increase in water levels, particularly in the autumn months, will have no effect on the beaches and shorelines because the maximal level will be lower than maximum levels which have occurred once or twice in the last hundred years. The other side of the argument states that the high levels necessary in the fall months would be extremely damaging to the shorelines because major storms and changes in the barometric pressure would cause waves and wind setups. Storms sweeping across Lake Winnipeg can drive the water into the south end of the lake and wave action can erode and damage beaches and shorelines, cottage properties, and the docks and wharfs . . . , but apparently, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources does not believe this. The chairman of Hydro has told him not to worry about this and I can only conclude, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister believes that he has discovered the man who can still the waters. No wonder he believes that there is no need for public investigation of Hydro plans - our trustee believes that he has put his hand in the hand of the man who will still the waters. Now the Minister's faith is touching, but it's not reassuring.

Mr. Chairman, there is much more to be said about the plans of Manitoba Hydro and we are going to have an occasion to debate that tomorrow and in the ensuing days, and you may rest assured that we will do our best to make the implications of the actions of the Hydro Corporation clear to all the people of Manitoba. You may rest assured that we will fully explore the financial implications of what Manitoba Hydro is proposing to do. But for the moment, Mr.

(MR. SPIVAK, cont'd.) Chairman, let the committee consider how well our trustee has behaved. Has he done everything that we would expect of a trustee responsible for the present and future of Lake Winnipeg? How much of this \$5 million of planning, research and programming money has been spent already to discover the effects of the plans of the First Minister for Lake Winnipeg? Has he drawn the matter of public consultation to the attention of the First Minister? Has he pointed out to the First Minister that a million dollars has been spent on technical studies which show that the control of Lake Winnipeg for Hydro development purposes is totally unwarranted before 1993?

But no, Mr. Chairman. The Minister has assured us that he is allocating money to do some more research on Lake Winnipeg. Since Hydro has already been granted their licence, the Minister has decided to spend a little more of the public purse, I think \$650,000, to find out just how much damage is going to be done. Having let the horse go, the Minister is now busily designing a new door for the barn. And this he refers to as his new thrust.

Mr. Chairman, this was a silent spring on Lake Winnipeg. Fishing boats did not go out; the transport vessels are not plying the waters of Lake Winnipeg to pick up the fish. All of last summer not a fish was harvested from the lake for commercial purposes. It's been a silent spring, Mr. Chairman, but it will be a very noisy autumn. The Minister has given us another treat. He showed us how agile he was in a sleight of hand as he defended the increases in his estimates. He said he was hiring -- he said he wasn't hiring, but at least we said he was hiring 150 new civil servants. He said he was only hiring 70 and it was really only 20. He shuffled and redealt and added and subtracted and confused, but things remain the same. He was still devoting \$1,285,600 to hiring even more bureaucrats. That's a 13 percent increase in salaries alone, or a big enough increase to hire 150 new civil servants at \$8,750 per year each, and that's nice, he tells us, because Manitobans want more bureaucrats. They don't care if fishermen are treated fairly or if resources are managed responsibly; they want more bureaucrats to work for the Minister and he's very happy that we're going to have Crown corporations who are going to be public corporations who are going to hire and employ people.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I could go on. I could deal with other resources, management decisions which have been taken under the authority of my honourable friend, the Member from Inkster, but I think these two examples will suffice. I think we can see from these two examples what sort of a trustee he is. Mr. Chairman, I review the actions of my honourable friend, I try to consider how effective he has been as a trustee, and, Mr. Chairman, I therefore move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney, that the Minister's salary be reduced to 50 cents because he's not worth a dollar.

MR. CHAIRMAN presented the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. No matter how bad he is, I think that the Minister should get more than 10 cents -- (Interjection) -- 50 cents.

Mines and Natural Resources, of course, Mr. Chairman, is always interesting for people that come from Northern Manitoba. But before I get into this, I kind of wonder where the Leader of the Opposition is going at times. He clearly stated that Lake Winnipeg is not a bathtub but what does he feel South Indian is? A bathtub? Because I'm sure he must say that South Indian is a bathtub because he has intended to make South Indian a bathtub. -- (Interjection) -- Oh yes. You can't say that the flooding of Lake Winnipeg will make it a bathtub and, as far as South Indian goes, it will not make it a bathtub. I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, that as far as I'm concerned the South Indian Lake has just as much to offer as the Lake Winnipeg has. The Leader of the Opposition says we've got to protect the shoreline. They weren't interested in the shoreline a couple of years ago. They said this is fine and dandy. They tried to make a policy for the north and a policy for the south, and these are one of the things that we really become concerned about when we do find government moving into two policies, one for one area and one for the other. It always seems that we get the end of the policy. In other words, there's one for the south and they'll look after the north when the time comes. This is why I became very involved in the South Indian area, because I could see at a later date just what would happen to South Indian Lake, and certainly I think if there is a policy and if any of us are asking for a policy, then certainly it should be the same whether it's Lake Winnipeg or South Indian.

I think that South Indian is just as productive as Lake Winnipeg. Over 800,000 pounds of fish were taken from those waters last year. It is one of the mercury-free lakes that we do

(MR. BEARD, cont'd) have, and certainly when they talk about fooling around with the Churchill River they must consider that this is one of the last of the great rivers that we have that is not polluted and we have to take a good look at it, because for every gallon of water that's directed from Churchill to the Nelson -- or to Lake Winnipeg -- it is said that that gallon is lost. It's lost as far as the fishing is concerned for the Province of Manitoba. So I really do feel that we've got to be very careful, as people in the past have indicated, in respect to diverting water from one area to another. I think that the government, past government, did say, well, take the attitude that there were not too many people in the north and this would not hurt, to flood that area, and there were other people that were supporting the government on it. They said that nobody lives up there; really what have we got to worry about? But I think they should be worried as residents of Manitoba in that in a few years there will be more people. There must be at least 100,000 people up there now and it will grow, and it is the one area that has kept Manitoba growing. Certainly without the industry in the north then we would find that our populations have dropped, and have dropped a goodly number of thousand. You only have to take a look at Thompson at 25,000, and Flin Flon, Snow Lake, Lynn Lake would add many thousands to the population of Manitoba. So we must protect our areas and must see to it that it is available for resource development.

In talking about resource development, I do part from the government's thinking when I look at their \$500,000 they set aside for exploration risks and developing of government mining operations. I think, first of all, they're competing with the many mining companies, and I believe that they will find that they will not be able to compete and that they'll be put in the position where they own the bat and ball in the game. In other words, it could be that they will not allow mining companies to go ahead with exploration on the whole of Manitoba as they are now allowed to, but they will be saying "You cannot explore here and here," etc. I think that they should be treated just the same as the other exploration companies. It should be a free area to explore. On the other hand, I would like to see them, if they're going to do that, do something about claims and not allow them to sit under the thumb of mining companies for too many years. Granted the mining company has to look ahead to when their resource is depleted in that one particular area, but I don't think we should be able to sew up the whole of the north just to make sure that they are going to be protected. I think that mining companies themselves spend millions of dollars, and it's risk dollars, and I'm sure that if the government set out to spend a million dollars on risk to see if they could find a mine, it would be very difficult for them to defend this type of a policy.

But I think that the government could direct their attention to another area which is important - as important or more important than the development of the raw material - and that is, of course, providing secondary industry for these large townsites. I think it's very important that they consider that the mine itself and the town is only good for the number of years that the unrenewable resource will be able to be processed at that one area, and we only look at Flin Flon today and find the position that they're in, where they've had a four and a half month strike. It would have been very valuable for Flin Flon to have a second industry for that area but, not having it, they're having a terrible time in the economic field. It isn't a risk if you assist companies to go into secondary industry and, while I used to have my reservations on government owning something such as this, I can see now that it would be of value because there are many areas, in fact the Churchill forest area is one in which it's a risk, but it's one that is providing jobs for many many thousands of people. I think that you could tend to say that government should feel they're responsible for the people that are working in large communities where the whole livelihood of the community is dependent on people working in the mine, and I would hope that they would do something about it.

The last point I would make at this time would be in respect to Paint Lake. Now either the Minister of Tourism or the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, and I think it would be the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, have laid down a policy where at Paint Lake there is no further leasing of lots allowed for the building of cottages, and I think this is a terrible position to put those people who want to build, particularly out on the islands. We say they don't rent the islands, or lease the islands in other parts of Manitoba, but there are hundreds of islands on these lakes. Paint Lake, I believe, has around 155. Some people have been allowed to build out there and now it has stopped. No reason other than it isn't allowed in the rest of the province. But I think this would be the ideal area. The government do not then have to be responsible for garbage or the services such as lighting and communication,

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) etc. ; they're free of it, and they can let these island lots go to people who want to live out on the island. But not only that, they won't let them build on the lakeshore and there are many people that are waiting and they expect to be able to build there, and I would hope the Minister could give us more information on why the freeze is there and when it will be lifted. Thank you.

. Continued on next page

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I will be brief because one of our other members will be taking part in this debate in respect to water resources and I'll cover some of the other areas. I at this time am not sure which way I will vote on the motion that was presented by the Official Leader of the Opposition. One area that I do find fault with the Minister, and that's in respect to the fisheries and the fishermen. I know personally I've had contact with fishermen, contact with people, not on one occasion but on many occasions in the last year or so, and they were inclined to believe that the Minister did not give them the time of the day or was not prepared to treat them in a proper way, and for this reason I will reserve my judgment on just what I'll do, but I'll come and deal with the fisheries a little later.

I would like to say at the present time that this is a very important department. I think this department, with the Department of Industry and Commerce, are two departments that can create a tremendous amount of employment, can expand our economic base, and certainly are very important departments. It deals with Fisheries, Lands Branch, Forestry, Mining, Wildlife, Water Resources and Northern Affairs, and it deals with a very wide range of resources, and for this reason I feel that it is a very important department.

I wish to deal first with probably Management and Wildlife. I believe that we must have a program designed to conserve the wildlife and other natural resources of the province, because I believe the Wildlife Federation quite recently have stated that some 65 species of our bird life will become extinct in the very near future if we don't do something about it, and the main reasons are that the species fail to adapt to the changing time, to the changing, not time but changing environment, and of course the abuses that are caused by man himself who destroys the habitat's environment.

I don't think we have kept pace with the changing needs of the times in order to achieve the best possible management of these God-given privileges. I appreciate that government can only provide so much and the rest depends on the people themselves, that they would have to undertake the responsibility themselves and conserve our resources that can be enjoyed by our children and their children later on, because, Mr. Chairman, after all is said and done, it's the heritage, one that nature gives us. We are fortunate in having wonderful forests, lots of water, plenty of game, but we must be careful to see that we conserve it, protect it and leave it for those who come after us. And I'd say that in the way of wildlife management we're just beginning to get involved in that field. Probably what we have done is very limited on a very small basis. Many conservationists talk about endangered wildlife in Canada and this is very appropriate because of the habitat destruction. We have the pesticides, pollution, and indiscriminate hunting and trapping are just a few of the reasons for the plight of our wildlife in this province and other areas. I know that modern agricultural practices have destroyed probably the greater part of our habitat for the prairie chicken. The water pollution threatens many species of our fish, which was quite clearly demonstrated and we are all aware of it now, of the mercury pollution, and I believe the former Member for Ste. Rose, Mr. Molgat, last year demonstrated quite clearly in one of his speeches to the House where he documented a very important piece of paper where he showed the number of pounds of fish taken from three lakes, Lake Winnipeg, Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipegosis, since 1940 to the year 1968, and the trend is quite clear, or the indication was quite clear that when we had a high production, say, in the years of the early fifties, somewhere in the neighbourhood of five million pounds on Lake Winnipeg and it continually dropped to 596 pounds, just decreased completely; and the same holds true for Lake Winnipeg and Lake Winnipegosis. This shows a period of some 28 years that there was a decrease in the pounds of fish taken commercially by the fishermen from your three lakes in Manitoba and I think it's quite unfortunate that probably the department and the government didn't give more consideration and undertaken a complete research or better research and determine what caused the fish to decrease in such tremendous numbers over a period of time. Was it some kind of pollution? Was it a different species of fish or was there too much commercial fishing on it -- so that probably better care would have been taken. It seems that once your harvest has decreased from two million pounds to merely 100,000 pounds then this became a serious matter and we started to do something about it, and it was very clearly demonstrated in this House last year. I wish perhaps the Minister can undertake that we won't let this happen again in some of the other areas that we are harvesting fish.

Now many of our birds as well, Mr. Chairman, the whooping crane, has become extinct in Canada because of the wintering ground in Texas; the land has been used by oil people,

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) commercial oil interests and DDT pesticides which becomes a threat to many of our species and many of our birds. The rocky mountain sheep winter ranges are grazed by the cattle and are becoming quite rare.

The other point that concerns me is the use of snowmobiles for chasing particularly foxes and jack rabbits which are on the decrease. I know that during the wintertime the wildlife is in a weakened condition and the females are probably pregnant and harassment are fatal in many cases. I know even at the present time you can still see some snowmobiles chasing foxes or jack rabbits on the open fields and I don't believe they should be permitted.

I also don't feel that there is any regulations, to my knowledge, on the hunting of say, jack rabbits as to quota, any person can go out on a Sunday or a Saturday and kill 15, 20 or 25 and there's no limit. I'm sure there should be some quota unless the game is so plentiful that this doesn't matter, but I'm sure that that type of legislation would be worthwhile in this area.

The other problem facing wildlife in Manitoba is the loss of habitat; a habitat base is so necessary to support wildlife populations. This loss is great in good agricultural zones because the land is used for agricultural purposes. Also there is the problem of the landowner and the hunting friction because of the crop damage and the nuisance of the hunter and the wildlife coming to the farm. I know that your Wildlife Federation should be congratulated for the tremendous good work they have done in getting the farmer and the hunter to somewhat improve their relationship and to understand each other somewhat better; but the point is that there are times that ducks or geese do destroy a tremendous amount of grain for the farmer and perhaps there could be some kind of compensation even if there'd be a fee charged on the hunting licence strictly for that particular reason as to ensure that the farmer gets some compensation if he has any loss of grain because of your wildlife.

Another point that came to my attention in southwest Manitoba where we have many many potholes and a large majority of your nesting takes place by certain species of ducks, your mallards and canvasbacks in the potholes around Minnedosa and south in that area, and the problem is that the brood is only about two, the hatch is only about two ducks or two chickens instead of 12 or 14, which it should be. So something is the problem there and I'm sure the department could look into it, what is causing in those small potholes that there is such small hatches instead of what a normal hatch should be, say a dozen to 14 or eight; instead we are seeing a mother hen with two little ducks instead of a dozen or half a dozen. It could be mercury pollution or it could be some from the spraying of crops, DDT, or some other reason for it but I would sure be hopeful that the department would look into it. This just came to my attention the other day.

Mr. Chairman, the other point that I wish to raise - I know that last year in your elk season there was some 1,100 permits with only 200 elk harvested which is, I understand, a small number because it was my information the department wanted to thin out the elk in the park because there wasn't enough feed. I would like to know how many of the ones that were taken were male and how many were female, because it is my information that mostly it's the female that are coming out of the park and getting killed while what you call the trophy animals are staying in the park and very few are shot. I think it would be in the interest of animal management that some of the old elk would be shot - if the hunters want to take him for trophy can take him because they'll die anyhow or the wolves will get him when they get in a weakened condition in deep snow. I don't know how this could be accomplished but it certainly would be worthwhile for the department to consider if there would be some way for the hunters to be able to take the trophy, or have a trophy season so there would be more of your older male animals taken instead of all your young female.

I noticed considerable increase in angling revenue from angling licences which is a good indication that we have a considerable amount more people getting interested in sport fishing and I believe that this will continue to a great extent. On the other hand, your commercial net decrease is considerable, and I wonder if since your sport fishing is increasing at such a rapid rate, and it's considerable increase - your residential licences increased by six percent, your non-resident licences increased by 12 percent, which is an interesting point, and my first observation would be to the Minister, are we stocking sufficient amount of fish in the lakes since there is such a tremendous increase in the sport fishing, because your sport fishing does not take place in areas usually where commercial fishing is done. I think that we have to restock our fishing if we are going to continue to attract many people to sport fishing and particularly tourists. So I would like to know from the Minister to what extent has the restocking increased

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) and in what lakes has this taken place.

I know that one of the provinces, I believe it's Ontario, I'm not certain - the Minister can check it out - has free licences for sport fishing for the tourist. I'm not advocating that because I know that if we have fish, the amount that you have to pay for a sport licence is very small and I don't feel that we should eliminate a licence, but my concern is restocking of the lakes which I believe is very important.

The other point is that briefly, perhaps, I can mention about some of the upland game seasons in respect to your grouse and prairie chicken. There is, I understand, a real increase of these birds and I wonder if there's going to be an extended hunting season for your upland game birds or not. I know that in the last couple of years, at least the Hungarian partridge, where the population has really in Manitoba gone down extremely low and they are quite plentiful in southern Saskatchewan, but I believe they are also on the increase in Manitoba at the present time and I wonder what the bag limit is and will there be a season for this species of this bird or not.

Mr. Chairman, I also have a couple of letters here, I understand every Member of the House received one and I believe the Minister has one from Robert W. Page, teacher from Tuxedo Shaftesbury High School. Copies went to the Premier, Ministers and MLAs of . . . and that's in respect to management. It's a very good point that he raises and I think it's worthwhile for the Minister to check. I believe you have a copy. It deals with wildlife management and it's from Robert W. Page, a teacher at Tuxedo Shaftesbury High School. I believe the Minister has it. It's a very good letter in respect to wildlife management and I hope that the Minister can take time to take a look at it. I will not read it, put it on the record, but I do believe that the fishermen, and this is the point that I wish to raise, the fishermen certainly have a problem. We all know that mercury contamination was discovered in the waters of the Saskatchewan River late in 1969 and by December 1, of 1969 it became necessary to discontinue commercial fishing operations on Cedar Lake, Lake Winnipeg in Manitoba. Subsequently testing of fish from all northern Canada revealed that mercury contamination existed in other waters as well, but the only significant waters in Manitoba were the Saskatchewan River, the Cedar Lake and the Lake Winnipeg from which I just quoted the following statistics where there was such a decrease in the number of pounds of fish taken out by commercial fishermen.

At the time this mercury contamination was discovered there was no workable official tolerance level for mercury contamination of foodstuffs in either the United States or Canada and because some 90 percent of the fish harvested in Manitoba is exported to the United States it was clear that the most important single factor was a tolerance level to be set. I believe that it was set by the United States Government, the United States Federal Government set this tolerance level, perhaps somewhat arbitrarily, at .5 parts per million of mercury and Canada followed suit with the same level. Fish containing more than .5 parts per million cannot be marketed in any form in Canada or the United States. Subsequent scientific testing concerning the medical effects of mercury in foodstuffs do not encourage the belief that the tolerance level will be raised. The possibility exists that it may be even lower.

Mr. Chairman, the sources of mercury contamination have not been definitely identified but it does appear that certain chemical plants were a major source of pollution. One was the Saskatchewan Chemical Plant owned by Inter-Provincial Co-ops; the other was the Dryden Chemical Limited at Dryden, Ontario. Also where mercury used as fungicides for treating seed grain, may have . . . from farm soils. Elemental mercury has been discovered also as a contaminating source in certain areas of Ontario. In all probability there are other sources as well because the Minister himself has announced two other lakes just recently - I believe Clear Lake was one, and I know it's very difficult to say where the mercury pollution would come into that lake because it's doubtful to say that it came from the spraying of crops.

Mercury pollution is a phenomenon with remarkably long life; lakes in Sweden found to be polluted 40 years ago remain polluted today. Mr. Speaker, we must be concerned about the fishermen because they may not be able to fish commercially to the extent that they were some time ago. Scientific advice from outside Canada has suggested to Canadian scientists investigating the problem of mercury pollution in Manitoba, that Lake Winnipeg is unlikely to be suitable for fish harvesting again within 20 years and that the problem might persist for a longer period of time. This assumption is based upon the behaviour of mercury already in the water.

We must also recognize that not all sources of pollution have been identified or stopped and consequently it is reasonable to suppose that mercury is still being poured into the lakes.

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.)

Mercury pollution affects only certain species of fish, I believe the most important species that we fish in this area are the ones that are affected which is jackfish, pickerel and sauger; that I guess of less commercial significance which are the bass, catfish, perch, maria, are also affected but to much lesser extent. I understand whitefish and tullibee are virtually unaffected, to my information, by the mercury pollution. If I am incorrect, I hope the Minister will correct me to put it straight on the record.

The levels of mercury contamination found in fish harvested in Lake Winnipeg and Cedar Lake are only marginal above the international tolerance level and tests commonly reveal levels of .7 and .8 parts per million in sauger, pickerel and northern pike. These levels are nevertheless above the tolerance level and consequently all fishing in these waters has to be suspended and they're not fished.

Now I feel that the Minister must give the fishermen some attention. I think that the fishermen need and have requested immediate continuation of cash compensation in order that they can still have an income until a long-term solution can be worked out. They have requested such compensation continue until it is phased out in favour of some long-term solutions. How close to long-term solutions the Minister is at the present time I don't know, but the information I've been receiving is that the Minister has not been giving his best attention to this problem.

I believe the fishermen have also requested \$50,000; I don't know if they've been successful or not to acquire resources necessary for the development of a plan. They have pointed out to both provincial and federal governments that failure by both levels of government to produce a workable long-term plan leaves the fishermen with no hope of improving the present situation.

They have stated and they believe that they can develop a plan acceptable to both levels of government if they are provided with a certain amount of money so they can do a research and study how they can best readapt themselves to some other program. I think a long-term program of resource development and perhaps even alternate employment is obviously the only worthwhile solution to the problem. This is what the Minister must give serious consideration to, because with the mercury pollution and as long as it takes to clear some of these lakes out with the knowledge that we have at the present time, which may be almost 20 to 25 years, so I say it's not a very small problem.

I feel that a long-term program solution to the problems of some 1,200 fishermen in this province whose livelihood is fishing, and in my opinion has been destroyed if not almost completely destroyed, we must have to look to probably a program for even some other form of occupation, be it a development of fish farming, or some other related support and supply industries. This is up to the Minister and up to your staff to determine what can best be done.

These are the few things that I wish to make at the present time in the Minister's Department but I want to point to him again with information that has come to me from the fishermen themselves - and not one fisherman, more, you know, I've met with quite a few fishermen - I cannot help be critical of the Minister in respect to the problem that the fishermen have been confronted with in the last year or so and with no almost solution in hand, and I guess probably response that the Minister has shown to the fishermen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I'm glad the Member for River Heights has returned to hear the response to the remarks. For a moment I thought that he had got up and gone again. That would not have surprised me because I think it's rather unusual, but not unexpected, that we have a motion to reduce the salary before answer has been made to the alleged criticism, but I'm quite satisfied that my honourable friend knows quite well that the position that he takes is not tenable, therefore there is no use weakening it by getting the answer before the motion is put.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, I notice my wife and three year old child in the gallery today, so there is a special reason for me to try to defend my salary appropriation and it's for their benefit I repeat that I'm going to make some response although it really does not come to me as a serious motion. I know that my honourable friend has become rather desperate lately. I know that when he sat on this side of the House that there were numerous occasions that he could not uphold this position to the extent where he now agrees that the changes that we made and that he tried to sustain, are things that he should never have tried to sustain. I know that

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) while a member of the opposition there are various times that he got up and made criticisms which were shown to be not worth a dollar, not worth fifty cents, not worth anything at all and that of late, he has tried to - I'll use his term, he has tried to attract attention by becoming more and more outrageous, and that each time he becomes outrageous, his position becomes more and more difficult to handle so his last outrage is to use the hackneyed but traditional and well accepted motion to reduce the Minister's salary. He is following the lead that was set by my colleague the Minister of Labour in not using the dollar figure, so he's used a 98 cent figure. The honourable former minister wishes to go one better so instead of 98 cents, it becomes 50 cents, and, Mr. Speaker, that's the extent of his originality.

I notice that the honourable member today used the phrase, "I'm not that stupid." Mr. Speaker, last week there was an argument at Committee concerning whether or not the former member was stupid. I note that that argument has been dismissed, that now it's not a question of whether or not he is stupid but the degree of that stupidity, because he says that he is not that stupid. He picks on this item with the treatment of the fishermen in Manitoba to make an issue out of, and I think that that's a very legitimate point of discussion, because certainly the fact that 1,000 fishermen in Manitoba have seen their income threatened by mercury pollution over which they have no control, and how that issue would be dealt with and whether the government would do everything possible to deal with that question, is certainly to me an important issue. If I was a member of the opposition, I would say what did the government do and how did they handle this; what efforts did they make. And of course if nothing had happened, Mr. Speaker, if before the criticism arose, the result or the projected proposal was that in the first summer when we didn't know what the resources would be, we provided 100 percent income maintenance by means of straight compensation or roughly 100 percent - and you know my honourable friend, he always uses the figures to his advantage. I remember last week I said I "presumed" he didn't give us the Ontario figures on taxation and I said I presume that if the honourable member doesn't give them it's because they don't help his case. I subsequently found out that I was right, that the reason the honourable member didn't give the Ontario figures is that they didn't help his case, they were out of the way. And the same thing is true with regard to the figures with regard to fishermen.

The honourable member indicates that the losses in Lake Winnipeg over an average ten-year period were \$4 million a year, that that was the average income. But, Mr. Speaker, is there anybody suggesting, is the honourable member suggesting, did anybody on his side of the House suggest that in the year '67 and '68 or '65 and '66 each year for the period of ten years, that the fishermen's income were dropping, did he suggest that somebody should come in and make up that difference? Because what we undertook to do, and the only thing that we could do, and the only thing that the Federal Government was prepared to do, was to maintain the level of fishermen's income as they were in the period immediately before mercury contamination took place.

Mr. Speaker, he says that I threw out the figure \$1,000,000. I want it indicated at this moment that if he will go back to Hansard or any place where that statement was made, what we said was that we would cover the income that was lost by the fishermen in the previous year of summer fishing and that my advice was that this was in the neighbourhood of a million dollars, but that that figure should not be used because we would be dealing with the actual figure; and that's the figure that we dealt with. And my honourable friend, when he withholds this information, or when he uses it the way in which he uses it, merely indicates once again that he has a very weak position and he is seeking a method of strengthening it. He uses a letter that I know nothing of. It's true the government would have received a letter in October of 1969, before I was the Minister. It would have had nothing to do with mercury pollution. It would have had to do with the fact that over the years the fisheries resources in Lake Winnipeg had dwindled. This is not something that my honourable friend discovered; the Member for Ste. Rose, the former Member for Ste. Rose made several excellent speeches on that in the House last year, put in an Order for Return which demonstrated the reduction in earnings; indicated that nobody knew whose fault it was and asked that a program of research be engaged in, and we offered with the Member of Ste. Rose to do whatever was necessary to discuss these dwindling earnings; but my honourable friend because he has a weak position with the fishermen seeks to link that letter with the loss of income as a result of mercury pollution. And I expect that. I expect that from my honourable friend, because in the last several weeks

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) I have learned to expect anything from my honourable friend.

Again, he refers to a meeting with fishermen - and let's just examine how a thing - you take a fact and see how that fact can be attempted to be used, for the benefit of the honourable member. I met with the Federation of Fishermen in my office. I think we met for three-quarters of an hour, at least, with my staff. We came to conclusions that we would pursue a program of income maintenance for the fishermen. I was asked by the consultant for the fishermen, who wants us now to pay his salary, I was asked to be present at the closed negotiations. I indicated to the consultant that I knew nothing about fishermen's income, that I had a staff to deal with these questions, that I couldn't negotiate the actual terms of agreement with every group of people that had a problem and that if the staff and the Fishermen's Federation could not get together on what they should be paid, that after they had had those discussions and came to some disagreement at some point, that I would re-enter the picture to see if that disagreement could be solved.

My honourable friend takes that fact and says he walked out of a meeting with the Federation of Fishermen and told them that he didn't have time to spend with everybody in Manitoba discussing their problems. Listen to what happened and listen to what the honourable member said. We were in session at the time, I spent three-quarters of an hour with them. I told them that they should continue their discussions with my staff. They said that they wanted me to be personally present while they were working out the discussions. I indicated that that wasn't possible but if any disagreement came up between them and the staff, that I would come back in. And my honourable friend says he walked out of the meeting, told them that he couldn't spend time with them.

I want to tell the Honourable Member that the President of the Manitoba Fishermen's Federation, who is not dealing with this I believe on any partisan basis, who is a candidate for the Liberal Party in the constituency of Rupertsland, in the presence of twenty people in my office, roughly twenty people, in the fall of 1969 told me that the Manitoba Government had done more with regard to this fishermen's income problem than any government in Canada. That statement was made in the presence of approximately twenty people; and I don't think that Mr. Ateah would deny having made that statement. But my honourable friend says, tell this to the Federation of Fishermen that you are doing something. He said that I was self-congratulatory. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that of all the criticism that he makes, perhaps that hits me in a most sensitive way, because I never said a word about what I did with relation to this question until the honourable member got up in the House and said that the fishermen in Manitoba are going to starve. "That they will starve", those were his words. The effect of the policy of the Minister is that they will starve. Then I got up - and I think that anybody reading back the message, who thought that this was self-congratulatory, if that would be anybody's judgment but the Member for River Heights then I would have to look at it again and try to assess whether in fact I was patting myself on the back - but if that's the judgment of the Member for River Heights, then I know like all of the other judgments that he makes, that it's not worth a dollar, it's not worth fifty cents, it's not worth the paper he is writing on, it's not worth anything and I won't try to answer that question. But I do want to come back to the question of the fisherman.

He says that in the beginning of 1970, which is true, the Federal Government recognized that they were 100 percent responsible for the problem of the fishermen and the income of the fishermen and as a result were buying all of the fish from Cedar Lake and paying for it as if it was not contaminated fish; and he recognized that that was a Federal Government responsibility and I don't expect that he is now saying to us, we should have told him not to do it, that we will pay a certain share of it. Nobody complained about it. They did it. And I'll tell the Member for River Heights that they did it because they thought that the problem was going to be a very temporary one, and that's really what they told us. They thought that the problem would be cleared up in three months and as soon as they found out that it wasn't - and I'm not going to be critical of the Federal Government - they cut it off with 15 days to go in the season; instead of letting it go to May 15th, I believe that was the time - or April 15th - they cut it off on the last day of a particular month which I don't remember and said that they would not do this any more and it was at that point that we started talking about an income maintenance program for the Province of Manitoba. And now my honourable friend says it wasn't really a Manitoba program at all, it was the fishermen's program themselves. Well I suppose if we had not used their advice, he would have said, reduce the salary of the Minister to 50 cents

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) because he didn't consult the fishermen. We did use their advice so the member says reduce the salary of the Minister to 50 cents because he used the fishermen's plan, he didn't use their own. Well the fact is, Mr. Speaker, we did - we used the fishermen, we used our own resource people, we used the Federal Government people, and we came up with a plan which was a good one; and I suppose because we came up with a plan which was a good one, the member says, reduce the salary of the Minister to 50 cents.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to but I believe that I must at this stage ready part of a letter that I sent to the Honourable Jack Davis with respect to these questions and which outlines the facts of this matter, so that we will be able to determine who is now gilding the lily. Is it the Minister of Mines who is patting himself on the back or is it the Member for River Heights, who having found no way outside of outrage and outside of going to tangents which I wouldn't even have expected of him, and I expect everything of him, who is trying to make a case, which can be substantiated in one way or the other.

Mr. Chairman, the following are the facts. "Little progress has been made since our presentation of our program to you on April 22nd, 1971". So if I'm going to read the letter I'm going to have to table it, so I may as well read the whole thing. "Further to our previous discussions in connection" this is May 26, 1971.

"Further to our previous discussions in connection with an income support program for Manitoba fishermen who have been put out of work as a result of mercury contamination of Manitoba Lakes, I regret to be advised by the Deputy Minister of this department, Mr. Mair, that little progress has been made since the presentation of our program to you on April 22nd, 1971.

"May I briefly review the sequence of events which have preceded our present situation.

"1. In April of last year, the Manitoba Government was required to close several important Manitoba waterways to commercial fishing due to high levels of mercury contamination being detected in the fish in these waterways.

"2. The Manitoba Government immediately undertook to formulate a program to compensate fishermen for income which would be lost during the open water fishing season of 1970 and the Federal Government undertook to pay 50 percent of the costs of any acceptable program.

"3. After consultation with various groups of Manitoba fishermen, an income maintenance program involving a total cost of approximately \$1,800,000 was developed by the Manitoba Government in consultation with your regional staff and presented to and accepted by the Federal Government.

"4. This program was immediately implemented in the summer of 1970 and information then available to us indicated optimistic prospects for the reopening of these commercial fisheries in the winter of 1970-71.

"5. In August of 1970 it was learned that optimistic predictions for the opening of the fisheries were unwarranted and that we could more reliably expect no early reopening of the fisheries.

"6. The Manitoba Government immediately contacted various representatives of fishermen in Manitoba and advised them of the pessimistic view relative to future commercial fishing in the lakes concerned and also suggested that long-range programs would have to be formulated to deal with the problem of fishermen whose income from fishing would be terminated or seriously affected as a result of the new conditions.

"7. In October of 1970 a provincial delegation headed by myself met with yourself and other officials of the Department to discuss a proposed program to compensate fishermen who would have been involved in the winter fishing season in the lakes concerned. At that time it was specifically indicated that the winter program would probably be hastily put together and perhaps not as satisfactory as should be the case but that it could provide much-needed experience and information which would be necessary for the successful implementation of a program to deal with the more serious problem which we would be facing during the summer of 1971. The Manitoba Government accepted full responsibility for formulating and implementing the program and the Federal Government's participation was discharged by the payment of 50 percent of the cost of the program. This program consisting mainly of winter works and costing approximately \$380,000 was implemented and administered by the Provincial Government.

"8. During our discussions in October of 1970 we indicated that we would be preparing

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) what we hoped would be a more sophisticated and long-range program which we could begin to implement in the summer of 1970.

"9. In April of 1970 following discussions with representatives of fishermen in the Province of Manitoba, the Manitoba Government prepared a proposed program for the summer of 1970 for discussion with the Federal Government. Although we did not regard this program as being perfect, we did feel that discussion with the Federal Government, whose officials we would have thought would have had the problem under advisement, would produce the best possible program to be undertaken this summer. The proposed Manitoba program was presented by myself personally to a delegation headed by yourself in Ottawa on April 22nd, 1971. At that time we were advised by yourself and other people present that the Manitoba program was the most sophisticated that your department had yet seen and that in principle the government was content to maintain fishermen's income and favourable consideration would be given to our presentation.

"I wish to emphasize that I at that time told the Federal Government time was of the essence and that in order to successfully handle all features of the program we would require a reply within a week. At that time you indicated to me that normal departmental restraints prevented you (now listen to this) normal departmental restraints prevented you from making a definite commitment that the Government of Canada would pay 50 percent of the cost of the program to maintain fishermen's income, but you also indicated that you were hopeful that such a commitment would be forthcoming."

My honourable friend says the Federal Government has made a commitment. Can we have the commitment? Does he have it? Did they make it to the Honourable Member for River Heights? Because they didn't make it to us and they told us that they couldn't make it.

"10. Between April 22nd and May 10th we received almost no report of progress from your department.

"11. During the week of May 10th to May 14th I intended to make arrangements to personally see you again in Ottawa. However, on Friday, May 14th, you spoke to me by telephone and indicated that the Federal Government would be assuming 100 percent of that part of the program which related directly to coarse fish development and fish research."

My honourable friend says that we did not start talking about a program, a long-term program until we received a letter in April from the Manitoba Federation of Fishermen. Well I can advise my honourable friend that prior to the month of April the program for coarse fish development was already in the hands of the Federal Government. Now maybe my honourable friend, when he was a Minister, knew how to do something in March which he didn't learn about until April but I say to you that we did in March what we knew about in April and we got a letter from the Manitoba Federation of Fishermen after we did these things, not before. Those are the facts and they're on the record.

"You also indicated that serious attempts were being made at a meeting on May 17th (that's the day of my learned friend's -- my honourable friend's 'starve the fishermen speech' -- the same day as they were meeting in Ottawa he was predicting that the fishermen would starve; he said that they would starve) to determine what monies would be available from other government sources for this program. I advised you that my Deputy Minister would be available in Ottawa to discuss these matters with your Department officials following the meeting of May 17th.

"12. The Deputy Minister of this department, Mr. Mair, stayed in Ottawa for the period Monday, May 17th to Thursday, May 20th inclusive but has reported that little progress has been made in connection with the implementation of this program which is supposed to be set in motion on June 1st, 1971.

"13. Officials of your Department were in Winnipeg on Friday, May 21st, to discuss these matters but again appeared to be completely unconfirmed as to the source of financing for this program.

"14. It has been indicated to us from time to time during our discussions that the Department of Indian Affairs would finance 50 percent of the works program which involves treaty Indians.

"The foregoing state of affairs has resulted in a feeling which can almost be described as 'panic' with respect to 1,000 fishermen who are unaware as to what will happen to their livelihood this summer. I have continually refrained from trying to deal with this matter in such a way as to shift blame to the Federal Government. It has been my intention throughout

May 31, 1971

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) to avoid acrimony in the hope that sincere efforts on both sides would produce results. I believe that you can obtain confirmation of my attitude in this connection by referring to your departmental officials who were in attendance at the Conference of Fishermen this summer when I indicated the steps that were being taken by both governments in this connection. My position in this connection is becoming less and less tenable." (In this regard maybe my honourable friend will feel that he has made a contribution to this because he appears now in my letter.) "In the meantime my inability to announce definite programs is being used by the Leader of the Opposition in such a way as to escalate the fears of fishermen. I would refer you to the exchange which took place during the speech given by the Leader of the Opposition during the Budget Speech Debate on May 17th, 1971, a copy of which is attached." So I gave him for what it is worth the honourable member's prediction that the fishermen are going to starve, to show what is happening as a result of the difficulties that we are having in enunciating a program, that there are people who are possibly irresponsible, possibly their degree of stupidity has not been agreed upon by themselves but that they will use this type of thing.

"Not having received definitive information by Friday, May 21st, I felt obliged to report on this matter in the House in order to alleviate any feelings of uncertainty. I enclose herewith a copy of the statement which I made."

Well my honourable friend was not in the House but if he were here he would know that I made a statement to the effect that we were going ahead, that we were going ahead on the basis of the commitments that we think we have, that we are going ahead with a program which might be limited by the fact that Manitoba doesn't have as great a capacity as it would have if it had both governments involved. We are doing, in effect, what the Minister of Agriculture did. My honourable friend says why don't you do what the Minister of Agriculture did? Well let's remember to my honourable friend that what the Minister of Agriculture did, he said that he was doing because it was a very small program, it was a very limited thing, it was -- (Interjection) -- my honourable friend says that there is a by-election and that there -- that there were no fishermen, somebody said, in Ste. Rose. On the Friday before the by-election the member, the Federal Member for -- the fellow who defeated the Member for Morris -- I wish he were here so we could throw him out too. He made a statement, he made a statement to the effect that there's this Minister in Manitoba, this Minister in Manitoba who is holding \$700,000 of fishermen's money and not giving it to them. He said that on the Friday before the by-election and it happens that there are many fishermen in the constituency of the Member for Ste. Rose and we did best -- I'm advised by the Member for Ste. Rose that we did very well in those constituencies which have fishermen. Mr. Chairman, I told you that the member would become outrageous. I am now -- I am now responding . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please. Order please. The Leader of the Opposition was given an opportunity to make his address without any interruption whatsoever and I would ask that he pay the same courtesy to other members. The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, but I welcome the interruptions because they give honourable members an opportunity of doing what my honourable friend said they should do. He said I'm not that stupid and he wants us to weigh the degree of stupidity and therefore I welcome the interruptions because they will give us a better opportunity to weigh. The fact is that there are fishermen in that constituency, fishermen who are apparently satisfied that the Manitoba Government was doing everything that it could with respect to fishermen and nobody, but nobody would accept the ridiculous notion that somehow we were holding \$700,000 in our pockets which was designed for fishermen and that we weren't giving it to them. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, it was out and out untrue. But not a word of truth. As a matter of fact it is so outrageous a statement that it's one that really can't be challenged. It's like trying to prove that one and one is two, completely outrageous. There was absolutely nothing to it at all and my honourable friend does the same thing now.

He says that we terminated or the -- maybe that's being unfair to him. He said that the program, the compensation program was terminated on October 15th. The compensation program wasn't terminated. He indicated that there was a program to compensate fishermen's income to the extent of roughly \$1,900,000 and that program was implemented. It wasn't a program that was to continue, it was a program that was terminated, that was finished and my honourable member should know -- it's not contained in my letter but again -- it's not

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) subject of argument that the Federal Government has refused us. We have told them we don't think that a compensation program is the best type of program; we had lots of complaints about this type of program. We don't think a straight money program is the best type of program but if that's what you suggest or if that's what you have to offer then we are not going to refuse the fishermen of Manitoba this program. But Mr. Davis -- and I don't criticize him at all for this -- says that this is not the type of program that we are willing to continue to participate in; we have to have a different type of program. And, Mr. Chairman, we gave them a different type of program and the fact, the fact that the people in the area claiming compensation -- and I don't fault them at all for this -- that there would be an argument between the people who are claiming compensation and the public of Manitoba who are giving compensation shouldn't be unusual to my honourable friend or maybe it should be because I was going to say he's a lawyer but since he didn't practice law he wouldn't know this.

The fact is that I have not, I have not hardly been involved in a case where the claimant didn't ask for one figure, the person who was being claimed against didn't suggest another figure and that some agreement had to be arrived at or else something had to be arbitrated, and we in fact provided, with the fishermen's compensation program, that where agreement could not be arrived at to the amount of compensation that there would be a board set up to deal with this question.

And if that comes as a surprise to my honourable friend I say to him he should employ his own words. I am supposed to be a trustee, he says a trustee, and I suppose I'm a trustee for all of the people of Manitoba whose money is going to be used quite properly to deal with the question of fishermen's compensation. Would he say that the figure that is requested is the figure that should be offered? That that's it? Because he himself says that the requested figure was a 10-year average figure of income for the previous years. And you know I don't fault the Federation of Fishermen for trying to act as the best trustee for their members but I have been too long involved both in solicitor-client relationships, in litigants relationships, in labour-management relationships in expropriation proceedings, in compensation programs of different kinds not to know that there is frequently, if not almost always, discussions that take place before compensation is arrived at and if my honourable friend says that he, if he were in my seat, could have come to an agreement as to compensation without any discussions, without any arguments and that the amount that was requested would be given, then I say to him that's a very good reason why he's no longer sitting on government benches because that's just not credible and nobody's going to believe you.

It's true that the people who are pushing very hard, and again I accept this from them, pushing the position that the fishermen have, and they definitely have a very good position, we all know that here is a group of people who suddenly, through no fault of their own, find that their means of livelihood are destroyed through agencies for which they are not responsible and everybody sympathizes with them. But nobody would say that he who says that he will do most for them or give them the most is the one who is most sympathetic to the fishermen's problem. Because, Mr. Chairman, there is a big difference between my honourable friend and myself. I am, as he put it, a trustee and I have to recognize the responsibility of the Government of Manitoba and the rest of its people for this compensation program and everything else that goes with that and my honourable friend doesn't have to recognize anything. He wants to make any statement which he thinks will have the result of seeing to it that my salary is reduced from whatever it is to 50 cents. Well, that's fine.

But if he is saying that he would do differently, Mr. Chairman, we know different because we saw him in action. The people who were at Damascus Steel, they had a claim, they felt that they were being undone, they felt that they were entitled to compensation. The honourable member said that we've looked at this and it's been through the courts and all kinds of other questions and we can't do anything. And I'm not at this moment going to fault him for that. But I'm going to suggest that there is a difference of perspective which he knows well about. It reminds me, Mr. Speaker, of the woman who came to the butcher shop, a story that's told quite often by Myron Cohen, a woman came to the butcher shop and said she wanted to buy some lamb chops and the butcher says "Fine, I have lamb chops." She says, "How much are they?" He said "They're \$1.20 a pound -- I don't know whether that's anywhere in the range or whether it's not -- (Interjection) -- Is it about right? -- So, she says "\$1.20 a pound," she says, "that's outrageous." So he says "What do you mean outrageous?" She

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) says "Well the butcher across the road he's selling them for 60 cents a pound." So the butcher said "If he's selling them for 60 cents a pound why don't you go over and buy them from him?" She says "Well he doesn't have any." So the butcher said "Well if I didn't have any I'd be selling them for 30 cents a pound." And the fact is that my honourable friend can say what he likes, the fact is that these events speak for themselves. The fact is that Mr. Ateah of the Fishermen's Federation said in the presence of myself and most of my staff that Manitoba has done more than any other jurisdiction. The fact is that we have had an income maintenance program and it's probably the first of its kind. I don't know whether in the event of other dislocations of this kind that governments have behaved this way, and in particular I don't know whether the problem has been shifted to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that generally it would have been accepted that this is a relocation problem, a manpower problem, an assistance problem, but, Mr. Speaker, we did not let it get out of our department because we felt that we would be the ones who would be strongest to do something about it and I think that events have shown us to be correct.

My honourable friend says we didn't give \$50,000 to Mr. Young, the consultant for the fishermen. Well, I suppose, I suppose that my honourable friend would figure that this is the best way of buying off these people who are making a noise; that really what we should do is give them \$50,000 and then they'll keep quiet and we would come to the Legislature and say, "Look, how wonderful we are, nobody is complaining about what we are doing." But it wouldn't solve the problem, Mr. Speaker, and the fact is that we then might be spending \$50,000 on the basis of paying consultants who would come up with nothing and we would have a problem with income maintenance for the fishermen; and I am not one to say that the staff that has worked in this department is less interested in solving this problem, is less capable of solving this problem, has less of a desire to solve this problem and is willing to accept the responsibility for whether or not the problem is solved. And we will have to answer for it, I will not come into the House and say "We bought off the fishermen by giving them \$50,000 to their consultant." Maybe that's the way my honourable friend operated but we can't operate that way. And the fact is that I believe that the same request was made to the Federal Government who, under the BNA Act which I'm not going to rely on, have the responsibility for fisheries, and the fact is I'm quite sure that the Federal Government has acted just as responsibly and feel that their research people with regard to fisheries are interested in solving the problem, are capable of solving the problem, and are willing to accept responsibility for what happens one way or the other. I believe, Mr. Chairman, contrary perhaps to what my honourable friend believes, that that's the way government should operate, and that's the way we have operated throughout. So if my honourable friend will make out of this case of what we have done with the fisheries, a case for demonstrating that we have no regard for the fishermen and that therefore we are bad trustees of the province, if he will use this incredible position to suggest that, it means that he's lost faith in any kind of program that his supposed party would administer and which he's asking the people of the Province of Manitoba to accept, because it's just not credible. It speaks against common sense, first of all, because it's not true and even if we were completely incompetent, which I hope we are not, that we will have tried to do something and my honourable friends could have said, they tried but they failed; but to say that we absolutely did nothing and that we have no regard for the fishermen is just not credible. My honourable friend tries to suggest that there is all this money waiting to be picked up from the Federal Government, there is all this money available to him and somehow the Minister of Mines and Resources who is interested in gaining the enmity of the fishermen is refusing to do anything about it.

Mr. Chairman, if we dismiss everything that has to do with competence, integrity, effort, sincerity, it's just not credible that anybody would behave in that way; even my honourable friend with his degree of what he referred to and with what I think is his compassion for people in difficult circumstances which I have to say that he probably has not been too close at hand to such people in his existence, but I would never say that my honourable friend did not try. I might say all kinds of things, of what kind of a bad job that he did, but to suggest that the money is on the table and they are purposely not taking it because they are trying to get fishermen antagonistic towards them, it just makes no sense at all, and I can't understand, except on the terms that I repeated previously how my honourable friend would try to take that kind of a position.

My honourable friend started off by saying that we were trustees. The property doesn't belong to the government, it belongs to the people and that we are the trustees for the people.

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) I agreed with the entirety of his opening except I couldn't figure out where the government stands. My honourable friend, in his concept of government, believes that the government is something separate from the people, that you have these people and then you have this overpowering government and maybe he is viewing it from his point of view as to how they operated as a government or how they think they should operate when they are a government. But I tell my honourable friend that I sincerely believe this, whether he believes I do or not, that I believe that the people are represented in this Chamber and that the government are the trustees for the people of Manitoba, indeed, but as a government. My honourable friend seems to think that we have three groups: we have the government; we have the trustees; and we have the people, and I say we have the people, one group; not three, one; and that those people select trustees and those trustees are the government. My friend could use a lesson in Civics because he has failed to identify where the government stands in this business. I say that the government and the people are in this Chamber and if he doesn't believe that then he has no business being here, because that's all the reason for us to be here, is to be an extension of the people of the Province of Manitoba and their ability to do things. He says that we are trustees and I agree with him. And somehow he went from this trustee business to how the trustee dealt with the fishermen.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have a lot of things to deal with as trustees. Yes, we have to deal with things such as how we are going to give out mining leases. I know that when the trustees over there who were the people's representatives, handled the situation, the leases, automatically you staked a claim, spent a certain amount of money, got a lease and then every 21 years you got the lease renewed at a previous rental. Did they ever look at these leases or what they were doing or how they were dealing with the trillions of dollars that my honourable friend is talking about? Did they? I can tell you that they didn't.

They did the same thing with oil leases. They did the same thing with franchises which are given with regard to the harvesting of wild rice, things of that nature, and I tell you that there was almost no concern once the regulations had been made as to how these things were handled. I tell my honourable friend that with regard to Crown land, which he referred to, with regard to mining leases, with regard to oil leases, with regard to other franchises, with regard to harvesting, we are looking, indeed we are looking at how these things have been dealt with in the past. We are looking at the return that the people of Manitoba got as a result of the way in which they were handled and we are looking to get them the best possible return.

I ask the honourable member whether as trustee these questions were ever raised or didn't they just follow the pattern; that this is the way it has been done, this is the way it will continue to be done and we don't know just how the people benefit by each of these things.

My honourable friend says he doesn't know where the lawsuit is. My honourable friend should know that there are lawyers, lawyers proceed in their good time, clients shout "Get busy", lawyers continue to proceed in their good time. It's no different here than anywhere else. I hope that the lawsuits are progressing, but certainly my honourable friend can't refer to a lawsuit of this kind involving that many millions of dollars which will have come to trial much sooner than we are in at the present time, but I repeat, my honourable friend doesn't really know a great deal about the law so we can't rely on his advice in that direction, or at least, if we are to rely on it, we are to rely on it to the same extent as we rely on him for his advice in other directions.

"We have produced not a single plan." Those were his words. We produced a plan for coarse fish development which has been, to my knowledge, agreed to 100 percent by the Federal Government; we produced several plans for income maintenance which I'm now advised Treasury Board in Ottawa will be considering on Wednesday and that we will probably get substantial approval for that plan. Whether we get approval for the plan or not, we've asked the officials of our department to deal with them.

My honourable friend refers to "self-congratulatory" statements. You know, I think my honourable friend, when he talks about government, when he talks about trustees, when he talks about self-congratulation, he relates everything to what he did and what he would do if he were in government. He's indicated that we've raised the staff, we gave staff to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources in order to make me appear to be some type of power broker, that what the government is doing is giving staff to the Minister of Mines, and we come out with his statement about 150 staff, over 1,300 people and my advice is it's more like 70 over 1,300 people which is, oh, I suppose, in the neighbourhood of five to seven percent. I've also

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) indicated where each of these staff years is to be used. And you know, my honourable friend has harped on this. He did it in the Throne Speech debate too; said somehow the Minister of Mines is seeking attention and therefore he found no other way of getting attention but to write letters to the Premier.

I tell my honourable friend that the writing of that particular letter - and we're not going to debate it at this time - but I considered that that particular letter was really a courtesy to the First Minister as to whether he wanted this person in his government or not and I wouldn't make some type of exit from everything that I have worked for in my political life as a result of a misunderstanding. Maybe my honourable friend would do that; maybe he feels that that would give him attention, but as far as I'm concerned, I've worked in this business for a few years in order to accomplish things and I'm not exactly about just to leave every time my nose is turned in the wrong direction, and therefore I wrote a letter. I didn't write it to seek attention but my honourable friend, because he himself knows that what he would do would be seeking attention and he puts it in those words. My honourable friend says that I don't know ways of seeking attention, but my honourable friend knows ways of seeking attention.

We have increased our staff roughly I say for the ongoing programs, roughly 20 people over 1,300 people. I challenge my honourable friend to find a lesser increase in any department in any of his years in government. We have increased our staff roughly 70 people if we take into account additional programs. I still say that that is an increase of less than seven percent, in the neighbourhood of five percent. I challenge my honourable friend to find any of those staff increase which is related to me seeking attention. On the other hand, where does this preoccupation with seeking attention come from? Well, my honourable friend had a department, the Department of Industry and Commerce and for a while they had an Information Services Department which was in another area. What was the Information Services Department? Well, after 1967, it became the Department by which my honourable friend got attention. I mean there were news releases regarding my honourable friend; there were movie pictures regarding my honourable friend; there were still pictures regarding my honourable friend; there was my honourable friend bringing in Mr. Rothschild; there was my honourable friend travelling in this direction or in the other direction. Mr. Speaker, in one area of one department, not in a department of government, they move from five staff people in 1967 and 1968, to 17 staff people in 1968 and 1969; and increase, Mr. Speaker, from five to 17. I think - excuse me, yes, from five to 17 people. From \$13,000 in 1967-68 to \$139,000 '68-69; these are the figures. Information Services: Staff from five to 17; expenditures from 13,000 to 139,000. And what was that staff devoted to? It was devoted to getting attention for the Minister of Industry and Commerce, but totally. So my honourable friend, when he looks at a budget, he looks with his own perspective. He says, What is a budget for? A budget is for getting attention. What has the Minister of Mines done? He's increased his budget by 70 people; that means that they're giving him staff to get himself attention because that's what I did when I was a Minister.

Mr. Chairman, we don't operate that way and you will not find any position in the department that are related to that. But an increase from five to 17, three times as many civil servants. In order to accomplish what my honourable friend did, we would have to increase our department from 1,300 civil servants to 3,900 civil servants, an increase of roughly 2,600 civil servants in order to equal the ability to acquire staff that was demonstrated by my honourable friend when he was in one section of one department. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon me? You hope that I'm a better lawyer. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not, and I admit this - I plead entirely guilty to not being willing to spend public money to get attention for myself as good as the Honourable Member for River Heights did, I will absolutely admit that. I think that people around here know that, that none of the staff here and none of the activity of my department have been designed specifically for that purpose unless - and I will admit to this because I'm not completely unhuman - I will admit that if we do succeed, if we do things that are successful, I am hoping naturally that I will receive approval for having those things accepted; yes, I seek that. I seek that like anybody else. But I seek it in ways which I think are distinctly different from the ways that were chosen by my honourable friend.

Next area where my honourable friend says that we should be trustees, and which he seeks to use to indicate that the salary should not be \$1.00, it should be 50 cents. He refers to Lake Winnipeg regulation. Mr. Chairman, perhaps we haven't said enough about Lake Winnipeg regulation because it's true that there were reports presented at one time that talked

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) about raising the levels of Lake Winnipeg to 716, 718 for the purposes of power and that the people were very much against these reports; but those reports, Mr. Speaker, were some time ago and they were before several disastrous summer and fall periods where the lake as a result of natural causes went to 717, 716, with wind velocity over 720 and that we have had nothing from the residents of Lake Winnipeg during the last three years but requests that we do something about that lake. Maybe my honourable friend should know that Lake Winnipeg regulation is not a plan for flooding Lake Winnipeg which he keeps referring to it as and maybe this is our fault that we have not properly explained. At least our explanations may to some extent have been made less clear by the kind of comments that my honourable friend is making.

The normal limits, the normal range of limits that Lake Winnipeg takes are a low approximately of 709 feet and a high of 717 feet - just remember those two limits. The plan for Lake Winnipeg regulation would squeeze the Lake so that the lowest limits would be raised to roughly 711 feet and the highest limits would be reduced to 715 feet, so that the net effect is to reduce the flooding of Lake Winnipeg from 717 feet to 715 feet.

Now under those circumstances the suggestions that were made with regard to Lake Winnipeg regulation and the ones that my honourable friend is referring to, just do not make sense. We've had nothing, Mr. Speaker, and we've had the residents, we've had the cottage owners, we've had the municipalities and they have been to my office - not complaining about Lake Winnipeg regulation at all, they want Lake Winnipeg regulation - the difference is and will be and this is one difference that will never be resolved, and I defy any Minister who is involved in water control to not have this as a continuing argument, the difference will be that certain people will say that you should use the regulation devices to bring that water down even from 715 to still lower levels and there will be the power interests who will say that in the interests of power, as between the limits we want you to raise those limits.

But nobody and, Mr. Speaker, I say this without exception, I haven't heard a single complaint about the fact that Lake Winnipeg regulation will reduce the upper level of the Lake from 717 to 715. I can't recall and I hope I'm right, a single complaint about taking two feet off the top of that lake and that's what Lake Winnipeg regulation will do and if I needed authority - you know there are some things that you need experts for and there are some things that if you have experts, one expert will tell you one thing and another expert will tell you another - which in law, and again my honourable friend doesn't know much about the laws, so I'll just refer this expression to him -- in law they refer to three classes of perjurers, liars, damned liars, and expert witnesses, and the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that experts can say various things but with regard to Lake Winnipeg regulations, everybody seems to agree that regulation of the lake would be a good thing, because 709 is too low for recreational purposes and therefore raising the lowest level to 711 will be beneficial, that that will be beneficial; 717 appears to be too high for the other interests around the Lake and therefore reducing 717 to 715 will be beneficial. Nobody argues about that and what is argued about is that how these levels should be maintained because they could do much better for the cottage owners if they are reduced at a certain time of the year and they would not produce enough for hydro if they are not built up when hydro needs them.

And, Mr. Speaker, we are examining those questions, we make no apology about examining those questions, but it seems to be generally agreed that if you take the normal limits, 709 to 717 and you keep the lake within those normal limits, 711 to 715, that this results in a net benefit to the area and that it's easier to say this is a benefit than it is to say that if you took a lake which was at 745 and increased it to 775, that that would be all right because that is outside of the normal limits and I tell my honourable friend that this aspect of Lake Winnipeg regulation is generally accepted.

With regard to the other aspect, my honourable friend says we should have hearings. He knows very well that the former Minister of Mines, the Member for Lakeside said that his hearings were a mistake, that he never ever had intended to have hearings over the regulation of the lake. What he intended to have was hearings as to what compensation would be provided. -- (Interjection) -- Well, he said it in the House. I am not saying that it's right or wrong. I am saying that it is wrong to know that you intend to do something (and I said it on that side and I say it on this side) that it's wrong for the government to know that it intends to do something, to have canvassed all of the expert evidence available and then to hold hearings in pretense that it's going to make a decision based on those hearings. That's what the previous

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) administration did. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon me? No.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that under the present legislation the hearings are really designed when a non-governmental agency applies for a licence and that when a governmental agency applies for a licence, in view of the fact that the government has control of the whole thing, both the Hydro and the Department of Mines, that no licence is necessary. Well, my honourable friend says this is wrong, I assure -- (Interjection) -- you say I sound like a lawyer . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Debate is not a private conversation between individuals in this House and whether someone sounds like a lawyer or not, I would ask all honourable members to direct their remarks to the Chair and refrain from these asides.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I would urge you to stop spoiling my fun. The fact is the honourable member now takes the same position, seems to divorce himself from the legal profession which I did for him half an hour ago and now he agrees with me. The fact is there is nothing wrong with lawyers, particularly. I don't think so and if a lawyer can explain something and it makes sense, I would not think that it should be disassociated with merely because it comes from a lawyer.

MR. BILTON: It depends on the situation.

MR. GREEN: It depends on the situation. I agree with you but my honourable friend refers to it as being merely a lawyer. Mr. Chairman, I appear to have lost my train of thought but I'll come back to it in a moment. The fact is that I said -- (Interjection) -- Oh yeah, you know, it's perhaps the train of thought that the Opposition will find difficult because I don't think that it really can be challenged. I don't think that my honourable friend would say that if the government decides on a position that they should then have hearings as a pretense to try to indicate to the public that they are giving them a say in it.

We are having hearings or we have indicated that there will be a public discussion as to how that pattern of regulations should take place as to what -- (Interjection) -- You are asking the question "when?" I am telling you that we will have, when? In due course.

Oh there is no question, Mr. Chairman, that we have said that Lake Winnipeg regulation will take place. Do I have to support myself by the authority of the Opposition? There is no question but that it was agreed and the authorities agree that Lake Winnipeg regulation will be a good thing. How it is carried out, the effects of different parts of it and what we will do as a result of the ecological differences that stem from Lake Winnipeg regulations, all those things are subject to the intensive continued consideration of this government, but Lake Winnipeg regulation as part of the Hydro scheme was never in doubt. It wasn't in doubt under the previous government.

And I want to refer to what the former Minister of Mines said when this program was announced - is there a better authority? Would my honourable friend accept the former Minister of Mines, the Member for Lakeside, as an authority as to whether or not this program, which he now says that my salary should be reduced to 50 cents because we are implementing it, and which he says shows that we are not trustee for the people of the Province of Manitoba - do you want to hear what your colleague, your deskmate said about it, because then maybe you'll have to talk about his salary. He said -- but the former Minister, now the Progressive Conservative member of the Legislature for Lakeside in the Manitoba Legislature, said he is pleased with the decision to build flood controls for Lake Winnipeg. He called it a 'dead right decision' and said he hoped it would accomplish much good. Mr. Chairman, he says that my salary should be reduced to 50 cents, not a dollar because it's not worth a dollar, and I say that his advice isn't even worth fifty cents, it's not worth anything, but I'll accept the Member for Lakeside's advice - a 'dead right decision' and he hoped it would accomplish much good.

I refer to the Mauro Commission report. We talked about whether this is - you know, whether Lake Winnipeg regulation is something which is -- (Interjection) -- You don't want -- he doesn't -- (Interjection) -- You forgot about it, I didn't forget about it. I want you -- (Interjection) -- All right, Mr. Chairman, I'll ignore him, I promise to ignore him.

He talks about the Hydro project. The Kettle generating station on the Nelson River has been designed for twelve units with a capacity of 102,000 KW each. In addition to this power station, this development will require:

(1) Construction of extra high voltage DC transmission lines to bring the Nelson River power system into southern Manitoba;

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)

(2) Diversion of water from the Churchill River into the lower Nelson River via the Rat and Burntwood River; and

(3) Construction of a control structure at Warrens Landing to regulate outflow of Lake Winnipeg into the Nelson River.

There is absolutely no doubt that Lake Winnipeg regulation was always conceived of as part of the Hydro project and our government proposal, which the Honourable Member for River Heights thinks I should come out and speak out against, merely accepts a compilation of all of the reports that deal with the question and says that we are going to go ahead with Lake Winnipeg regulation in this form at this time. But, Mr. Chairman, the same would happen - and nobody disagrees - the same would happen except in one circumstance, and even that we can't completely ignore.

It would appear, Mr. Chairman, that when the engineers started to look at the Churchill River diversion they said, well if you raise the Churchill River by 15 feet and divert the water into the Nelson and then we have Lake Winnipeg regulation, we could supply the power needs. Then another one took a look and said, well if we went from 15 feet to 20 feet we could do less regulating of Lake Winnipeg. And another one came along and said, well if you went from 20 to 30 feet we could do still less regulation of Lake Winnipeg, until, as you kept adding feet of water to the Churchill River diversion, you suddenly found that what was considered by everybody to be the necessary program could be handled without Lake Winnipeg regulation - maybe - and on the basis of that kind of continuous reliance on the Churchill - and, Mr. Chairman, I say without examination of the effects of the Churchill the previous government had decided to proceed with the Churchill River diversion without reports, which they are now complaining about that we are getting for the purpose of making this the best possible type of program - they had decided to proceed with it regardless of the kind of consequences that that meant for both the resources in the area and the people who lived in the areas concerned.

And because we have gone back and said that these are all integral parts of the program and we are going to use Lake Winnipeg regulation for its beneficial purposes - and let's remember that nobody, but nobody would pay \$50 million for the benefits of Lake Winnipeg regulation if it were not for the Hydro project - and that's why all of the requests that were coming from Lake Winnipeg to deal with the flooding on the lake went ignored, and it's only because of the Hydro project that we are going to be able to get some of those side benefits that result from Lake Winnipeg regulation, and which I repeat the Member for Lakeside described as a dead right program - dead right. Mr. Chairman, he was right and the Member for River Heights is wrong, and he knows it, and when he refers to my salary being reduced as a result of me being a trustee of Lake Winnipeg and permitting Lake Winnipeg regulation, then I say again he demonstrates the outrageous lengths that he has to look for to be able to find something to criticize about what the government is doing.

Mr. Chairman, I have to apologize to the Member for Churchill because I admit to having been somewhat involved in the remarks that were made by the Member for River Heights when his remarks were being made, so if he'll give me a little time I'll go back to the Hansard or I'll discuss it with him over the supper hour and have more specific answers to his questions.

With regard to the Member for Assiniboia, Mr. Chairman, with regard to the fisheries, I've tried to give as full an answer as I can give. In giving my answer I say that I have no way, nor do I know of any way to properly satisfy the frustrations, the difficult circumstances, the terrible disappointment that will be felt by many many fishermen in Manitoba as a result of the various things that have been done, as the result of the problems that have arisen with regard to mercury contamination. All I can ask the honourable member to do is to accept a statement of what we have done; to consider as to what a government could reasonably be expected to do; to consider what position is being taken with regard to this matter by other governments; and to determine for himself as to whether or not there are additional things that he thinks we should be doing with relation to this problem. And I don't mean to minimize the problem of the fishermen, but the fact is that they are one problem that the government has to deal with and the government has to deal with that problem in perspective to all of the other problems that they have in connection with the operation of the government.

You are suggesting a cash compensation program for damage caused to farmers by the actions of hunters. Such a licence premium was instituted last year to the extent that we have

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) collected some 100 to 120 thousand dollars. That \$120,000 in the meantime has been used on things such as you referred to in your earlier remarks - lure crops, other ways of trying to keep the hunting activities off of farmers' farms. We hope that the fund will build up in time to provide for a compensation program for damage caused. It has not built up to that extent as yet and therefore there is no direct compensation being paid at this time.

With regard to the announcement with regard to mercury pollution in Clear Lake, that announcement is made by the Federal Government. I don't blame them for making the announcement, I just want the facts to be clear that that's not one of the areas that I deal with. When you talk about mercury pollution generally - I will bare my soul, Mr. Chairman, by giving you my views on the subject. I believe that the tolerance limits are probably too strict, but I can't tell the people of Manitoba that they are because I know nothing about them. All I know is that we did test people who have been eating fish and we found no problems. We do find mercury contamination in lakes that don't appear to have an outside source of mercury, which would appear to me to mean that some of it is in the environment. I would suspect that people may have been eating these fish for years without ill effects, but everything that I say is intuition and you have authorities who say that this is the limit which you could set, this is the limit -- by the way when you say the Americans set the limit to us that is very important because the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation sells its fish south of the border and they just wouldn't buy them if they were fished from lakes which showed a degree of mercury contamination.

So it's not as if we are merely accepting an American limit, we are accepting a limit that we are going to be bound by, we just can't do anything about it. If one could work on intuition one could say don't tell the anglers about the level of contamination. Where would that put us if somebody got sick and said you knew there was a level of contamination in that lake, you didn't say anything about it. Would that be a responsible position to take? The only thing that I can say, what we do say in fact, there is this level, the health authorities say that this may be dangerous, we leave it to you to do as you like.

I rather think that jurisdictions are now even moving away from that particular proposition which, Mr. Chairman, was advanced by this government because when they first came in the Federal Government said that we should ban all fishing. The Government of Ontario did ban fishing, they banned angling and then after we announced -- I believe my sequence is right, if it's wrong then I will take it back -- we announced that anglers would be able to fish provided that we tell them that there is a problem and then subsequently Ontario changed their position and said that they, too, would permit people to fish and then mention the problem. I think that as time goes on somebody may suggest and it may be proven in hindsight that we should never have done this, and I really will not have an answer at that time except to say these are the limits that they told us about it, this is what the health people said about it being injurious to health, this is the position that we took and we felt that there was no other way that we could handle the situation. Certainly the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation would not buy the fish so that deals with it as far as we're concerned insofar as the commercial fishing is concerned.

So far as the sports fishing is concerned I would like to think that most of the anglers are doing what they wish to do, that some of them are fishing for fun and some of them are fishing and risking their health - as I see numerous members of this Legislature who have been told that cigarette is going to cause you cancer and you sit there and you smoke it - and I assume, I assume that some fishermen are doing that. I'm not going to make a criticism of that one way or the other I am merely saying that they are free to do it and I assume that some are doing it.

With regard to Mr. Page's letter, I did read the letter; I must admit that I can't remember its specific content at this time but I know that the Department is referring to it.

With regards to the elk season, I have a memo on the elk season and I'll be able to deal with it more specifically. The 1970 elk season around the periphery of Riding Mountain National Park in area 23 was held from December 1st, 1970 to February 27th, 1971. Licence sales were limited to 1,200 licences on an application basis and the licences were sold in various areas, some of them being very close to the areas concerned so that the local people could get hold of a licence. The kill statistics are not all yet in but it's estimated that a 20 to 40 per cent success was achieved. You indicated about 200 elk. If the lower of that estimate is accurate then you too are accurate and I am not saying that you are not. The recommendation

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) for the 1971 season is to hold an either/or season for moose or elk from December 13th to January 29th, 1972. This would be a month shorter season than in 1970 and the reason for offering either a moose or elk season to the hunting public in this season is that populations of both species in the park are at about optimum levels and depending upon weather conditions should provide available animals to hunters outside the park boundary. The method of handling licences is expected to be similar in 1970 except that they will be available in other places. The 1970 seasons in area 18 the Duck Mountain were a fall season from September 18th to October 17th and a winter season from the 5th to the 19th of December. Each season had a licence limit of 300 licences all selected by two separate draws. The fall season being a traditional calling season has an average hunter success rate of about 30 to 40 percent and the winter season somewhat higher. Suggested seasons for 1971 are similar but with fewer licences to be made available for the winter season due to the higher hunter success and the overall size and condition of the Duck Mountain elk herd. That's the manner that it was handled in in 1970. I'd be prepared to consider any suggestions from both -- (Interjection) -- Pardon me? -- (Interjection) -- No. I must admit, as I did last year in giving my estimates, that I am not a hunter, that whether members believe it or not I have difficulty swatting flies and I just don't engage in that type of activity, so I didn't get myself an elk you know. I have absolutely every regard for people who enjoy hunting, including the Attorney-General who is an avid hunter, but I have not yet found my way to that type of activity.

With regard to the stocking of fish, I could tell my honourable friend that in the capital estimates there are I think \$350,000 available for the continuance of the Grand Rapids Fish Hatchery which we announced last year, that that program will be available for fish stocking and there are other programs in the department that deal with the stocking of fish. I'll be able to deal with the hatchery program. The natural spawning areas for both pickerel and whitefish were made inaccessible to those fishes by the construction of the Grand Rapids Hydro Plant. When this happened it was considered advisable to build a hatchery and biological research station to aid in the propagation of these species. This station also would be used to produce various trout species for stocking northern lakes when the connecting road to Thompson Highway is completed. Construction of this complex began with a pipeline capable of supplying 4,000 gallons of water per minute by gravity flow from the Hydro dam and a service building which is being used as a temporary hatchery. It is operating full time on a limited scale producing pickerel and whitefish fry. During the summer of '69 two staff residences as well as a staff dormitory were completed. The plans and specifications for the main hatchery and research building are nearing completion and construction should be under way early in May.

I see we're at 5:30 so I'll deal with the other questions after supper.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder if the Minister would table the letter he said he was going to table to the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. GREEN: Yes, sure. We'll have to get copies of it, eh?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 o'clock.