

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, 19 March, 1982

Time — 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. D. James Walding (St. Vital): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. JERRY T. STORIE (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report the same, and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for River East, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. MURIEL SMITH (Osborne): A Ministerial Statement, Mr. Speaker. It is my pleasure today to inform the House that I will shortly be holding a press conference to initiate a major, national, co-operative program directed at replacing or substituting Canadian-made products for imported goods.

This initiative by officials of my department is targeted at the \$2.25 billion of purchases made by tax-funded institutions in this country, of which approximately two-thirds are currently imported. Our goal for this program is to redirect 10 percent of this expenditure to Canadian sources and that, Mr. Speaker, could mean as many as 1,200 new jobs for this country. A sizable share which we hope will occur in Manitoba. The focal point of this program, a major opportunities trade show, scheduled for Winnipeg this October will, I believe, encourage many of the smaller firms in Manitoba to pursue this market aggressively. I would like to assure the House that this is a program which we view as the first step toward eventually increasing the economic benefits which the expenditure of government-funded institutions can create for the benefit of the people of this country and Manitobans directly.

It is also encouraging to see how well the province's territories and the Federal Government can work together on specific opportunities for the benefit of all. I would invite all members to join the government in supporting this project.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased that the Minister of Economic Development and the government is continuing a program which was started at least a year-and-a-half ago, one that was mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition in the Throne Speech as had been worked on in this province for a long time. As a matter of fact, the show that the Minister is speaking of will be the third of such shows that we have had in Winnipeg.

The Import Replacement Show on medical products was held last year in the province and then the manufacturing show was held last year in the province. There are letters on file, Mr. Speaker, from five other Ministers of Economic Development of other provinces who wrote to us thanking Manitoba for taking the initiatives to start the Import Replacement Show. We had tremendous co-operation from the other provinces and I'm sincerely happy that co-operation is continuing from the other provinces and the Import Replacement Program will be carried on in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. VIC SCHROEDER (Rossmere): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a Provincial Tax Comparison as of February 1, 1982, which I would like distributed to the members.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we reach Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have present some of the curlers who are competing in the 11th Annual Western Canada Blind Bonspiel. It's the first time this event has been held in the province and it is being held in Beausejour this weekend. Each province is represented by two rinks and the two Manitoba skips are both from Winnipeg, Dan Monchak and Norman Lyons.

We also have present 81 students of Grade 5 standing of the Ryerson School. These students are under the direction of Ms. Judy McDonald and the school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STERLING LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Honourable Minister of Finance took as notice a question from the Opposition House Leader requesting information or confirmation from the Minister of Finance that a figure apparently used by the First Minister in a speech that he made at

Brandon the night previous was accurate; namely, that Manitoba was going to suffer at least \$100 million in federal cutbacks. Is the Minister of Finance able to confirm that statement to the House, the statement that was made by the First Minister apparently in Brandon?

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, based on the best information available prior to the First Minister's Conference last month, Manitoba was expected to receive \$339.7 million in EPF, Established Program Financing, cash payments from the Federal Government and \$480.1 million in equalization for a total of \$819.8 million for the 1982-83 year, if the current arrangements remained unchanged.

Based on the latest federal estimates of what Manitoba will receive, if the federal EPF and equalization cutback proposals are implemented in their current modified form, our province will receive 287.9 million in EPF cash payments and 431 million in equalization for a total of \$718.9 million for 1982-83. This represents an overall cutback of 51.8 million in EPF and 49.1 million in equalization for a total of \$100.9 million. I should add that a number of other factors also have a bearing on the net loss calculations.

Firstly, some losses relative to the February 2 situation in the order of approximately \$20 million would have occurred under the current equalization system due to revised population information associated with the 1981 census.

Secondly, the federal budget proposals included measures which have the effect of increasing provincial tax revenue by approximately \$31 million for the 1982-83 year.

Thirdly, revised federal estimates of certain revenue sources in 1982-83 would have the effect of further reducing equalization payments under the current system.

My department is in the process of preparing revised estimates of the cutbacks facing our province, as a result of the federal proposals as modified to date, taking into account the impacts of the preliminary census and the various revenue adjustments included in the revised federal forecasts of equalization under its five-province standard idea. It will, of course, be helpful if the Federal Government provides a complete set of information on the impacts of its proposals with respect to equalization EPF and other areas when it presents its fiscal arrangements package to Parliament — I understand that may well happen today. In the event that it chooses not to provide those Estimates, I will make every effort to ensure that my department's Estimates are provided to every member when they become available.

Finally, although we appear to have made some progress with the Federal Government during the course of the negotiations to date, we remain particularly concerned with the longer-term implications of the federal proposals and will continue to present our case to the Federal Minister and his officials in the hope that further adjustments can be made.

In fact, just this morning I sent a telegram to the Federal Minister of Finance asking for a meeting with him when he comes to Winnipeg tomorrow for what I understand to be a fund-raising event.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, we of course share the concern that the Minister of Finance has expressed with respect to the unilateral decisions that are being made by the Federal Government with respect to established program financing and with respect to equalization and we welcome the detailed statement that the Minister has made in response to the question.

I desire to attract his attention, however, to the question that was asked yesterday by the Opposition House Leader; namely, was the Minister not in a position to give this information when he was asked a few days ago or why did he have to give that kind of a statement this morning after the statement had been made not to this House, but the statement made by the First Minister to the Brandon Chamber of Commerce which, unless I'm mistaken, is not an adjunct or a committee of this Legislature?

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I could go into a history of when these particular numbers started coming forth. When we took office, the numbers were 160 million without that \$20 million change in population numbers because we didn't know about that. It was a preliminary situation then; we have since then worked on different figures. We weren't sure and still are not sure, as I said in this answer, of the exact numbers and won't be until the bill is presented in Parliament and maybe we won't be even then if we don't get sufficient information with it.

But, what I said yesterday was that I didn't know what the First Minister had said in Brandon. The House Leader for the Opposition referred to a specific statement which he said the Premier had made. I simply said I wasn't aware of that particular statement, I would take the question as notice and come back this morning with as much information as I could possibly supply to the House and surely I have done that.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the rather interesting statement that the Minister of Finance has just made, of course, leads to another question. Was he not aware that the First Minister of this province was to be making this financial statement to the Brandon Chamber of Commerce or is he telling us, indeed, Mr. Speaker, that he's still not aware of what his First Minister said to the Brandon Chamber of Commerce? If not, I would refer him to the speaking notes from that speech, refer him to page 5 of those speaking notes, and about half way down he'll see what the speaking notes contained.

The point of the question, Mr. Speaker, put by the Opposition House Leader, reiterated by me is this, Is it not better practice, when asked for this information in the House to give it rather than to have other members of the Treasury Bench giving it to organizations outside of this Legislature?

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I don't know how the Leader of the Opposition operated when he was Premier, but I can assure him that my Premier doesn't require the vetting of every particular statement he makes by members of his Cabinet before he makes

the statement. —(Interjection)— Look at the trouble he got you into.

Mr. Speaker, the statement that the Leader of the Opposition refers to is a statement that says there will be losses of more than \$100 million. That particular statement does not refer to a specific year, although I have referred to a specific year. That statement refers to losses of more than \$100 million. In fact, we believe that the losses will be much greater than that over the next 5 years.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I am sure, Sir, you would not wish us to get into a debate as to a document or a speech that was given by the First Minister outside of this House, but I refer my honourable friend to page 5 of that address and I suggest that he read what his First Minister is saying from time to time. They maybe perhaps, Sir, can get their act together so that the First Minister and the Minister of Finance will know when they're asked questions in this House, a little bit of forthrightness, a little bit of candour would help.

I'm merely suggesting to the Minister asking the question that hereafter, would it not be better practice to answer that type of question in the House instead of dodging it, as the Minister did the other day, and allowing the First Minister to make this statement outside of the House, a statement that is significant for the financial and fiscal planning of this province?

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, the particular information that I provided this morning is not information that I carry around in my head without looking at numbers. There's 339.7 million on EPF, there's 480.1 million on Equalization, there's 819.8 million for the next year in total. We can go through those numbers again but, Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Turtle Mountain really wanted that information, I could have had it for him here yesterday if he would have given me half-an-hour's notice so I could have that detailed information available for him. I gave that detailed information this morning at the earliest possible opportunity.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, to remind the Honourable Minister of Finance, the original question was asked some days ago of the Minister of Finance and he said at that time he could not give the figure, or words to that effect. We'll check Hansard.

The point at issue is this, Mr. Speaker, to get back to the first question, can the Minister of Finance confirm today what the First Minister allegedly said in the speaking notes that he used when he spoke to the Brandon Chamber of Commerce on Wednesday, March 17, wherein he said, "Yet Manitoba is still going to suffer at least \$100 million in federal cutbacks," and he can take it as having been said in the context of 1982-83 federal revenues to Manitoba are to be so and so. Can the Minister confirm that statement made by the First Minister last Wednesday in Brandon to the Brandon Chamber of Commerce?

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can confirm that the First Minister did indeed make that statement. I can also confirm the answer that I previously gave which had a number of specifics in it regarding the population adjustment. It had the spe-

cifics regarding the budget proposals and it is an Estimate. We expect that we have, we hope that we have definitely come close to recouping up to \$60 million that we would have lost had we had that government in office doing the negotiating since November. That is what was on the table when we took office.

Now we've come a long way for Manitobans. We haven't come as far as we would like. We would like a much larger concession from the Federal Government. We can go through that again.

We would prefer to retain the previous system of equalization payments and established program finance payments. If we can't have that, then we would prefer the agreement that the First Ministers arrived at, at their conference last month and if we can't have that, then the five-province average is certainly better than the proposed Ontario formula which was on the table in November of 1981. I don't know how I can make it more clear to the Leader of the Opposition that we have made some progress, but we haven't made enough.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, without in any way wanting to get into my honourable friend's powers of persuasion or powers of negotiation which would be a topic in itself, can the Minister simply confirm that the statement that the First Minister made to the Brandon Chamber of Commerce, Wednesday night last, of the \$100 million-shortfall in federal funds is a true statement? —(Interjection)— Can I then direct my question, Sir, to the First Minister and say, can the First Minister confirm that the statement that he made to the Brandon Chamber of Commerce, Wednesday night last, yet Manitoba is still going to suffer at least \$100 million in federal cutbacks, will the First Minister merely confirm that statement is true according to the best knowledge that he has?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, the statement that I made in Brandon is not inconsistent with the statements that have been on numerous occasions previously based upon the estimates of our discussions of a few weeks ago. Mr. Speaker, what I am noting is some sensitivity on the part of the Opposition to public discussion outside this Chamber. Let me mention, Mr. Speaker, that although the Opposition while they were in government may have avoided public discussion outside this Chamber, this government does not intend to avoid public discussion outside this Chamber.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, after that display of "little wet henism," I wonder if the First Minister would not confirm to the House, Mr. Speaker, and would he not confirm that it is good practice for the House when a Minister of the Crown is asked a question in the House that he should attempt to answer it in the House rather than to not answer it and then have the answer given outside of the House? That was the point of question.

MR. PAWLEY: I don't really know what all the ado is by the Leader of the Opposition. The information that, indeed, I provided to the Brandon Chamber of Commerce is information that I understand has been publicly commented upon for some time. I say to the Leader of the Opposition, it indeed would be good practice if members across the way want information a particular day of detailed nature to provide advanced notice to the Minister so that the Minister can indeed provide that information in the House on the day that the question is posed so that the Leader of the Opposition may very well wish to discuss with his colleagues if they are anxious to receive information on the precise day that the question is posed of providing the courtesy of some advanced notice to the Minister involved.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I thank the First Minister for his commentary. I can assure him that we will always attempt to show whatever courtesy we can in that regard because from time to time honourable members of the government when they were in Opposition, where they will be again before too long, from time to time showed that courtesy to us and it's appreciated.

The point of the question very simply though, Mr. Speaker, is this, and I would request without carrying the matter any further, that the First Minister read Hansard of the last few days to see the point of the question and would he not confirm as a general proposition that it is better practice for statements of that nature to be made in the House, particularly when the question has previously been asked and the answer denied in the House?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. WILSON PARASIUK (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, on March 2, I was asked by members opposite, the Member for Fort Garry and I believe the Member for Turtle Mountain, to indicate whether in fact the previous government had indeed made statements outside the House when in fact they could have been made in the House. I was asked to look into that and provide some documentation on my statement that they in fact had made statements outside of the House when they should have made them in the House and I didn't have that much time to do that much research on this, Mr. Speaker, but a quick look at 1978 Hansard indicates that there were four instances within the period of about a month-and-a-half.

Mr. Speaker, the first one occurred on Monday, May 29, 1978, when I raised the matter of privilege. It was Parasiuk from Transcona raising a matter of privilege with respect to the former Minister of Industry and Commerce. I raised the matter of privilege and that I had, at that time, been asking questions in Estimates about the future role of Leaf Rapids. I had received no information within Estimates, and yet I found that the Minister at that time and that government had issued a press release to the press just prior to that Estimates' meeting, Mr. Speaker, and I wasn't able to get information from him even though he had issued a press release outside the House. I raised that as a matter of privilege. It is documented; it's on page 2767 of Hansard.

Then, Mr. Speaker, on May 10, 1978, Mr. McBryde raised the matter of privilege. It appears some time yesterday that the Minister of Northern Affairs in the Conservative government made an announcement outside the House in regard to the Northern Youth Employment Program, Mr. Speaker. There's another instance that is documented, Mr. Speaker; it's on page 1999.

Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 13, 1978, Mr. Desjardins raised a point of privilege with the then Minister of Health regarding the questions that he had been raising in question period and he found out that he wasn't getting answers in the House, but there was a press statement that had been made outside the House. The date of that, Mr. Speaker, was Thursday, July 13, 1978, page 5044, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on June 23, 1978, Mr. Green raised a question of privilege in that he had been asking the government whether in fact the Minister of Education at that time was going to bring in legislation regarding publicly-supported private schools. He was getting no answers from members of the Conservative government at that time, Mr. Speaker, and he found out that a bill was introduced, but prior to the introduction, a press release had been handed out to the press. He had been asked questions by the press, Mr. Speaker. I find this feigned indignation on the part of the Conservative government rather surprising, Mr. Speaker, in the light of the documentation I've brought to them.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, now that we have had some indication that the government has some glimmer of understanding of the usual courtesies that apply in the House with respect to information being given when the question is asked, can we have a confirmation from the First Minister without him getting his feathers all wet again that he will instruct the members of the Treasury Bench to obey the rule, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Energy and Mines seems to be all a flutter about all of a sudden.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the Leader of the Opposition that I will indeed instruct the members of the Treasury Board to avoid at all costs the kind of precedent that was established during the four years of the previous government in the Province of Manitoba, and we'll do our utmost. There will be time to time, Mr. Speaker, when indeed there will be indiscretion, whether it be across the way or on this side, that does occur, but we will do our best to minimize the type of conduct that was just described so well by the Minister of Energy.

MR. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Mines and Energy assure the House that he is spending some of his time working on the aluminum smelter, on the Western Power Grid, on the Potash Project and other major economic enterprises of that kind for the people of Manitoba, instead of spending all of it thumbing through old issues of Hansard and amusing himself with countering debate in this Chamber on a superficial level? It's more important, Mr. Speaker, that he devote part of his time — if he's overworked, then perhaps the First Minister would create an additional post in the Cabinet

and have one Minister appointed simply to reading old Hansards and dealing with those issues while the Minister of Mines and Energy gets down to dealing with the important business at hand for the people of Manitoba.

MR. PARASIUK: I'd like to give an answer to that nonquestion, Mr. Speaker, which went on for about two minutes. I was responding directly to a question that had been raised by the former Minister of Health in regard to his past indiscretions or any other indiscretions on the part of the former Conservative government. I personally didn't spend any time doing this. I only had someone look at about one month of activity of the previous government. Mr. Speaker, having found four very clear examples I decided that I'd have to bring in a crane with all the documentation showing all the past abuses of privileges of the House by the past Conservative government, and I decided to make my point but not bring in all the documentation showing all of their indiscretions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G.W.J. (Gerry) MERCIER (St. Norbert): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. Mr. Speaker, in view of the decision of the City of Winnipeg Executive Committee to recommend to City Council, next Wednesday, a 15.3 percent increase in property tax rates, costing the average Winnipeg homeowner approximately \$95, in view of the Winnipeg School Board Division's increase of \$95 for the average taxpayer in the City of Winnipeg School Division, and in view of NDP School Trustee's Andy Robertson's statement that the Provincial Government is giving with the one hand and taking with the other, would the First Minister now admit that he misled the people of Manitoba when he guaranteed that the NDP party would ease the property tax burden if elected?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, if the former Minister would have listened to the statement by the Minister for Urban Affairs when the Minister of Urban Affairs outlined to this House, the grants and the assistance that was indeed being provided to the City of Winnipeg, a level of assistance that I am quite proud of in view of the deficit that we have inherited from the previous government and the fiscal transfer of cutbacks that we've spoken of earlier this morning, and compare that with the kind of increases that were provided in '78, '79 and '80, this government indeed has done a reasonably good job under very very difficult circumstances of ensuring that there be not an undue burden placed upon the ratepayers of the City of Winnipeg at this time.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that the NDP party misled the people of Manitoba in their promises last fall.

My supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Finance. In view of the Premier's statements that taxes will be increasing this year in Mani-

toba, can he confirm the advice that he apparently gave to Peter Warren of CJOB that taxes, including sales tax, should be increased in the first year of their government in the hopes that people will forget about the increase by the time of the next election.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, we had a very similar question yesterday morning. I explained to people who, although they've been in government for four years, don't seem to know that Budget information doesn't get out before Budget day. I will tell them again, that is a fact; on Budget day you will find out what, if any, tax changes there will be in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I wasn't asking the member how much the taxes would be increased, I was asking him to confirm his advice that the taxes should be increased in the first year so that the voters will forget about their actions by the time of the next election.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That was advice that was given to me by a news broadcaster and it was advice that he thought was sensible. If the Member for St. Norbert views that as sensible advice then let him stand up and so say. If he feels that it is not sensible advice let him do with it whatever he chooses to do.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I would urge then the Minister of Finance to do what we did when we were elected and that was to reduce taxes in Manitoba.

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I, unlike the Minister of Energy and Mines, don't have all the Hansards before me, but I refer the former Attorney-General to the discussions we had about the huge and inequitable tax increases to the people in River East School Division because of the fact that government wanted to set up and shift the tax burden from those who have little — shift from the rich to the poor. That's what happened. They put the tax burden on those who had less; that's what they were doing. I would refer him and the former First Minister to the changes in Property Tax Credits and Cost-of-Living Credits which put thousands of senior citizens in a position where they received less in those credits, where they put thousands of people who were farmers and low-wage earners in a position where they were receiving less in credits. That is the kind of government they had, and for that member to stand up in this House this morning and suggest they were lowering taxes, that is absurd.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm not sure that members are using question period for its proper purpose. I would ask members to consider that matter.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that numerous taxes were in fact decreased by our government and in view of the fact that approximately five of all of the school divisions in Manitoba taxes

went up last year and all of the others went down, is he now taking the position that all school divisions in Manitoba should have a decrease in education taxes this year and, if so, when is he going to implement that instead of giving on the one hand and taking on the other as they've done in the Winnipeg School Division, resulting in the massive tax increase that taxpayers and average taxpayers in the City of Winnipeg are facing this year?

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying that I fully support the proposal put forth to this House by the Minister of Education within the last few weeks for education financing in the Province of Manitoba. I believe it was an excellent proposal; it was the best that we could do under the very difficult circumstances left to us by that group when they left office. We're fortunate in this province that they did leave office before things got even worse.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if I might interrupt the proceedings just for a moment to introduce two school groups in the gallery.

We have with us 26 students of Grades 5 and 6 standing from the Shamrock School. The students are under the direction of Mr. Tony Rodrigues. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Niakwa.

There are also 45 students of Grade 10 and 11 standing from Miles Macdonnell Collegiate. The students are under the direction of Mr. Bugera and Mr. Peters. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Finance.

On behalf of all the members, we welcome you here this morning.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. DONALD ORCHARD (Pembina): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System: has the Minister had the opportunity since March 11 to make himself aware of the press release put out by the MLA for Thompson regarding television service?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I still haven't read the honourable member's press release, but I can advise the Member for Pembina, the former Minister responsible for MTS, that in response to his question about satellite dishes in Thompson, that the MTS is in the process of providing those pieces of equipment to a customer, namely the cable operator in Thompson.

I might also add, Mr. Speaker, an answer to another question that the honourable member asked me a couple of days ago with regard to MTS acquiring new office space either by purchase or construction, and I can advise the member that there are preliminary dis-

cussions going on, and there will be continuing discussions conducted in the next few weeks, the next few months.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased with now that the Minister knows he instructed MTS to install a second dish in Thompson for the receipt of US SatCom signals, and in view of the fact that the Minister yesterday indicated he had no new agreement or arrangement with the Federal Department of Communications or the Federal Minister, will the Minister now formally endorse the open-skies policy along with the nine other provinces that are adherence to that open-sky policy in regards to the TVRO satellite dish ownership issue?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, we're interested with getting on with the job of responding to the needs of people all over Manitoba, and the people in Northern Manitoba, including Thompson and Flin Flon, have certain desires in the case of television signals. MTS in accordance with its long-standing policy, is prepared to supply equipment to cable operators in this province and they, as a major utility, are simply in the process of supplying that equipment and we are simply doing as we said during the election campaign, that we would support the cable operators in their desire to supply the needs of the people in those communities.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House as when we were in government, endorse that freedom of choice for Northern Manitobans and we had made very definitive arrangements to accommodate that, and that is the nature of my questions for the Minister today and specifically which he didn't answer.

Is he prepared to endorse the open-skies policy of the previous administration and nine other provincial governments?

Secondly, has he to date made that representation to the Federal Minister as in reference to the Federal Minister's December 31 press release on the liberalization of the ownership of these television receive-only dishes? Has the Minister communicated the province's endorsement of the open-skies policy?

No. 2, the province's dissatisfaction with the scope of the liberalization of the ownership policies announced by his federal counterpart on December 31? That question I posed to the Minister on March 11 and he undertook to investigate it. Has he communicated with the Federal Government indicating his dissatisfaction, the province's dissatisfaction with that policy change by the Federal Government?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether I can answer that honourable member's question because I'm not quite clear on what the honourable member's open-skies policy has been precisely. It's a rather vague term and I don't know whether we can debate or answer questions that do hinge on rather vague generalizations.

So I simply say, Mr. Speaker, our job is to serve the needs of the people of Manitoba. Apart from any policy pronouncements or positions that the honourable member had taken in the past, we are proceeding with

the job of looking after the people in Northern Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, on March 16 I was asked a question by the Honourable Member for Rhineland and again the same question by the Member for Fort Garry yesterday, that is in regard to the ambulance at the shooting at the Montcalm Hotel on Saturday the 13th. This is the information that was obtained from the Ambulance Central Dispatch.

The ambulance from Winnipeg Ambulance Services arrived at the scene at 12:23 a.m. and immediately took the patient to the Victoria General Hospital arriving there in four minutes or at 12:27 a.m. Subsequently, the patient was transferred to the St. Boniface General Hospital. This transfer took 12 minutes. That is, they left the Victoria Hospital at 1:29 a.m. and arrived at the St. Boniface Hospital at 1:41 a.m.

The following information was obtained from the Victoria General Hospital, Emergency Department. The patient was transferred from the Victoria General Hospital to the St. Boniface Hospital because the attending physician was of the opinion that the patient required chest surgery involving the use of equipment that is located in the St. Boniface Hospital and usually used for open-heart surgery. The Victoria Hospital does not have this particular equipment.

MR. SHERMAN: I thank the Honourable Minister for that information, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to take it under consideration over the course of the next day or two. I have no immediate question following from his information, but while I'm on my feet I would like to ask the Minister whether he can confirm that 115 of 150 doctors in Western Manitoba will be closing their offices on Monday?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the honourable member knows as much as I do. I don't get any information other than what was in the paper about that. I read the same statement: I wasn't giving any information by the MMA.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister then advise whether, on the basis of that kind of indication and certainly the Manitoba Health Services Commission must be monitoring those kinds of indications, if there are any contingency plans that are intended by the government or by the commission to protect patients against any difficulties that arise from that kind of action?

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Speaker, it will be monitored when once it's happened. As far as the monitoring the standards, I feel that it is the responsibility of the College of Physicians. I've had discussion with them yesterday and I wrote them a letter and we've been in communication with them in asking them to monitor the standard; to make sure that the standard are high quality, do not suffer and we're getting full co-operation from them.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The time of Oral Questions having expired, The Honourable Government House Leader.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

HON. ROLAND PENNER (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 4 please?

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

BILL NO. 4 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE GARAGE KEEPERS ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 4, on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Attorney-General. Bill No. 4 was adjourned by the Honourable Member for Pembina. The Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, in perusing Bill No. 4 we have some concerns as were mentioned briefly by the MLA for St. Norbert on the second section of that Bill, namely the repealing of the requirement opposed to The Garage Keepers Act in a or a number of conspicuous places in a particular garage. It is our information, Mr. Speaker, that recent amendments made within the last year or two to The Garage Keepers Act have been most beneficial to the consuming public; to the people availing themselves of services in the garages throughout the Province of Manitoba. A repealing of the requirement to host that act is in our view a step in the wrong direction. We see no need for repealing of that requirement and indeed we see some substantial difficulties with repealing that requirement of posting. This new government and particularly the Attorney-General, who is I believe a member of the Manitoba Association of Rights and Liberties has made some significant statements and some frequent statements on his desire to provide information, open government; to be in touch with the citizens of Manitoba; to make them aware of what the government can or cannot do; to make the general public of Manitoba aware of their rights and their protections under the statutes of Manitoba.

Here in one of the very first bills that this Attorney-General introduces and this new government introduces, we see them with the background of wanting to increase the availability of information to Manitobans, we then attempting to remove a requirement which provides Manitobans with information as to their rights in dealing with certain commercial operations in the Province of Manitoba. We find that a very strange divergence from the public pronouncements by the Attorney-General and by members of his government as to the desirability of having greater public information being made available to the people of Manitoba.

This raises some additional concerns. Maybe this first piece of legislation is indeed an indication that the Attorney-General and his government will be attempting to quietly and through amendments such as we have in the deletion of the requirement of posting of the Act, The Garage Keepers Act, deprive in some small way Manitobans the availability of information to Manitobans. Then possibly come before

this House a year from now in the next session per chance and say that Manitobans do not have available information; their rights are being not fully understood; their privileges under the statutes of the province are not well enough known. I am concerned that at that point in time, the Attorney-General and this new government may make a major move in creating a new department and a new bureaucracy in the government along the lines of a government public information service where they will have a referral service on matters of concern to Manitobans; they will staff it with a number of people to provide information on the statutes available. They will justify this move by now deleting a requirement to provide information to Manitobans, turn around some year later and say information is not available therefore we must create a brand new department to assure that Manitobans have that information.

It is unnecessary to do that because the onus and the cost of providing posting of The Garage Keepers Act in conspicuous places throughout the various establishments, so required to do so under the present statute, is not onerous. The statutes are not costly. It's not as if it is a multi-thousand-dollar investment by the garage keepers in the Province of Manitoba. It is a very very small investment. It is an investment, Mr. Speaker, I submit that all garage keepers can well afford in Manitoba. It is of importance to them as well because The Garage Keepers Act is not a one-way Act. It is for the protection of both consumers and garage keepers.

I find this an extremely strange move for this Attorney-General, this government, who have enunciated on numerous occasions their desire to keep Manitobans informed; to provide open government; to provide information and Acts as to government; to make sure that Manitobans are aware of their rights in the Province of Manitoba, would now — as I said earlier in one of its very first pieces of legislation — delete a very useful and longstanding practice of having The Garage Keepers Act posted in the garages throughout the Province of Manitoba to inform the public of their legislative rights under that Act.

I think the Attorney-General and his government will have some great deal of difficulty in justifying why they are deleting that requirement and in effect depriving Manitobans of information that is readily available; available at very very minimal cost to the garage keepers for their protection and for the protection of their consumers.

That is our major concern in Bill No. 4 is why this government preaching on the one hand greater access, greater information to Manitobans is in the process through this amendment of depriving Manitobans from their right to access to certain information contained in The Garage Keepers Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Norbert and now the Honourable Member for Pembina, I think, have misconceived what indeed was proposed, namely, to get rid of a perfectly useless inoperative provision and I think there's no point in maintaining in statutes archaic things which have proved to be ineffective.

However, I wish to thank them for expressing a concern that I'm prepared to accommodate, namely, that for what is now — although they haven't admitted — that an ineffective method of communicating rights to persons against whom a lien may be claimed or, in fact, is being claimed, I'm prepared to accommodate that concern, and that I'm deeply concerned that people be made aware of their rights by bringing in at committee stage an amendment, or an additional feature of this bill, that will replace the proposal to remove the posting of the notice, which as I say and said in opening, has proved to be ineffective with the requirement that before a lien can become effective the garage keeper must give a simple written notice to the actual person against whom the lien is being claimed. And I will be prepared to discuss that in committee with the Honourable Member for St. Norbert and the honourable members opposite, and I think that would be a constructive way of dealing with what I agree is a problem.

I just want to make it clear that the notion, that there was some hidden kind of move in removing this archaic provision, is simply nonsense and I would hope that the members opposite, as we go through this sitting of the House, become more constructive; rather than saying, well what kind of hidden manoeuvre is this? That's not particularly helpful.

What we were doing, and what I was proposing and I am proposing, as I say, is to take out something that has in the fullness of time proved to be ineffective. When is the last time that anyone has actually seen in a garage — and there are so few of them left in any event — a notice under The Garage Keepers' Act? You just don't find them anymore. Now what I think I will bring in, and as I say, I thank the members for raising this issue, is an amendment at committee stage so we can discuss something constructive.

Finally, with respect to the point raised by the Honourable Member for Pembina about the communication of information, I think that is tremendously important to find the ways and means in which — I'm not talking about the kind of propaganda we saw too much of, particularly in 1981, from the then government — to provide straightforward, objective, non-opinionated information about rights under statutes to the people who need that information the most in the best way. What I'm now saying is, that the best way is not the old form of notice, but a written notice handed to the person against whom a lien may be claimed. And so, too, we will be looking as was noted in the Throne Speech at the possibility, and at the moment it's only a possibility, of better methods of oral communication to those people with respect to whom written information, even in a straightforward way, does not adequately communicate to them the rights and remedies which they ought to have. But that is a matter for future consideration.

So in closing debate, Mr. Speaker, and urging passage at Second Reading and into Committee I will be bringing into the committee stage a proposal that we can discuss, and I'm sure we'll come to a consensus as to a form of notice which will be effective rather than the present ineffective posted notice.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, would you call the Proposed Motion, Bill No. 5, standing in the name of Mr. Mercier.

BILL NO. 5 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE LAW OF PROPERTY ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, this bill, of course, merely gives to the county court the jurisdiction with respect to partition and sale that the Queen's Bench has in those areas. So, Mr. Speaker, it is a worthwhile amendment to The Law of Property Act in order to avoid extra proceedings or extra expense to the litigants, Mr. Speaker, in matrimonial proceedings.

I think, Mr. Speaker, what it does do though is raise the larger issue, the larger issue being that of the possible amalgamation of the Court of Queen's Bench and the county court into one trial division in Manitoba, rather than maintaining two separate trial divisions in the province.

I want to use this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to bring to the attention of the Attorney-General if he is not already aware, that last spring I did refer to the Law Reform Commission the question of the possible merger of the county court with the Court of Queen's Bench. The Law Reform Commission is embarked upon a comprehensive review of that question in conjunction and in full consultation with the Bar Association and the Law Society, and did indeed, I believe last fall, make trips out to various points in rural Manitoba to discuss the issue with local bar associations and persons who may be affected by such merger in order to obtain their views and impressions and concerns, Mr. Speaker. There will be concern in the rural areas, Mr. Speaker, with respect to maintaining a resident judge if such a merger is to be recommended, and I would urge the Minister, when he receives that report, Mr. Speaker, to consider that aspect very carefully.

As part of that referral to the Law Reform Commission on this whole question of amalgamation of the Court of Queen's Bench and county court, Mr. Speaker, I also bring to the attention of the Attorney-General that I asked him to very seriously consider the area of Small Claims Court services and give consideration to an improved training program for clerks who now hear those types of cases. I ask them to consider, Mr. Speaker, in view of the expense, an ever-increasing expense of litigation, Mr. Speaker, an increase in the jurisdiction of Small Claims Courts to \$2,000 and the possibility of having some of the matters heard by, perhaps provincial judges with perhaps matters under a certain amount, for example, \$500 or \$1,000, being continued to be heard by clerks.

Mergers have taken place, Mr. Speaker, in Alberta, in New Brunswick, and I believe, it may have, in fact, now taken place in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. So, I think that is really the larger issue that this particular bill raises.

I would anticipate, if I recall correctly, that some time later this year the Law Reform Commission will be reporting on that issue and I am sure that the

Attorney-General will want to consider that report very carefully with a view to possibly have legislation before this House at the next Session of the Legislature. Mr. Speaker, with that larger question being resolved, it would then be unnecessary for us to be considering small amendments to these acts, dealing with just small aspects of the jurisdictional question. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General will be closing debate.

MR. PENNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Honourable Member for St. Norbert for supporting the Bill and for raising, appropriately, the question of addressing the larger problem. I am aware, of course, there was referred to the Law Reform Commission the question of fusion of the two principal federal trial courts, the County Court and the Court of Queen's Bench. In discussions with chairperson of the Law Reform Commission, I have asked him, and he has agreed, to give this top priority. I would like to bring in legislation, hopefully, by the next Session. I think it is an important move. I don't want to prejudge what the Commission will bring in, that's up to the Commission. But I am hopeful that there will be some constructive suggestions that will find support on both sides of the House. I think that we will find that on many of the larger questions having to do with the administration of justice that there's a great deal of common ground between this side of the House and the Opposition side of the House. I thank him for his suggestion with respect to a problem which might be raised when we look at fusion for rural areas and that certainly will be given a great deal of attention. Again I think we can work co-operatively in resolving some problems there.

Indeed, the question of Small Claims Court which was the last point raised by the Honourable Member for St. Norbert is one, and probably the vexing question there of what do you do with the Small Claims Court when you have fusion, should we have it. One of the researchers working with this particular project is working specifically on the issue of Small Claims Court and is addressing several alternatives. I don't want to go into any detail on those alternatives. There are a number of possibilities; one, indeed, is the possibility of the Provincial Court Judge taking some jurisdiction in Small Claims, and I'm expressing no opinion on that. Another is to upgrade the present adjudicative methods, perhaps to use legally-trained persons for small claims and to up the jurisdiction. A third alternative is to look at an arbitration model or a mediation model using legally-trained persons on a volunteer basis. So there are some innovative, imaginative kinds of things being looked at to resolve that problem in the context of fusion. Should it be, for any reason, that fusion of the two trial divisions, County Court and Queen's Bench, cannot take place or cannot take place as quickly as we would like, we will still address, I hope, the problem of improving the Small Claims Court which has proved to be a useful and low-cost, expedient vehicle for citizens having claims one against the other, and I will certainly take into account some of the suggestions that have been made if it becomes necessary to bring in a separate

piece of jurisdiction on the Small Claims Court. So with those remarks I would call for the passage and the motion.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, would you call the Adjourned Motion of the Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs on No. 7?

BILL NO. 7 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE ARTS COUNCIL ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. GERRIE HAMMOND (Kirkfield Park): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have reviewed the bill to amend The Manitoba Arts Council Act. The amendments, on the whole, are the same that were being considered by the previous administration, and it is in essence, a housekeeping bill. We certainly welcome any action that will help the Manitoba Arts Council in its work. We are prepared to let the bill go to Committee for consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister will be closing Debate.

The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. EUGENE KOSTYRA (Seven Oaks): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to hear the comments from the Member for Kirkfield Park. The bill is basically a housekeeping bill, just increasing the size of the council and cleaning up some other sections of the Act. As members are aware, the members of the Manitoba Arts Council sit without remuneration except for any out-of-pocket expenses and the Manitoba Arts Council's role and function has been increasing over the past number of years and they've had difficulty with the present size of the Board in dealing with that. So I'm pleased to hear the comments from the Member for Kirkfield Park and I welcome to go to Committee so that we can get the bill passed as soon as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. PENNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you call Second Reading of Bill No. 13?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

SECOND READING

BILL NO. 13 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE PUBLIC TRUSTEE ACT

MR. PENNER presented Bill No. 13, An Act to amend The Public Trustee Act for Second Reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PENNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you. At present, The Public Trustee Act contains no provision requiring an annual report. Mr. Speaker, the size of the operations of the office of the Public Trustee has grown considerably in recent years. The office now has a complement of 51 staff, and an annual operating budget of approximately 1.2 million. More to the point, it administers approximately 55,600 estates, amounting to close to \$40 million in trust funds. Although there is, appropriately, an annual audit by the Provincial Auditor, it is deemed advisable to require a more comprehensive annual report for tabling in the Assembly, and that's the purpose of this Bill.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. In view of the fact that the Attorney-General's Department is not required to make a report — I think being the only department of all of the departments not required to make a report, and I'm not advocating, particularly, that they make a report — but is the Attorney-General considering an amendment requiring the Attorney-General's Department to make a report to the Legislature?

MR. PENNER: No, I'm not presently considering such an amendment. There is no single statute governing the operation of the Department of the Attorney-General but I will certainly take it under consideration. It may be appropriate at this time to consider that. I would prefer to leave that for future consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Natural Resources, 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.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, with the Hon-

ourable Member for Flin Flon in the Chair for the Department of Northern Affairs, and the Honourable Member for The Pas in the Chair for the Department of Natural Resources.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - NATURAL RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN, Harry M. Harapiak (The Pas): I call the Committee to order. We're on Natural Resources, page 100, on Wildlife. 9.(a)(1) Salaries—pass.
The Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, again, a quick perusal of the individual items listed in this division of the department's Estimates indicates little change in terms of actual dollars and therefore I assume in manpower.

However, this division has some particular concerns that I think continue to challenge the management of wildlife for all interested Manitobans, both the nonactive person who — when I say nonactive, I mean not simply for harvesting purposes but for enjoyment in terms of our environment — the appropriate way of managing this natural resource.

I would begin by asking the Minister to perhaps, as I asked him yesterday with respect to the fisheries question, update us if he can on the current story that involves the branch and that is the story about the amount of poaching or illegal activity, hunting activity, that's taking place. If indeed he can indicate to us what the branch is doing about it and what possible courses of action are open to the Minister at this time to address himself and that of the department to this growing problem, if indeed it is a growing problem that reports would seem to indicate is the case, how indeed in any way we can assist him in this problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

HON. AL MACKLING, Q.C. (St. James): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the honourable member's concerns. I will say a few words on them by way of general comment.

First, I'd like to introduce Richard C. Golden who is the Director of Wildlife, who is here and will be giving the specific information where I'm wanting.

In respect to the particular question that the honourable member asks, I think everyone shares a concern in respect to the scope of the activity that appears to be going on illegally in sale of game and fish. This section of the department dealing with wildlife is affected by that, but the particular section of the department that deals with wildlife, enforcement of the game laws and so on comes up later, Mr. Chairman. I will have the staff person who is in charge — the director of that operation — here with me at that time and he would be in a position to give me more specificity, in any event he isn't here.

I know that this may be an area where we want more detail than I will be able to provide myself or through Mr. Golden, so I'll just indicate that it is a problem. I could comment further about the result of the initial investigation in that, but I think it would be more appropriate to leave it to deal with under 12.(j) Enforcement.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I accept that position by the Minister and will pursue it at that particular point.

However, this is the area where the expertise lies both in terms of the actual management of this valuable resource and the biological data base that advises the Minister, establishes the kind of expert information upon which enforcement agencies. Our government indeed is challenged to pass the necessary rules, regulations of the game if you like, and I want to tread sensitively in this area knowing that is a difficult area for any Minister and for this department to handle, and that is a very serious question of how some species of game are being harvested and by whom and by what methods in this province.

I suggest and I submit to you, Mr. Minister, and I think you, Sir, with a legal personal background would have to appreciate, it's my judgment that a substantial portion of the problems that the branch faces with respect to how game are being harvested in this province to the detriment of their continued existence, or their thriving existence. Surely that kind of advice will come to you from this branch — and I'm speaking specifically about the problems of trying to marry together the obligations that we have specifically to groups within our society — that have been given by constitution, by treaty certain rights and marrying that to today's technology, to the technology of four-wheel drives, of airplanes, of spotlighting, of all kinds of methods that are now employed, are being employed and are available to persons who are in the woods and throughout the province are harvesting this game.

While I have every confidence in the other branch the Minister is responsible for, the Regional Services Branch which he just alluded to which is principally responsible for the enforcement of existing game rules and regulations, it's my contention, Mr. Minister, and I would invite you to express your views about this.

There has to come a realization that the methodology employed in harvesting game has to really seriously be looked at. I believe it's possible to do so without infringing on those particular guarantees that have been accorded principally to the Native members of our community, the Treaty Indian, under very specific treaties.

There are very sad examples, Sir, that you can avail yourself of, having to do with individual species of animals. I refer to the ongoing problems and efforts that are being undertaken for the preservation of the caribou herds, the two caribou herds that still have some presence in Manitoba, the Beverly and the Kaminuriuk herds. I know that our officials have had lengthy discussions involving our sister jurisdictions, the Northwest Territories, Federal Government, Inuit people, and Indian people, expressing their desire to find some way of bringing about the necessary agreement, the kind of herd-management capabilities that are available to us that our biologists know can be successfully employed but cannot begin to do so unless there is agreement and unless there is some statute support for those kind of management practices to bear fruit.

Mr. Chairman, the point I suppose I'm making at this point in time is that I would really suggest to the

Minister that efforts directed in this area, in my judgment are essential, and in my judgment are necessary if serious efforts are going to be made to control what I think we all, and the Minister has acknowledged as being an unsatisfactory situation, and that leads to the illegal meat trade in wild meats that then get sent to the commercial harvesting of game that we don't particularly want to see happening in this province.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member quite rightly referred to this concern as one of dwelling in a sensitive area. It has long been a problem to adjust the equities involved in conflicts that arise in the application of game laws and retaining the rights of the Native people in respect to hunting privileges that of course are very dear to them, very important to them.

I am pleased to be able to indicate to all of the members that for some time the department has been following a course of consultation, discussion, with the game and fish groups in respect to this problem but moreover, discussion with Native people directly in respect to matters of particular concern, because the Native people themselves, a good many of the people, have come to appreciate that the department is concerned about the conservation and continuance of the game supply and that's important to the Native people as well.

At this time I would like to acknowledge the initiatives of the Ministers — I include the immediate past Minister and the Minister before him, Mr. Ransom — in connection with some of the initiatives that are ongoing respecting the preservation of some endangered animals and in particular I'm referring to the barren land caribou herds that the honourable member referred to, the Kaminuriuk and the Beverly herds.

I'm given to understand that significant progress has been made as a result of those initiatives and that sometime, hopefully in the very near future, that effort will be culminated in the formal signing of an agreement for the better management of that herd which will involve active participation of a majority group on a committee of the Native people themselves. That was an excellent initiative and it's ongoing.

In many areas, Mr. Chairman, the concerns that we have as members of this Legislature, do not find themselves in fixed party positions because we share a common concern to preserve our natural resource heritage. I expect that this is going to be reflected in the decisions of this Committee and the attitude of the Committee in respect to particular items. I don't shy away from frankly acknowledging initiatives, positive initiatives, that have been made under a previous administration of a different political viewpoint. That doesn't trouble me in the least because we have a common interest, as I've indicated, to protect and preserve our natural resource heritage. In the wildlife field I've indicated in respect to that particular project, in respect to barren land caribou.

I think the course of action that seems to be ongoing within the department, to approach these problems in emphasizing consultation and education is the most effective way to deal with our common concerns because we all share, I think all of the people of Manitoba share a concern to see our game continue so that it's available for the generations that come

after us.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I'll deal with one more specific area of concern at this point in time and I appreciate other members of the Committee will want to bring up individual or specific instances involving this branch as well.

But I'd like to refer the Minister to the question that has occupied a considerable degree of time of the department for some several years now and that is the situation involving one of Manitoba's finest wetland managed areas, although there is a traditional conflict that this branch very often has to live with, namely from its sister department in Agriculture and up at the Saskerem these two competing requirements of agriculture and wildlife seem to focus. There had been some very specific steps taken in the Saskerem. The Member for The Pas is aware of them and he in fact may want to remove himself from the Chair briefly and engage in this debate — of course, he's welcome to do so at any time — it's in his backyard. The specific question that I have to the Minister is that there have been proposed boundary changes to the Saskerem Wildlife Management area. There was an intention on the part of the previous administration to try to acknowledge the multi-use pressures on this land by perhaps setting up a more localized advisory group consisting of the various interest groups in that area, The Pas Farmer's Association, Indian Bands involved, different wildlife organizations; perhaps representatives from the local LGD, etc. to bring the management of that area somewhat closer to the local level. A suggestion of a marsh manager or an area manager was being considered actively by the previous administration. Names were being solicited to sit on that advisory committee.

My first questions to the Honourable Minister would have to be again whether he has any personal feelings about supporting these initiatives or does he wish to start afresh. More importantly is the resolution of that situation at the Saskerem so that both the branch and indeed other organizations such as Ducks Unlimited can proceed with the necessary security of tenure and the long-term planning that an important area such as the Saskerem requires? I appreciate the Minister is of course free to take whatever direction he chooses in this area, but again I point out to the Minister that the question of the Saskerem is not new; it looms large in the concerns of the department because it is a very significant area. There is some historical background to that area that involves certain commitments made by governments well in the past. For instance, when the large hydro undertaking at Grand Rapids was done and the subsequent flooding of certain wetlands occurred there were some obligations — I don't know just how specific or in what kind of written form they may exist — but certainly there was a moral obligation on the part of the governments of the day to provide offsetting wildlife benefits, generally conceded to be in the Saskerem area. Those are some of the considerations that the agricultural community has to acknowledge and has to appreciate in coming to grips with the multiple claims on the various uses of that land.

So, Mr. Chairman, I will leave my questioning of the branch at this point with that question to the Minister:

what does he intend to do with the Saskeram?

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member is quite right in indicating that the Saskeram is an area of where the diversity of interest in the use of that area does produce varying demands from the interest groups affected, and I won't use the word — conflict of interest — but certainly there are different pressures at different times depending on climatic conditions for the use of the resource there.

It has agricultural capacity in some respects; I think there's argument that there could be even greater agricultural capacity. On the other hand, it is an excellent base for wildlife, both for ducks and muskrats and moose and other small fur bearing animals.

In respect to the working arrangements, a marsh manager has been appointed and that's Bob Uchtmann, and he is now employed there. The composition of a committee will include various interest groups including The Pas Wildlife Association, The Pas Trappers' Association, The Pas Indian Band, Ducks Unlimited, the LGD of Consol, The Pas Farmers' Co-operative Association, and one ex officio member from the Wildlife Branch itself.

The committee structure has not been finalized as yet, but it's very much in the work, and there is a recognition I think on the part of all that it's necessary to have a team approach and a multiple approach to the concerns about the proper management of that resource.

I might say in respect to the boundary changes the honourable member referred to, he is quite correct that there are boundary changes being recommended which will simplify and facilitate greater or more effective use of some of the property. Six thousand acres of the what is now the Saskeram Reserve will come out of reserve and three thousand go back in. Now that might seem like an anomaly but it's a matter of correcting the boundaries, adjusting them, to accommodate what the land potential is; and so there will be a net withdrawal of three thousand acres from the reserve for agriculture.

I don't think there is much more I could say about that, Mr. Chairman, except to say that it's a situation where with goodwill and the active participation of the interested people themselves, I'm satisfied that we can provide accommodation to all interest groups. Now, that's not to say that everyone will feel that their interest has been fully satisfied because there's no doubt that the resource could be weighted more heavily one way than the other, but I think that we have to be pragmatic about areas like this and establish through consultation what is the most effective use for the resource.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Emerson.

MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER (Emerson): Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering if the format that we have established here over the last period of time whether that I could sort of cover the areas that they have concerns about and then get them out of the way. Some of the concerns that I have were expressed to some degree by the Member for Lakeside and I'd like to just touch on that a little bit on the poaching aspect which I understand we can deal with under a different section.

However, there was an article in the paper which indicated that some of our field people felt that there was lack of legislation or legislation was hindering them to properly administrate some of their responsibilities and I think we can deal with it then, or the question that I really have is whether the Minister is considering legislation to be introduced in the House regarding that aspect of it that seems to have been a problem with the COs.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the honourable member has in mind. I did read with interest, the depressed story about that. I haven't seen the specifics of water suggested to be the areas of the Act that have to be strengthened or amended and so on. I'll be interested to look at that. That hasn't been forthcoming to me as yet, so there will be nothing this Session dealing with that, certainly, that I know of. Now, it may be that, if staff does come forward with something that is urgent of course I'll bring it on, but from what I am given to understand several areas will be reviewed and whether or not it'll be possible to bring legislation or change either an Act or regulation this Session, I wouldn't know.

MR. DRIEDGER: The other point that I don't know exactly to what extent it would be involved with this department, but under the same enforcement aspect of it, I'd like to pursue it at that time with the staff that you have what position the departmental people have regarding some of the gun legislation that is eventually proposed from time to time, whether we have any interest along those lines at all, has the department through the enforcement people at all, or not? I think it would be a key influence to some degree if departmental people took a position on these things and I'd like to pursue that a little bit later on when we come to the enforcement aspect of it. I'm just serving notice on that.

The other point that I'd like to just bring up at this time is the Member for Lakeside made reference to the barren land caribou herds, the Kaminuriak herd and the Beverley herd. I'd just like to encourage the Minister to continue with the negotiations. I was fortunate enough three years ago to end up north visiting Tadoule Reserve, Brochet and Lac Brochet, with the then Minister Brian Ransom when we initiated some of the discussions with the Reserve people about the protection and management of the caribou herds. I think awareness is a thing that has finally come about and I understand negotiations are proceeding and I felt encouraged by the statement of the Minister.

Continuing on to the Wildlife Management aspect of it; the previous administration established a pilot project in the St. Malo area, a wildlife management area which was sort of unique and was a pilot project and I wonder whether I could possibly have some reaction from the Minister as to how it's working. The administration end of it is shared jointly by the Wildlife Association as well as the resource people and I just wonder what the reaction or the gut feeling of the departmental people is on that?

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Golden has confirmed what I understood to be the case and that is that wildlife management area and its arran-

gement has been working out very, very well. As the honourable member knows, I have met with people from the game and fish organizations in that area and they continue to be very enthusiastic about that development as well.

MR. DRIEDGER: I'm pleased to hear that. I'm just wondering, could the Minister give me sort of his personal feeling in terms of, would he consider looking at the extension of this kind of a program in the future? Because, as the Minister has indicated, there was a group which represents about three or four wildlife associations, including support from the local government district of Stuartburn. The approach which is used here is possibly a little different from the one in the western part of the province where there is concern about too many wildlife management areas. Here we have a major project and everybody in the general area and councils, etc., seem supportive of this kind of an approach. I would like to strongly indicate my support to the Minister for that kind of a project that is being proposed if the Minister could see fit to operate it on the same basis as the one that has been established. The one at St. Malo is of lesser nature. The one that is being proposed right now to the Minister is of a more major nature, but I think it has a lot of merit and if the Minister could indicate whether he, in principle, supports that kind of approach, I'd like to hear it.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I think on an earlier occasion during the course of this review of the natural resource Estimates, I did answer questions to my honourable friend in respect to those very issues. I think it was under the Crown Lands Item when we were discussing that, Mr. Chairman, and I don't think that I could say more than I did then and what I think I — well, I could recall, if what I say now is in further elaboration that's fine, but basically the St. Malo arrangement that first we referred to is working out very, very well. As a model, it probably can be emulated and expanded on in other areas. However, we must be careful in arrangements like this to ensure that the land developed for wildlife habitat, or at least, initially by the interested group, a game and fish association in this case, a group of them, does not become focus only for wildlife habitation. It can be multipurpose, that is, there can be nature trails, bird-watching, all sorts of capacity for varying interest groups in addition to the wildlife people themselves.

There's a certain psychology involved in a particular group going out and buying and then having kind of a paternal interest in a system or development, and it has its advantages and its disadvantages and as long as the group understands the broader philosophy that's necessary in respect to natural resource husbandry, then there's no problem. But, if they become focused on only the one aspect, then it can engender problems. So, we have to watch that balance very carefully and I think most game associations are very enlightened people, but we have to bear that in mind because there's a diversity of interest in people wanting to use wildlife habitat area.

In respect to that particular development that the honourable member referred to, as I indicated I had a meeting with those very enthusiastic people and there

is possibility for that further development, but I really hesitate to say much more about it because, unless they are successful in obtaining assurances that we can pick up the private lands there for a nominal amount of money, I couldn't be very positive about it because it is relatively inexpensive or should be relatively inexpensive land, but if it were to cost the Crown any amount of money, then I think there are other ways we could put the money to better use. We can't afford to be spending a great pile of money on land that is marginal. It should be recovered by the association at a nominal amount and then we'd be able to go ahead I think.

MR. DRIEDGER: I'm pleased to, at least, get the indication from the Minister that he is prepared to keep on looking at it and working with it, because I can guarantee him the group certainly will, because they're a very active group.

I'd like to go on. A few years ago The New Wildlife Act was introduced and I just have a few more questions along those lines. Under The New Wildlife Act part of the provision was the requirement to get permission to hunt on private property. Initially, when this Act was introduced, there was, I think, well maybe word just went out, to indicate to the field people not to come down too heavy on it. It was sort of an introductory type of approach; it seemed to work well, and I must say to the Minister that, generally, there's been good acceptance, especially on behalf of farmers, and most hunters, the fact that they have to acquire permission — not necessarily written permission, it can also be verbal permission — and I just hope that the Minister is not going to be coming down too hard on this, as this transition and learning process continues, I think it is working out relatively well. I'm not sure whether that smile he is giving indicates that I'm in trouble some where along the way.

Further to that I'd just like to indicate to the Minister and to you, Mr. Chairman, that the fact that under the hunting license right now, the party license system is restricted to two to a party. I've had all kinds of representation made to me. It has created certain problems, for the simple reason that what it does to some degree, if a party of three or four people want to hunt in a general area, the field staff, rightfully, if they're hunting in a group, can take, and I understand, charge them. In some cases this has happened. I would encourage the Minister to possibly look at the feasibility of expanding the party hunting licenses to four in a party. I don't know whether this would be any dramatic problem changing it from two to four and why it was changed down to two to begin with. Anyway — (Interjection) — well, safety, a member says. I don't necessarily agree, but I'd like to make that recommendation to the Minister, that I think many of the people in the field that are hunters and sportsmen, and I like to refer to them as sportsmen, that I think there would be good acceptance to see it moved back to four to a license.

I have two other items that I'd like to bring up, Mr. Chairman. One is the license sold for the black bear hunting seasons. These are restricted to resource offices at the present time. All other license, or most other licenses can be purchased at the normal outlets, especially at country outlets, where the individual

storekeepers are selling the various permits and what have you, but they are restricted from selling the licenses for black bears at the present time. I've had that request from several of them, and it creates a bit of a problem for certain individuals if they have to travel 50-60 miles to try and pick up a bear license. The dispersal point in most cases for moose, deer, other things, is done right out of the local business place. —(Interjection)— That creates even a bigger problem.

Now I have one another item that I'd like to cover, and that is the wild turkey season that we had initiated. There's a problem with this. We have two jurisdictions that are actually handling the wild turkey seasons. I think, if I'm right, Wild Gobblers Unlimited have initiated the program to some degree and I understand that the departmental people, the resource people are handling the actual hunting regulations or the program itself. Some concern has been expressed, both by the Wild Gobblers people, as well as the resource people that there should be one jurisdiction that has the authority to initiate the program and handle it. You have a two-pronged thing right now and it's hard to establish who the major authority is, and I would very much suggest that possibly people could maybe come to some kind of an arrangement. As I indicated, we had a turkey season in the southeast for the first time last year. I understand that 220 licenses were issued on a draw basis. —(Interjection)— Yes, incidentally, I was successful. I understand that the amount of licenses that will be issued this year are reduced. Could the Minister indicate when the season is going to be opened, and the amount of permits or licenses that will be issued in both areas, the west as well as the east?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, in respect to Albert's desire to shoot another tom turkey — I'll defer that one for a few minutes and I'll have the date of the season. I know it either begins or ends on the 11th of May, and I think it's May 2nd to 11th, or something like that. Yes, I think it's the 2nd to the 11th. It's one week but there's no hunting on the Sunday. Anyway, we'll have those particulars for you. I don't recall them completely and I won't speculate any further than I have. It's on a draw basis again and if you're fortunate enough - I happen to know that the former Premier wasn't successful in the draw last year - but the Honourable Member for Emerson was, and I saw a picture of his trophy. I'll come back to that one.

Starting with the honourable member's concerns in respect of the effect of the new Act on trespassing, I understand there were only 25 hunters charged last year with illegally hunting on private land, so obviously the department has been exercising discretion in the laying of charges. I would assume that there were probably innumerable instances where hunters, not realizing that the regulations now provide that it's a requirement to get consent before you go on private land to hunt, didn't follow that course of action. But the consent doesn't have to be in writing, and so there can be some disagreements, I suppose, between the hunter and the landowner, but it sounds like the program is working very well.

In respect to the party-license issue I think the honourable member is right, that at one time party

licenses of four in number were permissible, but I think during the course of the last administration the changes did occur that brought a reduction to two, and I think there are different views on this within hunting groups and, obviously, within the general public on this question. These changes occurred and I heard the Honourable Member for Minnedosa sympathizing with the concern and I think he was around during the course of the last four years here in the administration, so there is a diversity of view on that. We'll continue to look at that but I'll take advice of honourable members and I'll take the advice of the department in that review.

In respect to black bear hunting and the licensing; those licenses, like the licenses for the wild turkeys are spring licenses and they're not issued in the normal way, they are special licenses then, and as spring licenses they're available only through the conservation officers, the districts, because there's a limited number of licenses involved and it would be wasteful and very inefficient to have all of the usual outlets having those licenses available. We are a very cost-efficient administration.

In respect to the overall management of the wild turkeys, the Honourable member is right that the growth of the wild turkey flock and resource has arisen as a result of the initiative of the Wild Gobblers Association. It's been a very worthwhile work and they've put a lot of money and effort into it and it's snow paying off in the terms of an additional recreational activity that members of the association themselves participate in. But the overall authority in respect to the wild game remains with the department. The Wild Gobblers rear them in captivity when they decide they want to do that but the government department supervises the game and issues the permits in respect to the release of them. It's a good program.

MR. DRIEDGER: I just have a few short questions that arise because of the comments made by the Minister. Under the present program for wild fowl or animals, the damage that has been created to some degree, do turkeys qualify under that program, wild turkeys?

MR. MACKLING: No, Mr. Chairman, apparently not.

MR. DRIEDGER: Then I would encourage the department to maybe look at that possibility because in areas where there's substantial wild turkeys around, it has created some problems and I would like to draw it to the attention of the departmental people. A further question: how many turkey licenses are going to be issued, eastern region, western region?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'm awaiting those particulars and I will get them shortly and even though we may have passed that item, I'll come back to it and deal with it.

MR. DRIEDGER: Then just one more and I'd like to go back to the barren land caribou. Can the Minister indicate whether the count of the two herds, the Beverley and Kaminuriuk herds; whether they are still on the decline; whether they have stabilized; whether they're starting to come back? This is a question I

should have asked before.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the advice that I have is that both herds are still on the decline.

MR. DRIEDGER: That's all, thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID R. (DAVE) BLAKE (Minnedosa): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have some general comments to make and I know the Minister is allowing us a lot of latitude here but I think we've been making good progress, and if we jump around a little bit he knows by now that when we're ready to pass, we have all our questions answered and even though sometimes when I feel the Minister maybe doesn't know anymore about it than we do, but we're ready to move on. We move on quite quickly.

Just on caribou, I have one question on woodland caribou that I would like to ask the Minister. There's a herd in the Reed Lake area between Cranberry and Snow Lake that forages back and forth in that particular area. I just wondered if he could let me know how that herd was doing, whether that was declining or whether that herd was being maintained? —(Interjection)— Woodland caribou, yes.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that herd is in the area that the honourable member mentions. It's in the Grass River Provincial Park. The herd is holding its own, but barely.

MR. BLAKE: I realize there's a lot of predators in there, two-legged and four-wheeled, but — and four-legged too.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to comment maybe on some of the things that the Member for Emerson has touched on and that is obtaining permission to hunt on private property. I think it has been pretty successful. I know that the COs are conscious of the intent of it all. I feel that maybe last year there was some abuse by certain members of the other police force, the RCMP that work in certain areas, and there could have been the odd individual that was maybe a little overzealous in performing his duties because there were people in hunting parties where the one person might get permission to hunt, and the other member of the party would take his word for it that he had permission. They were going to each member in the group and questioning them with a line of questioning as if they were trying to trap them into saying that they didn't have permission and I don't think that's the intent of the legislation. I don't think it's good for hunting and for game management. That was probably an isolated case.

I agree with the Member for Emerson in his assumption that party hunting maybe should be looked at because there are areas where it's just impossible for a party of two to accomplish any results at all. The bush is far too vast for them to attempt to push it, so they join up with other parties or they wait until another party moves in the area and then they stand point, and when you don't know where members of your party are, that's when you maybe are a little more prone to some accident where you don't know exactly

what the other people are doing.

Mr. Chairman, I don't want to get involved in this particular argument pro or con but I just wondered if the Minister might like to comment on Sunday hunting. I know if this ever rears its head it'll be a very controversial subject, but you know there are areas in our province where people spend a fair bit of money to get to. I'm thinking up north where I don't really believe the animals up there know what day it is. It's a shame to travel all that way and have to lay around camp all day Sunday waiting for sunrise on Monday because you — the Minister knows what may happen if you're laying around all day Sunday with a party of four or five fellows. You might have to take Monday off too. I have hunted in jurisdictions where they do allow Sunday hunting and I'm not saying that it should be any wholesale area — past a certain point up north for big game, surely. I don't advocate it for big game down here, but I think for upland game in the southern areas; there's very, very heavily-populated areas in the United States where they allow Sunday hunting. It's been a great boon to the tourist business and I don't see any problem with it. I just would like to have the Minister's comments on that; if he's had any representation from hunting groups or from wild life associations; what their views are on it.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, with your permission I'll answer the questions that the Honourable Member for Emerson had put to me because I think he's anxious to make arrangements and I don't blame him. —(Interjection)— Well, given your past success I might have to take you up on that, if I ever get out of here. There are two areas again. There's the St. Malo area and the La Riviere area and there are choices of dates and they're; the 3rd and the 4th; the 5th, the 6th; the 7th, the 8th; the 10th, the 11th; 12th, 13th; 14th and 15th; and a successful draw applicant will be enabled to select one of those couplet dates, same as last year, and will be able to shoot one tom turkey. —(Interjection)— Well, we have to think metric now and I don't know what that is. In St. Malo again, it's the same period of time: the 3rd, the 4th; 5th, 6th; and so on. You'll note that there's no hunting on the Sunday and there are 300 licences in total, 25 licenses for each day choice.

Now in respect to the matters raised by the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, I've indicated that in respect to party hunting I'm prepared to look at that and ask staff to look at it, and it may be as the honourable member says, that in some areas of the province where factors that were raised in opposition to more than two being in a party might be a factor, and if it is then since the province is zoned for hunting in various areas, we could look at that. That might be something that the hunters might appreciate and we'll look at it.

In respect to Sunday hunting, the best advice I have — well, I won't indicate what the best advice given to me was — but let me say that there is considerable diversity of opinion on that question. Personally speaking, I, as someone who enjoys the outdoors and I happen to fully enjoy the outdoors because from my perspective, I haven't been able to do any hunting and I hope that whatever we do in this Session we don't get involved in too much of the legislative work during the regular bird-hunting season anyway. But my inclina-

tion is to try and provide more free time for individuals to be able to hunt rather than open Sunday up for hunting. I like to see more opportunity for the short work week or whatever, so that people can get out and enjoy the outdoors during the summertime and during the fall which I think is the most splendid season of the year in more ways than one. So, if I sound like I'm skating on that one, it may not be as fancy as I would like, but that's it.

MR. BLAKE: I can see that there is some diversity of opinion on it, and there's maybe a possibility for someone who may advocate Sunday hunting, and there are some areas where I don't see anything wrong with it at all. I'm thinking, you know, around the Churchill area for goose hunting for people that usually have to fly in there, have spent a considerable amount of money, and as I say, sitting around Sunday seems kind of pointless when there is no church to go to and there's no danger of disturbing the local people who may not like hunting on Sunday; areas like that. And I know that the advocates are going to say, "Well, that's just the thin edge of the wedge, that's your foot in the door to open it up," and being a hunter as I say, I have hunted in jurisdictions where it's allowed. It's allowed in Europe, it's allowed in England, pheasant-hunting, and I've hunted in Iowa and Nebraska and they allow Sunday hunting there and there's been no problems whatsoever. In fact, it's been quite a boon to their tourist industry. —(Interjection)— but you still go to church; you don't shoot till after church. And there are a lot of very religious people down there, too, good strong Baptists.

Mr. Chairman, I know the department has a program on sustaining deer herds that are having maybe not as good graze in the various times in its — the Member for Arthur is not here — he'll probably be bringing it up Monday when he gets back, but there is one particular farmer down in his area that's feeding something like two hundred-and-some-odd deer right now, and that's a pretty heavy load for one individual. I was wondering if the department does have any assistance program or what avenues he should look at to try and get a little assistance to tide him over for another couple to three weeks maybe.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, the department itself does have a winter feeding program where problems have been identified and that's been ongoing for many years. In the event that there is a specific problem, and it sounds like the honourable member is referring to a case that we might look at, because the department will, if there's a specific problem that someone is prepared to look after, then perhaps we could supply feed in a situation like that.

MR. BLAKE: I'd just like to add, Mr. Chairman, that particular area is in Lyleton and the Conservation Officer down there might be interested in taking a look; he may be aware of it. But the farmers are, as you know, probably the best conservationists by and large that we have, because they do have a feel for the land and nature and animals and birds, and in most cases, they do a great deal to sustain the birds and the animals for those of us that like to enjoy the recreational hunting to enjoy it.

Mr. Chairman, my main point is — and it's something that the Minister maybe hasn't had time to look at or hasn't had time to find some solution to, but maybe someone in his department could. As you know, my riding takes in a large part of Riding Mountain National Park and we have great problems there with beaver damming up areas, flooding farmlands, blocking culverts and flooding out roads, and I know the problems that there is with the Parks Canada people. You can't go in there and clean them out and they have multiplied very, very rapidly and I don't know what the answer is, but the Member for Dauphin's not here. We attended a meeting at Ste. Rose last week where the municipalities are getting together with Parks Canada and with the political people and I know some people from the department were there, and it looks as if they have formed an ongoing committee that may require some funding in some way, but I think that is the first step to trying to solve the problem. I believe last year they had one or two people authorized to try and take the beaver out and he may indicate how successful that was. I don't think it was very successful, but if he would like, I could give him the name of a couple of people who would just love to go in there and take out a few hundred beaver every year, if you can get Parks Canada to agree, but we know the policies of Parks Canada. That park is not to be touched in any way, shape or form; in fact, if you get caught picking mushrooms in there you're liable to be arrested. But I guess that policy may be a long time before you're going to change it; but there are so many problems in there and I won't get into the drainage problem because that's another one, but they have done test areas that have proven very, very successful in holding back temporarily and providing some catch basins for the silt before it gets out of the mountains because that's the problem. Once that water is out of the mountains, the problem's created and it's a hell of a job to stop the water once it gets rolling. But the damage caused by the animals there, and as I say, we have the problem of the large animals too, and I know there's compensation paid to a number around that park, but the Minister may be able to bring us up-to-date on what progress he feels they're making with the Parks Canada people in arriving at some solutions to eliminating the problem of wild-animal damage and the beaver problem.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, the department confirms to me that the concern that the honourable member has, has been identified and he's quite right about the problems that have been occasioned by beaver that come . . .

A MEMBER: Our federal beaver.

MR. MACKLING: . . . yeah, our national emblem coming into areas outside of the park and causing a great deal of difficulty, as he has indicated. As a result of the concerns and the problems that have developed, the department has negotiated an agreement with Parks Canada and the Federal Government, and it's a prevention program that will cost \$60,000 cost-shared 50-50, 50 percent federal and 50 percent provincial. The department did encourage trappers to move into the adjacent area and —(Interjection)— no, they couldn't

go in the park, but the program was fairly successful.

In respect to the broad area of problems that arise in respect to fire and animals and so on and those problems that are associated with the park area and the neighbouring area, as the honourable member has indicated, there is a committee that has been established. It's called a Liaison Committee and the department has recently designated the Regional Manager in Dauphin as the provincial representative on that Liaison Committee and I believe that we're going to be having a meeting very soon. So, I think again, that progress is being made in establishment of consultative systems that hopefully will mitigate or minimize the problems that arise from the conflicts in control and use of resources in that area.

MR. BLAKE: I think that's a step in the right direction. I think the problem has to be attacked at source and it's in the park and it would have to be done in a controlled way and the rangers there are fairly co-operative.

I had the misfortune to wound an elk a couple of years ago when I was hunting in there, and my partner and I had to go and get the ranger and follow the trail and he accompanied us in two or three miles, and it didn't look like we were gaining too much on it and we suggested we didn't want to tie him up and take his time, so if he would just let us go on by ourselves that we would probably get the wounded animal and he said, "I know being a politician that I could trust you, but I'm not sure of your partner, so I think maybe you had better come back out with me." So, unfortunately, we didn't get the animal.

The beaver, as I say, at one time were pretty well extinct in there and they brought in two or three pairs and it's a good thing they brought pairs because they maybe would have been extinct by now, but they've got something like 3,000 or 4,000 colonies in there, which is a lot of beaver. If they don't get in that park to start controlling them or cleaning them out, I don't think they're ever going to solve the problem, but I see that steps that are being take. I know it takes a little longer to educate the federal officials than it does to educate provincial people, but keep the pressure up on them because it is causing great problems to the farmers in the adjacent areas.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member is quite correct in respect to the propensity of the beaver to propogate very effectively from the small numbers. I'm advised that in this area we have the highest density of beaver in all of Canada.

MR. BLAKE: We all would have been proud.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. LLOYD HYDE (Portage la Prairie): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, I was quite interested in the discussion that was taking place this morning in regards to some of the problems with our hunting rights and such as we have in the day. You're probably aware that we have quite a number of our population around the Portage area is Native and it has gotten to be a big problem in that area of night-lighting and it is a problem in our area and I first of all, before I go any

further, I want to say that it isn't only Native people, we have some non-Native people too, that are abusing their rights along that line.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope that you will continue, you and your government, will continue to preserve the different species that sometimes could very well be extinct through the noncare of some people.

I want to mention, if I may, just about the waterfall damage that has taken place in the past in the area of north of Portage, which is in the new part of my constituency. It has been a problem to that area for as long as we can remember, particularly in wet seasons, late falls, when there's more water than we'd like to have at that time of year. The damage that has been done by the ducks and geese is just unbelievable and I'm hoping that your government will continue to compensate the farmers that are being — (Interjection) — yes, set upon, by the unruly ducks and geese at that time of year.

Also, it was mentioned by some of my colleagues this morning in regards to the hunting on private properties. I'm not a hunter myself. I used to enjoy it, but of later years, I haven't, but I thought possibly that you did need to have written permission, but it has been mentioned here that it is not needed. I know recently there was a case where these two young gentlemen trespassed onto property and the authorities were notified. The authorities were right on the job and the case was taken to court, but was thrown out, a lack of proper evidence in that particular case. I don't know any more of the particulars on that, other than I know the case was thrown out, as I say, for lack of evidence on trespassing.

I was wanting to mention a little bit about Ducks Unlimited. In our area, you can realize that, in these last few years, we've had a number of farmers out in that area very concerned with the aggressiveness, if I might say, on that company. I don't know whether you would wish to comment on that at this time, Mr. Minister.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, —(Interjection)— The Chairman has indicated I have a half-a-minute. I heard someone say, the Minister loves Ducks Unlimited. You know, I love everyone and it's difficult for me to find words to describe my enthusiasm for those who want to preserve wildlife and to encourage it. Now, there are differences of course. Some people recognize that the organization has a perceived object and sometimes that causes problems for other interest groups. We have to work and try and balance out the priorities as those responsible for the preservation of our natural resources, and try and take the enthusiasm and the effort of all those who have maybe single-purpose interests and blend them so that we get a homogeneous, collective effort that is of benefit to all.

In respect to the depredation problems that the honourable member talks about, that's an ongoing program and, I think a very successful one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour is 12:30 and I'm interrupting proceedings for Private Members' Hour. Committee rise.

**SUPPLY — NORTHERN AFFAIRS,
ENVIRONMENT AND WORKPLACE SAFETY
AND HEALTH**

MR. CHAIRMAN, Jerry T. Storie (Flin Flon): Committee come to order. I address your attention to Page 107, Item No. 2, Administrative Support Services, specifically 2(b), Other Expenditures.

The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D.M. (Doug) GOURLAY (Swan River): Mr. Chairman, on Other Expenditures I understand that the management services to Channel Area Loggers and Moose Lake Loggers is covered under this area. I was just wondering if there's any change in this arrangement.

HON. JAY COWAN (Churchill): I'm informed that it's under 2(c) the next item, is that correct, where we'd be discussing that if you wish to discuss it under that particular item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2(b)—pass; 2(c) Canada-Manitoba Northern Development.

The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. GOURLAY: I wonder if the Minister could comment on the management arrangements with Channel Area Loggers and Moose Lake loggers as to whether there's any changes have taken place in this service since November.

MR. COWAN: My understanding of the situation is that there were two SMYs in last year's adjusted, and there are two SMYs in this year's request which is a status quo situation. We are asking for another \$1.7 thousand in respect to the funds and that's due to a position transfer resulting in increased salary requests for '82-83. So the salaries go up from \$51.2 thousand to \$52.9 thousand. The manager is the same of corporate projects, and the secretary is the same individual as well as was in the previous year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(c)—pass.

The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. ABE KOVNATS (Niakwa): I would just like to find out where I can ask some questions on the industry that prefabs houses out of logs in Northern Manitoba; under what item?

MR. COWAN: There is not really an item in the Estimates for that so if you wish to discuss it now I'm perfectly ready to discuss that in general terms.

MR. KOVNATS: Just a very very short question on it. Has the government got any intention or any monies allocated to the restarting of these industries that were curtailed because of the immense losses of monies that were put into them in previous years? Has the government got any intention of revitalizing the industry?

MR. COWAN: There is nothing specific in these particular Estimates in that regard. However, we are looking at those options under the Northlands Agreement,

under the special ARDA Agreement although to a much lesser extent, and we may as those agreements become more structured and we have more idea what may or may not be in them, be able to discuss them in that particular respect. For these Estimates there is no specific monies allocated for those purposes. That is not to say that we won't be looking at them over the course of next year in attempting to determine if, in fact, we can provide support for those sorts of programs. That is something we'll always be doing, as I indicated yesterday. We want to take both a long-term and a short-term approach to dealing with some of the significant unemployment problems in Northern Manitoba. These types of projects are exactly the type of projects which one would want to look at in that regard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item No. 3, Local Government Development, and in accordance with the suggestion yesterday from the Member for Niakwa, I'll read these into the record: 3(a) Local Government Services; 3(b) Local Government Services.

The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. GOURLAY: We're finished on 2?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry we should pass the Resolution first.

Resolution No. 115.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$470,200 for Northern Affairs, Environment and Work Place Safety and Health, Administrative Support Services for the fiscal year ending the 31st Day of March 1983— pass.

Continuing with No. 3, Local Government Development, we're on 3.(b), Local Government Services.

The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. GOURLAY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I take it this is where the Assistant Deputy Minister's role is, in Local Government Development. That position is currently vacant is it not?

MR. COWAN: The position shows up under 3.(b) but I don't want to get caught up in the same problems that we got caught up with last night. If you wish to discuss it at this point, I'm perfectly prepared to. Yes, the position is vacant.

Perhaps if I can, I can just give a brief opening statement and then if there are questions flowing from that at the start of each section.

Of course, the Local Government Development Division provides local government support services to the 15 northern and remote communities falling under the jurisdiction of the Department of Northern Affairs. These services fall into the area of local government support and local support services. Their services within this division are delivered through three different operating branches with the following objectives.

The first is local government services. Here we attempt to progressively advance the local self-government units falling within the jurisdiction of The Northern Affairs Act in accordance with the provisions of The Northern Affairs Act and as well in

accordance with governmental and departmental policies towards increased autonomy. As part of that process we are attempting to progressively transfer authority, monies and resources to communities as they become more and more capable of responsibly and effectively becoming self-governing units. During that process we monitor and assist where possible, the local government bodies in carrying out the local service requirements as defined in The Northern Affairs Act. Finally, we assist councils and committees in identifying and prioritizing major infrastructure requirements which are delivered by the department and other government department agencies.

To answer the specific question of the member opposite, we can discuss the vacancy in the Assistant Deputy Minister's position, if he wishes to do so at this time.

MR. GOURLAY: Mr. Chairman, the Minister in his opening remarks yesterday indicated that his objective is to see another six communities move up in to self-administering units, and another one into a joint administration from trust. I wonder if he could identify those communities.

MR. COWAN: We would hope, over the next period of time and that's the next fiscal year, advance from trust status to joint administration status, the communities of Dallas-Red Rose, Stevenson Island, Pine Dock and Princess Harbour. Those are four which we would hope to move in that direction. We would also hope to advance from trust status to self-administering status, Big Black River, South Indian Lake and Ilford, and, finally, we'd like to advance from joint administration to self-administration status, Easterville, Camperville and Nelson House.

Those are the objectives which we have set out for the upcoming year. Hopefully, we will be able to reach those objectives. We have put into place what I hope will be enough direct support services to enable us to assist those communities in what we would suggest, and I know the members opposite would agree, is a fairly logical progression of their self-development.

MR. GOURLAY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the Minister on his ambitious effort to endeavour to get more and more of the communities looking after their own affairs. I wonder if he could give us a little more detail as to how he sees this happening with another four or six communities in the current fiscal year, and at the same time, avoiding some of the pitfalls that we have experienced in the past.

MR. COWAN: To answer the member directly, I don't know if we can avoid the pitfalls that have been experienced in the past. I am hoping that we can avoid those pitfalls and we have put into the Estimates, as you will note, requests for three increased training officers, who will be entrusted with the responsibility of going out into the field and working with these and other communities to assist them in developing their own capacity to reach that expanded self-government capacity within their own area. There may be problems. As a matter of fact, I believe I could hazard a guess and be substantially correct that there will be problems and we don't want to underplay those prob-

lems. There are going to be very significant problems that we are going to have to come up with solutions for. Having said that, I expect that from time to time we will have to discuss specific problems and I will be looking to the members opposite, as well as to others who are interested and involved in this area, to make me aware of those problems when they realize that they exist and, secondly, to assist us in working through those specific problems.

MR. GOURLAY: Thank you, Madame Chairman. I certainly can say on behalf of members on this side that we certainly want to co-operate with the Minister in his efforts to help these communities in this important job, but I thought the way the Minister spoke yesterday that they had sort of a definite plan in mind with extra people working in the field, working more closely with the communities, and I just wondered if he could give us a little more detail as to how this would be.

MR. COWAN: Under 3.(d) in the Estimates, the member will note that there is a request for three increased positions; those positions will be filled by training officers. Those training officers will work with our co-ordinators who are in the field at all times; as well, they will go out into the fields themselves to work directly with the communities to try to provide the support services which we know are necessary if, in fact, we want to assist these communities reach a self-governing status. That is not to say that we won't be examining other options throughout the course of the year in respect to the way in which we provide training packages, in respect to the way in which we provide training to our own staff. That is an ongoing process as the member knows. We will be doing that as well, but we have identified three extra people in recognition of the objective that we would like to have six more communities gain that status.

MADAME CHAIRMAN: The Member for Flin Flon.

MR. STORIE: Thank you, Madame Chairperson, just to make a couple of comments for the record. First of all, I welcome the statement by the Honourable Minister regarding the increase in Local Government Services budget, and I think this is an important step. As a representative of the Flin Flon constituency and someone who has Northern Affairs communities in his riding, I certainly appreciate the value that this branch of government has to northern communities. I believe the communities of Nelson House, the Metis community there, the community of Wabowden and the community of Sherridon, all are in need of Support Services and as they continue to expand their self-government exercises, they continue to develop the expertise that's required for self-government. They're going to be from time to time in need of support.

I would also like to say that, as I see it, the Support Services are not only a means of developing self-government and of giving each community a certain sense of pride in their activities and their undertakings, I think it's also important as a training ground for individuals in all kinds of bookkeeping and accounting, on procedures and rules, and I know from having

attended some meetings with — I'm not sure what the official title is — the co-ordinators that work out of areas like Thompson and The Pas, having attended community council meetings there and watched the community councils develop a sense of direction and a sense of coherence and a sense of contributing to their own local communities, I know that the individuals involved, both as counsellors and as clerks, develop a sense of pride in what they're doing. I think, from that, develop a sense of pride in their community and a sense of hope that their communities can not only prosper but can develop and can function like any other centre in Manitoba, in fact, in Canada.

It's a welcome change. I welcome the increase in the amount of money that's designated for this type of service and I know it means a lot to these communities to know that the government both supports them and encourages them in their efforts to develop a style of government which is appropriate for their communities and appropriate for their lifestyles and of benefit to all the people that live in those communities.

I would just ask the Minister if there is a likelihood that other communities will, in fact, be developing self-administering capacity in the near future.

MR. COWAN: There's always a difficulty, Madame Chairperson, with providing a specific list and saying these are our goals and objectives in that you tend to restrict that list by omission. I would hasten to assure the Member for Flin Flon that, if there are other communities which move towards that capacity to become more self-governing, we will do everything in our power to encourage them to do so. By suggesting that these are our objective communities at this point, we are not suggesting nor should it be inferred that we are suggesting that we won't be working with other communities to move them along and also working with those communities that have reached a self-administering status to assist them in maintaining that because there's always times when you have to look at moving backwards a step if that's necessary as well as the member opposite knows. So, we will be providing those sorts of services to all the communities. We have isolated the communities which I read out before as ones where we believe we have a good chance of making the progress which we have suggested we intend to make, but that is in no way a reflection on the other communities.

While on my feet, I might add that I sent over a detailed chart of this division within the department and I have only one correction to make to that chart. The Assistant Deputy Minister which is a position I'm certain we'll be talking about very shortly is a vacant position and the individual who occupied that position previously has now gone back to Municipal Affairs.

MR. STORIE: I only have one other comment and perhaps it's not a question. The Minister may wish to reply in kind and that is with regard to the difficulties that these self-administering communities face from time to time and yesterday we heard the Member for Pembina and the Member for Swan River discuss and mention the fact that sometimes these communities do, in fact, violate some of the regulations that govern their activities. I would only like to say that for many of

these communities and particularly the ones that are not yet self-governing that this exercise is an experiment for them. It's a learning experience. It's not something that we can, I think, reasonably expect them to be proficient at the beginning. It's to be expected that the administrators and the councillors are going to from time to time make mistakes. They're going to violate certain of the regulations, perhaps without realizing it, perhaps without realizing the consequences of doing it even if they do understand that it's a violation. I think it's important to recognize that because it's a learning experience and because it's important to the residents that the reaction that we have to those infringements, if you like, not be that strict. I think there has to be some recognition that it's a valuable enough exercise that we cannot become overly alarmed at some of the problems that occur. We have to take them in stride and continue to encourage those communities to develop the capacity for self-government.

MR. COWAN: Of course, Madame Chairperson, I take the advice of the Member for Flin Flon into consideration. I assure him that we will attempt to provide that latitude as we see fit. We will be kind but firm in our dealings with the communities and, by doing so, I think we will generate the type of atmosphere which will indeed provide an environment and an opportunity for those communities to progress along the way to a self-governing status, and once having attained that status, will maintain that status as much as is possible.

MADAME CHAIRMAN: The Member for Swan River.

MR. GOURLAY: Thank you, Madame Chairman, I'd like to ask a question. I'm not sure if this is the appropriate place regarding the honorariums. That would be covered here?

MR. COWAN: It's under 3.(d) but if he wishes to discuss it here, I'm prepared to do so.

MR. GOURLAY: You had mentioned, Mr. Minister, yesterday that the local honorariums were being changed. I'd like to have some idea as to the changes and also the fact that many of the communities have different numbers of council members, and I was just wondering if that has been standardized to some degree or is it sort of hocus-pocus as far as the numbers of council members in the various communities or is that sort of being standardized to some degree?

MR. COWAN: As the member is aware, there was a proposal put forward that the number of councillors in each community be standardized on the basis of population and that was a proposal that came forward from his government and upon assuming office, I asked that process be reviewed and be delayed for that reason in order to accomplish a review.

Basically, what I want to do and I think the member will allow me this latitude, is go out into the communities and discuss that specific process with the communities as they are going to be the ones that are going to be affected by it to the greatest extent. I want

to assure myself that they understand what the changes will mean and as well that they are in favour of those types of changes. If we don't do that, then we would run the risk of alienating those people which we were not intending to alienate. I must admit that I don't know if there were those sorts of detailed discussions held under the previous administration with the councils and with the organizations which represent councils, but I do want to assure myself as Minister responsible for implementing the change, that I have had an opportunity to hear the voices of those who are going to be affected by that change.

The short answer to his question is, we have looked at the proposal, we have not acted upon the proposal, other than to say we are going to review it and discuss it with the councils. We've not rejected it.

MR. GOURLAY: Would the Minister like to comment on the other areas that had been looked at by the previous Minister. They hadn't had a chance to really discuss it in any detail as far as the levels of minimum services to the various communities and the standardization of council members. I don't think that there was any great dialogue that took place as far as the standardization of council members. There was quite a bit of consultation with the different communities with respect to levels of services for different sized communities and I was just wondering if the new Minister has had a chance to look at those proposals and whether he has any plans to act on those.

MR. COWAN: I've only had an opportunity to briefly be informed of some of the contents of the report. I will be reviewing the report in detail. I understand that report was developed with the type of consultation which we all know is necessary to design good programs. For that reason, I want to have the time to review it in some detail and then to make specific comments upon it at that time — perhaps during the course of this Session, more likely during the course of next year's Estimates if I am still in the position of responding to those specific questions in this area, but I assure the member opposite that report has not been forgotten or neglected and will be reviewed very carefully. As well, we will be going back into the communities and discussing a number of changes which they may see as important to them which may or may not be contained in the report. I do not want to leave the impression that we're going to base those decisions only on that report. However, that report will be an important part of our review.

MR. GOURLAY: I realize, of course, that the Minister hasn't had that much time to really have an opportunity to look at those reports in any great detail but certainly we will be interested as the time goes on as to what transpires there.

In this area there is, I think, reference to a new office located in Swan River. Of course, that is of particular interest to me, and there isn't a co-ordinator located in Swan River that covers some of the Northern Affairs communities that sort of use Swan River as their shopping area. I've heard some rumours that there may be changes made in that arrangement. I'm just wondering if the Minister would like to comment on it.

MR. COWAN: I have not heard those rumours nor have I started them.

MR. GOURLAY: I'm pleased to hear that. I think that the communities that are affected appreciate the fact that the co-ordinator is stationed in Swan River. They do use, for the most part, that community for their goods and services and I think that certainly the office facilities that Government Services have provided for the Northern Affairs personnel is very adequate and I think although it's only been operating for less than a year, it appears to me to be working out very well. I'm pleased to hear that there are no changes to discontinue that, at least, at the present time.

MR. COWAN: I would only ask the member opposite to consult with those people who have provided him with those rumours and disabuse them of their concerns and allay their fears in this regard. There are no immediate plans for change in that area. I am not going to say that from time to time we don't rationalize the entire system or rationalize one specific part of the system, and we always have to allow that option to be available to ourselves. But I can assure him that I have not looked at that office in an individual way as part of that process, that I have not heard rumours respecting that office or the way in which it is operated and, for that reason, have not directed any attention or caused any attention to be directed to that specific office. As long as it's performing its function and its role, I would imagine it would be an integral part of this system.

MADAME CHAIRMAN: I.—pass.

MR. GOURLAY: Excuse me, Madame Chairman. On the question of honorariums, that was to be covered under 3.(b), did you say? —(Interjection)— Well, no, we can maybe — unless someone else has some questions under 3.(a). We're on 3.(a)(1)(a)?

MADAME CHAIRMAN: 2.—pass; 3.—pass; (b)—pass; (c)(1)—pass; 3.(a)(1)(c).

MR. GOURLAY: Right. I would just like to ask the Minister if he can sort of bring us up to date as to —(Interjection)—

MR. SHERMAN: On a point of order, Madame Chairman.

MADAME CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Just for the clarification of the Committee and the assistance of those of on this side, could you indicate to the Committee whether or not 3.(a) was written and read into the record and passed and that we then moved on to 3.(b) on page 108 and are now on 3.(c)?

MR. CHAIRMAN, Jerry T. Storie (Flin Flon): That's correct. There's no I. It's just 3.(c) Community Works.

MR. SHERMAN: 3.(c) Community Works. (1) Salaries and Wages.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(c)(l). We're on page l08; 3.(c)(l) Salaries and Wages.

The Honourable Minister, on a point of order.

MR. COWAN: I'm somewhat confused, as are others, although I imagine it's more our fault for being confused. However, if the member wants to discuss, I believe, the Fire Program, —(Interjection)— Yes, I would give him an opening statement on the Fire Program and then address any questions he may have at that time, if that's permissible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's up to the Minister if that's the way he'd like to proceed. I don't think there's any intention of limiting debate. If you've missed it, I'm sure the Honourable Minister will accommodate you and answer any questions you might have.

MR. COWAN: I think we may have jumped ahead of ourselves, but let's have the latitude to address those issues which you want to address in this particular section — although not yet to Environmental Management, to the Member for Tuxedo.

On the Fire Program you will note that there is a request for \$90,000 more this year as compared to the adjusted figures for last year. The adjusted figures last year being 89,000 and the 1982-83 request being 179,000. This increase is due to increased training as a result of having more organized fire departments. As well, we are providing an allowance to replace or repair major equipment and facilities over and above the amounts budgeted for the maintenance in the community budgets. We found, as the member opposite is aware, that this is necessary to ensure that this program operates at a peak efficiency. So we provided that extra money in this particular section for those communities which may, in fact, need —(Interjection)—

The fire program request for this year includes money for equipment and building repair, training costs, a discretionary fund for unanticipated emergencies, office operating and travel costs.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister advise the Committee where that appears that in print? We don't, in our Estimates Book, have any print appropriation for Fire Program.

MR. COWAN: The reason for that, and this becomes somewhat confusing, because we are in the midst of negotiating a Northlands Agreement, and this money falls under the Northlands Agreement. These print figures, 81, 82, are shown at 80 percent of the money which was spent, and I do apologize, because it gets confusing because of the way in which this money has been calculated in the past and the fact we are in negotiations right now.

But what it shows on your page as 80 percent of the amount which was spent, which shows \$71,200, actually \$89,000 was spent but the \$71,200 amount is what came out of Northern Affairs, 20 percent of that came out of the Department of Finance, I believe, as part of the process which had been put in place by the previous government to allow for these expenditures.

The money for this program, which I have indicated to you will be \$179,000 which is 100 percent of the

money which we are going to spend, shows up in Vote 19 (8) —(Interjection)— No, 80 percent shows up in 19 (8) and 20 percent shows up in the Department of Finance and we hope to spend the money somehow, if they can remember where it is.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, where is 19(8)? That's in a different department?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We need some clarification. There is no 19(8).

MR. COWAN: That's Resolution 121 on page 110 under the heading of Canada-Manitoba Northern Development Agreement and an amount is shown for \$17,831,400.00.

MR. SHERMAN: So the money is included under that umbrella, Mr. Chairman. Could the Minister then since we've now really reverted, I guess by concurrence of the Committee, to Resolution 116, 3.(a)(1), could the Minister then provide the Committee with the estimated sums of expenditure and appropriation for all the items under that heading because the print estimates contain no such information?

MR. COWAN: I think I must make note that these are incumbent upon the Northern Development Agreement being successfully concluded. For that reason it's a somewhat confusing process as we try to lead you through the figures. It is certainly not intended to be a confusing process and I wish that there was a more efficient way to put these figures to paper so that it would assist you. I will look through the rest of the Estimates to see if there isn't some sort of fact sheet that we can provide to you at the beginning of any area where we have this particular problem.

What I am going to give you now is 100 percent of what we expect to spend in that particular area. So if you go back to 3.(a)(1), the \$446,300 figure is 80 percent; the other 20 percent of that figure was contained in the Department of Finance Estimates.

What we are intending to spend is — and I'm giving you a 100 percent figure and I will just ask my staff if they can give me an 80 percent figure so you can make the comparison, or a 100 percent figure of last year's — last year the 100 percent figure was \$577,900.00. Our request this year is \$577,200 or a \$19,300 increase, which is due to merit increments. We are not requesting more staff in that particular section.

Other Expenditures, the 1981-82 adjusted figure which is at 100 percent was \$169,400.00. Our request for this year is \$189,000, for an increase of \$19,600 which, as you can tell, is an inflationary increase. This amount includes vehicle operating costs, travel, and related costs for non-employees — that would mean bringing people in for sessions.

The next item is the item we were discussing and those are the figures which I gave you which might have been somewhat confusing, and I do apologize. The 1981-82 adjusted figure was \$89,000, 100 percent. The 1982-83 request is \$179,000, which is an increase of \$90,000 — which is a significant increase I might add — and one which I think the members opposite should take some satisfaction in because

that is a program that they worked very hard in developing and one which we have commended them on, for the most part, throughout and have seen fit to continue that sort of accelerated and expanded approach to providing fire protection in Northern Manitoba, and that's why you see that sort of a significant increase in that area.

MR. GOURLAY: Thank you. I'd like to thank the Minister for those dollar figures. The fire program I'm sure we're all quite happy to see the thrust that is continuing in that direction. I'd like to commend the communities, the volunteer fire fighters who have worked hard at that program and have done a commendable job. I'm just wondering if the Minister can indicate those communities that will be receiving fire trucks this coming year, if he has that information.

MR. COWAN: I just want to make certain that we're providing the information in the proper way because we are jumping around a bit and I have no objection to that because it's necessary to sort of move our way back and forth through the Estimates to get the full picture. I can give the member the information if he wishes. Okay.

These are the capital expenditures planned in respect to this program for the upcoming fiscal year of 1982-83. We intend to put in place six fire halls and tanker garages. The communities that will be affected are Berens River, Dallas Red Rose, Sherridon, Pikwitonei, Harwill and Stevenson Island.

Next we anticipate a waterline extension to the fire hall in Crane River. There will be four fire trucks provided, one to Berens River, one to Sherridon, one to Pikwitonei and one to Wabowden. There'll be one fire tractor put in place in Gods Lake Narrows and we will be spending \$95,000 in purchasing new equipment such as radio-based stagers and pagers, sirens for fire halls, pumps, hoses, nozzles, ladders and breathing equipment.

The figure which we are addressing breaks down in the expenditure for which we are on now as to \$50,000 for equipment and building repair; \$100,000 for training costs; \$10,000 for discretionary funding for unanticipated emergencies; and \$19,000 for office operating and travel costs. To break that \$100,000 figure for training costs down into more specific details, \$8,500 of it is anticipated for fire prevention courses; \$11,500 for fire service instructor courses; \$13,500 for a fire centre course; another \$13,500 for in-school fire fighting costs; \$46,000 in community training schools; and finally, \$7,000 for central fire college courses in Thompson.

I hasten to add that when I reverted back to these last figures, I reverted back to the fire program, which we are discussing under 3.(a)(1)(c).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Swan River.

MR. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't have any further questions on Page 107, unless other colleagues have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just before we get off this item for the second and what presumably will be the conclusive time, I would just like to ask the Minister where does he intend to deal, or where can the Committee deal with the Reconciliation Statement on Page 106? I am not sure that it comes under this area of the Estimates, except that this area does contain reference to the Canada-Manitoba Northern Development Agreement and that also occurs on the Reconciliation Statement, Mr. Chairman, so I raise the question at this time. — (Interjection) — Thank you, I appreciate the Minister's co-operation, Mr. Chairman.

Just one question on that — there is \$144,500 of function and spending that is transferred in 1982-83 to the Department of Northern Affairs, Environment and Workplace Safety and Health, from Consumer Services and Corrections. Could the Minister advise what that constitutes?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COWAN: Last year that would be the grant that was made by the Department of Community Services and Corrections to the Four Nations Confederacy. This year it will be made to the Four Nations Confederacy and the northern organization, the MKO; it will be split between the two of them on a basis which we have yet to work out with the organizations, but we are involved in discussions.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I gather from what the Minister is saying is that this year that will be done through this department and not through the Department of Community Services.

MR. COWAN: Basically that is the case.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Niakwa.

MR. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, just a couple of questions. I am aware that Transport Canada has a very extensive program of training fire fighters in Northern Manitoba, particularly at airports, has the Provincial Government co-ordinated this program, this fire program, with the Federal Government at all through Transport Canada to assist in the training of people in the different northern remote areas?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COWAN: I understand that there is some co-ordination ongoing through the Department of Labour and the Federal Government in this respect. We are not involved with that co-ordination at this time specifically. However, I will take the member's question as advice and ask staff to look into that area to see if there are options available to us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Swan River.

MR. GOURLAY: Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned earlier, I have no further questions on 107, but on the top of page 108, (b), I think this is where the Minister indicated that he would tell us about the ADM position and also the honorariums for the community councils.

MR. COWAN: The Assistant Deputy Minister position is a vacant position which arises out of the fact that the previous Deputy Minister who took that office in February of 1981 requested a transfer back to his original position, I believe, and I may stand corrected on that. You would have to ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs to confirm that or to provide you with more accurate information, but it is my understanding that he requested a transfer back to that original position and we have certainly agreed with him in respect to his wishes.

The Acting Deputy Minister, who is now Jim Perchaluk, is here with us today and I want to take this opportunity to commend the previous Assistant Deputy Minister on his work. While he was with the department he served the department well and we are now in the process of reviewing that position. The Acting Assistant Deputy Minister which we have in place is doing a commendable job as well.

MR. GOURLAY: I thank the Minister for that response. I wonder if he could indicate now the levels of the honorariums that he had indicated.

MR. COWAN: I can inform the member opposite that the total increase is \$65,000.00. I will provide him with the exact information as to what it was and what it will be either at this sitting or the next sitting.

We are now in the process of determining how that will be structured and I hope to be able to provide that information to the member opposite when we have made a Cabinet decision in that regard, but it will have to be a Cabinet decision, because I believe it involves a change in regulations and will become public information at that time.

MR. GOURLAY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is right, it does require a regulation change and we would appreciate getting the breakdown as to the honorariums for mayors and councillors, and whether there are any differences between sizes of communities. I think that at the present time all mayors in the Northern Affairs communities get the same honorarium, all the council members, if I am not mistaken. We were in the process of looking at making that a little more equitable as far as the larger communities versus smaller communities and so forth. We would appreciate that information when you have it available.

MR. COWAN: I can inform the member, at the risk of being overruled, perhaps some time in the future that we anticipate that the breakdown will be much similar to that which had been proposed previously, but I will provide him with that detail once I am at liberty to do so. I am certain he appreciates the fact that it does have to go through the normal procedures and it would be inappropriate for me to discuss details until I had an opportunity to have it moved through the normal system.

MR. GOURLAY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move on to (c) Community Works.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those items, because of some confusion there, we have already passed Item (b), so we could move on to Item 3.(c)(1) Salaries and Wages —

the Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. GOURLAY: I think this is the area where we can discuss the water and sewer programs that are in the process of being installed in some of the communities — Cross Lake, Norway House, maybe we can update on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COWAN: I have no objection to discussing it at this time. It would be by the rules more appropriate to discuss it under Capital Works, but if the member has some questions which he wants to bring to my attention at this point I'd be glad to address him. Before doing so, I would like to make just a brief opening statement on this particular section and provide him with the information which maybe of a more standard nature.

We are now talking about the Community Works Branch of the Local Government Development Division. Of course, the major activities of this branch are to provide major maintenance services respecting roads, and there are approximately 200 miles of roads that we look after as a department; water and sewer systems, and there are approximately 40 water and 5 sewer systems which we look after; and three diesel generating plants. As well, it provides supervisory and technical expertise in carrying out departmental projects, plus we attempt in almost every instance to assist the communities in the delivery of various self-administering community work projects. Again, these would include roads, buildings, garage facilities, water and sewer systems, subdivisions and the like. You will see that we are asking for no increase in SMYs. In 1981-82, the adjusted figure show 30 SMYs under regular staff man years; in project staff man years, there was a total of 37. That will stay the same in our request that is before you now. The increase in dollar terms are due to merit increments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Tuxedo.

MR. GARY FILMON (Tuxedo): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Last summer, in the course of a visit to a number of northern communities in discussions about particular problems with many of the residents, I recall that there was a considerable problem with respect to the water supply at Cross Lake. Among other things, the new water supply had gas seeping into the intake structure and that made it unusable at the time we were there. I know remedial measures were being recommended and actions to be taken, I just wonder if the Minister can tell us at the present time whether that has been totally corrected and whether or not that intake in water supply is now fully operational and available for the use of the residents.

MR. COWAN: I'm informed, Mr. Chairman, that problem has in fact been resolved at this time and there does not appear to be significant difficulty in that regard. If we are talking specifically about the problem with a gas leak which I think is the issue which has been put before us.

MR. FILMON: So it's the Minister's response that the

water supply is now fully operational and that the residents are able to use the water supply from Cross Lake.

MR. COWAN: I understand that we will have the project completed in its finality this year. We are monitoring now and providing information in respect to any difficulties which may be encountered, but in short, to answer the Minister — or the member, excuse me, I'm elevating him to his previous position — it's been deferred, they inform me, but that's not the answer to the question. The question is "yes," we have taken action and we'll continue to take action until the situation is resolved to our satisfaction and the satisfaction of the community are continuing monitoring programs at the present time.

MR. FILMON: I would also ask the Minister with respect to the community of Cross Lake, I was more than concerned about the problems that they were facing with respect to the low water levels. I had spent some considerable time up there in the summer of 1961 as a student surveyor and I was familiar with the community and the water levels and so on. Unfortunately, due to actions taken by the government in the early '70s, the Schreyer government, with respect to the construction of Jenpeg for the regulation of Lake Winnipeg, some massive changes occurred in the natural water flow through the Nelson River system which manifested themselves in serious problems as the member well knows — because we had discussions when we were on opposite sides of the House and at a meeting of the Northern Affairs Community Councils and other meetings with respect to just how seriously Cross Lake has suffered the effects of the low tail water that was downstream of Jenpeg. Of course, that was an effect that was not bargained for during the construction of Jenpeg although an understandable one and knowing the controls that it places on downstream flows.

We also know of course that when we're in a situation that Manitoba Hydro wishes to continue to store water and control the release of water from Lake Winnipeg via the Jenpeg control works, that they are in a position to cut back substantially on the flows; that the minimum flows that they are allowing are simply not sufficient to provide for Cross Lake's needs. This has caused many problems, not with respect to natural fishing habitats and we're not in a position to discuss that — that I recognize. But the fact of the matter is that remedial actions will be the prerogative and the responsibility of the Department of Northern Affairs. Several plans had been put forward with cost estimates. I'm recalling from memory but 400,000 sits in my mind. There are other, perhaps more expensive measures, reconstruction of various facilities at the water level, at shore level and so on and so forth.

My question to the Minister is, just exactly what his department has planned for the community and how high a priority is it and when we can we expect to see something taking place there?

MR. COWAN: The question the member asks are three questions and I'll try to address them as well as provide a bit of background, much of which he is probably aware, but perhaps some of the newer

members would appreciate that information. Of course, the concerns which the member has outlined are serious concerns. The impact of the change in water flows upon that community in specific and a number of other communities in Northern Manitoba have been serious impacts. As a result of an agreement which was negotiated between five affected bands, Manitoba Hydro, the Province of Manitoba and Federal Government, an agreement which is called the Northern Flood Agreement, many different options have been reviewed and examined. The Northern Flood Agreement, of course, also provides an opportunity to address those issues in a number of different fashions.

One is, the parties affected by the agreement can sit down and internally negotiate an agreement to satisfy the concerns which are brought forward by any one of the signatories to the agreement.

The other, of course, is they can go to arbitration where an arbitrator will then make a decision as to the justification of one case over another.

The problem with low water levels is one which has just recently been addressed by the arbitrator in respect to its effect on recreational facilities in Cross Lake and in respect to the level of water and environmental concerns.

Now when I say it's been addressed by the arbitrator, it was a claim that was brought to the arbitrator but I understand it has been settled internally by the signatories without the arbitrator having found it necessary to bring forward a decision.

I might add that I have read the testimony which includes several hundred pages of the parties to the agreement as they made their case before the arbitrator, and it's quite interesting reading. I would be more than pleased to forward it to the member opposite if he would like to advise himself of the details of this particular claim, which is Claim No. 11. It addresses many of the issues which the member has addressed in his remarks just previously. Those are issues which we find of grave concern as well.

The water supply question is one which we feel has been resolved, or is in the process of being resolved satisfactorily, and that's in respect to the intake. I'm informed that we have spent several hundred thousand dollars in that regard, approximately \$300,000 to be more specific, to try to resolve that particular problem.

We are now involved in a number of studies which will highlight ways by which — not only highlight I might add, but will examine — the effects of ways by which the water level may in fact be made more stable from an environmental perspective. Once we have those it will give us a better picture as to how we can deal with the problem, and not the symptoms of the problem.

As it is at the present time, though, we find ourselves forced to deal with the symptoms of the problem and that's providing this sort of safe water system and I understand that the water that is being consumed in that community now is of a safe quality, and of an acceptable quality, and also to address the other issues.

Capital works, and we can address it here or there if you wish, there's a proposal to put in a water and sewer system in the community as well. I hope that

answers the member's other question.

MR. FILMON: Well, it's only a partial answer, Mr. Chairman, because I am aware of the remedies that are available to the community by virtue of the Northern Flood Agreement and the negotiations that can take place under that aegis.

But what I'm really referring to is the costs of tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands of dollars, to various public facilities and private facilities by having to deal with a very drastically altered water level in a community whereby dock facilities and other shore level, water level facilities, will have to be permanently altered or adjusted in some way to deal with problem, or else some means taken to permanently stabilize the water level at a level that would be more acceptable for various purposes, whether that be recreation, or fishing, or boating, or transportation, or all those other things upon which the community relies.

I say to the Minister that I perhaps have placed some more urgent responsibility on his shoulders with respect to this because it results as a direct consequence of an action taken by a previous incarnation of a New Democratic government in this province, whereby the construction of Jenpeg which just incidentally happened to have been regarded by a judicial inquiry as being a totally useless project in the first place has now resulted in some very serious damage to communities and residents downstream. I place an even greater onus of responsibility upon this Minister, who represents that area both in his own personal seat and as the Minister responsible — no, no, I don't mean that area being Cross Lake but that northern downstream area — and as the Minister responsible for Northern Affairs, to give it a high priority. As I say, more through the sense of responsibility of cleaning up an adverse effect of a decision of a previous New Democratic government.

There are ways and means available, certainly engineering and technical solutions to the problem of the control of the tail water levels from Jenpeg and I urge this Minister to consider taking the action and taking it as a prime responsibility in the not too distant future.

MR. COWAN: I believe I am taking the action in that manner, and it is an urgency in respect to the activities of the department and one which we have addressed a great deal of thought, consideration and action to, to date.

So I wish to assure the member opposite that we, too, are aware of those problems. They are continuing problems. I don't want to rehash the Tritschler Inquiry or fight the last election campaign. I don't want to point out what would have happened if the Conservative plans for Hydro had gone ahead to Northern Manitoba. I don't want to become involved in that, although I will if I find it necessary. I don't want to become involved in that because there are much more important things to do.

I think the member opposite addressed those important things and that is to get about finding the solution to some of these problems and where the solution is not easily obtainable, finding some remedy which will in fact reduce the impact as much as possible, or deal with the negative impacts in a positive way

which come as a result of hydro development.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, a further problem or concern that was raised in the community was with respect to the operation of the sawmill there. This may not come under this item and I will certainly accede to the Minister's wishes with respect to the viability of the operation, the opportunity for it to continue to provide jobs and employment for people in the community and the opportunity for it to expand its markets by virtue of road access and transportation.

There was a further problem of course of getting hydro power into that particular facility which was one of the reasons why the economics did not work out for the sawmill operation. There were supposed to have been ongoing discussions between both the Native and the nonstatus communities in Cross Lake, hopefully under the guidance of the Minister's department, to bring some satisfactory resolution to the problem so that this particular industrial facility could continue to provide meaningful employment in that community for residents of Cross Lake.

MR. COWAN: This is a serious problem and one which we are well aware of. I found this problem on my desk shortly after having assumed the office. At that time we consulted with the community; we consulted with other individuals who could provide us with their expertise and their experience in this regard. The sawmill operation is in serious difficulty; we are going to do that which we can to try to assist it out of that difficulty. Part of the problem, in fact, is a hydro line to the sawmill and I understand right now the difficulty in that regard is obtaining a right-of-way transfer from the Federal Government. But we are working on that, we will continue to work on it; we are working on it with the community, with the main individuals involved with the sawmill operation and with other governmental departments to try and come to a satisfactory resolution.

I wish I could be more optimistic, but I don't wish that lack of optimism to be interpreted by any as a lack of commitment or will on our part to find a solution to this problem if in fact a solution is possible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Tuxedo.

MR. FILMON: Speaking particularly to the question of obtaining the right-of-way for the hydro line to the sawmill, and I think that there is also a problem with respect to obtaining a right-of-way for a road through the Indian reservation there as well, is there some common agreement between the two communities, the status and nonstatus communities that this ought to happen or is there still some difficulty in arriving at a resolution to these problems because of a lack of commitment on all sides with respect to this?

I wonder if the Minister could indicate that.

MR. COWAN: I understand that they are moving closer to an agreement and it might be too strict an interpretation of the word to say that there is an agreement in principle, but I would suggest that is very close. If all goes well, and as the member understands there are difficulties that can enter into the picture at any time in this type of negotiations, but if

all goes well we should not have that difficulty in the very near future.

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

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. STORIE: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Concordia that the House accept the report as received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. Monday afternoon