



Second Session — Thirty-Second Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

31-32 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable D. James Welding
Speaker*



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 66A - 2:00 p.m., THURSDAY, 12 MAY, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, Andy	Springfield	NDP
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BANMAN, Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BLAKE, David R. (Dave)	Minnedosa	PC
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
BUCKLASCHUK, John M.	Gimli	NDP
CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.	Brandon West	IND
CORRIN, Brian	Ellice	NDP
COWAN, Hon. Jay	Churchill	NDP
DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent	St. Boniface	NDP
DODICK, Doreen	Riel	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	NDP
DOLIN, Mary Beth	Kildonan	NDP
DOWNEY, James E.	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	PC
ENNS, Harry	Lakeside	PC
EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
EYLER, Phil	River East	NDP
FILMON, Gary	Tuxedo	PC
FOX, Peter	Concordia	NDP
GOURLAY, D.M. (Doug)	Swan River	PC
GRAHAM, Harry	Virден	PC
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry M.	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd	Portage la Prairie	PC
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, Gérard	Radisson	NDP
LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling	Charleswood	PC
MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al	St. James	NDP
MALINOWSKI, Donald M.	St. Johns	NDP
MANNES, Clayton	Morris	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin-Russell	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)	St. Norbert	PC
NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)	Assiniboia	PC
OLESON, Charlotte	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald	Pembina	PC
PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.	Selkirk	NDP
PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland	Fort Rouge	NDP
PHILLIPS, Myrna A.	Wolseley	NDP
PLOHMAN, John	Dauphin	NDP
RANSOM, A. Brian	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Burrows	NDP
SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SCOTT, Don	Inkster	NDP
SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
SMITH, Hon. Muriel	Osborne	NDP
STEEN, Warren	River Heights	PC
STORIE, Jerry T.	Flin Flon	NDP
URUSKI, Hon. Bill	Interlake	NDP
USKI, Hon. Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, Hon. D. James	St. Vital	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 12 May, 1983.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As members will notice by the Proclamation and the Manitoba Tartan, today, May 12th, is Manitoba's birthday.

I wish to be the first to say "Happy Birthday" to all members of this House and to all people who consider Manitoba home.

A province is people and their heritage, though the word "Manitoba" may conjure up boundaries drawn on maps, cool lakes, golden fields of grain, forests of poplar and pine, and the Canadian Shield.

People and traditions made this province the home we love, cherish and identify with.

I wish to pay tribute to those Manitobans who, in the early years, toiled to build this province and to make it a place in which we are proud to live and raise our families; and also, those who have recorded these events and used their talents of singing, painting and writing to celebrate our way of life. Those persons contributed greatly to establishing an image of our province as a leader.

I also wish to pay tribute to those who were proud of their individual background, who saw the importance of preserving that heritage, and who have worked together to create a new society in a new land.

I also wish to recognize those Manitobans who continue to dedicate themselves to creating a cultural life which will grow and change with our province in the future.

From its strong roots, this province will continue to produce persons capable of leading us to a better life in virtually every form of human endeavour.

I invite all members of this House and, indeed, all Manitobans to join with me in celebrating the achievements of our people and of our province, and in wishing all Manitobans another Happy Birthday.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that everyone on this side of the House and all of the people of Manitoba would wish to associate themselves with the generous views that have just been expressed by the Minister of Cultural Affairs with respect to our birthday, our 113th birthday as a province.

In addition to all of the matters that he has quite properly noted that we can have pride in Manitoba, there is one further group that attest to the citizenship and to the loyalty that Manitobans have always shown to this country and, that is, for those men and women who have made the ultimate sacrifice for their nation by laying down their lives for this province and for this country in times of stress that this nation unfortunately has found itself in, in those 113 years.

We join wholeheartedly in the expression of birthday wishes which the Minister has enunciated today and hope that Manitoba may enjoy many many more generations, peace, prosperity and happiness in this great country.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member for Radisson have a point of order?

MR. G. LECUYER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the House to revert back to Reports of Standing and Special Committees.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the wish of the House to revert back? (Agreed)

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. G. LECUYER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Second Report of the Standing Committee on Economic Development.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Your committee met on Thursday, May 12, 1983, to consider the Annual Reports of Moose Lake Loggers Ltd., Channel Area Loggers Ltd., and the Communities Economic Development Fund.

Mr. C. Jones, President and Chairman of the Board, Mr. R.J. Kivisto, General Manager, and Mr. G.P. Trithart, Secretary-Treasurer of Moose Lake Loggers Ltd., provided such information as was required by Members of the Committee with respect to the Company.

Information with respect to all matters pertaining to the operations of Channel Area Loggers Ltd. was provided by Mr. Bill Bennett, President and Chairman of the Board, Mr. G.P. Trithart, Secretary-Treasurer, and Mr. J. Benoit, General Manager.

Mr. Bernard Wood, President and Chairman of the Board, and Mr. Hugh Jones, General Manager, provided such information as was required by Members of the Committee with respect to the Communities Economic Development Fund.

The fullest opportunity was accorded to all Members of the Committee to seek any information desired. Subsequently, the Annual Statements of Moose Lake Loggers Ltd., Channel Area Loggers Ltd., and the Communities Economic Development Fund, for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1982, were adopted.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. G. LECUYER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Wolseley, that the report of Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS (Cont'd)

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a statement.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to report on an extremely successful sale yesterday of Crown-owned oil and natural gas leases, which I believe augurs well for a continuation of the mini-oil boom in southwestern Manitoba.

Indeed relative to Manitoba's share of Canadian oil play and its history, we may be on the brink of a full-fledged boom. I say this because some of the significant sales yesterday indicate that several oil companies are prepared to embark on more exploration in areas previously unproven. Yesterday's sale generated revenues for the province of \$646,739.00; 34 of 45 leases offered were sold; leases sold covered 4,043 hectares with bonus bids averaging \$146.73 a hectare.

The highest lease bonus per hectare was paid by Pipestone Petroleum Incorporated of Calgary for a quarter-section located in the Lyleton area, 18 kilometers southeast of Pierson. The company paid \$48,790, or \$762.34 per hectare as a tender bonus.

In the corresponding May sale held in 1982, bids on 30 of 36 parcels offered generated sales totals of \$430,000 with an average price per hectare of \$131.16.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to note that three Manitoba-based companies played a significant role in yesterday's sale. New Scope Resources Limited purchased seven leases, while Westmead Limited and Brosco Fund Limited jointly acquired six leases.

Other indicators which give basis to my optimism for continued development and expansion of the province's oil industry are contained in a new Quarterly Report my department plans to issue in the future. I have tabled that with the remarks I am making, Mr. Speaker. I am making the first report available to all Members of the Legislature.

Members will find of particular interest the fact that licensed geophysical programs have already exceeded last year's activity by 400 percent. Licences have been issued for 4,623 square kilometres of activity compared to 996 kilometres for all of 1982. This rapid expansion has in fact taken place since the report just mentioned was compiled.

The Quarterly Report shows that a total of 49 wells have been drilled so far this year compared with 24 during the same period last year which is a big expansion over the year before. Forty of these wells were completed as potential producers, Mr. Speaker.

Production for the first two months of the year climbed by 27 percent over the same period in 1982, from 558,835 barrels to 709,789 barrels.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to express my pleasure with the pace of oil development and reaffirm my department's continued support and assistance to the entire industry.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I think it's evident to everyone that we welcome this announcement by the Minister of Energy and Mines.

It is indeed fortunate that the Minister of Energy of Mines has some good announcements to make which flow from policies that were put in place by the previous Minister.

MR. H. ENNS: Which he opposed.

MR. B. RANSOM: This activity, Sir, is a direct result of the fact that our government, in 1978, returned to the practice of leasing land for the exploration of oil and gas, a procedure that had been ended by the Schreyer administration in 1971. The people of Manitoba did not receive a dollar in lease fees between 1971 and 1977.

We went back to leasing at that time and changed the royalty structure to make Manitoba competitive once again and the present First Minister, at the time that those changes were made, Mr. Speaker, said in this House, "that if I as Minister of Mines thought that those changes were going to lead to increased oil exploration, then indeed I was a foolish visionary."

What we have announced today, by the Minister of Energy and Mines flows directly from those changes in policy, Mr. Speaker. We are very pleased to see that come about because the people of Manitoba now are experiencing this economic boon in at least one area of our economy and it came about, Sir, without ManOil. It came about without a nickel of tax expenditure by the people of Manitoba. I commend the Minister of Energy and Mines for continuing with these policies; he should consider simply dropping the ManOil.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to table the department's annual publication of the Financial Statements of Boards, Commissions and Government Agencies for the fiscal year ended March 31st, 1982. That book is a consolidation of financial statements, most of which have previously been tabled because of a legislative requirement to do so. I trust that members will find it to be a useful reference.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to table the Annual Report for the year 1982 of the Clean Environment Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. V. SCHROEDER introduced Bill No. 73, An Act to repeal The School Capital Financing Authority Act; Loi abrogeant la loi connue sous le nom de School Capital Financing Authority Act. (Recommended by Her Honour the Lieutenant-Governor)

HON. A. MACKLING introduced Bill No. 76, An Act to amend The Crown Lands Act.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we reach Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery. We have 28 students of Grade 11 standing from the Glenlawn High School. The students are under the direction of a Mr. Styko and the school is located in the constituency of St. Vital.

There are 25 students of the Inglis Elementary School of Grades 5 and 6 standing, under the direction of Misses Jackson and Janke. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

On behalf of all of the members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Garrison Diversion Project

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Natural Resources or the First Minister. Can the Minister of Natural Resources or the First Minister confirm that negotiations are under way between the Federal Government and the Government of Manitoba with respect to a second Federal-Provincial Parliamentary delegation to Washington in order to lobby against the Garrison Diversion?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to confirm that I have had discussions with the Federal Government in connection with that matter. I have also attended in Washington, approximately two weeks ago, and had discussions there. Confirmation of the arrangements and the details will be confirmed sometime later in this Session.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Natural Resources confirm that the target dates for that meeting are the 24th and the 25th days of this month?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of dates involved and a number of visits involved and I'll confirm the details of that in due course.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, from the standpoint of the government and opposition working out personal schedules, can he confirm the fact that the date that is being worked on presently by Members of Parliament,

Senators and the appropriate Minister in Ottawa for the parliamentary delegation is the 24th and 25th of May? If that's the case, could he confirm it in order that the people here who may be interested in being part of the delegation can make their plans accordingly?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position to confirm the exact dates. There have been tentative dates considered, including the dates that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition mentioned. There are some earlier dates as well that have been considered and different representatives who will be attending at different times, but the exact times and visits have not been confirmed so far.

Demonstration at U.S. Consulate

HON. S. LYON: Can the Minister of Resources advise the House whether one of the purposes of his trip 10 days ago, or whenever, to Washington was in order to, shall we say, absolve himself from the cloud under which he operates in this House and in this province with respect to his unfortunate appearance at an anti-American demonstration in front of the Consulate? Was he there for that purpose as well?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I can confirm to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that I had a very friendly and very favourable visit to a number of key people in connection with our interest in the Garrison issue. Certainly I did want to make clear to all concerned there that the suggested anti-American suggestion about myself or any other member of our caucus is a distortion of fact; that we love our neighbours, but we reserve a right to speak out openly in connection with issues that we feel are important to us.

We Canadians are welcome in Washington and I was made to feel welcome in Washington, and I think they appreciate our concerns in respect to environmental issues and are happy to receive us.

Garrison Diversion Project - delegation

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, a question to the First Minister, is it still his intention to nominate the Minister of Resources as a member of the Joint Federal-Provincial Parliamentary Delegation going to Washington to speak on behalf of the citizens of Manitoba against the Garrison Diversion?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there's been no suggestion, outside of possibly my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, otherwise.

HON. S. LYON: Is the First Minister saying that there have been no communications with the Department of External Affairs about the advisability of the Minister of Natural Resources not being part of the delegation for Manitoba?

A MEMBER: We have no problems with that.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have not had, to my knowledge, communications. I would ask the Minister

of Natural Resources to deal with that. But, Mr. Speaker, insofar as Manitobans - and I know those Manitobans that are mainly involved and concerned with respect to the Garrison - the information that I have received is that those most concerned about Garrison want the continued leadership of the Minister of Natural Resources on this important issue.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, can the First Minister advise whether or not the parliamentary delegation that is being discussed between Ottawa and Manitoba will include persons other than Members of the Legislature or of the Parliament of Canada?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I can indicate that in discussions I've had with the members of the Parliamentary Legislative Committee in respect to Garrison that discussions have included representation from both Houses of Parliament in Canada, that is, the Senate and the House of Commons, and representation from this House.

As honourable members may know last year included in the delegation to Washington was a former Premier of this Province, Senator Duff Roblin, whose representation was well-received in Ottawa and I hope that he will be a part of the representation again this year.

HON. S. LYON: I take it then, Mr. Speaker, that the answer to the question is that there will be no members of the parliamentary delegation, that is, other than Members of Parliament and Members of the Legislature, will be no municipal representatives attached to this delegation about which we have been speaking today?

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, there will be representation from Parliament and the Legislature only.

Workers Compensation Board - amount of settlements

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for the Workers Compensation Board. Last summer the Minister arbitrarily fired the members of the Workers Compensation Board and substituted those members with his own appointments who also subsequently - note the clause, Mr. Speaker, for that action - the new members of the board appointed by the Minister arbitrarily fired two longstanding career civil servants of the board. Would the Minister advise this House as to the amount of the settlement given by the Workers Compensation Board in settlement of actions for severance pay and wrongful dismissal?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. COWAN: Well, without accepting the premise that there was wrongful dismissal - and I certainly don't

do that - I can indicate to the Member for St. Norbert that Workers Compensation Board Estimates will be, or that part of the Estimates, will be before the House shortly and I would be pleased to have that material provided to him at that time.

As he can confirm, we have made some arrangements already between the two of us to ensure that we have staff present for the discussion of those Estimates which will be a precedent as well, and I think will open up the process much more. One of the reasons we want to have that staff present, one of the reasons the members opposite requested that we do that, and certainly the reason that we accepted that request was so that we could discuss those sorts of items in detail.

I can provide the detail to him at that time or I can get it and provide to him through another question period if he so desires, but those two options are immediately available to us. I don't have it here at the present time and I don't accept the premise of his preamble.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for the arrangements which we have made for consideration of the Workers Compensation Board.

Can he confirm that the Workers Compensation Board settled a claim by Mr. Norm Hiebert, the former Director, who had served 25 years in the public service of Manitoba, settled his claim for severance pay and wrongful dismissal for \$66,000; and settled the claim of Mr. Ernie Dyer, Director of Assessments, who had 29 years in the public service, for some \$57,000.00?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

— (Interjection) —

HON. J. COWAN: You know, on the opposite side, Mr. Speaker, they are shouting their typical comments of resign and their disdain for the improvements which have been made to the Workers Compensation Board.

I would suggest that they talk to workers who are being better served by that new Board of Commissioners and better served by the new system than they ever have been in the history of this province, if they want an accurate reflection of what's being done in that system today.

I am ashamed that it took so long to provide the reforms that enabled the Compensation Board to better serve those workers, but I am extremely proud for the limited role that I had to play in making that system more responsive to the needs of workers in this province and I will defend them in any forum, given this forum.

Now, I cannot confirm the amounts which were paid as a result of those dismissals. I certainly will not not or cannot confirm that they were in any way connected to wrongful dismissal charges. But I will provide the information in a specific way which the member asked, as I indicated to him earlier, either by way of the Estimates review or by way of answer in another question period. But notwithstanding that fact and notwithstanding his question, I want the record to be very clear, that system is better serving the workers of this province today in a more efficient and effective way than it ever has been in the past.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister confirm that within the past few weeks the Workers Compensation Board has fired or released another longstanding employee of the Workers Compensation Board, and that the Workers Compensation Board will have to pay similar damages as those paid to Mr. Hiebert and Mr. Dyer, for damages, for severance pay and wrongful dismissal?

HON. J. COWAN: If the Workers Compensation Board of Commissioners is in fact changing personnel in that manner, I can assure you that they're doing so because they believe those changes will better serve workers in this province. The fact that there was a need for a couple of reviews and a judicial inquiry being started under the administration of those members opposite indicate that there were serious problems with the Workers Compensation Board. We didn't throw out hands up and say there are no problems. We went in there, we took decisive but tough action, and we made certain that system is in fact defending the rights of workers for which it was intended to serve.

Now, if the Workers Compensation Board Commissioners have decided that management changes are necessary as part of that overall reform, then in fact they have made those changes. I would be prepared to discuss the details with the member during the appropriate occasion; I don't have the specific information. I can't confirm nor deny his specific allegations at this time, but I can confirm and will confirm that in my opinion, and in the opinion of those with whom I have discussed this matter, who are being served by that Board, they are pleased with the changes that have been made. They are for the most part satisfied that the Board is undertaking its responsibilities in a productive and a positive way, and they in fact support this government in the changes which it has brought forward as a result of reforms being necessary to that system for a very long time. They are appreciative of the fact that they have been brought forward in such a definitive and positive way as has happened in the past.

I want to make certain that the comments of the member opposite in no way reflect poorly upon the Board of Commissioners whom I believe are doing an excellent job in their capacity of service to this province.

Workers Compensation Board - firings

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister responsible for the Workers Compensation Board assure this House that there will be no further firings at the Workers Compensation Board, particularly of long-term career civil servants of the Board?

HON. J. COWAN: It has always been an honoured practice, one to which the members opposite subscribe, that the Workers Compensation Board of Commissioners have responsibility for staffing in that area. I have allowed them to undertake that responsibility and to exercise it in a manner which they have seen to be most fit. I will continue to support them in exercising their decisions as they feel is necessary and using their decision-making power to provide reforms to that system which are long overdue and extremely necessary and urgent.

MANDAN interconnection

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday I took as notice a question from the Member for Pembina regarding the Mandan line routing alternatives, and I'd like to answer him now.

Alternative route proposals for the MANDAN line in Manitoba have been announced. Landowners, municipalities, and agencies affected are presently being informed of the details. In a mailing which was undertaken on May 10th - the landowners, municipalities, and interested agencies - Manitoba Hydro supplied a large-scale map delineating the alternatives. Interested parties have been invited to attend a series of open-house meetings in June so that their suggestions and concerns can be incorporated into the process of selecting one preferred route, a 250-foot wide right-of-way for the line.

The Provincial Government has reviewed each stage of the route selection process and has approved the alternative route proposals. The Mandan Project schedule requires that Manitoba Hydro select one preferred route by September, 1983. The preferred route selection will then be referred to the Provincial Government for final review and approval. Once the Provincial Government has approved the route, the matter must be referred to the Federal Government's National Energy Board, which may hold public hearings for a final assessment of the entire project.

I've asked that those letters be also sent to all of the MLA's in the southern part of Manitoba and the MP's.

Affordable Homes Program

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Housing and would ask the Minister to advise the House whether the \$50 million Affordable Homes Program which he and the Premier announced last August and September is now being administered or run by the Jobs Fund?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, no, the Homes in Manitoba Program is still being run by the Department of Housing; however, additional funding has been allocated to the Homes in Manitoba Program by the Jobs Fund. That had been indicated a number of days ago by a press release, and that is the case.

MR. R. BANMAN: I wonder if the Minister could advise the House what portion of the unspent \$50 million Affordable Homes Program announced last year by himself has been transferred to the Jobs Fund.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure if I'm clear on what the honourable member is asking. There have

been an additional \$23 million added to the \$50 million allocated in the first instance to the Homes in Manitoba Program; an additional \$23 million allocated because of the tremendous response of Manitoba home buyers; the tremendous response and enthusiasm of the program by the Homebuilders Association and the construction industry in this province. We certainly anticipate being able to use those additional \$23 million.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a question to the same Minister. Out of the \$50 million program announced last year, would the Minister confirm that about \$16 million of that was spent in the last fiscal year, and that some \$34 million of that particular program has been transferred into the Jobs Fund?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that approximately 15 percent was spent, physically cash flowed, in the Homes in Manitoba Program. However, as the member will be aware there were approximately 1,000 units under construction in the province in the months of March and April, I believe, and that the cash flow is on a progress basis. So that while the program has committed those funds, clearly the cash has not flown to this point, all of that \$50 million. But as I indicated, the commitment is there; the \$50 million is on the way as the builders progress on each of the units; and in addition to that, the further allocation that came from the Jobs Fund will also be spent and over the course of the next number of months.

MR. R. BANMAN: Would the Minister of Housing confirm that the unspent portion of the \$50 million program which he announced last September, that the unspent portion, some \$34 million, is not in his Estimates but is in the Jobs Fund?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm that. The Jobs Funds Estimates will be before the Legislature shortly, and certainly these particular questions that the member has in mind we'll certainly be more than happy to answer at that time. I've indicated what has happened. The additional funds has come forward, and certainly we'll deal with those questions of the Jobs Fund.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister, is he telling the House that he doesn't know where those some \$34 million are, whether they're in his Estimates or in Jobs Fund?

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister a further question. In light of fact that the \$34 million are in the Jobs Fund, and in light of the fact that the Jobs Fund is now advertising that particular program as being part of the \$200 million Jobs Fund, and that these ads are now being played on radio and I understand also been appearing in the newspaper, would this Minister undertake to stop the use of taxpayers' money to really put forward fraudulent ads which are recycling funds in the past and really stop one of the biggest snow jobs in the history of Manitoba.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, if there is any snow job being had, it's from the honourable member opposite.

Mr. Speaker, the Jobs Fund was set up to create jobs in this province. Mr. Speaker, we're talking about \$73 million that has been committed or will be committed partly under the initial Homes in Manitoba Program, partly under the additional funds that have been located by the Jobs Fund. We're talking about 3,500 or more jobs in Manitoba and, Mr. Speaker, on top of the fact that we're creating 3,500-plus jobs, we are also talking about the fact that this money, the money that is being allocated by the Homes in Manitoba Program, by way of mortgages at 11.5 percent, is not a significant cost-back.

We are creating thousands of jobs; the money is committed. I don't know what the honourable member is talking about when he's talking about a fraud. The jobs are out there. The construction industry is working, Mr. Speaker, and that's what the Jobs Fund is about.

Number of bills this Session

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: I took as notice a question from the Opposition House Leader, the Member for Turtle Mountain, relating to the number of bills yet to be introduced in this Session. I can advise them that as of today, and over and above anything that is presently on the Order Paper or for which notice appears on the Order Paper, I am anticipating approximately 35 more bills. Of those, approximately 10 could be categorized as major; that is, they are not necessarily full Acts, but there may be one or two amendments of major significance. Three of that number are the usual Finance Bills and approximately 22 contain minor amendments, more or less non-controversial. Only time can tell. One never knows where the opposition can find controversy if they root around deeply enough, but approximately 35 in total.

Finance, Dept. of - Capital funds

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday in the Estimates of the Natural Resources, the Minister of Natural Resources was candid enough to acknowledge that some of the Capital funds that were not in his Estimates, part of the \$7 million to \$8 million reduction, were indeed in the Jobs Fund. If that Minister knows where his missing Capital is, my question to the Honourable First Premier or the Minister of Finance is, will he not do his Ministers a favour and tell them where the missing Capital is, the shifting game, the shell game that's been going on with this \$200 million fraud fund?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought I would never get the opportunity to get into this. The questioning that the Member for La Verendrye has just completed demonstrates the total lack of honesty and integrity in the argument of the opposition that there is no money. We had the Member for Turtle Mountain just recently saying there is only a maximum of \$18 million. Now, we have the Member for La Verendrye saying just in one program there is new

money of \$23 million to build houses in Manitoba. They accept that.

In addition to that, there is the \$10 million from the Manitoba Government Employees Association which they recognize. Now we've got \$18 million, \$10 million, \$23 million that they recognize, but if we go back a few weeks and if you read the speech of the Member for Turtle Mountain, his first speech on this, there was zero. He was standing up in this House and saying there is no money in the Jobs Fund. We've said all along that there was some carry-over Capital. I have provided the members of the opposition with the exact dollar numbers of carry-over in Capital. They've got that, they know that; they don't have to ask questions. They're grandstanding today, Mr. Speaker.

They have also been told as I said on Budget night that one-half of the \$200 million is new money; the other half is not new money. So when the Member for Lakeside says that there is this money from one spot to another — (Interjection) — yes, we have never denied it. We have said that there is money shifted to a central pot in order for a central control mechanism to make sure that we get maximum jobs out of our money for this year. That's what we're doing. There is approximately \$100 million of new money; there is approximately \$100 million of old money gathered together. That is true; we've never denied it. That group has now said, zero money, \$18 million, and today when you add all their numbers up together, at least they're at about \$50 million. Pretty soon, we'll have them up to the \$100 million when they get rid of their Turtle Mountain arithmetic.

CHMC housing starts

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Housing. I am wondering if he can confirm to the House whether or not he has received a report from CMHC comparing Manitoba's performance in housing starts compared to the previous four years of the previous administration and to other provinces in this country.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Have you got the right answer this time, Jerry?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. STORIE: I will thank the honourable member for that question. It is a very interesting one, Mr. Speaker, and it is certainly public information and I would be more than happy to provide my honourable colleague with a copy of the report and certainly be perfectly willing to table this report, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the report is the First Quarterly Report, 1983, a quarterly report published by CMHC and it indicates all the way through it the tremendous impact that the Homes in Manitoba Program has had on the housing industry performance this year.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, it's significant not only in what it says about the number of housing starts that

we have experienced in the first quarter of 1983, it also laments the fact, and with paraphrasing I would say that the report laments the fact that the previous four years saw a continuing decline in the importance and significance of that industry. Mr. Speaker, if I can paraphrase, it says a dismal performance was leading the industry and other investors into questioning whether there was ever to be a viable housing industry in the province and commends the provincial program for the initiative that we've undertaken and for the success that's been experienced in the building industry.

CHMC First Quarterly Report, 1983 - population changes

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the same Minister, the Minister of Housing. I wonder if he could also indicate whether or not that report gives any indication as to the population changes and what happened to the years when the Tories were in government in this province and what has happened in the last year, in the year 1982.

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the report does deal with some of those figures specifically when referring to the decreasing vacancy rate that Manitoba's experienced, and it indicates that from the years 1978 through 1980, Manitoba lost approximately 10,000 people per year, then you can compare that I think quite favourably to 1982 when 4,400 people actually immigrated to this province.

Jobs Fund - Capital

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Finance which I'm sure he'll be able to answer briefly. Can the Minister of Finance advise the House how many dollars of new budgetary authority appear in the Jobs Fund?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I've provided that information to the Member for Turtle Mountain previously. I don't have the exact dollar amount in front of me. I can assure him however, again, because he doesn't seem to understand, that we have approximately \$100 million of new money in the \$200 million.

I can also assure him that whether it is budgetary or non-budgetary, it is money that the government has to borrow. It is money that will wind up creating jobs for unemployed Manitobans; and for those who are getting the jobs out of that \$100 million new money, they will not be so concerned about whether it is described here as budgetary or non-budgetary as they are concerned about getting jobs out of it, and that's what we're trying to provide.

Manitoba Cattle Producers Act

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I'll try a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Perhaps he will be more forthright in answering.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture is reported, in the Winnipeg Free Press of May 12th, as saying that he advised the Manitoba Cattle Producers on Monday that he would be changing the checkoff provision in The Manitoba Cattle Producers Act. Will the Minister of Agriculture confirm that this is the case?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, we did have discussions with the MCPA on Monday. The matter of the bill in question in terms of policy will be presented to this House. But as I indicated before, that we've had representations made and the final decision which will be tabled in the House, the honourable members will be aware of and that's basically what I've said.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, the newspaper headline says, "The province is ending the forced checkoff on cattle sales." Now, I'm not inquiring as to the accuracy of the report in the newspaper, but it is going to raise questions among the cattle producers, so my question to the Minister of Agriculture is, does he plan to make an alteration in The Manitoba Cattle Producers Act with respect to the checkoff provision?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the bill, when it will be presented in this House, will be debated, Sir. It is our intention to amend the legislation.

MR. B. RANSOM: A question to the First Minister, Mr. Speaker, because this borders on being a question of privilege, that Monday in this House I asked the Minister of Agriculture if he planned to make any changes with respect to the checkoff provision. That very same day he advised the Cattle Producers Association that he was going to make a change and he would not give that information to this House when he was asked directly on Monday.

Will the First Minister direct his Minister of Agriculture to stop misleading this House with his answers to questions?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should know that in discussions with groups, intentions are given. Whether they are carried out is a matter of government policy. In fact, when a piece of legislation is tabled in the House and debated, whether it will be passed or amended is a matter of this House to decide. The fact of the matter is, Sir, there is that intention but the bill in its entirety cannot be released to anyone, and will not be released, and it is a matter of policy as to when that type of a measure is tabled in this House.

Government policy re Ministers

MR. B. RANSOM: A question to the First Minister then, Mr. Speaker. We have the situation where some Ministers act on behalf of the government and some Ministers act on behalf of themselves. This Minister now says that when he makes an announcement to someone it doesn't necessarily represent what the government is going to do.

My question to the First Minister is, how are we to know, and how is the public to know, when one of his Ministers is speaking, that they are indeed enunciating government policy?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the public have much more common sense obviously than the Member for Turtle Mountain is prepared to attribute to the public. The public have no difficulty in discerning that the Minister of Agriculture, indeed, represents the Government of Manitoba pertaining to agricultural matters and the public has no such problem.

Mr. Speaker, I never thought for a moment that there would be any questions relating to a Minister discussing his concerns pertaining to particular legislation affecting a particular group and telling that particular group that he is giving serious consideration to changes in that legislation, asking that particular group if they would like to respond to him in respect to different alternatives in order to alleviate the concerns of that Minister, Mr. Speaker, that is consultation with people.

Honourable members across the way may not know how consultation is spelled. It is spelled c-o-n-s-u-l-t-a-t-i-o-n.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this Minister of Agriculture - and it's supported by the Premier - that government policy is not going to be announced in this House, but going to be announced to different groups or talked about outside, will we be allowed to go to those meetings, or at least invited to those meetings, so we as legislators can be kept informed of what is going on?

Manitoba Cattle Producers Association - contracts

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that last year only 44 cattle producers opted to withdraw from the Cattle Producers Association and withdraw their funds out of some - probably in excess of 10,000 cattle producers who are producers - 44 of them decided they didn't want to participate in that organization. Is that the justification he's using, Mr. Speaker, to introduce the major legislation he's talking about? If it isn't, would he table the documents that he says he's had so many of from the cattle producers requesting the changes that he is telling everybody but this House that are going to take place?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, at least the Honourable Member for Arthur was being honest and forthright that the original intention of the questions of the Member for Turtle Mountain was, that I was somehow announcing government policy and legislative intentions outside this Chamber before I announced them in this Chamber. At least the Honourable Member for Arthur was honest in revealing that was the intent, to try and

say that somehow I was announcing legislative measures outside this Chamber. I did not do that and at least he was honest and indicated that his colleague was trying to say something that wasn't the case.

Any measures that will be brought in will be decided upon on the merits and the stance of the government and representations made, but all decisions will not be made on the basis of someone's pressure or someone's intent as to whether or not a measure is good or if someone left a plan or not, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member well knows that when a decision is made on this very specific measure it will be as a result of positions taken by members of this House, representations made and, on that basis, a collective view will be presented to this Chamber.

MR. J. DOWNEY: In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister has now said that they are going to move because of their political motivation and not because the numbers of producers have decided to opt out. In his approach to the beef industry, and now saying they will have freedom of choice whether to be a part of the program or the Cattle Producers Association or not, will he give that same opportunity to the people who have signed his ill-conceived Beef Stabilization Program, that they will now have the freedom to market their cattle in a way in which they like and not proceed to use his state imposed marketing board on the beef producers; will they be allowed to market where they like to, Mr. Speaker?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I did not, as one member of this government, go around rural Manitoba twisting any producers' arms to sign a contract, Sir. There were approximately 5,000 producers who signed contracts and who saw the wisdom of having long-term stability in the beef industry; who saw the wisdom of having a guaranteed income for producers, the very fundamental question that producers have faced for many years, and in this one industry they have been given, once again, after having a program totally wrecked by the previous administration, have been given another chance to have long-term stability in that industry.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact he indicates, in his own mind, that he did not go around encouraging producers to sign into the state marketing system that he is imposing on the producers; or is it true that there are a number of producers who have initially signed up because of the way the program is working, and it is not a payout to the producers but, in fact, more money being paid into the program than they have ever hoped to receive out, that they are not opting out in great numbers, Mr. Speaker, by the hundreds; is that true? Would the Minister give us the numbers of people who have recently opted out of that program; or requested to opt out?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, first of all, the honourable member should recall his words where in this House he said that we would be lucky if 10 percent of the producers would sign up on the program.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Arthur on a point of order.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I want the Minister to withdraw that statement because I did not refer to 10 percent, or any percentage, in this House of any cattle producers signing up to that program, and I would like the Minister to withdraw his statement and correct it.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable member for that matter of clarification.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: The honourable member should know that the program is voluntary and that any producer who wishes to opt out of the program, that's always been a factor in the program . . .

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur on a point of order.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I've asked the Minister to withdraw the statement that he made, that I had made reference that only 10 percent of the producers would participate in that program, Mr. Speaker; or else prove that I said it, Mr. Speaker.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, if there is a point of order, and I'm not sure that there was, if the member was clarifying that he didn't make that statement, I accept his statement that he didn't make that statement. I accept that, Sir, but the honourable member should be aware — (Interjection) — It's not a matter of keeping honest. I will check the record and the newspaper clippings of his statements.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should be aware that the program is a voluntary program and that any producer is able to opt out at any point in time, provided that the contract obligations that they have entered into are lived up to. There have been, and I go from memory, approximately between 20 and 30 producers, I believe, who have opted out of the program, Mr. Speaker, from the time of inception till today. There have been that many who have opted out of the program, there is no doubt about it, out of approximately 5,000 producers, Mr. Speaker, there have been that many that have opted out.

Mr. Speaker, they were not coerced, as under the former program when the Tories were trying to scuttle a good program that provided stability of producers, they have the freedom of choice to opt in or opt out under this program.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Oral Questions has expired. Does the Honourable Member for Lakeside have a point of order?

MR. H. ENNS: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, it was I, indeed, that uttered that prophetic 10 percent statement, and I want to put it on the public record, Mr. Speaker, my only trouble is that it'll be a Progressive Conservative Government that will have to find some way of getting the remaining 10 percent out of the plan when we take office in 16 months.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable member for that clarification.

The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs on a point of order?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: No, Mr. Speaker, I'd like leave to make a non-political statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister have leave. (Agreed)

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, last evening on the eve of Manitoba's birthday the YMCA

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I'm sure the YMCA would join with the YWCA. The YWCA held its Seventh Annual Woman of the Year Awards and announced winners in six categories, Mr. Speaker. Included amongst the winners, in the business category, was Suzanne Banfield; in the community service was Dr. Sybil Shack; and the management category was Razelle Kovnats who, I understand, is the sister-in-law of the Member for Niakwa; in the professional category was Dr. Karen Johnson; and in the public affairs category was our colleague, the Minister of Labour, the Honourable Mary Beth Dolin.

Mr. Speaker, the last category was the arts category and that's one I would like to just spend a moment informing members the award winner in the arts category was Nadya Kospyshyn Bailey who is a Provincial Government Civil Servant who has been working since 1969 for the Provincial Government as a creative arts consultant and I'm certainly pleased and proud that she has been recognized by the YWCA as Woman of the Year in the arts category.

I might just let you, Mr. Speaker, and members know, and the people of Manitoba, some of the accomplishments of Nadya; she, as I indicated, has been employed in the Department of Cultural Affairs and Historic Resources since 1969 and she initiated the first Provincial Leadership Training Program for leaders of children's programs in the arts in the Province of Manitoba. She also initiated the first leadership training program in the arts during the period in the late '60s and early '70s.

She also developed the first International Folk Dance Training Program in the province. She developed the first Ukrainian leaders course for training. She also developed the first art training program for the Manitoba Child Care Association. She has been a person that has worked far above and beyond what is required of a civil servant in the Province of Manitoba working for the arts.

I'm certainly pleased, and I'm sure all members will join me on congratulating Ms. Bailey on her award.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance, 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. I understand that there may be a vote as we go into Supply.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair for the Department of Environment and Workplace Safety and Health and the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair for the Department of Natural Resources.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY - NATURAL RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: Committee, come to order. We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Natural Resources.

The Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: In the section of the Committee of Supply meeting in Room 255 last Tuesday night, May 10, 1983, considering the Budget of the Department of Natural Resources, the Member for Lakeside moved after 10:00 p.m., a motion to the effect that the Minister's Salary be reduced to \$1.00.

I now report this matter in accordance with Rule 65(10) in joining me to put forth such a motion without further debate of the first item of business at this next sitting of the Committee of Supply in this Chamber.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order. The motion before the committee is that the Minister's Salary at the Budget item Line 1.(a)(1) be reduced to \$1.00.

MOTION presented and defeated.

HON. R. PENNER: Yeas and nays, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members.

Order please. The motion before the House is that the Minister's Salary at the Budget line Item 1.(a)(1) be reduced to \$1.00.

A COUNTED VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

Yeas 20; Nays 28.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion defeated.

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. SANTOS: Committee please come to order. We are now about to consider the last item which is the Minister's Salary, Item 1.(a)(1).
The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I know the Minister acknowledges and appreciates the

exercise that we just went through in terms of voting the reduction on his salary. The reduction was voted as the traditional form of protest that the opposition feels and a means that is open to the opposition to indicate our concern about the fact that this department, along with other departments that have to do with physical infrastructure of the province, whether it's road building, whether it's agriculture, whether it's natural resources, seem to be the departments that have been singled out by this government for actual reductions in appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, I have on many occasions indicated my willingness to co-operate with a government that, indeed, is attempting to live within its means, or at least restrain its spending to the levels of revenue collected by the government through the taxes it imposes. However, when we see the average spending increases of this government, consisting of figures of somewhere between 18 percent and 20 percent; when we see this government's willingness to enter into hastily agreed programs in the City of Winnipeg to build, whether it's more arenas or whatever, and at the same time subject the Department of Natural Resources to severe restraint, then we simply register our protests in the manner and way in which this Minister is carrying his weight within the Cabinet rooms of the present government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't wish to enter into a lengthy debate this afternoon, but there is another issue that I would like to raise with the Minister, bearing in mind that he has acknowledged, as we have pointed out, that in so many areas money has been of acute scarcity in the department throughout his Estimates, monies that conservation officers, staff require to bring the service to the people have been reduced in the item listed under Other Expenditures in each expropriation. Staff, fortunately, has not been reduced, although when a department like Water Resources is going to spend \$7 million or \$8 million less than they did last year, one has to ask themselves precisely what staff is going to do that they could administer an \$18 million program last year, what are they going to do with the \$11 million program this year?

But, Mr. Chairman, when that has already been the case, I do appeal to the Minister, to reconsider a standing order that he has allowed the department to take, and that is, to remove a small section of road in the Oak Point area, a piece of road that enables several ranchers to get at some of their Crown lands which the same department leases to them, enables them to bring out some of the hay that they require; this is a road that was put in a few years ago. I appreciate there's a continuing question of concern with respect to wildlife interests, but I think these are questions that can be resolved.

Certainly the ranchers in question are prepared to go along with any reasonable request the department has with respect to limited access; they are prepared to see the road barred, or gate erected, so that undue access will not in any way disturb what is a very desirable and suitable wildlife habitat area, contains substantial goose feeding and potential muskrat raising and muskrat raising operations; but, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that when a Minister in a government is already strapped for dollars, it just doesn't make sense to spend, yet, an extra \$17,000 or \$20,000 to take out

a little piece of road that was put in three or four years ago, particularly when this is done at the request of an absentee landlord living in Montreal.

I simply don't understand that kind of reaction on the part of this Minister and I would ask him, he is aware of the case, he has had personal representation of the case; there has been a lot of heat generated in this particular area about that, although I must report to the Minister that it is my considered judgment that both the fishermen and some of the wildlife interests that originally had voiced some objections to it, are now of a different opinion, feel that the department can properly supervise and manage the wildlife resources in that area without any undue harmful effects to the area with the remaining in place of the road.

If the Minister can acknowledge, as he has acknowledged throughout his Estimates, that, yes, he's had to cut back on some of the extra equipment that his department has; yes, he's had to cut back on some of the extra field services or mileage allowance that his conservation officers have because of restrictions of dollars; and, yes, there have been deferral of some of his projects, and I don't fault the Minister for that. But it simply doesn't make a great deal of sense to the people, and even to the people that originally objected to its presence, to now see the government spending taxpayers' money in removing that road.

I'd ask the Minister to reconsider that position that his department has taken and whether or not he would not even, at this late date, consider rescinding that order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, just very briefly, I don't want to prolong the . . . The Crown land sale policy was one based on agriculture Crown leases that were leased by agricultural people, or people of Manitoba, on a long-term basis, and the application of that sale policy is one which land that had been leased for some two-year period prior to the desire to sell, that land would be sold. Is that policy in place now or has there been any policy change in that area?

HON. A. MACKLING: I'll answer them all at once.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions?

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, is there any policy change that would allow people to buy the land if they've had it leased on a long-term basis - agricultural leases on a long-term basis - is that now the policy that is in place? That's all the questions I have.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other questions from any other member? The Minister wants to answer all the questions all at once.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I will take the questions then in reverse order.

In respect to Crown land sales policy, the answer is effectively, no. We have reviewed the Crown land sales policy; the policy continues to be that where someone has an agricultural lease of Crown land and has been in possession and leasing it for two years or more,

then it is open to that to lessee to apply to purchase and provided the land is confirmed to be suitable for agriculture, then the land may be sold.

In respect to the road that was established for haying purpose, and I believe - I'm not sure whether that's the Marshy Point Goose Reserve, I believe it is - I had representation both ways in connection with that. Certainly the representations from game and fish interests and my understanding of the fishermen's concerns were, that they did not want the road there; they were very much opposed to it. It is a very prime goose nesting habitat and the concerns were that it wasn't just the haying operation itself which is destructive of habitat; the concerns were that with the provision of the road, there was trespassing, there were people getting there, molesting the geese. It was not a desirable thing.

I certainly am prepared to ask my department to confirm what the views of the Game Branch is in respect to this road; what the views of the Wildlife Associations, the Manitoba Wildlife Federation and the fishermen's associations, what their views are. I may be mistaken, but my understanding was, that they are very much opposed to the continuation of that road.

I would like to put on the record, Mr. Chairman, the fact that too often I think in the history of land development in this province, wildlife has been sacrificed. Now I am not saying that in any way, in derogation, for the need for agricultural land. That's a given, we must develop agricultural land to grow food to feed people. But there has to be some consideration, some firm consideration for wildlife if we're going to preserve wildlife on this continent.

Just recently, Gerrie McKinney, the participant in the anti-Garrison lobby from Brandon, brought to my attention an advertisement in a Melita paper of an American group who are very much concerned about the proposed drainage of a very large swamp or marsh area in the Dakotas which will add, according to the advertisement, some 26,000 acre feet (sic) of water to the Souris River, a river that is already a problem from the point of view of flooding.

The attitude in some parts of this continent are that wetlands must be drained, they must be drained for agriculture. I can appreciate, as I say, the concerns for agriculture. We need good arable land, but there has to be some consideration of wildlife, there has to be some consideration of the effects of continued massive drainage of wetland, not only in wildlife, but on the environment itself. We don't know what we're doing with certainty in respect to our ground water, we don't know what we're doing to our environment if we continue these massive raids on wetland.

I, this morning, toured the Oak Hammock Marsh, Oak Hammock is, I think, a marvelous facility, it's an example of where government people have determined that wildlife does have a value. We have spent money reclaiming to marsh an area that historically was a very large marsh and became all agricultural land, almost all, except for about 45 acres of remaining wetland that could not be developed agriculturally because of the artesian wells and the continued persistence of marsh in that area, that couldn't adequately be drained.

Mr. Chairman, that is now a nesting area and a staging area for thousands and thousands of wild fowl. It's a tribute, it's a credit to this province, it's a marvelous

resource. We had 35,000 people visit that facility last year, we spent a fair bit of money last year on upgrading the facilities there and I hope that I can invite all Members of the Legislature to tour that facility some day soon. I'm going to discuss with my department laying on arrangements for a visit of all MLA's. So I want to put on the record my concern for the preservation of wetland; my concern for the preservation of wildlife; and, yes, there are times when, despite the concerns about wildlife, we will have to make sacrifices because of drought conditions for agriculture, but I refuse to be stampeded, Mr. Chairman, in respect to the needs of agriculture for hay when it is prime nesting area for wildlife and there should be other resource available.

I will look at that, Mr. Chairman, I will discuss that with my department but I indicate my concern that we not continue to give second place to wildlife in this province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(a)(1)—pass.

Resolution 116: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,093,500 for Natural Resources for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984—pass.

HON. A. MACKLING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman; thank you, colleagues.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. This concludes the consideration of the Estimates for the Department of Natural Resources.

SUPPLY - ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND TOURISM

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: Now we are about to commence consideration of the Department of Economic Development and Tourism. As is traditional with this committee, we shall start with an opening statement from the Minister responsible for the Department of Economic Development and Tourism.

HON. M. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When the Minister of Finance tabled the Budget and Spending Estimates of our government in the Legislative Assembly on February 24th of this year, he began his Budget Address by saying that unemployment is the No. 1 problem in Canada and that it is the No. 1 problem in Manitoba. Tackling this problem has been the No. 1 challenge for our government and the No. 1 challenge for my department over the past year.

Throughout, we've attempted to meet this challenge in a spirit of compassion, creativity and co-operation. This is a spirit that characterizes the theme and the tone that our government has established for itself. In the Department of Economic Development and Tourism, this is the spirit we have endeavoured to capture and follow in fulfilling the particular mandate of the department and of my portfolio.

In introducing this year's spending Estimates for the Department of Economic Development and Tourism, I want to put my department's efforts over the past year and our plans for the forthcoming year, in the context of this challenge for our government as a whole.

Every department and every Minister in this government has contributed to the effort in our battle against unemployment. As Minister of Economic Development, I think it is important to review the Estimates of my particular department in the context of this overall government effort.

Mr. Chairperson, there are three major priorities underlying the economic policies of our government and my department. These three priorities are, in summary, jobs, jobs and jobs. What I mean by this, Mr. Chairperson, is that there are three distinctly different kinds of job action which we have initiated. All three are a priority for our government. They are, more specifically: first, creating immediate jobs; second, retaining viable jobs and third, creating new long-term jobs. Let me briefly go through each of these in turn.

Our government's first priority is jobs, immediate jobs. These are jobs that will get as many people as possible back to productive and useful work as quickly as we can. Examples of government programs and initiatives targeted at this kind of immediate job are, our accelerated Capital Works Program announced last year; the Homes In Manitoba Program; our work with municipalities and local businesses through our Community Commercial Development Program and Main Street Manitoba, and most recently, the Jobs Fund.

I want to emphasize the importance we attach in this type of job action, to creating immediate jobs that are both productive and useful. Note that every one of the initiatives I have mentioned will put people to work doing something that will fulfill an established need in this province. My colleagues and I have been most insistent on this. We have worked hard to ensure that the immediate jobs created by these programs fulfill priority needs and generate long-term benefits for the people and economy of Manitoba. In other words, Mr. Chairperson, none of these initiatives are make-work projects. Furthermore, we categorically reject the idea that every job created by or in the public sector, is by necessity unproductive and make-work.

In some quarters the idea is vigorously promoted that the only productive job is one created by and in the private sector. Mr. Chairperson, we acknowledge the productivity of private sector workers and the importance to our economy of private sector jobs, but the notion that all other jobs are unproductive or a drain on society, is shallow and narrow-minded nonsense.

What is required is balance between the sectors. What is required is vigilance to ensure that immediate jobs generate long-term benefits spread throughout the province, and what is required is co-ordination between the public and private sectors to achieve this. Our government is committed to ensuring that all of our immediate job initiatives meet all these requirements. Our second major economic priority is retaining viable jobs. These are jobs which, for a variety of reasons, Manitoba is in danger of losing, either temporarily or permanently, within the present economic environment.

Mr. Chairperson, it is important that we neither expect nor attempt to save every job in Manitoba, no matter what the cost. However, it is nevertheless true that in many cases a great deal both can and should be done to retain a number of these jobs.

Since we have taken office, a number of important programs in my department and in other departments have been initiated with this specific objective in mind. Examples of this type of program, targeted especially at retaining jobs are: the Manitoba Interest Rate Relief Program, as designed and administered by my department; the Department of Housing and the Department of Agriculture; the extensive training and retraining programs, jointly initiated by the Department of Labour and Employment Services, the Department of Education and the Federal Government; the Business Alert Program instituted in my department in conjunction with Labour and Employment Services to reorient our resources to respond quickly to firms in financial difficulties; the task forces on plant closures, to explore every alternative to closure, or in the event that closure is inevitable, to ensure that employees are given every possible support in making their transition to another job, further training, or early retirement. In this category I would also place our extensive efforts to sustain operations at Assiniboia Downs, of which I will be saying more later.

In all of these cases the emphasis has been on joint co-operative action of all sectors involved. Also, in all these cases, our emphasis has been on retaining Manitoba jobs in economically viable operations by assisting the necessary adjustment process. All the groups we have worked with under these programs fully understand the importance of this viability criterion and has supported us fully in this. Through these initiatives, I believe, government has put together a solid and innovative package to retain viable long-term jobs in our province.

Our third major priority, is creating new jobs. These are especially longer-term jobs that are going to be needed to respond to the significant structural and technological changes ahead of us in Manitoba. Members will appreciate that creating new long-term jobs is no easy task. Even more than efforts to retain jobs, the creation of new job opportunities is very much a joint effort.

Note that I did not say, this is an effort solely for the private sector. I have emphasized that this must be a joint effort. It is an effort that must involve business, labour, community groups and co-ordination between numerous departments of government at all three levels. In this joint effort, our government and my department have undertaken a number of important new initiatives targeted at the challenge of creating new long-term jobs for Manitobans.

Let me mention a few of the most important of these initiatives. In August, the Premier announced the formation of the Economic and Resource Investment Committee of Cabinet, ERIC for short, to create and oversee the long-term economic development policies and efforts of our government. The Department of Crown Investments was established last spring, to allow us to co-ordinate the investment, purchasing, personnel and marketing policies of our Crown Corporations to the greatest of public advantage.

The Economic Summit convened in Portage la Prairie last fall should also be seen in the context of our conscious policy of co-operating with business and labour to attempt to find solutions to the joint challenge of creating new jobs for Manitobans. The new Northern Development Agreement negotiated with our federal

partners, the Department of Northern Affairs, also falls in this category.

Finally, throughout the government we have been rebuilding our planning capacity to evaluate projects and options; to allow us to participate in joint efforts with the private sector to create the kind of long-term jobs we need. These are examples of interdepartmental efforts.

With regard to my own department, let me list some of the long-term job creation initiatives we will be discussing in conjunction with these Estimates. First, there is our Innovative Venture Capital Corporation Program; the three Tourism Capital Programs we have launched jointly with the Federal Government; a new industrial investment thrust, of which we will be saying more later; a new technology thrust including in particular a new CAD/CAM, Computer Assisted Design Computer Assisted Manufacturing initiative; our small business development services; our trade promotion programs; a new emphasis on community development and regional development; and our Buy Manitoba Program. We will have an opportunity to discuss each of these programs in detail as we go through the Estimates line-by-line. However, I would like to make use of these opening remarks to put these departmental programs in perspective and to outline the broad rationale behind some of these key initiatives.

The responsibility and mandate of the Department of Economic Development and Tourism is focussed primarily on the medium and long-term dimension of economic development and job creation. Our department has been charged by the Economic and Resource Investment Committee of Cabinet with special responsibility for the priority placed on retaining jobs and on creating new jobs.

Recently there's been a great deal of public debate on the immediate need for jobs and upon the reasons for this immediate problem. This is both understandable and justifiable. The fact is, that in the last year Canada has experienced the most severe economic recession of the past half century. There's been no one simple causal factor underlying this recession, so there will not be any one simple solution to the problem. On the other hand, two features of the current recession are, in our view, undeniable.

First, much of the problem can be traced directly to the highly unjust policy of forcing up real interest rates that was followed by both the Government of the United States and the Federal Government of Canada. Secondly, the recession has meant for our society billions of dollars in lost production, as well as human costs that are immeasurable.

Another feature of the recession however, is that to a certain extent it has served to mask a number of more fundamental structural and technological changes occurring throughout the world economic system of which Manitoba is a part. Perhaps of even more importance here as elsewhere, the critical process of adjusting to these structural and technological changes has been severely restricted and even crippled by the recession. In order to understand the policies and efforts required to retain and create jobs in the context of these more fundamental changes, it is important to put current unemployment in a somewhat longer term perspective.

Mr. Chairperson, our current circumstances are not wholly or solely a phase in a business cycle. In many

respects we're at a turning point in our economic history. There are signs that the present recession cycle may be beginning to turn around. This recovery, when it materializes, will most certainly be both fragile and gradual, but whatever form the recovery takes, even if it were to materialize miraculously next month, we would find ourselves emerging into an economic world quite different from that which predated this recession.

We will increasingly find ourselves facing new, largely unprecedented fundamental challenges. It's quite reasonable to expect that there will be no going back to that previous economic world. Working together we will have to adapt in a dynamic way, or we will have adaptation forced upon us.

One component of this fundamental change and the associated challenge, has received a great deal of public attention. The so-called new wave of technological change has been well documented and thoroughly discussed. High technology and the implications of the microprocessing revolution have been the focus of much attention. I do not want to underestimate the significance of this challenge for a moment. When we come to discuss our departmental programs in more detail, it will be evident that we have attached a great deal of importance to this particular technological challenge. What I want especially to emphasize here, is that the microchip is only one of a series of challenges which we will have to face in the next decade.

A number of these other challenges, although well documented, have not received as much attention. It is important we not become overly fixated on only one dimension. It is the combination of a series of fundamental changes that must be analyzed and responded to by the public sector, labour, the private sector, and society as a whole. To a certain extent this combined effect has not received the full public attention it deserves. In planning our program we've attempted to avoid such fixation on one single program and put together a package of initiatives that is both balanced and pragmatic. Let me list a number of the most important components in this series of challenges and changes ahead of us.

Emerging in the international economy is a group of nations newly industrialized and challenging established industrial structures. We're faced with nations of the Third World asserting themselves and demanding quite justly their share of the world's economic wealth. We will pull out of this recession to face a population now much more aware of the high costs of economic growth in terms of environmental damage, and much more conscious of the dangers of nuclear proliferation. We will be competing in the world economy with nations not only further along in the microchip revolution, but also with more modern plants and equipment, and with much more sophisticated labour management models and national planning systems.

Finally, we cannot ignore additional complications associated with the implementation of the general agreement of tariffs and trade. With the past failure in this country of an industrial strategy based on megaprojects and with uncertainty surrounding the future of energy prices, other commodity prices and markets.

There's no need or intention to be alarmists about these developments. To a large extent these developments are international in scope and everyone

will have to adjust accordingly. Furthermore, the challenge posed by these developments can be met by Manitobans and by Canadians. We do have difficulties. We're not the richest nation on a per capita income basis, but on the global scale we are truly in a favoured position.

I think there's three major lessons to be taken from this. First, there is not going to be any simple initiative or single sector that can be isolated as providing the key solution to these challenges. What is going to be required is a balanced and well thought out package. Simplistic, ready-made solutions pulled unthinkingly from the past, will not do. We must be innovative and pragmatic.

Second, there going to be a heightened need to be even more dynamic and forward looking in our response and adjustment to these changing technological, competitive and structural factors. Any economy that does not respond to the challenge in a dynamic way, prepared to make the necessary changes, will be left behind. A period of change and adjustment is ahead.

Third, there will be an increased need to be co-operative and work together to keep our economic dynamic and forward looking. We are not going to meet these formidable challenges ahead of us merely by battling it out through the market, letting all the weak, the unfortunate, or the disabled fall by the wayside, though the market will continue to be an important reality for all of us. We must learn to work together and to develop new models and attitudes for making the market work better and for overcoming its greatest inequities.

In the Department of Economic Development and Tourism we have incorporated these three major themes in our programming over the past year and in our plans for the forthcoming year. These themes will be evident as we look at specific programs and initiatives in our Estimates.

The Enterprise Manitoba Agreement with the Federal Government has been a significant component of this department's programming over the past five years. That agreement officially expired March 31, 1983.

I'm pleased to announce that we have successfully concluded negotiations with the Federal Government to provide for an orderly termination over the next 18 months. Several of our highest priority initiatives will be maintained through 1983-84. A three-month task-force review of the Regional Development Corporations is now under way. The review team will visit 22 rural centres and make recommendations on the future role of the RDCs in the development process. We have provided for increased RDC financing in our 1983-84 Estimates so that we can immediately implement desirable recommendations.

The Enterprise Development Centre in St. Boniface has provided important services to the small business community over the past three years and these services will continue to be provided through 1983-84. Graduates of the advanced factory space are prospering and creating new jobs. The Enterprise Development Centre through its one-stop-shopping concept is actively helping rural and urban businesses solve financial, marketing, production and general management problems.

The Brandon Enterprise Development Centre has not, however, been as successful, largely because the smaller

size of that city could not sustain the advanced factory space program. We cannot afford to fund programs that do not fully and efficiently meet their objectives. Therefore, we will not renew our lease on the Brandon facility when it terminates in January, 1984. Officials in my department are currently developing options to replace this program and ensure that the businesses in Brandon and the surrounding communities are well served.

In our consultations with the private sector, the plight of existing and proposed small business enterprises faced with problems of high debt-to-equity ratios, chronic shortages of working capital and a lack of risk capital have been raised repeatedly. The remoteness of Manitoba for major capital markets and the lack of interest by large venture capital companies in smaller firms have focused attention on the need for new sources of venture capital.

In February, I announced a \$1 million Venture Capital Program. In the very near future, I will announce the appointment of an advisory board for this program to provide input and expertise by appropriate interests. This board will review the proposals by private-sector investors interested in establishing venture capital companies and recommend for approval a range of proposals to test the program. The advisory board will also monitor and review the content, structure and performance of the program and make recommendations with respect to its continuation and improvement following the initial trial period. The Venture Capital Program is an innovative initiative designed to address a chronic and pervasive problem. The success of this program is largely dependent on the response of the private sector and that is why we engaged in extensive consultation in the development of the program.

Once the advisory board is in place, we will actively solicit the participation of individuals and groups throughout the province. It is estimated that the initial \$1 million allocation will generate \$2.4 million in new equity capital. This in turn will stimulate additional investment of \$7.2 million. It has been estimated that the program could create in the order of 250 direct and indirect jobs and generate provincial tax revenues of approximately \$330,000 annually. It is our hope that the program will make an important contribution in providing a remedy for the limited access which small businesses frequently face in the current capital markets. At the same time we recognize that it is a modest trial program.

Manitoba is a trading province but we're also a province that has a severe imbalance in our trade. To improve this situation we must export more and we are working systematically to accomplish that. How well we do in the national and international markets depends in large part on the quality and competitive pricing of our products. Efforts aimed at increasing productivity and quality are essential elements of our strategy. We are expending substantial energies in stimulating the application of state-of-the-art manufacturing technologies in our existing industries. The Industrial Technology Centre in Winnipeg and the Food Centre in Portage la Prairie are key components of this important thrust. These centres are now well-established and their value to industry is clearly demonstrated in their growing project-based revenues,

but the long-term stability of the manufacturing sector is so dependent on adopting new technologies that we must not relax our efforts.

I'm pleased to announce that we have reached agreement with the Federal Government to allocate nearly \$2 million under Enterprise Manitoba to bring advanced computerized engineering technology to Manitoba industry. These funds are being used to develop computerized design and computerized manufacturing facilities at the Industrial Technology Centre. This is a significant and strategic expansion of the Centre's capabilities and will enhance its role of providing technological leadership to Manitoba industry.

CAD/CAM Systems harness the power of the computer to store, retrieve, manipulate and display graphic information related to the product and the production process. Adoption of this technology can lead to remarkable increases in productivity and quality with accompanying decreases in costs of design and production. Moreover, sophisticated product analysis is now possible in the design phase which can identify potential problem areas before any prototypes are built enabling early error correction, and again, reducing development time and cost. The Centre, in addition to helping businesses solve immediate problems, will now be able to provide manufacturers with the opportunity to gain firsthand experience with the latest production technology.

Full business and labour support for a more competitive technology-based economy is critical. To this end, I've expanded the role and mandate of the Manitoba Research Council to ensure that the human side of technology is not ignored. Manitoba must keep its competitive edge in marketing by keeping pace with technological change but this must be accomplished in a way that ensures an orderly, planned and humane transition to new technologies. As some jobs are phased out through technological advance, new and expanded job opportunities can be made available if markets are expanded through a parallel thrust. We must be as concerned with redeployment of our human resources as concerned with redeployment of our human resources as we are with the restructuring of capital for national and international competitiveness.

However, we must not focus exclusively on national and international markets if we are to achieve a balanced, stable economy. We must also improve the capability of Manitoba companies to compete in-province to provide the goods and services we ourselves require. That is why we have launched the Buy Manitoba Program.

The three main elements of the new program are: Improved tendering practices; the introduction of a review procedure which can under certain circumstances provide a discretionary price preference in favour of Manitoba-made products; a strong request for the private sector to join in efforts to source more requirements from local manufacturers. Again, we have consulted extensively with the private sector in the development of this program.

The Buy Manitoba Program is intended to complement the Buy Canada initiatives of the Federal Government. We are very much aware of the importance of Canada's role as a major trading nation and the importance of exports to Manitoba business. We have and will continue to strongly support the Federal

Government's efforts to maintain unrestricted trade between the provinces and territories. Manitoba will remain one of the least protectionist jurisdictions in Canada.

My department's Regional Benefits Branch will be active in 1983-84 in implementing this important new initiative. The branch will undertake four concrete initiatives: expand and improve our sourcing directories and be more active in our efforts to familiarize major purchasers with these directories; co-ordinate purchasing seminars involving major public- and private-sector purchasers; sponsor reverse trade shows where opportunities for local manufacturers to supply goods presently being imported are being presented; develop an opportunities catalogue identifying products now being imported. These initiatives will complement our continuing involvement with the Federal Government and the other provinces in the Institutional Marketing Program.

I've outlined some of the key elements of our strategy to strengthen the small business community, to improve our export performance, to keep pace with technological change, to improve our ability to supply our own needs and to foster regional development, but we must also intensify our efforts to attract new investment and new jobs to the province. That is an immense challenge in current economic circumstances.

These efforts will be supported by a new advertising campaign but, more importantly, we are developing a sophisticated investment analysis technique to target our marketing efforts on specific companies. This approach will be innovative and promises to provide a technically advanced method of identifying potential investors.

We also are working closely with the Federal Government to attract more entrepreneurial immigrants from abroad to Canada and, more particularly, to Manitoba. These efforts have already shown promising results.

Tourism continues to make an important contribution to the economy of Manitoba, although like many other sectors, it has felt the negative effects of the 1982 recession. Research has indicated that international and interprovincial travel was reduced generally in 1982 as families in our primary travel markets felt the effects of recession on their incomes, or generally became wary of the economic situation. For the 1983 calendar year, we look toward some modest recovery in non-resident travel receipts and toward continued growth in in-province travel by Manitobans.

As the economic recovery appears to be advancing more rapidly in the United States than in Canada, we look toward our primary United States travel markets to show increases in numbers of visitors. In addition, we have established growth objectives for in-province travel and for travel from the Northwest Ontario and Saskatchewan markets. We are targeting for real growth in tourism receipts for 1983 of approximately 2.6 percent.

In order to realize these short-term growth objectives and to establish the improved tourism product that is necessary for long-term development, the Tourism Division has set seven strategic priorities for this fiscal year. First, we will undertake a year-round program of promotion and travel information services. These promotional efforts will include programs of tourism

advertising, direct marketing and special promotions targeted to our priority markets. We will be conveying, to these priority markets, a sense of the warmth of the province's hospitality and its diverse vacation opportunities by introducing a new advertising theme, "Take Another Look." With this new theme and image we will be inviting previous and potential visitors to take another look at the array of pleasure travel opportunities that exist in the province. This new theme highlights diversity; emphasis is placed on the variety of vacation products and experiences which can appeal to a range of market segments.

Second, we will be initiating a program, in concert with provincial marketing activities, that is designed to generate increased private sector promotion and marketing efforts which are complementary to the provincial programs.

Third, we will seek to generate increased federal and inter-provincial marketing and development resources toward Manitoba tourism objectives.

Fourth, we will undertake an aggressive program for the upgrading of the existing plant and the development of new tourism attractions in Manitoba. The Capital Assistance Resources available for tourism attractions development under the Canada-Manitoba Tourism Agreement, Destination Manitoba, provide a substantial incentive toward this objective. These Capital Assistance Programs were made operational in July of 1982 and provide a total \$16.5 million for tourism attractions and accommodation development. Two of the programs under this agreement, Winnipeg Destination Area Development and Rural Destination Areas Development provide \$3.5 million and \$6 million respectively to Attractions Development by government and nonprofit organizations. The third program, Rural Tourism Industry Incentives provides forgivable and low-cost loan assistance to private-sector development of tourist attractions.

While the printed Estimates reflect our assessment of cash-flow requirements for these programs in this fiscal year, it is our objective to commit the full \$16.5 million to projects by March 31st, 1984. Again, the Capital investment levered by these programs will provide construction jobs now and new jobs for the future. The level of response from the nonprofit and the private sector to date suggests that this objective is reasonable.

Fifth, we will implement a program designed to develop and improve private sector accommodation facilities in rural Manitoba. The major planning study undertaken by consulting firms in 1980 and 1981 has indicated a need for improving our resort-oriented accommodation plant. The Tourism Development Section will be assisting operators in identifying and developing viable accommodation projects. It is our objective to commit the full \$7 million available, under the Destination Manitoba Agreement, for accommodation development by March 31st, 1984.

Sixth, programs will be developed and implemented to upgrade skills in the tourism industry. Human resource counselling and training resources will be made available to operators and industry associations.

Seventh, the success of this industry, more than most, depends upon the co-ordinated and co-operative activities of many business sectors, local organizations and governments. It is our intent to increase our efforts directed toward facilitating this co-operation.

1983-84 Grant Assistance to the Central and Regional offices of the Tourism Industry Association of Manitoba will total \$173,800.00. The assistance is provided for administration, ongoing programs and regional tourist booth support. The grants vary among regions in recognition of regional disparities, transportation factors and population. Destination Manitoba is currently reviewing an application from TIAM for additional support for special marketing and co-ordination initiatives.

The printed Estimates for the 1983-84 fiscal year provide an allocation of \$3,700,300 to the horse racing industry in Manitoba. This industry has come through a troubled year, due mainly to the receivership and temporary closure of Assiniboia Downs. Unfortunately, public attention has been focused on this problem to such an extent that many positive activities that will help secure the long-term position of this industry have been overlooked or simply not recognized. A number of positive achievements over the past year, such as, the first full winter standard-bred meet ever held in Manitoba; the growth in the Great Western Harness Racing circuit; and the first Quarterhorse race meet, with pari-mutuel wagering, held in Rosburn, to mention a few examples, are indicative of a rather successful year for the horse racing industry in Manitoba.

The very considerable job of overseeing the racing industry through this turbulent period, while making very considerable progress in matters of concern to the industry, was handled with dedication and professionalism by the Racing Commission. I would like to commend them for the valuable work extended on behalf of the racing industry in Manitoba in 1982.

Briefly, to review a portion of this work, I must recall the efforts of the commission in the early spring of 1982 in establishing the financial status of the track through the hearings; their success in mediating the negotiations necessary to get the track re-opened and operating after the receivership with a loss of only six racing days, the development of new regulations that provide for the protection of horsemen's and the public's money from track closures which should allow for improved public confidence in the industry as a whole.

Finally, with the extension of racing to a year-round activity, and with the obvious need for close scrutiny and enforcement of the new regulations, the staff resources of the commission have been strengthened. We expect to have the position of supervisor of racing filled in the near future. We expect the successful candidate to bring to that position the strength of experience and qualifications clearly required for the job that must be done.

We look forward to 1983 as the year to build upon the positive changes that have occurred in racing in Manitoba. Provincial support programs for purses, breeders, the rural circuit, and the developing quarter horse sector have been provided for at the enhanced levels begun in 1982.

With the current operator of the downs close to becoming the full legal owner, with purse agreements in place for the thoroughbred season, and with plans being made for continuing the fall and spring harness meet, we expect a record year in wagering and attendance.

The commission will be working with the standard bred industry this year to design a breeder's incentive

program that will provide stimulus to increase racing stock in that part of the industry. In addition, new regulations will be developed in co-operation with standard bred horseman. The current standard bred meet operates under Canadian Trotting Association rules which are somewhat inappropriate to the Manitoba situation.

Further change to the thoroughbred rules of racing have been prepared for industry review in an effort to clarify the processes relating to appeals. With the positive steps taken in 1982 and with consolidation based upon these changes, we are confident that the racing industry in Manitoba can look forward to a brighter and more secure future.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairperson, the programs of our department that I have outlined, fit into the economic priorities and policies of our government. I have emphasized our special role in long-term job creation efforts. I have also mentioned the key role we have to play in retaining viable job opportunities in this province.

Together, with our government's emphasis on immediate job creation, especially through the Jobs Fund, this constitutes a comprehensive and innovative economic package responding to the complex economic challenges we face in Manitoba. I have emphasized the importance we attach to a balanced, pragmatic approach to a dynamic innovative response and to the need to co-operate with the private sector in the programming.

That is the major theme on which I would like to conclude these introductory remarks, in responding to the challenges ahead, especially in adapting dynamically to the fundamental, technological, competitive and structural changes we must face. Everyone has a role. Together we are strong. Our government and my department is committed to continuing our efforts in a manner fully consistent with this message.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Consistently the traditional procedure of this section of the Committee of Supply of the Whole House, the Chair now calls upon the loyal opposition party's man, critic of the department, the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, to present his customary reply to the Minister's statement, if he so wishes.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has given a very broad outline of the department, and I had the opportunity to myself for three years to give the same type of an outline when the Estimates came up. I am well aware of the ability of the staff to put together a very comprehensive outline of what the department is doing. But at listening to it, and reading the Estimates that have been put before us by the Department of Economic Development, there seems to be very very little change.

I am not being critical of that because I know the department works under these different titles in many different ways but there is very little change in the department structure and Estimates. So I can only say, Mr. Chairman, that we will not be spending 18 hours on these Estimates, unless the Minister wants to, as we did last year. We will be moving through them much faster because it really boils down to, the staff is there and available to do the work that the Minister has outlined, to do this work that they have been doing

for several years, but it is the policies of the government that will make the economic structure of this province better and it won't matter about the efforts of the staff to any great degree, because it's 100 percent most of the time, if the policies of this government are such that industry avoids the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, a lot has been made of the Summit Conference that was held and put together by this government. It was quite impressive that everybody got together and gave their opinions and their help or any suggestions that they might have, to help build the economy of the province. The government made a lot of noise about it, publicized it, and as Mr. Martin said, made good political gain. Mr. Martin also said that the next meeting was bad. There was no good structure for the meeting and the meetings since the first one have not been constructive at all as to helping the economic development of this province.

Mr. Chairman, I know the Minister answered that question in the House when I asked it or presented the letter from Mr. Martin and she said that we appreciate criticism from all sides and I think that's very commendable, but you got criticism. You got very strong criticism as to the follow-up of the Economic Summit meeting in the Province of Manitoba. So, I would sincerely hope that when the government keeps talking about the Economic Summit meeting that there is something under way to make sure that these meetings are continued in a fashion that are going to help the Province of Manitoba and not be of any use the way Mr. Martin described the follow-up meetings.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister has used the word "balanced" approach since she became Minister. I am still having trouble trying to figure out what that balanced approach is, or what it means. Last year in the Estimates, the Minister said the same thing. The balanced approach, that we would have industries throughout the province and that the industries would be such that would be good for Manitoba as far as creating jobs, and they would be good corporate citizens of the province, and they would be consideration of environment; all of those things that the development officers have been instructed to look at for years.

During the Estimates last year, we questioned the Minister very very stringently on whether the government was going to direct where industry would have to go. It would seem by the sound of this balanced approach again, that the government is going to be the ones that will decide where industry will go in this province. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, maybe they want to have industry spread out through this province in a balanced way, but I also suggest that when communities are working to have industries within their area and the companies decide where they would like to locate because of the labour force available, etc., that is, either accommodated working with the communities or they will go elsewhere. I still, as I said, I'm not quite sure what the balanced approach means. The Minister goes on to say on Page 690, the balanced approach, which does not completely please business, which means that you may have to go somewhere else, or I take as that. I submit that many of the policies and programs should be quite compatible with what business want. We are not leaning completely to one side or the other, but before the Minister makes that statement she makes the statement, we don't believe

that there's an automatic benefit to all the people if we have a large number of thriving businesses, nor does that mean that we think we can do without a large number of thriving businesses.

Mr. Chairman, I have a hard time understanding what the balanced approach really means because I know, and all of my colleagues know, and all of the 54,000 people that are employed in this province know, that we have been through a tough time in Manitoba, but the indicators for Canada is that it is starting to move up gradually. The First Minister makes a big thing out of the fact that we are now third or fourth in the overall investment in the country. Naturally he likes to bring that up but he never brings up the fact that the reason it dropped down to as low as it was is the previous government stopped the investment on the hydro development in Northern Manitoba.

So, Mr. Chairman, the province has gone through some tough times, but with the slight upturn that is being forecast by most of the forecasters, is Manitoba going to be in the position of taking advantage or getting its fair share of private investment. The Minister mentions the Venture Capital Program and I've read it over. It would appear that the Venture Capital Program will do some good, it's something that we always thought we should have more of in Manitoba; Venture Capital is very very valuable to us here. I don't really like the idea that your program does have an equity because I think that more important people with more money to invest may just steer away from that clause in the Venture Capital Program. You may not get the top people becoming involved in your program with that clause that has some equity in it. But that is the policy of a socialist government and we all know that that won't change but we all know that that will scare investment away from this province.

Will we get our share of this upturn that we're speaking of in 1983-84? Mr. Chairman, I don't know how this government can honestly believe, and the Minister debated the 1.5 employment tax with me last year, a tax on employment in this province, the Minister didn't seem to think, as Minister of Economic Development, that it was going to harm investment in this province and yet everybody that is involved with business in this province has advised this government that it has been harmful.

Let's take, Kimberly-Clark, who have decided to leave this province and they were going to expand. I wonder if you're going to expand anywhere and you're sitting down deciding where you should have the expansion, and you have a facility elsewhere that can be added to, you have a facility elsewhere that has a little more modern equipment than the present plant in Winnipeg has, and you say, if we expand in Manitoba we have a tax on employment, if we expand other than Manitoba, except for Quebec, you don't have any tax on employment.

Mr. Chairman, I said quite awhile ago that I would not pay any attention to anything the Member for Inkster said and I will tend to keep that promise for the rest of my life. Mr. Chairman, if he chooses to keep going I will have to keep reminding him that red fireflies are something that I don't bother with. Mr. Chairman, I would say that the Business Alert Programs, the plan that has been brought forward by the Minister; the Tourism Co-ordination; the R&D, the Tourism

Advertising, the Advertising Program that's being spoken of within the department. I commend the Minister for keeping that up and I don't really believe that the province should stay with the same motto every year, or stick to Good To See You forever, and I think the change of Take Another Look is something that is desirable, but we'll see if it catches on or not. Advertising of this type is always a gamble, hopefully, it will catch on, but I also say, hopefully, it was tested in other areas in a small way first the way we used to test the advertising and the promotional programs to see if they were attractive to people, I certainly hope that that has been done.

I hope the Minister is not going to have a big new advertising department like the Minister of Education has put forward, at least, it doesn't appear in the Estimates as if the promotional department has gone overboard, as far as other years are concerned, but there's no question that the advertising that is being done by this government is being handled somewhere outside of the different departments and I will be questioning just how much money that other group is spending to put together the films and everything that is being done for the tourism program.

I compliment the government on their work as far as the computers are concerned. I think that that's a good move, I think it's a follow-up on the move that we had started with the University of Manitoba in the Micro-electronic Centre, and I think the computer research in the Technology Centre is exceptionally good. I have to say that all of the base, all of the base for these programs, has been here for a very, very long time. I don't really see, other than the Venture Capital Program, anything new. You mention the programs of the Destination Manitoba took off in July of last year. I have read the pamphlets on the program, I would say that they're not quite the same recommendations that I had regarding launching those programs, but the government has the right to set up their programs any way they like but, really, what you have set up is just another loan program which might be called a small interest rate relief program, that's basically what you have in your new tourism attraction programs.

With the first \$25,000 forgivable you pay back the next \$25,000 - and I don't have it in front of me at the present time, but the pamphlet says that you'll pay back the balance on - I don't know whether it's arrangements or prearranged interest rates. I would be asking the Minister if I could have the regulations or the guidelines of those programs. I phoned her office the other day making the request. I might say that I haven't got them as yet. I would be requesting those guidelines.

Mr. Chairman, the attitude at the present time toward Manitoba by business is not good. I'm sure that the Minister knows this. She gets reports from her industrial trade officers or development officers. Maybe they haven't been aware, or maybe the people haven't been straightforward with them, but the people that I have been talking to and the people that I meet that are looking at investment in Manitoba are very cautious of investment in Manitoba.

As I said in the Throne Speech Debate, when you have Mr. Martin or the head of the union that's in charge of the Retail Grocery Stores Association say, you know, you can't close in Manitoba unless you have certain

regulations, or you can't go broke, or decide that you're going to move unless you're going to abide by certain regulations that we would like to have in Manitoba. Well then that's fine, they just won't come to Manitoba.

If you're going to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 4:30, the Member for Sturgeon Creek will have 15 minutes when we resume after Private Members' Hour. We will resume at 8:00 p.m.

SUPPLY - ENVIRONMENT AND WORKPLACE SAFETY AND HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. Eyler: Committee, come to order. We are considering the Estimates of the Department of the Environment and Workplace Safety and Health, Item 1.(a)(2). Does the Minister have any introductory remarks?

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

I have held some discussions with the critics from the opposition on the presentation of these Estimates and it's been indicated that we will be discussing areas of general concern. We've agreed to that arrangement that we'll be discussing issues, therefore I will confine my opening remarks to some very brief comments and will use the opportunity of responding to suggestions, criticisms, ideas and concepts from the members opposite to extend into the areas into some detail.

Firstly, I might say that it's a special honour and it's a rare privilege to have this opportunity to introduce the spending Estimates for the first time of the newly formed Department of Environment and Workplace Safety and Health. The Provincial Government has been some time in reviewing this option and throughout, we have undertaken to discuss and consult with those that are going to be most affected, from staff, to management groups, to labour groups, to environmentalists, in order to obtain their advice and their assistance in making certain that this new department indeed reflected the needs that they perceived and provided the services which they felt were necessary. So I'm particularly pleased to have this opportunity to present these Estimates in this way to this Legislature for review and consideration.

There are a number of areas that the department has undertaken, other activities throughout the last year, and there are certainly a number of areas where we expect to continue those activities, or to develop new thrusts over the upcoming year. I'll very briefly provide some broad parameters as per agreement with members opposite, and then get down to questioning the detailed items which they would like to discuss.

The Department of Environment and Workplace Safety and Health, through the Environmental Management Division, has been working on a Hazardous and Special Wastes Management Program. This will include the provision of mechanisms to deal with the more potentially hazardous nature of certain substances throughout their existence. We are developing a program that in the past has been termed, "Cradle to Grave." Given the new emphasis on recycling, and one which we share, we've decided that the Program Manitoba would best be entitled, "Cradle

to Resurrection," because recycling is such an important part of that whole process.

We are reviewing legislation as was indicated in the Throne Speech Debate in respect to dangerous goods handling. As you are aware the Department of Highways and Transportation has indicated it will be moving with a bill entitled "Transportation of Dangerous Goods," that will cover highway situations. Our bill would cover all other situations.

We are involved in a very extensive consultation process with industry, with unions, with other groups, university and professional groups, technicians, etc., to develop the best possible legislation, and hopefully we'll have announcements to make on that previous to the end of the Session.

We've just recently completed a Hazardous and Special Wastes Management Symposium that was international in nature, having speakers from both this continent and Europe and one which we felt provided a good start for the public consultation process. Of course we'll be continuing that public consultation process through Clean Environment Commission hearings and other informational programs such as have been developed in the past.

I think we should also mention that our pilot project on Pesticide Container Disposal mechanisms was successful and we are now working with the municipalities to see them take over this responsibility. You are also aware that recently we announced our response to the Clean Environment Commission mosquito control and report recommendations, excuse me, and I'm certain members opposite will want to discuss that. An important component of that was the emphasis on the permit system in the future which will be developed in consultation and co-operation with municipalities, university and staff from different various departments.

As well, the money which we're providing through the Jobs Fund to the larviciding, mapping and programs that are ongoing to municipalities is a chief part of that announcement.

We are continuing on in our discussions with the provinces, commonly termed those being in the "eastern bubble" in regard to acid rain apportionments. I will be having meetings with the provincial Ministers over the course of the next month and will be having a meeting, I assume, with the Federal Minister and the other Provincial Ministers in the eastern bubble sometime within the next two months.

We've also reviewed some of the different staffing patterns that have developed in the Environmental Management Division over a period of time and are trying to, right now, work out a co-operative and co-ordinated agreement with the Department of Health to establish a new internal mechanism to address, in a co-ordinated way, those issues commonly referred to as environmental health. That activity is ongoing as part of the organization of the new department.

In the upcoming year, we'll be continuing those items but as well we will be addressing, in a more specific way, environmental land use issues and Red River water quality. As you are aware, we have a committee which is comprised of the Province of Manitoba, the City of Winnipeg, the Town of Selkirk and Environment Canada. They have been meeting as a technical working group; they have been reviewing options for action in this

regard and we hope that, as a result of their hard work, we'll be able to come forward with specific recommendations and programs in the next year.

That, by the way, is not the entire list of activities and new thrusts but I did want to put those matters on the record - and I mean no disservice to those that I haven't had time to mention - but as I suggested earlier, I will keep my remarks brief so that we can concentrate on the items which the members opposite would like to see discussed.

In respect to the Workplace Safety and Health Division, we have been involved in the development of new regulations. The Forestry Logging and Log-hauling Regulations is one that has been put in place since last we had these Estimates. We are now in the final stages of a regulation regarding Roll Over Protective Structures and we're reviewing a number of other regulations which I'll be pleased to discuss at the time of the debate on that particular section of the Estimates.

We are also providing a strong focus for training for Safety and Health Committees and for other individuals as well as those within the department and those outside of the department who require such training.

I just seek some direction from the member opposite now. Perhaps it would be best to stop at this point, having discussed the environmental concerns and by way of introduction on the section dealing with the Workplace Safety and Health Division and the Workers Compensation, provide a basic statement at that time. If he's agreeable, I'll do that. He indicates he is and I'd welcome his comments in response.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I thank the Minister, both for his brief opening remarks with regard to the Environmental section of his Estimates.

In response to his question I would suggest that, in view of the fact that the Member for St. Norbert and I are sharing the role of chief critic on the two separate areas of his department, perhaps it may be of more expediency to deal with Environment now and have his opening remarks with respect to the Workplace Safety and Health section a little later and the Member for St. Norbert can deal with him on that basis. If it is agreeable, I would suggest that we proceed with the environmental section of the Estimates now and, as well, if it is agreeable with him, I would propose, since there are four items, 1. Executive Administration, which I assume deals with both parts of his department; 2. Environmental Management; 3. Clean Environment Commission; 4. Manitoba Environmental Council, as being the areas that are directly related to my areas of concern and discussion, if we could deal with them all together - and the only reason that I ask that is - that I wouldn't want to get in the situation of discussing issues after having completed Environmental Management and on to Clean Environment Commission, having to say, well we already covered that and it should have been covered under that.

I know that basically the two areas that I would like to question the Minister on have to do with the Clean Environment Commission orders and its role and responsibility, and the Environmental Management section of his department and I would like to have the

flexibility of dealing with issues as they relate to either one or the other of those areas, then I believe we could just simply pass the items if we can deal with them on that basis.

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, I can certainly provide my commitment and my enthusiasm for the process of examining the entire four areas as a unit and being able to move back and forth freely between them because I think it will provide for a better discussion, then we would pass those four items as we'd finish those discussions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for your staff to come in now?

HON. J. COWAN: I think the staff are coming down, so if the Member for Tuxedo wants to begin, I'll certainly attempt to respond until they get here.

MR. G. FILMON: I wonder if, in dealing with it on that basis, prior to entering into specific issue areas of discussion, if the Minister could indicate what staff complement changes there have been in the areas of, for instance, Item 1.(a)(2); Item 1.(b)(1); Item 1.(c)(1); Item 2.(a)(1); Item 2.(b)(1); Item 3.(a) and Item 4.(a), all those areas, if the Minister could just indicate for me what changes in staff complement there have been in any of those areas.

HON. J. COWAN: I'll run through all of the areas in succession and then up to the Workplace Safety and Health Division.

Under Item 1.(1)(a), was that the first request?

MR. G. FILMON: Yes.

HON. J. COWAN: The SYs are actually the same; it's a half-year for the Minister in each instance. Then there are six last year as an adjusted figure and six this year as a request.

Now there has been some shifting of staff person years in respect to the development of a Deputy Minister's office. I can indicate where those are coming from if you desire. In actuality, they were staff years in another part of the department previously and they're now staff years in this year, so there's no increase in staff years, but there is a new department there. Perhaps I'd better single that out and indicate from where those staff positions are coming: .24 staff years are coming from Administration, which is term clerical time; .3 staff years from Environmental Control Services, which was a term public health inspector student time; 2.26 staff years from Environmental Management Services for term projects that are completed and non-recurring; .23 staff years from Environmental Management and Services which was term lab time for a total of four staff years. So there have been four staff years that have internally been reallocated to allow for the organization of the Deputy Minister's office in the new department.

Now, 311(b), there's a decrease of one staff year, it's a clerical position; 311(c), there were three last year, there are three this year; 312(a), there's a decrease of one, there were 90.43 last year, 89.43 this year; 312(b),

there's a decrease of five, 75.42 last year, 70.42 requested this year; two staff years for the lab; one SY for an enforcement officer, it was a vacant position; one SY for Terrestrial Studies and one SY for a senior consultant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, we're going to have to go over this all over again unless I interrupt the Minister, because he's using numbers that aren't in my book. I'm guessing that he's following through each section. There seems to be a very great disparity so maybe I should ask them one at a time now that he has his staff with him.

Dealing with the first item under Executive Administration (a) the Executive section, (2) Salaries have gone up from \$93,000 to \$183,000, yet the Minister said there were no staff changes. Does that mean that everybody got 100 percent raise this year or what's happened?

HON. J. COWAN: The increase in Salaries is \$93,000 to \$183,000 which is a \$90,000 increase results from making provisions for salary increases for the contract first. There are a number of factors, and I'll run through them all. Merit increments, the extra pay period in 1983-84 and the reclassification of positions necessary for the establishment of a Deputy Minister's office. That's how those different salaries fit together.

In the other sections the merit increases, and the contract increments, and the extra pay period have resulted in probably from 15 to 20 percent increase. The rest of the increase is as a result of taking lower paid positions out of a different section and reclassifying them as a higher paid position to provide for services to the Deputy Minister and the Deputy Minister's position.

MR. G. FILMON: Does the Minister have an organization chart? That might help us so that we know who's now where. My understanding of it would have been that you would have moved up an Assistant Deputy Minister position into a Deputy Minister position. That shouldn't have resulted in virtually a 100 percent increase in salaries.

Just so the Minister knows, I've gone through this exercise with Ministers in three other departments as part of this Estimates process, and generally the increases have ranged between 25 and 30 percent to take into account that 27th pay period, the carry-over from last year's settlement with the MGEA and the merit increases, plus this year's MGEA contract increase. Depending on the departments and the amount that they had set aside for the last year's MGEA settlement which was unknown of course at that time that the Estimates were drawn, it amounted to somewhere between 25 and 30 percent. This appears to be virtually 100 percent and so I'd like to know just how all of these positions have worked out.

HON. J. COWAN: I believe you now have the organizational chart in front of you, so perhaps that will be of some assistance.

The member is absolutely correct in his assumptions as to what has been the cost of those particular changes

in the past or in other departments this year. There was not an Assistant Deputy Minister's position available to move up that was vacant. There is an Assistant Deputy Minister who is filling that position and who will continue to fill that position for some time, but there was not a vacant position to move up. So what we had to do was take positions from elsewhere in the department and move them up. That's a standard practice. In this instance it's concentrated all in one particular area, so it looks to be a major change, and it is a major change for that area. You can well appreciate when you start to staff up a new department of a Deputy Minister's level, you are going to have significant increases in the salaries for the positions. That's what has happened in this instance.

Had there been an ADM position that was not filled and not anticipated to be filled, then that one could have been moved up. The fact is there wasn't one and the decision was not to move the Assistant Deputy Minister up to the position of Deputy Minister. The decision was to go with a bulletining and to have a regular selection process undertaken. That's why we had to move other positions from lower down in the salary scale up to that position. That's why there's a significant increase.

MR. G. FILMON: So the Minister then is telling us that we are not going to have a situation where we had an Assistant Deputy Minister, and instead we now have a new Deputy Minister position and that's been bulletined. So it isn't a case as has happened many times in the past, where one Deputy Minister was shared between two different departments, just as the Minister is shared between two different departments. You're saying that you're going to have two separate deputies, one for Northern Affairs, one for the Environment and Workplace Safety and Health. Each of them is in turn going to have an Assistant Deputy Minister, and you're also going to have the other directors and so on down the line?

HON. J. COWAN: Well, yes and no. There won't be a new Assistant Deputy Minister. The Assistant Deputy Minister that is there is occupying that position. In fact there is an Assistant Deputy Minister. That is indeed the fact.

The reason we did that is because this department may or may not stay with any one Minister over a given period of time. For that reason, we want a department that's not sharing personnel as we have been doing over the past year as we attempted to put this department together. That was the way in which we chose to proceed. While it does cost a bit more in the short term, I think in the long run it provides benefits which are of value equal to or greater than that initial cost in the first instance.

MR. G. FILMON: Well, when I think of the very fraudulent kinds of remarks that were made and the cynical kinds of comparisons that were made by the Premier when this government took office about reducing the number of Ministers and the sort of senior staff complement in departments on a very very temporary basis because, you know - have more Ministers than the previous government had, and you

have far more Deputy Ministers and Assistant Deputy Ministers than the previous government had. I only pointed it out to point out the fraudulence of the kinds of cheap politicking that were done by the Premier when this government took office. If you can justify this to the Legislature, and the people of Manitoba, then that's the Minister's business and problem, but I say that it is the kind of justification that under close scrutiny is not going to present this government in a very favourable light, regardless of what the Minister wants to say about it.

So, we'll move onto the next area and see if, under Item (b), Administration, if there has been any change in staff complement that goes along with the resultant increase of about 30-odd percent in Salaries.

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, there's been one staff reduction, as I indicated before in my fast run-through, we went from 25.25 staff years last year to 24.25 staff years this year; that is a reduction of one clerical position. Again the contract increments, merit increments, position reclassifications, extra pay period and provision of salary funds for two positions approved in 1982-83 for which salary funds were not provided, amount to the increase.

MR. G. FILMON: Under the Community Relations, again we appear to have a very major increase in dollar amount that would be 60, 70 percent. Are there any increases in staff positions?

HON. J. COWAN: I want to drop back to the previous comments the member made as well in respect to the statements by the Premier. That is certainly something that he would want to address directly with the Premier, but I will say that in fact as Minister, I am assuming the same responsibilities that I assumed at the time the Cabinet was formed; that in fact we have tried to undertake this development of an entirely new department in the most cost-efficient way possible. I believe we have accomplished that given some very difficult economic circumstances, and I believe as a government - and I'll speak on behalf of my Premier, but I certainly would not want to prolong the debate - but I don't think it would be appropriate for me to allow the comments to be made by the member opposite without some suggestion that we don't accept that on this side. Certainly he indicated that there are others who will be looking at the process and reviewing it to which we both have to defend our positions, that is the case. But I want the record to be clear that I certainly do not accept his comments about the way in which the announcement of a smaller Cabinet was made or the changes that have been made since that time.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't have expected the Minister to accept my comments, that doesn't make them any less true. We'll read the record back to the Premier when we have an opportunity about his leaner more efficient government. — (Interjection) — I'll clip the news report or the Hansard report on this Minister's response on behalf of his Premier and tell him that he is at least continued to be loved by some sectors of the Manitoba Electorate, although they

appear to be narrowly bounded by the members of his caucus. The ranks are closing quickly and those who are on his side are jumping to his defence, but that doesn't make his statements any the less acceptable or any the less fraudulent.

I carried it further by saying that although this Minister may consider his reorganization to be efficient, he has added through his reorganization a deputy minister position to the whole mix and I am not sure - I would have to count up the numbers - as to whether or not he has also added an Assistant Deputy Minister on the Northern Affairs side, but that doesn't really matter. That will come up for discussion later.

Did we get down to discussion as to what the staff complement was in the community relations side? Did he respond to me on that, I am not sure?

HON. J. COWAN: I did in the quick list and I'll respond again. Last year it was three staff years, this year it is three staff years. There is a \$1.4 thousand decrease in Other Expenditures.

MR. G. FILMON: We'll assume that everybody in the Minister's department has gotten a healthy readjustment in their position, because this again with no increase in staff complement, indicates a salary increase of something in excess of 60 percent this year over last year and I just have to shake my head and wonder at this upgrading of everybody in the Minister's department. Again, he'll have to answer to the public for that, not to me.

Under Item 2, the Environmental Management area, the Salaries of the Environmental Control Services appear to be up some 20-odd percent. Is there any increase in staff complement there?

HON. J. COWAN: Firstly, to go back to Community Relations, one of the reasons why there is the increase is that there was the transfer of a position in '82-83 from Consumer and Corporate Affairs. It came over with insufficient salary funding provided for it. That happens when you do these sorts of internal transfers and the member opposite is aware that it happens. So it's not unusual, nor should it be unacceptable, but passing on beyond that we'll go to Environmental Control Services, the staff years last year were 90.43, this year they are 89.43, or a decrease of one.

MR. G. FILMON: Under Item (b), what is the change in staff complement, (b)(1)?

HON. J. COWAN: In Environmental Management Services there is a decrease of five staff years from 75.42 to 70.42 and it breaks down as follows: two staff years for the lab; one position that was vacant as an enforcement officer; one position as a terrestrial studies program delivery person; and one for a senior consultant.

MR. G. FILMON: I have to ask on that one for the justification in the decrease. It seems as though we're adding to the administrative complement and we're decreasing in the areas where the people are doing the work in this department. For an activist Minister, I would say that his action appears to be in feathering

his own nest and not getting environmental work done in this province.

HON. J. COWAN: Again we're going to have to disagree on the premise and I think that's fair. I think what we are doing, is we're providing for a structure that over a long period of time will provide more efficient services for the people by way of environmental workplace protection. So these decreases which were difficult ones to make are in our opinion not providing for significant reductions in the activities of the department, although there will be reductions in certain areas. That has been determined as a matter of repriorization exercise which has been ongoing for sometime to look at those areas where we felt reductions were possible and to look at those areas where we felt they were not possible. The result of that internal review has been the following changes.

MR. G. FILMON: Well, Mr. Chairman, we'll get into more of the Minister's approach to working on the structure versus working on the need to focus in on environmental control problems and environmental management problems in the province in more detail as we hit the issues. I'm afraid that, as I say, my assumption has to be in looking at the manner in which the staff complement is being swung away from active environmental observation, control and management into inactive administrative positions. I acknowledge that shuffling paper and making administrative decisions is an activity, but it's not the kind of activity I'd like to see in the Environmental Section of his department.

The Clean Environment Commission, I'm almost positive and he can confirm there hasn't been a change in staff complement. Manitoba Environmental Council, I believe, continues to consist of one staff position and so if that's it then we can hit the issues, if he can just confirm that.

HON. J. COWAN: Agreed.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the Minister in just a little bit of discussion about the lead in both soil and air in the Weston area of the city with respect to the Canadian Bronze establishment of some longstanding duration in that area. My questions will follow on the report which he shared with me; it was released earlier this year with regard to the Lead-in-Soil Removal Program. It follows up on studies that were being done when I left the office he now occupies as Minister responsible for the Environment and at the time that he announced the program I complimented him on carrying through with a matter that had been left for action when we left office. I wonder if he can confirm for me the rationale behind the decision, in other words, the concern for safety or health that triggered the decision to have the Lead-in-Soil Removal Program carried out.

HON. J. COWAN: Certainly there was a concern about the potential hazards especially in regard to children and young adults in the area, but that concern did deal with the known health effects of lead exposure at levels over 2,600 parts per million which is a guideline that has been used by other jurisdictions in lead removal control programs.

MR. G. FILMON: In other words, the Minister is saying that the reason that the program of soil removal was carried out was that there was a legitimate concern to the health and safety of particularly young children under five years, as I understand it, and their possible ingestion of materials that would result in lead content in their bodies increasing beyond an acceptable level.

HON. J. COWAN: Yes.

MR. G. FILMON: I thank the Minister for that very brief response. The next question I have to ask the Minister is, the report seems very inconclusive with respect to the sources of that lead in that area and I'm aware of continuing and ongoing studies to try and pinpoint it. I'm wondering whether or not there is any strong indication that the high content of lead either in air or in soil in that area is due to the operations of Canadian Bronze at the present time.

HON. J. COWAN: Could you repeat the last . . .

MR. G. FILMON: I'm saying, is there any conclusive evidence that the high levels of lead in either the soil or the air in that area now are as a result of the continuing operations of Canadian Bronze?

HON. J. COWAN: No, certainly that would be one of the factors that would provide for lead in the area, automobile emissions would be another major factor that would provide for lead in the area and other areas throughout the province. There would probably be some - although I couldn't confirm it I'd have to look to the final report which I understand is being finalized right now, and take a look to see if it implicates lead paint peeling off in some of the areas as well. Those are three factors. We have no indication right now with the cleanup having taken place over most of the area but not all of the area, that there are significant problems recurring but we will be monitoring to make certain that we have some idea of what is happening in that area over a period of time.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, my question to the Minister is, given his stated concern for health hazards and public safety or public health in the area, the stated concerns that led to a provincially-funded removal of soil program in the area, why then did he not order the removal of soil in all the areas that occurred above the level that was selected as being the hazardous level? Why did he not order it there and why did he not order it in the boulevards which is the most prominent place for children to play, I would think, in the area?

HON. J. COWAN: I think the most prominent place would be the schoolyard but the boulevards are extremely important. I made a mistake when I didn't order it to be done and I quite freely admit to having made that mistake. I was operating under the assumption that we were going to be able to reach an agreement with the City of Winnipeg to have them remove the soil. I had indications that that was going to be the case. I then did not, as a Minister, maintain sufficient vigilance over the matter to make certain that it happened. What did happen was the talks prolonged

and went on beyond the period when that removal was possible and, in fact, the lead in the boulevards was not removed. I certainly believe that that was a mistake that we should have, in some way, provided for that lead to be removed last year.

We still would like the city to undertake that activity but the city has indicated to us that they're not prepared to fund it. They're prepared to do it, but they want us to pay them to do it. I've just responded back to Mayor Norrie and said to him, give us permission to go in and take it off this year; we'll take it off we'll get the job done. The delay was regrettable but I think more importantly that we admit to the mistakes we make and try to put in place corrective actions which will deal efficiently with the problem. That's what I believe we've done. I wish it had been otherwise.

In hindsight and knowing what I know today, I probably would have taken the course of action that the Member for Tuxedo suggests should be done. I probably would have ordered our own Environmental Management Division to include that as part of the contract and tried to collect from the city later. That was a tactical error that resulted in unnecessary exposure. I don't think it is, given the context of the entire program exposure that cannot be handled by removal this year. That lead has been there for a long time, and as of this summer it will be removed. It could have been done much more efficiently, you're right.

MR. G. FILMON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I accept the answers and the candour of the Minister in saying that. I only point out to him, and for the Member for The Pas who has been impressed with the honesty of the Minister in his answer, that everything that is said in this House and in the course of all of our discussions is on the record. The Minister knows full well that he is on the record in great volumes in the past for his position with respect to concerns for lead in the environment, lead in the soil and in the air, lead in the workplace, in the various work locations involved in this particular item and others in the city. Therefore, his lack of action appears to be inconsistent with his concerns and positions in the past.

The fact that he, as Minister, was placed in the position - he referred to the school yard as being the most likely. Well, the reason that he wasn't in a position to have to be responsible for the removal in the school yard was that it was already done when he assumed office because that was a decision of our administration. That was, of course, the area of foremost concern as far as children playing.

The second area I would think would have been the boulevards because they are (a) public property, and (b) had consistently higher levels than the level of concern that was identified in the Ontario study that resulted in lead and soil removal.

So I say that this Minister in his lack of action, in his inaction, has been terribly inconsistent and untrue to the position he took as an environmentalist who argued loud and long about the lack of action on the part of the previous administration with respect to concerns for lead in the environment, as I said, in soil and air, and in the workplaces of this province. When he was put in a position to do something about it, the first thing he did was to stall and argue about the cost

of removal with the city. It cost something like \$13,000 to do the yards in the area. I don't know whether we were talking about \$10,000 or \$20,000, whatever, \$7,000.00. He hesitated and left it for a full year, despite being somebody who presumably is terribly concerned with the potential hazardous health effects of this sort of thing. I say that the Minister was - I think to be charitable - inconsistent in his approach to this kind of problem.

So I leave it at that because I think we've put that on the record. The Minister wants an opportunity to respond; that may invoke some additional discussion on my part, but I'll give him an opportunity to respond.

HON. J. COWAN: I certainly don't want to provoke additional comments, unless the member feels they are appropriate, necessary and helpful, but I do think the record should be clear that what we did do was undertake for the removal of lead and soil in the area. That was done to a certain extent; it was not done to the fullest extent. I have assumed responsibility for not having ensured that it was done properly in the first instance and all the areas were covered in the first instance, but the fact is that as of this summer, and I can categorically state this without fear of contradiction, the lead and soil on the boulevard will be removed by the province. We should have done it last summer certainly, but the fact is we're going to do it this summer. I don't think that's highly inconsistent with my previous comments, nor do I think that it's highly inconsistent with the approach that has been brought to this portfolio.

MR. G. FILMON: I think it's highly inconsistent given the kind of urgency that the member placed on the matter when he was in opposition and the lack of urgency he apparently placed on it in dealing with it this time. I know the difference is that now he has the power to deal with it and that, of course, in itself brings a more conservative approach, having the power.

I'm interested to know then if the Minister considers his inaction last year to have been a mistake, whether or not he is then going to push forward and order the removal of the soil on the five private properties that decline to give voluntary agreement to having it done.

HON. J. COWAN: We are certainly going to undertake discussions with him while we have the removal ongoing on the boulevards. Hopefully, they will see that the process that happened last year wasn't terribly disrupted and that they will participate in the program. I think most likely they chose not to participate because of fears of disruption of their own lifestyle on their own property. We believe the program has been undertaken in a satisfactory way. We believe they'll see, by example, that there is nothing to fear from that removal. We'll go back to them and suggest that now with that example in front of them that they co-operate with us.

MR. G. FILMON: If they don't co-operate, will he order it?

HON. J. COWAN: I would consider it if it was felt to be necessary in the interests of public health, yes.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, if it wasn't felt to be necessary in the interests of public health, you wouldn't have done any of it.

Mr. Chairman, on to the order which the Minister indicated previously with respect to the air emissions at Inco I note that, although the Minister was in a position to change the emission standards, he did not. He has maintained existing restrictions for the 500-foot smelter stack and as the order requires Inco to continue the operation of an ambient sulphur dioxide monitoring program, to continue participating in forestry and vegetation sites, to continue participating in study of long-range transport of SO₂ and so on. The order also requires Inco to submit a monthly summary of daily sulphur dioxide and total particulate emissions and so on, all of which are things that were in the order before.

Now, when we were in government and, specifically, when I was Minister, the Member for Churchill, and now the Minister, argued strenuously that new and more stringent environmental emission standards ought to be imposed upon the smelters in Northern Manitoba. The discussion occurred at that time with respect to the HBM&S emissions, but again I put to the Minister that he had the power to deal in a much more stringent fashion with Inco and he declined to use that power. I wonder whether or not the effect of having his own the power now to do it has moderated his views substantially on this issue.

HON. J. COWAN: No, not in the least. The fact is that as part of the eastern bubble this province has committed itself to participating in the apportionment of a 50-percent reduction in acid rain emissions. In the eastern bubble, that is, provinces east of the Manitoba-Saskatchewan border, including Manitoba, we have held a number of meetings with Provincial Ministers and Federal Ministers on this. As I indicated in my opening remarks, we are holding a meeting within the month with the Provincial Ministers of the Eastern bubble, and we are hopefully holding a meeting with the Federal and Provincial Ministers in two months' time. At that time, we will be discussing apportionments for the different provinces and those apportionments will be undertaken in such a way as to accommodate the needs for the entire country to effectively address the issue of sulphur dioxide emissions, which is commonly referred to as acid rain. Those are tough decisions that all the Ministers have been participating in, in a co-operative fashion. I would suspect that as a result of those discussions on apportionment, we will be coming back to smelters in Manitoba and saying, look, here is your role as a part of a nationwide initiative to reduce acid rain in this province. I think at that time, we will want to review existing orders and existing emission levels to the greatest extent possible and develop methodologies to reduce them so that, as a unit, we have provided for reduction of acid rain. So nothing is inconsistent in that regard in my opinion, but the member may be of an opposite opinion.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I am saying that the kinds of objective, broad, general objectives that this Minister has agreed to were no different than the broad general objectives that we had in mind.

HON. J. COWAN: Did you commit to 50 percent?

MR. G. FILMON: Certainly that was within the discussion framework of what we were considering.

HON. J. COWAN: But, did you commit to it?

MR. G. FILMON: Well, whether we did or not - we weren't asked to at that point in time. I have no doubt that we would have because that was the kind of . . . the difference between what the Minister said then was that he imposed a certain urgency on it and said, do it, regardless of time frame, regardless of practicality, regardless of the economics of it, but do it at HBM&S in Flin Flon.

Now he has had the same opportunity to say the same thing to Inco, we don't care about the economics; we don't care about the time frame; we're just going to say, go ahead and do it and he hasn't proceeded in that kind of activist manner. Now, I don't disagree with that, but I am saying that power has had a very sobering influence on the Minister - and I know that the Minister does not imbibe or at least to my knowledge, so I am not saying that in any personal sense - it has a sobering effect on him and his approach to dealing with these problems. It seemed so burning as issues in the past. All of sudden the availability of the power to act has somehow prevented him from acting and I just have to wonder about his approach to these things.

My next area for discussion, Mr. Chairman, is to ask the Minister what is the present status of the Warren Sewage Lagoon on a matter that was before the Clean Environment Commission when we left office some year and a half ago. I believe that we're approaching the point at which the lagoon would have to be discharging possibly this fall or next spring, so I wonder whether or not the Clean Environment Commission has yet reported and if the Minister has dealt with it.

HON. J. COWAN: It is my understanding that the lagoon is currently receiving waste from holding tanks. It was last inspected by us on February 21st, 1983 at which time there was .62 metre of ice in the primary cell and the secondary cell was empty. It's certainly not anticipated the lagoon will fill before 1985 and the next inspection, as part of a regular ongoing monitoring program, will be May 20, 1983. Agro-Water is actually still in the process of reviewing land disposable proposals. It is our understanding the land in the area is not capable of accepting sewage effluent irrigation so that there has to be looked at an alternative land disposal method. That's being undertaken by Agro-Water at this time.

MR. G. FILMON: I thank the Minister for that response. Another area in question that I had is, I wonder if the Minister is using Dr. Jean Stelman, either formally or informally, as a consultant on anything with respect to the environmental matters over which he has jurisdiction.

HON. J. COWAN: Not at the present time, no.

MR. G. FILMON: In view of the fact that the member consulted Dr. Stelman when he was in opposition, I wonder why, when he has an opportunity to consult various areas of expertise, he hasn't used her.

HON. J. COWAN: I think the matter is that when in opposition, she came forward with suggestions and

recommendations on a specific problem. If that problem were to reoccur, I would certainly seek advice from her in whatever manner was acceptable, but that problem has not reoccurred to my knowledge. Therefore, we have been addressing other issues which we feel will help to prevent those sorts of incidents from occurring in the past. Certainly, if there was a specific nature in which there was expertise available, I would seek consultation with any individual whom I thought could bring a new perspective or a better perspective or even a somewhat different perspective to discussions so that we would have an opportunity to review these matters in detail.

It's not that I don't want to consult, it's just that there hasn't been that type of similar incident from which those consultations would flow.

MR. G. FILMON: What area does the Minister consider Dr. Stelman is expert at? What areas would he consult her for?

HON. J. COWAN: Certainly, she is considered to be and expert by many in the area of Workplace Safety and Health and in the area of environmental health. If there were incidents that demanded that type of technical expertise in respect to determining what a particular hazard was or what potential a particular hazard could have under such circumstances, then consultation with her would be as appropriate as consultation with many other individuals. I can assure you, I would seek as extensive consultation process as possible, as quickly as possible in those circumstances.

Usually what happens in that particular instance, if it is an area of some unknown quantity in respect to local expertise, then one seeks expertise in ever-widening circles and tries to bring in as many people as possible in order to draw the best picture, the most complete picture possible.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I just want to put on the record, reading from an magazine article earlier this year that did a summary of the famous MacGregor derailment, and the misinformation that was contained within the various news stories and so on that were disseminated at that time. It summarizes Dr. Stelman's remarks on arriving in Manitoba in the midst of that furor over the derailment as saying that if a MacGregor-style derailment involving a leaking vinyl chloride car occurred in the United States there would be an immediate mass evacuation of at least a 10-mile radius because VCM - vinyl chloride monomer, I assume - has been proven to cause cancer.

It says that every newsman and newswomen in Manitoba climbed onto the story, so did opposition parties and the Manitoba Legislature and the Feds in Ottawa. Environmental and labour groups joined the crescendo of indignation, as did most of the western press core. It says that Dr. Stelman's claim that VCM causes cancer in the context of the MacGregor incident was never thoroughly investigated, nor did anyone investigate her credentials to make such an inflammatory statement, "The facts were these, repeated exposure," and so on. The exposures required, according to the scientific summary, was in the order of hundreds or thousands of times greater

than what was occurring in MacGregor, and that Dr. Stelman was only referring to the danger of the long-term chronic exposures of hundreds and thousands times as many applications as were possible or prevalent at MacGregor. It's a terrible statement on the misuse of scientific and medical evidence, Mr. Chairman. I would hope that the Minister would not, in fact, consider bringing in Dr. Stelman as an expert on anything, as part of his responsibility.

HON. J. COWAN: Where is the article from?

MR. G. FILMON: It's the Fall Quarterly of something or other and I'll share it with the Minister because he may have cause to debate the issue at some point in the future, so I might as well have him forewarned if not forewarned.

HON. J. COWAN: Well, again we're going to disagree and I guess that's nothing unusual for this House. I think Miss Stelman among others - and I don't mean to single her out - in that field have credentials and have expertise and knowledge which are valuable to us. There have been other incidents involving train derailments of vinyl chloride; there have been other incidences of evacuation arising out of that, oftentimes for different reasons and circumstances that existed here, but sometimes for similar circumstances. So I think it's a matter of a judgment call and we're going to disagree on both the qualifications and the expertise and what had transpired in that case, but I certainly don't back away from it. Since we're putting things on the record, I think they it should be clear that that's on the record as well.

MR. G. FILMON: Yes. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could indicate. We have had a decision by the Executive Policy Committee of Winnipeg City Council, yesterday I believe, with respect to the preferred method of sewage treatment for the settlement at Shoal Lake and in view of the fact that the city and the Director of the Federal Environmental Protection Service seem to disagree on the preferred method of treatment, which of the methods of treatment is preferred by the Minister or his department, in this case?

HON. J. COWAN: We have indicated some support in the past for the sewage lagoon sites off Reserve just on the border of the Reserve and a road accessing them. We've done that because of the time. That was one proposal that was coming forward that appeared to be safe, that appeared to protect the water supply of the City of Winnipeg and appeared to be, at that time, cost efficient.

As a result of that, there were further discussions held and the report which has a minority report - that's the wrong word because it does tend to diminish the effectiveness of the consultant's report - had two different options presented for review which was undertaken by Environment Canada, was compiled.

Now I want to make a couple of things clear in the first instance.

1. The matter of sewage disposal and garbage disposal on Indian Reserves is a federal responsibility.
2. The City of Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba, and I hope the Indian Band at Shoal Lake and the

Federal Government are committed to protecting the City of Winnipeg's water supply by the most efficient and best means possible.

3. The province is prepared to work with the parties and, in fact, has worked with the parties and will continue to work with the parties to co-ordinate activities.

We were asked to review options before and we did review options and the two sewage lagoon sites was the option which we thought was appropriate at that time for further discussion and it was put forward, not as a provincial position, but it was put forward for further discussion. It has been discussed. There is now another option which, I think, merits some consideration which should be discussed.

I have had some discussion with Mayor Norrie and my colleague, the Minister of Urban Affairs on this, and we are going to be meeting with Mayor Norrie, hopefully when I'm through Estimates within the next week or so, and we will be discussing their perspective; we will be providing technical advice and we will, in fact, be assessing the different options and we will assess that option of running a line underneath the Bay into another site using effluent that has been somewhat treated in the first instance.

We have concerns about that as well. We have concerns about the sewage lagoon; we have concerns about every mechanism. None of them are foolproof but we certainly want to review them all fairly and with equal diligence and this new one is one that we just haven't had time to review in that way; and we intend to do so.

Basically our bottom line is, it's a federal responsibility but we understand our responsibility to protect the City of Winnipeg water supply. If they don't exercise their responsibility and their authority in that regard, we will do whatever is possible to protect the City of Winnipeg water supply. We've stated that in the past and will continue to state that. But what I'm hoping will happen as a result of some of our initiative and the initiative of others, because we don't deserve all the credit, but some of our initiative in trying to bring this to a head and review different options is, we'll be able to sit down, the four parties together, and agree to a solution and it could be, right now, either one of those two but I haven't had time, nor have staff had time, to thoroughly assess and discuss the option of a line going underneath the Bay from the technical perspectives. That's what we're providing in this instance, technical assistance, backup protection for the City of Winnipeg water supply, if necessary, and we're trying to play the role of a party which keeps things moving and keeps discussions going and tries to focus in on a solution.

MR. G. FILMON: What's the bottom line position if the parties don't agree on the preferred method, from the province's viewpoint?

HON. J. COWAN: The bottom line position is that the City of Winnipeg water supply must be protected.

MR. G. FILMON: So that if there is any risk, that there will be harm or a reduction in quality of the City of

Winnipeg's water supply, the province will insist that whatever proposal is put forward, not go forward in order to protect that.

HON. J. COWAN: I'm not certain I understand the question in its entirety but, yes we will continue to participate in the process. If the process breaks down there are certain things that we can do - and I've stood in my chair over the past year and said we are prepared to make certain that the City of Winnipeg water supply is protected - we believe it's a federal responsibility; we believe the city has a very large role to play in this; we want to work with those parties to ensure that that happens, so I hope that answers the question. If not, I'm certain that the member will advise me. But we see ours as a consultative role at this stage, as a backup protection if the consultation and co-operation breaks down and as being able to provide technical advice.

MR. G. FILMON: I acknowledge the consultative role with respect to staff, but I'm saying that when it comes to a final decision of intervening or acting to ensure that no harm comes, that no degradation occurs to the city's water supply, is that a responsibility that the Minister will take regardless of political and intergovernmental relations and considerations? Will the Minister stand on that and give that assurance to the people of the City of Winnipeg?

HON. J. COWAN: I think the record is very clear that we have been prepared to in the past, and we will continue to be prepared to use whatever mechanisms are necessary and available to us in the event of a breakdown in the co-operative process whereby the City of Winnipeg water supply is threatened by any action on the part of any party. In the past we have had strong words to say to the Federal Government in respect to their assuming their responsibility; we've had strong words to say to the other parties; we have looked at it very carefully. We have said, let's try to work this out in as amenable a way as possible, but if it can't be worked out in that way, our responsibility is to protect the City of Winnipeg water supply. The record is clear on that; there's no doubt in my mind as to any statements that have been made otherwise on this side. We have always taken that position. It's a federal responsibility, but the bottom line is we will act in spite of jurisdictional problems, in spite of political problems, and I can't see any political problems arising out of the protection of the City of Winnipeg water supply in a forceful way. So I tend to think that won't be a problem, but the fact is that this issue, like many issues, goes beyond partisan considerations and geopolitical considerations.

MR. G. FILMON: I note that the term "geopolitical considerations" was utilized . . .

HON. J. COWAN: I couldn't resist it.

MR. G. FILMON: . . . a little earlier in the day in an article with respect to the position of the federal director of Environmental Protection for this area but, in any case, I'm pleased to have the Minister's assurance on that because that assurance I don't believe was

apparent in the past. If it were, I don't believe that the city would have taken the unprecedented step of sending out an explanatory folder, just as the province has done on Garrison, and the city sent this out to every household in Winnipeg to ensure that they were all aware of the potential harm that could occur to the city's water supply if a 350 cottage lot development were allowed to proceed, and the need for a Federal Environmental Assessment Review process and so on. I believe that if the province had adopted a strong position on that, the city would probably have not felt it necessary to enlist public support to ensure that they had the full backing of all the citizens of Winnipeg in dealing with whatever issues occurred with respect to the protection of its water supply.

Carrying on in the same vein, Mr. Chairman, since we are on the topic of the city's water supply, another doctor, I believe in this case it was Dr. Linda Murray - is that the person - who is the Chief Medical Officer of the Workplace Safety and Health Clinic of the Manitoba Federation of Labour, who recently, I think irresponsibly and inappropriately, made statements before a public gathering not unlike Dr. Stelman did a few years ago, in which she raised the spectre of a serious cancer threat to Winnipeg residents as a result of asbestos fibres in the city's water supply. I wonder whether or not the Minister, notwithstanding his invitation to drink the water and his example of drinking the water, has satisfied himself through the technical staff available in his department that that inflammatory statement is not one that the citizens have to take seriously at the present time, and I wonder if he can give any assurance to the citizens of Winnipeg that their water supply has not deteriorated and does not pose a threat to health.

HON. J. COWAN: I can repeat the comments which I've made earlier in this House and there is absolutely no inconsistency with those comments or comments I made previously when this matter came up when I was in opposition at that time, and I've gone back and reviewed the comments.

My request of the government was that they undertake more studies, that they look at different studies, to come to a determination as to whether there was a threat. We are doing exactly that; we are working with other agencies on those studies and I can say exactly the same thing I said previously. I can't give you categorical assurances and I don't believe that you can give categorical assurances or anyone can give categorical assurances that it's going to cause cancer or that it's not going to cause cancer. I think there is a question that has to be addressed.

Dr. Linda Murray put forward a particular perspective on the issue. The member opposite puts forward a different perspective. I probably put forward a perspective that's somewhere between the two, but the fact is that we need more work done on this before those categorical statements can be made. I'm not certain that we can ever make the categorical statements one way or the other, but certainly there is some good work that's ongoing that will be completed shortly, I would hope, and that will move us along the road to being able to make statements that are of a more certain nature.

In the meanwhile, I'll continue to drink the water and I would not discourage people from drinking the water, but I can't make the categorical statement that you would seek of me.

MR. G. FILMON: Is the Minister saying that he thinks it's valid and reasonable from a scientific or medical perspective to go on record as saying that there are serious health hazards to people when there is no scientific evidence to prove it. We're not just dealing with a "maybe" - that it can or maybe it cannot. We're dealing with a statement that said the city should not wait until further "bodies pile up" before it takes action on this. Now, that to me is not a very mild statement that indicates that there may be a concern but we're studying it. That says that somebody - and that somebody happens to be a medical doctor which gives it the aura of authenticity which it probably doesn't deserve - that person made that statement, and I want the Minister to make a statement that at least clarifies his position on it, or indicates whether or not that statement is valid.

HON. J. COWAN: I would not make that statement in that way, certainly. I do believe that she is entitled to make whatever statement she wishes to make, and if you have cause to argue with her, please argue with her directly to her and not through me. I have made my statement. My statement is, that given all the information that we have now, we have not seen an immediate and urgent threat of the nature that she talked about, but I cannot give categorical assurances that there is not a threat. All I can suggest is that we are doing the responsible thing and participating with other jurisdictions and encouraging other studies of this to make certain that we have the most complete information available to us. That's the position I've taken for some time now.

MR. G. FILMON: Has the Minister seen the most recent information that the city has available to it, which concludes in part: "The city water distribution system does contain some asbestos fibres. These originate in the source water delivered to the city and also may enter the system due to construction and maintenance activities." Has the Minister seen that?

HON. J. COWAN: Yes.

MR. G. FILMON: Okay, so I'll conclude the discussion on that item with that response and say, just so that the Minister knows, that my colleague from Pembina has an item to raise with him with respect to emissions in Simplot; and I have one more item to raise with him and we'll try and do that very promptly when we get started in the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour is 4:30, time for Private Members' Hour. Committee will reconvene at 8:00 p.m.

IN SESSION PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time being 4:30 and Private Members' Hour, the first item on the agenda for Thursday is Debates on Second Readings of Public Bills.

**ADJOURNED DEBATES
ON SECOND READING - PUBLIC BILLS
BILL 36 - THE AGROLOGISTS ACT**

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for The Pas, Bill No. 36, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to contribute a few remarks in support of Bill 36. I'd just like to indicate that I have been a member of MIA, which is the Manitoba Institute of Agrologists, the Agricultural Institute of Canada since 1956, and just a couple of years ago received this lapel pin, 25 year button.

I think it's interesting to note that the Manitoba Institute of Agrologists held their 33rd annual meeting at Portage la Prairie on April 8th and 9th. Unfortunately for me the annual meetings of the AIC are usually held at this time of year and it conflicts with the Session.

I'd just like to indicate that the application to join the AIC was enclosed with the job offer from the Department of Agriculture back in 1956, and that is when I applied for membership so that I could proceed with the offer to become the agricultural representative at Pilot Mound, Manitoba.

In my opinion this bill endeavours to provide the opportunity, encouragement and the insistence for its members to attain the highest level of proficiency. Just to read briefly from the bill: "In the communication or dissemination of information on or experimentation with the principles, laws or practices relating to the production, improvement, use, processing, or marketing of agricultural products, crops or livestock."

After having said that I sincerely believe that each and every member practicing agronomy does provide to the best of his ability services to the agricultural community that might not otherwise be done if there were no organization. I see it as an umbrella organization that oversees if you will, that agrologists provide the best service possible. I feel that it works. The majority of members respond positively.

During the time that I served the Province of Manitoba as agricultural representative, I found this organization very helpful to me through its many professional affiliations; the branch meetings that were held. I believe - I'm not certain of this - but I'm sure that I did serve as the president of the branch in southwestern Manitoba back a number of years ago. I certainly attended those meetings on a regular basis and I found them most helpful.

Of course there's the provincial meetings that I just indicated. The last one in 1983 just a month ago was held at Portage la Prairie. Of course every year the Agricultural Institute of Canada holds the national meeting; usually alternates one year in the year east and the next year in the west.

The agrologists also provide inservice training sessions. I think that it encouraged and it also provided the opportunity to generally associate with many people of various fields of agriculture with expertise in the different fields of agriculture. I'm certain that this opportunity would not have existed nearly to the same extent if there hadn't been professional organizations.

I haven't practiced agronomy since I came into the Legislature here in the fall of 1977, however, I still

maintain my membership although I've not been active or attended any meetings in the last six or seven years.

This bill is very similar to other professional bills as I understand the other bills. Bill 36 is primarily endeavouring to clarify various sections and also to clarify some of the definitions therein.

In closing I would just like to say I think it would have been a good gesture on the part of the mover of this bill to have suggested that a member of the opposition who is also a member of the Manitoba Institute of Agrologists to have seconded this bill. However be that as it may, I am pleased to offer these few comments and will be supporting Bill 36.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for the Pas will be closing debate.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: Mr. Speaker, there are several questions that the Member for Pembina raised yesterday and that was the question of the period of time allowed for a person to be notified there was a hearing and I think that I have not got that information back from the Association but I think that can be addressed when we are in committee stage, and if there's need for amendments, then there's an opportunity to make an amendment at that time.

The Member for Swan River makes the suggestion that it should have been raised or introduced by a member who is a member of the Association. Possibly I'll give you the opportunity to second the resolution when it comes to the committee stage.

The Member for Emerson had raised several questions and one of them was why be a member of the Association? I'm sure this question faces any person who joins any organization and unfortunately the question continues to be raised. Full support of the MIA can only be realized when one sees the personal benefits one can achieve from membership and, more importantly, what benefits he can see from the profession and also what benefit there is for the agricultural industry and the general public, and this comes through participation.

The institution is implementing an Agrologist-in-Training Program which will help new members become more aware of some of the benefits that are available to them for becoming members of the association and this awareness and participation is required and it should help answer some of the questions of why a person should become a new member.

He also raised the question as what is meant by being more responsive to the needs of both the members and the agricultural community. The assumption of increased responsiveness is based on having a more efficient management system with increased responsibility and authority placed in the hands of council. First of all council on behalf of members will be able to react in a more timely manner. With all issues that are facing the members of the association they will not have to wait for the annual meeting before they can face some of the questions that are being raised by their association and the representatives are confident the viewpoint can be expressed in a quicker manner than has been done in the past.

The same goes for responding to the needs of the agricultural community. As agrologists they are

responsible for extending accurate and useful, factual information. When a problem arises MIA council, again on behalf of the members must respond in a quicker period of time, they wouldn't have to wait for the annual convention before they could give the membership some of the answers they are looking for.

In summary to that question I guess the MIA feel they can be more efficient, more responsive and more active if they would have taken this avenue.

He also raised the question of a better definition of agrology and the association has struggled for several years to develop an acceptable definition of agrology and practising agrologists. The profession is obviously very broad in scope, the definition should also be broadened to effectively cover the profession. The MIA feel that current definitions, although, broad and encompassing, are the best possible solutions to indicate where membership is required and so they also avoid technical loopholes which would be necessary to tighten it up more. Obviously the definition covers individuals where there is no need for membership and these are covered by the list of exemptions that are covered in the bill.

The Member for Emerson also raised the question of enforcement provisions, I believe the Member for Pembina had some questions in the same area. And the current Act prohibits the use of the term agrologist by non-members. This has not changed with the new Act, it's the same in 15(1) of the old Act or 15(2) of the new Act, it's the same exemptions.

Conviction for violation of the Act carries a fine of not more than \$100 for the first offence and not more than \$200 for a subsequent offence. A stronger deterrent lies in Section 15(4) and 15(5) where the individual cannot collect fees for service and where an injunction may be invoked. In practice, MIA would first try persuasion if there was a violation to the Act and they would only resort to court action to prevent a continued violation to the Act. The individual would have every opportunity to prove that he has not been practicing agrology.

The Member for Emerson, and I believe the Member for Morris, and the Member for Pembina also raised the question of why are farmers not allowed. The Act does not prohibit farmers from obtaining membership as long as they meet membership requirements. If you're presently a member and you become a farmer you can still carry the title of agrologist. Several of the current members in the association right now are presently agrologists. Members would fall into the definition of practicing agrology. It is not the intent of the MIA to require farmers to be members, therefore the exemption under 1(2)(a) of the Act would cover that. Only if a farmer claims to be an agrologist is a membership required.

He also raises the question of other exemptions and this is a catch-all exemption which would allow exemptions should the need arise. It is the alternative to overlooking technical violations in which there would be no advantage to anyone if action was taken. A hypothetical example would be where someone falls under a definition which does not meet formal requirements for membership and whose action benefits the agricultural industry. No purpose would be served in taking the individual to court, lack of action would still leave a cloud of uncertainty and exemption by

council would solve the problem and it wouldn't be necessary to take the person to court.

You also raise the question of upgrading and I guess continual upgrading is desirable. It's the same in any profession, so agrologists should not be exempted from that as well. This is one of the reasons for the association to be formed in the first place. The organization is closely involved with Manitoba agriculture and the University of Manitoba in organizing a series of professional updating courses.

A MEMBER: Are they compulsory?

MR. H. HARAPIAK: No, they're not compulsory but in order to keep abreast with the changes in the profession, many should be taking part in them. However, there has never been any indication that a member would be subjected to requalification. If a member is removed from the register such as through a resignation or non-payment of dues then he may have to meet membership standards if they are changed.

A MEMBER: I never thought of that.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: There are a few other questions that the Member for Pembina raised which I do not have the answers for but I'm sure these questions can be addressed at the committee level so I would move that this bill go to committee.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert, Bill No. 41, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Stand, please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Brandon West, Bill No. 56, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Springfield. (Stand)

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING - PRIVATE BILLS BILL NO. 40 - AN ACT TO INCORPORATE PORTAGE AVENUE BAPTIST CHURCH

MR. SPEAKER: Second readings on private bills. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, Bill No. 40, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With a great deal of pleasure, I have a few observations concerning Bill 40. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to congratulate the Honourable Member for Fort Garry for presenting Bill 40 in this Chamber as An Act to amend An Act to Incorporate Portage Avenue Baptist Church.

Mr. Speaker, after closely examining the intention of those two congregations, which decided to amalgamate

and to build a new church at the corner of Waverley and Cadboro under the name of the Waverley Fellowship Baptist Church, I do not find any difficulty in supporting this bill.

The existing Portage Avenue Baptist Church being incorporated under a private Act of the Legislature, the title of An Act to Incorporate Portage Avenue Baptist Church, being Chapter 67 of the Statutes of Manitoba, 1943, as amended by the statute of The Law Amendment Act, 1974, being Chapter 59 of the Statutes of Manitoba in 1974; so, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that they are already calling themselves the Waverley Fellowship Baptist Church and are contemplating to proceed with the construction of their new church if it will be possible this summer.

Personally, Mr. Speaker, I am happier to see the building of new churches than the construction of more beer parlours in our community. So, Mr. Speaker, with these few remarks, I am supporting Bill 40 which is proposed by my colleague, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry; and with God's blessing and the best wishes to the Waverley Fellowship Baptist Church. Amen.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, Bill No. 53, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Concordia.

MR. P. FOX: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand.

SECOND READING - PRIVATE BILLS
BILL NO. 38 - THE SOCIETY OF
MANAGEMENT
ACCOUNTANTS OF MANITOBA ACT

MR. D. SCOTT presented Bill No. 38, An Act to amend the Society of Management Accountants of Manitoba Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Some time ago, I was asked by the Society of Management Accountants of Manitoba to bring forward some amendments to their bill which was first passed in this House in 1947.

The changes that they are asking for this time basically deal with three or four different matters. The first one, and by far the most important, is the changing of the designation of a member of the Society of Management Accountants of Manitoba from an RIA designation - that is the letters RIA - to the designation of CMA. RIA stood for Registered Industrial Accountant. CMA follows more in line with the title of their actual organization, the Society of Management Accountants, and the CMA stands for the Certified Management Accountant.

I might add, as well, that one of the impetuses towards doing this was so that their colleagues across the country, be they Anglophone or Francophone, can use the same designation; for in French the title stays CMA or CMÁ, which stands for comptable en management en crédit. That provides — (Interjection) — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a slight accent speaking in French, as the Member for Minnedosa clearly points out. We're waiting for him to use some of his in the House and then . . .

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: He does the Ukrainian accent.

MR. D. SCOTT: He does! Some of the background towards wanting this, as I mentioned a minute ago, is so the designation can be used universally across the country and transcends the linguistic lines of the two national languages of our country.

In Manitoba, there are about 775 graduates who are members of the Society of Management Accountants of Manitoba, and approximately 1,300 students currently in the province.

We have had the modern role of accountancy moving not - or more away just from strictly dealing with figures, but also far more interpretation of those figures as well. The Industrial Accountants, as they have been known for many years, the RIAs, have played a leading role in a development of management accounting. The RIAs, or as they shall soon be called, the CMAs, are responsible for obtaining, interpreting and reporting on managing the economic information required for effective management control. They are not limited strictly to practising their profession in a private sector or in the industrial setting itself of heavy industry, for you will find members of the Society of Management Accountants of Manitoba in almost every walk of life or every form of industry as well as in public service. As a matter of fact, the chap Bill Cessford, who works in the Department of Finance, is the past president, I believe, of the association and is the gentleman who handles the money markets for the Province of Manitoba.

So it is perhaps more fitting that they are changing their name now - or their designation, I should say, not their name - the designation away from being Industrial Accountants, as a Registered Industrial Accountant, towards a Certified Management Accountant. This change is also consistent with what is happening across the country. The association, in trying to maintain uniformity right across the country, serving both language groups as well, has already petitioned successfully in the Province of New Brunswick and the Province of Ontario for the designation change from RIA to CMA.

They have also petitioned the Government of Quebec, and the Government of Quebec is currently reviewing professional legislation as a whole and will, probably within a year to two years, want some of the differences there ironed out between the professions, in accountancy in particular, as unfortunately there's always been a great deal of competition and one might almost say pettiness between the chartered accountants, certified general accountants and the Society of Management Accountants. One would hope that the least that is being taken in this instance in

Quebec will end up having changes across the country as well towards a clear definition between the various professions or professional bodies.

So currently, between Ontario and New Brunswick, one has approximately 50 percent of all the members of the Society of Management Accountants. Of the various provincial branches across the country, those two provinces represent almost half of them and they have already had their designation change approved, but they will not be taking place. They have deferred implementation until later in 1983 in the expectation that during this Legislative Session and the spring Session of the Legislatures across the country, most of the other provinces will also receive similar bills and pass these bills, so one has, instead of having a checkerboard of designation across the country, of CMAs in some provinces and RIAs in other provinces, that we will have uniform legislation passed by the 10 different provincial jurisdictions across the country.

Some of the smaller amendments that are part of this package as well, clarify the difference between the students as members of the association, and regular members or members who have received the certification. The principle other changes are just the additions of the word "certified" in the bills in various sections of the legislation so that it can, I guess, match up and replace in some instances, or add to in most instances, I guess it is, add to the words "registered" as is already there.

For members of the association who wish to preserve and to call themselves by their former name, as RIAs, shall be allowed to do so; it is not a forcing of members to change their designation if they're more comfortable with the RIA designation, then they may maintain the use of that designation for it is still registered under the Act. They can also move to the newer designation of the CMA, if they so desire, and the new members who will be coming in would all be receiving a CMA designation and not the RIA designation.

There is also one other change in the Act which deals with fines. Previously the maximum fine, I believe, was \$25, and they're asking now for a judicial discretion to be permitted in here and for the fine to range from \$25 to \$500 for someone using the designation CMA or RIA without having passed the accreditation test.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been a small amount of controversy over the introduction of this bill from one group of accountants who are the CGAs or the Certified General Accountants. They base their complaints - and it's interesting to note that no complaints have come from other provinces. From what I can gather, in both Ontario and in New Brunswick when the changes went through there, there was no opposition to it whatsoever. But we have received some comments from the CGAs, the Certified General Accountants, protesting this on the basis that the designation "certified" was their property, and that the designation of another group of accountants with the title "certified" in front of their name would provide some confusion on behalf of the public.

Mr. Speaker, I can't really accept their position there for the operative words or the main designating words is not "certified" but rather "general" in the case of the Certified General Accountants; "public" in the case of the Certified Public Accountants which was brought into legislation a number of years back, 1950 - wait

one second - the designation, CPA, Certified Public Accountants was registered in 1950, yes. That designation still stands on the books, although it has been absorbed into another body, the CPAs. So the three operative words under various accountancy, one is "general"; one is "public"; and one is "management." The proposal in the changing of this legislation is to move from the designation of the RIA to a CMA, Certified Management Accountant.

I really don't think that they are that identical. I think the management accountant stands out quite clearly from a general accountant in the title, as does a "G" from an "M," and that any person who is looking for the services of an accountant, I'm sure, will have the wherewithal about them to recognize the difference between the words "management" and "general."

So, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to carry this on too long, but I would like to recommend this to the members of the House, and recognizing as well, of course, that although there is some objection from the CGAs towards the passing of this legislation, I do not think their position or their case really holds too much water upon any investigation. The people in the Consumer and Corporate Affairs Branch have checked with them to see if they thought there would be problems in confusion or if the CGAs had, in fact, any right to the use of the word "certified." Their comment back, the Director of the Corporations Branch said, there is no such ownership towards the designation "certified."

There is one other group that I should not want to omit that maybe are making presentations contrary to this as well. That is the Municipal Administrators in the Province of Manitoba. They give out a certificate under a course of studies that is done in conjunction with, I believe, the University of Manitoba. It's a certificate in Municipal Administration. With that certificate comes the confusion or, if one simplifies that to use as a designation as CMA, there would definitely be a conflict. But the municipal people in the province have not attempted to register that designation, or if they are using the designation to call themselves CMAs currently. If they had intended to do that, when we're dealing with correct professional designations, one tries to get designations and letters that would be used in common across the whole country. Where two provinces have already designated the letters CMA to be used for the Society of Management Accountants, I do not think that it would be wise, or I do not think that they would even likely receive, if they were to apply to the Corporations Branch for the use of a designation behind their names of CMA.

I think that it's dealing with a certificate - a certificate is somewhat different than a certification. We should be looking, where possible, to move towards national standards in these instances and to be able to piecemeal designations, professional designations to people, province to province, across the country would cause a great deal of confusion.

So, Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to commend this bill, Bill No. 38, An Act to amend The Society of Management Accountants of Manitoba Act, commend it to the Legislature and would hope that the members of the Legislature will see fit to pass this legislation and to move it on as quickly as possible, so that we'll be able to deal with it at the next sitting of the Law Amendments Committee.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?
The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

RES. NO. 2 - AMENDMENT TO THE NATURAL RESOURCES TRANSFER AGREEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' Resolutions.

Resolution No. 2, the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, as amended. The Honourable Member for Inkster has 17 minutes remaining.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thanks very much, Mr. Speaker. Here I go again. It seems to be my day here.

Mr. Speaker, last time when I started on this resolution, just after the amendment proposed by the Minister of Natural Resources, I believe - no, Mr. Lecuyer, I'm sorry. Just after that amendment was successfully passed in this House, I rose to address what I thought were, partially out of the shock that I had that the members opposite would even call for a standing vote on the issue itself, I felt, and I still feel, very, very strongly about the character of how one goes about dealing with treaties and you do not single out a group of people in our society, and say, your treaty doesn't count anymore. To heck with your treaty, we're going to go to the Federal Government and amend an Act to take away treaty rights.

Under the new constitution, as any member in this House is aware, there is provision for aboriginal rights and that is aboriginal rights - the definitions of those rights are currently being worked on between the Native people of Canada, the Government of Canada, and the provinces of Canada. For us to feel, or to go forward at this stage in time, asking for a blanket change of treaties, before the treaty rights are defined, I don't think we would get anywhere in the courts. I don't think the Federal Government would be foolish enough to go along with us on that sort of a proposal to change treaties, because that's what it in effect, does, it changes the understanding that people have of treaties right now and it changes the legal rulings that the treaties have received over the past few years. And for us to go in, walk in and just say, okay, to heck with the treaties, or to the Government of Canada, let's change this law, we've got a problem in Manitoba and we're going to address the problem in Manitoba from a narrow point of view. In other words, we're going to blame the problem with the decreasing numbers of wildlife in this province, strictly through nightlighting, and nightlighting particularly by Native people, and once that is resolved then we will have a rebound in the wildlife population, particularly the moose population, because that's the one that I think right now is probably the most affected.

We've had court rulings in the past. The members opposite know darn well there were court rulings in

the past. It is the court rulings that have restricted Native hunting on private land as recently as 1980. They've restricted hunting with lights back in 1975 as a dangerous hunting practice, where it is conducted within areas where people live, or within roads, or populated areas. We've had rulings back in 1977.

Now much was made when the opposition was bringing their case forward, that a lot of the problems in the Duck Mountains area, in particular, is from Natives coming in from out of province and hunting both day and night in the Duck Mountains. Well, that Supreme Court of Canada ruling was in 1975. They gave Native people the right to go across provincial boundaries, and if it was such a concern, why did the Minister of Natural Resources at the time, who is now the Member for Turtle Mountain, or the Member for Lakeside, when he was the Minister of Natural Resources, why did they not propose and take this legislation that they're asking us to do now, to go forward to the Federal Government and change treaties?

If it was such a problem and certainly, I think, I maintain that it can be a problem and that it very well is a problem, but the way of resolving the problem isn't to just go simplistically in, hat in hand to the Federal Government, asking for changes to legislation, which would deny treaty rights to people who gained these treaties in the late 1800s and some extensions into the 1900s, as well, or some interpretations of the treaties into the 1900s through the courts.

Mr. Speaker, one has to deal far more - far, far more in this resolution and what we have tried to do in our amendment to the resolution, in dealing with the problem of wildlife, that wildlife is having in the province, is to try and work with the Native people and not just to say, to heck with them, we're going to go ahead, change the legislation, without the consultation with those people.

That's why our resolution and the RESOLVED part of it, is "consult as a matter of priority, with the leaders of Indian bands of Manitoba and the Government of Canada and other groups" as well, who have interest; such as the Wildlife Federation; such as the Brandon National History Society; such as the Manitoba Naturalists Society; such as individuals, landowners out in the countryside, who have a problem with people coming and hunting illegally on their lands. To deal with these people towards developing further measures which will address the problem, Mr. Speaker, of declining numbers of wildlife, we have to recognize very clearly that to move in and change laws affecting Native people in this province is going to end up in creating tensions between Native people and non-Native people, build tensions to a higher degree in some instances, present confrontation by going the route of attempting to get a change with the Federal Government to an Act, a 1930 Act.

If there is going to be a resolution of the problem it's not going to be done through laws alone; it has to be done through a recognition by all concerned, including Native people and non-Native people, treaty and non-treaty people, including us who may be naturalists, including hunters - the whole works of society. We have a responsibility as modern man to protect our natural resources, to protect our ecosystems. We have to start addressing those sorts of problems and building a level of understanding not

only in the user groups, but in society in general as to the cost of continuing as we have for a number of years of administrating our wildlife almost simply as if the only reason it is there is to consume it. For that is a very important part of our natural heritage and we have a responsibility to protect our natural ecosystems and to enhance other species, not just game species - all species.

Healthy gene pools of the various plants and animals in our ecosystem is the key toward maintaining healthy populations. It's not just healthy game species, the predators have to be included as well. The feed species have to be included as well. You've got to look at the habitat overall, you don't just try and pick out one particular problem and try to address a whole complex issue with one particular item, of nightlighting, and making reference over and over again in a resolution, as the members opposite had, towards treaty people. The result is that Indians and non-Indians alike are deprived of opportunities to hunt big game, the resolution says.

They've got to recognize that towards the protection of our natural environment we have to go far deeper than looking simply at the issue of one particular group and their hunting patterns.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I'm of the opinion and I hope that through negotiations with the Native people we will, as we have with the Kaminuriak and the Beverly herds, build both an understanding of the nature of the herd, because about many of these animals we know surprisingly little of, almost nothing. An awful lot of the assumptions that we have been so-called managing the resources in the past, managing the various game species in particular, managing the predators has done far more harm than good. With research comes understanding as to how they function and the role that each animal plays in maintaining a healthy ecosystem.

We've got to replace our management philosophy, I think, in allowing kills of animals until a species is threatened with one of trying to maintain a healthy broad spectrum of gene pools in the respective habitats and the respective ecosystems. Sound ecological principles, Mr. Speaker, demand that wildlife management be replaced with basic ecological principles, that a healthy ecosystem is one that each species survives in adequate numbers to play its role in maintaining the health and stability of the whole ecosystem. Each species serves several other species and is in turn dependent on other species.

The value of wilderness itself and the maintenance of strong gene pools is something that cannot be measured with simple economic terms that one sees trying to be used so often. We have to look at the habitat destruction; we have to look at the hunting technologies that we're permitting, the hunting technologies that in many cases are promoted; at the technologies in near-hunting areas and near-wildlife areas. What is happening to them? What's happening to the habitat?

Last week when the Minister and I flew out to participate in the designation of the John McPhail Wildlife Refuge near Vista, one saw a great deal of consolidation, flying through the Minnedosa pothole country. One saw bluffs, where bluffs once were. You drive out quite often into areas and you see areas that

had good potential for habitat and that habitat being destroyed. One sees land being drained, streams and rivers . . .

A MEMBER: You can't tell the forest from the trees. That has nothing to do with it.

MR. D. SCOTT: Yes, it has, it has an awful lot to do with it. It's sad that the Member for Arthur and his colleagues didn't recognize that they're dealing with a lot larger problem than just trying to go after Native people for an alleged hunting practice which they in some instances have used, which is the same thing as the white man has used, and I think the white man probably taught them in the first place the practice of nightlighting. What we're dealing with is the health of our whole ecosystem, and the sooner these guys get it through their heads that the ecosystem and the species that they are most concerned with, the so-called game species, that the reason for the degradation of those species is far beyond Native peoples hunting.

It's principally a case of hunting technologies, of roads being opened into areas that cut across anything from caribou grounds, in the woodlands caribou, up in the Nopoming area, and the impact that that road has had on those animals, to getting up towards the Cranberry Portage area and The Pas area with all the forestry roads running helter-skelter through the bush and the access that gives to hunters, be they legal or illegal, be they treaty or non-treaty. Those are the things, Mr. Speaker, that are contributing more than any other single factor to the degradation of the wildlife in Manitoba.

The Five-Year Plan that the Member for Turtle Mountain relates to, I think, is a very narrow look at the ecosystem of Manitoba in looking particularly at game species, and looking at them as the legislation required them to do as was set up by the Member for Turtle Mountain, I believe, when he was the Minister, designating, Mr. Speaker, that they look at the demand for and the use of particular species and aimed simply at the game species as if the other species didn't hardly exist, except for nominal mention.

We have to look at the overall ecosystem, the animals that are there that they want to go and hunt, or other people want to go and hunt as well, or that I may want to take my binoculars or hike through the bush to be able to observe in a peaceful manner, that those animals and the health of their ecosystem is dependent almost totally on the maintenance of habitat.

The Member for Turtle Mountain just hollers from his desk, that's nonsense. Well, I think that's his problem, Mr. Speaker, is that he, I don't think, really appreciates fully the impact that the road networks have, that the access that people have towards, in hunting in particular, the increased access that they have through snowmobiles, through the road network that has been built in the bush countries. Those are the things that are affecting the wildlife more than any other single issue.

Society, if we are to be a responsible society, must recognize that we have a very strong role to play in the maintenance and the preservation of our ecosystem. To deal with it, we must deal with it on a very broad basis. We must bring in all sectors of society, and in

particular Native people, to bring them in as active participants, Mr. Speaker, in the determination of programs and of plans towards how much of a harvest can be taken, how much of a harvest can be encouraged in some instances as well. For without the understanding of each individual animal and each individual species and the role that they play in the total ecosystem, one is asking not just for a degradation of particular species, but one is asking for a degradation of total ecosystems.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to start out by saying that I have a few comments to make on this bill, and I will start with the time that is left - or the resolution, I'm sorry - I want to first of all acknowledge the fact that my colleague for Turtle Mountain has recognized a very serious problem.

I want to, as well, recognize my colleagues on this side of the House who have pointed out very capably the kind of difficult situation that has arisen because of the problems with the maintenance of law and order in the province. I want to condemn the Provincial Government, the New Democratic Party, for their lack of understanding of what really is taking place with the wildlife situation. I do not want to degrade personally the last speaker, as he did to my colleague for Turtle Mountain, who made a personal attack on an individual who brought a resolution in that was with good meaning and good intent.

I want to deal specifically, Mr. Speaker, with one particular part of the amendment that was brought in by the government. How phony this government really is. Their main thrust of their amendment, Mr. Speaker, is to consult with a group of people in society. They don't give a darn, Mr. Speaker, about that particular group in society. The Native people in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, are less thought of by the New Democratic Party than they are by the Progressive Conservative Party. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I want to put it on the record that they are less thought of, because who in Canadian history, who was the Prime Minister that gave the Native people of Canada the right to vote? John Diefenbaker, Mr. Speaker, gave the Indian people in Canada the right to vote. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it was John Diefenbaker that gave them the right to vote, a person in this country who felt very strongly towards the rights of the Native people. We, Mr. Speaker, feel equally as strong towards the Native people and their rights to participate in a democratic society.

They, Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party say they want to consult with them. Well, Mr. Speaker, we've

seen examples of the consultation process. We have seen examples of their consultation. My colleague for Minnedosa can give you the example of consulting about the crop insurance office in Minnedosa. Oh yes, the Premier made a great trip through western and southwestern Manitoba, wringing his hands, looking at the problems, seeing the roads that have gone to Hades, seeing the fact that there is nothing left to drive on with the oil activity that's going on. He talked about, to the media, the need for changing the legislation protecting the ownership of land in Manitoba. He talks to the people about consulting with them in Minnedosa, and they turn around and blatantly, through a political move, move into the constituency of the Member for Ste. Rose, into Neepawa, Mr. Speaker. That is the kind of consultation that we're hearing from the members opposite.

So now what they are going to do; they have amended a good resolution, Mr. Speaker, which has the intent of treating the Native people fairly, asking them to live within the same kinds of laws as everyone else in Manitoba for the preservation of their livelihood that have been written within the Treaty rights of Canada, for the preservation of the food source that has been traditionally theirs. I will get into that when I have my time again, Mr. Speaker, but the whole problem with this government is, they say one thing and do the other.

They don't give a darn about the Native people in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker. They only want to play up to the Native people in Manitoba for their own political purposes, Mr. Speaker, and get elected. That is the only reason. The people who live within the Native community and all the Natives in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, believe very strongly in fairness and equality. That's what we believe in as Progressive Conservatives, Mr. Speaker, and that is what we will continue to strive for.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time being 5:30, when this resolution is next before the House, the honourable member will have 15 minutes remaining.

The Chair will accept a motion to adjourn.

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, that, subject to the committees meeting this evening, this House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow (Friday).