



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 Walding
Speaker*



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 63B - 8:00 p.m., MONDAY, 9 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	Virden	PC
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry M.	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupert Island	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

Monday, 9 May, 1983.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - NATURAL RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: Committee, please come to order. We are still on 9(a)(1), where we started - the Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We may be where we started almost until we finish.

I'd like to ask the Minister some questions about the management imperatives which have been identified in the five-year report, the continued loss of habitat obviously being one of the main concerns; the two principal concerns of Wildlife Management being the ability to control the harvest or to manipulate the habitat. The Minister gave us some information earlier that 51,800 hectares of upland habitat are lost each year as a consequence of agricultural development. Can the Minister tell us how many hectares or how many acres, square miles, whatever, of habitat are developed or saved as a consequence of the government's programs on a yearly basis?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, yes, I'll endeavour to do that. By way of preliminary, I might indicate that I am certain that most people appreciate the fact that this is a difficult time for government to spend considerable money in connection with the development of wildlife habitat when dollars are precious for job creation or initiatives that have a high labour input; but nevertheless we have over the course of a relatively short period of time that I've been Minister developed some additional wildlife habitat. It's not anything like the numbers of hectares or acres, whichever honourable members would prefer, that we lose, and there's no question about that.

By way of additional information, Mr. Chairman, I'm advised by Ducks Unlimited that the acreage that is lost to wetland in the United States per year is something like 500,000 acres per year. We have throughout North America a very serious problem in connection with retention and preservation of wildlife habitat. It is disappearing on a very large scale.

In 1982-83, a wildlife management area was established as an addition to the Narcisse Wildlife Management area to encompass the snake den area. It's 320 acres or 130 hectares. It was a land trade of agriculturally suitable land deleted from the Clematis Wildlife Management area, and I suppose being a trade, there's really no additional wildlife management area. Not really, the director indicates.

In 1982-83, we did acquire some additional wildlife habitat in southeastern Manitoba to the extent of 480 acres or 194 hectares, and as I indicated earlier, I hope to be making some further comment about that. In my

answer to the Member for Emerson, I indicated that groups were involved in that and I wanted to share with them any announcement in connection with the overall development.

I might also add that private lands that are currently being acquired for inclusion in Wildlife Management areas, an area of 840 acres or 340 hectares, these lands are being exchanged for Wildlife Management lands, 230 acres, 53 hectares, better suited for agriculture. So, there is a net gain there in wildlife management acreage.

We propose, for new wildlife management areas, an area of 72,700 acres, or 29,400 hectares. As I indicated earlier on, I was pleased - and this isn't reflected in these statistics, I assume - to receive the dedication of the 160 acres and I don't have the immediate translation for hectares, I'm sorry, as a wildlife refuge in the Vista area. As well, a major facility to bring people closer to wildlife proceed that at Oak Hammock and other points.

MR. B. RANSOM: Having had this problem identified to him now, and it's evident from the program just outlined that it's relatively small compared to the magnitude of the problem, what, if anything, is the Minister contemplating by way of expansion of programs?

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I did indicate the numbers of the proposed additional Wildlife Management acres that we proposed to acquire as quickly as we can and when funds are available.

MR. B. RANSOM: That is the Minister's response then to the problems outlined in the Five-Year Report and to the facts stated, for instance, 20 percent loss of habitat for the next five years, I believe the figure is.

HON. A. MACKLING: No, Mr. Chairman, I will not accept the abbreviation of everything that I've said earlier, by the honourable member. I've indicated that there is no doubt that we have to get more Alexander McPhails in the province donating land to the people of Manitoba as a place for wildlife. We also have to convince all of our legislators and all of the people of Manitoba that consideration for the exemption of marginal land, either wetland or in cover, is appropriate in order to stop the drainage or the clearing of land that should not be drained or cleared. I might say, also, that we continue to work with the Conservation Districts in respect to rehabilitation of land that was once put under the plow and should not be and it, again, adds to the potential for wildlife habitat. There are many segments of an overall thrust in connection with public education in respect to this problem.

Honourable members may have recalled the fact that during National Wildlife Week, we had a poster contest, and although it may seem rather insignificant or not all that meaningful, let me assure honourable members it is important that young people, particularly in schools,

understand and appreciate the problem of wildlife and the need to preserve wildlife habitat. So the focus of our poster contest and our prose contest in which a large number of schools participated, particularly a large number of rural schools, focused on the question of wildlife habitat. I was pleased, on behalf of the people of Manitoba, to be able to present the successful winners with binoculars and books on wildlife.

In this way, Mr. Chairman, we instill early, I trust, a love and appreciation for wildlife and the necessary base for wildlife and that is habitat, that we need to preserve it. We have to get this message to each individual owner of land in Manitoba so that there will be a continued preservation of land.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, we're not getting very specific answers from the Minister in that area. Perhaps I would try him on another area.

Page 56, refers to a problem that exists in the Oak Hammock and Whitewater Lake areas where there are very large numbers of non-resident hunters competing with the resident hunters there, and that it's an area of emerging concern. Can the Minister give an indication whether or not he plans to make any changes in the regulations governing hunting by non-residents in those areas?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, extensive discussion took place recently within the department in which I participated, in focus on the problem that exists in some areas of the province where there is concern about the issue of non-resident hunting seeming to provide a very substantial pressure not only on the resource, but I suppose competing with resident hunters. Southwestern Manitoba - or I think parts of it in particular, I think Whitewater Lake and some other portions of southwestern Manitoba - are focused as areas where this pressure has seemingly developed.

However, there seem to be several points of view. We have, through the branch, talked with people in the area. I admit that I haven't talked to the Member for Turtle Mountain or the Member for Arthur and others to date to weigh their opinion, and I'd appreciate their opinion here as to the problem.

There seem to be several points of view; one point of view that the towns in the area welcome the influx of the hunters. It does produce some additional benefit. There are licences purchased. In some instances, I'm sure, there are shells, supplies purchased. There are hotels that are used by these hunters, some of them; I admit that some of them may come self-contained in their own camping units and so on. But there seems to be a mixed view about how and how quickly and to what extent we apply any differentiation in the policy that existed in the past in respect to hunting in this area.

After discussing this matter at some length, I am persuaded that the way that we will deal with it is, this year, have a very full consultation in the communities, particularly in the southwestern part of Manitoba, where these complaints have arisen to determine what the perceived problems are with precision, and to get an appreciation for what people in the area believe might be reasonable alternatives to consider. What we did - and we discussed a number of alternatives. I might

confirm to the honourable members that there will be an increase in the non-resident, that is non-resident of Canada, game licence this year. There was a consideration of a partial closing of some areas to non-resident hunters; a consideration of closing some areas for non-resident hunters during certain periods of the week, say Saturdays and Mondays - that's one of the proposals we looked at. We also looked at the proposal to sharply reduce bag limits for non-residents and a number of options.

Quite frankly, it was not an easy problem to resolve, and after, I say, a very lengthy discussion on this question, having heard the views, I should also indicate, of those in the Manitoba Wildlife Federation, we decided that we would have to look at alternatives, but consult over a period of time with area residents, area hunters, area businessmen and that is our intention during this year, Mr. Chairman, to monitor the situation very closely, consult it as effectively as we can with residents and concerned people, including the municipalities in the area, and see what course of action can be recommended.

I might say this will also co-ordinate with the completion of the five-year waterfowl bag limits and seasons, so it will give us an opportunity to make some, I think, better-balanced and weighted decisions in respect to that problem.

MR. B. RANSOM: So really the Minister isn't going to make any change in this area this year then. He's going to be monitoring further. I can just briefly tell the Minister that as far as I'm concerned, and as far as a lot of people in that area are concerned, that they have passed the point now where the non-resident hunters are having a negative impact on the quality of recreation that's available to Manitobans and to other Canadians. That kind of experience, the quality hunting that is available there, is one of the things that attracts people into rural Manitoba, to live in small towns, and it's been one of the things that has made that area attractive in the fall and we now find the situation where non-resident hunters are coming in in great numbers. They're extremely well-equipped. The local hunter who simply goes out after work, or on a Saturday to hunt, simply isn't in a position to compete anymore and we find that areas in publicly-owned land, that presumably are kept primarily for the benefit of Manitobans and Canadians, are no longer available to the local people because they can only accommodate so many hunters.

So I would urge the Minister to consider taking action. One of the very simple things that he might do would be simply to confine the non-resident, non-Canadian hunters to private land to which they can gain access, and that the publicly-owned lands would be retained primarily for the benefit of Manitobans and other Canadians and the non-residents of Canada who could gain access to private land would be able to do so. I think you'd find there were still substantial numbers of people coming into the area and making use of local facilities and doing business there, etc.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I thank the honourable member for his observations and certainly that was one of the alternatives that was suggested as well. There is, as identified in our discussions in

respect to that particular proposal, kind of an ancillary problem that has been developing and that is, it's maybe not in that area but that focus of the non-resident hunter on private lands in southwestern Manitoba could produce a continuation or an enlargement of a problem we're getting in the Oak Hammock Marsh area, where Manitoba-resident hunters are contending at least, that non-resident, particularly American hunters, have been enabled to buy up hunting rights for blocks of time and Manitoba hunters are being foreclosed of their hunting option in that area.

It's something we have to look at very carefully. I neglected to mention also, that because of our concerns and the concerns of the residents in the area we've been talking about, the Federal Government has assured us that they will provide an enhanced enforcement effort in this coming hunting season.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I've got a couple of different concerns I'd like to raise. First off, following up some of the concerns raised by members opposite on habitat itself, and I'm very much concerned and as the Minister has already mentioned, we certainly need more Alex McPhails. I think there is something we can be working on with rural landowners in particular, because that's the primary group of people who are involved with it, in raising awareness of things they can do in their communities.

One proposal I have that I think I would like to see reaction, not just from the Minister but also from members of the opposition too, as to how they feel about it, would be to move in towards wildlife corridors along rivers and streams.

Prior to 1931 and The Resource Transfer Act, I understand title was given to the riverbeds and streambeds as well, but after 1931, on lands deeded after that date, I believe there was a 99-foot limit from the upper water shore of the river or stream, that that distance back remained as Crown land. Now a lot of that land has now been under cultivation and was cultivated in some instances right up to the riverbanks.

I would like to make a proposal, and I would like to have some reaction to it from members, not necessarily here tonight, but also just in general about what they would feel if we tried to work on a co-operative program with landowners and farmers leasing some Crown lands as well along rivers and streams, for them to move back the intensive agricultural use of the land, say, to 99 feet from that river or stream, therefore creating a substantial network of wildlife corridors much more so than they are currently throughout parts of the province where wildlife has been very detrimentally affected by the destruction of habitat. This area along the rivers and streams is quite an extensive network of corridors that would be created there, or at least they are there presently, but with the assistance of the department for reforestation in some instances, other instances it may not be appropriate, but it would work in extreme bank stabilization as well. It would work along the enhancement of the rivers and the streams; and because the buffer of non-cultivated land between the agricultural use of the land and the rivers itself is also a tremendous buffer for absorption of agricultural

chemicals and fertilizers from getting into the river systems, which can cause both death to the aquatic as well as to the land-based animals using that habitat.

Well, I guess that's the first thing I'd like to put out for a bit of general comment. Would you like to respond?

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comment from the Member for Inkster. It's something that certainly we can look at. I know that one thing we have to be concerned with is bank stabilization, and if we've got cultivated land right up to the edge of the rivers and streams, we are risking the stability of the banks and so on, and I would think that some growth along the banks is appropriate to maintain them, and that growth can certainly provide suitable habitat.

I might say, and honourable members may have some fun talking about this one or in my comment about this one, but I've made some further observations from aircraft. While flying to Vista the other day - it was a remarkably clear day despite the haze - we saw quite a number of snow geese migrating north, but we also saw the Assiniboine River in its closest point to flood stage along its course; but what was very interesting to note was the old oxbows of the river path from days gone by. I have asked the director and we are going to look at the question of the use or the propriety of the use of some of the oxbows that really are far too low - they are parts of the old river bed - for a realistic agricultural cultivation because most of them contained a lot of water in the spring, gradually dry out towards fall, and are very marginal habitat lands because of that.

I would like the department to look at those oxbows from the point of view of enhancing the opportunity for wildlife habitat and I have an assurance that we're going to do that.

MR. D. SCOTT: Well, those words are certainly most encouraging, Mr. Chairman . . .

A MEMBER: Were you with him in the airplane?

MR. D. SCOTT: Yes, I was with him in the airplane and something else I noticed from the airplane.

HON. A. MACKLING: They were key observers, gentlemen.

MR. D. SCOTT: Key observers. Yes, it's amazing what you can see from the air. On a nice clear day you can see forever. One of the things like canvasbacks, they show up just beautifully and I wish in some ways that we'd had the Congressman Conte (Phonetic) from Massachusetts with us as well, because he could have, as a very keen observer and hunter for the canvasback in particular, in his office he has one, and I'm sure he would have been just tickled pink to see the number of the canvasbacks we saw, especially in the Minnedosa area.

That brings me to the other point from aerial observation, is the amount of pothole consolidation that is going on. We have, I guess, one department that is encouraging pothole consolidation in the Department of Agriculture. At the same time we have

another department that is spending considerable amounts of money to maintain and to restore areas for waterfowl, in particular, waterfowl habitat. I would like to see us taking some efforts, I guess — (Interjection) — Can I have a little order, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. D. SCOTT: You do not get anywhere near the habitat for waterfowl, in particular, out of two or three consolidated potholes, rather than five or six that were on the land originally. I can appreciate it as well from the farmer's perspective that having to farm around all those potholes is darn inconvenient.

But having travelled a couple of years ago into southern Saskatchewan and what was, at one time, prime pothole land and they have pretty near all of those potholes drained now and the place is now a virtual wasteland for waterfowl because everything has been drained. We can work as much as we want in preserving areas like the Saskeram, but they're not going to produce anywhere near as much waterfowl as land in its natural state in the southern part of the province with the potholes in their normal state. So we have to, I think, look very clearly at what we are doing, both as industrial and agricultural land, towards the habitat. I don't see that we've learned that many lessons.

The other point I wanted to raise and this is a final point, Mr. Chairman, is dealing with Sunday hunting. I have a number of the regulations and also copies of the Act dating back to 1971 and going up until 1982. In 1971, The Wildlife Act stated under Section 15(1) Hunting on Sundays, "A person who kills or hunts a wild animal on a Sunday is guilty of an offence and is liable under summary conviction to a fine not exceeding \$200, or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding one month, or both such a fine and such imprisonment." In 1980 that was softened up a little bit. In Section 25 of the 1980 Act, The Wildlife Act again, I'm referring to, under the title Sunday Hunting, "Except as otherwise permitted by this Act, or the regulations, no person shall hunt or kill, or attempt to kill a wild animal on Sunday." So there they were opening the thing up so there could be some potential under the Act for Sunday hunting.

The 19 regulations of that year, 1980, made only one reference to Sunday hunting and on the cover page, the first page, I guess, of the regulations, it states very clearly that hunting is not permitted on Sundays. In 1981 on that same page, right on the first page of the - at least I believe it's the first page - of the 1981 regulations, under Non-Game Hunting it states, "Licences are not required to hunt unprotected, non-game species such as rabbits. Unprotected species may be hunted at any time of the year, including Sundays." That's clearly a dramatic change from what was in 1971, or even the previous year, where it stated very emphatically that hunting is not permitted on Sundays and now we have it for a so-called non-game species in 1981, and it's expanded so that the non-game species can be hunted on that day.

A MEMBER: Who was the Minister then who did that?

MR. D. SCOTT: The Minister at that time - 1981, spring of 1981, I guess would have the Member for Lakeside.

I don't know if he was acting on his own or under pressure from outside groups or other forces within his Cabinet. In 1981 the regulations further stated . . .

MR. H. ENNS: I never did like rabbits.

MR. D. SCOTT: That's what I was afraid of. Harry, you see it's your antipathy towards rabbits and squirrels that has me worried.

In 1981 under General Regulations, General Closures and Restrictions it says, "Hunting for game birds and big game species is not permitted on Sundays." Then in 1982, once again on the first page, it says, "Hunting for game birds and big game species is not permitted on Sundays." But then under Licencing Information, it states that, "Under small game hunting licences are not required to hunt unprotected small game species such as rabbits. Unprotected species may be hunted at any time of the year including Sundays."

So, Mr. Chairman, you can see that the concerns that I and an awful lot of other people have towards Sunday hunting have been able to go out into the bush, particularly on Crown land, and not have to be worried about someone out plinking away at squirrels, or whatever. You're not supposed to even have a rifle. If you're out in the bush, you're usually out in the bush with a rifle to hunt and for the non-hunter and for other people, I think Sunday is a time of peace and it's not a time for target practice. It's not a time for going out and trying to kill various small critters just because they're not classified under The Game Act.

So I would like to let my objections state with my previous statements, quite clearly, that I am very much opposed to what seems to be and what clearly has been the erosion of the principle of no hunting on Sundays. In one decade we've gone from a clear statement of no hunting on Sundays to a section in 1982, where it says that the other species are allowed. We have a couple of members here - the members of the opposition have been catcalling me all through this short presentation, Mr. Chairman, but I don't know if they don't share my concerns towards hunting on Sundays or that they want to open it up more and I guess while they were in office they certainly opened - I hope it's not a floodgate - but they certainly opened the gate towards hunting on Sundays. Whether it's plinking at gophers, or whether they want to shoot on gophers, people know and knew in the past that it was clearly against the law even to hunt gophers on a Sunday . . .

MR. L. HYDE: Oh, put another conrol on it, for heaven sakes.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Chairman, when the Act in 1971 stated, "A person who hunts or kills a wild animal on a Sunday is guilty of an offence and is liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding \$200 or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding one month, or to both such a fine and to such an imprisonment." And if the Member for Turtle Mountain doesn't think a gopher or a rabbit or a squirrel isn't a wild animal, then I don't know what the heck he thinks a wild animal is. Maybe out his way he's got them all tamed. I don't know. That's how he shoots them.

A MEMBER: The last time I was attacked by a rabbit, he was very tame.

MR. D. SCOTT: If it was Jimmy Carter - he got attacked on a Sunday afternoon on a rabbit hunt, I know. So, Mr. Chairman, that's my comments on this and I would like to see us move back towards the spirit of the original Act for 1971. It clearly stated, as the regulations in 1980 clearly stated, that hunting is not allowed on Sundays, be it for small game or non-game species or whatever.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, I just want to go on record for target practice on Sundays.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, to take them in reverse order, dealing with the latter question the Member for Inkster has brought to my attention, he has indicated to me his concern about that. I haven't had an opportunity to review that concern with staff of the department. Part of the difficulty may be in the definition of what a wild animal is that one is not allowed to hunt. Wild animals are defined in the Act and therefore it may be that from time immemorial rabbits, squirrels and so forth were not identified in the Act as wild animals where the Act would apply.

However, I have undertaken with the member to look at that whole question, because I think that the common understanding in Manitoba has been that you don't go into the woods with your rifle, a .22 rifle or otherwise, on the Sunday shooting rabbits. Now that was always the common perception, that you didn't shoot on Sunday. — (Interjection) — I hear honourable members saying - at least that was the common perception that I had and I — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, I am hearing that there is some doubt about the accuracy of what I say. Maybe that's gross understatement, but in any event let me say that the question is one that I indicated to the member I would look at the regulations and confirm to him and the other individuals that I've heard from in connection with this.

In respect to pothole consolidation, there is no doubt that there has been the draining of potholes in this province that did not make sense; that is, there have been attempts to make usable, arable land out of land that should stay wetland. However, there are instances where farmers have shallow, depressed areas on their land, and with effective drainage into one depressed area, there could be a usable pothole developed for waterfowl and you would get a net gain of more arable land and you would get a pothole that would actually be the base or the habitat for wildfowl over a nesting period.

So there is a basis of looking at pothole consolidation. Maybe the description, pothole, may not be appropriate to the kind of improved drainage that I am talking about, but I have indicated to the Conservation District Board my concern about this issue; that we don't try to eliminate potholes where we shouldn't be trying to; and that the consolidation should be such that we really do get a net gain to agriculture. So I think the Conservation Boards are aware of the merits of responsible drainage, and I anticipate that they will follow those guidelines.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Still on the same line of questioning? The Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: It seems that the Wildlife Branch, itself, didn't have any trouble in 1980 in determining what wild animal, whatever it was, because it said simply that hunting is not permitted, and not is in a heavy type or heavier type than the rest of the sentence — (Interjection) — bold, yes. Hunting is not permitted on Sundays.

Now maybe shooting - they want to get into some identification or some new definition of what hunting is. Hunting, to me, is taking some form of a weapon or your hand or whatever else and shooting something or killing something. If that's what hunting is, then it says it is clearly not permitted on Sundays. So it's pretty clear in the mind of the general public, I think, that hunting must not be permitted on Sundays. That's all I have to say on the matter, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: I want to be fair. He's next.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, he is? Okay. The Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, the Minister, I don't think, clearly answered the question of the Member for Inkster. I'm wondering if he can tell me what the definition of wild animals are in the Act.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I will read The Wildlife Act, Section 1, in the Definition Section, "Wild animal" - this is (y), Clause (y) - "means an animal or bird of a species or type listed in Schedule A or declared by the regulations to be a wild animal." Then Schedule A has a very long list of animals and birds.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Rather than read the whole thing, Mr. Chairman, can the Minister tell us if it includes rabbits, gophers and tree squirrels.

HON. A. MACKLING: Not that I can see.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It says of the type, it is only listed.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister then confirm that the hunting of animals such as rabbits, gophers and squirrels that has been going on in rural Manitoba for many years despite the amendment in 1980, and it's that particular practice that has occasioned municipalities, such as my home municipality, the R.M. of Springfield, to have passed a by-law over 50 years ago prohibiting any hunting whatsoever on Sunday, and other municipalities which might have had some concern and felt The Wildlife Act was not adequate in terms of banning Sunday hunting, have, by local option, banned any hunting whatsoever on Sundays? Can the Minister confirm that's the case?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I can confirm that. I should correct one point. I didn't read the extensive list, but the red squirrel not the grey squirrel, but the red squirrel is a wild animal and cannot be

hunted on Sunday — (Interjection) — well, yes and I don't know whether we've changed that by the regulations.

MR. B. RANSOM: Can it be trapped on Sundays?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, it can be trapped.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister then advise this committee what the effect was of the change then in terms of the way his department administered the Act and the regulations thereunder, of the change that was made in 1980 to the Act and to the section quoted by the Member for Inkster?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, my department confirms that from their perspective there was no change. It could be that there is some misunderstanding because of the interpretation of the Act by laypersons and the fact that the wording in the regulations was changed somewhat.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is confirming that, in effect, there has been change in hunting practices with regard to Sunday hunting or no Sunday hunting since 1971 or whatever the consolidated statute reference was that the Member for Inkster used?

HON. A. MACKLING: No, Mr. Chairman. I won't confirm what change in practice has occurred by people. I don't know that. I know the department says that from their perspective there's been no change in the law or the regulations.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, I guess my question wasn't carefully worded enough. I was referring to department practice in administering the Act and the regulations. There's been no change in the last 15 years or thereabouts. Can the Minister confirm that?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Thank you.

There was some further discussion on hunting this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, that gave me some cause for concern. We were talking about Crown land.

Peripherally to that discussion I was wondering if the Minister's given any consideration to the concerns of many persons having Crown land under agricultural lease and the abuse of the privilege which is granted. I call it a privilege, because I have some difficulty calling it a right, to hunters to in many ways infringe upon the leasehold rights of the farmer in their use of their privilege of access through that land, across it and whatever.

I'm referring to damage done by four-wheel drive vehicles, the cutting of fences, the use of fields for target practice, especially haystacks and things like that set up as backdrops even when there's cattle in fields. I have some serious concerns about that and I'm wondering what the department's been doing.

I know this has been an ongoing problem, it's existed for many years. I realize that a whole series of

governments of various stripes have attempted to maintain the rights, because Crown lands are so pervasive in the good hunting areas of the province that limiting access is not something we could consider, but what are we doing to control the kinds of abuse that are taking place?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, as the honourable member knows Crown land leases for agricultural use do allow hunting access during the legal seasons. The Wildlife Act does provide for the prosecution of people who damage agricultural property or equipment. There is no question, but there is a minority of hunters who will offend, in some instances, their rights by damaging property. The difficulty is in apprehending them at the time.

The honourable member refers to interference with haystacks, or using haystacks for a backdrop for shooting, and cutting fences. These things do occur. We do have a program for compensation for livestock that have been lost during the hunting season. We have made no provision for miscellaneous damage to farms, because I think it might be a very, very difficult area to administer. We do our best in trying to educate the licensed hunter to obey the law and to be mindful and respectful of the rights of the landowner.

For some time the Manitoba Wildlife Federation had a program called Operation Respect. It was well-received. I think that with the passage of the new Wildlife Act that made it mandatory that any hunter obtain permission for going on private land, that that program has not been pursued as it had been in the past.

It may well be that we can persuade user groups such as the Wildlife Federation to reinstitute a more, vigorous program of that nature. Certainly there are ongoing problems, but we think that it would be far too restrictive to take the agricultural leased lands out of the areas where hunting can obtain. In most instances, the hunting seasons are targeted, if I can use that expression, to ensure that most livestock should be or certainly could be out of the leased land when the season is on.

I think that's all I'll say right now, Mr. Chairman.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister advise how many dollars were paid out by his department last year in compensation for livestock shot during the hunting season on any type of land, either under agricultural lease, or under private ownership? And does the Minister have a breakdown between the land on which compensation was paid if the land was leased as opposed to under direct private ownership?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, no we haven't got a breakdown. I think that the most current statistics we would have would be those contained for the conclusion of the 1981-82 season.

Staff are looking for statistics on that now as may be contained in the Annual Report. If not, we'll try and get that information to the committee.

MR. A. ANSTETT: The second question, Mr. Chairman: Has the Minister's department given any consideration to some suggestions I've heard with regard to this whole question of obtaining permission to hunt under the rules

that were made a few years ago; specifically to providing a standard form of sign for use by farmers where farmers had some concern about this, or perhaps requiring a standard permission agreement where farmers were concerned about the use of verbal permission, which is the current practice, and some sort of standard contract or standard agreement, or letter of permission that would be entered into, and standard form of sign which would show those farmers who had a special concern about this? Has there been any discussions about providing that, since particularly on agricultural-leased land, there's some real concerns, because this tends to be in those areas where you've got grazing leases, and it seems that it's in those areas where you're going to have pressure on cattle by deer hunters?

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate there can be a conflict between seasons in some areas. I would disagree that it would likely be in respect to deer hunters and those with livestock, except perhaps maybe in some early seasons. Quite frankly, I don't see that as any very significant problem.

I know that we did have discussions with people in the wildlife federation about the question of getting a written permission to go on private land, because of the concerns that people of enforcement, people saying well they thought they had permission or something else, and it would facilitate enforcement if there was a written requirement. But we quite frankly want to weigh that pretty carefully before we go that route because it becomes pretty difficult to implement.

In some instances, for example, people make decisions to go hunting whether it be for migratory waterfowl, or upland bird, or big game animals. In order to get the written permission, oftentimes they'd have to awaken someone or find them in the area after they've driven to the countryside and often that is a very grave inconvenience, not only to the hunter but also the landowner. — (Interjection) — Yes, as the honourable member says, it's kind of like double hunting. We certainly haven't ruled that out, but we haven't decided that should be mandatory this year. We are promoting the idea of operation respect. We're using that sort of sign where we have concerns about people going on the land where it's agricultural leased land.

In respect to the numbers, in 1982-83, we paid out \$9,100 for compensation for livestock lost; in 1981-82, the previous season, we paid \$6,300, and those were determined to be hunter accidentally shot livestock.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, does this indicate that the present government is more generous or that there has been more dangerous hunting taking place since the change in government - these figures?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I think the statistics can be interpreted many ways; it could be none of those things.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, if we're talking \$9,100 last year, and I take it the bulk of the animals, the livestock that would have been shot would have been cattle, and yet the Minister suggests that particularly

with regard to cattle, there is no conflict between hunting for deer and the shooting of cattle or other large game, deer, moose, whatever. From what we're hearing, there aren't that many moose to be had out there. I'm just wondering how the Minister rationalizes the fact that he's been paying out this amount of money in the department over several years if there aren't any cattle in the way of deer. If there is no conflict - well, if these were people, we'd be looking at 25 or 30 people a year in terms of taking a rough estimate in terms of value of these cattle.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, of course, I couldn't recall a reconciliation of the claims, but I'm sure that some of the claims involve the accidental shooting of cattle very close to farm or ranch operations, hunters not realizing that they were in such close proximity to the buildings or the areas where the livestock were herded.

I might say that in respect to the quantum, 691 as to 6.3, it largely depends on the quality of the cattle, or what have you. I recall recently signing a confirmation in respect to a horse, and that had a fairly substantial value because it was a relatively young horse and a good horse, and it seems to me that it was far higher than most of the claims that have been authorized.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Member for Arthur hasn't lost any cattle and that's why he's not concerned about the double hunt he's suggested be involved in finding the owner of the land. Mr. Chairman, I have constituents who have lost cattle in this situation, who have some serious concerns about what's been happening. If the Member for Arthur isn't concerned about that, that's his problem.

I certainly support the compensation program, since he's asked that question, but I have some concerns about how it's being organized and about how the enforcement is taking place and the whole question of permission; because when the Minister tells me this is happening close to buildings or farmsteads, he's increasing the level of my concern because that confirms the fact that these animals are no longer far away from the farmstead in a grazing situation maybe on leased land, but are close to buildings and that hunting's taking place close to the farm and the farmstead where the owner is easily identified and cattle are being shot or horses there. That concerns me about the hunting practices that are taking place and the adherence by hunters to the regulations requiring them to seek permission.

So I look to the Minister for some assurance that his department is taking some action to reduce these costs because I believe that every dollar paid out in that program, although it's necessary and I agree with the compensation, is a demonstration of the failure of the government to prevent this kind of careless hunting activity; and in many cases, because it's not possible, I understand, to identify the hunter, providing further evidence that those hunters aren't seeking permission by identifying themselves to the farmer on whose land they're hunting, which indicates another problem with the program. I'm wondering how the department is addressing that. I agree with the program, but I believe every dollar that comes out of that fund is further proof

of the failure of the regulatory system to ensure that these kind of activities don't take place.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, my chuckle is at your note; I won't read it. Mr. Chairman, you and I are entitled to have our private correspondence. — (Interjection) — Yes, that's right, and I may agree or disagree with your private note.

However, in respect to the observations made by the Member for Springfield, the department does not take lightly the loss of animals and the consequent claims that are put to the government. We are concerned about it. We can't have conservation officers everywhere watching over the operations of individual hunters. We do operate a Hunter Safety Program. We make it mandatory that persons starting out hunting take a Hunter Safety Program. When people have had any problems with hunting, we recommend that they take the hunter safety training course. We counsel safety; we provide in our regulations, in our guidelines, as much public education as we can about the need to respect rights. It's not a simple matter. We just can't simply eliminate the irresponsible hunter, just like we can't eliminate the irresponsible driver on our highways - people who drink and drive. There's always going to be a small number who disregard the law, and we have to contend with that.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, do the compensation figures for 1981-82, 1982-83, include in the figures we were given this evening compensation for livestock killed by means other than by hunters; for example, depredation by other forms of wildlife?

HON. A. MACKLING: No, Mr. Chairman, there are other statistics for that.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Can the Minister advise how much money was paid out in either one of those years in that category?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, staff will look up the statistics, but we have compensation programs dealing with apiaries. We have, particularly in the region of the mountains - the Ducks, the Porcupines, the Riding Mountain - extensive claims for damage to beehives and loss of honey by black bears primarily. We also have claims in respect to damage to crops, of course, by waterfowl and we have claims for damage to standing crops from bears.

Big game compensation paid 1981-82 for damage was 159,000 - I'll say 160,000 - and 1982-83, 176,000. The breakdown - yes I have - this appears in the Annual Report. Compensation for big game damage to crops: Deer, 105 claims of \$102,915; Elk, 12 claims, \$14,144; and Bear, 84 claims, \$44,487.00.

Now the Waterfowl Damage Prevention and Compensation is a separate item. I could touch on that, but I think you know that the numbers are significant. There is a shared-cost program between the province and Federal Government in respect to crop depredation.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, what about the killing of livestock by, for example, wolves affecting sheep?

HON. A. MACKLING: No compensation, Mr. Chairman. I might say also that some animals are obviously killed

by hunters who do not appreciate the fact that they actually accidentally did kill an animal. They may shoot at an animal that they do not find. They do not realize that they have killed a domestic animal because they don't find it; they don't see it. It may be a stray bullet. It may not be a premeditated kill at all.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, has the department given any consideration to provision of compensation for livestock killed by wild animals, particularly in relation to the concern expressed in portions of eastern Manitoba over the last several years, and in the Interlake, about the increasing presence of a very elusive animal, the cougar, which very few people see; but there has been some fairly regular suggestions of killings by cougar of farm livestock, particularly sheep and young calves, some as recently as in the last two weeks in my constituency. What is happening in that regard?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I haven't had a report up until this point about the killings alleged to be by cougar. I know that earlier on this year - or was it last fall - we had a number of sheep that were killed in the Interlake. The department finally tracked an older she-wolf that was finally slaughtered, and it was contended that a number of sheep had been killed by that wolf. It could well be, however, that a lot of the sheep had died from natural causes or other things. A very strict accounting was not readily obtainable by the branch in respect to those claims.

MR. A. ANSTETT: I'm wondering, Mr. Chairman, how sheep that have been torn limb from limb have died from natural causes. I have some difficulty when the farmer finds a sheep in their field — (Interjection) — no, Mr. Chairman, natural cause may have been loss of blood, yes, as the Member for Minnedosa suggests, after some wild animal has torn them limb from limb.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I did not suggest that sheep had died from natural causes having lost their head or lost a shoulder or lost a leg from causes unknown. I am indicating that the sheep rancher contended he had lost large numbers of livestock, large numbers of sheep. It was not possible to find the carcasses of these animals. It was not possible to determine, therefore, that they had actually been destroyed by predators or how they had been lost. They could have been poached or any number of reasons. There might have been a wrong count on the number of lambs that had been born. We don't know. We know that there were a number of kills. We did find and track one she-wolf, and it was eliminated.

Mr. Chairman, in most instances, good husbandry, good count, good watch over animals, particularly animals that are ranged, is necessary because it's very difficult to prove losses otherwise. I know that there are people who contend that the public should pick up the expense of animals that are destroyed by predator animals, domestic animals destroyed by predator animals. That is a very large area of administrative responsibility, and I question that we would want to consider that at the present time.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister confirm that in March of this year, staff in his

department, the Wildlife Branch, suggested to individuals in the Monominto area in eastern Manitoba that the tracks found near cattle, recent kills of calves, were the tracks of cougars or a cougar?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, staff present can't confirm that. There may have been words to someone else, but we don't know about that.

MR. A. ANSTETT: These would have been the field staff who, I assume, aren't present here tonight.

HON. A. MACKLING: That's right, Mr. Chairman.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Two other questions, Mr. Chairman. Section 1(h) of The Wildlife Act, Chapter W-140, provides that definition of hunting which includes trapping. I recall hearing the Member for Turtle Mountain suggest that trapping of red squirrels was allowed on Sundays. If I am to interpret properly what the Minister has advised us by the regulations, since trapping is included in the definition of hunting and hunting of red squirrels is prohibited on Sundays, does that then mean that trapping of red squirrels, which the Member for Turtle Mountain suggested was legal on Sundays, is or is not legal on Sundays?

HON. A. MACKLING: No, Mr. Chairman. Hunting is defined in the Act. If you want me to read it . . .

MR. A. ANSTETT: I have it in front of me.

HON. A. MACKLING: All right. It does not include trapping, as I understand it - oh, includes trapping?

MR. A. ANSTETT: Second line, last word.

HON. A. MACKLING: Just a minute. I'm getting a lot of advice, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I am advised that hunting includes trapping, and trapping has always been permitted on Sundays.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, on this same point, prior to the change in the Act in 1980, how was trapping permitted on Sunday if the Act specifically prohibited all hunting on Sunday?

HON. A. MACKLING: There has been no change, Mr. Chairman. Trapping was always permitted on any day of the week.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, as I recall from the excerpt quoted earlier in this committee, all hunting was prohibited on Sunday and that the definition of hunting has not been changed. At least, it doesn't show as having been changed.

HON. A. MACKLING: Hunting of game animals is prohibited on Sunday. Mr. Chairman, I might read from the General Trapping Information Guide, and it reads as follows: "Trapping on Sundays is permitted, provided that the trapper holds a valid trapping licence and trapping occurs during the period of the year and in the area where trapping of the species is permitted."

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, Section 15(1) of the old Act that was in effect in March, 1971, provided ". . . a person who hunts or kills a wild animal on Sunday is guilty of an offence and is liable on summary conviction, etc." There's no provision for any further exemptions from that in the regulation. Mr. Chairman, I apologize; 15(2) does allow trapping on Sundays. I'll go to my next point.

Mr. Chairman, there was an argument this afternoon and I didn't get an opportunity to enter into it. — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, maybe the Member for Portage la Prairie wants to take a trip and I suggest that if he does, that he not burden the committee with his itinerary. — (Interjection) — Yeah, the Member for Pembina suggests that the Member for Portage wants to go sample the magic mushrooms. They have those on the West Coast too.

A MEMBER: He got into them already.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Or he's been into them already. Yes, we're not sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. You are bordering on the irrelevant.

The Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: There was a suggestion this afternoon by the Member for Turtle Mountain, when he was commenting on the practice of nightlighting in the Province of Manitoba by non-Natives and Natives, that his only concern in raising the matter was to limit hunting methods, but he didn't want to in any way infringe upon the rights of Natives on the numbers that were taken or the seasons in which they were taken.

Mr. Minister, I'm wondering if you can see any way in which the limiting of hunting methods would in any way further protect those species whose numbers are endangered if there's no cap put on bag limits or on seasons. In other words, if the former Minister is suggesting that he wants no limitations or further regulation on numbers taken or seasons allowed by Natives, how is a limit on hunting methods going to in any way protect those species the member was concerned about?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, in total, I agree with the logic that the Honourable Member for Springfield is arguing. However, the short-term argument; that is, the loss of wildlife that can occur without there actually being a harvest and a use of the animal is substantially greater when the hunting occurs at night. In other words, animals can be shot, wounded and never recovered, and therefore lost to those who would otherwise be able to shoot that animal and actually consume it, so that there will be, therefore, more pressure to continue to hunt in order to get an animal to put on the table; I mean, to put meat on the table. But you're quite right when you say that unless there is consideration for the totality of the resource and the numbers that are available for consumption, that merely limiting the instrumentality of the hunt or the nature of the technique of kill will not provide the solution. The solution is conservation — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Chairman, I refuse to be drawn into a . . .

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, a further question on this subject. Is the Minister suggesting then that the suggestion of limiting hunting methods might have the desirable effect of limiting the total kill, particularly the wastage of animals, even if no changes were made in terms of regulating the number of game taken or the seasons in which the hunting can take place? In other words, would just an agreement to abolish nightlighting limit that activity, succeed in increasing population, because of the wastage which would then not occur? Is that what the Minister is suggesting?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm saying that a very limited objective of eliminating night hunting will not necessarily have the desired effect at all. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out and as the Five-Year Wildlife Report highlights, the problem area by way of wildlife at the present time are not those animals that are hunted by nightlighting. Moose are not animals that are customarily hunted by nightlight hunting. So the answer to the question from the Honourable Member for Springfield is, no. The concern that we have to have is not only conservation by the user groups including treaty Indian people, residential hunters, non-resident hunters, but we also have to establish a policy where we can ensure the retention of necessary habitat for wildlife.

MR. A. ANSTETT: One final question, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, has the enforcement section of the Minister's department increased in any way their attempts to limit dangerous hunting practices, particularly as those relate to nightlighting of big game in the last couple of years? Have they done anything as part of the Minister's expressed concern about this - what I consider a very dangerous form of hunting and to which I have some very strong opposition - to further limit that activity under those provisions which declare it to be dangerous hunting and therefore an offence. In other words, what has this Minister done which was not done by previous Ministers, because of his concern in this area and because of his knowledge about the loss of some of these big game species to limit what he considers to be not only a dangerous form of hunting, but a form of hunting which is directly leading to the wastage of these animals?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member should know that we deal with those concerns under a different section of the Estimates. However, in view of the fact that I've answered similar questions of other members after having pointed that out to them, I will point out that yes, we have increased the kind of communications equipment - we've upgraded the communications equipment that the branch has. We have a vigorous program of surveillance, including surveillance from aircraft. I don't say that it is substantially different from anything that has gone on before, but certainly it has increased the capacity of the force to deal more effectively with some of these problems.

MR. A. ANSTETT: How do the prosecution numbers compare with previous years, last year over previous years?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, when we get to Item 12, we will deal with them. I've answered some questions; I'll answer no more until we get there.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'll resist the opportunity of challenging some of the Minister's comments just recently about the method of hunting not having much impact on the game taken. Surely, this Minister wants to familiarize himself with what an airplane, for instance, can do to a herd of caribou swimming a lake, or certainly what a high-powered spotlight can do equipped out of the back seat of an all-terrain four-wheel drive vehicle, snowmobiles, etc. So I think the Minister may want to reconsider those comments, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, aside from having an interesting discussion about Sunday hunting and what is permissible and not, and other than suggesting that perhaps the Minister take the time occasionally to invite some of his caucus members into his office and chat about this with his staff and get that straightened out, it has, of course, brought out another significant point. I'm always quick to point that out, because there is that fundamental difference that keeps coming up once in a while between those of us on this side and my socialist friends on the other side. You see, you believe that unless a law or regulation tells the Manitoba citizen what he can do, the citizen can't do anything. We believe just the opposite. We believe that a citizen can do anything unless a law or regulation says he can't do it. That is the fundamental difference between us.

A MEMBER: That's his problem.

MR. H. ENNS: No, that's very true, The fact that . . .

MR. A. ANSTETT: Nobody said that.

MR. H. ENNS: The Wildlife Act spells out what a wildlife is, what a wild animal is. It's not just somebody's imagination or somebody's suggestion. The Wildlife Act spells it out very succinctly how and what can be trapped under . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

A MEMBER: Red squirrel in order.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I have the floor now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside has the floor and I cannot hear him.

MR. H. ENNS: The Wildlife Act spells out what the Manitoba citizen can do with respect to taking of game, and it's from that point of view that we conduct ourselves.

Mr. Chairman, one specific project that I know the department spent some time on - I haven't heard too much about it - and that is the efforts that were being made over the past number of years to establish a wood bison herd in the northern Interlake. Is work still

proceeding on that? I know that departmental staff spent some considerable time in discussing that certainly with the Native communities involved, whose co-operation would of course be paramount. But can the Minister indicate if any further action is being taken on that project?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman I can, but let me first address a couple of the concerns the honourable member had earlier; and that was his indication to me that I didn't recognize the effect that hunting, different modes or techniques of hunting, would have on the wildlife base. I wasn't agreeing to that proposition. I was agreeing to the concern that if there is unregulated hunting in respect to limits of animals taken, when they're taken, and what species are taken, and there is obviously a growing or an intensive use in respect to that; the mere fact of changing the technique would not in the long run answer that problem.

But I did not say that the type of hunting, the technique of hunting wouldn't have any effect. I agree with the honourable member completely if and when he suggests that if you use aircraft, well, if you use an atomic bomb you'll wipe them all out. What limits - sure there are limits to the kind of technique and there ought to be for that, but the overall concern, the preservation of the species for the priorities that we have all confirmed still exist.

Now, in respect to the other matter, and it's kind of a backhanded reference to my colleagues asking questions on the record, I appreciate that members of the Legislature from both sides of the House have constituents who have concerns about lost animals, about hunting practices, and want to put on the record their concerns even though those colleagues on both sides of the House who may be in my office, members of the opposition and members of my own Caucus are in my office from time to time and they're welcome there. Nevertheless, if they want to put on the record, the formal public record, their concerns, that doesn't trouble me in the least.

In respect to the concern about the wood bison herd, yes, that proposal is very much of concern to me. We have had recent meetings with representatives of the Waterhen Band and representation from the Federal Government through its Department of Indian Affairs. We are pursuing a probable agreement in respect to a reintroduction of that species. There are a lot of contingencies; there are a lot of problems that have to be solved in connection with funding, but we certainly are very much in sympathy and very much desirous of seeing an introduction of that species to Manitoba.

MR. H. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, allow me simply to encourage the Minister to redouble his efforts. I always counted among one of my failures in not having succeeded in reintroducing the wood bison back to Manitoba, and it seemed like an excellent opportunity to do several things; to not only reintroduce a species that has vanished more or less from Manitoba, but also provide a very worthwhile program involving our Native people both in the management of this same herd and the eventual economic production from this herd that could assist in communities where a lack of economic base is always of utmost concern to governments.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Springfield expressed references about hunting on agricultural leased Crown land. The Minister is, of course, aware of the fact that the Act permits him to pass the necessary legislation or the further posting of these same Crown lands. Has the Minister any intention of doing same? It's my understanding that no such regulations have been passed either by the previous administration or in the first 15-16 months of this year. I'm asking the Minister what his plans are?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I've had meetings with representatives from agricultural interests who would clearly like to see that. I've had indication from wildlife groups that they wouldn't welcome that in the least. We have made no change in the existing policy. I know the provision exists, that by regulation we can require posting. We have not done so. It's a policy decision that would not be entered into lightly and we have no intention at this time certainly of proclaiming or providing for that regulation.

MR. H. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, it would be my hope that we pass this section of the Estimates tonight and I don't wish to preclude, of course, any further questioning that other members have, but allow me to ask one general question about not just this appropriation but, Sir, it runs through much of the department, and that is the question of why the reduction in the listing of Other Expenditures.

In the Department of Wildlife, for instance, it's fairly significant. In virtually every appropriation, there is a fairly substantial reduction in the item under each heading listed Other Expenditures. We note that the item listing the Salaries, of course, reflects the general increase in Civil Service salary agreement, but in the Other Expenditures, you will note, and I draw members' attention to that, that virtually every case the reduction is there.

In the case of this one branch, and it's not that big of a branch, a rough tally indicates some \$170,000.00. In the case of, for instance, the Canada-Manitoba Wild Fur Agreement, the reduction is from \$236,000 to \$166,000.00. My question has to be a general one.

I assume that the Other Expenditures item covers the other expenditures that staff have in carrying out their programs; the mileage, other costs related to service in the field. My concern has to be is that we are aware, of course, that the Civil Service have concluded a successful agreement with respect to salaries, but are these same civil servants going to have to spend more time in their offices, less time out in the field servicing the programs that we are responsible for, or how can the Minister explain - not only in this expropriation, I may say, the same thing can be said about the Department of Fisheries that we just dealt with a little while ago, and others - the appropriations show under the item, Other Expenditures, as being decreased in a considerable number? I would solicit the Minister's comments on that.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member is quite correct. There is reduction in many instances of other expenditures, if not all of them. They

reflect part of the result of the agonizing process of what we could call belt tightening. We have squeezed this department - like I can say that other departments have been squeezed hopefully to like amount - to ensure that we don't have any additional fat in the department. I might say that there are some minor savings. I shouldn't say just minor savings because, if you add them all up, there are quite a few thousands of dollars in the Centrex telephone cost savings. I see 1,900 in one section, another 3,400 in another, 3,500 in another and so on. Overall, it adds up to a number of thousands of dollars, but the honourable member is quite right that it is a belt tightening, it is a reduction.

We don't believe that there will be reduced service. If there is, of course, I'm going to hear about it in the level of complaints, not only from the public, but from those who have been limited in their other budget expenses, and I'll have to live with that.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister's comments aren't really all that reassuring. We know, for instance, that the Minister of Transportation is going to build \$20 million fewer roads in the coming year and less roads for maintenance, and he is going to have his own little consolidation of a pothole program, unfortunately not on the wetlands of Manitoba, but right on the provincial highways, trunks highways and roads of Manitoba. But at the same time, this government - and we're not dealing with the Civil Service right now - they've committed themselves to a no reduction, no cutback on staff, a substantial salary increase for the Civil Service but, by the Minister's own admission, cutting back in the area of Other Expenditures.

That leaves you with the distinct impression that the staff will be there and they will be well paid, as they should be, but they will be cut back on being able to provide the services of their programs to the users, to the consumers. I put on the record, Mr. Minister, that we will be watching very carefully how this is affecting the capability of the department to deliver their services.

Mr. Chairman, I leave it at that. The Minister can respond, but I have one further question and it has to do with the - and I appreciate the Minister's allowing us to deal with the branch in total. I have indicated to him that we will be prepared to pass it in total, but why is the fur flying in the fur department? Why is it that Metis leaders are all of a sudden calling those fellows alien individuals? What's gone wrong in that fur department? That used to be a pretty nice tight little organization, reasonably well-run. There were even some pretty decent guys running that operation. All of a sudden, as I say, the fur is flying in that department. Can the Minister tell me what's going on in the fur department?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I don't know what reductions - I will ask staff to see if they can find, through the fur, what's happening here.

In respect to the reductions, there were three staff positions in Wildlife that were unfilled and that were cut. We have some fewer publications. We have reduced travel to conferences somewhat. We've, in effect, done belt tightening.

In respect to the fur management, Mr. Chairman, I can indicate we're doing a lot of things, program

management. I could read the highlights of every aspect of fur management. Maybe I'll just touch on a few highlights for the honourable member.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I don't wish to be rude to the Minister, but the Minister has been doing this throughout his Estimates. I asked a specific question. There is some trouble in the fur department. If the Minister wants me to be more specific, I'll quote the Vice-President, I believe, of the Manitoba Metis Federation, Mr. Head I believe it was, that refers to this particular section of the department in the manner that I earlier alluded to. I am asking the Minister a specific problem. What caused that recent difficulty with the Manitoba Federation, the trappers, in the fur section of the department?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister. The Minister is not listening.

HON. A. MACKLING: I'm sorry. I apologize, Mr. Chairman, to the member. I was distracted.

MR. H. ENNS: Well, I'll repeat the question again and without a general sermon about the fur industry, I'm simply wanting to ask: What is the specific problem in the trapping industry that has aroused the ire of the Manitoba Metis Federation, for instance, and other trappers?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I am not aware of there being a problem that has attracted the ire of someone in the Trapping Association. I have had meetings with anyone with problems; I haven't had a request to meet with anyone recently that I am aware of that I haven't been able to satisfy. My staff are somewhat at a loss to understand what issue or what item of concern the honourable member is reflecting.

Mr. Chairman, my door is open. I insist that when people have problems, we deal with them as quickly as we can. I'm at a loss to understand what the problems are.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I believe that one of the specific issues is the question of licensing cabins, trapping cabins on the traplines. That recently made the front pages of the Free Press. It was in that article that trappers came down rather hard on the department. It referred to them as "alien individuals."

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, there is a concern within the department to be able to monitor what buildings are established in areas of registered traplines. I know, and I thought the honourable member was referring to one problem that was brought to my attention some many months ago by someone who was very annoyed that a vacation residence or a vacation cabin had been permitted to be erected on a trapline and as I recall there was very emotional concern about this interrupting the quiet enjoyment or the pursuit of the trapline, and yet, this cabin was very proximate to a railway and all the rest of it.

My staff tell me that they are concerned now to make sure that any building is confirmed to the department. So, they have requested trappers to advise the

department if and where any cabin is erected on a trapline. The department has not indicated that they insist on the person getting a permit, but it is very useful to have this information so that we can deal with people who otherwise may be squatting. Because we identify a building from the air, we would not know whether it belongs to the registered trapper on the trapline or someone is actually erecting an illegal building there. We are concerned from the point of view of the conflicting uses and concerned about monitoring people who would otherwise be using those properties and using fire, either outdoor fires, camping and so on. It is a matter of concern. We would like to be able to identify every building that is built on Crown land.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, just while we're dealing with the trappers. A question of humane trapping always is a matter of concern to many Manitobans, perhaps more so those that are not involved in the industry. I know the Minister receives from time to time submissions in some instances wishing to ban trapping, period, or particularly the leg-hole trap. The department has over the years worked in various ways with the different experimental programs. Can the Minister update us on what is happening with respect to humane trapping in Manitoba?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member's concerns here are very worthwhile. We are very conscious of the need to continue the efforts that Manitoba has established for many years in this field as being a leader in respect to the development and use of more humane trapping techniques, because the raw fur industry is subject to the pressure that is being mounted by those who are concerned to eliminate all forms of trapping. It doesn't stop with seals. Seals are just part of it. It is obvious that there are people who would like to eliminate all forms of trapping, not just humane traps. We are concerned to establish humane traps.

Some of our actions to maintain this effort include: Continuation of mechanical and laboratory testing of new devices; assistance to inventors of humane traps; expansion of the experimental trap line system for field testing; new inventions and techniques; and the formulation of a co-operative field testing program in northwestern Canada; the continuation expansion of educational efforts for the general public; and a lead role in the development of the Fur Institute of Canada involving both public and private sectors to co-ordinate humane trap development and rationalize the entire wild fur industry.

MR. H. ENNS: Can the Minister indicate what level, in terms of gross value, trapping reached in the year we are considering, as say, compared to the previous few years? Do we have that figure by any chance?

HON. A. MACKLING: I think in the Annual Report.

MR. H. ENNS: In the Annual Report?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I think in the Annual Report we have some statistics. While my staff is looking for those actual statistics maybe I could

indicate the 1982-83 Humane Trapping Program. It involves a field test program that I mentioned earlier, 15 trappers who have volunteered to conduct field tests and work with 172 traps of nine different models. The major emphasis was placed on improved traps for muskrat with tests being carried out in the Netley and Libau Marshes. Controlled testing and education program and I've indicated the highlights earlier. Now the numbers: 1981-82, total value of all species for the year ending August 31st, 1982, 5,564,491; prior year, 1980-81, was \$8.2 million. This largely reflects not only the numbers of animals harvested but the conditions of the market, Mr. Chairman.

MR. H. ENNS: Can the Minister indicate whether or not roughly speaking the same number of trappers are in the field? I know we have the two kind of groups, the ones with specific traplines, but is the number of trappers, particularly in the North, still of the same number?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the numbers are holding up very well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. L. HYDE: Mr. Minister, much has been said this year in the last while about the nightlighting, and from the reports that I'm getting from the part of the province that I represent, not only is this act taking place by the Native people of our area, but also by the hunters of the white race. You, a moment ago, stated, Sir, that you have presented binoculars and trophies, etc., to school children of the province to encourage them to appreciate the wildlife of our province. My question to you, Sir, is, how can you and your government support this deplorable practice of nightlighting?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I indicated that I had participated in a presentation of binoculars and books to the winners of poster and prose contests in respect to this contest associated with National Wildlife week. In respect to my position on nightlighting, I had earlier, I guess, on at least two occasions before this committee and earlier in my statements in the House indicated that I do not support nightlight hunting. Certainly, we prosecute it when white people are involved in it. We are committed to upholding the law. The courts have indicated that Treaty Indian people are entitled to do that and we can't defy the courts, Mr. Chairman.

MR. L. HYDE: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry to realize that you're saying what you are at this point in time when the resolution was presented by the Member for Turtle Mountain on that particular issue. It's difficult for the people of the province to accept that.

However, I want to go onto a next question. During the Schreyer years, many acres of farmland adjoining the Delta Marsh, south of Lake Manitoba, was purchased for the purpose of increasing the wildlife inhabitat project. Some development was made on that project and I believe completed. During the four years of the Conservative Government, the project, as I understand it, was shelved.

My question to you, Sir, is: Is it your intention and the Government of the Day to further develop the wildlife habitat area of the Delta Marshes?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, we have not purchased any land at the Delta in the last two years. There is land at the Delta that is under development and certainly we'll be doing more in respect to that area in the near future.

MR. L. HYDE: The Minister has just stated that they haven't purchased any land of recent months, of recent years in the area. I believe that, but I know it for a case that there is a farmer who has been badgered on concluding an agreement that was made many years ago - in fact, back in the Schreyer years.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, yes, I know the honourable member is referring to George Love, who has an appointment with me. He's coming in to see me to talk about his case.

MR. L. HYDE: Well, Mr. Chairman, that will certainly be interesting to find out just what takes place on that particular case, because it is a concern of not only Mr. Love, but it certainly is by many of the adjoining farmers of the area.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister about a report or a study that he had done in January, I believe. He had sent out letters to members of the Legislature requesting input on big game hunter safety, wanting members to have input into the report or the study that he was doing. I would ask the Minister if that study is complete, and if so, can we have a copy of the department's report?

HON. A. MACKLING: No, Mr. Chairman, the Safe Hunting Review that has been initiated is not complete. I trust it isn't, because I haven't even seen any drafts of any of it and it was at my insistence that this review was commissioned.

MR. J. DOWNEY: When will the report be ready, and when it is ready, will all members of the Legislature receive a copy of it?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I don't know when it will be completed. I hope it'll be completed in reasonable dispatch, but after consultation with all that have an interest in it, certainly all members of the Legislature will be entitled and will get a copy of the review.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, how widely publicized was this review? Was it put in the public media and fairly well advertised, or was it just fairly low profile type requests?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I can assure the honourable member that the department has done their utmost to make sure that everyone had an opportunity

to know that we were looking at this. What we have done, Mr. Chairman, is evaluated past accidents; evaluated the Hunter Safety Program that we have now; requested public inputs from over 250 agencies, organizations, or individuals, such as, the Manitoba Wildlife Federation, the rural municipalities, members of the Legislative Assembly, the Manitoba Association of School Trustees, etc.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 9.(a)(1) - the Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, it's interesting to note that you're anxious to move it through when there are some questions of a little bit more of importance than the trivia that we are getting from the members of the government, who are asking questions of the Minister.

Mr. Chairman, a further question . . .

MR. A. ANSTETT: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the Member for Springfield state his point of order?

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Arthur has reflected on other members and their participation in debate in a pejorative fashion and I think he should withdraw that. Any suggestion that any contribution or questions asked by members on either side of the committee are trivial or unimportant is an insult to the process. Every member on the committee has an equal right. I've never decried members opposite for wasting the committee's time. I think members have every obligation and opportunity to raise the matters that are of concern to them and to do it here in the committee. I think that's an affront to the committee and to all members, when the Member for Arthur does that.

MR. J. DOWNEY: To the same point of order, Mr. Chairman. I did not particularly say there was anything terrible about it. I just indicated that that was the type of information they were putting on the record and if the member is sensitive to it, then let him be sensitive to it. It's in my opinion and let him feel the lumps if he feels he should wear them.

Further questioning, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Member for Minnedosa had a point of order too.

MR. D. BLAKE: I didn't have a chance to speak on that point of order, Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out to you that there was a difference of opinion there and really a difference of opinion doesn't constitute a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well taken. The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is dealing with the report or the information that the Minister was requesting during his Hunter Survey Study and also dealing with the same question that the Member for Springfield had brought up on hunter safety or compensation paid to producers.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Well that wasn't a trivial question then, is that right?

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the member likes to speculate about all different things that are said over here and comments, but it's like everything else, he is not very well-informed and should possibly listen.

I have a constituent who, approximately a year ago, Mr. Chairman, had considerable damage done to their house with big rifle bullets going through it - an accidental shooting and a considerable financial loss to those individuals. We're unable to — (Interjection) — Well, the members opposite find it quite humorous, but I don't find it humorous when people have bullets flying through their house. I think that the question has to be asked why is it more important to pay for livestock loss to a farmer than it is to pay for house damage or other property damage? If the principle of compensation due to hunter carelessness or hunting accidents is payable for one cause on the farm community or in a village - I don't say necessarily a farm, but if the principle applies for damages for one loss of particular item of personal property, why doesn't it qualify for other losses of personal property? I would think, in view of the small amounts of money that have been spent, the Member for Springfield seemed to make big issue, or take big issue with how you were spending some \$9,100 and \$6,000 respectively in the years past. That is a very small amount of money to pay and I would hope you, Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, would reconsider your policy of paying for losses due to hunter damage, and would respectfully submit that be taken into consideration in your review and acted upon.

Second point dealing with that, Mr. Chairman, I as well had a constituent who is a farmer, lives in a very heavily-hunted area in the southwest part of the province, as well requested consideration be given to morning hunting of white-tail deer. In view of the fact that a lot of the hunting does take place on private land in the southwest corner of the province; and in view of the fact that a lot of farmers have to pursue their work activity, whether it be fall work in the fall of the year or whether it be livestock management or feeding of livestock or whatever, that to leave half the day open for normal chore activity around a farm without the worry of hunters and the traffic of hunters and the danger that could, in fact, incur with the hunters on the property of that same individual. It was a sincere request, and I would like your response. I know that the hunting of geese, particularly in some of the regions or the hunting zones, have been limited or restricted to mornings only. I would, in a very brief reply, like the Minister's comments and wonder if he is sympathetic to those comments.

Thank you.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, indeed I am sympathetic to anyone who has suffered damage as a result of someone's negligence. There have been individuals who have been shot and seriously injured as a result of hunter negligence. In those instances, there is no compensation paid by the Crown. The right of action, of course, exists on the part of the injured party to bring proceedings in court, and proceedings are taken in court for damages that are caused by the negligence of hunters.

The compensation program that exists, Mr. Chairman, is one that provides for compensation for accidental

hunting, accidental loss of livestock. It does not cover loss by intentional wrongdoing. Where that occurs, the right of action, of course, exists on the part of the owner if he can identify of course who it was that caused the damages and prosecute.

One of the things that I would point out is that it's not customary for ranchers, farmers to have to insure their livestock, but it is usual that people do insure their property from various causes. Hopefully, most people's insurance do cover miscellaneous damage.

Mr. Chairman, the program is a limited one. We can't, in any way for example, guarantee that all people who have losses occasioned by people exercising their rights under any number of licences that are granted are going to be compensated by the Crown by the wilful neglect of people who are obviously misusing their rights.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was interested in the safety aspect of the Minister's Estimates. I could relate this Intermountain Handgun Club problem that has been addressed to the Minister and his department who are practising exactly what that is, the handling of guns and the safety of same. Now they have been asked to vacate the property that they have been using for some time, and they've also been using it for RCMP to come and practise the use of handguns there. I am wondering the change of location, has the department found a change of location for the Intermountain Handgun Club - they are short of funds - or will the department pay them, compensate them for the removal of their equipment and that from that site and help them install it on another site? They have been offered a new site, I understand, north of Grandview where the fire ranger's tower is, but there are livestock and horses and cattle in that area. So, as late as today, I was speaking with the president and they're still wondering what can be done or what arrangements can be made, and asked me to raise it with the Minister in his Estimates.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, as I'm quickly advised by staff, it is Crown land in which this target or practice shooting takes place. There seems to be some local issues involved in this. I assume that we are not involved in the program itself, and the local land staff are involved in trying to resolve these differences.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: I just wonder - certainly it's Crown land. There is no problem with that. I guess the option that the Parks Branch maybe have offered them is another parcel of Crown land. The other problem is then, because they don't have that kind of money to move their equipment and that, they're wondering if some kind of arrangement could - or are they just going to have to pack it up and forget their hunter safety and their handling of these handguns?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope, and staff would, that this issue can be resolved to the satisfaction of the parties, but it's not our responsibility. It is not our program. They are merely using Crown

land. Certainly any way that we can assist in the resolution of this problem, we will, but it's not mandatory that we come up with a solution for them. We're trying to help.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's No. 21. I had occasion to be out in the southeast corner of the province on Saturday, celebrating Ukrainian Easter with some of our friends out in that area and, after we had celebrated supper, we went out to my farm and we saw many, many white-tail deer, great numbers of white-tail deer which feed on the alfalfa in my garden that I have over the summer. I have no complaints about that, but you know I would think that we had a count of about 18 on Saturday night and, with the middle of May and the end of May approaching very rapidly, I know that there are going to be many more mouths to feed inasmuch as they will be having their little babies before too long — (Interjection) — Bambi's, that's the ones.

What I am interested in is the compensation that the Honourable Minister had mentioned a little earlier concerning some of the crop damage. Now I know that there was a count of 18 that we saw and probably another few before too long and there is a loss of crop, particularly in this particular case. Last year, my whole lettuce crop was wiped out and my whole cabbage crop was wiped out also, and much of the alfalfa. Now as I mentioned earlier, I have no complaints. Is there any consideration, and what type of compensation and how does one go about receiving compensation for losses that come about because of these white-tail deer eating the crops?

Now, in addition, Mr. Minister, is there any consideration given to people like myself who have farm property out in that particular area to be given special times that they could shoot deer, particularly two or three days ahead of hunting season? It's all got to be considered. I know that the white-tailed deer are part of the natural resources of the Province of Manitoba and are owned by all of the people of the Province of Manitoba or anybody else who has enough money to go out and buy a licence. — (Interjection) — That's right.

Now, is there any consideration given to people like myself, who don't make a claim, or people other than myself, farmers in the area, who don't make claims for compensation for losses, to be given special consideration to hunt these animals two or three days prior to hunting season opening?

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could repeat, I don't know whether the honourable member was here when I did review the compensation that has been paid in respect to white-tailed deer: 105 claims, total \$102,915.67. These claims are really, I would think, comprised of all agricultural claims; that is, people who are making their livelihood from the crops that were damaged, destroyed or consumed. If it was a commercial operation, then, of course, we would look at it, but we'd also look at whether or not it was possible for the commercial operator to reasonably protect the crop and it, of course, depends on all of these factors.

In respect to the member's concern about the landowners being given an earlier opportunity to hunt, there is some concern for that on the part of landowners and is part of the technique that has been suggested we consider as an incentive for landowners maintaining suitable wildlife habitat, to give them an opportunity to ensure that they get something from the wildlife that they have held on their property for most of the time before non-residents or hunters from elsewhere come and harvest those animals.

It is something we are prepared to look at. We have followed the principle in respect to elk. We have provided for a landowner season, somewhat earlier. They still pay a fee, but they have a somewhat earlier opportunity to hunt elk on their own property. Certainly, it's a suggestion that is worth considering. We haven't adopted it for the upcoming season, but it's one that's a package of concerns that we're looking at.

MR. A. KOVNATS: To the Honourable Minister, I would advise him that this time I'm not really speaking for myself, I'm not a hunter, and I don't think I could ever shoot one of those animals. It's a beautiful sight at sundown to see them running across your land, and I enjoy that, and I'm not about to change my attitude towards destroying these animals. — (Interjection) — Well, when I say I was wiped out in my lettuce crop and my cabbage crop, it could have been rabbits besides, and I don't want to blame the deer for something like that.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Do you shoot rabbits?

MR. A. KOVNATS: No, I don't shoot rabbits and I don't shoot the gophers either. It's just not within myself to do so. I don't mind anybody else coming on my property and doing it. It's just the way I feel.

If the honourable Minister would take that into consideration so these people, my friends in the area, and other farmers in the areas, because God knows what's happening to these farmers, they're getting pushed around all over the place and I think they should be given some compensation. If they would be given some compensation also in being given some special privileges in moose selection when it comes time for moose selection, also, I think they should be given some consideration. The only thing I'm asking the Minister is for some compensation for the two bullet holes in my cottage out on the farm.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, as I've indicated, the principle is one that has been applied in part in respect to big game animals, in respect to elk. There have been representations about white-tailed deer. In respect to moose, moose generally do not inhabit land that is privately owned. The prime moose habitat is on Crown land. A moose is not an animal that thrives in close proximity to man like the white-tailed deer and game birds like the sharp-tailed grouse and ruffed grouse.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Well, to the Honourable Minister, my property is the very next piece of property next to Crown land, so I'm very very close to where moose are available. Again, I'm not about to go out and shoot

them, but some of the people in the area have just mentioned; you know, shouldn't they be given some special consideration and I think that they should. I'm just bringing it to the Minister's attention. Please do whatever you can to appease these people who really help this department look after the natural resources of the Province of Manitoba, and I think that they should be given some special compensation. They're not about to go and make claims to the Minister for \$100 damage, because they've stomped on some alfalfa or they've eaten a little corner of alfalfa. They're not about to do that, but I think the Honourable Minister should give them some special consideration.

With those remarks, I thank the honourable Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just when the Minister is considering the damage that those 18 deer that my colleague has mentioned, I have a very close friend and former colleague who counted 296 deer in one herd on his fall rye in one evening not too long ago. So, when you get his claim, I hope that you give it some consideration as well as the crop of lettuce that was eaten.

Also, when you're considering those special permits, Mr. Minister, I have applied for four years in a row for the special elk season in Spruce Woods, and I haven't been drawn yet, so I hope you consider that.

I have one question, Mr. Minister and I'm sorry that I missed it under (c) Habitat Management, I just wondered if you could bring me up to date on what's happening in Proven Lake area, in my area just south of Erickson - Proven Marsh?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that we are considering the development of a Wildlife Management area in that location.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 9.(a)(1) - the Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: That wouldn't preclude hunting in the area?

HON. A. MACKLING: No, not necessarily at all, Mr. Chairman. In Wildlife Management area hunting is permitted, but there is some degree of control for all other things.

MR. D. BLAKE: I think the Minister may be getting some recommendation or resolution from the wildlife people to make it a wildlife sanctuary, but that's still in the mill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 9.(a)(1) to 9.(h) were all read and passed.

Resolution 124: Resolve that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,809,100 for Natural Resources for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984—pass.

Committee rise.

SUPPLY - NORTHERN AFFAIRS

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

of Northern Affairs, Item 3.(a)(1) - the Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Yes, I wonder if the Minister could indicate how many co-ordinator positions there currently are and how many of these positions are vacant if any?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. COWAN: We're just doing a quick account right now. It's my understanding that none are vacant at the present time and we have a total of 15 co-ordinators in place.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Yes, I wonder if the Minister could indicate why he felt it necessary to transfer the Director from the Dauphin office, to The Pas? A man that had considerable experience in the field from a heavy area office, like Dauphin, to The Pas area where it was considerably less demanding?

HON. J. COWAN: Well, that was a decision that I arrived at with staff after a period of time during which we considered the overall structure of the departmental activities in the field, that individual's capabilities and the way by which we wanted to proceed with the internal development of staff. As a result of those deliberations and discussions it was felt that we would ask the area manager, who was in The Pas, to transfer to Dauphin, and the one in Dauphin to transfer to The Pas.

There were a number of reasons. I don't want to go into all of them as you can well appreciate. It would probably be inappropriate to do so here although I'd be more than pleased to discuss them in a different forum with the member opposite as the opportunity presents itself.

We did as well want to lessen the workload of that individual, for reasons which were known to that individual, and to the department. We felt that was the best use of his capabilities. At the same time we wanted to challenge the person that we had in The Pas by putting him into a situation where he would have more communities to look after and be able to provide for further development for his own abilities.

So for those reasons, we decided to make that internal transfer and it was not done without some concern on the part of all parties and it was not done without some disagreements as to the appropriateness of the action, but it was a management decision, which we felt was in the best interests of the department as a whole and for that reason, we undertook to make those transfers effective as of a number of months ago, I believe.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Yes, I wonder if the Minister could tell us whether he received any complaints from the various communities for making this switch?

HON. J. COWAN: It's my understanding that there were two communities which indicated concern about the transfer. Staff did meet with them. The Assistant Deputy Minister, I believe, was at those two meetings and it's my understand that while there still may be concerns

in a general way, the issue has been thoroughly discussed and for the most part resolved.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Yes, was there any change in the director located in the office of Selkirk?

HON. J. COWAN: No, there's been no change in either the job description or the activities or the individual of the director located in Selkirk.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I wonder if the Minister could bring us up to date on the activities - perhaps we could pass - I wanted to ask questions about the Fire Program and I guess that's in another section, so maybe we could pass the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 3.(a)(1)(a)—pass; 3.(a)(1)(b)—pass; Item 3.(a)(2)(a) - the Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I wonder if the Minister could bring us up to date on the activities under the Fire Program during the last year? I understand that the manager transferred to another department. Is that position filled and what other activities have taken place with respect to volunteer firefighters, the addition of new firefighting equipment, fire engines and the like?

HON. J. COWAN: It's my understanding that the individual who had been filling that particular position asked for a transfer to Natural Resources. If I understand the situation correctly and I'm going only on memory and perhaps my staff will advise me if I'm wrong; he was in Natural Resources as a member of the Civil Service a number of years ago. I'm not certain what position he went to directly in Natural Resources, was it a promotion of sort. It was a promotion, at least in terms of job duties and monies. He'll be training northern Conservation Officers, I'm informed by staff, and therefore it has to be looked at as a promotion from, I guess, his own personal perspective.

We have had his position filled on an acting basis since that time. I understand that the job has been bulletined. The competitions are closed and interviews will be taking place on the 24th and/or 25th of May. So that is the status of that position and that individual. I understand that was an entirely voluntary transfer over to another department and a promotion of sorts for him.

You asked about major activities in the Fire and Emergency Program section over the past years. Generally, the section is designed and developed to assist regional staff in establishing fire brigades in the remote northern communities. That involves co-ordination and the training of the fire brigades in consultation with the regional staff and the Fire Commissioner's Office in another department and community representatives. We also provide funding for fire brigades in their activities in regard to suppressing and preventing fire in the communities. Through this program, approved fire and emergency equipment for the entire program is bought, purchased in consultation with the Fire Commissioner's Office. Therefore, we are maintaining an inventory of that equipment through this particular program, and we provide funding assistance to community councils or

local committees to allow for unexpected expenditures relating to the operations and maintenance of the local fire department.

In 1982-83, there were seven new fire halls and shelters. I'll go through the list for the member by community. There were, I believe, fire halls and shelters in Pikwitonei, Sherridon, Berens River, Homebrook, Dallas, Red Rose, Harwill, Anama Bay, and some of that was cost-shared with LEAP, I understand. Just the Anama Bay one was cost-shared with LEAP. It was a total expenditure on the part of the department of \$352,000.00.

There was the completion of two fire halls. One was 80 percent completed in 1982-84, and that was at a cost of \$30,900.00. That took place in South Indian Lake and God's Lake Narrows.

Two fire shelters were renovated, one at Herb Lake and another at Stevenson Island. The one at Stevenson Island, we're still involved in some discussions with as to the final form of that fire hall and place of that fire hall, but there was some work done in that regard.

Seven fire trucks were purchased. Two were purchased new at a cost of \$63,000 each. That was for Wabowden and Bissett. Five were fabricated fire trucks which, as the member is aware, is a new fabrication on a used three tonne chassis, at approximately \$3,500 each. Those trucks went into Berens River, Pikwitonei, Sherridon, Dallas, Red Rose, and Crane River. There was about \$90,000 worth of equipment purchased, \$89,500 to be exact, and that's just the standard equipment, training aids, hoses, coats, helmets, etc. \$21,500 was spent on training for a basic firefighting, vehicle search and rescue, dangerous goods, fire prevention inspection, fire service instructors, level one and level two. Those are ongoing activities. So that was what happened last year.

Does the member wish me to go through what we anticipate to do in this year's Estimates at this time, while I'm on my feet?

MR. D. GOURLAY: Yes, that'd be good, sure.

HON. J. COWAN: Okay. For this year we're talking about new fire halls and shelters in Duck Bay at \$80,000; Matheson Island at \$20,000; Pine Dock at \$20,000; Stevenson Island at \$75,000; and Wabowden at \$60,000, for a total of \$255,000.00.

Fire hall renovations or completions are anticipated in Barrows at \$3,500.00; Manigotagan at \$10,000; Big Black River at \$2,000; and Moose Lake at \$6,000, for a total of \$21,500.00.

One fire truck is anticipated as being purchased by the department at a cost of \$37,500 for Manigotagan.

Fire tank and trailer units are being purchased at a cost of \$20,000 for Matheson Island and Pine Dock, each being \$10,000 each.

We anticipate purchasing equipment for the fire tower for Wabowden for hose drying and miscellaneous fire equipment, as I mentioned earlier, at the cost of \$60,000.00.

Then we plan on spending \$55,000 for training of fire prevention courses, fire chief courses, and fire service instructor courses; \$5,000 in school firefighting training at Thompson and Brandon; and \$40,000 for local training in the communities.

Last year, the vote adjusted for 1982-83 was \$179,000.00. This year, it's \$178,000 for a reduction of \$1,000, or just a little over a one-half of 1 percent, .61 percent.

I can go through the expenditure detail if the member wishes while I'm on my feet and that would take care of the general information I have in this regard for the Other Expenditures.

Construction, the 1982-83 adjusted vote was nil, we're asking \$15,000 this year. Fees, it was nil last year, and nil this year; facilities and equipment was \$50,000 last year, down to \$3,000 this year; specialized equipment was \$10,000 last year, but up to \$45,000 this year; operating cost was 19,000 as compared to 15,000 and subsistence was 100,000 last year, and 100,000 this year, for 179,000 versus 178,000 this year, a reduction of one-half of 1 percent approximately.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Yes, I wonder if the Minister could indicate if there were any major fires in any of the Northern Affairs communities during the past year and any casualties as far as injury to people?

HON. J. COWAN: Firstly, I've been informed as well that I should have indicated that all this money is cost-shared under the Northern Development Agreement so that the record be clear on that.

No, we don't know of any major fires such as the type that took place in Ilford a number of years ago in which in a lot of ways precipitated the activity which is ongoing here. There were house fires and I think perhaps the program should be given some of the credit for the reduction in fires through the training of local residents on proper fire control programs in their own communities, and the fact that there is a facility now available in many communities very quickly to fight fires and there are trained staff. So, I would think that the fact that we haven't had those sorts of tragedies indicate that the program is working.

I'll be quick to add that if, in fact, we do have a tragedy which happens even in areas where you have the best of fire equipment and the best of fire departments, I don't think it should be used to condemn the program, but should indicate to us that we need to do work in a specific area.

But the program has been in place for awhile, it seems to have been successful, and I think we're starting to reap the benefits of the work which has been ongoing for five, six, seven years now in this particular area.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Are there any of the 51 communities that do not have a volunteer fire department, I guess you'd call it, or brigade, or equipment of any kind for fire control?

HON. J. COWAN: I'm certain the member can appreciate that the development of the fire brigade is part of the overall development of a community, therefore, as I indicated earlier, you have a number of communities in different stages of development. No, we wouldn't have a functioning fire brigade in every community. I can find out the ones which would not have a functioning fire brigade in the communities for the member and give him that detailed information perhaps later on by having staff review the records.

But, I think there is an opportunity for each community to have a functioning fire brigade if they so wish. We will provide the training. We will provide the assistance which is necessary. The extent of the equipment which we have in different communities differs community by community as well. Some have new fire trucks, some have reconditioned fire trucks, some only have tanks, some only have extinguishers, if I understand the situation correctly, but over a period of time, we hope to provide the equipment necessary for a functioning fire brigade to operate effectively once we have that training program and the ability to support that brigade, or the ability of that brigade to support the use of that equipment when it's in place.

So it's not because of a lack of opportunity nor lack of direction on the part of the department. I think we're there to aid at whatever stage of development the community may find itself in, but acknowledging that there are different stages for different communities. Not all of them have fire brigades which we would consider to be functioning effectively at this point. There is a lot of work that needs to be done yet in that area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a couple of questions to the Honourable Minister. I was listening very attentively and I didn't hear Red Sucker mentioned at all, whether there's any facilities there or not. So I will leave that with the Honourable Minister, and so he can answer me on Red Sucker whether there's any facilities available. When I was there last, there just wasn't anything but I don't see why Red Sucker, particularly when we have an honourable member from Red Sucker, is not being looked after.

Now, the Honourable Minister also mentioned that there was cost-sharing with the Federal Government on all of this, and I know the program and I've got to compliment the Honourable Minister for even mentioning that the program was started under the previous administration and carried on well under this administration - no complaint on that regard - but is there any assistance other than cost-sharing that there is an involvement with the Federal Government, either with training supervision, particularly at locations that have an airport that might be under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government? Does the Federal Government have any involvement with the actual training, with the personnel, any other type of personnel? Can the Honourable Minister advise what control there are over the facilities, the shelters, the fire halls, to see that they are used strictly for the purposes of firefighting equipment? For instance, and I'm not saying that this is a true fact, but in some locations maybe they take the firefighting equipment out and they move in winter road-building equipment in so that it would be available to start the next day when they are working on winter roads. Is there any control that this type of thing doesn't take place? I'm only suggesting that it might; I don't have any specific cases where it has.

HON. J. COWAN: Well, it's good to have the member rise to speak of Red Sucker Lake. We both remember that day we spent together in Red Sucker Lake with a great deal of pleasure, I think. It was a good

experience for both of us and I think we both benefited by it. You didn't know that, to the Member for Flin Flon, but we did spend a very enjoyable time at the opening of their reserve. It was a historic occasion for the community and one which we were honoured and privileged, I think, to be able to participate in.

I'm not certain of the level of equipment they have in Red Sucker Lake. I was there over the break between the Sessions, and I just can't recall what sort of equipment they would have in place. I'll find out; I don't think it would be much. I'm certain that the Member for Red Sucker Lake will appreciate the fact that you, Sir, brought it to the attention of the House and myself. I'll certainly be discussing it with him to see if, in fact, we can provide more equipment if it is needed in the community.

The Federal Government does assist - or we work with the Federal Government might be a better way to put it - in respect to a course in emergency planning. That's about the only interface that staff inform me exists at the present time, and I wouldn't suggest that it's a major part of the program. Certainly, there might be areas where we can have a larger interface with the Federal Government.

A lot of the communities, as you are aware, are Metis communities or Northern Affairs communities right on the boundary of a reserve. For that reason, there are a lot of times that our equipment is used to fight fires on reserves. I believe we are involved in discussions with the Federal Government right now in respect to cost-sharing that sort of activity or reimbursing the brigades when they undertake firefighting on reserve communities. There are a lot of questions about that and how we want to proceed on that, because we are not certain that the fire brigades that we're developing in Northern Affairs communities are large enough to adequately serve the community that's adjacent to it which may be much larger.

So we want to find a better way to work together with the Federal Government, particularly the Department of Indian Affairs, in regard to cost-sharing that activity; and have been involved in discussions, I think, as far back as when the Member for Swan River was Minister and continuing those discussions. We may be able to resolve that issue some day soon. I would hope it would be sooner, rather than later. Again, it does bear repeating, however, that the entire program is cost-shared with DREE or DRIE (phonetic), however they're saying it now, and so there is that federal money that's coming in.

The control over facilities is an area that I have not given a great deal of personal attention to, because it has never been brought forward to me as a problem. I have been impressed, though, when I've travelled through the communities, with the pride that the fire chief and the brigade had in their facility. They are spotless and it really is quite impressive. The ones I have seen, at least, have always been hosed down. The trucks are spotless. If the trucks aren't in good running order, they soon let us know about it in the most vehement of terms, but it's important to them. There is a great deal of pride in their training activities, in the fact that they are a volunteer fire brigade that are out there functioning. You can see the awards that they have won at the different contests and the plaques and the certificates that they have gotten. They are all prominently displayed.

So I would not think that there would be much of a difficulty in regard to the fire halls being used for purposes other than storing that fire truck and the equipment then for training purposes. I have not seen any indication of it, and I usually try to visit the fire hall whenever I'm in a community because I like to see what's happening there; so I just haven't seen the problems.

As well, in a small community, the residents of that community themselves have a great deal of control over the activities of their leaders, and the fire chief and a volunteer brigade in a small community is considered to be a leader in the community, usually someone who has a host of other responsibilities in the community as well. I am certain that if there was a difficulty in the way by which a fire hall was being used or the equipment was being used, the community itself would be very quick to either go directly to the fire brigade, go directly to the chief in council, or advise the department of those sorts of problems.

I am not aware of any specifics to date. Again, I can check with staff and see, but I would be very surprised if we've had any problems in that area. If we have had problems, I'm certain they were of a temporary nature and short-lived.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Can the Honourable Minister advise the type of pay that the chief, the deputy chief and the volunteer firefighters might be paid? Is it on an honorarium type of basis, or is it per fire, or is it just expenses? Is it all volunteer? Can the Honourable Minister bring us up to date on what the cost of having these people as our employees, even though they're protecting their own communities, what type of monies or honorariums are paid to them?

HON. J. COWAN: Their activities generally are volunteer activities, but it's my understanding that they are paid \$5 an hour when they're in training programs, and I believe \$5 an hour when they're fighting fires. Is that the case? Yes. So for those two specific activities, they're reimbursed on an hourly basis. It would not amount to much in any given year. Most of it is volunteer time and given freely by the participants from the fire chief level on down to the member of the fire brigade.

MR. A. KOVNATS: In most of these communities, I'm sure that the firefighting - well, let's take the Hudson Bay Company and their Northern stores. I don't want to bring in red herrings or anything like that, but do the Hudson Bay Company, who are really protected by these firefighting equipment, are they assessed an amount of monies towards the training of these people because, in effect, it is protecting their properties also? Is there any type of arrangement through the Hudson Bay northern stores?

HON. J. COWAN: First, I'm sorry; I have to correct the record. The fire chief is paid \$260 per year honorarium, I'm informed, plus the hourly rate. So it is not entirely volunteer, but \$260 per year is not an exorbitant amount. I'm certain you'll agree.

The Hudson Bay store and other commercial operations in the community are assessed taxes, and part of those taxes, of course, go towards the

development of community infrastructure such as fire programs. So as a general taxpayer in the community, they are involved in financing these operations, but there is no assessment or special application of a tax or a rate or some other financial mechanism above and beyond the general taxes they pay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 3.(a)(2)(a)—pass; 3.(a)(2)(b)—pass.

Item 3.(b)(1) Local Government Services: Salaries and Wages - the Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I wonder if the Minister could indicate what the situation is at Bissett at the present time? The mining operation there, I understand, is cut back considerably and there was a lot of planning gone into that community in recent years to accommodate the gold mine operation. I wonder if the Minister could just indicate what the situation is for that community at the present time?

HON. J. COWAN: I'll have to find out exactly what the situation with the company is in regard to their plans for ongoing activity in the area. I've had one opportunity to visit the community and met with the company at that time and also met with local officials and had quite a pleasant evening there, touring the facilities and talking to residents. At that time there was some doubt as to the continued operation of the mine, given the price of gold. Since that time, I had an opportunity to meet with the mine manager, I hope I got his title right, Mr. Hogan, at least, and he indicated to me that they were doing some deep drilling in order to try to map out the ore body at the bottom of the shaft.

My understanding of the ore body there is that it is like most gold mines, or a large number of gold mines, and that you sort of follow a vein of gold, and they're found throughout the area. It's a very difficult way to mine because you're always following small pockets of gold. You're not doing a large area at one time, although they do some stoke style mining there, and they were going to be mapping out the bottom levels of the mine to see if, in fact it looked like it would be possible to proceed with the development of the mine. Given the ore that they had mapped and the grade of the ore, they were confronting difficulties of an economic nature.

So, I'll find out exactly what's happened with that mapping since that time. I don't know if they've proved it out or not, but I have the director in the gallery upstairs and when he comes down perhaps we can give you more detailed information as to what's happening there. But that aside, because that's always going to be a problem with any mining community whether it be Bissett or Lynn Lake or Agassiz or Fox Mine, or even Inco, you know, given enough time. Mining companies do suffer somewhat precarious economic positions from time to time and given low metal prices and low ore prices now, that is true more so than it ever has been before.

When we assumed government the member had been working on the development of Bissett for some time and they have been working on the development plan, I would suppose, or I was informed, under the assumption that there was a viable mine there that was going to continue to operate for some time and we

needed to get infrastructure in because there would be people coming in. There would be more demands placed on the services of the community. We reviewed that and we had the value of some extra time to review it and during that period of time gold prices started to look dangerously low, so we didn't move ahead with the large-scale development. We scaled the development down to provide those services which were necessary at that time and desired by the community, but certainly not to build up a lot of infrastructure to support a mine of the size that was anticipated to be in the first instance and even at that time the mining company was beginning to say, we don't know exactly what's going to happen here because they were watching the trend lines in gold prices as well.

So, we didn't, in fact, go with the more expensive proposition, we went with a less expensive one. I can give you the details of what we've done if you're interested in that, while I'm on my feet.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate what the Minister has indicated. I know there is a problem in planning for development when the main industry is sort currently on hold. I guess, I don't know whether it's fortunate or unfortunate, the price of gold futures looks very encouraging. So, the long-term situation in Bissett could be fairly good. My main concern in asking the question now is just what kind of planning is the department doing at Bissett in view of the current situations that we now face, what kind of planning is going into the community, what types of expenditures are you looking at for Bissett, for perhaps the next couple of years? I appreciate that hopefully the mining operation is just on hold for a short time and that it will continue bigger and better in the future, but I'm just interested in the situation now as to what planning, how much money you're planning on spending in there, what type of facilities is the department involved in at the present time?

HON. J. COWAN: It's my recollection that we've just approved or we're in the process of approving an interim planning scheme for the community. Now, that is not the type of planning which I think the member is requesting information on but I wanted to get that on the record to show that the community itself is involved in trying to develop a plan for their area notwithstanding what may happen with the mine. They're looking towards tourism as being another opportunity in the area. They know that there is difficulty with the mine, and that they may want to have in place a secondary industry or an opportunity for a secondary industry. So, they're looking to tourism and they're trying to develop a planning scheme for their community which will allow for reasonable growth that will provide support for a mine if it were to go back into operation at full levels of production or would provide for a reduced economy in the area through tourism activity if, in fact, the mine were to remain shut down.

We've had a lot of difficulty in planning for Bissett, for a number of reasons: One is the instability of gold prices right now and the fact that you can't justifiably ask the mine to make a commitment for five or ten years and for that reason you don't know what sort infrastructure to put in. How many houses do you want

to put in? Do you want to build houses for all the employees that would be there in full production and then find that you are left with a situation where a lot of individuals and the government have invested a lot of money in infrastructure which won't be used, in fact will be a drain on the community because you'd still have to maintain the water lines, maintain the sewer lines, maintain that sort of infrastructure.

Do you want to provide recreational facilities that will meet the demands of a population of 500 or a population of 200? Those are questions that have to be asked. What sort of fire equipment do you put in, because if the mine's operating you obviously need more fire equipment than if the mine isn't operating because you have more people in the community and more risk of fires? What sort of water treatment do you want to provide? And one of the worst things you can do in a community, outside of not providing any water treatment at all is to overbuild the water treatment plant, because it's a drain on that community, or on the Provincial Government in the case of a Northern Affairs community for years to come, and it just doesn't function well. Water treatment plants are set up to up to run so much water through at a given rate in any given period of time. In fact, if you're not operating them at that efficiency level you lose a lot of the value of the plant and it costs you more than it should. Do you want to go to mobile home lots or do you want to go to permanent structures; do you want to go to apartments, and if so, how do you zone properly? Those are all questions that we've been asking and the questions have all been put in the context of the development of the mine, and until we get a firmer picture as to what's going to happen there, we find it a difficult process.

What we have decided to do is put in the lowest level of infrastructure necessary to support the mine at the time in which the infrastructure was provided; not to over-build, but to try to anticipate where the level of the population of that community is going to be over a period of time on a trend line. If the mine doesn't operate at all, then we have over-built and it's unfortunate. If the mine goes full steam, then we've under-built and we may have to provide for more capacity for locks, water treatment, sewage treatment, etc.

So what we have tried to do is approach it from a very cautious perspective and we've had to backtrack. We had in place plans for a waterline that was to go to the new subdivision and because of the difficulties that they're finding themselves in now, we're not extending them to the subdivision. So we've had to be flexible in that way; we're only extending it to existing houses. We still have provisions and plans and blueprints and drawings ready in case we do have to go to the subdivision at a later date and, hopefully, we will because that will mean that the mine is producing; but if we don't, then we have avoided the cost of that extra infrastructure which really wouldn't be serving any purpose.

We've done a number of cost benefit analyses on it; we've done a number of different studies on it, but they all pointed to a very cautious approach. An approach that acknowledged the instability of the economy in the area and allowed us to tinker with it as we went along; certainly not the way in which I like

to do things, and I don't think it's the way in which the members opposite like to do things, but necessity forced that sort of a process on us. Now, if gold prices go up, we will have in place the plans that are necessary to provide the infrastructure.

One other point has to be made. The community itself has been very active in involving themselves in these decisions. We had one instance where we were wanting to spend money in one way and they were wanting to spend it for another purpose altogether, and we went into the community and discussed it and reached a solution to that particular problem, but they certainly have been essential parts of the process of deciding on the planning for the community. They've been very active and very vocal in that area. So that is another factor that we've had to take into consideration when we developed a plan for Bissett. It was a factor which we gladly have taken into consideration because that's the type of activity we want councils to undertake to provide us with that sort of direction.

I just had a note here from staff which indicates that the mine is in fact cutting back due to the economics of gold prices at the time and they're presently cutting out some operations in favour of lower level development - well, that's what I indicated earlier - a projected ongoing staff of 20 to 40 persons rather than 200. You can see what sort of impact a decision of that sort would have on the type of infrastructure you needed and consequently on the type of planning you do for a community. So we're trying to approach this one with a great deal of flexibility.

We're also trying to build into the planning some long-range economic opportunities such as I indicated before - tourism or whatever may be appropriate for the area - so that we're not entirely dependent on the mine.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Of the 180-odd people that were expected to be laid off according to a news item I had seen some time ago, would most of those people be people from outside of the area, or would there be a large percentage of those 180 employees hired from the immediate area of Bissett? What percentage would be sort of local employees?

HON. J. COWAN: Well, I know from my own visit there that a lot of the workers were, in fact, from a local area, Manigotagan and in that area, and they were commuting on a daily basis, so I'd imagine a large number of those would be laid off.

As well, there were miners from as far away as Lynn Lake and Leaf Rapids. I happened to meet one of my friends there and he was working at Bissett, and when I was up in Lynn Lake last week, he was back up in Lynn Lake and working there. So a lot of the miners were from outside the area as well, and they've gone back. But I think the impact would be the greatest on those individuals in surrounding communities that were commuting on a daily basis and those individuals who had moved into the community from farther away, such as this miner had. He'd moved his family in in a trailer and left the trailer or sold the trailer, I'm not certain which, and moved back to Lynn Lake. So it's had that sort of impact.

I would imagine it's had some impact on local activity in the area as well, both in regard to individual workers and entrepreneurs who were providing support services to the mine, but most of those individuals were there before the mine and will be there after the mine, and they have other activities which keep them busy when the mine's not operating. So, while they will be affected by any cutback, it probably won't cause them to move from the area.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Are there regular ongoing discussions with the mining people and the community personnel and the elected people of the community, as well as Northern Affairs staff, to look at the long-range planning of that community?

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, there's actually quite a good working relationship between the elected officials at the community level and the mining company officials. Staff involved themselves as needed to provide backup or support or assistance or information to either party, and I've had several discussions with company officials. They have been most agreeable to providing information to us and sharing their concerns. As with all things, we can probably improve those communication lines somewhat over a period of time, but they seem to be working well enough now to allow for effective communication back and forth. I know, as well, that they've been in contact with my colleague, the Minister of Mines, in respect to a number of concerns.

MR. D. GOURLAY: You mentioned tourism as being another industry that could be developed for the area. Has tourism been on the increase, especially since the mine has started up in recent years, or has that had an effect on increasing the tourist business to that area?

HON. J. COWAN: It's my understanding that it hasn't had a significant impact on tourism in the area - no. I think what the community is doing is looking a bit to the future here and that's good planning. They see that area as being one of the untapped tourism resources, and that's in relative terms, in the province and they're expecting over a period of time that demands for increased recreational areas such as that will have an impact on tourism in the area and that they will, in fact, hopefully have in place the infrastructure and the planning and the work that is necessary to enable them to capture some of that economic benefit that arises from that tourism, so it's not because there's been a significant increase in the area because of the mine, nor a significant increase in the area generally. I think they do see very clearly though the potential for that area once it's developed.

At the same time they believe that development will be necessary as demands are placed on other areas that are currently serving tourists.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Just to leave that area.

I wonder, getting into the situation of unconditional grants to the various communities. Has there been any significant increase in the amount and number of unconditional grants to various communities under Northern Affairs?

HON. J. COWAN: If I can just ask your indulgence for one minute. We're really not in that particular area yet,

but I'll look for the information or I'll have staff look for the information while I make a few general comments on it.

This is one of the areas that is of great concern to the communities, to the government generally, and to the Northern Association of Community Councils which, in fact, represent the communities. We've just undertaken a process of reviewing all the policy directives and rewriting them in a somewhat different language to make, what we believe, is easier reading for the community officials who have to use them. We did that in consultation with the Northern Association of Community Councils executive. At the end of that process, we had a meeting in Thompson, at which I was in attendance, to sort out some of the unresolved issues; those issues which could not be satisfactorily dealt with at the staff level.

One of those issues was unconditional funding and we had probably an hour, an hour-and-a-half discussion on it, and I'm afraid that we weren't able to resolve it entirely, but that we did very clearly outline the questions which had to be addressed over a longer period of time.

I can give you the specifics as to what is considered and what is considered unconditional. I don't think you'll find that there is a major difference in what is conditional now and what is unconditional now, as compared to what was conditional and unconditional for the last number of years. It's pretty much the same.

Community clerks' funding; police constable funding; fire program - that's a local fire program and funding; water supply funding and night soil funding are all conditional. I'm certain you can see the rationale behind that. Those are the types of essential services which we believe the community must expend provincial money to provide if we are going to give them money for that purpose. They're basic public health services. We're talking about administration, fire program, water supply, night soil.

Unconditional funding is operations and maintenance, discretionary funds and community employee benefits. That we consider to be funding that is of an unconditional nature.

Now, having said that one is conditional and one is unconditional, we are very flexible. When we met with the NACC, we talked about this problem because what they see happening that is of great concern to them is we give them conditional funding. Let us say we give them conditional funding for a community clerk program and their community clerk quits for some reason or another. That funding is then unspent for a period of time. Due to no fault of their own, they would prefer to have a community clerk in place and spend that money on the community clerk. They'd go off to hire one. Well that takes a certain amount of time. They finally do hire one and that individual works and perhaps they've had two or three months of conditional funding which wasn't being spent. They then come back at the end of the year and say, we want to do these other things which are important to our community.

As you're well aware, we never have enough money to provide the communities with enough resources to do everything that needs to be done, much less everything that wants to be done, and we have to say no, that was conditional money. That doesn't make us feel very good, and it doesn't make them feel very

good. We do that because we want to avoid conditional funding being not spent and used for other purposes. That's a difficult situation when it happens and it doesn't happen very often, but the potential is enough that we're concerned about it happening.

So, we certainly don't want to create the impression that that conditional funding is going to become unconditional if for some reason it isn't utilized. At the same time, we believe that money is owing to the community and that if we can devise a way by which it can be spent effectively and efficiently in that community or another community, then let's spend it. We voted on it in this House. We said that it should be spent. It's money which has been directed through the department to be spent. So we try to approach that situation with some flexibility.

At the same time, we're quite strict about the expenditure of any conditional funding and we reserve the right to say no we're not going to spend it in that community for that purpose. It may get spent in another community for another purpose. What we like to do is sit down with the community itself and discuss it and try to resolve the issue at that level.

So I don't know as if that is much different in approach than was proceeded with under the previous administration. I couldn't tell you quite frankly, but that's the way in which we're proceeding at this time.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Yes, you indicated that this wasn't the proper place to ask that question. That would be under (b)(3) is that the . . .

HON. J. COWAN: It's under 3(b), Local Government Services, but if you want to continue discussing here it's perfectly fine.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I don't have any more questions on this area. The Constable Program, would it be included in this same area?

HON. J. COWAN: Yes.

MR. D. GOURLAY: What is the current situation with respect to the training of constables? Has there been any change in that program? Is it still much the same as it has been for the last couple of years?

HON. J. COWAN: No, there's no changes of a significant nature in the way in which the program is administered or implemented.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Are there any new areas that are now engaging the services of a community constable during the last year?

Are there any new communities engaging the services of a constable during the past year that didn't have this service prior to this year?

HON. J. COWAN: I understand the community of Norway House was included in the Estimates last year, but could not hire a constable. They have hired one now so while the position is actually two years old, there is a new constable in that place. I understand they're in the process of hiring one now, so it hasn't finalized, but hopefully it will be in the near future. So,

yes there is one new community constable in place, but the money was there last year but was never used for that purpose.

MR. D. GOURLAY: With respect to the detention facilities that have been included in the Budgets during the past number of years, are they still using the same type of facility for detention centres? Are there any new ones being arranged for, for the coming year?

HON. J. COWAN: No, there are no new ones anticipated as part of these Estimates in the coming year and they're using the same type of facilities, which they've used in the past.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(b)(1) - the Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I have a question on Other Expenses, and then perhaps we can move off this whole area. The Other Expenditures under Section 2 are down considerably. I am just wondering if the Minister could indicate what constitutes the decrease. What areas are being withdrawn under the Other Expenditures?

HON. J. COWAN: The 1982-83 vote was 156,700.00. The present request is 143,800, or 8.2 percent decrease for an absolute amount of \$12,900.00. Fees, and again I'll give you 1982-83 adjusted as compared to 1983-84 request, went from \$900 to \$800; facilities and equipment went from \$89,000 to \$78,800; specialized equipment went from \$19,400 to \$21,600, an increase in that area; operating costs stayed pretty much the same, 37,700 as compared to 37,600; and subsistence went from 9,700 to 5,000.00. Of course, on those areas that stay pretty much the same, there is a decrease due to inflation, but the absolute amount is pretty much the same. That's what I mean by indicating that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(b)(1)—pass; 3.(b)(2)—pass; 3.(b)(3)—pass; 3.(c)(1) Community Works: Salaries and Wages - the Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask the Minister about public health services and provisions in Northern communities. Last year, during his Estimates, I discussed with him the urgency of zeroing in on health matters largely from the perspective of a provision of public health facilities and support systems, particularly in Northern and remote areas. I raised with him the fact that a number of Northern communities, through their spokesmen in particular at the convention of the NACC here in Winnipeg in 1982, had approached me and my colleague, the Honourable Member for Swan River, and identified some specific problems in terms of services as basic and fundamental as the provision of clean water in a number of Northern communities.

I recognize the difficulty of guaranteeing and supplying clean water in a lot of our remote communities, but I think the Minister agreed with me at the time that if we're going to achieve and maintain standards of health care, those basic services are fundamental to that.

We discussed at that time the infant mortality rate which, for Manitoba in general, is not bad, but for the

North and particularly for the Native community is very serious and of great concern to a lot of us. And I know the Minister shares that concern.

So I would just like to ask the Minister at this juncture, one year now having elapsed, Mr. Chairman, whether he can bring us up to date on the initiatives that he is undertaking to supply clean water and sewer and basic public health services to Northern communities.

HON. J. COWAN: This is certainly an area where I share the member's concerns and sense of urgency, because it is an item so essential to basic public health that we must, in fact, operate with a sense of prioritization for water and sewer facilities and a sense of urgency. He mentioned the infant mortality rates, and that certainly should be enough to motivate us to move as quickly as we can in this area. So it is a priority within the government.

I would like to first take you through what we have done last year, and then perhaps address what we plan to do in the upcoming year, and certainly would solicit any of your comments, suggestions or criticisms in this area because it is one in which I know you have a personal interest and an interest, I think, that can benefit all of us.

In Anama Bay, we put in a septic field and a well last year which provided for water and sewer somewhat for the community. In Bissett, we designed and constructed a water control structure, the West Bissett Watermain and Water Treatment Plant upgrading, and Round Lake subdivision watermain extension. Now the Round Lake subdivision watermain extension is the one that I indicated that we had deferred. I believe it is the one that we've deferred until we find out a bit more as to what is happening in that community. In Crane River, there was a water line extension to the community hall and subdivision. In Cross Lake, there was a completion of a water sewer system at \$1,515,000.00.

Now I want to talk about that for a minute, because I was just up in Cross Lake and had addressed earlier that we had been there to open the administration building. Part of the other purpose, of course, was to open the water treatment plant and the sewer system and the plant for waste disposal. Again that was an activity that was undertaken with a large component of local participation and employment. I don't know if you were here earlier in my opening statements, but one of the things I indicated when we were doing these sorts of Capital projects that we wanted to get the best benefit out of the projects that was possible. So not only do we want to build a water plant that provides for clean water, we want to do it using local labour as much as possible and using designs which are appropriate and technology which is appropriate to the area and the time.

They have a beautiful building there that was constructed with a large component of local labour, not as much as went into the administration building because it's a bit more complex operation, but certainly a large component of local labour. I think it will serve that community well for a number of years. They also had the sewage disposal plant which we opened.

Then, as an aside, they had a surprise for us that day. I think it indicates the pride that the community has in the facility, but also the expectation that the

community has in the facility. As you can appreciate, the completion of the plant is only part of the process. Then you have to get the lines in, the main lines, and then you have to get the lines into the homes, and it's a long process over a period of time. What they did was one of the first houses to be served - and there weren't many served yet, one of the first ones had an outdoor structure which had been used for that purpose in the past. The surprise was the setting of that structure on fire. Of course, they had the local fire department come out with their hoses just in case the fire were to spread, but I think it was symbolic of the anticipation that they hold for the operation of that plant and the service it will provide to the community. It is extremely important. That was an expensive project, that \$1.5 million, but it was one that was well worthwhile.

In Stevenson Island, we are developing a new disposal site and we're still working on the technologies which we're going to use there, but that's in the process. In Thicket Portage, land was acquired for the waterline. In Warren Landing, a nuisance ground was constructed. In Waterhen, water filters and storage tanks were put in place, and then we had various water and sewer remedial work done for a cost of \$80,000.00.

In Norway House, last year, we did the water and sewer design for \$43,000.00. We're now ready to start on the construction, if we haven't just already started, and I believe we're anticipating a cost of \$1 million this year and \$2.5 million in total by the time we get that facility operational and complete. So that's another big project.

In Pine Dock, we provided a liquid waste disposal site. In South Indian Lake, there was a garbage facility that was constructed. In Homebrook, again, a garbage facility was constructed. In Matheson Island, such a facility was relocated; and in Meadow Portage, we designed and constructed a water system at a cost of \$130,000 approximately.

The total for '83-84 is \$2,292,000 that we will be spending on these sorts of projects.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Can I have that figure again?

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, \$2,292,000.00. By the way, we hope to be able to supplement that activity with other programs as they become available. So I'm hoping that we will be able to spend more on that, and we will be able to accelerate our activities in that regard because it is a matter of extreme importance both to the public health of the province in general and, as well, to the health of individuals who live in those communities. We're also anticipating spending \$199,000 on garbage disposal sites as well.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the Minister for that information and I must say that my colleague, the Member for Swan River, and I certainly welcome it, and I'm sure that residents of all of the communities affected share in a great deal of satisfaction both from the point of view of the projects themselves and their participation in them.

I'd just like to have an opportunity to clarify my own thinking on the subject from the Minister's programming perspective, if I can. He has mentioned a number of communities, Mr. Chairman, in which a wide-ranging

number of public health projects have been installed or completed in the past year and I wonder, two things: (1) how the program for '82-83, which would have been the one largely under discussion, compares in financial outlay with the '83-84 projection that he has given us of \$2,292,000; and (2) whether he can cite for the committee what the 1983-84 program encompasses or envisages in terms of projects of this kind. I'm not sure whether the list that he gave us was a mix of '82-83 and '83-84 or whether it was all '82-83.

HON. J. COWAN: If I can just ask your indulgence for one minute while we get the detailed information together as quickly as possible. Perhaps the member has more comments that he'd like to make while we put that information together for him.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister and his officials can assemble that information, it would be welcome. Did I make my question clear? I don't need to have specific dollars attached to every project, I'm not really asking that. I'd just like to have an identification of where he feels projects of this kind require to be handled in '83-84 and thus what his '83-84 projected program is from the point of view of communities requiring services, and what the '82-83 program consisted of from the point of view of communities requiring such services?

But while his officials are looking for that, I'd like to ask him - and this subject certainly can be discussed under the Estimates of the Department of Health, but I think it is certainly legitimate to raise the question with him here under Northern Affairs, Mr. Chairman - whether the Minister has had discussions or meetings with any of his colleagues representing other northern constituencies as he does relative to the Northern Patient Transportation System, the so-called "air ambulance service"? There have been considerable criticisms raised in the past month, or at least they've come to light in the past month. They've no doubt been raised over the past period of time with respect to the service and the aircraft itself; the viability of the aircraft for emergency medical calls; the capability of various northern landing strips to handle that aircraft; and general public levels of satisfaction or dissatisfaction; and certainly there has been considerable reported with respect to general hospital and medical levels of satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

I was in The Pas on Friday and in discussions with officials at The Pas Health Complex in St. Anthony's Hospital, the Northern Patient Transportation Program was a major theme and subject of concern and comparative unhappiness. Now, I know I can deal with this with the Minister of Health, but the Minister of Northern Affairs and the Environment, the MLA for Churchill, is one who was pretty vocal on this subject when he was in opposition. I'd like to know what he feels about that service, what he feels in his relationship to the Minister of Health, what he can do or should be doing about that service, and whether four other members of the government caucus representing northern communities, the Honourable Member for Flin Flon, who is also a member of the Executive Council, the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, the Honourable Member for The Pas, and the Honourable

Member for Thompson have come to him and said, Mr. Minister, we've had problems with the Northern Patient Transportation Program and something needs to be done about it.

HON. J. COWAN: Well, I'm certain that the member, having been a member of a government caucus and Cabinet before, appreciates the delicacy of this situation. I will have to rely upon him to make a lot of the comments that others might make under different circumstances in regard to the complaints which have been expressed by Northerners, in respect to the Northern Patient Transportation Program and the provision of service for air ambulance and evacuations - medi-vacs. I've heard those same complaints. They are not new complaints. They are complaints that I take very seriously. They are complaints that I discuss with my colleagues. They are complaints that my colleagues discuss with me.

I do not believe that we have a perfect system in place. As a matter of fact, I believe that the system we have in place can use improvement. I'm not certain that we will ever have a perfect system in place. I'm not certain that we will ever have a system in place that does not deserve a need for some improvement, but at the same time I do know there are complaints that are vocal enough now and that are consistent enough now to give us cause for concern. I share that concern and will continue to discuss it with my colleagues, both in and out of Executive Council, until we have as near a perfect system in place as we can.

That will need some changes. That will require some changes and I'm certain it's something that you will want to discuss with my colleague, the Minister of Health, when he comes back into these Estimates, I believe, after I've been through them and I'm certain he'll have something to say about it. You may, although the opportunity's lost for this year in respect to Estimates, you may want to undertake discussions with the Minister of Highways and Transportation as well, in regard to the service that's provided by his department respecting medi-vac.

I hope that answers the question for the member. The concerns that have been expressed are, in fact, consistent concerns and I think they demand our attention and I can assure you that we are giving them our attention. Given the circumstances of the day, it's difficult to make major new innovative changes in that area, but it's something that I recall this House voting in unanimity on and by way of a Private Members' Resolution which I introduced a number of years ago. As a matter of fact it was the only Private Members' Resolution, I think, which I introduced which passed in this House when I was in a capacity as an opposition member and I take some pride in that. I believe it passed because everybody recognized the problems and I believe the concerns are still there in many ways and we should continue to recognize that problems continue to exist and deal with them as effectively as we can.

You have your way of dealing with them now and I certainly have my way of dealing with them internally now and it is a matter that has not escaped my attention, nor have I, I don't believe, in any way abrogated my responsibility to bring those matters forward in the most appropriate way possible.

Now, if you have other questions than that, I'd be pleased to address them when you next rise, but I do want to deal with the information on the list of departmental water, sewer programs which we anticipate for this year.

On an extension of the waterline in Camperville, Duck Bay and Pelican Rapids . . .

MR. L. SHERMAN: Are we looking at 1983-84?

HON. J. COWAN: This is 1983-84, I'm sorry, yes. I should have been more clear on that. An extension of the waterline for Camperville - do you want the cost figures?

HON. L. SHERMAN: I beg your pardon?

HON. J. COWAN: Do you want the cost figures at the same time on these, or do you want me to identify the ones that are of significant cost?

HON. L. SHERMAN: Just the significant cost.

HON. J. COWAN: Okay. That's not to say that any project that we do is not significant, but there are some that are more significant than others.

Camperville waterline extension; Duck Bay waterline extension; Pelican Rapids waterline extension; Berens River Water-Sewer Feasibility Study; Bissett waterline extension. I'll give you the ones over \$100,000 if that's an appropriate figure - that would be one at a \$100,000.00.

The Manigotagan waterline extension at \$300,000; Matheson Island is a drill one well; Pine Dock, investigate and drill two wells; Fisher Bay, drill well; Seymourville water-sewer system including a sewage lagoon at \$350,000; Cormorant community water-sewer design at \$215,000, they must be doing some work there as well as the design; Easterville, develop a well in the subdivision; Herb Lake, develop a well in the subdivision and shelter; Moose Lake, develop well and shelter in new subdivision; Norway House, community water-sewer system, \$1 million; Pikwitonei, a waterline upgrading; Thicket Portage, a purchase of water delivery trailer; Cross Lake, finishing up of what we have at \$71,000; for a total of \$2,292,000.00.

Now that's a figure I gave you as a total earlier for 1983-84. I'll have to get you a total for 1982-83. We just don't have that available but I'll be glad to provide that to you once we've been able to do the computations on it.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to thank the Minister for that information. I'm happy to see that effort that we all must get behind and stand behind to bring those infrastructure systems of public health services to the North and to our remote communities. It appears to be continuing on a pretty solid course. The range of projects and the range of communities to be included this year is certainly gratifying and good to see.

On the other point, on the Northern Patient Transportation Program, I just want to - I'm not going to labour the point - but I just remind the Minister that although he's busy - I know he's busy and I know the

kinds of demands that are made on members of the Executive Council, having had the honour to be in that position myself for some years - but a year and one-half has gone by and certainly he had criticisms of the Northern Patient Transportation Program and I'm sure if he were back in opposition, he'd have criticisms of it again tonight.

The fact that he's busy, the fact that he's got lots to do in Northern Affairs and Environment should not preclude his attention, should not detract from his interest, attention and obligations to doing something about what he thinks is wrong with the NPTP and I cite it, in his instance in particular, because he is a Northern member. It is one thing for a southern member like me to complain about the Northern Patient Transportation Program, but another thing altogether for a Northern member.

The Honourable Minister was very vocal in his conviction that the service should be located in the North, based and operating out of the North, rather than out of the south, when he was Minister. There are practical problems with that, but I hope that he's sweating it out at 3 o'clock in the morning, because he certainly made a lot of noise — (Interjection) — Well, that's right. But I remind the Minister that a year and one-half has gone by and there have been a good many complaints in the last year-and-a-half. There were none of a significant nature that I can recall when I was Minister.

MR. G. FILMON: That's because we had a good Minister then.

MR. L. SHERMAN: But the last year-and-a-half, the complaints have started piling up, Mr. Chairman. It doesn't take very long for somebody venturing into the North to pick them up. Since the Minister had such great concern and interest in it a year-and-a-half and two-and-a-half and three-and-a-half years ago, I hope he still has that interest in it now. I would be very happy if he were to come back and report to the House that the system should properly be - he's satisfied that it should properly be based in the south for the following reasons: (a), (b), (c), and (d). But if he thinks it should be based in the North, and if he can demonstrate that it would operate better and more effectively if it were, then he has an obligation in his Ministerial office now to present the supporting arguments for that kind of position, unless he's changed his mind entirely.

So I just leave that with him, Mr. Chairman, as a reminder that some of us are watching what he's doing about northern patient transportation.

HON. J. COWAN: Well, I certainly can't let the inferences go unanswered.

MR. L. SHERMAN: I was afraid of that.

HON. J. COWAN: I don't want to drag you off the debate, because I think the member has made a good point and he's done it quite capably. But I think the rhetoric should also be clear that when I brought this matter to his attention a number of years ago on a number of occasions, there were no complaints. When he brought this matter to my attention now, I certainly

have confirmed that those complaints exist. As a matter of fact, I've acknowledged that they are serious and consistent. So I don't see any inconsistency in my approach whatsoever.

I do want the member to know that this is a matter that has not escaped my attention, nor has it escaped my efforts to try to correct it as much as is necessary and in a way that is appropriate through different mechanisms now than I used before.

I am glad to see that the member opposite is taking up some of the slack which exists because of the change in circumstances, and we both now sit on different sides of the House. I think that's important and I welcome him into that debate. I hope that he will talk about that with the Minister of Health and the Minister of Highways and Transportation, if he hasn't already done so. He may have already done that; I don't know, to be perfectly honest, but if he has not, I hope he does because it is a serious concern. It is a serious matter. It is one which, I think, we share by way of a vote several years ago and by way of a common interest now, a desire to rectify in the most satisfactory manner.

I will continue to work in my own way on that, and I welcome his expressions of hope that we will be successful. I too hope that we will be successful in providing for the best service. I welcome his involvement; I welcome his change of heart in respect to this service and the way in which it should be best provided, because he indicated now that the concerns are there and perhaps that is because the concerns have just risen over the past year-and-a-half, or perhaps it's because they have been of a different nature over the past year-and-a-half. I can assure him that some of the same criticisms which have been voiced just recently in the media were voiced two or three years ago to me personally and as a representative of the area.

I can also tell him, without fear of betraying any of my responsibilities or duties as a member of Executive Council, that my constituents are still saying that there is room for improvement there, and I take those concerns very seriously. I can tell him that my colleagues are saying there is room for improvement there, and I take their encouragements seriously. I know by all of us working together, whether it be a constituent who has a complaint and making it known, or the Member for Fort Garry who makes his concerns known by vehicle of this House, or my colleagues and I who make our concerns known in a different way, that by all working together, we can provide a better service. I think that's what we are all after, so I look forward to working with him on this one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: The Minister had indicated a number of water and sewer programs, extensions, and new installations and so forth. I think he mentioned too that a lot of local people were being involved in the construction of these or installation of these projects. Could the Minister indicate how this is being handled through Community Works? Have they undertaken hiring many new staff members to work on this project, or how is this being attended to?

HON. J. COWAN: I am just asking staff to review now if, in fact, we have hired any new individuals. I would

assume you mean positions rather than persons. No, we haven't provided for an increase in positions. As a matter of fact, we have provided for fewer positions. We reduced staffing by one clerical position in Thompson, one construction supervisor in Selkirk, and three term positions which were used in a general way to provide services in the communities.

We have been able to do that because there is a greater involvement of local individuals in design and construction. Hopefully, there would be a day when we could reduce this part of the department to a bare skeleton of what it is today. I mean, that's what we should be working towards so that we would just have individuals that would go into the field, get the communities activated, get them working on a project, provide support services in whatever way is necessary, then let the community take over the project and work the project through to its completion, and just go in in a supervisory capacity and an auditing capacity to make certain that the work is being done properly. That's a goal to which we all seek at this time. I'm certain that is the case.

The reductions which we put in place this year are not anticipated to create severe difficulties. I hope they don't create any difficulties at all. We are certainly assuming that we will be able to provide the service, because the local communities are taking greater involvement in the construction of these facilities. So I would like to be able to come back here year after year to a certain degree and say that we have been able to reduce the staff because the communities are more active until we got to the stage where we had a staff in place that was there to support the communities in their work and to provide that service.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister how these projects are being handled. Are they being advertised for local contractors or how are they advertised as far as the installation of these somewhat major installations? I think you said a million dollar extension at Norway House; most of the list you gave us were over \$100,000.00. If the Minister could indicate just how those are being handled, and how are the installations being put in, so that we can be assured of the standard of work that is being attended to.

HON. J. COWAN: Certainly the projects over \$100,000 would be tendered by way of a public tender. When we get to some of the smaller projects, and there are some projects in that list which are probably about \$1,000 and \$5,000 in that range, we may use other mechanisms such as the departmental staff going in, equipment rentals and invitational tenders in some circumstances which has been the normal course over a period of time - although quite honestly I'm attempting to move away from invitational tenders over a longer period of time - or at least make them more responsive to Northern contractors and entrepreneurs, if nothing else. But the ones over \$100,000 would be public tender.

The procedures that are followed are similar to the procedures that are followed in any construction of such a facility. There is a study which is done which is designed to map out the needs and demands, and then there's design phase which is intended to provide

a plan to meet those needs; then the actual construction is undertaken with departmental staff involved as much as is necessary - but hopefully no more than is necessary - and that certain standards are subscribed to and hopefully in all cases, met.

Now, there may be specific instances where standards are not met to the satisfaction of all parties and if we catch it in time we go back in and correct it. If we don't catch it in time we have to go back at a later date and correct it but we certainly try to minimize those circumstances. I think you can well appreciate that would be the case with any construction of this sort. You're going to have mistakes that happen from time to time. I don't think we have given any more, under the circumstances which the facilities are designed and constructed, but they do occur from time to time.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Yes, the reason I was concerned about this area I think the Minister is well aware in the past that certain installations were installed in different communities where there were serious problems with the installations. They probably were not inspected at the time of construction and a lot of repair work was necessary to bring the water and sewer program up to a suitable, or a minimum standard.

With respect to other projects under Community Works, recreation facilities, road construction and that; roads for instance, are they being handled through the Department of Highways or are they being looked after completely within the Department of Northern Affairs? Also the recreation facilities, are they being worked on by the Community Works personnel in conjunction with local communities or what is the situation there?

HON. J. COWAN: The road maintenance is of course the internal roads in the communities and does not apply to roads leading up to the communities that are part of the Public Highway system. The work is done in the large part by the Department of Highways under that department. There are times when it is a small job, or there is equipment in the community and entrepreneurs and workers in a community that wish to undertake that project, they are at times given the opportunity to do projects of that nature. In those instances I believe we're using Highway rates as a standard for the use of their equipment, yes, that is the case. But most of it - and I can't give you an exact figure, I could at a later date - but right now I can just indicate that the large majority of it is done by Highways itself.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I wonder if the Minister could bring us up-to-date on the South Indian Lake housing problems that have been worked on the last couple or three years with respect to foundations under a number of houses there and also the problem with the community store at South Indian Lake.

HON. J. COWAN: I believe that all the foundation work has been completed now. I would have to check to confirm that, but it's been indicated to me that it has in fact been completed.

I imagine you're talking about the actual construction of the South Indian store and some of the maintenance problems in regard to it. Is that the case? Or are you talking about the operation in general?

MR. D. GOURLAY: A couple of years ago some serious deficiencies were showing up in the store at South Indian Lake and the contractor was to undertake some repairs to correct the problem and I'm just wondering what the situation is there now.

HON. J. COWAN: It's my understanding that it has been completed, I think about two years ago, a year and one-half, two years ago, so the work has been completed. There's always ongoing maintenance problems in a facility of that sort and the community store has been working with the department to try to arrange a maintenance agreement over a longer period of time but they're certainly not of the nature they were a couple of years ago and certainly aren't significant in respect to any impact they would have on the operation of the store. They're typical type of maintenance problems that we would encounter in this building or any other building.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Recently there's been some publicity about a new arena at Cross Lake. I'm wondering what involvement will the Northern Affairs staff of Community Works have with respect to this arena, if any. Will they have some involvement with it?

HON. J. COWAN: This is indeed a difficult situation in that the arena comes under the Northern Flood Agreement. I can just advise you of some of the history in respect to the arena and then perhaps answer specific questions that you might have regarding that information.

The Cross Lake Indian Band filed Claim No. 11 on March 4, 1981, in respect to the loss of recreational opportunities in the community resulting from the water levels, the fluctuating water levels and the lower water levels in the community.

By the way I have a copy of the claim and a copy of the Interim Consent Order and I indicated that I would table a copy for the Member for Turtle Mountain when he asked for that information. I'll have copies made for you and then I'll table them, then perhaps you can share them with the Member for Turtle Mountain.

The Cross Lake Indian Band filed that claim, arbitration hearings were held on the matter in 1981. I've had an opportunity to read through the actual testimony itself and it's quite a thick document and a very telling document. Sometimes we have difficulty here putting an arena of that sort in the proper perspective. The members have indicated and committee members in other committees have indicated in the House that it seems as if that arena is costing a lot of money for the service it provides. It seems like that arena is costing a lot of money in comparison to other arenas in other communities of a similar sort. That is, in fact, the case. It's an expensive arena; there is no doubt about it.

The arguments which were used to present that claim were significant as well. The arguments that were provided by residents of the communities - it wasn't really arguments - they were stories about what things had been like and what things are like now, and how there isn't an opportunity for them to escape like there was in the past, how swimming is not the same as it

was, and how children get rashes from swimming now. They attributed it to the different water levels and the problems with the water.

They also talked about the other things that have happened to the community as a result of that Hydro activity. It sort of all gets rolled up into one. It is hard to separate recreation from public health, recreation from economic opportunity, recreation from the other impacts on the community. It's almost necessary to read that long complex document, where Hydro lawyers do cross-examination and Manitoba is involved and residents of the communities come forward and talk about the way things were and the ways things are to have a good picture of that arena. It's important to the people; it's important to the community. So they've put in a claim, as is their right, as is their obligation really in a lot of ways, their responsibility under their Northern Flood Agreement.

Interim Consent Order was agreed to on March 19, 1982. We, as a province, agreed to that Interim Consent Order, as did the Federal Government, as did the Cross Lake Band, as did Hydro. We did that because we felt that it provided for a satisfactory resolution of those grievances, very real grievances. We weren't totally satisfied, by the way, that money couldn't be better spent in another way. As a matter of fact, I think I would be quite honest in saying we wish the money had been spent in another way, but that was not our decision to make, not under the terms of the Northern Agreement, not under the philosophy that we approach these sorts of problems with. We had to take into account the feelings, the desires, the needs of the local residents.

At the conceptual stage, at the time when we talked about the Interim Consent Order, the estimates for the cost of construction of an arena and operation were estimated at \$2 million. So we agreed to it on that basis. We also agreed to some provisions for operation of the arena, training of local residents to operate the arena, trying to allow for the arena to provide some economic opportunity for residents. Again, the estimated cost was \$2 million; that has to be put in a comparison.

In 1980, the Lynn Lake Arena was constructed at a cost of \$1 million, and it serves a community that would be - what's the population of Cross Lake? - about the same size and will be a bit smaller, unfortunately, probably over the next little while. In 1974, the Leaf Rapids Arena was constructed at a cost of \$2 million. That's the cost we are talking about for the Cross Lake Arena. It was serving a population of much the same size. Arenas of lower standards, as the Member for Swan River referenced earlier, were built at Norway House and Wabowden for approximately \$1 million each. Now maybe they shouldn't have cost that much; maybe they needn't have cost that much, but that's what they cost. They are serving the communities well now, even if they are not up to the same standard as the arena at Cross Lake is anticipated to be.

We then became involved in the process of designing the arena, finding a site for it, designing it and actually beginning to undertake construction. The costs escalated rapidly, and they have gone up and down. This hasn't been a stable situation. There have been discussions between the Cross Lake Indian Band, Hydro, Northern Affairs and the Federal Government. We sat down and some meetings I have been involved

in, some meetings I haven't been involved in. We have said, do you really need this component? Do you really need that component? But in a lot of ways we weren't in a good bargaining position because of the Northern Flood Agreement, and that fact that if at any time we could not reach a consensus, the arbitrator could step in because it was only an Interim Consent Order. The arbitrator could step in and arbitrate and impose upon us a settlement. We were concerned, based on the testimony which was provided to the arbitrator, and testimony which I have read, and I suggest you read, that settlement might have been more than the consensus-type arena which we were discussing. We could have been proved right or wrong on that, but we were acting from the perspective of our best judgment that the arena provided the services which we felt were necessary to provide, that the arena was being constructed in a way which was sound, that the arena was not of such a nature as to be totally extravagant but certainly was more expensive than we would do under other circumstances.

The arena cost estimate now is \$3 million to \$3.5 million. Hydro will pay the initial cost of that and then the apportionment of the total cost amongst the parties will be finalized later. Now, that \$3 million-\$3.5 million includes some infrastructure that has to be developed around the arena. It also includes some engineering work which is being done by Hydro staff which they cost out as part of the cost of the arena. So the actual construction itself is not anticipated to be - I am careful on that - \$3.5 million; but when everything is put together it may be \$3.5 million. As well, that the placement of the arena is imposing some demands on the community infrastructure and through that on the Department of Northern Affairs. So we're going to have to provide some other services as well. Roads, sewer and water services to the arena are estimated at \$180,000.00. Arena management training costs, which does provide for employment and economic opportunities, estimated at \$90,000.00.

We've had some difficulties with the site. The site that was first chosen was a site which had been used for disposal of waste in the area and we were concerned about methane generation at the time. We took samples and it was determined that the site was unsafe, and therefore we had to remove the organic material, put it somewhere else and put the fill back in to make the site safe. So we didn't end up with exactly the type of problem which the Member for Swan River is justifiably concerned we may end up with, if we don't proceed very carefully on determining what site should be used and what sort of construction should be undertaken. So that's the situation with the arena.

The operating maintenance costs are estimated to be \$100,000 a year and that will be apportioned as well between the parties. That's all part of the process of the Northern Flood Agreement. So we entered into it because a claim was put in place, but because, as well, we were convinced by the testimony of the hearings that there was in fact a negative impact on recreational opportunities in that area resulting out of the diversion, the fluctuating water levels; and we felt that we had some responsibility under the Northern Flood Agreement to involve ourselves in that construction project and involve ourselves in some of the costs. We probably would do it differently if we had a different

mechanism by which we could determine what the arena should be, but that is not available to us, and the reality of the situation is this is a type of arena which we believe will meet the demands which are being imposed upon us by the Northern Flood Agreement.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't doubt for one moment that the hydro project certainly seriously affected the recreational and lifestyle of the community of Cross Lake very seriously. I've been there at a time when the water situation was drastically low and the water intake situation was just completely put out of commission and a whole new project had to be looked at. I don't deny that Manitoba Hydro should be responsible for compensating those people for recreation facilities. It just appears to be a very luxurious type of arena when perhaps other projects could go much further as far as the \$3.5 million is concerned.

At what point does the Department of Northern Affairs become involved in this project? Have they been working with the community and Manitoba Hydro right from Day One, or is it something that is being now passed onto the Department of Northern Affairs to become involved in, or is it an ongoing commitment through the Northern Flood Agreement which comes under the Department of Northern Affairs?

HON. J. COWAN: Well, we were a party to the claim; the claim was directed against us as one of the signatories to the Northern Flood Agreement, so it was directed against us, Manitoba Hydro, and Canada, if I understand it correctly, by the Cross Lake Community. So the cost will be a portion between us because we are going to be, in the end, paying for some of the costs both of construction and perhaps of operation of that facility. We have been involved in the discussions; we have discussed it with Hydro in regard to what we think is necessary and what we think is appropriate and they, in turn, have discussed it with others; I'm certain they've discussed it with the community, I know. So we've been involved primarily with Hydro; I could find out if we've had meetings with the community on it. I'm not certain that we've had official meetings with the community, in respect to the arena, other than to talk about the provision of other services in the community which might be necessitated by the arena, but I can certainly check that out. I have not had official discussions that I can recall being any significance at this point, we may have discussed it in passing.

So our involvement is somewhat limited. We're party to the agreement; we have certain obligations imposed upon us by the agreement. There is the arbitrator involved in the agreement and, for that reason, we can have matters such as this imposed upon us from outside the normal government circles by way of a decision by the arbitrator. We have consented to the Interim Consent Order because we felt that it provided the best deal for the province and the people of the community and we certainly did take into consideration the amount of money which would be spent, and the province's role, in that whole development when we did agree to the Interim Consent Order. It wasn't done haphazardly, but we did feel that it was the best way out of a difficult situation.

As I indicated earlier, if it was just up to the province to build an arena for Cross Lake we would probably

proceed in a somewhat different manner, but that is not the case and, for that reason, you have this sort of a proposal which is expensive, but not extravagant, at least, I have not been convinced that it's extravagant. I have been convinced that it is expensive, on the table before you, and we have some obligation to proceed with it. If we were, at any stage, to back out we would then run the risk of the arbitrator filing an order which would be more expensive to the province.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Chairman, I understand what the Minister has said, that the site now has been established and meets the requirements for this type of building and the necessary infrastructure is being planned to accommodate the arena facility. Did you also say that the plans are finalized for this arena, at this time?

HON. J. COWAN: I believe the plans are in their final stages, and I understand that a construction contract has been awarded so we are into the construction stage. The site has been dug up; the organic material removed and clean fill put in so as to prevent any methane problems from occurring in the future, and I would anticipate that construction will be starting very soon, if it hasn't already started in a preliminary way. I guess site development itself is certainly the start of the construction.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Chairman, has the Minister indicated that the contract has been awarded? Who will be building this arena and what involvement will the Community Works personnel have, as far as ongoing involvement with this project?

HON. J. COWAN: As I indicated earlier, Hydro is in charge of the construction and they're undertaking that activity. We will certainly offer advice to them, where necessary, and encourage them to make use of local residents to the greatest extent possible. They've been fairly co-operative, as of late in that regard, so I don't anticipate major problems, although we may have some areas that have to be worked out. It is my understanding, and I can get more detail on this for you at a later date, but it's my understanding now that the contract has been awarded to Ed Penner Construction Limited out of Winnipeg, and more detail could be forthcoming if you so desire it. I'd have to get it from Hydro though.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Chairman, at this point in time then the Department of Northern Affairs does not have any direct input as far as the construction phase of this project?

HON. J. COWAN: I'm sorry, I've just been handed a note which indicates that Northern Affairs has been involved in the Steering Committee which has been composed of Hydro Canada, the Band and the Community Council, so we are part of that Steering Committee, so we have had some input into the design, but as one of the parties which will be apportioned some of the costs in the long run, and as one of the parties to the signatory. We're not the primary proponent, nor are we involved in a significant way in the actual

construction and operation; that is Hydro's responsibility at this time. The Steering Committee, as I understand it, has been developed to review different designs and to attempt to reach a consensus, without having to go back to the arbitrator, on exactly what form the arena would take in the final instance.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Have the Community Works personnel had any involvement recently with respect to agriculture in the Northern communities, in the tunnel-growing of vegetables or anything of that nature? I know that they have had in the past. Is that a program that's still being looked at or what is the situation with respect to agriculture in the Northern Affairs communities including the growing of vegetables at the present time?

HON. J. COWAN: We may have some future activity in regard to special ARDA, I would have to check that out. I can't indicate at this time what the status of those applications would be for gardening projects, but I do understand that there's either been a suggestion that they will be forthcoming or they have been forthcoming and are being reviewed.

The department has not had involvement for a couple of years at least now in regard to the tunnel-gardening projects which the member addressed earlier.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to ask the Minister a couple of questions about the Cross Lake arena? The Minister undertook to provide a copy of the arbitrator's award. Is that available at this time?

HON. J. COWAN: They are making copies right now and I've indicated to your colleague, the Member for Swan River that I was giving them to him in the hopes that he would pass them on to you as well. So I have a copy of the Interim Consent Order and a copy of Claim No. 11 which was filed by Cross Lake Indian Band which precipitated the whole action and provided for the Interim Consent Order.

MR. B. RANSOM: Can the Minister tell me who selected Ashmead Consultants to do their preliminary design?

HON. J. COWAN: As I indicated earlier when we discussed this for sometime, the role of the Department of Northern Affairs has been somewhat limited in this regard, so I don't have that information available to me at this time. I can certainly get it for you and provide it to you, but this is really a matter which has been undertaken primarily by Manitoba Hydro itself. They can probably provide more direct answers to you, but I can certainly get the information that is available and present it to you at the earliest possible opportunity. I don't have it with me now and I don't know why that decision was taken or under what circumstances it was made.

MR. B. RANSOM: Well, the Minister of Energy of Mines indicates from his seat that I asked questions in Public Utilities. That's true, but I didn't get answers in Public

Utilities. The indications were that Hydro had not been responsible for the selection of Ashmead Consultants, that it was some committee that made that selection. So I would like to know from the Minister, and I asked in question period for this type of information, as to the makeup of that committee which he just referred to a few minutes ago. I would like to know from the Minister what the role of that committee is then relative to Hydro.

I'd like to know whether the committee selected Ashmead Consultants or not and who has been responsible for the preparation of the site. Has that been the responsibility of Northern Affairs, or is that also being handled by Hydro?

HON. J. COWAN: The Steering Committee as I understand it is a committee, and as I indicated earlier this evening, made up of representatives of Canada, Manitoba, Northern Affairs - as the representative of Manitoba - Hydro, the Cross Lake Indian Band and the Cross Lake Community Council. It is my understanding that they are the ones that review the plans and review the development of the arena.

It's a Steering Committee that has been set up because those are the parties that have a direct interest in the completion of the arena, either because they are parties to the claim, or signatories to the agreement, or will be affected by the construction of that arena in their own community, such as is the case with the Community Council of Cross Lake.

So they may well have selected the individual or the company that did the design. I can find that information out for you. I can also find out more information on how the Steering Committee is functioning, what meetings they have held and that sort of information as well but I don't have it available with me right now.

MR. B. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate if the Minister could get a bit of information of that nature because there is some question about where the decision-making has rested. I've now received the order from the arbitrator and will have an opportunity to look at that and perhaps we'll have some further questions for the Minister after having looked at it.

HON. J. COWAN: I'll certainly try to get that information as quickly as possible for the Member for Turtle Mountain. I imagine that this item can be brought up under Agreements, Management and Co-ordination as well, or the Northern Flood Agreement actually, so there's a number of opportunities to discuss it further along in the Estimates. I will endeavour to have that sort of detailed information to the Member for Turtle Mountain previous to those items being discussed if at all possible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(c)(1)—pass; 3.(c)(2) - the Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I wonder if the Minister could give us an indication as to the reason there's some \$33,000 less in this item this year than was budgeted for a year ago.

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, the item in '82-83 was \$246,000; the item this year is \$212,700 for - as the member

indicated - a \$33,300 decrease or a decrease of 13.5 percent. The detailed breakdown as is follows, and again I give him '82-83 Adjusted Vote, and '83-84 Request.

Fees were nil in both instances. Facilities and equipment went from \$31,500 to \$40,000.00; specialized equipment dropped from \$92,500 to \$87,000.00 and operating costs dropped from \$122,000 to \$85,700.00. So you see the significant drop in operating costs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(c)(2)—pass; 3.(c)(3)—pass; 3.(d) - the Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I wonder if the Minister could indicate any changes in the programming in this section in the past year. I believe the elections come under this area, do they not?

HON. J. COWAN: For 3.(d)? I just wanted to make certain I was addressing the right area. In '82-83 the Adjusted Vote was \$203,700; '83-84 Request was \$279,600, for an increase of \$75,900 or 37.3 percent, that's in Salaries and Wages, (1)(a). Do you wish the specific detailed increases?

MR. D. GOURLAY: No, I'm just wondering if there's any major changes in the function of this part of the department.

HON. J. COWAN: The change would be that we now have one training officer per region, four training officers, in total, and the staff years were the same for last year and this year.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I believe elections were held in all communities this past February, has the election date been set in February the last couple of elections, is that working out quite well or do the communities have some concerns about this time of year?

HON. J. COWAN: I'm not aware of any significant concerns in that regard there may be communities that express specific concern from time-to-time but I'm not even aware of that, I just wouldn't say that it's out of the realm of possibility; that could be the case but it seems to be generally well accepted and has been, I think, applied effectively and the communities are in support of the process.

MR. D. GOURLAY: This is the area where the manuals are updated for the various community councils and clerks, the routine to follow for those various communities?

HON. J. COWAN: I don't know of a significant difference in the way by which the manuals are prepared or distributed, or in any significant changes in either requests or demands for them. You may want to address the census here, which we have provided for some changes, by way of human resources census this year and that is, I believe, the major change in the work of this particular component.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Chairman, I didn't catch what the Minister had said about the census, if he could repeat that.

HON. J. COWAN: That was a diversionary tactic on the part of the Member for The Pas.

I said, no, there haven't been any major changes of a significant nature, either in demands for the material or the way in which the material is developed, compiled or distributed, except in the case of the census in the Human Resources Census which we have undertaken and that, I think, is a new initiative that was not in place previously.

MR. D. GOURLAY: The 1982 Northern Affairs Committee Reports, were they compiled under this section?

HON. J. COWAN: No, they weren't in this particular section, they were compiled as a co-operative effort among administration agreements, management and municipal services, I believe. But I will be prepared to discuss them under this particular item if you so desired.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Well, I just wanted to mention that, I think, this is a very useful kind of document and I think that there is lot of good information with respect to communities that is not otherwise readily available anywhere, and I would just like to commend the department for the work that they have done on this particular publication.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 3.(d)—pass; Item 3.(e)—pass.
Resolution No. 131: Resolve that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding — (Interjection)

MR. D. GOURLAY: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, I thought you said (b), you mentioned (e) did you?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(e) Grants.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Yes, I'd like to get a breakdown of the various grants that are being paid out and the amount, please.

HON. J. COWAN: There is an adjustable for '82-83 of \$729,800, and the request this year is for \$819,900, an increase of \$90,100.00. I'm informed that there will be some adjustments in the grant to the First Nations Confederacy which we will have to address at a later date, I don't think we have the detail yet, but I'll give you what it was anticipated to be with the indication that there will be changes, and I imagine that will be based on the per capita of the organization.

Native Communications Incorporated was \$112,900, is now requested \$123,100 - I believe they're all 9 percent increases, except for the grant NACC, or the Northern Association of Community Councils - the Manitoba Metis Federation grant was \$150,000, is now \$163,500; the Manitoba Keewatinowi Okemakanak Grant was \$69,000, is now \$75,200.00; the First Nations Confederacy was \$81,000, as I indicated we were anticipating \$88,300 but that will most likely have to be changed.

As the member is aware, last year when those two organizations split off we split the existing grant on the basis of per capita, and the per capita was based on the number of bands participating in that umbrella

organization and that's why there may be some changes necessary, but overall it would still be a 9 percent increase for a grant that used to go previously to one organization and has now been split into two organizations.

Grants to Native Organizations, which is a general category, last year was \$100,000, this year is \$100,000; and there was a supplement to tax sharing last year which was \$17,800, and there is no money provided for it this year. In respect to Northern Association Community Councils, last year the grant was \$199,100, and this year the grant is \$269,800 which is a 9 percent increase in funding, as well as, reallocation of the \$17,800 supplement to tax sharing, to provide for the executive director of that organization, which gives them another staff person year, and \$35,000 additional funding to produce a newsletter.

The newsletter concept is one that we're presently discussing with them, they have always had a newsletter that has gone out to various communities. I'm certain that you are still receiving a copy of it and received a copy of it throughout your term and it has provided a service, but it's been a relatively low-cost newsletter. We want to get more information out to the communities about what the department is doing, what opportunities are available to them by all levels of government and also provide for more education through that newsletter. We felt the best way to do that was to provide money to them and to let them produce a newsletter, and that would make certain that it didn't become just a promotional piece for a Minister or a department but that, in fact, it was meeting the perceived needs of the communities through their umbrella organization, the Northern Association of Community Councils. We've indicated to them that that money is in the Estimates, we have initiated discussions with them as to how that money can best be utilized. I don't think any final determination has been made yet but we have provided for \$35,000 as a maximum amount to be used for the expansion and enhancement of their existing newsletter over a period of time. If they take us up on that particular offer then we'll sit down and work out the details.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Are there any conditions attached to the NCI grant of \$123,000, did you say?

HON. J. COWAN: There are four conditions which I believe have been standard in the past and are current: (1) is that they submit in 1983 for Budget; (2) is that they must submit Quarterly Financial Statements no later than 30 days following the end of each of the first three quarters; (3) they must submit in writing acknowledgement that the grant payment from the Government of Canada, Secretary of State, will be at least equal to the grant provided by the Province of

Manitoba; and (4) they must provide not later than 120 days following its fiscal year end, March 31st, a copy of its annual audited financial statements. I believe those are the conditions that have been in existence for some while and are continuing.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could indicate the conditions attached to the MMF Core Funding at the present time.

HON. J. COWAN: There are three conditions attached to the MMF: (1) is that a 1983-84 Budget be provided; (2) is that they submit Quarterly Financial Statements not later than 30 days following the end of each of the first three quarters; and (3) that they provide not later than 90 days following the fiscal year end, March 31st, a copy of its annual audit and financial statement. So the one condition that applies to one doesn't apply to the other is the indication of involvement by the Secretary of State of Core Funding.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, during the election, the Manitoba Metis Federation, which was then headed by Mr. John Morrisseau, was committed to the NDP Party. Does the Manitoba Metis Federation have any political position at the moment?

HON. J. COWAN: I am not certain as to the nature of the question. I don't believe that there is any direct affiliation or formal affiliation. I would probably suggest that each local from time to time has concerns which expresses in different ways, either by way of support or by way of criticism. As a matter of fact, I just attended a regional meeting in Thompson a couple of weeks ago, or last week actually, and they were quite critical of some government programs and quite supportive of others.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, was the Minister aware then that during the election in 1981 the Manitoba Metis Federation had publicly taken a position in support of the NDP Party?

HON. J. COWAN: I believe their position was one of endorsement and certainly I was aware of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 3.(e)—pass.

Resolution No. 131: Resolve that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$6,709,900 for Northern Affairs, Local Government Development for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984—pass.

Committee rise.