

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Thursday, 10 April, 1980.

Time: 8:00 p.m.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE (Contd)

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): It was moved by the Honourable Government House Leader, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Government Services . . .

The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to have this confirmed. I believe I have about 18 or 20 minutes left, but I will assume that . . .

A MEMBER: Take lots of time.

MR. EVANS: I would like to continue my grievance discussion, Mr. Speaker, which relates to the questioning this afternoon of the Minister of Labour, pertaining to the exodus of people from this province and the drop of our total population level.

Mr. Speaker, there is one very important observation that we must not overlook respecting this whole question of outward migration of our people. As long as we have a net loss of people through interprovincial migration, Mr. Speaker, we are losing from our midst probably people who have a training better than average, people who are highly motivated, people who are probably younger rather than older. Now you might say, well, that's simply your impression. But, Mr. Speaker, I have some evidence to back up those observations with reference to a report issued by Statistics Canada. In fact it's Report No. 99751, if anyone on the opposite side is interested in looking it up, and maybe the Minister of Labour would like to have his staff look at it.

At any rate this particular report is based on an analysis of the 1971 census, and it deals with the type of people who are engaged in mobility and migration. There are three main findings from that particular report, Mr. Speaker:

No. 1 - That is was the young adults in the age bracket 20 to 34 who most frequently engaged in a change of residence. The other observation about these young people, is that the mobility pattern of these young people was heightened if they happened to have post-secondary education or other levels of education beyond elementary school. So, No. 1 then, they're young people.

No. 2 - They tend to be predominantly professional people, people who are professional, occupational groups, technological, social, religious, artistic, teaching occupations and, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the evidence shows that those people who are least mobile are the people who have the lowest level of skills, or the people who are generally in low-skilled occupations.

And the third observation about the people who move, Mr. Speaker, is that as the level of schooling increases so does the degree of mobility, and this is true both for males and females, that as the level of schooling rises from Grade 9 - or less than Grade 9 - right up through university, you find a higher rate of mobility.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, these figures are more serious than perhaps they appear at first glance, because we're losing among the best educated of our population, the most productive, because they are the young age group and people, who I would submit, Mr. Speaker, will indeed be making a great contribution to wherever they are going.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the question arises, just why do we lose people? I know there are many theories about why we lose people. I know there are many perhaps common observations that because there are resource developments going on to the

west of us that therefore this is the natural reason for people to leave. The only thing I would say about that though, Mr. Speaker, is that, you know, petroleum wasn't discovered in October of 1977; Alberta's oil industry wasn't developed in the month of October 1977; the potash and uranium developments in Saskatchewan didn't start in October of 1977. Those developments in both Alberta and Saskatchewan have been present and have been a source of attraction for many years, not just the last couple of years.

Mr. Speaker, I would be the last person to say the reason you lose population is because of a particular government that is in power. There are many reasons why you population. There may be reasons pertaining to the state of the national economy, the level of economic activity in the nation as a whole, the national business cycle, if you will. There will be international factors that will obviously have a bearing on the state of the economy. And there are resource opportunities, or a lack of them. But nevertheless, we still have to agree, we still have to recognize that government policy does play some role, and to the extent that it does play a role, I think we have to look at government policy. I cannot say, nor can anyone say just to what degree government policy has a bearing on whatever level of employment we have or on whatever level of economic activity we have. We can begin to make some approximations, but nevertheless it is a very difficult measurement to undertake.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that people do leave because of economic opportunities elsewhere. They are not leaving because of the weather, although in some winters we may think that that may be a great factor, but the weather has been with us for many a decade, Mr. Speaker.

Another study prepared that I would like to refer to, by a Miss Yoshika Kasahara back in 1963 - it was a comment she made at a conference on statistics and it was published in a book on conference and statistics, and she says it is quite clear from the data that they have . . . Perhaps I should read this paragraph because I think it is very pertinent:

"Even when allowance is made for the attraction of pleasant climatic conditions along the West Coast the predominant pulling force appears to come from employment opportunities offered by areas of rapid industrial and urban expansion. In other words, the general pattern of migration indicated by net migration figures appears to imply a fairly close correlation between the stage of economic development in a given province and its rate of population growth or decline due to migration. It also implies that a trend in net migration, gain or loss, observed in a given area is dependent upon economic expansion or contraction in the potentially important sending and receiving areas outside."

Well, Mr. Speaker, then there have been other studies done. There was one by a Mr. T. J. Courchene that appeared in the Canadian Journal of Economics in 1970, again saying, and I am quoting from that article: "We have demonstrated in this paper that most of the interprovincial migration that does occur can be explained in terms of resource allocation considerations, which includes movements of labour to match the economic opportunities created by investment decisions."

Okay, investment decisions. Mr. Speaker, the level of investment activity - of all the economic indicators that you can look at, there is no question but that the level of investment activity has got to be the most key factor in the rate of job creation anywhere, including our province. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would recommend to Honourable Ministers opposite, or the appropriate Ministers, that they get their research staff to take a look at what has been happening to investment trends in Manitoba, not just in the last two years, not just during the NDP administration years, but right back, go back 20 years if you like, the figures are there, and analyze them and compare changes in investment with changes in employment. You can correlate investment changes with changes in the level of economic activity in the province, and I think you will find that there is considerable correlation between investment and economic activity generally.

I want to make this observation, Mr. Speaker. I don't whether it is a revelation to members opposite who put great store or great faith in private investment, but during the years of the Roblin administration, during the years of the Conservative government which preceded the administration of the New Democratic Party, the level of public investment was far more significant than it is today. The level of public investment in percentage terms was far more significant than we find occurring today. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, without quoting too

many figures, if you only looked at private investment in Manitoba and compared it to private investment levels in Canada, you would see that we were very deficient. But what happened under Premier Roblin, was that the province engaged in a great deal of public investment, public sector investment. When you added the private and the public together, you found that the percentage of investment in Manitoba, as a percentage of our gross provincial product, came up to the national average. The only way we came up to the national performance in investment as a percentage of gross provincial product, or in the case of Canada, the gross national product, was by engaging in public sector spending.

I just might add, Mr. Speaker, the figures are available and I commend this sort of research to some of the Ministers opposite, that if you took the years 1964 to 1969, you would see that public investment as a percentage of total investment was 41 percent, much higher than occurred in Canada in those years. In the comparable period in Canada, public investment was only 31 percent of total investment.

If you take the period 1970 to 1975, which was the period of NDP administration, you will find public investment was 42 percent of the total investment, whereas it was only 30 percent in the same period in Canada. So, again, the same pattern held true under the NDP. If you want to take the combined period, 1963 to 1975, you'll find that public investment in Manitoba was 42 percent of the total whereas it was only 30 percent of the total in Canada as a whole. I think those years generally were years of fair amount of activity. I don't think we had the same problem in population loss in most of those years as we have now.

But what's happening now? If you take the Budget Address of the Minister of Finance from last year, which is the latest that I have available, 1979, and you look at page 67 of the Budget Address, and look at what's happening to public investment as a percentage of total investment, you will find, Mr. Speaker, that the public investment is dropping very rapidly. Instead of being around 40, 41, 42 percent, it has dropped to, in 1980, 32.6 percent.

So there is no question that public investment as a part of the total package of investment has dropped off very dramatically, so that what we have now, Mr. Speaker, is we have a situation where there has been a fall-off of public sector investment and this fall-off, this deficiency, has not been made up by the private sector. This deficiency has not been made up by the private sector. --(Interjection)-- Well, it is true, you know. The Member for Minnedosa says from his wrong seat, that it's not true, but it is true, Mr. Speaker. The deficiency, in terms of our relative position in investment spending, we are well below the national average. We were not during the days of Premier Roblin and we were not during the days of Premier Schreyer. And I'm saying the reason for that was because we had a relatively high level, higher than you find in the Canadian average, of public investment.

Of course, the way to compare our investment performance, I guess, with the rest of the country is to do it on a per capita basis and I think if you did it on a per capita basis, you will find that we are falling quite short. The investment for 1979, the investment per capita in Manitoba, was only 36.7 percent; I'm sorry, I'm looking at manufacturing. It's only 36.7 percent; this is for manufacturing. I don't have the figures with me but if I had them for the total, you would see the same pattern at work.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think if you want a comprehensive answer to the problem of population loss, I say the answer is an increased level of government activity to stimulate the economy in construction and in consumer spending, investment in resources, and so on. And there is a long long story on this matter itself. I would say, Mr. Speaker, all of us regret the loss of people. Everyone regrets the loss of people, on both sides of the House, but the facts are staring us in the face and I say the government of Manitoba has a responsibility to live up to. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the Premier of this province said he will not lose sleep over the matter of population loss; he will not lose sleep over the matter of population loss. The Premier is sleeping well. I say, well let him sleep, Mr. Speaker, let him sleep, but when he wakes up, Mr. Speaker, he will find himself out of office.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to give up my Grievance Motion to reply to this garbage, the junk, the crap that we have listened to from this economic genius from Brandon in the last, what, 40 minutes. The Mickey Mouse economist that I have ever heard in my wildest imagination again has rose to his feet today and is trying to tell the people in this government how to run this province. I say to you, my friend, if you had been so good with Schreyer with your two and a half times one, there should be no unemployment in this province for the next 1,000 years. Everything should be gold. What a bunch of garbage! What a bunch of junk!

Show me one businessman over in that whole caucus who understands the economics of business.

Ah, the great Member for Elmwood puts his hand up. But you don't know what you are talking about, you guys. You have never been in the business field and you don't know what it is all about. I know, Mr. Speaker, they have got the Member for Fort Rouge on their side now. They have this great Liberal over there, they have their courage screwed up now that she has joined them, and they are coming out of the wings like they have never come out before. They have joined them at the federal scene. They defeated Clark with the Liberals joining them, and now they are coming out, and this great lady from Fort Rouge has been lighting fuses . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. JUNE WESTBURY: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I heard somebody say I was in bed with someone. That is absolutely a disgraceful remark to make, Mr. Speaker, and I would request that you draw that person to order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I think I was listening very closely to the remarks . . . Order please. I think I was listening very closely to the remarks and at no time did I hear the Member for Fort Rouge's name mentioned.

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: The Member for Roblin made a statement to the effect that I have joined another party; I have not joined another party. I am still sitting here as a Liberal, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Whether or not a person joins another party, I don't think is a matter of privilege. It may be a matter of misinterpretation, but differences of opinion do not make points of privilege.

The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I am going to very brief. It's only going to take me about two minutes to answer the economics of the Member for Brandon West, but I would like to explain to the new Member for Fort Rouge, if in any way I have said something regressive to the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, I apologize. But what I intended to say was that you were in bed politically with the members opposite, because I have yet to see you stand up, rise and support us on any motion or resolution since the House opened. So I can only assume from that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. May I point out to the honourable member it is not parliamentary to refer to any votes that have occurred in this Chamber.

The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw those remarks and I apologize to you, and the members that I may have reflected those remarks to. But, Mr. Speaker, to get back, we'll deal with the subject matter of the collusion that's going across over there and we'll deal with it another day, maybe on a more favourable tone; but I think the record speaks for itself. But let's get back to the economics of this genius from Brandon who . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I don't know but I think it's a tradition of this Chamber that when a member is speaking, in most cases, the rest of the members do give him the courtesy of the floor.

The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, again I'm going to be very brief. It's only going to take me, maybe, a minute and a-half now to answer this economic genius who again is rising up. But I just can't understand, Mr. Speaker, how he can again get his courage screwed up after bringing us back that two-and-a-half times one theory that him and Schreyer tried, and the economics we saw in their years unless the Member for Fort Rouge has joined their party and that's why they're fired up now, because they know that they got the federal machine backing them over there. But, anyway, we'll deal with that.

Mr. Speaker, can any member in his wildest imagination sit down in his seat or go to bed tonight and rest assured that if we follow the plan from the Member for Brandon East, that this province is going forward, that we're going to solve all the problems? Absolutely not at all because of the simple reason, Mr. Speaker, until they elect some business people over there that have even some sense of economic dollars; when you have in your pocket and you have to go and invest them yourself and play the market by yourself, then you can stand up and talk in this House and tell us about how to run this province. But until you can elect those kind of people, I say you better sit in your seats and talk academic politics and socialism and this. It isn't going to work; it doesn't wash and I say, Mr. Speaker, real quick, the oration that I have listened to of the Member for Brandon East is garbage, absolute garbage.

If I was to have run my business over the years on his economics and those speeches I've listened to from him, I'd have been broke in 48 hours. It's not worth listening to; it's a bunch of garbage; it's social dogma and Manitoba is not going to move forward with those kind of policies. You've got to have some hard-nosed business people over there and with us and we'll move this province for it.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, until the Member for Brandon East goes again and talks to the Member for Fort Rouge, and then he comes and gets this Liberal-NDP thrust, then we may listen to you. But up to now, it's not worth listening to; it's a bunch of garbage.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Natural Resources, and the Honourable Member for Virden in the Chair for the Department of Government Services.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY - GOVERNMENT SERVICES

MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor (Virden): I would like to call the committee to order. We are on Government Services, Resolution 70, 1.(a).

The Honourable Minister.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have some copies of a very brief opening statement that I will pass out to the members of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I present the 1980-81 Estimates for the Department of Government Services to your committee for review and passage.

As I stated in last year's opening remarks concerning my intent to improve the existing departmental operations, Government Services has, over the last several months, undergone a reorganization primarily in respect to the reporting relationships within the department.

The department has been restructured into four major functions, and perhaps I will take the opportunity at this time to introduce the four senior executive directors of the department: Mr. Keith McMillan, who is not a stranger to any of us; his executive director of field services, Mr. Neil Osler, again no stranger to the department to most of us, he's the good-looking fellow there with the white

hair; he continues to provide the direction in terms of architectural planning and engineering services, design, project management, etc.. I am pleased to welcome to the Government Services the addition of no stranger to the Manitoba Public Service, Mr. Charlie McIntyre, whom I lured away from Highways with me, to come and join us as the director responsible for supply services, involving principally the Central Vehicle Branch, office equipment machines, equipment purchasing materials branch, etc. He brings to the department many years of government experience doing similar work in the Department of Highways and Transportation. I am also pleased to introduce to members of the committee Mr. Dan Coyle, formerly with the city of Winnipeg, in a senior administration capacity with the City Board of Commissioners, who is our executive director of general administration within the Department of Government Services.

Further to this end, internal reorganizations to improve the reporting relationships and managerial accountability are presently under way in each of the four divisions. These changes are in keeping with the overall departmental objectives which are to streamline the bureaucratic process, improve response times and to further increase program efficiency, effectiveness and accountability.

Some examples of the specific policy and program improvements that have either been initiated or are soon to be undertaken in 1980-81 include:

1) A review of the role of the Emergency Measures Organization with emphasis on improving its planning and training function and its relationship with municipalities. It is in the final stages of completion, this reorganization and review.

2) Improvements in the purchasing system to unencumber the bureaucratic processes thus enhancing overall departmental performance is also well under way.

3) As a matter of department policy in recognizing the need for energy conservation, the Central Vehicle Branch has been instructed to purchase compact cars for its vehicle replacement program and an improved vehicle cost information system has been initiated to obtain better information on vehicle operating costs. In addition, new guidelines for energy conservation are being prepared for the operation of existing buildings and the design of new buildings.

4) Full-cost recoveries systems are also under review in a number of areas, including the Leased Accommodation Program, the Telephone and Post Office Programs, from which it is hoped that a more businesslike approach will be established with line departments, instilling a greater accountability over their expenditures.

5) Significant improvements have also been made in budget preparation procedures, particularly in the area of advancing the planning the preliminary design and cost preparation for the line department projects in the Construction and Acquisition budget administered by the Department of Government Services.

6) In addition, a quarterly construction projection reporting system has been prepared to provide the construction, labour and consulting industries with information regarding our proposed Construction Program, to allow its membership to more adequately plan for their manpower and business requirements.

7) The department, of course, is continuing to move towards conversion of government buildings to adhere to the new fire safety codes.

In addition, I intend to bring forward amendments to The Land Acquisition and Expropriation Act, an amendment to The Public Works Act concerning building height controls adjacent to the Legislative Building, the latter designed to go further than present legislation in an effort to preserve the aesthetics of the Legislative Building and surrounding grounds.

The combined 1980-81 Estimates for the department, including Operating, and Acquisition and Construction Programs, totals some \$47,408,700.00. This represents an increase of approximately 2.3 percent over the \$46,340,100 voted in 1979-80. The major items responsible for this increase are inflationary adjustments, the allocation of a general salary increase, an increase to the Vehicle Replacement Program, and a 5 percent increase in the departmental Acquisition and Construction Program.

Within our Acquisition and Construction Program, the department has continued its policy of improving fire safety in government buildings, with priority being given to those institutions where people are detained or bedridden. Between \$4 million and \$5 million is budgeted again in 1980-81 for this purpose, which is comparable to the expenditure in this area during the 1979-80 fiscal year.

In addition, three major projects that were under construction in 1979 have or should be completed in 1980. The new Provincial Court facilities at 373 Broadway are scheduled for occupancy by the end of March, providing 11 new courtrooms which will go into operation early this spring. This, of course, already is past history; we officially opened this facility this very week. Two: The Environmental Lab is in the final stages of completion and is expected to be opened in early summer and fully operational by mid-summer and these Estimates include provisions for some additional staff with respect to Government Services' responsibility in this area. The third item, which is the The Pas Correctional Institute and Court-house, is also well underway and is proceeding on schedule with a projected completion time toward the end of 1980 or early in 1981.

This, Mr. Chairman, gentlemen and ladies of the Committee, concludes my opening remarks. I commend this Estimates of the Department of Government Services to the members of this committee for their consideration.

Before I leave the mike, let me also, of course, acknowledge the assistance and the tremendous support that I have of my Deputy Minister, Mr. Boris Hryhorczuk, who I didn't introduce when I was introducing other senior members of the staff, along with his Administrative Assistant, Mr. Bob Krochenski. I commend these estimates for the due consideration of the committee which I know will be brief, to the point and constructive.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Chairman, on a . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I guess we must realize the Minister is only going to comment on (1)(a) (1) opposition, then we go on to (1)(b)(1).

MR. MERCIER: That's the point I was going to make Mr. Chairman. On a point of order if the Minister and the Opposition critic were in agreement, this might be the first set of estimates we might use as a test of the rule we discussed this afternoon, and perhaps drop both (1)(a) and (1)(b) down to the end and simply proceed on with (1)(c).

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're suggesting that we drop (1)(a), (1)(b)(1) and (1)(b)(2) and go down to (1)(c), is that . . .

MR. MERCIER: Yes, the procedure that has been proposed for consideration was then to discuss (1)(a) and (1)(b) together, I think it works out with this set of estimates in the way they are presented. That's up to the members of the committee, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All agreed on that interpretation. (1)(c)(1) pass. The Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Chairman, this department deals with the administrative structure and also with policy and program development. I want to discuss a particular policy but before then, since I am not familiar with a couple of the faces across the way, I wonder whether the Minister could explain, holding aside his Deputy Minister and Mr. Osler and Mr. McMillan, when the other two directors were appointed and also what happened to the people that they replaced.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, it is not a question of anything happening to people being replaced, the structure of the department has been flattened out, if you like, to four executive directors, each having an area of responsibility that, we hope, will allow for faster reporting up and down throughout the department, as compared to the structure that was in place where we had two ADMs reporting to the Deputy Minister and through to the Minister. It is simply a re-organization that we believe will bring, and in fact I'm confident it already has brought, the kind of efficiency to the department. I was very pleased to note the entirely in-House work done on the renovation of a major project by 373 Broadway has brought to bear on the department where a major department came in on record time with all functions of the department operating smoothly. There were no senior personnel displaced in this reorganization in direct answer to the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I again ask the Minister, there were two directors and I wonder if he could indicate whether they're still with the department and in what positions they are with the department, or in the government.

MR. ENNS: I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the honourable member is confusing the terms "director" with "executive director". We have a number of directors responsible, such as Mr. Smith responsible for directing Supply and Services; Mr. Glover as the director responsible to the Central Vehicle Branch; Mr. Baranet who is a director responsible for the Purchasing Branch; Mr. Miller responsible for Emergency Measures Organization, answering now to the Executive Director Mr. McIntyre. And that similar pattern is repeated in the organizational structures that Mr. Osler, Mr. McMillan or Mr. Coyle are responsible for.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to discuss the policy that was announced the other day by the Minister, which I think is the most significant announcement made in the Department of Public Works in this administration, and that is their decision to halt the freeze on the development of the Courts Building and of the renovation of the Law Courts Building. This seems to me to be a major decision within the department and within the government and I would like to discuss that because there are a whole score of facets here connected with that decision and with that particular announcement. I do so under the general umbrella of policy of the government and the policy of the administration and the Minister.

The other day I asked the Minister a number of questions and he seemed to be somewhat unclear about the past history of this particular project. For example, when I questioned him he made some very interesting remarks about the location of the new proposed Magistrates Court and they've made a major decision to go against what was an invitation by the city of Winnipeg, to the provincial government, to do something about the revitalization of the old inner core of the city of Winnipeg. And I have to say to the Minister that he may not be familiar with the background, but I am and so are a number of people in the previous administration, and what he is doing in effect is reversing a policy decision that was taken by the previous administration and city council. This is what I want to deal with at this point in time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on a point order, I have absolutely no hesitation in discussing that item, and I appreciate that that's an item of concern to the honourable member. But I'm wondering whether or not, inasmuch as we are not dealing with my salary, which is the opportunity for the Minister or the members to talk about anything and everything - we are not dealing with Project Services, which involves the Acquisition and Construction Program, the design and so forth, is this, Mr. Chairman, the appropriate place to be discussing this item? I am asking for some direction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood, on the point of order.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with administration. I assume that there must be some relation between administration and the preamble which indicates policy and program development. This must be the most important policy decision and program development that this Minister is going to live under in the next year or so, the only one that I am aware of. It seems to me that this is appropriate. Otherwise, this whole first section is just absolutely null and void, there is nothing to discuss here. It seems to me that it is perfectly in order to talk about the major announcement made by the Minister, made by the Premier himself on Wednesday in relation to what the government is planning on doing in terms of the development of the Legislative core area. So if you rule this debate out, I don't see anything that can be discussed at all under 1.(c)(1), or 1.(d) or anything else. This is the only item I want to particularly deal with here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder if I could draw the attention of the Member for Elmwood to 4. Project Services, which provides planning and space requirements. Would this not fit under what he is attempting? I don't think there is any great disagreement if he carries on under (c), but it would seem to the Chairman it would fit more appropriately under 4.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, you know, it fits there and it also fits here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on the same point, I have no aversion to discussing it here, but I would accept some consideration then from members of the committee that we have the discussion on it now and then not repeat the discussion all over again on Project Services. That's the only point that I am making, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOERN: I agree to that. Mr. Chairman, there are some very important ramifications of this decision and this is what I want to deal with. I want to refer to the press releases issued, to the statement of the Premier, to the remarks of the Minister in Question Period, and so on. I note, for example, that a lot of the program that was announced by the government this week was really in effect simply a recycling of the previous government program. In other words, our government made a decision to build a new provincial judges' building; this government froze that particular project and now has announced it again. Our government announced an extensive renovation of the Provincial Law Courts Building; the government froze that and now announced that that will be done. The only thing they did, I suppose, that was different was they purchased a building on Broadway and renovated it to the tune of \$2.25 million.

Now, on the surface, this looks like a new thrust. I suggest that it isn't, that what has happened in effect is that the government froze a series of decisions and a series of projects, which resulted, unfortunately, in the worsening of our whole court system. First of all, it has set backward a number of developments in terms of new construction and renovations and the net effect of that decision was to make a worse log jam in terms of trials and in terms of case backlogs and court backlogs, so that when our administration left office and our Attorney-General, who is now the Leader of the Opposition, left office, there were a number of months' backlog in terms of court cases. This, I guess, varied between some four months and up. Now, as a result of this particular government's actions, that caseload and backlog, in particular, increased seven to eight months.

Now the Minister is telling us that by buying a new building and renovating that building for \$2.25 million, which in a sense might be an additional expense, now he tells us that he is going to proceed to break the log jam by releasing the programs that he and his government have held aside for two and a half years.

So I suggest that there are costs incurred here by the government - and I can't put a dollar figure on them; I don't know if they are in the hundreds of thousands or in the millions of dollars - which have been made worse because of the decision to delay these projects. Now the government is asking us to give them credit for the fact that they are going to reduce a seven to eight-month backlog and cut that down to size. This, to me, Mr. Chairman, is a little like digging a hole and then asking somebody to give you credit for filling it up, when you were the person who dug the hole, or the pothole, in the first place. If you make a situation worse, then I cannot see how you can then claim credit for making it better in the sense of taking it back to square one. That's one point that I make to the Minister.

Another point I make to him is, that because of the freezing of architectural programs, he has exacerbated the situation in Manitoba. He has caused architectural firms, not just him alone, but his government, has caused architectural firms to disintegrate. Some have left the province, some have gone bankrupt, and a number have merged. Some of those who are hanging on by the skin of their teeth are doing so only because they are getting work outside of Manitoba. There are a number of Manitoba firms who have now opened offices in Saskatchewan and Alberta, and it is only because they have done this that they are in a viable position.

In addition to that, the construction industry has been staggering along over the last couple of years. Many of the smaller contractors are no longer around

and many of the other contractors are again trying to hang on or trying to work outside of the province. Skilled tradesmen have left the province. Many of them will never return. And this is the kind of situation that we are in. Now, what I would like to specifically get back to, because I'd like to look at each of these projects in turn because I don't know if the Minister is aware of some of the background connected with these particular projects. For instance, he was speaking in a rather offhand and loose fashion in the question period the other day, making all sorts of interesting and wild statements about the . . .

MR. ENNS: I've never been known to do that.

MR. DOERN: Well, you know, the Minister is known to be a person who enjoys drama and I am sorry to see that he was not nominated for any actor awards. He missed that cutoff the other night, but depending on what he does today and in the next few days, he may be nominated for an academy award. But we have to wait and see whether he's going to talk at his normal level, or whether he's going to raise his voice and start shouting. If he does, then we know he's definitely throwing his hat into the ring.

Mr. Chairman, one of the things he said yesterday that was interesting was he said that they were going to develop their new Magistrates' Building or new Provincial Judges' Building on the site adjacent to the Law Courts and that would seem like a logical decision but it's no more logical and it's probably less logical, I would argue, and my colleague sitting here, the former Minister of Corrections, I think might get somewhat exercised on that point; it's just as logical, if not more logical, to have that complex built right beside the Public Safety Building where we were acquiring property.

Mr. Chairman, I have to say right now that the Minister is very easy to say that this is surplus and that is surplus, and this is a waste of money and that is a waste of money, and all he's really saying when he does that is that he has a different program.

We asked him last year about the Autopac Building beside the Centennial Concert Hall, and he said he wasn't worried at all about the land acquisition in that particular area, because he said land was always valuable and there would be no problem in selling it if that was their intention. He could also, of course, use it for surface parking in the present tense.

I simply say to him that, first of all, if he wants to make a different decision, which I am going to ask him to justify, because he hasn't justified it; I'm going to ask him to justify it, if he's going to do that then he can, of course, very easily sell prime property in the vicinity of the City Hall. I think he would agree with me that the banking of land is never a bad investment in that the property values tend to increase and one can probably unload them. But he said that he felt it was a very bad decision to go there and I want to give him a little bit of history on the development of a magistrates' court building or a judges' building, because he doesn't seem to be familiar with this. I know and my colleagues will remember that when the Minister had two portfolios, he spent 90 percent of his time in Highways. We're hoping to get him back there. We're not supporting the present Highways' Minister and we would just as soon have this Minister go back to where he wants, and not have to spend all of his time on Government Services, where as he spent only two or three hours before.

A MEMBER: Half a day a week.

MR. DOERN: Half a day a week. I don't know what he's doing most of the time now. I don't know whether he and the Deputy have long lunch hours or just how he fills up his day. But, anyway, I want to remind him that when he says that he cannot visualize why our government decided to go there, I want to remind him that it was in response to a request from the mayor and the council of the city of Winnipeg some five years ago, in about 1975. They asked us to do something about developing the urban core and, as a result of that, we came up with a number of proposals which would help rejuvenate the central core of Winnipeg. That included among other things, a Judges' Building, which we were thinking of building around here, which we decided could be built there; an Autopac Building, which we decided should be built beside the Centennial Concert Hall, which this Minister decided or

his government decided shouldn't be built and now they're leasing vast quantities of space in lieu of that construction; an environmental lab, which they were going to, first of all, try to sell a foundation and a piece of land, which was preposterous which they finally decided to proceed with - probably the same lab, Mr. Chairman, which they're now going to use to do chemical testing in; probably the same kind of lab that Emergency Measures will use and that various branches of the government that does chemical testing will be able to work under - and a Provincial Garage, which now the Minister is going to use. He wasn't going to use it last year; he wasn't going to use it the year before. He doesn't know that it didn't cost \$5 million, it cost \$3 million, but now he's talking about knocking down the old garage for a remand centre. Now that's a new development.

A MEMBER: Well, he wouldn't go there last year.

MR. DOERN: No, he wouldn't go there now and he's going to knock it down now and then he's going to move into the new garage. It's going to be a little late. It's going to be a lot of money spent, a lot of money that he's going to spend, that he spent on heating it he told us and I suppose keeping the water pipes loose, and on security, and the money that was spent on just the interest on the investment and so on. So I just want to get to a couple of points here and then the Minister can respond because I don't want him to store this all up.

In 1965, I'm now referring to a memo from Sam Simms that was written to me in October of '71. This was only a few months after I became the . . . Well, I was at that time the Acting Minister of Public Works. The Minister stands in a long line of great Ministers of Public Works, starting with Borowski. And I say to him, that at that time, Sam Simms wrote the following memo and pointed out that in 1966, under the Roblin administration and . . . I don't know if the Minister was elected in '66.

MR. ENNS: '66.

MR. DOERN: '66, like myself. So, he wasn't then familiar with this but I point it out for his benefit that there was, during the construction of the city of Winnipeg Public Safety Building, there was a dispute between the province and the city with respect to the inclusion of the Magistrate's Court into this building, and what happened, in effect, was that they appointed Wiseman Ross, now No. 10, which you recently re-appointed I believe for this project, and they were asked to consider developing a facility in the same general area as the Manitoba Centennial Centre. So it was right down there that your government, under Premier Roblin, was considering going into that particular area. In '68, there was a proposed addition to the existing Law Courts, again with the same firm, in the Attorney-General's Department and that was not proceeded with. And then more recently I guess, they again, I think about a third time, considered a development around here and that didn't proceed. And I can tell you that Attorneys-General, going back to Al Mackling, were forever trying to get something on track in terms of a judicial building and in terms of renovating the law courts. And there were meetings held and there were papers presented in Cabinet; Al Mackling as Attorney-General did not get this thing entirely through; Howard Pawley did. And it was finally approved about 1975.

And I want to tell the Minister as well that in 1974 I made an announcement as Minister that we would build an addition to the law courts on Broadway. So your government, in 1965, was going to build around the Concert Hall, which was where we decided later would be a good place. Then your government decided years later, a few years later, to extend the present law courts. And our government decided, five or six years later, to extend the present law courts. But what happened was that in response to the city of Winnipeg, they asked us to do something to develop the area around where they are and in the central part of the city. And in response to that, we changed our decision and we decided to come downtown; I'm sorry, we decided to come from the downtown complex and construct a building near the Public Safety Building.

Now one reason that we decided that was because the Public Safety Building was adjacent to it, and one of the things that the Minister is going to have to do if he proceeds with this plan, providing he decides to proceed, providing his government wins re-election, they're going to have to build a remand centre - and he

already has indicated that might be on the site of the old garage, which means that he is going to have to build a remand centre there, which means he's going to have to knock down the old garage, which means he's going to have to move into the new garage. And I don't know whether he'll even have to transport prisoners from the Public Safety Building, or whether that won't be necessary.

But anyway, I just ask him there as to . . . Getting back to a very basic point here, we responded to a request from the city. He tells me that Deputy Mayor Pearl McGonigal came out, smiled, cut a ribbon, and that this is tantamount to civic support. And I ask him whether he had dealings with the council and Mayor Norrie, whether he discussed the switch of locations, which would be a reversal of their requests and a reversal of their policy. I see nothing in the paper to indicate that they changed that policy; all I see is that suddenly there is an announcement made by the Premier, by the Attorney-General, by the Minister of Government Services, that there is going to be a switch. So I ask him, why did he decide to change locations? Could he give us the rationale for that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Elmwood raises a number of matters and one particular one that I am happy to respond to because, Mr. Chairman, if there has been one particular failing on the part of this government, and the part of some of its Ministers, it is that we haven't taken the time to respond with factual figures often enough when members opposite simply make a statement which is not true. It then gets repeated a few more times, it gets picked up by the media, and consequently it becomes accepted as a fact.

One of the statements - and I'm referring to these Estimates, Mr. Chairman, I could say the same thing about the Department of Health. Members say that this government has cut back in health spending and of course that's not true. But regrettably, it's said often enough, and we perhaps haven't responded often enough in a positive way to the point where a certain segment of the population is actually believing it.

In this department, in terms of levels of construction and actual public cash flow of moneys, let me read into the record, the actual cash flows of record within Government Services, which the Member for Elmwood had responsibility over for some years as compared to the years that I was responsible for.

In the fiscal year 1974-75, Government Services actually cash-flowed some \$15,500,000 in construction. In 1975, the figure was \$13,500,000.00. In 1976-77, \$14,600,000.00. These were years under the leadership of the former Minister of Government Services, the now Member for Elmwood. In 1978, the first year that I was responsible for the department, we cash-flowed \$21 million. In 1978-79, that figure is \$22 million. So the two years that the Conservative administration has been responsible for construction activity within the Department of Government Services; in both those years, they were substantially higher, Mr. Chairman, than the three, four years just mentioned and read into the record under the direction and leadership of the former member.

Mr. Chairman, I only take this occasion to read into the record so that the often heard statement that the amount of building that is taking place under the responsibility of the Government Services has somehow been drastically cut in half, or because of deferment of some particular projects, that the level of activity has been drastically curtailed. The truth of the matter is that a substantial amount of our construction work has been in carrying out a very specific election promise, and that is dedicating a substantial amount in the upgrading, meeting of fire codes, in the various institutions, none of which unfortunately the general public sees. It is expensive work, it is very necessary work, and it's work that this government, I am proud to say, committed itself to. And that is principally, and we've set out our priorities, and the health institutions, Brandon, Selkirk and Portage, as well as in the correctional institutions, where millions of dollars are being spent and often this fact being oblivious to the general public.

Mr. Chairman, the honourable member asked the specific question, and he raised many questions, but the one that I think that he wanted perhaps a particular answer to was the decision, the reasons for the recent announcement with respect to the development of the judicial complex on Broadway Avenue. Mr. Chairman, I

suppose I could say if I wanted to be unkind, one of the fundamental differences between this administration and the administration that the honourable member was part of is that while they did a lot of announcing, we are doing it. Yes, it's true. This member suggests that deferment and delaying have cost the people of Manitoba dollars and have backlogged court cases. I remind him with some kindness that he just indicated in his opening remarks, that they appointed, or designated, No. 10 architectural group in 1974 to proceed with the construction of a court house. What happened in the intervening eight years?

Mr. Chairman, we have designated, we have appointed - we have not designated, we have appointed - the same, Mr. Chairman, by the way, architectural group No. 10, although there have been some changes in terms of individual personnel involvement --(Interjection)-- Well, that of course only underlines the point that I was trying to make. It is quite true, if the history of the judicial complex is that it was under conservative administration, in the mid-60s, that made the initial determination that the requirements for new court house facilities were necessary. It then languished for 8 years under the NDP administration with no action being taken. We have taken the specific action, first of all acquiring 373 Broadway, which provides us immediately with badly needed courtroom space. The operation is in full swing at 373 Broadway. The department deserves the highest of praise and congratulations for the manner in which that project was brought onstream. It's not that easy to estimate accurately when you are starting you know, gutting a building completely, working with a group of people - clients as we call them in the department - who have a tendency to be somewhat critical some-times of our work, and demanding. It's not simply office space that we're providing; we have to provide the special conveniences, security and otherwise, that is necessary when one builds courtrooms. That that was done in a short period of time of 8 months will have to stand as some kind of a record of achievement by the Department of Government Services.

But, Mr. Chairman, let me deal with the honourable member's central question - why the decision to change locations? He suggests to me that they responded to some of the political requests made of them by former mayors or city councillors. I would have to suggest to him that the one group of people of course that the previous administration did not listen to or respond to was the people who were actually going to use the facility; namely the judges, namely the Users Committee, namely the whole complex of services that are associated and required with the staff of the Attorney-General that is principally housed in the Woodsworth Building, which he built, and that is a possible, and indeed a very probable reason why the courthouse is built where it is being built. There is, I can assure the honourable members of this committee, universal acceptance by the judicial people in the province of Manitoba of the decisions to locate where we are locating.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is a more fundamental reason for doing that, a more philosophical reason for doing it. There is good reason, Sir, to separate the law enforcement activities from the whole justice system and the judicial system. There have been several enquiries, inquest juries have severely criticized this administration, or past administrations for the close proximity of such facilities as remand centres where, after all, people that are yet innocent are held pending some decision by the judicial process as to whether or not they should proceed to trial. The concept that has been recommended by these inquest juries has been that they should be separated from the law enforcement offices. In other words, once the person has been brought into custody the police have done their job. I'm simply telling you in simple terms that it is not a good idea to build your courthouse beside the RCMP headquarters; to build your courthouse beside the police headquarters. In philosophical terms there ought to be a separation. The law enforcement officers have a job to do, which is to apprehend and to bring in people to a situation where the judicial system then takes over and determines whether or not people are innocent or guilty. There is a concern and this concern has been expressed, it's been expressed in instances where fatalities have occurred in the present remand centre; there has been a concern that perhaps there has been some undue influence, from time to time, exerted by law enforcement officers when the two are mixed. So I say to the Honourable Member for Elmwood that this is recognized by the judicial people involved and this is being acted upon in the decisions that were made by this government.

Further to this the honourable member states some case, and I believe this was a large part of the motivation for the previous administration to acquire land in the downtown area and the inner core area, to in effect use these kind of projects for some type of inner core urban renewal projects. Well, Mr. Chairman, I can't argue with the honourable member, that's his concept of inner renewal, but the mere placing of massive concrete structures in steel does little to invigorate or rejuvenate problems that an inner core area of the city has. I suggest that the garage on Logan and Henry Avenue has very little social significance to redressing the problems that are legitimate and that are real in that part of the city, and so I reject the position that the member puts forward. He's welcome to that point of view - I'm welcome to my point of view. It's my prerogative however, at this time to act on the decisions, the policies that my administration reflects.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, that was a very interesting discourse and I want to say right away to the Minister that his figures about cash flow, I think is a red herring because I ask him to name the new projects that he undertook, and his government undertook, since October 1977. All they did was to freeze all new construction and then to complete the projects that were in the works. So that when he gives me figures showing that there were several millions of dollars spent under his administration, what he is saying in effect is that some of the projects which were started by us were completed by them. I mean that surely cannot be interpreted as new programs on the part of their government. If we started a project like the Environmental Lab, where the foundation was put in and then the project was frozen and then completed under them, he wants to count that as a credit accruing to his administration to stimulating the construction industry. The garage was almost complete at that time so 10 percent of the funding was spent there. The Dauphin Office building was in the works and under way and he wants to say that that was to the credit of his administration.

I want him to tell me what new projects he has come up with in the past 2 1/2 years, his administration has come up with in the past 2 1/2 years? Maybe the ladder that the Minister of Corrections, \$50 for a ladder that's now leaning against the Dauphin Correctional, I'm sure that's included in that particular project.

Mr. Chairman, in terms of preparation for these programs that's all well documented and I have to say to the Minister he just doesn't know what he's talking about when he says that we did not have extensive discussions with the judges. I can tell you that some of the people sitting right across from me were involved, and most of the same staff is still with the department, had endless meetings with the judges. Although the Minister didn't quite say this I know he would agree that the judges are among the most difficult and demanding clients of all time. I won't elaborate but they are difficult people to deal with, they know what they want, they demanded what they want, and they fought for what they want, but there were endless meetings; I can document them, I know that the Minister only has to ask his Deputy to shuffle through some of the old papers. So I am saying that we acquired land, we allocated funds, and these things were in the works.

Now the Minister's talking of corrections policy. Well, the former Minister of Corrections is here. That would be an interesting debate - and my colleague can talk more eloquently on this matter than I can . . .

A MEMBER: Very likely.

MR. DOERN: We appreciate the fact that you should have a separation of a Remand Centre from the courts. But you know there's a problem there, the greater the separation the greater the problem. In other words, if the buildings are near each other - now you know we had a situation in the Public Safety Building, where the courts were contained in the same building, so you had a certain attitude there, and my colleague, the Member for Winnipeg Centre was the one who oversaw the transference of the guards as being Winnipeg Police to members of his department. That was a philosophical and a practical change, but if you want to start separating buildings by distances, which you might want to do, then you're into bussing. And that is a bit of a problem too, you know. It's convenient. --(Interjection)-- Who? Which Kennedy?

MR. BANMAN: The one that's running for President.

MR. DOERN: I see. Well, I don't know what you're talking about now.

MR. BANMAN: Bussing.

A MEMBER: Don't confuse Russ.

MR. DOERN: I'm talking about the bussing issue. Anyway, Mr. Chairman, if you decide to separate these functions within a building, well that makes a lot of sense, they shouldn't be in the same building. But to be in near proximity, there are a lot of advantages, mainly that people who are, say, charged with crimes or remands or whatever can be easily transported to the court system, you start separating by miles then you're into bussing. You have to take people out of a building into a bus and then you have to move somewhere else and park the bus, and so on and so on. So you're into a real difficult problem.

Now I want to ask the Minister this. He wants to build a court building. He wants to have a new court addition. He has now a parking lot on the north side of the Law Courts with 400 cars. I want him to tell me what he's going to do with those cars several years from now. You know the Premier throws out all these figures, wonderful, 16 million bucks, but this is going to happen over seven years. So it's easy to say we're going to spend all this money but it's going to be over a long period of time.

A MEMBER: Well they won't be there at that time.

MR. DOERN: There's going to be a lot of moving around, and so on. My colleague is perfectly right. They will not have to implement these plans. That's what I'm worried about, because we're going to have to . . . I don't know if that was the gavel of the Chairman or the pipe of the Deputy Minister, but I have to ask the Deputy not to bang his pipe during debate, it's distracting. And I say, what are they going to do?

MR. ENNS: I'm your Minister. He's a member, you treat him with respect. But I'm your Minister.

MR. DOERN: What are they going to do? And remember, I also have to say the Deputy, he may be working for me or one of my colleagues, so he has to be very careful. He once worked for Metro, and that disappeared; I mention to him in passing, that his present bosses will disappear, like his past bosses.

Mr. Chairman, there are 400 cars, 400 cars on a giant parking lot between the Law Courts and the Norquay Building. In order to undertake any construction, those cars have to be moved. In order to build a facility, the Minister is not only going to have to get those cars out of there temporarily, he will probably have to build either a parking structure or he will have to build several floors of parking into the provincial judges building. Could he enlighten us on what he intends to do in that regard?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Sport, Recreation and Fitness.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Chairman, first of all let me say that I was over at the opening ceremonies yesterday when we opened the additional courtroom facilities, and I found it quite interesting when the former Minister here was saying that prior to his administration in 1965, had done some work on some possible courtrooms; in 1968 they had . . .

MR. DOERN: No, that's your administration.

MR. BANMAN: That's right, yes, the Roblin administration. Then in 1974 he did some work. But you know, Mr. Chairman, in the short year that this Minister has been here, what do we see? We see action. Action. --(Interjection)-- Well, you should have been there yesterday if you wanted to see, when something happened. We cut the ribbon and there are a whole bunch of new courtrooms there. There's action. No studies or nothing, there's action. This Minister is moving.

When the Minister read the cashflow figures - one of the problems that the Minister has had is that instead of building monuments to himself, and the cash-flow figures speak very factually - in the last two years he has spent more money than you did in the last three when you were there.

MR. DOERN: What did he spend it on?

MR. BANMAN: This is precisely the problem. Would you rather say that the Minister should get up and build edifices to himself and let people in public institutions, where you need fire upgrading, where you need things like the Red River Community College where structural changes had to be made, and things like that had to be done, would you rather say that he should build a monument to himself than do things which are going to save people's lives, help live up to the Fire Commissioner's standards and help upgrade the facilities that we've got? I think anybody in Manitoba would think that's foolhardy. And this Minister has taken his responsibilities well and has spent the money where it had to be spent, on a lot of repairs and maintenance and Fire Commissioner's reports.

So, Mr. Chairman, let it not be said that this Minister has cut back. But he has not spent money on high profile things and build monuments to himself. He has done things for people. It's been a peoples-oriented spending in the last couple of years, and it has had nothing to do with the freeze, Mr. Chairman. How can the member say, the last year that he was there, from 1976 to 1977, he spent a cash-flow of \$14.6 million, and in 1978-79 we cashflowed \$22 million, even taking constant dollars it's considerably more - how can he say there was a freeze? How can he say there was a freeze? If there was a freeze, we would have spent less than needed, not more. --(Interjection)-- You know, Mr. Chairman, that is the problem with the members opposite.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One speaker at a time.

MR. BANMAN: The member would rather build monuments to himself than look after the true responsibilities that the government has to ensuring the public safety of the people of Manitoba, and that's his problem. Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal briefly with the announcement made yesterday.

I think, Mr. Chairman, when we get people in from outside the province, when we see people coming in to look at this building and looking at this complex, they are utterly amazed at the foresight and the construction of this particular facility. I think it stands in good stead for the people of Manitoba, to have had some people in the system that have had the foresight to build this type of facility. I think that we are moving in the right direction in the restoration of the Land Titles as well as the Law Courts Building across the street.

And, Mr. Chairman, I'm going to go one step further. I'm going to say, to try and clean up some of the mess that we've had and some of the problems that we've had, I would recommend to the Minister that that walkway - and there have been a lot of descriptive adjectives used about that walkway coming from the Woodsworth Building into the Law Courts Building - I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that he, and for the aesthetic value and for future generations, would tear that thing down and go underground and do away with that monstrosity that has been created in that area. I think it does nothing to the aesthetic value of this whole area. We've got some beautiful buildings here and I think even if it will cost us a little more to retain those buildings here, I think it's something that the people in the future will value and I think the Minister would go down in history as having done something positive to restore the buildings around this area.

The other question that has been raised here is why there hasn't been more building going on. One of the things the member opposite doesn't realize, is the empty leased accommodations that he had under his wing when he was Minister. Mr. Chairman, I know when I was in charge of MDC, CEDF, lotteries and the Fitness and Recreation side, I amalgamated, and by moving a few people around, we saved \$128,000 in space.

MR. DOERN: You bought tires too.

MR. BANMAN: That's right. Sure I bought tires. I mean . . .
--(Interjection)-- That's the problem, Mr. Chairman. You know, the heat's on a little bit. He knows he's wrong in this. He knows he's wrong on this. But let me tell you, the least space that that Minister had and the poor inventory that he had of that space, as evidenced by one little department of government, to save \$128,000 by just moving a few people around and bringing them together in one area, that's what one little department did. And now what you would like us to do, is build more space. More space for what, Mr. Chairman?

A MEMBER: For his penthouse.

MR. BANMAN: To pay heating bills on? --(Interjection)-- Well, I think it is because I think it's a long time overdue when we sit back and we hear the type of accusations that have been made in the last little while and then we don't really get the real facts out. I think it's about time that the Minister, who has been looking after the problems dealing with Fire Commissioner Code and other things, is looking after those. The figures point out very clearly, he's doing an excellent job on that and I think that that will be borne out in the years to come. I think that he's got a good program. He's looking at finishing off some of those Fire Commissioner things and I believe that it's a peoples-orientated type of a program that he's been into for the last couple of years. I guess the only regret I have with regard to that, is that he won't be able to get up and say that, look at the beautiful Woodsworth Building or the Central Provincial Garage building that I built - beautiful things to do. But what was neglected, Mr. Chairman? That's what I have to ask. If we have to spend this kind of money now to upgrade the facilities, what was neglected?

I have one suggestion further. This is with regard to parking. One complaint that my constituents have, and I think that a lot of people have, is the parking accommodations around this building. I would suggest to the Minister that he should go underground, like the former member did across the street, just with a little different twist, I think he should build something for cars this time. I think that somewhere in this building, off of Kennedy, or off of Assiniboine, there should be an underground parking facility built on the Legislative grounds, built underneath with top soil and the trees replanted so that the aesthetic values of the area are kept. But I suggest that he could go down a few stories. We could provide parking for the employees here at the Legislative Building, but also more importantly, we could provide better parking for visitors who are coming to see this building in the summertime, also for constituents who come to see their members from time to time or people who are coming to sit in the gallery. So I would recommend to the Minister that he have a serious look at providing some kind of parking structure which would be aesthetically pleasing for the area, underground, that you could put the trees back on top and go with a structure which would enable us to - not be forced to have all these cars parked all over the place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague, the Minister for Sports and Fitness for that entirely unsolicited, but nonetheless very truthful and accurate description of how I'm carrying out my responsibilities as Government Services Minister. Also he did remind me of the one description of that walkway that he referred to that was given to it by a local reporter at the time; he described it thus, of a spaceman seducing a spinster. The suggestion of looking at that piece will be given consideration, I can ensure the Honourable Minister.

Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Elmwood raises the parking question. I can assure him that it's a serious question. It will be and is being currently addressed. I must remind him that I offered him that opportunity, I think, in one of my finer speeches in the House one day when he was responsible, back in the early Seventies, much along the lines that the Honourable Minister of Sports and Fitness now has suggested. I even went further. I said I would agree, as an opposition member in those days, to have it named the Russell Doern Parkade.
--(Interjection)-- Or the Russell Doern Memorial Parkade.

But, again, Mr. Chairman, it was all talk and no action and eight years went by and the parking problems only have increased in this general area and not decreased and I will have to, and the department and this government will have to deal with it, and we will deal with it. We recognize that we cannot bring additional services into this general area, which has already got an acute parking problem, and the Deputy Minister, or the department, is currently undertaking a very serious parking study to hopefully have something built concurrent with the construction that we anticipate will take place with the judges' building scheduled for completion in 1983.

Mr. Chairman, the other point that I make - I don't argue with the Honourable Member for Elmwood as to who initiated what building and when and who completed it. The point that I was trying to make, in giving those cash flow figures, if you associate the spending of money with the level of construction activity, then it is obvious that a government or a department that spends \$20 million, as compared to a department in government that spent \$15 million, that there was no serious curtailment of construction in these past two years. That was the simple point that I was making. I concede very readily that a goodly number of the building projects were initiated by the previous administration. But that's not the point. The propaganda that has been used effectively against us time and time again, as they are using it with health costs, as we increase health costs by \$30 million, \$40 million, and \$50 million every year that we have been in office, the propaganda has been that we have cut back, we've cut back, we've deferred. And you get people believing it and you get the media believing that we are doing somewhat less, considerably less than what in fact is the case. The truth of the matter is that this department, this government, under my administration, has spent some \$20 million for every year that we are responsible, as roughly compared to \$14 million, \$15 million during the tenure of the Member for Elmwood. That was the only point that I was making; that was the only point. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Chairman, there are a number of projects, and we will have occasion when we get to the projects to review the new ones that we are initiating, and we will discuss them.

But I am speaking about the cash flow. Now, if the honourable member wants to indicate that cash flow, laying out actual dollars for construction, has no bearing on construction activity level, that's another question. --(Interjection)-- Your projects. We'll put it on the record.

MR. DOERN: Oh no, the people of Manitoba's projects.

MR. ENNS: The people of Manitoba's projects. --(Interjection)-- And a change in direction, as the Honourable Minister said, a tremendous emphasis of fire code and safety in building.

But the point that I am trying to make, and I will make it for the last time, is simply this, that the charges that have been levelled against the Department of Government Services and this government that we have curtailed in a substantial way the level of construction activity in these past two years, simply is not true. Let me remind you of those figures one more time. The level was roughly \$15 million in 1974-75; \$14 million in 1975-76; dropping to \$13 million in 1976-77; and then raising to \$21 million in 1977-78, the first year of our administration; and to \$22 million in the past year. Those figures cannot be refuted.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, David Blake (Minnedosa): The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Fitness of Amateur Sport, whenever he starts shooting his mouth off, I am a little suspicious because he never has accounted for the billion dollars that he said left the province. But the Minister of Government Services, I am really shocked, that he is trying to con the public of Manitoba with his argument. Of course, everybody knows that he is mixing Schedule A and Schedule B dollars, that they changed the accounting procedure, that no one else in the country can get away with. If an accountant did it, they would throw him in jail, but governments do it, where they are mixing current and capital. One of the first things they did was to change the accounting procedure. So it is a totally fallacious argument and anybody can see through that.

But I am almost hesitant to say anything because we are talking about Corrections and I empathize with my colleague, the Minister of Community Services, because he will have difficulty, as every predecessor has had difficulty. There is much more pizzazz in building a couple of miles more roads than there is in getting dollars for Corrections.

The location of the particular building, I wish we had moved a little quicker to get the twin-tower concept implemented so that it would have been located in Winnipeg Centre rather than Fort Rouge, but I guess that's a little bit of parochialism in that. I would disagree with the Minister's argument somewhat; I agree with him that concrete in itself doesn't upgrade but, nevertheless, in the older part of the city of Winnipeg we haven't had an urban renewal policy, under any government, since 1956.

I would like to direct my questions to a couple of specifics. When the Minister says that he is implementing plans, I hope that he does, and I hope that they are done with a little bit more foresight than past governments have had. I mention, as an example, economically, I'm sure if the present Minister of Community Services had been there, or I was there in the Fifties, that they would have started rebuilding a new Headingley Jail, rather than the horrendous costs of continually upgrading a facility that should have been relegated to the scrap heap because when you start fixing pipes that are imbedded in several feet of concrete and the rest of it . . .

But there was an overall plan which really didn't have that much flesh on it except for the fact that they were going to build in Brandon. I know that the Minister has taken a couple of cracks at us, primarily, I suppose, from a difference of philosophy of what correctional institutions should be about, but that is in place. But prior to the changing government, contracts were let for The Pas. Having been the Minister responsible at that time, the old The Pas Correctional Institution, I don't think anyone would have accepted the responsibility of keeping people in that facility any longer than I did. That was one of the first things I refused to do was to accept the responsibility of people in that place. That is why we made temporary arrangements with the trailers that were there, and the understanding was that those trailers would come out of there, that there was only a three-year - I'm sorry; my memory . . . I think it was it a two-year or three-year - understanding with the town of The Pas that those trailers would only be used as a stopgap measure until such time as the new facility could be completed. I believe that the contracts were actually let prior to the change of government and the present government chose to stop that. That's one question.

Then the other question was . . . We are pushed into it once again. I guess this is why I empathize with the present Minister, because it is very difficult to get money in this area. We are pushed into it because of the circumstances with people in a remand situation who . . . I agree with the Minister when he said they should be separated from the correctional population in that they are not guilty under law but, nevertheless, remand people were being held in a municipal lock-up which was perhaps stretching the law, and in Headingley. So we made the arrangements, once again on a temporary basis - it was on a lease basis - with the city of Winnipeg, with the understanding that a proper remand facility would be built and in fact the scheme of things at the time and I'm not claiming - you know, I get a little tired here at some times - your mistakes are worse than mine. But nevertheless, things, if they had progressed the way I had envisaged them, the remand centre would be coming onstream within this fiscal year, as I recall.

So with reference to the The Pas situation where the contracts had actually been let, with the plans that were in place for the building of a "proper" remand facility and I believe further down the road was an actual replacement of the Dauphin Jail which, again, was built at the turn of the century. Some people, or I guess most people, really don't pay much attention to this phase of government and don't know that the whole system was built at the turn of the century. It was my hazard guess at the time that to rebuild the facility over 10 years would have cost us approximately \$100 million. But nevertheless, I think it is that kind of a public effort which is required. Brandon is in place and The Pas has to be built; the remand centre has to be built; and Dauphin, albeit with the latter, has to be replaced.

So perhaps the Minister could take this opportunity to advise us of where these various facilities sit.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, to the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, he is remembering a course of action that he felt administration should have proceeded with, dating back to the time that he was responsible for the Department of Corrections.

I have to remind the honourable members, and I do this really just by way of general information to all members, the Department of Government Services as such, does not initiate and actively participate in the decision-making as to the priorities of the client departments, whether it is Corrections, Health, the Attorney-General's Department. We respond to the requests of the departments and if a particular facility is not prioritized by that client department in a particular way, it is not the function of the Department of Government Services to intervene or to make decisions, perhaps based on how we would like to construct or how we would like to follow a construction schedule paramount in the decision in these instances.

The honourable member is correct; we have, of course, the Brandon facility operating in full capacity. I can report to him that the The Pas facility, which was deferred for a period of time, we believe that despite the fact that the deferment has perhaps stretched the arrangement that the Honourable former Minister entered into, and his description is correct, the temporary arrangements that were agreed to by the town of The Pas and the council of the town of The Pas in the trailer arrangements, that concurrence to allow us to operate out of those facilities for an additional year or two, wasn't taken lightly but we believe that the redesign and the modification of the The Pas facility was worthwhile in terms of long-term operating and staffing costs. Of course, I have to remind him that in addition to the plans that he had when he was the Minister responsible for Corrections, we have added a separate juvenile facility, as was pointed out by the Ombudsman and others, that was necessary if the letter of the law was to be followed in the keeping of people in that facility.

The original size of the facility has been reduced some 15 to 20 percent from some 67,000 square feet that was projected at the time of the previous administration's plans to the current 56,000 feet. I give this just by way of information but, really, I suppose, what I am trying to tell the honourable member is that the facility is onstream, the construction schedule is basically being adhered to and we look to its completion in the latter part of this year or early part of next year.

I must indicate to him that the honourable member places high priority on the Remand Centre. In the years that I have had responsibility for discussion and in talking with senior Corrections people, their priorities did not place the Remand Centre in that light. Indeed, they had such other concerns that were well ahead of the Remand Centre, such as a driver intoxication centre; as well, of course, as the principal one being The Pas, and also, I think the ongoing requirements of upgrading facilities wherever they were in contravention of the fire commissioner's code.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, someone made the comment that they didn't want to build monuments to themselves. I hope the Minister doesn't get involved in building monuments to himself of a different nature. When he says that The Pas is being reduced from 76,000 to 56,000 square feet, I hope this isn't relative to the same population, because Manitoba had the reputation of having the worst jails in the world and in the United Nations - the lock-up in the city of Winnipeg. So I hope that the space isn't being cut back less than the United Nations, which is pretty minimal, and that you'll have clean straw once a day and this sort of stuff.

But I would ask the Minister, I appreciate that he is not the instigator of programs or even the final authority on the prioritizations, but I would ask the Minister as an interested Manitoban to support the Minister of Community Services in his prioritization, not necessarily those people who are in the correctional staff, because they will have differences of opinion as to priorities. But nevertheless, the Minister pointed out and took the trouble to point out that from a public standpoint, the necessity of underlining the concept in our justice system, that a person is innocent until proven in a court of law, he is innocent, and this

of course may be not in keeping with some individual's philosophy that thinks that anybody who is arrested, apprehended, should be just incarcerated.

But, Mr. Chairman, I didn't want to take this time to get into the program part of it, but it's just that the Minister, in dealing with the problems of a reconstruction, which is still going on under the present government, and in this particular area I wish to commend the government because they are proceeding in difficult times to allocate dollars in an area in which you haven't got much public support - there is not that much public demand for the allocation of tax dollars in this field. But it's incumbent upon the government, in a long-term public interest, to see that these things are brought onstream as quickly as possible. And albeit some of the recommendations that we have from some people, ombudsman, and fire commissioners, and others, it is the ultimate responsibility of the Ministers involved to accept the responsibility, and I say that in reference to the keeping of juveniles in the Brandon institution. I was satisfied on legal advice that it fulfilled the requirements of the law, that they were in fact separate, albeit under the same roof, because the original concept was that there be different modalities, that there be cottages separated for remand, for juveniles and for females; and if you take all these different populations, the cost of providing a facility in that area, with all those different separate facilities, it was just prohibitive. So I too had to hew pretty close to what I could get support, as a Minister, in interpreting the law as far as the separation of populations within a correctional institution.

And with reference to the trailers in The Pas, the fire commissioner recommended that there be a push-bar, so that they could all get out. And of course I had to accept the responsibility of saying, no, there won't be a push-bar.

But all I'm raising at this point, Mr. Chairman, is the importance to Manitobans that in the field of corrective and rehabilitative services for which the Minister of Community Services is responsible, that the Minister for Government Services as the agent to build these things, that the Minister support as much as possible the prioritization of these things. And perhaps now that he hasn't got Highways, he can just squeeze out a few less miles of road and put some of these dollars where, in my opinion, they have to be spent. And I don't want to - I only use it as an example, not that your mistakes were worse than my mistakes - but nevertheless the dealing of juveniles at the old Vaughan Street Detention Centre, the Youth Centre as it was envisaged and it was built under our government, that the concept and the development of it took several years, and by the time it was built, it was almost out of date. And it took, well, your government followed through on some of the changes which had to be made and in fact the superintendent, I believe, is still there, who did an excellent job in settling the place down. But it's these delays which cause more problems in the long run than we would cause if we invested the money at the time that the people who were involved recommended it be invested.

So if Cabinet, sitting around the table, when it comes to \$2 billion, I think a better, higher proportion of it should be allocated in the next couple of years to bring The Pas onstream, bring the Remand Centre onstream, and bring within the next three to five years, a new place, a new institution in Dauphin.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I thank the honourable member for his contribution. I accept most of what he says. I make perhaps just one correction; when I indicated that the Department of Government Services as such is not the initiator of programs. We do initiate and are perhaps the department that insists on the fire commissioner code type work to be done. That does fall very much within our responsibility.

MR. BOYCE: Perhaps the Minister can advise us when he's going to put fire escapes on this building which the fire commissioner has been recommending as long as I can remember.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I will just indicate to him that as it now stands, virtually every public building that we have is in one way or another in violation of the fire code. However, the fire commissioner's office has accepted and acknowledged the common sense approach that we tackle those buildings and institutions first where people are bedridden or where people are housed or incarcerated

under some form of lock and key that the spending and the allocation of available dollars, that the emphasis on the life-saving projects be given top priority. The item that the honourable member refers to is technically correct; there needs to be some adjustment to this very building in terms of keeping with the present stringent fire commissioner's code.

MR. BOYCE: I would just like to put on the record that someone may construe that I'm taking a backhanded slap at the fire commissioner; I am not. He calls them as he sees them and does an excellent job. All I mentioned is that sometimes it is necessary for the Minister to exercise a prerogative and accept the responsibility for not accepting a recommendation of the fire commissioner.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister, last year when he had the responsibility for two departments, and I think it's been mentioned before, said that this was only a half-a-day job a week, and . . .

MR. ENNS: I'm already sorry I ever said that.

MR. JENKINS: . . . and after hearing the Minister of Amateur Sport and Fitness this evening, I am beginning to wonder whether the Minister even spends the half-day that he was doing last year, because it seems that the Minister of Amateur Sport and Fitness seems to be more aware of what's going on in the department than the Minister. And I don't say that facetiously, I think that the Minister is aware of what is going on in his department.

The Minister, I am glad to hear, is going to use the new garage facility, because I remember last year when we were dealing with his Estimates, the Minister was praising up the old facility to high heaven. And I said to the Minister - in fact he offered us a tour of the old facility - but I asked the Minister that we do it immediately, that we don't give someone in authority over there the idea that they get the place all cleaned up before we go, and we go immediately and have a look at the facility and see how people are working under actual working conditions. The Minister didn't see fit to do that at the time and perhaps he had his reasons. I know that when we were in the Armed Services, when the Minister of National Defence was going to come and visit us, and I am sure that the Member for Rock Lake will agree that we had lots of warning that he was coming. We used to polish everything up and make everything look nice and beautiful so that when the Minister of National Defence would come around to visit us, it would be beautiful, everything, so if you did any bitching, he'd say, what's the matter with you guys, this place is perfect.

And, of course, the same thing happens at work. I remember at work when the president of the CPR or the vice-president in charge of operations would come to visit the Weston Shops, we would have well in advance notice, for a couple of days we would be cleaning up, making sure that there was nothing lying around, production would drop, so that the people who could really make the decisions would not see the place in actual operation. And it's all very well and good for the Minister to say that the facilities at the present provincial garage are adequate. The best way for the members of this Legislature, is to go right now before the Minister has a chance to get on the telephone, and visit that facility; that's how you do it. That's how you visit a facility - don't give them warning. And even if the Minister wanted to go, I am sure that there are members within his staff that would be on the telephone that the Minister is coming to visit. Oh yes, this happens, I've seen it happen time and time again. And my friend for River Heights says, if it's good enough for the CPR, it's almost reminds you of L'il Abner and Al Capp.

MR. ENNS: Tell me about it.

MR. JENKINS: When General Bullmoose used to say, if it's good for the bullmoose, it's good for the people.

MR. ENNS: Is that what L'il Abner used to say?

MR. JENKINS: And the CPR, I'm sure their thinking is, if it's good for the CPR, it's good for the people.

MR. JENKINS: But anyway, to get back to . . . the Minister of Highways has come in; I don't know where he's been. He's apparently been out looking at . . . There's been much criticism of the former Minister. --(Interjection)--

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we are to have order, committee members, remarks should come through the Chair.

The Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The criticism has been of the former Minister for building edifices to himself, and a favourite one is the wash-room that we have across the way. Well, you know, Mr. Chairman, I don't where the members of the Progressive Conservative caucus have ever been; I really don't know. Winnipeg, I would say, has one of the worst public facility for people of any major city in North America.

MR. ENNS: Yes, but we've got a lot of trees.

MR. JENKINS: Well, maybe the Minister is advocating that we should do the same thing as they have in Paris, where they have the pissoirs on the streets. Has the Minister ever seen the pissoirs in Paris?

MR. ENNS: I don't know whether I want to be remembered for that, Bill.

MR. JENKINS: Well, they are public facilities. If that's the kind of public facilities that the Minister expects to have here in Winnipeg; he says we have lots of trees. --(Interjection)-- Now, the Member for St. James, the Minister of Economic Development, he is the member - of Sturgeon Creek, pardon me, I stand corrected - he is the Minister in charge of Tourism. I know it's not his responsibility, but as the Minister in charge of Tourism in this province and he's trying to get people to come here, he should be putting pressure on not only the city of Winnipeg, but other cities here and places in Manitoba.

The Member for Elmwood, when he was the Minister, got lots of criticism for putting that facility there. Maybe the location wasn't the best spot, but it's not a bad location. If he really had wanted to build an edifice of himself, he could have built a miniature version of the Legislative Building over there, but it was put underground to try and be as unobtrusive as possible. But you expect tourists to come visit this park - and I've heard the guards on many occasions prior to the building of that - tourists coming in here looking for a public facility. The Hudson's Bay, they can go to the Hudson's Bay. When it closes down at night where do they go? As the Minister says, "To the trees", that's where they go. They had no other place to go and you know the Minister may think it's a joke; it's not a joke. It's a public disgrace for a city the size of Winnipeg, for the lack of public facilities that are there for the public to use and for the tourists that we're trying to attract here. You expect the private enterprise people out there to provide the public facilities that should be provided by the people . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister on a point of order.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the previous administration, the previous Minister built the facility on that little piece of land that we own around the building. What he's now talking about is obviously a civic responsibility. I concur with his remarks but I can't, through these estimates, start building public facilities throughout the city of Winnipeg which is a matter perhaps my Deputy Minister should have given some greater concern to when he had some responsibilities in the Department of Public Works in the city of Winnipeg, you see, or the Member for River Heights and other former councillors, the Member for St. James could have addressed themselves to. I only raise, Mr. Chairman, before the

Member for Logan gets himself too far involved in this, that we are talking about a civic responsibility here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I think the Minister's point of order is well taken. The Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Well, that's the Minister's opinion and that's your opinion, Mr. Chairman, whether the point is well taken. The point that I'm trying to express to this Minister, and also to the Minister who is over there who is responsible for Tourism, that he should get off his butt and make sure that these people in the various levels of government do provide some public facilities within this city of Winnipeg and within this province. If you want tourists to come here you've got to provide them with facilities. Go to the European countries, go down across the line and you will see what public facilities are, much better than what we have here in the city of Winnipeg. I'm not saying it's your responsibility, but when we hear these facetious remarks - I'm getting just a little bit cheesed off with the remarks that the former Minister of Public Works was building an edifice out there for himself. He was building a public facility for the thousands of people who use that park and I think that we'll be well advised to put a plug in the ear of his compatriot, the Minister of Economic Development, who has the responsibility for encouraging tourists to come to this province. And if you want to get tourists then you've got to provide some facilities and not totally depend upon the private enterprise sector to supply the facilities that should be provided by the public.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I want to get some further clarification here on the courts. Now another question I have for the Minister is this, he is now beginning to commit the government to some construction in the legislative core area and he's now talking about demolishing the garage; he's now talking about a parking structure or a building that contains parking, he's talking about a law courts extension, and so on and so on. I was wondering whether he also is looking at all future requirements as best as can be projected of the provincial government in this particular area, whether he has in fact asked his staff to develop or revise a master plan. There have been master plans before, I think I inherited some master plans, I think we developed some master plans and so on. But if the Minister is going to start redeveloping or continuing the development and freezing the development in this area I think that's one thing he's going to have to pay attention to because when we put the Woodsworth Building into this area that placed a tremendous strain on the parking facilities in this area. And now if he's going to move 400 cars temporarily and then possibly provide for those cars either on the lot beside the Convention Centre or put them underneath a court building I think that's something he should indicate to us.

The other thing I asked him is again about the city's involvement. You know, the city of Winnipeg has some very serious problems, one of the most serious being the north side of Portage and there's some very serious problems in the inner core. The one that I see that I think is becoming a greater problem and sort of visible every day is the north side of Portage; it's just absolutely disintegrating. There was a time when a person could walk between the Bay and Portage and Main and sort of window-shop and look at some of the finest stores. Now, because of expansion of certain buildings and connecting overpasses and new buildings near Broadway, like the Imperial Building and so on, we're seeing a bunch of junky operations, pinball places, hamburger places and a great number of empty buildings. And it's because of that sort of development that we responded to the city five years ago.

Now the Minister and some of his colleagues, like some of the slippery comments of the Minister of Fitness who makes his comments and then takes off, we'll talk to him when he comes back, he's very big on using certain concepts and so on, and the Minister himself is very glib when he talks about the fact that there are certain projects were built in the urban core. Now I have to remind him that there was a package of developments; there was a considerable amount of public housing built; there was infill housing built; there were all kinds of units committed and developed in the old Midland Railway location. So there was a package of public works, housing - I think there may have been some senior citizen

apartments either built or committed in that particular area. And I'm saying it's nice to develop the Legislative core area; it's nice to develop what we ourselves are, perhaps, in frequent touch with and finely attuned to. But does it really help the city of Winnipeg as compared to other possible locations and other possible developments. So I'm saying to the Minister, is his government doing anything that would be complementary to what our administration undertook or consistent with what we undertook, namely, to try to put more housing in the core area in combination with a public works' package. That's one area that I would like him to comment on and maybe he could answer that and I'll ask him a few more specifics.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Pass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Well, I asked the Minister if he would like to comment on whether his government is going to try to work with the city of Winnipeg on a plan to redevelop and do some urban renewal or whatever you want to call it around City Hall, down Logan Avenue, the north side of Portage, etc.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm aware and I could now indicate to the honourable member of some of the concerns that the government has and, indeed, some of the plans that the government has in this respect. However again, it doesn't come under the immediate purview of my responsibility as the Minister responsible for Urban Affairs, who is the Minister chiefly responsible in working out programs and plans of the nature that the member describes in concert with the city would want to be making those kind of announcements. I'm also aware that in the area of sports and fitness that there are some particular plans that are being seriously considered at this time in concert again with the city of Winnipeg. And I'm referring in this instance particularly to that area that the member expresses concern about, the north side of Portage. I can only underline that the problem is real; there is a very growing concern about that part of the city of Winnipeg and its lagging development. But again, Mr. Chairman, it is not the function of the Department of Government Services to speculate on, or indeed to report prematurely on; the specific responsibilities of the Minister of Urban Affairs or indeed other departments that would be involved in the planning and in the discussions with the city of Winnipeg in this area. When those plans and discussion reach fruition decisions are made, the Department of Government Services is asked to be involved, then I would have something to report, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOERN: I'd just like to make this point then, Mr. Chairman, that when I first caught something on the news about this court development, this package, I thought I was hearing for the first time some new urban program being carried through by the government. This was my immediate reaction. I heard something on the news, just caught some figure and I thought, well, this is the fieldhouse that's being talked about; this is being tossed about. That would be a new program for the Lyon administration and then I heard the complete announcement on another newscast and realized that what was being done, in effect, was that the government was re-announcing what our government had announced; that the government was, in effect, saying that the program of the previous administration which was frozen has now been unfrozen. And one change was that they were going to shift the location of a judges building and, of course, they had also undertaken to build something on Broadway.

Well, you know, all this talk about monuments I think is just an absolute lot of nonsense. In other words if I built, under the time when I was the Minister of Public Works, a court building, it was a monument. Right? That's what the Minister of Corrections would say, it was a monument to yourself. When they build it, it's a court building; when it was a Dauphin office building it was a monument to the Schreyer administration; when it was opened by the Minister and I happened

to be in Dauphin the same day by coincidence and you didn't even invite me. But I don't know whether you announced that it was a monument that you were opening. You probably announced it was simply an office building. So, you know, Mr. Chairman, this is just a lot of bunk. It's the same business of when you're drinking, you're drunk and when I'm drinking, I'm inebriated. It's just label pinning. Pinning labels on what one administration does, it's monuments to them; and when we do exactly the same thing, we're meeting a requirement, Mr. Chairman.

Well, I didn't want to cast any aspersions on the sober judgment of the Minister or the distinguished chairman. Mr. Chairman, distinguished as you are, I want to ask just a few more questions and then maybe we can pass part of this section and adjourn for the evening. In fact, I just want to ask this question. The other area I wanted to deal with at some length with the Minister and the Minister of Corrections if he's around is the whole question of fire protection. I'm prepared to let this go to some time tomorrow or next week. I'm just wondering where the Minister would suggest that would logically be discussed.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that whole area would be best discussed under Resolution 6. Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets at the bottom of Page 57.

MR. DOERN: Now, a few more questions here. It's my recollection that - I want to talk about the architectural appointments - No. 10 was awarded the contract under our administration and the Minister has reconfirmed that appointment. It is also my recollection - in fact I want to ask the Minister whether they are also going to be given responsibility and therefore the commission for the renovations to the law courts or is another architect. I believe that that appointment was given to Peter Langes I wonder whether that was going to be continued or whether there was a revision made.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I can give that information to the honourable member. No. 10 group is the prime architect of the new courthouse with Crosier Kilgour, and Scouten Mitchell Sigurdson as part of the consortium in the mechanical, electrical and engineering design that is required, and the honourable member is correct, we have continued the appointment of Peter Langes & Associates for the renovations of the old Law Courts Building.

Mr. Chairman, if I may be just be permitted to expand on that answer. There has been, and there always is, I suppose, some degree of politics attempted to be made out of the appointment of architects for some reason particularly, and that was so the case in previous years, or last years debate around the subject matter of architects appointments. I take the opportunity of underlining the fact that in both of these instances this administration concurs and carries out and proceeded with the carrying on the appointments that were originally suggested and designated by the previous administration.

MR. DOERN: I might point out that we too reconfirmed the same appointments since we've had No. 10. They've been working on this project for 15 years, not full-time, no real revenue rolling in, but you appointed them in 1965, we reconfirmed them in 1975, you reconfirmed them in 1980 and they may be reconfirmed again - thrice-blessed up to the present.

MR. ENNS: I don't really wish to provoke the Honourable Member for Elmwood. The big difference of course is that we're not just appointing architects or reconfirming architects; we're building the projects.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)(c)(1). The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: I have to say to the Minister, he is building the projects, but when I look north of the law courts I don't see anything there. And when I look at the law courts renovations I don't see much there. So he intends, he declares his intention. I declared my intention so we will see how it works out.

I want to ask him what changes are going to be made in the law courts? In 1975 we approved a \$3.15 million renovation. Some first initial stage of that was complete. Now it's complicated by the fact that the government bought the old IBM

Building and has spent \$2.25 million renovating and buying, and are going to spend another million on the law courts. I wonder if he could indicate how much has been spent on renovations of the law courts to date, and what changes in the program there's going to be. Obviously because of the Broadway Building they're not going to do as extensive a renovation. Could he give us some idea of what's going to be done.

MR. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I can give the honourable member an idea of how the cash requirements are going to fall into place. We have in place in the complex that we are talking about some \$2,240,000 at 373 Broadway. Roughly breaking down in half a million dollars for the purchase and a million plus for the renovations. Development of the new courts building is, and I hope that the honourable members will appreciate at this point estimates, but we are talking in the order of some ten millions of dollars. The renovations of the former Land Titles building which is part of the programme now, is being estimated at this time in 1980/81 dollars as being in the neighbourhood of \$670,000. The renovations of the Law Courts Building are estimated at this time in 1980/81 dollars again of the magnitude of very close to \$4 million - \$3,9 million. Reoccupancy of 373 Broadway for the Provincial Family Courts when this programme moves in its natural progression will probably be, there will be relocation costs as we move in the family courts to that facility. And by the way the requirement for this is pressing, some of the family courts facilities now where they are now operating at the Fort Osborne Barracks, are literally beginning to cause us difficulties and so there will be some \$50,000 involved in relocation of the family courts system back into 373 Broadway.

At this point, we are not prepared to talk about dollar values that may be required for a remand centre in that area. There are a number of the early design and decisions that have to be made as to the requirements of the Attorney-General's department in this regard, as well as site and actual location decisions. The suggestion that has been talked about around this table about the old garage being the remand centre at this point is only a suggestion.

Mr. Chairman, if that helps the Honourable Member for Elmwood somewhat, then I hope that information will be helpful. I should indicate to him that the reason for appointing the Peter Langes & Associates to the major renovations of the old Law Courts Building at this time is principally so that he can be involved and working in concert with the prime architects, which are No. 10 of the new courthouse. So that there will be interconnections that both architectural firms will have to take into account. The plan, of course, is not to really proceed with the old law courts renovations until we can move the judges right out of the Law Courts Building and then proceed to properly renovate the Law Courts Building. Just to fill it out one step further, the proposals for the Land Titles office, which is a beautiful unused building at the present time, is to renovate that to provide essentially offices for senior federally-appointed judges.

MR. DOERN: I want to address some remarks to the Minister of Fitness who made one of the most stupid speeches I ever saw made around this table. You know, I was very touched by that speech that he made supporting the government. Its always nice to hear one of the ministers supporting his administration. But I would say that what he should do is he should stick to what he knows best, which is making deals with promoters like Jarmoc, who is his special case, and he should also stick to making the kind of deals he made on the lottery, which I think was a blatant error on his part, and one that is going to come back to haunt him and you know, I don't think I have to comment on his record in government; his own minister commented on it, his first minister, by demoting him because of such a rotten job that he did in tourism --(Interjection)-- . . . Yes I think it probably did hurt you at the time . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I must bring to the attention of the committee, we are on 1.(c)(1), so I would request . . .

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I have to say that the Minister of Fitness shot his mouth off, made a lot of silly comments, and I think that he can read the record as to what I said about his comments about monuments because he obviously doesn't know what he is talking about.

Now, back to business, aside from that interruption. I want to clarify some of these points again here. The Minister is telling me then that he is going to spend about the same amount of money on renovating the law courts; it's actually up about 20 percent. We were going to spend \$3.25 million; I assume that essentially he's doing the same things, that he's continuing the programme that was started a few years ago. It's up 20 percent in cost, that he's allocated about ten million for a court building, is that right? Which I believe is the figure that was allocated a few years ago. I don't know if that figure is adequate, whether the program is reduced, but as he says, it is an estimate, and I think he knows like any minister in Public Works, estimates usually go up. The only instance I can recall where we came in way under an estimate was in the Woodsworth Building, where we were a million dollars under estimate and were delighted to be proven wrong. And I don't take the aesthetic judgement of the Minister of Fitness. He not only has no aesthetic taste, he doesn't even know how to pronounce the word. So I don't take any advice from him.

I ask the Minister in regard to Land Titles, he says that is for the purpose of federal judges, and is he going to utilize that whole facility for judges quarters or courtrooms? I am not quite clear on what he said there. Well, I am not going to yield the floor if the Minister is not going to reply.

So then I would also ask in terms of the building on Broadway, it is very confusing to read the press releases and to read the press reports, because the impression is given, for instance in The Free Press, that in fact I read from an article by Glen Mackenzie of today, saying that a million dollars will be spent renovating the existing law courts, so obviously it's you know, between what was said and what was understood, it's clear to those of us who are trying to hear the government's explanation. So the Minister's telling me then that the law courts renovation will proceed, but here's where I am bothered, and I ask the Minister to clarify this. It would seem that there's something additional in here and that is the expenditure on the courts, that monument that the Minister just opened to his government on Broadway. I ask him whether the fact that they built those courtrooms shouldn't have meant a reduction in some other programme. In other words, you appear to be doing the following: you appear to be building a new court building, as we would have; you appear to be renovating the law courts, as we would have; you appear to be using the Land Titles we had other plans but I understand that. Holding all of that aside, the same general programme is now being given the green light. But what is different is that you have spent - is it \$3 million, \$2.2 million on the IBM building on Broadway - and I ask the Minister whether that expenditure shouldn't have meant a reduction of some program, either in law courts renovation, which I thought was the case, or in the new construction of a court. Because if the Minister says no, then what he's telling me is that they appear to have spent several million dollars more in addition to inflation to accomplish what would have seemed to be the same program. Now, can the Minister enlighten us on that point?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I don't know if the Attorney-General is with us and I am more than happy to answer some of those questions, but I would ask the members' indulgence to have the Attorney-General speak on the subject briefly, in terms of the provision of services, the addition and improvement of services that are now being contemplated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes the Attorney-General was next on my list, committee. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, firstly let me take this opportunity to congratulate the Minister and his staff on what everybody in the judicial system recognizes as an excellent job that was done with the building at 373 Broadway Avenue in a very short period of time. I think in something like eight months' time, a brand-new facility was brought on line providing 10 courtrooms for the Provincial Judges' Court, which does need additional courtrooms and which will provide additional courtrooms to assist us in our attempts to reduce the backlog in the Provincial Judges' Court. So the facilities are very welcome indeed to the judicial system in Manitoba. That facility has been brought into line, I think, very economically at a cost of \$2.2 million and is a facility in which, I can tell

members of this committee, provincial judges are extremely happy with in the way the offices are set up on the fifth floor, the security measures that can now be brought into play, which has been a concern of provincial judges for some time, particularly in the Law Courts Building, and by removing the Provincial Judges' Court to 373 Broadway Avenue from the Law Courts Building, it has been able to provide an additional security to the County Court, Queen's Bench, and Court of Appeal Judges who are left behind in the Law Courts Building.

With respect to the comments of the Member for Elmwood at the end, if there is an addition to the program, it is that when the new building is constructed and occupied by provincial judges in the Criminal Court, the Juvenile and Family Court judges will be able to move into the building at 373 Broadway Avenue and I am sure the Member for Elmwood would be aware of the concerns expressed, not only by lawyers and judges, with particularly the use of the Fort Osborne facilities, which goes back even prior to their government, as I recollect, but which was a very inconvenient location for particularly clients who had to appear in that court in numerous separation cases and in juvenile cases. The location was very inaccessible to the people who had to appear in that court.

Again, I want to say to the Minister that I am very happy that he was able to participate in the announcement of the actual appointment of consultants for the new Law Courts Building. It is something that has been discussed for a great length of time, 13 or 14 years. The actual appointment of consultants, which is the first time that has happened, to do the actual design and planning work for tendering in the very near future, is a commitment to the project that was very well accepted yesterday at the opening. I think, and I know the Minister is aware of this, that there is a need for parking facilities in this particular area and I hope he will keep that in mind as this matter progresses.

I want to say one thing, Mr. Chairman, about the location, because there were some questions raised in Question Period the other day about location and consultation with City Council on that particular matter. I want to check the records, Mr. Chairman, because if the Member for Elmwood was indicating there was complete concurrence by city council in the previous location that his government chose, I say that is not correct.

MR. DOERN: Can I ask the Minister a question?

MR. MERCIER: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: I didn't suggest that every single member on council voted in favor of it. I am saying that council, as a body, in conjunction with the mayor, agreed and asked for and was in agreement with what was done. I don't know whether one or two member dissented. I just say that the official position of City Council was to build in that location. I think we have correspondence to back that up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: I would like to go back and check that correspondence because as I recollect, subject to correction, Mr. Chairman, what was on record was a general resolution from city council requesting assistance from the provincial government in developing the inner core area. It was a very general revision. I think on the basis of that, the provincial government took some steps. But I can recall specifically, at a meeting with the former Premier and their Urban Affairs Cabinet with the city's official delegation, of which I was a member, that I particularly objected to the location of the Law Courts Building in the location that the previous government picked for it. I think the construction of the new Law Courts Building in the general location which the Minister is looking at is the correct one because it ties in with the whole judicial system; it makes for much more efficient use of manpower, of clerical staff, of library facilities, which are very very expensive, and I think it will turn out to be the correct location. I can tell members of the committee that we have indicated to the city

we are prepared to discuss the ultimate disposition of the land that was previously acquired by them because I believe they have some interest in it for their own long-range plans and we will be proceeding with this.

But I think, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is to be congratulated for the announcement and the construction of the building on Broadway and the commitment to this Construction Program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I just have one more question and a brief observation. I now think I understand the series of moves. If the courts are then pulled from Fort Osborne - this is like a checker game or a chess game, more accurately - does the Minister have plans to utilize the space at Fort Osborne, if that is going to then become vacant? Has that been thought through at this point?

MR. ENNS: The immediate problem that we have at Fort Osborne is the occupancy of buildings that are no longer, in some instances, fit for occupancy. We have fire code problems there; we have buildings that are scheduled for demolition. There are no further plans at this moment for a development, either by government or other agencies, for that site. I should indicate, of course, the involvement of the provincial government at Fort Osborne is by no means limited to Family Courts. There are ongoing commitments by other departments that will continue our presence at the Fort Osborne site for some unforeseen time in the future.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I would just simply say to the Minister, isn't it ironic that a couple of years ago, the Minister was prepared to name a parking structure after me and now the parking structure is going to be, presumably, undertaken by him and therefore I think it should appropriately be named after him as the "Harry Enns Parkade," or "HEP," in the hep talk of the 1950s and I think that it is rather ironic that he was prepared to give me that honour; I am now willing to relinquish that honour to him.

MR. ENNS: Poetic justice of politics, Russ. That's the way the ball bounces.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(c)(1)--pass; 1.(c)(2)--pass; 1(d)(1)--pass; 1.(d)(2)--pass.

Is it the desire that committee rise?

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that committee rise.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise.

SUPPLY - NATURAL RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): This committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members' attention to page 80 of the Main Estimates, Department of Natural Resources. Resolution 107. Item 8. Fisheries, (a) Administration, (1) Salaries.

The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me it would be prudent before we get into the area of Fisheries, that the Minister take this opportunity to bring back a number of answers that he indicated to us in committee the other day, or last week, that he would bring back. I believe there are quite a number of questions that were put that he took as notice. We would appreciate having an earlier reply than at the end of his Estimates in order to further facilitate the debate, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whether the honourable member was referring to some specific questions or not but I do have a number of answers here that I would be happy to give him. One of those was a question concerning the severance lines and who paid for severance lines and the answer for that was that Hydro does in fact pay for them.

There was also a question with respect to a problem with some flowing wells, and the answer was that there have been some problems experienced with one well near Gunton, but remedial action had been taken by Water Resources and the problem seems to have been resolved. Indications were that the ground water level had dropped at the most of about five feet; all other systems in the area seem to be unaffected. It is unknown if there were problems in the Teulon area, but there have not been any reported.

There was a question from the Member for Lac du Bonnet about drainage in East Selkirk relating to ground water pollution problems. And I am advised that on March 16, 1979 Water Resources branch submitted an engineering report in response to the rural municipality of St. Clements for: (1) undertake a surface water drainage survey of the East Selkirk area and recommend drainage improvements and recommend the best method to seal the abandoned limestone quarry on the MHRC property. Recommended improvements do not affect any provincial waterway in the area, therefore the branch would not be responsible for implementing the proposals.

There was a question whether the Brokenhead area was included in the flood damage agreement, and I'm not sure whether the honourable member got an answer to that today or not. The information I have is that Schedule A of the agreement lists the areas and floodways to be mapped in the province, and the Brokenhead River will be mapped from the south of 33-12A East, to north of 6-13A East, which is the reach of the river which may cause flooding problems in the town of Beausejour. That would be with respect to the flood damage reduction agreement. And in the 1979 Municipal Flood Assistance Program, the rural municipality of Brokenhead is included in the designated area.

There was also a question in the capacity of culvert installation on Devil's Creek in the northeast, I think, of 21-13-6 East; the answer was it would convey about 450 cfs.

There was also a question about the capacity of the bridges along the Thornson Drain prior to their replacement by culverts, summer of 1979. The time the bridges were built normal design practice was to span the water surface and provide adequate freeboard. As a result they usually provide the capacity far in excess of what was required to convey the agricultural runoff. Bridges were favoured over culverts at the time because timber bridges were less expensive than culverts. The 8'6" by 6'2" corrugated metal arch culverts installed in 1979 will carry a flow of approximately 125 cfs with a head differential of 0.7 feet. Now this capacity is judged to be more than adequate to handle agricultural flows.

There had been some questions about the recruitment of a Director of Parks. There had been 17 applications that were received for the position; 11 of those were ultimately interviewed; the board was held in August. All the unsuccessful applicants were notified at the time that the appointment of the director was made; and I have some material here outlining the qualifications of Mr. Doyle, who has been appointed Director of Parks. I would be happy to provide a copy to the honourable members.

There also had been a question from the Member for St. George about maintenance programs within the drainage area or Watershed 32 in the Interlake region, and I have the information and I'll just make it available to him rather than go into the details of it, Mr. Chairman.

I think a number of the other answers - some were already provided and some we don't have available yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has recapped some of the answers the second time. I believe that we have pursued some of these points earlier and that he was going to seek further information. With respect to Watershed No. 13 and the culvert installation on Devil's Creek, I had tried to impress the department

and the Minister that while we recognized that the facility that is there now may well conform to the CFS requirements of that area, according to standards established by the department, that notwithstanding that, Mr. Chairman, it is clear to me that substantial changes have taken place both upstream and downstream of this one location, where the capacity is much greater than is the capacity on this particular location. Therefore, we now have a bottleneck situation which does severely affect a number of people, just at this very point, and it seems to me that there is just no logic in, if we are upgrading the capacity of culverts or bridges upstream and downstream that we should leave a bottleneck in the middle. I know that the Minister may argue that perhaps the structure that is there now, and has been there for a good number of years, is fairly sound and can probably be left there for another ten or fifteen years without collapsing or whatever, without rotting away. It is a wood structure, but it is a treated wood structure I'm sure. So that in essence, if the Minister is trying to suggest that until we have a need to replace that particular bridge, we are not going to do it, what he is really saying is that the particular people involved around this particular bottleneck will have to suffer for some period of years, and I just think that that is wrong, Mr. Chairman. I believe, you know my own opinion on it would be that probably the people in question may have a legal case, given the fact that the department has enlarged the capacity on both sides of this particular location.

Now with respect to the other matters, I believe we will just pass that on to the Member for St. George and of course, the Member for Rupertsland is here and will deal with the matters that he had requested. The Minister did not respond, however, to the questions put to him some days ago on the Grand Beach Hotel. We wanted to know precisely what the nature of that acquisition was in terms of dollars and cents; who the owners were; who are the beneficiaries; what is the cost involved, and what is the intent of the province? That was taken as notice and we had hoped that we would have had the answers by now, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)-pass - The Honourable Member for . . .

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the Minister whether he is indicating that he is not in a position to supply answers with respect to the Grand Beach Hotel?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: I think, Mr. Chairman, earlier this week when perhaps the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet was not here I indicated that I would provide him with complete information prior to the Ministers salary being debated. Part of the problem is that the person in the Attorney-General's department who had been dealing with it, isn't in the office this week.

MR. USKIW: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I didn't get that last comment on the part of the Minister.

MR. RANSOM: I said that the person in the Attorney-General's office, who is dealing with the question was not available this week.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure just what the Attorney-General's department has to do with the question of how much the province paid for that facility and the question of who the facility was bought from, the question of the amount of money paid, and who all the beneficiaries of that transaction are - what the arrangement is for the municipality of St. Clements. I am sure that all of those things have nothing to do with the Attorney-General's department, Mr. Chairman, unless the Minister wishes to clarify why he wants to wait for the Attorney-General's department to give him that information.

MR. RANSOM: . . . the number of questions raised, Mr. Chairman, including one dealing with the recommendation from the Attorney-General's department. The other information I think the honourable member will find has been provided.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated that the department had paid something in the order \$14,000 for that hotel. If I am not correct, the Minister could correct me if he wishes. He also indicated that there were some \$20,000-odd in tax arrears that were paid to the R.M. of St. Clements. Now Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that the tax arrears were \$76,249.75, so there's obviously quite a discrepancy between what the Minister had indicated to this committee and what the reality is and is the Minister suggesting then that he has paid to the R.M. of St. Clements something far less than what the arrears are, and if that is so what is the position of the R.M. of St. Clements with respect to the collection of the balance?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that I indicated that we paid \$20,000. I don't recall that figure; if that figure was used, it was not the correct figure. The amount of money that has been paid is the \$76,000 figure, whatever that may be. I would just suggest, Mr. Chairman, that when I have the complete information, because the history of this problem goes back to 1973, I will provide the information and all the answers that have been for. I think that is the only time that we can have an informed debate on it, when all the information is available. I judge at the moment we are attempting to deal with the fisheries item.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, we were unable to debate the question at the time that the question arose, because the Minister was unable to supply us with information, and now the Minister is suggesting that we wait to the last item on his estimates before he is prepared to table the information. Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know what his motivation is, perhaps he feels he won't have the information till that point in time. On the other hand he is denying the opposition the opportunity to debate what has taken place with respect to that transaction by shelving it to the last item in his estimates. You know, tradition has it, as I recall, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister tries to bring back the information on his first opportunity after he has taken the matter under advisement or the question as notice. To suggest that we will have to wait until all of his estimates are complete before we can then re-enter into the debate on those points that he has taken under advisement, is truly jeopardizing the debate and stifling the role of the opposition, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass; (2)--pass. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A.R. ADAM (Pete): Mr. Chairman, we are on the first item Salaries, Department of Fisheries, and I thought I'd make a few comments. In my constituency there are a number of freshwater lakes, none of which are entirely within the constituency, but a great portion of them are, that is the Watershed of Lake Dauphin, and Lake Dauphin, Winnipegosis and Lake Waterhen and Lake Manitoba, parts of the shores of these lakes are in the boundaries of the Ste. Rose constituency.

I wanted to point out to the Minister that the problems that he got himself into last fall with the major changes that he was proposing on these particular lakes, and I suppose all the lakes within the province of Manitoba. In my opinion, it's understandable that the Minister may have embarked on his all-embracing policy and I can perhaps excuse him for that, because I don't expect him to have full knowledge of all these different lakes and the fisheries and the tradition of how these fisheries were operated in the past.

With the exception of Lake Winnipegosis in those lakes that I've mentioned, the other lakes and many other lakes in the province support only a winter fishery. Lake Winnipegosis does have a summer fishing as well, and I think fall fishing, but the other lakes and many other lakes support only winter fishing and traditionally a winter fishing fishery will not support a total income for anyone in that fishery. It never has been that way in the past and I doubt whether a winter fishery would be capable of providing sufficient income for a fisherman to be involved only in fishing on those particular lakes.

As a matter of fact we see this happening in agriculture, as well, as a great many farmers are obliged to go out and supplement their farming incomes in order to remain solvent or be able to remain in the farming industry. Traditionally, the fisheries in Manitoba have had a similar - with a few exceptions of course -

had a similar role to play. We have found over the years that many people who are fishing in the wintertime, they're ranchers; they could be trappers; they could be people who go out working for the summer months and when things slack down in the fall they come back home and they get involved with their winter fishing and they have a winter income.

So I think that the policy that the Minister embarked on last fall was very ill-advised and I'm sure that if he had made any investigations at all, he would have found this out. He had but to ask. I suppose any fisherman would have been able to tell him what the situation was, in particular, to these lakes. If he did not choose to go out and speak to the fishermen on these particular lakes, I'm sure he could have found that information from myself or some of the members on this side of the House who represent constituencies where there are many fishermen involved in fishing.

In my own particular case, Mr. Chairman, I was involved in the fishery all my life, all my early life at least, until about the age of 40, I suppose. I recall that I was five years old when my father moved into Crane River where in the community the main industry was fishing in the wintertime and trapping. And at one time people used to go out and dig for seneka root, which apparently is no longer a product that there is any demand for.

I suggest to the Minister that while I don't feel that even this policy change, as I understood that was going to take place, would be a correct way to proceed even on lakes where they do have summer fishing because I can see where we will have a diminishing of the numbers of fishermen on those particular lakes. But I do know that the lakes that I mentioned, that are in my constituency, the Dauphin Lake, the Waterhen Lake and Lake Manitoba will not support a summer fishery and I doubt whether they ever would be able to support a summer fishery, and I'm sure the Minister knows that. So I would say that the way that these lakes have been fished in the past have been mainly to supplement other incomes or vice versa.

I'm pleased that some of the department people are now getting out and speaking to the fishermen. I attended a meeting here last week at which the director of the department there was present and at the Lake Manitoba Fishermen's Association. I'm sure the Minister now must have some of the proposals that these fishermen expressed to the director when he was present at that meeting. So I would very strongly recommend that the Minister not proceed with his policy change that he had proposed last fall, certainly not for those lakes where there'll never be any hope that a fishermen could begin fishing in the month of November, the middle of November, and fish till maybe March, the 15 of March or whenever they do, and expect to be able to make a sufficient income from that fishery to maintain his livelihood for himself and his family for the whole year. I believe that some of the recommendations that were proposed that I heard at this meeting last week, some I agree with and some I don't.

When I first heard of the policy that the Minister was proposing, I felt that it was a way to undermine the Fish Marketing Corporation through the back door, by eliminating a number of fishermen on the lake and allowing fishermen to opt out from the Fish Marketing Corporation. It would be similar to allowing a number of farmers to opt out of the Wheat Board, and so on. I think this would undermine the Wheat Board and I'm sure that a policy such as this would undermine the Fish Marketing Corporation which, in my opinion, has been one of the best things that's ever happened to the Manitoba fishery. And as I mentioned awhile ago, well, I started my own fishing operation when I was age 18 and I did continue for many years after that.

I also want to mention that the Member for Dauphin, in his comments some time ago said that I had been at some meeting immediately preceding or following a meeting from the department and that I had spread some rumors. I want to state for the record that at no time did I ever meet with any fishermen in the situation that he claims or spread rumors. I did attend a meeting with a group of fishermen at Crane River who phoned me up and asked me if I could come down and give them some information on the policy that the Minister was proposing. Not having been apprised myself, or having received any information from the Minister, I did not have too much information to give them and the fact is that I went down there to try and learn or find out what was going on.

There were about 40 fishermen at this meeting and they were quite concerned. I didn't know how to handle the situation except to advise them that it looked as

though it was a plan to undermine the Fish Marketing Board and that I did not think, knowing the winter fishery that I have been involved with for most of my life, I didn't think that a leasing arrangement would be of any advantage to them.

I attended a meeting in Meadow Portage the following night and I was requested by the fishermen, the fishermen asked the department people in charge if I would be allowed to speak and I indicated to the department people there that it was not my meeting, it was a meeting that was set up by the department. I didn't feel it was right for me to get up and make statements, but they insisted that I do so as the representative for that area, and I did get up and state my opinion on this matter. I attended another meeting at Eddystone a few days later and there were quite a number of fishermen there.

I just want, for the record, to advise the Member for Dauphin that at no time have I spread any rumors. In Eddystone I was there as an observer. I made some suggestions on moving fish out of Churchill, if possible, and that was about the extent of my involvement at the meeting at Eddystone.

Some of the points that the fishermen raised last week, I have a copy of the minutes - not the minutes but of their agenda for the night, their meeting - and one of the recommendations are, in regard to licences, that they would like to see the system left as is, except for the following: That no licences be issued to fishermen with no production record for three years. That was one of their recommendations.

Another recommendation was that where a retired fishermen no longer wanted to be active in fishing on a commercial basis that he be allowed to obtain a special permit, say for a one gill net or whatever fathoms, for his own use. There were a number of others . . . they recommended that the quota be left at two million pounds for Lake Manitoba; that the size of the gill nets be left as they are at present, I think it is 3 3/4 on Lake Manitoba; and that the nets be set at least 100 yards apart between fishermen, between nets, I presume; and they also recommended that the Lake Manitoba Commercial Fishermen's Association have representation on the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation. Well, I suppose that perhaps does not fall within the Minister's responsibility as to who sits on that board, but perhaps he can make recommendations.

Now, there is an Advisory Committee, but it has very little power. Perhaps if that advisory committee was changed to giving even representation on the board, that might solve some of the problems.

They asked that licences be required for dip net fishing on culverts. I suppose they are referring to rough fish, and that carp fishing be allowed. I just can't get the next word here of the typewritten - but anyway, that the season be from April 1 until July 1 for carp fishing.

Number 5 was a recommendation, and I believe they are referring primarily here to carp and mullets - they recommend that, if possible, to look at the feasibility of marketing the carps and mullets outside of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation. I don't know what was the outcome of the meeting. Now, whether the meeting agreed on that or not, I am not aware if they agreed to any of these things that they had down on their agenda, but certainly number 5, which would allow marketing of rough fish, I believe, outside of the Marketing Corporation, I would be opposed to that. I think in the long term the best solution for the fishermen - and I have lived under the previous situation where we had many private dealers all over the place, and I happen to be one myself, as was my father before me, and I would very much be opposed to going back to that kind of situation where the quality was very very questionable that was coming into Winnipeg. There were a lot of charge-backs; we were continually receiving charge-backs and there was a lot of poor quality product that was getting to market.

The request that the lake be restocked with pickerel at different places, I only arrived towards the last part of the meeting so I was not involved when they were discussing all these items and what was the outcome or the opinion of the majority of the directors. They feel that there should be some kind of an arbitration or appeal board be set up between the government and Lake Manitoba Commercial Fishermen's Association. I'm not sure what they are asking for.

They are suggesting that the government institute some sort of a check-off for the Lake Manitoba Commercial Fishermen's Association. I would strongly oppose the Minister forcing an association upon the fishermen which they do not want, similar

to what has happened with the livestock producers. I believe in voluntary groups that wish to improve their particular situation. I do not believe it is the role of government to impose what the government thinks is good for them. I would rather that the fishermen developed their own mechanisms, their own bodies, their own associations to do their lobbying for them.

They recommend that the grant system be dismantled, - at least they talked about it - and that the money be allocated for the purpose of subsidy on mullets. Like I say, I wasn't there for the full discussions and I don't know what took part or whether that was approved or not.

Again, I want to emphasize that it would be foolish on my part to try to impose . . . look upon those winter lakes, the lakes that are fished only in the winter time, as being an occupation where someone can make a living for the whole year. It's always been either supplementing some other income or vice versa.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I would ask the Minister if he would be able, at this juncture, to provide us with any information in regard to methyl mercury contamination among fish. I speak particularly to the community of South Indian Lake, although it is my understanding that there is contamination along the whole river system there, up into Gillam, and it has become a serious problem. We spoke to this problem last year and did not have information available to us last year that has been compiled over the last year and has become available to us now.

So I would ask the Minister if he can indicate what is being done by his department in regard to protecting the fisheries in these areas from continued contamination by methyl mercury and what appears to be, at least in some instances, increasing contamination by methyl mercury?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I don't have the information with me but there was a federal study done, I believe, by the Freshwater Institute on that problem. I believe that copies of those reports should be available and I will attempt to get one of those reports for the honourable member.

There is no question there is a problem in that there is mercury contamination. I think at the moment it is still regarded to be within acceptable limits. There are some theories in the report, as I recall, as to how it might have come about, but again, as I recall, I don't think that there was anything conclusive, really, in the report. But I'll attempt to get a copy of that for the honourable member.

MR. COWAN: Well, if I just can then, Mr. Chairperson, read to the Minister from a newspaper article entitled, "Study Reveals Vast Drop in Quality of Whitefish," which is of recent vintage from the Winnipeg Free Press, Monday, January 14, 1980. I will just read the last couple of paragraphs, if I can. The quote is:

"As well as the impact on the quality of whitefish, Southern Indian Lake fishermen also face a sharp rise in the mercury count in pickerel and pike, which make up much of the remainder of their million-pound catch. Scientists estimate that if the trend continues, the sale of these species will have to be restricted by mid-1980s. It is estimated that almost the entire whitefish catch could be second or third-class by the end of next year."

Now, of course the mercury contamination is more in the pike and the pickerel and the predatory fish rather than in the bottom feeders such as whitefish. That's a separate problem all unto its own which we will discuss later. But the fact is that some scientists, some experts are saying and suggesting that if the mercury count continues to increase at the rate it has been increasing over the past number of years, that we will have to severely restrict fishing in South Indian Lake.

I would ask the Minister at this point if there are any areas in the province at the moment where fishing has had to be restricted, particularly on pike and pickerel species, which are most susceptible to methyl mercury contamination. Are

there any particular areas where fishing has been restricted and where the commercial fishermen have been told not to catch, or have been told that they cannot sell their catch of pike and pickerel because of mercury contamination?

MR. RANSOM: I am advised that there are one or two areas that have been in existence for some time. I am not aware of any new areas of the problem to that point where they had to be advised of that. I think one of the areas is around Nelson House and, of course, the member is probably familiar with the problem that dated back some years when the problem was on a very large scale.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. The problem is a problem that does come and go and that's part of the problem with the problem is that we don't seem to have any or not enough knowledge, at least, as to why this problem comes and why it goes as it does. I would ask the Minister what his department is doing to investigate this very serious contamination problem which, at the moment, seems to be on a rise approaching a peak. It seems to be increasing year by year. So I would ask him what actions his department has taken to protect the fisheries industry in northern Manitoba, which seems to be in certain areas under a certain degree of threat from this particular contamination problem.

MR. RANSOM: The main work is being done by the Freshwater Institute. Our department co-operates in helping to collect the information and that sort of thing, but the main research thrust is being carried out by the Freshwater Institute.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. To the Minister, then, is his department in any way attempting to direct these activities to specific problems that they feel may affect the fisheries, or are they in a position of advising upon request and one of general co-operation, which I had assumed that they would be at any rate? Are they in any way trying to take initiative and lead in this investigation to protect the fisheries?

MR. RANSOM: I would say, Mr. Chairman, that we are satisfied with the kinds of investigations that are taking place through the Freshwater Institute and if a situation arises where it is evident that some further investigation is required, then I don't anticipate that we would have any difficulty in being able to concentrate research effort into that area.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. The Minister says that they are satisfied with the kinds of efforts and the kind of investigations that are being undertaken now. Can the Minister elaborate on what those efforts in investigations are and in specifics so that we can have some ideas - the opposition and myself as a representative of that constituency - as to exactly what experiments, what investigations, what studies are undertaken right now to deal with what seems to be a serious problem and a problem that is getting more serious year by year.?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I am not familiar with the details of it myself, but again, I would be happy to provide perhaps the study outlines of work that is being undertaken or the reports that have been completed. This is a pretty technical area and I think it is very difficult to try and summarize in a few words. I am sure that the honourable member would want to see some of the detailed information and I would attempt to get that for him. I think that that's the only way that I can provide him with an adequate level of information.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Well of course I would expect that detailed information be forthcoming. The problem of course is that we're talking to the issue right now and it's rather difficult once we get that material to bring the issue up again, except under the category of the Minister's Salary, and at that point the Minister does not have his staff with him so it puts him at a disadvantage. I would hope that we could get that information, on this side at least, so that we can peruse it very quickly before this particular section is over so that we can discuss it in some detail. It will make our job a bit easier.

The reason that I am concerned particularly about this is, the recent report from Health and Welfare Canada, which is dated December 19, 1979, so it is a quite recent report, which I have taken the trouble to get from the department, entitled, "Methyl Mercury in Canada. Exposure of Indian and Inuit Residents to Methyl Mercury in the Canadian Environment." And while the report indicates that the problem is far worse than in Ontario and Quebec, it certainly does state that we have a problem in the Manitoba region. A total of 2,219 tests have been performed in 42 communities in Manitoba; 1,459, or 65.7 percent of these tests showed levels less than 20 parts per billion, which is a level that one would not become inordinantly concerned with if that was the only type of level you were finding.

On the other hand, 745, or 33.6 of these tests showed levels of methyl mercury contamination; now this is not in fish, this is in individuals, this is in human beings, Indian and Metis people. The tests showed between 20 and 99 parts per billion; now that's 33.6 percent. Well now we're approaching a danger level where we actually are, according to some theories, in a danger level, but if we use the threshold limit value - and I am not certain if that is the exact terminology that one would use in this sort of contamination - perhaps it would be permissible exposure level. But if we were to use a level, a cutoff, which is a standard cutoff, and that's of 100 parts per billion as being unsafe above that level, then we find that 15 results or 7/10's of 1 percent of the total results for Manitoba were between 100 and 199 parts per billion.

Now what we have to understand, and we face this problem consistently when we start to deal with safe levels, unsafe levels, TLD's, PEL's, MAC's, whatever terminology one wishes to use, what we have to understand is we're not talking about an absolute cutoff point. A person at 99 is in a safe area and a person at 100 parts per billion is in a danger area. What we are saying is as a person approaches that 100 parts per billion, they are in increasing danger areas and when they go over the 100 parts per billion, then they are in what is commonly called a danger zone.

The greatest number of tests in this survey were carried out in Norway House, Lac Brochet, and Nelson House. And levels over 100 parts per billion were found in the three communities: Lac Brochet, Nelson House, and Paungassi. Of the six individuals with levels over 100 parts per billion, one is from Lac Brochet, one from Nelson House, and four from Paungassi. Five of the individuals are males and one female. That would make a certain amount of sense because the males are usually involved in the guiding activities, and the guides are going to be those individuals who are eating the most fish on a consistent basis. In other words, they are out on the lake doing their guiding, doing their fishing, and their diet consists primarily of fish, some of which obviously are contaminated with methyl mercury, so we would expect that result to have occurred.

Now I must add at this point that two of the "at risk" individuals now "at risk" individuals are those individuals of over 100 parts per billion - have received full clinical examinations and no abnormalities attributable to mercury were detected. Now one individual refused the examination and of course that's the right of any individual to refuse an examination if they so wish, whether it be a guide in a remote community or a worker in a workplace, or yourself or myself, Mr. Chairperson, we have that right. So one exercised that right, and the remaining three have not been clinically examined as of December 31st, 1978.

At the same time, I have to point out that our examinations and our technical expertise in this area sometimes does not allow us to detect minute neurological changes, the type of changes that one would expect to accompany exposure or over-exposure to methyl mercury. So while we can be somewhat reassured by the fact that there have been no clinical abnormalities attributable to mercury, we still have to be concerned that there may in fact be a health problem at this point, and of course we have to be concerned that this health problem may become a major health problem in the future unless we can check the source of the mercury contamination.

There were 66 maternal and 43 core blood samples taken. Of these, 64 maternal and 39 core, blood mercury levels were below 20 parts per billion and the remaining samples were between 20 and 29 parts per billion. Now that is significant in itself in that we do have to watch very carefully women of child-bearing age because mercury can make a trans-placental transformation and go from the mother

to the child, and of course in this case, it would have a major impact on the child, while it might not have a major impact on the mother.

If we take a look at the cumulative samples that have been taken in 1976, 1977 and 1978, we'll find that in Manitoba, in the parts per billion range of 100 to 199, we found one individual in Lac Brochet, two individuals in Nelson House, and twelve individuals in Paungassi, which give us our total of 15. And again we have a number of individuals in the different areas between 20 and 99, which would show some exposure to mercury in the fish, and that covers almost every community, every fishing community, that was tested. There is about six out of the twenty or so that were tested that did not have mercury, so it's a widespread problem. I would hope that the Minister would direct the resources of his department towards a thorough investigation of what seems to be an increasing problem of mercury contamination.

One of the unique features of this in Manitoba is that we can not exactly trace the source. In Quebec we can trace the source, industrial sites; in Ontario we can trace the source, industrial sites, usually pulp and paper sites; in B.C. we can trace the source, pulp and paper; but in Manitoba, we can't, we can't trace the source. There has been conjecture as to it's a natural leaching process that accompanies the erosion of South Indian Lake and that to me, being a non-technical person and surely not an expert in this area, sounds as acceptable as anything else. Other suggestions that have been offered have been acid rain. Acid rain, in fact, has been suspected of linkage with mercury pollution and I am not certain exactly how it happens, but I do know the studies that I have read on acid rain from time to time do mention that increased mercury, in the water environment particularly, may come as a result of increasing acid rain; and we all know that we have a problem with acid rain, not only in this province but throughout the modern industrial world, in particular in areas where you have large industry and large sulphur admitting polluters. That not being the case in Manitoba, our problem is not as bad as it is in other areas but nonetheless, it is a problem that we have to direct our attention to because what we have to do is not try to be on a par or be less polluted than our neighbours, we have to strive towards the goal of no pollution. We have to strive towards a goal of no mercury contamination.

So it is a difficult and complex problem that greets the Minister in regard to mercury contamination in northern Manitoba and it is one that I would expect he would be directing the full resources, or as much of the resources of his department as is reasonably expected to be allocated to a province, to dealing with this problem. I would have expected the Minister to have the information available this evening. I would have expected the Minister to have anticipated the fact that we were going to be talking about the fisheries and to have a concern for the mercury contamination and to have brought that information here, so we could have had an opportunity to discuss this problem in detail at the proper juncture of the estimates proceedings.

But him having not done that, we find ourselves at a disadvantage. And the disadvantage that we find ourselves at is very temporary. The Minister himself will find that he is at the disadvantage when we have to bring this issue back to him on his Salary and when he does not have his staff before him to aid and assist him. Because just as I don't expect myself to know all there is to know about methyl mercury, I don't expect the Minister to know all there is to know about methyl mercury.

So it's not that I fault him and it's not that I say that he's not doing his job properly by not knowing, but I do believe that it has been an oversight on his part not to have brought that material with him this evening, especially because of the topical nature of the subject to which we speak. I would think the Minister could have anticipated that this being a problem in my own constituency and of course being an environmental problem, that someone in the House would have raised it, given the great concern over the environment that the people of the province are beginning to show in increasing numbers, not that it always hasn't been there but it is becoming more vocal and there is more of an awareness of the province.

Having said that to the problem of methyl mercury contamination, let me just say that I would hope that the Minister, if possible, could get that study to us this evening. If he can't, I would hope that he could get it to us as soon as is possible so that we can have an opportunity to go over it and come back and discuss it under these estimates, which is the appropriate place to discuss it.

No. 2, I would hope that the Minister would direct his department to play a full role in the investigation of this problem. What he has told me leads me to believe - and it's just a conclusion on my part and it may be incorrect or it may be correct, time will tell - but it leads me to believe that he has not directed his department to play a substantive role in the investigation of this problem that is increasing and becoming particularly more onerous as time goes by. It's now at the point where certain experts are predicting that we may see the pike and pickerel fishery closed down in South Indian Lake.

When I was in the community not too long ago, one of the individuals there came up and said, "I've gotten a letter saying I should stop eating fish". Well, excuse me. He said "I've gotten a letter saying I should restrict my fish intake, that there is mercury contamination in the fish and that I should only eat so much fish on a daily basis". Well that indicates that the problem there is increasing, to me, or we are becoming more aware of it, one or the other.

I would hope that the Minister, in his capacity as Minister responsible for the Fisheries, would play an active and prominent role in trying to determine where the mercury pollution is coming from, No. 1, because we don't know and that's the frightening aspect of this whole problem and, No. 2, that he would play a prominent role in trying to develop means and measures to minimize the mercury contamination. Now if it is coming from industrial sources, there may be something we can do about it. If it is coming from acid rain, then there is probably very little that the province of Manitoba, as a single entity, can do about it, but we can certainly become part of a vocal group; our province can play a vocal role in trying to stop this pollution from occurring, such as Ontario is doing right now. You hear Ontario make statements on acid rain from time to time, which are very strong, very powerful, and I believe these statements do benefit those trying to deal with this pollution problem; do support those and also provide the whole fight against this environmental problem, such as acid rain, with a certain amount of legitimacy. You do not see our province playing that same sort of role. You do not see the Minister playing that same sort of role; nor the Minister of the Environment playing that same sort of role; or the First Minister playing that same sort of role as an advocate for a cleaner and a better world.

So I would encourage the Minister to do that. I think he's been somewhat lackadaisical in his approach to this problem, in regard to the mercury pollution in northern Manitoba. And I would hope that he would pay more attention to the problem and perhaps it is not that he does not pay attention to it, if that is the case, then I would hope that he would be more visible in dealing with the problem, in fighting with the problem, in taking an interest and appraising himself of what investigations are going on, what efforts are going on and how he can contribute to the process of dealing with that hazard. So if it is a part of an acid rain syndrome or if it is leaching from the soil, from erosion, then one has to wonder how we deal with that.

Well, we obviously at this point, don't have the expertise or the mechanisms available to stop acid rain or to stop the erosion, so we have to deal with it from a different perspective. We have to say the problem exists, that is unfortunate. But let us find a way to minimize, not the contamination because we know we can't, but let us find a way to minimize the impact of that pollution on the individuals. That means dealing with the fisheries problem because you just can't take the pike and pickerel fishery away from South Indian Lake and the white fish fishery of course is suffering.

You just can't reimburse those individuals monetarily for their loss because that's not enough; because that puts all sorts of social strains on the fabric of the community and rips the community apart. You have to deal with it. You have to come up with innovative approaches. You have to come up with progressive approaches to deal with the loss of income, as well as with the loss of livelihood, because income and livelihood are not exactly the same. Income implies the money that's coming in. That's an input. Livelihood implies money coming in, as well as an output, which is a person's labour, which is a very precious thing that we all should be able to exercise to the best of our ability. And you have people who will want to fish and who can't fish because of mercury contamination and because of other pollution problems. So you're going to have to find a mechanism so that they don't just end up accepting welfare of one sort of another, whether it be a subsidy or whether it be a welfare cheque; that they can play a viable role in providing for their own livelihood.

So again we have expectations of the Minister in this regard, Mr. Chairperson. And then of course we hope that the Minister will, when he is dealing with this problem, impart full information to the individuals that are being most affected by it. We need an educational program here. It is not enough to tell an individual in South Indian Lake, by way of a very short three or four paragraph letter, that that individual should stop eating a certain amount of fish every day because that does not work. It didn't work in Ontario. It won't work here. All it creates is a sense of frustration. It creates alienation. It creates distrust. It creates despondency and depression.

What you have to do is you have to say, "We have a problem". You have to be honest with the individual. "We have a problem. You have a problem because we have a problem. It's not our fault. It's not your fault. But the fact is you are going to have to change your lifestyle way to deal with this problem and here's what we want you to do, and here's why we want you to do it. And we want you to take the hair samples because they will give us some indication of how well you and I are dealing with this problem. And we want you to do the examinations if you so desire; we will give you full opportunity and encouragement to do that because they will give us a better grip on the problem. And we want you to try to be on the lookout for other sorts of environmental contamination and environmental pollution so that we can deal with it on an individual basis as quickly as is possible, while we are, at the same time, incorporating a broader program of pollution control".

You have to - and this is something that The Workplace, Safety and Health Act has tried to do or was intended to do - and that is to make each individual in the workplace an inspector, to know what problems they may face and to know how to deal with them. --(Interjection)-- Well, when you're dealing with the contamination in South Indian Lake, what you have to do is make each individual fisherman more than an environmentalist than they traditionally have been. They've always been very strong environmentalists and had we listened to them, we would probably not be facing this problem. But the fact is that the environmental problems that they face now are different than the environmental problems that they have faced traditionally and they need new tools to deal with them; they need education to deal with them; they need information to deal with them and then they need a right, some sort of a structure or mechanism, that they can use to deal with them.

I'd just like to talk about one other aspect of South Indian Lake, if I can, and that's the Minister's fishing program. I happened to be in the community. I was asked to come into the community, quite honestly, when the Minister's staff came in to explain the proposed changes in the fishing regulations, and I did go into that community. It was during the time of the federal election and I, unfortunately, could not make it to some of the other communities that I had wished to and had been asked to go into, but I did talk to fishermen throughout the north on every opportunity, either when we happened to meet in the community outside of their own or when we met in their community before or after a meeting had taken place. I had listened to their concerns and I had promised them, when I listened to their concerns, that I would relay their concerns to the Minister when there was an appropriate opportunity

.This seeming to be an appropriate opportunity I would like to take a few minutes to do it. I will not dwell on them because the Member for The Pas, the Member for Rupertsland and the Member for Ste. Rose have all spoken to this issue in some great detail and I think that they have explained many of the concerns from their vantage point. But I have a promise to the people of South Indian Lake and to other fishing communities in the north. I have promised to come and speak their voice for a few moments in this Legislature, the voice of the fishermen, the voice of their families, that were at that meeting. And it was an angry voice, Mr. Chairperson, at that meeting because there was an angry mood at that meeting, because the people, before the Minister's staff even came in, were afraid of what those proposed changes meant to them. They were willing to listen. They wanted to listen. They wanted to be reassured. They were not reassured, but they wanted to be. They came there with an open mind but they were angry and they were somewhat apprehensive, Mr. Chairperson.

They were apprehensive over the implied threat of the proposed changes, the threats within the Minister's new regulations, that at that time to any individual who would watch the whole process unfold, would appear to have been already in

place, or at least so close to being in place that one would anticipate that they would automatically go in. If it were not for the political environment of the day, I have no doubt in my mind that they would have proceeded with them, but that is a statement that can be argued and I don't want to get caught up in that particular argument. They were concerned because they carried the proposed program to its logical conclusion and their primary concerns were three. Their specific fears were three.

One, is that if this 20-year lease program came in, they would be bought out. Maybe not in the first year, maybe not in the second year, maybe not in the third year, but as time went on they would lose their fisheries. The community would lose their fisheries. Now these are the concerns they expressed to me and expressed to the Minister's staff. He can check with them in that regard.

Secondly, they were concerned that new fishermen would not be able to opt into the system because they would have to buy their leases somewhere and where were they going to buy their leases? Where were they going to get the money to buy their leases? This was the second problem.

And thirdly, they were concerned about what they thought to be, and I have to agree with them because I've watched the Minister in this Portfolio for a number of years, the erosion of the FFMC; the fact that they were concerned that that corporation was being weakened and that the powers and the responsibilities of that corporation were being eroded, and they support the corporation. Not that there can't be changes from time to time to the corporation because there must be from time to time, to any corporation, to any movement, to any organization in order to make that organization reflect the times in which it exists.

They spoke in unison. I have to make that point very clear to the Minister; it was an angry voice and it was a voice that was spoken in unison from the fishermen to the person who was young and wanted to be a fisherman, to the fishermen's wives, to the people in that community who depended upon the fishing industry for their livelihood that was created out of the money that came and accrued to that community through the fishing industry. They voted unanimously to reject the Minister's proposals. Every individual in that room in South Indian Lake on that day voted to reject the Minister's proposals. The Minister must know that. We must make the Minister aware. We must underline, underscore and emphasize the point that unanimously there was not one vote in favour of it.

I think the Minister does know that from the report that he should have gotten from his staff. They have rejected the new regulations. They have rejected the implied threats in the new regulations and I can only hope that it was not only the political environment of the day, the fact that certain candidates for the federal Progressive Conservative Party were not being allowed into reserves, the fact that would seem to be a tremendous political backlash against the Minister's programs and Progressive Conservative candidates, but I have to hope also that that voice, a very learned voice, the voice of the people of South Indian Lake, the voice of the people of the other communities where the Minister had the meetings, is the voice that changed the Minister's mind, the voice that brought the Minister to his senses on this issue because what he had proposed would have resulted in what the members of the South Indian Lake fishing community feared. It would have. As night follows day, there would have been an accumulation of licences by a few. There would have been a problem for young people to get into the fisheries. There would have been, and there may still be, an erosion of FFMC because it is not in keeping with the ideology and the philosophy of that government.

So I can only hope that it is reasoned and it is the sincere concerns that were expressed to the Minister's staff and therefore expressed to the Minister that resulted in the new proposed regulations of the Progressive Conservative Party being taken away. I can only hope that they are not imposed in the future, that that reason shall prevail.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.--pass; 2.--pass - the Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, following up on some of the comments and questions of my colleague from the Churchill constituency: Mr. Chairperson, I welcome the Minister's indication that he would attempt to provide us with a copy of the study from South Indian Lake. I wonder if the Minister would also be

willing to provide us with a copy of the study on Cedar Lake that was done by Dr. Doan and his own department, so he probably has quicker access to that one than the South Indian Lake study that was done by another agency.

Mr. Chairman, what seems to be happening is that the biologists are not sure what is going to happen environmentally when there is a change in water flow, when there is a damming of water, when man intereferes with nature in terms of the waterways, because back before the Grand Rapids Hydro Dam was built and the Grand Rapids Hydro Dam meant making a reservoir out of what is called Cross Lake - it's "little" Cross Lake, I guess is one way to refer to it - and of Cedar Lake and raising the level of Moose Lake and the Saskatchewan River in some places. Mr. Chairperson, at that time the biologists predicted a decline in the Cedar Lake fishery, that the people of Chemahawin community were moved to Easterville, so the people now of the Easterville community would experience, in terms of their fishery . . . That is, the predictions were for a poorer quality of fish, more rough fish, and a decline in the higher priced fish and the pickerel production in Cedar Lake.

Mr. Chairperson, that isn't what happened. What happened was an actual improvement in the commercial fishery at Cedar Lake and the people of Easterville now have one of the best fisheries in the province of Manitoba. The amount of high-quality fish increased and the production of that lake, of Cedar Lake, is very high indeed and the opportunity is there for the people of Easterville to earn a good living, those that are involved in the fishing industry.

I guess, Mr. Chairperson, when the biologists then went to study the effect of the diversion on South Indian Lake, they would have had the information available from Cedar Lake. Now, we are talking about a slightly different situation, Mr. Chairperson, because in one case you have a reservoir, an actual damming, and in another case, you have an increasing of the water level, but a diversion of the waterway. The study, which the Minister indicated he would make available to us, shows a decline in the pounds of fish caught and shows a decline in the quality of fish caught, and it shows a problem in terms of the ability of fishermen to catch the fish, that they have to pull up their nets much more often than they had to in the past and try new areas to try to find out where the fish are moving to and from.

I wonder if the Minister could, one, give me an indication that he will make the Cedar Lake study available to us; and second, if he would like to comment in terms of what the biologists think is happening on South Indian Lake as compared with what happened on Cedar Lake, if he would like to make some comments as to what is taking place, as far as they can understand at this point in time?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I should say that I think that the Member for Churchill raises a question that's serious now and could be potentially much more serious because he does point out some gaps in our understanding of the problem. I do take a bit of issue with his allegation about we should have been anticipating the question and had the necessary technical information here. I don't mind admitting that I am not familiar enough with those sorts of technical aspects to be able to discuss them off the cuff. I did, at the beginning of my estimates, in my introduction, suggest to the honourable members opposite that if there were some areas of technical information that were going to require, that if they would be kind enough to advise me of that in advance, that I would make them available. I think they probably realize that we have attempted to provide information where informatio has been asked for. So had that request been placed earlier, I certainly could have had the information and been in a better position to be able to discuss it.

A couple of points that perhaps need to be stressed are the one that the Honourable Member for Churchill raised with respect to the lack of ability to identify a source for the contamination in the area at Paungassi, for instance. To my knowledge, there is no kind of development above that on the watersheds that one could trace the contamination to and so, I suppose, lacking information over past decades, one doesn't even know whether that has been a longstanding natural sort of background or whether it is a problem that is increasing, and that is one reason why, of course, it is necessary to have the monitoring program in place. It's not just a question of monitoring or testing levels that might be in the people who live there, but also in the water and the fish. I recall that when I

had the responsibility for the Environment, I know that we had quite a number of sampling stations across the north - not just the north, but across the province - that were collecting samples just in order to be able to establish a base to determine the levels of different metals and chemicals that might be in the water.

The honourable member did say one thing that I'm not sure that from a practical point of view that really it is possible to aim for when he says that it is necessary to aim for a zero level. Now, that may be an ideal level; no doubt it would be ideal in our environment if we didn't have any sorts of contaminants at all, but from a practical point of view, it is really questionable whether that can be achieved. I am somewhat familiar with the arguments that are put forth for striving for zero levels but I think there are very few agencies, governments that can accept a zero level of contamination for this type of thing. When they are faced with the responsibility of having to try and achieve that level, they usually end up trying to establish a level which is, to the best of the information available, thought not to be dangerous. So I can appreciate the honourable member's wish to strive for that level but I suggest it is probably not a practical one.

I am quite aware of the comments that he reported on from the meeting at South Indian Lake and I know that those are the concerns of the people there. We were aware that there would be concerns and that we would attempt to deal with those. In some cases, it is probably not even advisable to attempt to make changes in the leasing system and it could be that the communities such as South Indian Lake, that that's such an area where the volume of fish being taken is up to the maximum; we're not facing problems with not being able to harvest fish. If everyone is satisfied with the system, then perhaps there is little need to change it.

But I can point out again to the Honourable Member for Churchill, because I am not sure he was here yesterday when I made my introductory remarks, that there have been problems in the north in terms of the fishery. The volume of fish taken in the north from 1968-69, when it was 9.5 million pounds, declined to about a little better than 5.5 million by 1976-77. When we are faced with problems of not being able to harvest the fish, we have got to look at the system and see if there aren't some weaknesses in the system that have led to that kind of decline. If it means looking at the marketing system, I'm quite prepared to look at the marketing system and examine various options.

But I think the honourable members are quite aware that there are other agencies involved, there are other governments involved in the Corporation and before changes are made, there has to be agreement among those agencies that in fact those changes are desirable. It is our intention to continue to have further discussions with the fishermen and to try and make those kinds of changes which we think will work to the interests of the fishermen and to the interests of the industry.

In response to the questions from the Honourable Member for The Pas, I will have to look for that report. I don't see any reason why it shouldn't be made available. I'm not familiar with the report myself; I should be able to get a copy of that rather readily.

I am afraid his last question, I didn't quite catch, but I think it was something to do with a comparison of the Grand Rapid forebay situation and the one relating to the diversion. I'm really not in a position to make comparisons one way or the other but it is a question that I can discuss with my staff and perhaps be able to provide a more technical answer for the Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could outline for us what he sees as the role of this section of his department in terms of the environmental effects on the fishery, because we have the situation clearly before us in terms of Cedar Lake, in terms of South Indian Lake, and the outcomes there are different than those that were predicted or thought to come about.

Mr. Chairperson, I know that we had a situation in the Saskatchewan River and it seemed to be predominantly downstream from the ManFor Pulp and Paper Mill, problems experienced by fishermen in that particular area. I wonder if the Minister and his staff have information now on whether that situation has pretty well rectified itself and whether the fishing downstream is back to normal and the amount of debris attaching itself to the nets has now returned to a normal level?

I'm wondering, sort of two questions: In a general way, what does he see as the role of the department in terms of those outside environmental influences on the fisheries; and then as a specific question in terms of what has happened in the Saskatchewan River at The Pas, south of the ManFor outlet there?

Mr. Chairperson, that then relates to a number of other questions. Again, the general questions, in terms of . . . Is this specific section of the Minister's department or is it some other section that's looking at the possible effects in terms of Garrison and what it could have on the fisheries because that could affect the majority of the commercial fishing in terms of Lake Winnipeg and Nelson River fisheries. So I wonder what he sees as his role there, and what, if anything for this section of his department or whether they are not the ones that are involved in that.

Mr. Chairperson, similarly, I'm wondering what the Minister sees as his relationship in terms as the Minister responsible for Fisheries and whose staff is involved in the quality of fish coming out of South Indian Lake, what he sees as his role with Manitoba Hydro? Is he seeing himself in assisting fishermen in their dealings with Hydro, or does he see them as completely separate kind of dealings? Mr. Chairperson, this can relate back again to my experience as a representative for the community of Easterville and with the numerous problems in Cedar Lake with floating debris in the lake causing damages to boats, motors, and nets. I don't know if the Minister has had a chance now to see a tangled mess of net, but it's an impossible situation for a fisherman to try and untangle his net once it's wrapped itself around a floating debris and begun to turn around that debris, which is what takes place; and the only option then is to replace those particular nets.

So, in those environmental issues as they relate to fishermen, I wonder if the Minister could give me some general idea of what he sees as his responsibilities in that regard, and maybe he wants to take the more specific detailed questions as notice, Mr. Chairperson.

MR. RANSOM: The role re the environment is rather a complex one, I guess, in that we have the situation in the provinces where the federal government really has the responsibility for fisheries and they have used that responsibility to extend their interests and concerns to water pollution as well. I guess that explains to a considerable degree why the Freshwater Institute is involved to the extent that they are in research efforts; and having that kind of an institution available in the province and prepared to bring very high-level expertise to bear on the kinds of problems that we are talking about, then I think that it automatically means that the province hasn't developed the same kind of expertise.

In addition to that, of course, the Environmental Division is interested in the quality of the eco systems, I guess, of the water. They are responsible for doing, as I mentioned before, the water monitoring. So, I suppose that we are interested from the point of view of the effect that it has on the fish. Naturally, our interest is being able to produce as many fish as we can in order for people of the province to be able to benefit from them. But, I think largely in that role we've been one of co-operating rather than undertaking really substantial research thrusts on our own.

The specific question on the Saskatchewan River - it hasn't been brought to my attention as still being a problem. The member is probably aware that in that case, - I believe it's the federal government that have set the standards and are monitoring for the effluent from the ManFor operation. It hasn't been brought to my attention as a problem.

With respect to the Garrison - we are not doing any additional work to quantify the effects of Garrison, because I don't it's going to affect our position. We know what our position is; we know that the potential damages are simply unacceptable, and that's what we're basing our position on. We couldn't make our position any stronger, Mr. Chairman, by being able to quantify another \$10 million worth of damage. We're taking as strong a position as we can.

The relationship to Hydro, naturally, we would prefer to see a direct relationship with Hydro fulfilling their responsibilities, but if there are problems brought to our attention that we don't think are being adequately dealt with then I certainly have no hesitation in attempting to play a part to see that the communities are fairly dealt with. I have been involved, to some extent, with the

Easterville situation in trying to go back and review the Forebay agreement and see what kinds of grievances the community has and which of those we've judged to be based on any lack of governments fulfilling the commitments that were made under the agreement. We're just in the process of having seen a list of those grievances and commenting on them and communicating them back to the people at Easterville. And I certainly would hope that we would be able to work towards resolving those differences so that the people would feel that they had, in fact, been justly dealt with by government and by Hydro.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, what is the Minister's position now in terms of the request that comes from communities? I know that during the period that he was sending the civil servants out to explain the new policy that he wasn't readily available to communities, but there are lots of specific community problems that come up from time-to-time, where they make a request for a change in the quota system, where they have a concern over where boundary lines are, etc., etc. Is the Minister willing at this stage to meet with communities to gain an understanding of those kinds of problems or does he want them only to deal with these civil servants to see if those can be resolved?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I think I have explained previously that during the course of the winter when we organize some 40 meetings it simply is not possible for a Minister to be able to attend that many meetings. I think the Member for The Pas, having been a Minister of the Crown himself, is probably aware of that fact. I have on occasion met with fishermen's groups, but there are a great many communities, of course, that are involved in fishing and several organizations and several thousand individuals. It is, as a matter of practice and the practicality of it, it's not possible for me to be able to meet with every person or group that has a problem. I don't think that's the correct way to deal with it. I think the best way, the most effective way, is to deal with the departmental people and, in particular, with the director. And when situations can't be resolved then, of course, the individual or the community involved should feel free to take it up with higher authority.

I can say that I'm very pleased that my staff have been able to conclude an agreement with the fishermen at Easterville. After some several months of discussion, on and off, and following the problems that arose there about a year ago now I did meet with representatives from the community there, the fishermen's representatives, and urged them to try and sit down with our staff and establish a working relationship where each would understand what the others were trying to do. I'm happy to say that we have concluded an agreement to have fishermen's representatives and the departmental representatives sit down to work towards a common objective in the management of the fishery, and they have agreed under what conditions that quotas should be increased or quotas should be decreased; that the communities will be kept informed of the kinds of information that is coming available and, in fact, the community people will co-operate in helping to gather information. I see that as being an extremely positive step and I hope that we'll be able to establish that kind of working relationship in other communities as well. I think that we can avoid a lot of potential problems. We're not giving up our responsibility for the management of the resource. I don't wish to give the impression that we're doing that. What we are saying is that we are totally prepared to inform communities of why we're doing things and to involve them in understanding the information and in helping to make the decisions as to what will be done. I'm very hopeful that agreement will be one of a number of such agreements.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, I guess the problems that the Minister experienced with his proposed announced policy has had at least a positive side benefit and I think the Minister sort of now realizes: (1) the power and the effectiveness of fishermen and fishing communities in Manitoba and I believe that he has now become a little bit more responsive in terms of their requests and their concerns and a little bit more willing to listen to their point of view. Mr. Chairperson, I think that is very important to the fishermen of the province not to have to be in a confrontation situation with the Minister, but in a working relationship with the Minister. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairperson, that change also

relates to personalities. I think the fact that the Minister no longer has Mr. Jarvis dealing with fishermen is one reason why there's a tremendous improvement in the relationship between staff civil servants of his department and the fishermen in the communities. And, Mr. Chairperson, I do see evidence of his staff being able and willing to listen to the fishermen, to explain their point of view, to exchange ideas and to arrive at a workable solution. It's for the benefit of the fisheries and it's for the benefit of the fishermen in the communities. And I hope that after the problem the Minister faced with the attempt to impose a new program - after the serious mistakes he made in that regard - that things will improve in terms of that relationship between the Minister and the fishermen in the province.

In that regard, Mr. Chairperson, I wonder if the Minister can report anything new in terms of discussion and negotiation with the fishermen of Moose Lake. They had a fairly sensible proposal that made sense to me, Mr. Chairperson, in terms of changing the quota. The unfortunate situation that occurred was that the way the quota was defined, the way the quota was set up and I think, maybe, still is set up, was actually encouraging the fishermen to emphasize and go after the pickerel in that area. At the same time, the departmental biologists were very concerned that the pickerel were being overfished, but because the jackfish were on the quota and the jackfish price is lower, the fishermen avoided the jackfish areas and went after the pickerel, and so they were therefore hurting the fishery because of the way the regulations and the quotas were set up. So they came forward to the Minister with a very reasonable proposal and at that time the Minister was not able to meet with them directly to be involved in a direct discussion.

Mr. Chairman, maybe if that situation has been resolved and the Minister has understood that situation, he could indicate and I won't continue the whole argument in terms of the point of view of the fishermen. But what the fishermen were proposing that some way be found to either take the jackfish out of the quota or to set up the quota in such a way that there would be so many pounds or so many pounds of pickerel, whichever came first, which would be an incentive for the fishermen to go after the jackfish and the jackfish prices are now good enough that it is worthwhile to take the jackfish out. But if they are on the same quota, in the same bag with the pickerel, then you don't take them. But if they could somehow be separated, and there were two or three means that were proposed, then I think, it's just the sort of thing that in discussion and logical working out an agreement that would protect the fisheries and help the fishermen can come about, if both sides are willing to listen and work it through. So I wonder if the Minister has anything to report in terms of that situation.

MR. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a comment on what the honourable member said, that I was unable or unwilling to meet with the fishermen in Moose Lake. I have to stress again that there were several, I would say up to forty, meetings taken place at that period of time. The fishermen contacted me, I spoke to them on the phone and they told me what their problems were and I simply advised them that my Director of Fisheries, Mr. Hayden, was going to be a person with primary responsibility for the management of fisheries and I wanted staff and the fishermen to be able to establish a good working relationship and that I was satisfied that they would be able to resolve most of the problems. When they couldn't resolve the problems on a matter of policy, then they could feel free to call me and to arrange for us to meet. I also advised them that if they were technical questions I was going to be taking the advice of my technical experts in the department.

But on the problem, the specific problem that the member refers to, we are aware of that and we are prepared to work with the fishermen of Moose Lake. We are prepared to try and establish the same kind of working relationship with the fishermen in Moose Lake that we have been able to, at least begin, with the fishermen at Easterville and I agree with the honourable member that a lot of these problems when they are clearly laid on the table and each government and the fishermen try and understand each others problems that most of them can be overcome with an understanding of the different positions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass - the Honourable Minister for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, that is one case when I think because the Minister had to make the final decision on that particular instance where it would have been effective had it been possible for him to be in attendance at that time.

Mr. Chairperson, I understand when you are a Minister that you can't attend all the meetings that it would be worthwhile and profitable for you to take part in.

Mr. Chairperson, I wonder if the Minister could fill me in a little bit more in terms of the present working of the subsidy in terms of the transportation. Because I know one of the Minister's concerns is, and one of the previous Minister's concern was in terms of the unharvested lakes, and the transportation subsidy was one way to encourage the unharvested lakes to be harvested. I wonder if he could report to us in terms of whether there is a positive effect coming about, whether there are more lakes being harvested now than before; if he could just give us a summary or an update in terms of whether that program is doing any good and whether he intends to expand that program any further or increase the amount to make it more effective.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, the program is operating as it has always operated. There may have been a limit removed in terms of the maximum amount that an individual fisherman could get but otherwise its still operating the same as before and there's an equal amount of money being budgeted for this upcoming fiscal year as there was for the last. It's hard to say how effective it's been because there are so many other factors that can mask the effects of it, especially just within this last year as prices have risen to the extent they have. But I think that there is some indication that it was doing some good because the production in the northern lakes had dropped in 1973-74; 1974-75 they dropped down below 5 million pounds; in 1977-78 it was up in excess of 6 million and in summer only of 1979 it was over 5 million, which was equal to the total of 1978-79. I would have to judge, on that basis, that it had some positive effect.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass - the Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister or his staff could refresh our memory; exactly what date did the Transportation Subsidy Program come into effect so that I can relate it to those figures.? There is a relationship.

MR. RANSOM: I think during the open-water season of 1976, my information.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister then could give us some indication of what other efforts he and his department are making in terms of the unharvested areas. What other kinds of encouragements can they give? What is the Minister's thinking in this regard or what are his planning or present program?

MR. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Chairman that's precisely one of the problems that was being addressed as we examined the policy options that were being discussed with the fishermen, both as they relate to marketing and as they related to licences, and as they related to performance criteria.

One of the points that we had in the proposed policy had to do with performance criteria, that if fishermen didn't utilize the allocation that they had, then they would lose it. Now that may have been worded a little too harshly because it didn't indicate under what circumstances, and how the performance criteria would be established. It wasn't going to be a question that just if for some reason a person couldn't fish for one year they were going to lose their licence, there would obviously have to be some kind of reasonable standard. I think that's one point that, in discussion with the fishermen there's agreement. There should be some kind of performance criteria. If that was the case, it would mean that some lakes that are not now being harvested would be harvested by other people.

I believe that long-term leasing would in fact encourage fishermen to fish some of the remote lakes when they had some assurance that they would be able to do it on a long-term continuing basis. I think that there are some areas in the north that part of the reason why they weren't viable was because of the operation of the marketing corporation and that one of the alternatives that I have asked the technical committee to examine is let's look at what some of the criteria might be to allow an area to operate outside of the corporation. If a corporation can't

service an area, then does it not make sense that the area should be able to be given a chance to operate on its own outside of the corporation?

Now I know that there are arguments against that, that people associated with the corporation feel that any kind of erosion, any kind of freeing-up of marketing of that nature would be an erosion of the authority and jurisdiction of the corporation and would eventually lead to its destruction. I don't accept that myself. I don't think that's the case. But that's one of the options that's being looked at as well, and I think that those three things, taken together, would have a very substantial impact on increasing the amount of fish that could be taken in the north. But probably the biggest factor, of course, is what has happened this year: As prices go up then naturally more lakes are viable and they're going to be harvested. But my understanding is that the projections are that the prices may not hold up on the long term and so the fortunate circumstances that fishermen are experiencing right now may not be of very long duration.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, while the Minister is talking about part of his proposed changes, maybe he could fill me in in terms of a further explanation of what he saw happening in terms of, for example, the lease for a 20-year period, and how he would see the leases changing hands. How would somebody new get into the fisheries if this system came into effect?

MR. RANSOM: The way that they would get into the fishery would be to buy a licence. There would be a couple of ways that might be done of course, either by purchasing from another fisherman or by purchasing from the government as the government had an allocation of fish then that would be made available. It would necessitate, of course, that there be an adequate system of credit in place so that a fisherman isn't without some kind of opportunity to get adequate financing to get in.

Maybe I could elaborate a little bit while I am on my feet, Mr. Chairman, the concerns that have been raised at the community meetings I think: Certainly the one concern was that fishermen would end up losing their licence, but I think it is fair to say that no individual fisherman really felt that he would lose his licence but he feared that somebody might lose their licence. I happen to have a greater faith in individual people than that but that's a concern. The other concern was that they would end up in the hands of big companies or big operators and they would all be concentrated or that a community might lose its base. I think that the principal of the policy can still be implemented and put safeguards in place to see that those sorts of things don't happen.

That's the sort of thing I was referring to when the Honourable Member for Rupertsland refers to a CBC broadcast. I believe that the principles that are involved can be applied to work in the interests of the fishermen and prevent those things that they are concerned about from taking place. It's possible to put limitations on the amount of quota that the people might hold or it's possible to restrict it to a base, a community base, an area base. We certainly had every intention of seeing that no one could be cheated out of their license on a short-term proposition, that the government would have to clear the transfer, and the individuals would have to be made fully aware of the implications of parting with their license.

Those sorts of things are the concerns and I think there are means of dealing with them, but we are going to be carrying on a lot more discussion with communities and their different types of fishery, as the members are very aware. Some of the fisheries may be operating well enough. With prices the way they are, it doesn't make any sense to try and change it. In other areas, I think there are benefits to be gained by making some changes and when we have had an adequate opportunity for discussions with fishermen, then we will make decisions on which of them can be implemented and how they can be implemented.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could elaborate a little bit more on that because you have a fairly simple direct proposal that you can sell or assign your license to some one else, and then when you add in all the restrictions that would be necessary to deal with the concerns that have been expressed by the fishermen, there might not be any difference between that system and what you have right now. I'm not clear then whether the Minister would still

want to call it a new system or whether he would say, well, we're just leaving that existing system in effect or we're going to make some minor adjustments to the existing system; I'm not clear what his thinking is in that regard.

MR. RANSOM: Well, I think it would be quite different, Mr. Chairman, in the way that a person would have access to the fishery and their ability to be able to sell their interest and their equipment. I think if the honourable member will talk to fishermen and ask them if they wouldn't agree that the concept of being able to own that access to the fishery and being able to say that when they want to retire, that they can approach somebody with their equipment and with their license and be able to sell it. I think the honourable member will find that a lot of fishermen like that concept, but they have concerns, they have concerns about licenses being amassed by large operators or by corporations and losing them from their communities. I don't personally believe that would happen but if that's the belief of the fishermen and they feel that there are some restrictions that should be put in place to protect a community's base, for instance, you can have the principle apply within that area. But it's quite a different way of gaining access to the fishery than is the case now where the government determines who will get in. And that sort of system, any time that the government determines who gets in, of course that sort of system is always open to abuse, because it's the same old question of who will watch the watchers, and who is going to protect against the abuses when the government is determining who gets in.

There would also be opportunities for individuals to have enough quota to be able to be a viable fisherman. The Member for Ste. Rose points out that in some cases, that's perhaps not possible, that's not the nature of the fishery. In others, it is, but people are restricted by the quota that they have now, and so the limits would conceivably at least allow an individual to expand to the point where he has a commercial operation.

I don't think the honourable members can deny the statistics that are available that show what's happened to the industry since the early 1960's say, that the gains that have been made in the industry have largely come about by a reduction in the number of fishermen that are involved. I will readily admit, I will even advocate, that there should be fewer people involved in the fishery if those who remain in the fishery are to get a satisfactory return from it. And if you look at the information, you will see that from 1962-63 to 1977-78, that the number of fishermen in that period declined by, from 3,900 and something to 2,900 and something, I believe; about a 25 percent reduction in that period of time. And the increase in income to fishermen when you take inflation into consideration, the only increase came about as a result of that reduction.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, what kind of restrictions would the Minister see being put on to protect these concerns of the fishermen, in terms of a person's previous fishing experience? Would he see that being part of the restriction? He mentioned maybe rural-area residents would be part of a consideration to protect that concern. Would he see previous fishing experience as part of that concern as well?

MR. RANSOM: Not necessarily.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass - the Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Under what circumstances, then, would he or would he not have that as part of the consideration?

MR. RANSOM: I can't answer that definitively, Mr. Chairman. I don't see any reason why that restriction should be placed on anyone more than anyone has to have previous experience to be able to go out and become a farmer, or you have to have previous experience to be able to get a forestry quota. I think that sort of thing is something that an individual person has to make a decision; if the individual feels that he knew enough about fishing or was going to be able to learn enough about fishing to become a fisherman, that should be his decision. But this will be a question that would have to be discussed with the fishermen, along with other issues that we will be discussing with them.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, one of the reasons that I couldn't quite put that together, that there is a quote in the Opasquia Times from The Pas, February 6, 1980, where the official of the department indicated that even in the sale of a licence that the person would have had to have three years experience in order to purchase a licence. Now I don't know whether that's the person's misunderstanding of the Minister's intent, or whether it's a misquote by the interviewer, in saying that the only condition under which a person could sell a licence was if it was to someone who had three years fishing experience.

MR. RANSOM: I think perhaps, Mr. Chairman, it may have referred rather, to a time period in which an individual could sell a licence which they might have acquired from the government; that one could not speculate on a licence.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I had some questions on the Minister's previous comments and I'm trying to remember exactly what they were. The Minister spoke about the transfer ability and the quota system and the fact that fishermen would be able to then earn, hopefully, a more reasonable income. I'm assuming that the figures that he has there reflect the price of fish. That is, when the price of fish was up, there were more fishermen and when the price of fish was down, there were less fishermen. Do those statistics follow that kind of a pattern?

MR. RANSOM: I'm sure, that's reasonable, Mr. Chairman, under certain kinds of quotas, but when there's limited access to the fishery then that would not be the case. When the number of the licences are limited then they're not going to increase just because the price goes up. That's why there was a substantial demand, of course, for more people to get into fishing this year because the prices were high, but there are limitations on the numbers that are left.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, in those fisheries that you can earn a living even when low prices . . . Certainly in the Lake Winnipeg fisheries there's always a pressure for licences and I'm assuming that Easterville always has a pressure for licences there because the fisheries are good. Where the change comes in, is in the marginal fisheries like - if I say this too loud the Member for Ste. Rose might get upset but - Lake Winnipegosis or Lake Manitoba, where people do move in and out of the fishery more often, I believe, and where people are using the fishery only as one small part of their income. The Lake Manitoba, Lake Winnipeg fishermen, Easterville fishermen, tend to be people that depend on the fishing for their livelihood and any other job is a supplement. In some of the other areas, especially as you get more further south, the fishing was a supplement and other major income might be farming or something else.

Mr. Chairperson, I'm assuming that the Minister, when he talks about the desirability of having less fishermen so that those who are fishing can make a larger income, I'm assuming, and maybe I'll just double-check with him, that he's not thinking that way in terms of the areas that are underfished now; that he would be wanting to increase the numbers of fishermen in the remote northern areas, but that in the overfished areas - I can think, for example, like, Lake Winnipeg, Sturgeon Bay is one that has very low quotas right now. I wonder if the Minister could comment on how he sees that relationship between those areas that are underfished and those areas that are overfished, in terms of his diagnosis.

MR. RANSOM: First of all, Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that I said that it was a desirable thing that there be fewer fishermen, in the sense that just being fewer fishermen was a desirable thing. It would be nice if we had an adequate resource to be able to support more fishermen. I'm saying that the gains that have been made in terms of the returns to fishermen have come about largely as a result of the reduction of the number of fishermen. With the exception of these recent price increases, it would appear that further gains will very likely also come about, by there being further fishermen involved. Now in some cases that may not be desirable, but there's going to be a smaller proportion, even in those cases, a smaller proportion of the community who are able to participate in the fishery, given the population growth that has taken place in the communities.

On the other part of the question, in northern areas where there's under-harvest, then I don't see that it's a problem, particularly, but I think that the people who are given the chance to get in should be given the chance at a level that offers them an opportunity to make the investments that would allow them to harvest fish and to make a profit at it. It wouldn't be advisable to put a limitation on them, which in itself, would limit them from being able to make a satisfactory return.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, the basic question with the Minister's announced changes that are currently under suspension is how the transfer of licences takes place, whether it be by the points, in terms of your past fishing experience and therefore your eligibility in terms of points, or whether it be on the basis of how much you're willing to pay for it. I wonder if, in the Minister's mind, can he see any restriction on that? Let's take hypothetically if the value of a licence got up to \$1,000, \$10,000 or \$20,000, would the Minister see any need then to intervene in the market in terms of purchase and sale of fishing licences?

MR. RANSOM: I think that is a hypothetical question, Mr. Chairman, that's not possible to respond to. Markets have a habit of reflecting what the resource is capable of returning, and given the condition of the fishery over the years, I think that those prices would probably not rise; they would not rise out of proportion to the value of the access to the fishery.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, the Minister might have more experience than I have in terms of the quota systems in other arenas and maybe he bases that on that experience but there seems to be a danger or a possibility, maybe the Minister doesn't see it as a possibility, that if you have a quota for sale - and I understand that this has happened in some instances with agricultural quotas when you can sell your quota - that the quota takes on a value much greater than, of course, the operation itself. So when you have somebody else new getting into it it's very difficult for them to do so. And then in order for them to get out they have to get just as high a price of course to be able to afford to get out, and so it does, I understand, have had a tendency in some particular areas, with some particular kind of quotas that are resellable, to actually hurt the operation. And I wonder if the Minister would care to comment on that possibility.

MR. RANSOM: The two situations aren't really all that analogous because in the one case you are selling the right to market and the product has to be produced through other resources. In the case of the fishery you're selling an access to the resource, not the marketing quota and so it's quite a different situation. It is more like selling a piece of land than it is selling a commodity quota.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass - the Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The Minister disagreed with me before when I made this statement but with the fishermen that I deal with regularly, there still is concern and confusion in terms of the new policy and the Minister's clarified it a little bit for me tonight, that he is willing to be reasonably flexible. I wonder if it would be worthwhile for the Minister to basically announce that he has withdrawn the policy that he announced on October 9th, and that he wants to then dialogue with the fishermen in terms of what changes, if any, there should be in the licencing system. I'm wondering why the Minister wouldn't find it to be worthwhile to clarify that doubt and confusion that is there, at least I'm still finding it with constituents in my area.

MR. RANSOM: We are summarizing the results from our meetings that were held and it will be our intention to send a letter to the fishermen with that summary and the results of the meeting and indicating what our intention is and I think that should clear up any misunderstanding or concerns that they have. Basically I don't think that they should have any concern and I think that the honourable members will find that there is more support for the policies, in the

principle of them, than has been admitted to this point. There are concerns in the application of them; I readily admit and I expect that. The intention was always to discuss and consult with the fishermen as those who attended the meeting here in October will know. I can also point out to the Member for The Pas that our discussions with the Easterville fishermen had nothing to do with the policies that we're discussing here and that were discussed over the course of the winter. We started to have discussions with Easterville fishermen last spring and they continued during the summer and finally after that period of time we've been able to include the agreement that we have.

MR. McBRYDE: I wonder if the Minister could elaborate a little further on item No. 4 in his letter, the royalty system will be developed and phased in to provide a fair return to the Crown for the use of fishery resources. I wonder if the Minister could just explain what his thinking was in that regard.

MR. RANSOM: Yes, we just simply feel in principle that the fishery is no different than the fur resource or the forestry resource or the mineral resource. It happens that the fishery is the only one where there isn't a royalty paid. The same people, maybe some of the same individuals who fish, are trappers and they're paying royalty on the fur that they get - it may not be much but they are paying royalty. We are simply saying that we think that if the industry were to become a viable one that it should also be paying a royalty that would at least be sufficient to, if not cover, at least offset the management efforts that go into it. But we made it clear that there is no intention to implement it until such time as the industry was capable of supporting it. I must say on that point, as well, Mr. Chairman, that I think a great many of the fishermen had no quarrel with that concept.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I assume this is the item under the estimates where I might ask the Minister a question on the trout farming, or the fish farming as they refer to it in my area. I know it is federally sponsored to some degree and there have been several people in the Erickson area and we have a fish biologist and what not, that I understand are leaving there or have left there. I wonder if the Minister might just bring me up-to-date if he has the information available on what's happening in the trout farming as far as rainbow trout goes in the Erickson-Minnedosa area.

MR. RANSOM: Well it is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that was largely a Federal Freshwater Institute undertaking and that they are either terminating or drastically reducing their inputs into that project. I assume that at this point they feel that they have probably advanced about as far as they are going to be able to advance and that they are going to direct their efforts elsewhere now; one of the things that I hope that they would be looking at would be to address themselves to the problems on the situation like Lake Winnipegosis where we have begun some rearing pond experiments.

MR. BLAKE: Yes, I thank the Minister for that, Mr. Chairman. Just on that theme, that particular project or the projects in my area have been largely of a hobby nature, I think, rather than a full-fledged commercial venture and I might add very successful from the point of view of those of us in the area that are able to enjoy the product. The Minister mentioned some fish rearing or ponding and I wondered if he has had many requests for that type of operation of a fairly large commercial nature where they would pond and force-feed rainbow trout such as we are raising in the natural state in our particular area. This has become a fairly big operation in several areas down in Ontario where they're raising a 12 to 13 inch trout in a matter of a couple of years by raising them in ponds and force feeding them and I just wondered if the Minister has had any inquiries or if there are any of those ventures being contemplated in Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before the Honourable Minister answers, I would hope that the remark that was made concerning the chair was not meant to the Chairman. The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that was the case.

To my knowledge that is not something that is under any kind of serious consideration in the province for a number of reasons, but the basic interest is centered around the naturally occurring ponds.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: It's obvious, Mr. Chairman, that the backbenchers in the Conservative Party don't have an opportunity to talk to their Ministers very often in the confines of caucus or wherever that they have to bring their questions into the Legislature of that nature.

Getting back to the estimates and the particular issue that we are talking about tonight, Mr. Chairman, that of the fishing licencing, I must say that as far as the fishermen are concerned and the discussions that I have had with them they are almost unanimously in opposition to the proposed licencing policy of the Conservative government and they are particularly incensed about the way in which it has been handled by this Minister and this government.

I might say that one of the reasons they are opposed to it is because they see this as a way that the government is planning to bring in something through the back door which they weren't able to do, or didn't have the nerve to do, to bring in through the front door and that is, Mr. Chairman, the commitment that the Honourable Member for Gimli made during the election campaign to a certain select group of people in the Gimli constituency. I brought this matter up before in the House and I believe it to be true that a commitment was made to a certain group whereby that group was promised that they would have bigger quotas on Lake Winnipeg and they would be able to market their fish outside the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation.

Now whether or not the Minister denies that or not the fishermen around Lake Winnipeg believe that is a commitment that was made; they believe that this proposed licencing policy is one that is designed to assist that group in achieving their objective; and that is of getting larger quotas for themselves on the lake and to obtain the opportunity to harvest the resource on Lake Winnipeg which is the most valuable fish resource in Manitoba and to sell that fish resource past the corporation, in other words, sell it directly to market.

In other words this very small group, Mr. Chairman, would be able to hog a large section of the resource on Lake Winnipeg, the most valuable whitefish in the world, the best pickeral and other species - Lake Winnipeg goldeye. I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, you are aware of some of these species that are possible to market at premium prices and, Mr. Chairman, if they are able to market these things, if they are able to market these fish while the corporation is still operating, the corporation is establishing a very secure market and is going to have to market all of the other species from all the other areas of Manitoba, some of them that are not possible to market directly by the fishermen. The result of this of course will be that all the other fishermen in Manitoba will suffer because there is no doubt that the Lake Winnipeg fish when in competition with the fish that the corporation is marketing from all over the rest of the Freshwater Fish marketing jurisdiction which encompasses four provinces, that they will have a negative impact on the market price. In other words that competition at the market level will bring down the average price that fish will bring to fishermen.

The net result, Mr. Chairman, is that all the other fishermen in Manitoba that are not able to market, for whatever reason, outside the corporation will end up getting a lower price for their fish.

Mr. Chairman, regardless of what the Minister may do with this policy now, however he may try to amend or change it, that nagging suspicion and doubt will still be there in those fishermen's minds around Lake Winnipeg, that this Minister is still trying to underhandedly bring in a policy which will help that select group. There are people right in the same community of Gimli that are opposed to that group and opposed to that direction that this government is taking.

Fishermen in other areas of Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, do not have the same licensing system as we have introduced on Lake Winnipeg. Fishermen in northern Manitoba are not hampered or restricted in any way from getting more licences. In fact, as the Minister indicated, the problem in northern Manitoba is that lakes

are not fished, so if fishermen come forward, if individuals come forward to the government and say, I would like a licence to fish this lake over here that hasn't been fished for the past ten years, the government makes these licences available. It is not a question of the price of the licence or that there is any restriction on the licence, Mr. Chairman. So the real reason, the fishermen believe, that the government is bringing in this particular licensing policy is because of that select group, and the other suspicion they have is that the government is attempting to set up a system that will allow private groups or private individuals or corporations to buy up large numbers of licences and control the fishery, much like the old fish companies used to do in the days before the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation.

I would point out to you, Mr. Chairman, that many of the fishermen are of the age group that remember only too clearly what the conditions were like when those private fish companies controlled the fishing industry in Manitoba. Conditions were terrible, Mr. Chairman. The fishermen were exploited by the small fish companies that were operating. Many fishermen ended up fishing for the whole season and at the end of the season, Mr. Chairman, it was like the old story, "They were still in debt to the company's store." They were still in debt to the company. The company supplied them with a boat, a motor, and nets on certain terms, and at the end of the season they weren't able to pay off any of those things, at the end of the season they were still in debt, the fishermen. The fish companies operated in such a way, Mr. Chairman, they never told the fishermen what they were going to pay for their fish until after the season was finished. So the fisherman would fish all season not knowing what he was going to get for his fish, and then after the company took the fish, brought it to Winnipeg, processed it or whatever they did to it, iced it, sent it on to market, and then after they had received their money for the fish they decided how much of that they were going to give to the fishermen.

Well, Mr. Chairman, this left the fishermen at the mercy of the companies, and it was such an abominable situation that even the Progressive Conservative Government under Roblin decided to have a look at this, they had a McIvor Commission that looked at the whole situation and made recommendations. The Honourable First Minister was one of the ones from Manitoba that made a very impassioned speech at the McIvor Commission, when it was held in Winnipeg, that there was a need for rationalization of the industry, and there was a need for an overall marketing agency for the fishermen, that the conditions of the fishermen were terrible. He was the Minister of Resources at that time.

Mr. Chairman, the establishment of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation has been a terrific boon to the fishermen. There are still some nagging little pockets of opponents to the Corporation. There are some that would argue that the Corporation doesn't pay quite as good prices as they would like to have and there are representations that are made that the Corporation should sharpen up their administration and pay a larger proportion of the total of the price they receive for the fish back to the fishermen. That was an argument I had when I was Minister of Resources, and one which I still have, that there should be better organization and administration. There is always room for improvement.

But, Mr. Chairman, the majority of fisherman want the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation to stay. They don't want that Corporation to be threatened by situations that this government may create, whereby there will be competition set up so that it will threaten the existence and the single marketing desk concept of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation. And as I understand it, Mr. Chairman, when they had a meeting of the provincial Ministers responsible for Fisheries and the Federal Minister, some time in the fall of 1979, that this Minister was the only one who was pressing for changes in the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation. The other Ministers were content to see the Corporation continue as it is. Now I understand, Mr. Chairman, he was not even supported at that meeting by his federal counterparts, although I believe he is still pressing as he has indicated here tonight, for changes in the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation. He apparently still believes that there should be competition there, even though the fishermen have told him and will be telling him in the future, I am sure, that they do not want to see the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation concept changed, they don't want to see competition established.

The policy that this Minister has tried to bring in through this licensing, as I say, is one which has made the fishermen of Manitoba very suspicious, and even the way in which this Minister has handled it has created even more suspicions in the minds of the fishermen. He has lost credibility in the eyes of fishermen all over Manitoba. They simply don't trust him; they simply do not trust him, and they don't trust this government. That is why they are saying we don't even want to talk about any changes in policy; we don't even want to discuss this. No way; get out of here. Leave us alone; leave the fishery as it is. Because they feel as soon as they open the door, as soon as they say, well we will discuss it, that this Minister will just ram that policy right through and they will have the worst of all worlds that they are worried about. They are worried that this Minister will bring in a system which will benefit that little group in Gimli and other private operators that want to grab up and gobble up and hog huge portions of the fishery in Manitoba. That is what the fishermen are concerned about, Mr. Chairman.

If the fishermen look at the events that have taken place, it certainly hasn't given them any less cause for concern, because they know the actions of this Minister. They know that in the summer of 1979 at a meeting, which was attended by many fishermen in the city of Winnipeg, he made the statement that there would be no policy changes until the fishermen had been consulted. He left the impression with them that they would be consulted every step of the way and there wouldn't be any major changes unless they were in agreement with them. Then he sent a letter to the fishermen in the fall of 1979 saying, this is the policy, this is the way it is going to be, we will be sending groups out to talk to you from the department to discuss how this policy will be implemented. Not how you think the policy should be, or how you think we should change this policy, or how you think it should be amended in its implementation. No, we will discuss with you how this policy is going to implemented.

Mr. Chairman, when the fishermen's meetings were followed up, the fishermen soon realized that the people that were coming out to talk to them were not coming out to discuss with them any of their ideas or suggestions as to how a new licensing system should be established; they were coming out to tell them how the policy was going to be. At that point in time the fishermen realized that this Minister and this government was going to ram through a policy that was going to be very detrimental to their industry. It was at that point in time that they started to really get anxious about it and to really protest it. Some of the people that were willing to listen to the government up to that point, at that instance when the fisheries representatives from the department came out to the meetings, and told them, this is the way the policy is, we have no mandate to discuss with you how this is going to be changed; we are simply here to tell you how it is going to take place; that is when the fishermen that were willing to listen decided they were not going to listen any more, that they were simply going to tell the government and tell this Minister, and tell those people to leave and not to even talk to them about their policies.

Luckily, Mr. Chairman, it happened that there was a Federal Election going on at that time and they were able to impress on the federal candidates and to this government, through those federal candidates, that this was a disastrous policy politically for them in those areas where they were running federal candidates, where there were large groups of fishermen, and people that sympathized with those fishermen, and they were able to pressure this government into suspending the implementation of the policy.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have the retreat. We listened tonight to the government and the Minister attempting to retreat from his position of implementing this new policy and he is trying to be very very cautious in his approach and saying, we are going to discuss with the fishermen, we are going to listen to some of their ideas. But throughout all this discussion, Mr. Chairman, as I listen, I still hear that he is determined to push through the concept of licensing of fishermen, licensing of fishermen in such a way that they can sell their licence, and that is the one thing that the fishermen are very suspicious about and very concerned about. If you talk to people that have been in the industry for years, they tell you that it would be a disaster for the fishery, a disaster for the fishing communities, if this system is implemented where licences can be sold to anybody in any number, where anybody can come in and buy licences and buy as many as they want. They know well enough the weaknesses; they know well enough the problems of

many communities; they know well enough that people can be caught at a weak moment and have their licence bought from them, and thereby lose their livelihood and perhaps the livelihood of their sons and daughters, who may have wanted to follow them into the fishery.

Mr. Chairman, they are concerned about that, and I know the concern, because even when we were in government, whenever the fishermen were asking for larger individual quotas around Lake Winnipeg, for example, I used to ask the staff to ask them to, by way of a vote in the meeting, to indicate if they would agree at that meeting to the concept that when a fisherman retired or otherwise left the industry, that his quota would not be given to any other person coming into the fishery, that they would take that quota and divide it up by the remainder of the fishermen in that area and thereby, over time, the number of licences would be reduced and the individual quotas of the fishing members in that area would go up.

You know, Mr. Chairman, that every time and in every community, where that question was put, it was almost unanimously defeated, because the fishermen didn't want that. They didn't want the door shut to new people coming into the fishery. They wanted the fishery to be expanded. Well, naturally, Mr. Chairman, you can't expand the resource base. There is a finite resource base and you must work within that, but it is indicative of their concern for the fishery and for their communities when they defeated that kind of a question every time it was put to them.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, they don't even want in their own area, they don't want individuals buying up huge blocks of licences. In other words, where there are 50 fishermen now, those fishermen, if given an opportunity to vote, will not vote that those 50 licences should be given out to only ten people. They are opposed to even that. So the Minister's suggestion that the licences should be sold and they should be sold to individuals within that area, that it could be confined to that area, that is not acceptable to the fishermen either. They don't want the 50 licences that are now available in the Berens River area, for example, to be gobbled up by the ten most aggressive fishermen in that area and then have only ten fishermen.

The Minister, in one of this comments tonight, seemed to think that if he put in a system of transferring by sale, that somehow this would get around the controversy of people coming forward to the department and wanting more licences issued. Mr. Chairman, it is not going to lessen that controversy or that problem, it is going to intensify it, because after a period of years, and 50 licences have shrunk to 10, what do you think are going to happen to the other 40 people that have sold their licences? They are going to come to the government and say, hey, I want a licence. I have been a fisherman for 50 years and in a moment of weakness I sold my licence and I went to do something else, but now I want to get back into the fishery; I want a licence. The department and the Minister at that time will have to say: well, you know, you have sold your licence, now it has been divided up into only ten pieces instead of 50. There are obviously going to be some pretty unhappy people. And in communities where fishing has been a livelihood and a way of life for the last hundred years, how is the Minister and the department of the government at that time going to explain that to the fishermen?

So this whole idea of allowing for the transfer of licences by sale is completely unacceptable to the fishermen, and I don't believe that the Minister should attempt to implement it. I think that he can take the advice of fishermen like the ones from Norway House that contacted him and told him, and I quote, "We, the members of the Norway House fishermen's co-op, have unanimously rejected the licensing leasing system. We are happy with the existing system." And I'm sure he has received letters and resolutions and reports from his staff from people all over the north, from places like Berens River, from places like Matheson Island, even in these areas, Mr. Chairman, even where they said: Well, maybe we would agree with the sale of licences but we don't agree with a person having more than one licence or more than one quota per season.

Mr. Chairman, what's the point of bringing in a sale of licences, bringing in this system if he's not going to achieve his other objective, and that is to reduce the number of fishermen in the industry? And what is he going to say to the individuals that they have made a commitment to in Gimli, where they were going to give them larger quotas on Lake Winnipeg? Mr. Chairman, I know the fishermen around Lake Winnipeg, and they do not trust the Minister in his attempt

to bring in this system because they feel right now that the fishing is the best it's ever been in Manitoba. They are content with the production they are getting. They are happy with the prices, the prices have been the best they've ever been. These are the statements I've heard from fishermen: they are saying the fishing is the best it's ever been. Why does this government now want to fool around with the system? Why do they want to bring in new regulations and new licensing policy, when we're happy with the way it is?

This Minister came along too late, if he thought he was going to push through changes to the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation, because just when he was talking about making changes, that's when the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation was achieving record prices on international markets and giving record prices to fishermen. Then this Minister comes along and is ten years behind in his thinking and thinks that he is going to bring about changes in the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation, and this is going to be popular with fishermen? There were petitions and protests from all over Manitoba when the Minister made those kinds of statements, and the fishermen representatives of the Advisory Committee to the Board of Directors of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation sent a letter in November of 1979 to him and to all the other Ministers who were involved in the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation, and they sent this resolution in this letter, which says that the Advisory Committee strongly supports the present marketing system for freshwater fish, as well as expresses full confidence in the Board of Directors and management. In expressing support at this time, the Advisory Committee opposes any changes, either regional or across the entire freshwater area, which would have the effect of eroding the strength and market position of the corporation, including provisions which would permit fishermen to opt out. And this was taken from Minutes of the 18th meeting of the Advisory Committee to the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation Board of Directors, November 6, 1979.

Mr. Chairman, a more clear and unequivocal statement could not be made. This statement came from the Chairman, Bill Bennett, from Matheson Island, who is a long-time fisherman on Lake Winnipeg, a very responsible individual; John Ateah from Victoria Beach, who is certainly not politically motivated in the sense of being a New Democrat - John Ateah was a Liberal candidate in 1973 in Rupertsland constituency; Raymond Fleming from Winnipegosis, one of the more well known fishermen from that area, --(Interjection)-- he probably is; Alexander Jonasson from Wabowden, Roland E. Gaudry from St. Laurent; Louis Dysart, South Indian Lake. And the other members I won't mention; they're from Cumberland House, Saskatchewan and other areas of Saskatchewan, Alberta, North-West Territories and Ontario.

But Mr. Chairman, it is very clear from this statement - and I believe these people to be representative of fishermen in Manitoba - they are people that have been critical of the operation of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation in the past, and are not blind supporters of the corporation. They're simply people that are concerned about the fishery, and they're making what they believe to be a responsible recommendation to the Minister. I think that he should heed their advice and heed their recommendation, and not go charging off in his own direction. I mean, who does he think he is and who does he think his department is, that they know better for the fishery, than the fishermen? Who does he think he is that he is going to decide what kind of a policy for licensing, all by himself, will be the best for the fishery in Manitoba, that he's going to increase production in northern Manitoba by giving someone a long-term lease to a lake?

Mr. Chairman, if a particular lake in northern Manitoba cannot be fished today, because the transportation costs are too high to fish that lake, they're not going to fish that lake if the Minister gives them a 50-year lease, or a 100-year lease. It's not going to help. What is going to help is prices. And that is something that the Minister could assist with by beefing up the Freight Assistance Program that we introduced in 1976. The Minister and his department could put in a higher freight assistance for the fishermen in northern Manitoba. That would have the effect of increasing the prices to those fishermen that fished those remote lakes, and that, Mr. Chairman, would get greater production from northern Manitoba, not giving somebody a long-term lease.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, on this particular problem, I would, on behalf of the fishermen of Manitoba, demand that the Minister of Resources suspend, indefinitely, the implementation of his new proposed fishing licensing system, and

request that his fisheries departmental officials go around to the communities, discussing the major concerns of the fishermen with respect to the fishery, not go there with a pre-arranged agenda of what is going to be discussed. Go there with an open agenda, and allow the fishermen to lay on the table all of their concerns and all of their problems with the fishery, and in that kind of a dialogue, let the fishermen assist the department to put together policies that are relevant to the industry; that are relevant to the fishermen; that are going to really assist the fishermen in improving their livelihoods and not cause a major disruption in the whole fishery, such as would be evidenced if this Minister and this government bring in this proposed new licensing system.

I don't know how much more the fishermen have to say to the Minister before he realizes that this is their desire. I don't know how many meetings he is going to have to have. It's probably revealing, Mr. Chairman, that no Fishermen's Advisory Committee meeting has yet been scheduled for this spring, and that's a group that the Minister at least should be listening to, not solely and only listening to them, but certainly getting their views. That's a group that I believe will tell him' when he calls that meeting, that the proposed fishing licensing system is unacceptable and something that the majority of fishermen do not want. I believe that if the Minister is going to have some credibility with the fishermen at this point, and I expect that he would want to have that credibility or try to restore his credibility because he has certainly done a good job of losing his credibility with the fishermen to this point in time - that he should announce that he's going to throw out this policy, suspend it indefinitely, and not leave the fishermen in any mystery or confusion about what this government is going to do, and as I suggest, send his fisheries officials out to talk to the fishermen about their real concerns and their real problems, and deal with those and not with some imaginary problems that the Minister has thought up, or that some of his advisers have thought up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Yes, I just wanted to bring one more point to the Minister's attention that arises from a comment that he made in answer to the Member for The Pas, when he was comparing the selling of fishing leases as selling land. There is a marked difference, Mr. Chairman, with a farmer selling land that he owns. That's a big difference from selling a resource that he does not own, the fact that the Crown has given him the privilege. It's not a God-given right to have access to a resource. It's a privilege that he is receiving from the Crown, from all the people, from a million people in Manitoba. He is getting a privilege, the same privilege for driving.

But I want to point out to the Minister what has happened in the Crown lands, what happened in the past when Crown lands were leased out to ranchers. I wanted to bring just one particular case of what will happen to the fishing licences over the years, that every time a lease changes hands, the price goes up. And it gets to a point similar to what farmers are facing today when they want to have access to farmland, when they want to buy a piece of farmland. I want to point out one specific case, where a person and some of the members here know this one person who obtained a lease from the Crown, and he held that lease for the production of livestock for a few years, and then it was transferred over. That is in the early '70s, late '69, before there were any policy changes made to the Crown lands. The lease was transferred, and there was a payment of \$3,000 that was made on the transfer of this lease. The lease was held for a year or two by the second lessee, and was sold for \$12,000 to the third lessee. It was a businessman that was the second lessee. The third lessee held that Crown land for a very few short years, a couple or three years, and it was offered for sale at \$25,000.00.

This is what was happening in the Crown lands. It was illegal to do this. It never was legal for any lessee to sell Crown land to another lessee. It was being done. It was sanctioned by the government, the Roblin government, and the case that I'm referring to is what prompted the previous administration to change their regulations in order to stop this flagrant abuse of a privilege of obtaining access to a resource.

Because one has but to look at this situation to realize how difficult it is, how difficult it would be for a young, new rancher to get access to Crown lands

when he has to pay \$25,000 up front, in order to have access to that resource. And this is an example of the resource no longer performing what it's intended to do, but rather land speculation. It's more profitable to sell leases than to fish, or to ranch, as the case was in this particular case.

Mr. Speaker, you will see that happen in the fishing industry. It will come to a point where everytime a lease changes hand the price will go up and it'll get to be so high that young people wanting to get into the industry will not be able to do so, and that is what's happening in agriculture today. It's going to be a situation that governments are going to address themselves with very shortly; within the next five or ten years governments will have to address themselves to the problem of land transfer. The Minister is attempting to implement the same thing that happened in the Crown lands and I would strongly urge the Minister to think very seriously of what he is trying to impose on the fishermen of this province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, my colleague certainly makes a good point and one which I think the Minister should take to heart, in terms of his proposed policy. I think it's one more argument very well put, as to why this policy should not be implemented. I would like to suggest to the Minister, as alternatives to the problems in the fishery and, I believe that these are things that he will hear about when he sends his people out if he follows our suggestion to talk to the fishermen to discuss what can be done to assist the fishermen, and if one looks at the prices problem I think he will hear that they will want him to continue to pressure the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation to improve their organization and to improve their administration, so as to pay a larger and greater proportion of the final price to the fishermen and to improve their marketing structure, so that they will be able to obtain a higher price for some of the lower quality species that the fishermen now fish, but do not receive a high price for. And I think those are areas that the Minister could make a contribution.

As far as the costs, Mr. Chairman, the operating costs of fishermen are going up like the operating costs of everybody else. I think he should take a look at that and look at ways that he could assist the fisherman in their operation costs.

I think that they should continue the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation loans to fishermen; perhaps ensure that the interest rates on those loans are as low as possible so that fishermen can continue to obtain the necessary equipment for fishing at reasonable rates. That has been a very successful program. I think they've had almost no defaults, Mr. Chairman, on loans to fishermen, because the money is collected at source where the fishermen delivers his fish; they deduct a certain amount off his catch each time and he pays back the loans for equipment.

I think he should look at winter works or summer works activity, whatever is more applicable to the fishery in question, to assist the fishermen in their down-time periods at working to improve the fishing facilities that they utilize. I think we had programs to deal with that. This government has suspended them, or cancelled them. I think that he should look at reintroducing those kinds of programs whereby he would assist the fishermen, when they are not fishing, to get the necessary equipment, lumber and supplies and so on and provide the necessary grants for labour, in order to improve their fishing facilities and to give them some employment in the down-time between fishing seasons.

I think further, Mr. Chairman, he should look at the facilities around the province for fishing generally, because I know that many of them are in deteriorating shape, many of them desperately need replacement. There's a plant at Savage Islands on Island Lake, that is 25 or 30 years old or more. It was a good plant in its day, Mr. Chairman, but it's almost past its useful age and should be looked at, I think. A joint federal-provincial program to assist the fishery would be something that the Minister could explore in this whole area of facilities. Right now there's really no agency of government, federal or provincial, that are looking at fishing facilities, even those these are the life blood of the fishermen. If you don't have a facility in which to process or pack your fish, there's no way that the fishermen and particularly in the remote, more inaccessible areas, can do a proper job of fishing.

I think that he should reassess the Fisheries Freight Assistance Program, take a careful look at that and see where it can be improved. I think there are some areas where . . . And certainly the general level of assistance could be raised since costs have gone up since 1976 when we introduced the program. I think that the Minister could look at that.

As far as the licensing system is concerned, as I say, I think he should scrap it, go back to the fishermen and discuss with them ways in which they think the licensing system could be improved.

The point system on Lake Winnipeg was developed in that way, by discussing with the fishermen, and since it has been introduced in the early 70's it has gradually been changed. Each year the fisheries representative would go around and talk to the fishermen; the fishermen would make recommendations. And certain areas of it have been improved; some rough edges have been worked away and gradually the fishermen have, I think, have come to really appreciate the way in which that system works. In fact, the Minister should look at utilizing that model in other lakes, rather than destroying that model by his new system.

I might point out to the Minister, that in that system, a father or a daughter of a fisherman could have access to the fishery, after having a couple of years of experience, could take over his or her father's licence. And that was their recommendation that came from the fishermen from fishermen's meetings around the lake and I think it was a good recommendation and it's an example of what can be done if a government is prepared to dialogue the fishermen and listen to their concerns and take them into account when bringing in regulations.

I think that as far as the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation and changing its nature of marketing and the control and jurisdiction of the corporation, I think the Minister should definitely have a hands-off attitude on that; leave it alone. Try to improve it, but don't try to set up groups to compete against it. That's defeating the purpose of it.

I think I've covered most of the areas in the fishermen's policy that I wanted to cover, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask the Minister if he's had any further studies or research made on the effects of the Garrison Diversion, the proposed Garrison Diversion project on the Manitoba fishery and, if not, if he's planning to have some studies or research done on that, and what steps has he taken through his department and particularly through his fisheries officials, to discuss this problem with the fishermen so that they know what the dangers are and can make their independent recommendations and protests to the American officials.?

MR. RANSOM: I dealt with that question previously.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. The hour being late and the fact that my colleagues have covered much of the area in some great detail, I'd ask the Minister a couple of specific questions and would hope that he could endeavour to return, before his Salary comes up, with the answers. One is, to be a list of where pollutants, other than mercury and including mercury, are being monitored in regards to their effect on the fishing industry. In other words, we talked a bit about mercury tonight, but it is not the only pollutant that one has to be concerned with and I would include in this, of course, the southern lakes as well as the northern lakes, although my own parochialness would want to talk specifically about the northern lakes. But I'm certain there are others who represent other constituencies that would care to see what is happening in their own areas.

We know for a fact that acidification from mining industry is having some impact and I know last year that Ruttan Mine was involved in an environmental hearing regarding the fact that their tailings were acidifying certain lakes and I was again approached by the South Indian Lake fishermen and trappers in regard to the decreasing quality of their fish in certain lakes and river systems in the area and also in regard to decreasing trapping activity because of that pollution. So I'd ask the Minister if he could just outline that and also report to us what sort of program his department has in effect in order to judge from year to year, changes in these particular qualities of fishing and trapping also, as that comes under his department.

In other words, one has to have an overview in order to understand the situation. You just can't take one year, 1979 and say, in 1979 this was the situation and then hope to be able to draw a conclusion. You have to see what it was in '75, '76, '77, '78, '79, so that you can start to notice the trends and when you notice the trends, then you can isolate the incidents where you believe the greatest impact is going to take place in the least amount of time. All you're doing, in fact, is prioritizing and coming up with a concerted effort to deal with the specifics as they tend to occur. So I'd ask him if he could come back with that. I know that he wouldn't have it here tonight, nor would I expect him to have all that information here tonight.

I'd ask him also, if he could come back at a later date with some information as to the effect that this pollution is having on fish production; if there can be a co-relation. In other words, is there any area where we can specifically point to a decreasing quality or quantity of fish and pinpoint a source for that problem.

I'd also, while I'm on my feet, like to address myself to a couple of issues that the Minister, in his reply to my earlier statement a couple of hours ago made in the House and one was, he indicated that I said that we must aim for a zero level of pollution and of course that, in many instances, would be an impossibility. And at the same time, he used the words, that we must strive for a zero level of contamination and that, indeed, is the case. I just want to clarify that I am not among the naive, who believe that you can, in all instances, create a pollution-free, nor contamination-free environment; but I do believe that if you are going to set goals, you set goals towards decreasing the amount of pollution and contamination, rather than increasing. And so when I say you strive for a zero level, that does not have in it an implication that you will ever reach a zero level, but merely that you strive for that level. I think the Minister was aware that was the intent of my remarks and I believe that is how my remarks would have been interpreted and should have been interpreted; not that we're going to reach a zero level, but that we must always be moving in that direction as far as it is technically feasible. So I wanted to clarify that point so that there be no misunderstanding in that regard.

In closing, then, because I do want to be brief at this time of night, I would just ask the Minister if he can come back with the information we've asked for and if he can apprise himself of some of the facts and figures, so that when we do get to the Minister's salary, we can speak to the matters in some detail that we have not been able to speak to this evening.

MR. RANSOM: I'll attempt to get as much information as I can on those questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Ruperstland.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman, unless my colleagues have more questions, I would just ask the Minister to outline the relevant information regarding SMYs as he goes through the items and we pass them tonight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like a little bit more information as you get to that item on (e) The Northlands Agreement, just a brief statement in terms of what that involves.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the Honourable Minister, would you care to list the SMYs all together, or do you want me to . . .

MR. RANSOM: I'll just go through them, Mr. Chairman. On Item (a) there were five last year, four this year; Item (b) 36.05 last year, the same this year; Fish Culture 25.36 last year, the same this year; Biological Services 20.19 last year, 22.17 this year. The Northlands Agreement Item includes the fry rearing pond experiment at Lake Winnipegosis and some lake inventories.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clause by clause. Clause 8. Fisheries--pass; Resolution 107--pass;

Resolve that there be Granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,689,700 for Natural Resources. Fisheries, \$2,689,700--pass.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dauphin, report of committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

MR. RANSOM: I would move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Member for The Pas that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning (Friday).