



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

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

31-32 Elizabeth II

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



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 64B - 8:00 p.m., TUESDAY, 10 MAY, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 10 May, 1983.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - NATURAL RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: Committee please come to order. We were on 11(a)(2) when we broke for Private Members' Hour.

The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, as indicated prior to the supper hour adjournment, a request was made for some additional information with respect to the Capital Program that we'll be into very shortly. Further on this item, in terms of administration, services provided by this branch to municipalities has always been of importance in rural Manitoba. Is that still being provided, and if so, at what level?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I know that under consideration was some change in the rates, but after looking at it and considering the impact that that could have on municipalities, the rates were not increased to the level that would have fully compensated the department. I'm just going to get the details. I don't think they were changed - the present rates are \$95 a day for a survey crew.

MR. H. ENNS: And those, as the Minister indicates, remain unchanged for the coming year?

HON. A. MACKLING: That's right, Mr. Chairman.
Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, I have to make a correction. The recollection of the Deputy Minister was not quite correct. It's \$75 a day for a survey crew.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, have there been any significant staff changes in this group?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I think I reviewed the details of those before the break. There were a number of vacant positions totalling 14 that were reduced.

MR. H. ENNS: Just one further question. Mr. Bill Newton is still senior person in this group?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. H. ENNS: And he is not available to this committee for what particular reason?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, we have had some administrative problems in respect to really flushing out some of the start-up problems in the Turtle River Conservation District and he is on temporary assignment there, as acting chairman of that

Conservation Board, in addition to his duties here as division director.

MR. H. ENNS: It is contemplated though that he will resume his responsibilities with the branch?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, he's continuing to be director of the branch and he is also doubling to resolve the transitional problems that we have in that Conservation District.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, just a straightforward answer from the Minister and we'd get off the subject. Is it contemplated that he will continue in the responsibility as director of this branch?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I found Mr. Newton to be an excellent director - there's no problem. He has assisted us in the resolution of a problem in that Conservation District and that's why he's not available, but I can assure the honourable member that he's the most highly desired and hardworking division director.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, just as an aside - it's always good practice never to volunteer more information that is asked for. I simply asked whether he's going to continue . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: 11(a)(2)—pass . . .

MR. W. McKENZIE: One question if I could.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. McKENZIE: Could the Minister advise me of the number of meetings he had with Mr. Arthur Doering from Grandview and if he's resolved those problems that he has brought to the attention of the department?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I did have one or two meetings with Mr. Doering in my office. I don't recall the exact number. I also did meet with Mr. Doering while I was out in, I believe, it's Grandview, looking at the new storage reservoir for water there. We did look at the Valley River and Mr. Doering pointed out some natural and unnatural obstructions in the river and demonstrated his concern in connection with them.

I must say that I don't think that Mr. Doering's problems have been resolved to his satisfaction. He contends that the structures in the river effect a ponding action, the result of which is that the land that he owns upstream of the town floods, particularly in the springtime. The Engineering Branch do not agree with his assessment of the result of the obstacles in the river but, of course, it's very difficult for anyone, including a layman like myself, to appreciate all of the engineering facts and their relationship to flooding conditions.

MR. W. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, maybe it's not the right place to ask the question - I'm not sure - but the

lagoon that was put into Grandview and it's all installed now and it's working well, has the Minister any concerns about that decision that was made? I had some questions raised last year, which I raised with the Minister, about the weeds and things around the area. But has the department got any problems with the decision that was made to go the lagoon route?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, we're not equipped with information on that to any extent. We're not aware of any problems coming to our attention. The operation of the lagoon is under the Agricultural Water Services Board.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: I understand. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 11.(b)(1)—pass; 11.(b)(2)—pass; 11.(c)(1)—pass; 11.(c)(2)—pass.

Resolution 126: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$6,989,200 for Natural Resources for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984—pass.

12.(a)(1).

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, in introducing this section of the department, Regional Services, I want to acknowledge the contribution that Ernie Psikla made as a Regional Director of this branch. As most members may well know, Ernie received an offer he felt he couldn't refuse from the Province of Alberta and did return to that province. He's lived there and worked there prior to coming and working for us in Manitoba. Ernie regretted leaving, but as I say, the offer was such that he felt he couldn't refuse. Joe Nespor is with me and Joe has been Acting Director in the interval, but of recent days we held a competition and Ed Wong, who has served in a number of capacities within the department including Acting Director, I believe, of Parks, was the successful applicant and has assumed these duties. He's not with us today because he's presently in Regina on some personal matter, but Joe Nespor is with me and I think many people know Joe who has been very active in the department for many years.

Under this section, we provide the support for all of the branches. We provide conservation officers who are our front line in respect to all of the services that this branch affords to the general public. The conservation officers are faced with a multitude of problems and activities that require understanding, empathetic treatment from them with the people that enjoy the rights under the various sections of this department.

I had the occasion to meet - I think only once - with a regional meeting of conservation officers and enjoyed that experience thoroughly. I want to put on record my appreciation for the efforts of our "boys in green" I think I could call them, who do a very difficult task many times and do it very well in applying and administering the rules and regulations of the department, interfacing with people who fish, who hunt, who trap, who harvest our forests, to name but a few of the many activities that they're involved with. They're a good group and I think that the transitional problems that obviously were encountered when departments

Parks and Natural Resources were merged. Those problems I think are behind us, and I think that we have a good working group out there that are a tribute to the province.

I know that there are members, individual citizens, in society and one of them is present as a spectator, who has indicated to me from time to time how diplomatic and how effective some of our staff have been, particularly those, I'm referring to those in the Whiteshell.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, allow me to also acknowledge appreciation on the part of the opposition for the services of Ernie Psikla. Manitoba lost the services of an excellent person - and at the same time welcome the appointment of Mr. Ed Wong. The gentleman that you have with you is Mr. Joe Nespor, and at the same time acknowledge the work that he's been doing in the acting capacity.

Have there been any substantial staff changes? Mr. Chairman, I'll ask a few general questions and then we will proceed along on the different items. There will be some specific questions on the fire suppression, fuel services and enforcement, but in general in the Regional Services one does hear complaints about the lack of staff in terms of carrying out some of these services that are required from this branch, particularly in the area of conservation officers. Are we holding level or have we reduced or what is the situation in terms of field personnel, particularly in the area of the "boys in green" as the Minister describes them.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, overall there has been a reduction of six staff. We have had people come and go. We had 11 Natural Resources Officers and I was using conservation officers. I apologize, it's Natural Resource Officers although I use the terms interchangeably, that were hired during the period 1982-83. There were six that were transferred on promotion. There were 22 lateral transfers mainly for career development but, of course, recruitment filled those changes. Overall there's a small reduction, net reduction of six. There are no layoffs but those were obviously unfilled complement.

MR. H. ENNS: I know it will start sounding like a broken record but this is a particular aspect of this Minister's department we've been made aware of. The Minister has certainly been made aware of some substantial difficulties in terms of enforcement and of presence by the department to try to remedy or to reduce the amount of illegal activity that's taking place in the field in the past year, some rather disturbing, startling headlines about substantial poaching that's involved, whether it involves big game animals or fish; and again, Mr. Chairman, I know that I can appeal to you, Sir, for your fairness and your influence in your caucus. Surely, you will see the difficulty that members of the opposition have that these areas of government activity are being reduced. They're being reduced at a time that the Honourable Member for Urban Affairs can find an extra \$20 million to build yet an extra arena in Winnipeg or the Minister of Finance can find an extra 18 or 20 percent more money to spend for all other departments but these departments.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I've made that point and I won't reiterate it, but it is noticed. The question was asked; the question was raised. We notice the absence of those six persons or the fact that the full complement isn't there.

HON. A. MACKLING: No, Mr. Chairman, we didn't lay anyone off. We have the same numbers of active people, but there were six positions that had not been filled that are not here now as unfilled positions. That's my understanding of the numbers; and what we have done is in effect we've got the same work force, the total work force, but we are redeploying people where the need is greatest. We're moving people where we think, for example, there is a greater incidence of involvement, hunting infractions or whatever. We have been moving people on a seasonal basis where that is required. So we've been very cost effective, but we've been very employment effective in utilizing our staff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 12.(a)(1)—pass; 12.(a)(2)—pass.
12.(a)(3) - the Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I wonder if the Minister might permit a question. It's general questions on Field Services not necessarily related to an item, but I only have a few questions.

HON. A. MACKLING: Go ahead.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you. The Minister is familiar with a hunting incident at home that I described to him last fall. The question I have for the Minister, and I've written to - I forget which one of the staff was asking for recommendations on change to the Act - but I wrote to them and made a couple of suggestions and I'd like to bounce them off the Minister. I don't know whether it's within the abilities of the municipalities to undertake this, but could a municipality during deer hunting season basically by notice in the paper restrict the entire municipality to deer hunting in this particular instance, except by written permission, and make that a bylaw of the municipality such that you couldn't have a similar incident of just plain irresponsible hunting that happened not only in my instance, but in several instances last year? Is that within the - call it the legislative framework of a municipality - to pass such a bylaw?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I have to be quite candid and say that I really don't know. I don't know whether my staff could assist me with a definitive answer there or not. I would want to check with the Act and The Municipal Act - perhaps talk to Municipal Affairs. I know that municipalities can, by by-law, prohibit any discharge of a firearm on a Sunday and a number of municipalities have done that. Whether or not a municipality could, by by-law, restrict other forms of hunting, I really don't know.

I am familiar with the incident that the honourable member refers to and for the record, it involved a very careless hunter firing, discharging his rifle, obviously at deer, but in close proximity to a farm residence; in this case, the residence of the honourable member. It's reckless hunting. It's actionable under the Act because it's dangerous.

Hopefully, that kind of incident is in a very small minority. I say hopefully, because I respect the concern the honourable member has that these incidents aren't isolated. There can be a number of them, but I say hopefully they are few in number. These incidents do occur; it's hard to deal with them other than through hunter education, publicity. Even so, there will still be some people who just are irresponsible with their hunting practises, but they are in a very small minority, I believe. But as to the law, I'm not sure.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, there's no question that - like the length of time I've lived there, I've never had a similar incident and clearly that proves that the hunter population, in general, is pretty respectful of landowner's rights and pretty careful. But, as the Minister is well aware, and as all of us are well aware, it's these few that tend to be able to flaunt the law, and in this case it happened there was no charges were able to be pursued for a number of reasons, that cause a lot of land to be posted "Absolutely No Hunting," because the landowner, on one occasion or another, has been subject to a similar circumstance. That deprives the rights to hunt of a lot of very responsible and legitimate sportsmen, and that's why I pose the question about whether municipalities could establish such a by-law.

Could the Minister indicate to me whether it is municipal or whether it is department regulation which restricts certain areas to shotgun hunting only with slugs in deer hunting season? Is that a municipal capability or is that a departmental and provincial regulation?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, again, I must indicate my ignorance on that subject. I really don't know. I believe certainly that the department can; that is, the government can establish, by zone, areas where certain types of guns would only be allowed, and as a matter of fact, as part of that hunter safety review that I requested. I've indicated to staff that I think we ought to look at some of the practices that have been followed in other areas of the North American continent. There are a number of states in the United States of America where they have very large deer populations where they have a long history of game hunting, white-tailed deer and others, and where they employ restrictions like shotguns with deer slugs only, no high-powered rifles. I think those concepts are worth looking at because they would have the marked advantage of not having missiles, the bullet travelling distances of a mile or more and landing on or colliding with things which the hunter had no perception would occur and these things have happened, and I think we have to look at some alternatives.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I thank the Minister for that answer, and if he could check out to see what the Act would or would not allow in terms of municipal bylaws, I would be appreciative of receiving that answer. I have a question on another matter.

Under the operations of Fire Suppression, the Minister invites tenders for aircraft utilization under spotting, I believe it's primarily just spotting. In the advertisement for tender the Minister requires all people offering a tender to submit a, I believe it's called a schedule of

tariffs, along with the offer to put planes in service for the department for Fire Suppression. Does the exclusion by a tenderer of the schedule of tariffs invalidate that person's tender when it's an advertised requirement to be part of the tender?

HON. A. MACKLING: My understanding, Mr. Chairman, from the department is that the public tender requirements have to be strictly complied with and if there is an omission, that would invalidate it.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Then, I won't take up the time with the committee tonight on this matter, but it was drawn to my attention sometime ago, and I waited until we got to the Estimate process, I thought we'd be there a lot sooner. There was a complaint drawn to my attention that the case the Minister indicates, the practice the Minister indicates, was not followed in that tenders were accepted without the schedule of tariffs being part of it and had that been adhered to strictly the tenders would have been offered to other than the people and in each case the tender selected was the lowest tender in dollars per hour or whatever the tender method. So, if I may, I'll discuss that with the Minister this week.

HON. A. MACKLING: Fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Well, perhaps we can move on to (b), Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 12.(a)(3)—pass; 12.(b)(1).

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, dealing with the various regions, can the Minister indicate to the committee what the complement of a regional office is in Regional Services, such as the Northwest Region, the number of staff, the number of professional people, what do we have? We have the conservation officers, park ranger, or?

HON. A. MACKLING: In the Northwest Region we have a total of 33 staff years: one manager; one superintendent; 11 in administration; 3 in technical, I'm not so sure what technical means? - fire control officer and we have 16 Natural Resource officers; and one term clerk. A total complement of 33.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, that is for all the regions?

HON. A. MACKLING: No. That's the Northwest Region.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Dauphin is it? Swan River?

HON. A. MACKLING: That would be Flin Flon and The Pas area. Then if you want I can just run over the complement in each region.

MR. H. ENNS: Would you please, Mr. Chairman?

HON. A. MACKLING: The total complement again is similar, manager, superintendent, administration, technical, NROs and term clerks. For the Northeast

Region a total of 31.18. That arises from the clerk's term position, that fraction - 31.1. The Interlake at 45.03. The Southwest Region 28.5. The Western Region 39.14 — (Interjection) — no, that's the Western. In the Southeastern Region, 54. In the Eastern Region 29. I've rounded those last figures, rather than deal with the fractions.

MR. H. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would assume that the variance of numbers is dictated by the responsibilities the department faces. In other words, substantial installations such as provincial parks, etc., would indicate the higher numbers in particular regions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 12.(b)(2) - Mr. Minister.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, that's right, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 12.(b)(1)—pass; 12.(b)(2)—pass; 12.(c)(1)—pass; 12.(c)(2)—pass; 12.(d)(1) . . .

HON. A. MACKLING: Not so fast, Mr. Chairman, that's the Interlake.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I don't think it would be out of order for me to plead special cause for the Interlake, after all, it's an important region in the Province of Manitoba, and I'm the only Tory representative in that area that has to look after their welfare.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perfectly legitimate.

MR. H. ENNS: Perhaps I can use this region, joking aside, to deal a little more specifically with the regional officers' work. It also happens to be a region where we have, partly because of its proximity to larger urban population, we have pretty severe hunting pressure in the area. We continue to hear reports of serious taking of illegal game, particularly deer in this area. Moose, unfortunately, as we've discussed earlier, have just about vanished from the region and regrettably so, as well as we have numerous fishing problems located with the Lake Manitoba Fisheries, Lake St. Martin Fisheries and I don't know, would this include the Lake Winnipeg Fisheries as well?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. H. ENNS: So the only thing that's missing, and I'll never forgive a former Parks director for this, is a major park in the Interlake in terms of development and so forth on the — (Interjection) — oh, no, pardon me, we have Hecla; that's right, but that's far away. I was thinking of it close; I was thinking around St. Laurent, but anyway.

Can the Minister give us some indication of this branch's work, the number of problems, enforcement problems? Do they have a specific problem in the Interlake with poaching, for instance, to be specific?

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, yes, we have had substantial incidents of problems and the Interlake

is certainly not unique. As a matter of fact, as the honourable member points out, perhaps because of its close proximity to the city probably the incidence though is somewhat greater.

In this region we've had 54 charges laid in 1982, one-half of them against Treaty Indians. We have a very substantial park, the Hecla Park; we have wayside parks; we have beach areas in the Interlake, of course, that receive many, many thousands of people. We have a high incidence, therefore, of people involvement in this region and that reflects the very substantial number of staff we have in this region.

I should acknowledge that in our Field Services, in our NROs we have not only males, we have females. I don't know whether I recounted to this committee the fact that . . . no, I guess I didn't, because in one of my tours to communities respecting commercial fishing, I believe it was at Winnipegosis or just south of Winnipegosis, we called in at a Forest Ranger Tower, and our NRO there was a female. And she climbs that tower, and comes down again in a matter of less than a minute, I believe - a very, very enthusiastic and efficient and I must say charming Natural Resource Officer.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, there's always been a hope I think and some effort made at, particularly in this area of the departmental work, to provide for greater employment opportunities to our Native people. Can the Minister indicate to the committee how many of his personnel in this area of work are of Native extraction, either Metis or Treaty Indian?

In fact, is there - what is the term? - an Affirmative Action Program involved in trying to bring more Native employees into this area of responsibility for the department? It surely has to be an area of work that for any number of reasons it would be desirable to do so.

There are problems of communications and working with and seeking the co-operation of Native people with respect to the responsibilities of the department in this, and all other. As I'm just using the Interlake area as one region; these questions apply to all regions of course but they apply particularly to the Interlake.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member is quite right. An Affirmative Action Program on the part of government is appropriate in this area.

In respect to staff presently employed, we have four, five-men Firetac crews that are predominantly Native people. I would like to compliment the work of our Firetac crews. I was out at Beaver Creek at a demonstration - well, it's actually a contest that they hold of fire crews demonstrating their ability to be able to put out a fire. They have specific tasks that they have to accomplish and they're timed, and they take great pride in the work. They're very enthusiastic and I'll tell you it's inspiring to see some of our crews. They're in full gear, and that means generally rain apparel of some kind, carrying many hundreds of pounds - well it looked like hundreds of pounds, maybe it isn't hundreds of pounds, many pounds anyway - of hose and equipment and going through an exercise that depends on speed. We have 14 trap-line officers in our Northern regions and a very large number of these officers are Native and Metis people.

I might also say, and I don't know how much publicity has been given to this as yet, in the program recently announced by the Minister of Education and the Minister of Labour, we are developing our own Resource Management Assistants. And we are going to have 10, I believe the number is 10, enrolled at Keewatin Community College this next season. The purpose, or at least one of the criteria will be to try and develop more affirmative action involving Native people in the development of the skills necessary for Natural Resource Officers.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm aware, of course, of the work that the Firetac crews have been doing; they have been there for some little while; also aware of the trap line officers. I suppose the question I'm asking is, is this a marked increase in terms of Native employment in the departments, say, since 1981?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether I could use the adjective "marked." I think that we have been endeavouring to assist any career opportunity for Native people. I might say that I think I recall reporting last year that I believe there was one Native person as a Natural Resource Officer; my understanding is that there are three now.

The Resource Management Assistants, I could elaborate somewhat on that Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member would like the information. It's assumed that initially it will be part-time. One person started on the 7th of May at Split Lake and he's assigned to work with a regional fish biologist. We have two trainees starting May 16th at Cross Lake and Nelson House; both of these people are Treaty Indians, they previously worked as fire rangers and trap-line officers. The training program will include report writing at the Keewatin Community College; the Churchill goose study, a two week study; field activities with fish and wildlife biologists and fire rangers during the summer months. We are holding interviews at Moose Lake on May 17th for 15 applicants seeking the Resource Manager assistant position at Moose Lake. We have 15 applicants were interviewed and 7 will be hired on June 1, 1983 in resource related areas for training and development with potential entry to the Resources School.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the Minister's plans for the future and his hopes, but the point that I'm really trying to make is, what was the complement of Native, or of Native-extraction employees in the department in 1981, as compared to today, 1983? Can the Minister tell me that?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I haven't had definitive information offered to me by staff. I indicated that my recollection last year was that I confirmed one with certainly - maybe it was two. Oh, I'm advised by Mr. Nespor that there have been three for quite some time and that is why, Mr. Chairman, we have launched an initiative that the Resource Manager Assistance Program hopefully will provide the base for us to be enabled to get more Native people involved in governmental work including, of course, the work of this department.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I won't pursue the point any further. The point that becomes obvious, of course,

is firstly, the need for continued effort in this direction. But, secondly, the Conservative Party has been, from time to time, accused of not showing sufficient concern or regard for our Indian brothers, particularly in terms of seeking to provide employment opportunities for them within government. I think the Minister has put on the record that the present administration is certainly attempting to pursue that same course, but, in fact, has perhaps added one or two employees of Indian extraction to that of those that were employed during the Conservative years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 12.(d)(1) to 12.(h)(1)—pass;
12.(h)(2) - the Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister advise me what kind of equipment do the conservation officers have in the Roblin-Dauphin area, to go out and deal with the nightlighters and the four-wheel drives and the aircraft that are in there harvesting wildlife? My talks with the staff in that area tell me they are not properly equipped and they don't have the staff and they can't deal with the problem.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the staff in that region have modern equipment in the form of . . .

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Well, spell it out, would you please?

HON. A. MACKLING: . . . four-wheel drive vehicles. They also have air surveillance by aircraft, two-way communication between aircraft and the ground vehicles. They also have excellent working relationships with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in respect to backup, in respect to apprehensions or violations. We also transfer or move natural resource officers where there is a need because of a high incidence of reputed illegal activity in an area. As I indicated earlier, we find that can be particularly effective.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, first of all with the RCMP service that the Minister has put on the record, I hope that he goes over and talks to the Attorney-General's Department from time to time to understand what's going on in the country with the RCMP. First of all, we can't afford the service, and secondly, they don't have the time to come out and deal with these matters unless there's a special call and the services are delayed sometimes for days, to try and come up and pick up these matters.

I wonder does the Minister know that there's vigilante groups that have set themselves up in my constituency - I think there's five already in place, who are now out at night, 24 hours a day, patrolling the area for unlocked doors, for wildlife violations, for the problems that the law enforcement officers can't deal with in this province today.

In my lifetime, Mr. Minister, I've never seen the day when we have to have vigilante groups organizing themselves to try and deal with these problems and they're serious problems. When you get people that are prepared to go out and work 12 hours all through the night, to try and enforce the wildlife regulations and the RCMP regulations in our province, it's a pretty sick society. I wonder does the Minister know it's that

bad and if he doesn't know, I invite him to come out to my constituency and see how these vigilante groups are operating. They are there and they're working and they're operating.

MR. H. ENNS: Socialists breed vigilantes, Wally.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Well, I don't know, but I'm most concerned, because I talk to conservation officers. The conservation officers tell me they don't have the equipment to deal with these problems, nor do they have the manpower. The RCMP - you can check with the Attorney-General - Gilbert Plains and Grandview are two examples that can't afford that kind of a police service anymore. It's beyond their tax means. So what's happening - they're certainly busy - the police forces, Mr. Minister, but what's happening is vigilante groups are now established and they're putting signs up on people's fence posts and doors. They're going to guard their property and the wildlife population of the area through the night hours. I just raise it. I don't know if the Minister of the department knows anything about it, or does he understand that it's going on?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I sympathize with those people who perceive that the incidents of vandalism or theft or crime is such that they want to do something positive in connection with being of assistance to law enforcement officers and our conservation officers, or Natural Resource officers, in connection with wildlife violations. But please, Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that these people should be given the term "vigilante groups." I'm sure that the common perception or the connotation of vigilante is one who would take the law into their own hands. I don't think that's what these people obviously are doing. I think that throughout the various communities, there are people who have developed the technique - you may call it the "community watch technique", where they assist in reporting violations or suspicious circumstances and that is an assistance to our Natural Resources officers. We need community assistance to enforce the law. We need people who are prepared to say that they have seen a violation of The Wildlife Act. Certainly, we count on, rely on community support and to the extent that we have people who are actively watching to ensure that the laws aren't broken, that people aren't enabled to do things and get away with them; that is an assistance to us. I don't categorize that kind of activity as vigilante activity; it's community watch activity; it's being involved, being concerned, and assisting law enforcement officers, the RCM Police and the natural resource officers in doing an effective job, and that complements; it doesn't take away from what we do.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, can I ask the Honourable Minister, does he and his staff and the department support these people that are out patrolling our area through the night. Is he prepared to give his staff in the area their support and work with them? Does he recognize that they are a viable force - they're volunteers, mind you, but they are there and they're alive, and I think there's five that I know of that are operating today.

The other point that really annoys me, because we come to Other Expenditures in this item and we see a considerable cut in dollars, which my colleague has already raised, the dollar's likely gone to this new rink in Winnipeg — (Interjection) — Kostyra's got the bucks - and all these problems we have out in the country where people now have to go and police their own property. I don't think in my lifetime I've ever heard of this before, Mr. Chairman.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, we are living in a highly materialistic and a highly mobile and somewhat volatile age. There's no question but the incidence of vandalism, the incidence of theft, has not diminished in the last decade, if anything it's increased. Whether it be in rural areas or whether it be in urban areas, there are people who, in light of these circumstances, have organized devices to help assist the police and those charged with the responsibility of enforcing our laws. We have block programs in the City of Winnipeg to assist people, I'm happy, not unhappy, to see in rural areas people taking a vigilant attitude towards improper activity, not in a way where they act as peace officers, because they are not peace officers, but where they actively assist us, and certainly we welcome that and have made clear that we will certainly be happy to respond to the advice that they give, because I'm sure that they are going to be an assist to us in being able to have many more eyes and many more ears to be able to see and listen to the activity that takes place within the countryside. That is a definite positive assist to us and we welcome it.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Honourable Minister for his comments. The greatest thing that could happen out there at this particular time is for the Minister or his staff to go into the Game and Fish Association of Russell, Roblin, Grandview, Gilbert Plains and say, look, we'll work with your vigilantes and try and clean up — (Interjection) — well, the Minister shies away from it. They are there and they're alive and they're functioning today, so he says he's going to have no part of those people at all.

What's the reason those people are there today? The reason is because somebody is not doing their job, whether it's this Minister's department or it's the Attorney-General's Department, I don't know. But why are these groups being struck up, and they're there today, Mr. Chairman. The Minister throws up his hands in disgust and says, no, I don't want no part of that. — (Interjection) — Well, they are there, I'm telling the Honourable Minister they're there and all he has to do is go out and talk to these people and recognize their concerns. Their concerns are exactly the resolution as raised by the Member for Turtle Mountain; they see what's going on in the Duck Mountains, they see the unfair tactics and the illegal practice of hunting that's going on in there and they're fed up right to there.

I'm asking the Minister tonight, and his department, to co-operate with these people and see if we can't - and I'm sure, these are not people who are going to go out and gun down somebody on the street. They're there to protect the property, the wildlife and the safety of the people in the area, and they're doing it for nothing.

Am I asking an unfair question of the Minister to co-operate with them?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I apologize to my colleagues if I appeared to flinch everytime the honourable member used the word "vigilante".

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Well, what do you call them?

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, they are community watch organizations. The word "vigilante" has a very distasteful connotation in North America because vigilantes in times past apprehended people and gave them summary capital punishment. They were oftimes hung by the neck with rudimentary trials. — (Interjection) — The honourable member has a problem with that definition? No. So I don't think it's fair to characterize these people who are concerned about being an assist to enforce the law as vigilantes, because they don't take the law into their own hands, I'm sure, and summarily treat people whom they believe have committed an illegal act. We're happy, as I say, to be able to hear from these people when it's opportune for them to let us know about an alleged illegality, because we will be responsive to that kind of information. We're sure that it's given in the best interests of enforcement of our game laws.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I apologize, maybe for raising the word "vigilante". That's the only word that crossed - may I call them freedom fighters?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, we are very upset, particularly with Item (j), we're dealing with (j) Field Services and Enforcements.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's pass (h) first.

MR. H. ENNS: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (h)(2)—pass; 12.(j)(1) - the Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, we have noted on all too many of this department's and this Minister's Estimates, where it involves bringing the service to the people, whether it's in Engineering Services, or whether it's in the other services in the wildlife area, we have made those objections known to you. But Mr. Chairman, in the field of Enforcement, this Minister has, on numerous occasions, stood up in the House, told us about the serious poaching problem that we're facing, told us about the millions of pounds of fish that are being illegally caught and shipped out of this province, told us in dramatic terms about what he intends to do about it, and what we see here, once again a reduction from \$222,000 to \$186,000 on this particular item. Mr. Chairman, we can't do what we want to do because it takes a message from Her Honour, that is to double this appropriation. All we can do, Mr. Chairman, and I want to put it clearly understood, is that we wish to have a recorded vote in opposition to this item.

We do not want to pass this item; we are not in support of this item; it is not sufficient to carry out the

problems and the responsibilities that the Minister himself has indicated the branch faces in this regard.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask you to call these items and register our opposition to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are we going to have a voice vote?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I want to comment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister will have a say first. He will use persuasive powers.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I assume that the honourable member's concerned about the reduction of \$35.8 thousand in Other Expenditures on this item, and the note I have is that we have a maturing organization, we've had training programs that now are no longer vital, and that accounts for a reduction of some \$19.3 thousand of that \$35.8 thousand. We, Mr. Chairman, were engaged at the time of Estimates Review internally, governmentally, in a very precise agonizing way in looking at every section of the department to ensure that where we could we would only spend the dollars that we had to. In this case, there is some reduction, but it is not a very large reduction. The gross reduction was 35.8, of which \$19.3 thousand was a reduction in training programs, which we felt were no longer vital or absolutely necessary. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the anxiety of the honourable member is not very well-founded.

In respect to our activities regarding enforcement, there are a number of charges that are now before the courts and the honourable member mentioned them and I would like to put it on the record. I think there is no problem with my putting this on the record.

There are a number of charges: 10 felony charges that have been laid by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service resulting from the co-ordinated activity of our branch with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; 38 indictable offences; 7 further felony charges against a company, Rainy Lake International; 38 State charges by the State of Minnesota; 10 felony charges against another individual - I should give these names. The first one was Brian Denchuk, the company was Rainy Lake International, and the third person I referred to was a Colin MacKay.

There is a total of 112 charges that have been laid. This was an extensive amount of work and notwithstanding the difficulty in investigation, the department has done - and I want to commend them - an excellent job in getting these charges before the courts.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, that doesn't take away from the fact that in Field Services and Enforcement we are facing no increase in budget; and a decrease in Other Expenditures. At a time when the government generally is spending 18 percent more, this Minister - and quite correctly I might add - has brought to the attention of all members of the House the serious problems that the department is facing with respect to illegal taking of game and fish. By his own admission, if I want to go back and read Hansard back to him, he indicates that we are probably only scratching the surface or tip of the iceberg.

Certainly there are suggestions that in the amount of bootlegged fish that can be reported, that it is possibly much higher. I can't find any other better way to register our opposition to the inadequacy of this appropriation by asking the Chairman to call a vote.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I would also like to indicate the enforcement statistics for the current period. The total occurrences in 1982-83, 8,520; total occurrences in the period April 1st to May 4th, 1983, 354; of that total of 8,520, 2,861 were nuisance wildlife occurrences; total prosecutions in 1982-83 were 2,289; and total prosecutions between April 1st to May 4th, 1983, 101.

Mr. Chairman, the Department hasn't been slow in dealing with these things. I think the level of activity, unfortunately, is high. I say unfortunately because they involve prosecutions, but I don't think that we have been neglecting the work that has to be done.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, it is not a question of the Department not carrying out their duties as best they can with the resources they have. It is a question of this Minister, around that Cabinet table, getting the necessary resources to run this Department properly. That is what we are talking about and that's what we want to vote against, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As many as are in favour of passing 12.(j)(1), say aye; as many as are opposed say nay. The ayes have it.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hand vote.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Hand vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All in favour, raise your right hand.

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

MR. D. ORCHARD: Oh, no, why don't you go back to B.C.

MR. CHAIRMAN: State your point of order, please, the Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, we are carrying on with an awkward practice if we allow count-outs in a section of a committee, when the committee only sits as a section. If there is a request for a count, that's a request for yeas and nays, which requires the sounding of the buzzers and a division.

MR. H. ENNS: The same point of order, Mr. Chairman. It's not a request for yeas and nays; it's a question for a simple hand vote in the committee. It can be done and has been done before.

MR. A. ANSTETT: To the same point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The same point of order, the Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: I agree that it has been done and it has been improper every time. I therefore request yeas and nays. I hope I have support for this.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Has he got support, Mr. Chairman? — (Interjection) — You guys are goofy! You have got us out-voted, you just won it down 7 to 5.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. H. ENNS: I wonder, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do we want to facilitate the proceedings of this House? The ayes have it and we can stop this.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I sense some hesitation on the part of the Chair and on the part of the Clerk advising the Chair. It is my understanding that a simple vote in committee is not out of order. We are not requesting yeas and nays, which is a recorded vote, where the individual members are polled and named. I am not asking for a recorded vote. I am asking for a vote on this particular appropriation in the manner we just had.

That to my best recollection has taken place in the committees on previous occasions without the dire consequences that the honourable member refers to, bearing in mind that members of the opposition can in no way increase appropriations being asked for, we don't have that authority. We can only show our displeasure by asking an item to be deleted. We are not even asking that it be deleted, we are simply expressing a displeasure at the amount being shown.

Speaking for the opposition, and you have your numbers here, we simply want that recorded with a hand vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the Member for Lakeside, yeas and nays in Committee of Supply is not a request for the naming of individual members, it is a request for a count-out, just as was requested in this committee, but this committee is only a section of the whole Committee of Supply. What has been done in the past and was done throughout the '70s, when this practice of split Committees of Supply was first established, was for the buzzers to be sounded, members to assemble in the Chamber, where the count-out was conducted if that committee was also sitting. It is a count-out with the Clerk counting, not naming the members who support the motion in committee. That's a standard count-out in any committee. I submit that where we have had a count-out and a split committee before, it was irregular and improper. The Rules Committee ruled on that question in 1975 or '76 and agreed that a split Committee of Supply could not have count-outs for one very simple reason; that majorities could be moved back and forth from various sections of a split committee.

Our Rules Committee reports are fairly clear on it, but our Rules specifically are silent on it and I am concerned about us continuing to indulge in a practice that could lead - I say it quite bluntly, my reason for raising this point - to the defeat of a government motion in a split committee, which would then have to go to the full committee to be turned around. That's an embarrassment to the government, and even though

there's a government majority here tonight, there might not be tomorrow night or next week and I don't think the government should be put in that position repeatedly where those majorities could be moved from section to section. That's why I raise the point. I don't think there's any argument, in terms of past Rules Committee consideration, against it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Springfield would have to withdraw his request for the counted vote in the House before the request of the Member for Lakeside would be able to be dealt with. Other than that, as I understand this committee, the Member for Springfield has called for a vote in the House and at this point, we have no other alternative but to proceed. It's not a debatable motion. I can see no other alternative but for him to withdraw that motion and for us to have the counted vote here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, one of the problems is that when a bureaucrat becomes a politician, we get into these areas. The point I wanted to make, as far as I'm concerned, has been made. We register our strongest objection to this appropriation in its present form. We've indicated by a voice vote that we're opposed to it and I'm prepared to leave it at that and withdraw my request for a hand vote, if that satisfies the Honourable Member for Springfield, but it will not satisfy the people of Manitoba, Mr. Chairman. They want some protection out there; they want some enforcement out there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, I'll withdraw my request for yeas and nays.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 12.(j)(1) is then passed by a voice vote; 12.(j)(2) - the Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: On Fire Suppression, can the Minister give us an update about the current fire situation. I appreciate the fact that in Northern Manitoba, particularly, we've had more snow cover and more moisture than in other years and subsequently have been fortunate in not having as serious a fire problem as we've had in some other years. But the committee would appreciate an updating of the fire suppression activities of the department at this point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to indicate that last year we had a total of 425 fires; to this date last year, we had a total of 79 fires; to this date this year, we've had a total of 72. I might say that I have recently had occasion to look at the results of the effectiveness of our water bombing in arresting fire development. We've had two fires in the Whiteshell this month, an area that is of course prime forest, but it is a prime recreation area as well, and the use of the

water bombers has been very effective in arresting or holding the fires so that they could be put out in a relatively short time.

The department has completed arrangements in respect to the engagement of equipment and I think they're in a high state of readiness. I don't doubt, providing we have a reasonable fire period, that we can expect that with the kind of attack crews we now have, the incidence of significant loss can be reduced. That is not to say that we can't have another major fire, but we have spent a good deal of time, effort and money in increasing our readiness to deal with fires. We have lightning arresters now positioned throughout the province to confirm lightning strikes so that we're better ready and equipped to deal with those incidents. We have seven commercial suppression aircraft contracts completed.

If the members want further detail of all of that, Mr. Nespor is pointing out to me that we have 24 Firetac crews distributed throughout the province in high-risk areas. We're in a good state of readiness.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 12.(k)(1)—pass; 12.(k)(2)—pass; 12.(m)(1)—pass; 12.(m)(2)—pass; 12.(m)(3)—pass.

Resolution No. 127: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty, a sum not exceeding \$20,469,600 for Natural Resources for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984—pass.

We are now in 13.(a)(b)(c)(d) - Expenditures Related to Capital Assets.

The Honourable Minister.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I wonder, before we start, if we could have distribution of the material that we have here.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, A. Anstett: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: I suppose, perhaps, the easiest way to start consideration of this most important aspect of the Minister's spending estimates is, when you consider that in the year just passing we spent some \$17,943,500 on this item of Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets and are intending to spend some \$11,386,100 this year, a reduction of over \$6 million. So, the easiest way to start discussion on this is, what has been cancelled as a result of the \$6 million reduction? Can the Minister - not to the penny, Mr. Chairman, I'm reasonable - but can the Minister indicate to us some of the major projects that obviously are being deferred, that had been on the planning stage for which, in the case of a drain, perhaps right-of-way had been purchased, or design work had been completed, can the Minister indicate some of the major projects that are being deferred?

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's difficult to give immediate precision to the honourable member's request - oh, wait a minute, he's not here.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Just carry on. We are prepared to carry on. It goes on the record, if you didn't know it.

HON. A. MACKLING: No, but I'd rather not repeat it, and I think I'd like the honourable member . . .

MR. D. SCOTT: He was more interested in coffee.

HON. A. MACKLING: No, no, come on now.

MR. D. SCOTT: He could have sent somebody else.

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I noticed that there is nothing under the Water Resources Capital Expenditures which relates to the flood protection project at the Town of Carman, and I'd like to ask the Minister that since that project the diversion around Carman was the No. 1 water-related project in the government's "wish list," did that indicate its priority to be the first one funded should the Federal Government participate in any funding?

HON. A. MACKLING: No, Mr. Chairman. What it did reflect was that the position that this government took that there were a number of capital projects, which we, quite frankly, couldn't conceive of pursuing in the very near future because of the dollars involved and the type of fiscal position of the province, and given the broad general indication that the Federal Government had provided that they would look at capital projects generally, we did want to have a spectrum of capital projects from which they could choose. So, we did add in two water-related projects that we thought might be of interest to them and we haven't certainly had any confirmation yet as to the Federal Government's desires there.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Then do I assume from what the Minister is saying that the diversion at Carman has no status in the provincial priority list unless there is federal participation?

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't want any particular conclusion to be drawn from the fact that it is not included on a priority list. All of the water-related concerns have to be looked at on their merits. At the present time, that project is not on our list for implementation now, or in the very near future.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the Minister was kind enough to come out to the R.M. of Thompson last fall and tour a project that was being studied for water retention in the escarpment within the R.M. of Thompson, and I think it's fair to say that the Minister was reasonably impressed with the kind of direction they were proposing to take. Can I ask the Minister if the provincial department has any active participation in the ongoing study there with PFRA?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member is quite correct, there is a study under way by PFRA. We do have staff assisting. The main staff are funded by PFRA. The report has not been received yet in connection with that study.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Now, could the Minister indicate whether the type of project envisioned would fall within the capital projects that the province might be willing to cost share with the Federal Government, because

I believe PFRA is looking at it from the standpoint of placing capital dollars? Would the province be willing to cost share with PFRA?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't want to really comment by way of any speculative assessment of what the report will be. We would certainly want to look at the benefit cost ratios, see what the Federal Government is prepared to fund before we would consider our decision. There's also the social environmental impacts of the development. It's something that - well, you don't make a snap decision, nor do you speculate on what decision you're going to make until you have the study.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, that's interesting, Mr. Chairman. I think the study will prove long-term benefit; there's no question about that.

Mr. Chairman, on another area, are there any ongoing discussions, studies, or plans on the Pembilier or Pembina Dam proposals on the Pembina River?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I believe that earlier when we were in the Estimates of our Water Resources Division, I had indicated that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers had completed their preliminary report. We haven't seen that, although we understand that it's a relatively negative report and the final report will be submitted to the Bureau of Reclamation, presumably, or the Corps of Army Engineers gets the final report. But from what we're given to understand, while at the outset they were optimistic as to the cost benefit ratio, that doesn't appear to be the case now. Now it may be that the waiting on some things has varied, I don't know, but it doesn't sound very optimistic.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Did the province have any participation in the Corps of Engineers' Study?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, we worked with the Corps in respect to an evaluation of the benefits in Canada and provided that input. That's pretty well the extent of our contribution.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Now I noticed that there is no capital expenditure at Pelican Lake. There was, I recall, some scheduled improvements at the east end of the lake which would allow transfers of water in the spring. I don't see any continuation of that project. Is it fair to assume that that's one of the projects that has been pulled by the Minister?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, that project I don't think had ever been provided an appropriation of money. I stand corrected on that, Mr. Chairman. I am partly correct. Last year, we did not have funds. Apparently there were funds in 1981 on that item. We didn't have it last year. I have had several meetings with municipal officials and others concerned about Pelican Lake. I have made it clear that as a prerequisite to consideration for government funding for that project, that we would want to see some significant measure of local contribution. I think there is a measure of support for that, but it's been difficult for us to pin down the extent to which the municipalities are prepared

to provide equipment or provide a portion of the work to be done and have it completed. We want to have some specific identification of what the R.M.s are prepared to do before we consider what the province might fund.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, that's very interesting, Mr. Chairman, that funds were available in 1981, and obviously not expended, weren't carried forward in last year's Budget and don't appear again this year. It's also interesting to note that the Minister now sees a possibility existing from municipal participation. I can say to the Minister that probably he's correct. There might be a willingness of the municipalities to participate to get something done, but it's a willingness that is only stemmed from pure desperation, because the Minister has pulled the funds that were allocated and carried over and pulled them and put them elsewhere and not proceeded with any expenditure whatsoever, so that the Minister may well be correct.

But simply pointing out the willingness does not explain the reason for the willingness, and I suggest the reason for the willingness of the municipalities to all of a sudden start joint funding - a provincial responsibility - is from pure desperation. They want to get something done there; they can see that this government is not at all interested in anything south of No. 1 Highway in terms of recreation facilities and, naturally, they may be open to the suggestion of a jointly funded project with them picking up part of the bill.

I just have to register with the Minister my dismay that he has seen fit to pull that project. Last year might have been excusable in terms of rearranging his priority, but to leave it out again this year clearly indicates that the Minister has no intention of doing anything there. It's further more clearly indicated he doesn't want to do anything to assist the recreation potential of Pelican Lake by the fact that now he's talking about a joint project involving municipal funding.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to engage in any vituperative debate with the honourable member. I'm going to put on the record the fact that the concerns about Pelican Lake have been of long standing. Governments of the past have had money on the books and haven't spent it. Opportunities existed over the course of many years to deal with this problem, and the fact that it hasn't been dealt with up until now does reflect, I suppose, on many people and on a number of administrations. I'm not going to criticize anyone for a quick solution of the problem there.

I know that lake has a checkered history. It is a history of flooding; of complaints by cottagers of high water; demands for lower water; concerns about the need for more water. It has a history of flooding and low level or very low conditions on that lake.

At the present time, because of the weather pattern and the relative low precipitation levels in southwestern Manitoba, the lake is admittedly low and there's concern about getting more water in the lake, and that's a valid concern; but my staff indicate to me there isn't an easy cheap solution to it. To do it right, one would have to provide not only an introduction of water from the

Pembina River, but a control mechanism to ensure that high water could be released from the lake, so that we wouldn't be involved in a situation where we get flooding again and innumerable complaints from the cottage owners to the reverse of what we have now.

One of the concerns we've had is that if we engage in any work, in addition to getting some municipal contribution, because the work is largely to the benefit of the recreation interest there, the cottagers, we would like to see some significant local input, and we'd like to see some clear commitment on the part of the cottagers that they would waive claims in the event that by introduction of more water and unusual buildup of rain, or whatever, that high water level would occasion some flooding. We don't want to be involved in being damned, Mr. Chairman, both ways on this, and it's not been an easy one. I've spent a lot of time meeting with people; I've met with representatives of the R.M.s in Morden, and we are genuinely concerned to be able to provide a long-term solution there, but we do want to see some significant local contribution and we want to see a significant commitment on the part of the cottage owners to hold government blameless for our efforts if we should decide to go ahead with remedial action there.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, those are all very brave words from the Minister, and I appreciate all of the discussions he's had with people, the cottage owners, municipal people, etc., out there. He mentions the complexity of resolving the problem, and how there may be some expense involved.

Well, I can assure the Minister that when he has pulled the funding that was available to divert water from the Pembina to the Lake, that inaction certainly is going to do nothing to even partially resolve the problem at Pelican Lake. The Minister, no doubt, will have several other meetings and several other requests for action, and I would only hope that when we are at this stage of the Estimates next year, that we might see some of those efforts on behalf of the municipal people, and the landowners, cottage owners, bear fruition with some action on the part of the Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Member for Lakeside had asked some questions dealing with those projects that had been deleted from the capital program for the Department of Natural Resources and Water Resources, and I probably maybe would have been more fair to allow the Minister to respond, but as I sit here and listen and look at the maps and the proposals that are put forward by the Department of Water Resources and the present government, I become totally disgusted to the point of which one would look at the map and remember some of the comments that were made probably three or four years ago when reference was made to some of the roads that were not being looked after in Manitoba by our government, which was the reverse, where there was attention paid to rural Manitoba and the development that was taking place with the infrastructure.

We are now seeing the reverse, Mr. Chairman, where we have a government and a Water Resource

Department that have cut some \$6 million out of their water program for the development of drains or dams or that type of thing, and if you look at that, and I would invite anybody that's at this committee meeting to look at the kinds of projects and where they are located.

Mr. Chairman, this is a disgrace, and I'm not attacking the staff of the Department of Water Resources because they know precisely some of the critical areas that should be dealt with, but we are dealing with, I think, people who pay their taxes, they are legitimate Manitobans and they feel very strongly as a part of the Province of Manitoba, but being politically ignored and not being dealt with fairly by a government who pretend to be a government of the people of all the Province of Manitoba.

I am disgusted, Mr. Chairman, with this kind of proposal. I could name projects throughout the entire Province of Manitoba that could be dealt with. The Member for Pembina makes reference to the one at Pelican Lake, but you can go from the Souris Valley straight up to Swan River with projects and water resource development and the ponding of water so as you don't have the problems that are taking place in the lower watershed of the Hudson's Bay and in the Winnipeg and all these watershed areas.

Mr. Chairman, this Minister, who sits around the Cabinet Table of the Pawley Government, isn't even recognized as was the Minister of Highways, as was the Minister of Agriculture. He makes light of it. This is not a light situation, Mr. Chairman. This is a situation of resource development in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Inkster is laughing and some of the members are taking it seriously, and I hoped they would, but the Member for Inkster is laughing at the fact that they have stripped the resource development budget of the Department of Water Resources, and I'm pleading for the staff of the Water Resource Branch, because they are going to be like the Department of Highways. They're going to have to hide and find something to do, because they're going to be paid 27.5 percent wage increase over the next 30 months, and what are they going to do with their time? The agreement that was recently signed between the MGEA and the Government of Manitoba, they have a 27.5 percent increase, and what are they going to do?

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that this Minister of Natural Resources may as well save the additional \$11 million and hire someone at \$50,000 a year to dust off the water resource studies that have been put in place over the last few years, because that's precisely all the action that's going to take place, is a dusting off of reports and looking at those things that should be done. He doesn't need to fool the rural constituents of Manitoba that he's going to do something.

What is he doing, Mr. Chairman? His first proposal is, and I refer to the Hartney Dam situation, he says he will put a drain around it if the municipality pick up the maintenance of that drain. He's telling the people of the Constituency of Carman if they participate in the expenditure of that capital expenditure, then they can proceed with it. He is transferring the responsibility of what has been traditionally the provincial responsibility and the taxpayers of Manitoba's responsibility to the local taxpayers. That is all he is

doing, is a transfer. He is not doing anything to further enhance the water supply or the water management within the Province of Manitoba.

Let's make special reference to the Saskeram area. You know, there's a tip of the hat to the Member for The Pas - No. 16, you go to Swan River. The rest of them are either in NDP territory or they're within one-half an hour or one hour's driving distance for the staff within the City of Winnipeg. There's not one project for the majority of the people of Manitoba who are affected by water in this province.

It's a disgusting disgrace, and if Howard Pawley and Al Mackling and any of you other people screw up your courage to come out and talk to the municipal councils and try and handhold that you're doing something for them, then I'll let you know where you stand, because you are a disgusting disgrace to try and tell us that you're doing anything. I'll make sure that you, Al Mackling, and you and everyone of you won't return to the office of government again because you don't deserve the credits that go with it, because you can't justify the dollars you're spending as it is.

Mr. Chairman, I rest my case.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to sink to the level of the Honourable Member for Arthur in the kind of rash angry statements that he makes.

MR. J. DOWNEY: You haven't heard the end of me yet.

HON. A. MACKLING: He uses a lot of inaccuracy in his contribution. He says, for example, that civil servants, including some of those . . .

MR. J. DOWNEY: I didn't attack the civil servants.

HON. A. MACKLING: . . . are going to get a 27 percent increase in the next 30 months. Continues to not merely obfuscate, but to distort a voluntary reduction on the part of the civil servants in this province to enable this province to deal with the real problem of jobs in this country, in this province.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member slaps the counter and talks about the map. Well, we'll look at the map. Out of the 17 projects on the map, nine of them, nine of them, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. J. DOWNEY: Within a half an hour of Winnipeg.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, they're certainly south of No. 1 Highway.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Don't give me that.

HON. A. MACKLING: We've heard honourable members from the opposition crowing and decrying that nothing takes place south of No. 1 Highway. Count them.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I didn't say that.

HON. A. MACKLING: Oh, but your colleagues have said that then. You didn't say that tonight, but your colleagues have said that, that we don't know of anything south of the No. 1 Highway.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I didn't say that.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, your colleagues have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Arthur has a point of order.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I did not make reference to south of No. 1 Highway. I made reference to the major rural parts of the province that lie within or that extend more than a half-an-hour's drive from the City of Winnipeg, Mr. Chairman.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I didn't say that he said it, but I know that members of his caucus, colleagues of his around this table have accused this Minister and others of ignoring anything south of No. 1 Highway. You look at the map and that statement is false, Mr. Chairman.

Now, Mr. Chairman, all of us have to face budget constraints, problems of trying to establish our priorities, but we have to face the realities of costs.

The honourable member wants us to spend money, but when we indicate that we have to raise taxes he attacks us on that score. You can't have it both ways. We have to realistically look at the money we have and determine our spending priorities. We think we've done a creditable job in respect to facing that problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It's interesting to see the Minister and hear the Minister now say you can't have it both ways. That you can't spend money and you can't complain about taxes too.

I don't recall that the New Democratic Party said during the election that they were going to be constrained by money not being available. That wasn't part of their platform. As a matter of fact, they told the people that they'd be able to pay for services through ManOil and Manitoba Hydro. That was the way they were going to finance it and there was never any indication that it wouldn't be possible to continue to carry on the services and indeed to expand the services that government had. So all that we're asking for is that the government simply fulfill its promises.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to return to the Pelican Lake situation again. The Minister said that other governments have had opportunities to have done something about that. I would like to tell the Minister that project had been planned for some period of time. It had reached the point in the fall of 1981 where I was told by staff that we could have let some of the contracts at that time to begin work on it, but that it wouldn't be possible to let the entire project because some land had not yet been acquired. But I was assured that the contracts would be let in the spring, just as other people in the area were assured that contracts would be let in the spring. That project had proceeded to that point.

What this Minister has done is put a stop to it. Plain and simple this Minister has put a stop to it.

MR. D. SCOTT: That's a pile of crap.

MR. B. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Inkster says that's a pile of crap. I'd like to ask the Minister then to confirm with his staff that this project had reached the point, in the fall of 1981, where portions of it could have been let for contract and that the remainder was to be let for contract in the spring of 1982.

MR. D. SCOTT: It wasn't, it was an election pork barrel.

MR. B. RANSOM: Why don't you shut up?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Just to think we used to have Sid Green in here with some intelligence and we got a dummy like you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, there's no question but this matter was obviously a matter of concern to the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, I believe in whose constituency Pelican Lake resides. He, as Minister of Natural Resources, I am sure, gave a high priority to this item, but notwithstanding that, it was in the fourth year of the term when materials were finally readied for this project, but necessary land acquisitions had not been completed. We were not in a position to complete the project because all the items had not been completed, particularly the land acquisition.

MR. B. RANSOM: Can the Minister confirm then, by consulting with his staff, that the problems with land acquisition were some that staff thought had been taken care of earlier, but it found on looking further into the situation that a problem dated back for decades and that was the reason why there was some further delay?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that there was one longstanding problem, but that there were two relatively new acquisitions that were necessary.

MR. B. RANSOM: The Minister said that some materials had finally been acquired, or materials were finally ready. Can the Minister tell us how much material had been acquired for this project?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the culverts and sheet piling were on order for the project.

MR. B. RANSOM: What happened to the order? Did the Minister have it cancelled?

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, the materials were used in other ongoing projects. We didn't waste them.

MR. B. RANSOM: So what we have here, Mr. Chairman, and I don't know why the Minister doesn't just simply acknowledge that that's the case, what we have here is a problem at Pelican Lake, a lake where there are

hundreds and hundreds of cottages located. There are a great many people have an interest in that lake. A project had been planned and the position had been arrived at where we were ready to let contracts; people had every expectation that project was going to go ahead; and the Minister cancelled it. That's all. There's no reason why he shouldn't just simply admit that's what he did. He cancelled the project and what he's done is - take a project like Lake Dauphin and put it onto the Jobs list. He didn't even put this project onto the Jobs list, onto the "wish list." If he wanted this project to go ahead, why didn't he at least include it on that list?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I have indicated - I don't know whether the honourable member did hear my earlier remarks, because the Honourable Member for Pembina did address to me concerns in respect to this. I pointed out in looking at the project, there was no question but there was a desire on the part of a number of people, particularly the cottagers for higher water levels. At the same token, the lake had been subjected to excessively high water levels at one time and we had complaints from the cottagers that they were being flooded. We know that the precipitation in the area has been, in the last five, six years, much reduced, so there is less water in the area. We are confident that at one time we are going to see a return of higher water levels. We want to be assured that we're not going to be involved in any claims from the cottagers in respect to these proposed works. It is my belief that the cottagers and the municipalities should have some input into - and I'm talking about fiscal input - the kind of spending that they seek from the province here.

MR. B. RANSOM: Is the Minister now telling us that one of the reasons he cancelled this project was because of concern over high water levels?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I did not cancel the project per se. The project was allowed to lapse really. It had not been completed. It hadn't been started. Certainly a number of factors were of concern. The fact that there were a large number of people who had previously complained about high water levels, had even brought claims, I believe, against the Provincial Government in connection with them. Now we're seeking a significant public contribution to a recreational benefit.

Quite frankly, we wanted to see a contribution, as I've indicated, from the R.M.'s and from the cottagers and a greater sense of participation on their part in respect to the size of this funding. We still do.

MR. B. RANSOM: Well, is one of the reasons then why the Minister allowed the project to lapse, as he puts it, because of a concern for high water?

HON. A. MACKLING: No, Mr. Chairman. If the project had been completed to provide for a regulation, both in and out of the water, we were quite confident from an engineering point of view that the problems of high water would not likely face us. But we did want to see input from the area.

MR. B. RANSOM: Can the Minister confirm that is the way the project was planned, to have both an inlet and an outlet, because we were not prepared to proceed to put more water into the lake, without having some provision to take it out?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. B. RANSOM: Then what's the nonsense about high water that we're hearing from the Minister? Is this some vindictive action that he's taken against some of the people who were on the lake before and caused problems for the government? He said he had two reasons. One was he wanted local input and the other was that he had concern over high water. Now he's admitted there wouldn't be any concern over high water with the kind of plan that was in place.

What the Minister has done, clearly, Mr. Chairman, is decide that he was going to cancel this project, period, and he can say he let it lapse, if he wants to say that he didn't cancel it, that he simply let the funds lapse - fine. He can go out and tell the people that at Ninette that, I really didn't cancel that project. All I did was let it lapse and there's quite a difference. I'm sure the people will be very sensitive to that difference. What he's done is simply decide that he didn't want it to go ahead and he's cancelled it - the materials that were to be used in the project are going somewhere else and what he's doing is looking at projects of a similar nature in other areas, such as the project he has on the "Wish" List for Lake Dauphin.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member can categorize my actions any way he sees fit. I will not characterize his actions and be critical of them. He had an opportunity when he was Minister; he was in government for four years; this project was in his constituency; there had been a history of this problem for some time. Now to suggest that because I, as Minister, and my government feel that there should be some measure of local input into a considerable government spending for recreational purposes in that area is irregular or improper, or somehow wrong, I don't accept that.

We know, for example, Mr. Chairman, that previous governments and this government and the Federal Government have insisted on contributions from local government in connection with improvement in water services, improvements in protection from floods. Now to suggest that our request for some input and some measurable input is demanding too much, I think, Mr. Chairman, is being overly critical and he can do it, but I do not accept it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I just want to interject that, first of all, to put it on the record that I, in fact, was the last Minister responsible for previous administration. I want to indicate to the honourable member and put it on the record - something that shouldn't escape this Minister - that there was an eight-year NDP administration prior to that brief four-year administration that the Member for Turtle Mountain and I had something to do, to address this problem.

That we, in fact had those kind of meetings bringing about and asking for local input. We didn't just plan moving water in and out of a lake, without discussing it with the area residents. Those discussions took place; a plan was drawn up and it was a good plan; and it's now acknowledged by the Minister that that plan would not present difficulties for the lake inasmuch as that the branch would be able to regulate the levels of that lake and avoid some of the difficulties that the Minister keeps referring to. So, Mr. Chairman, let's just put that on the record that it took those three or four years for us to put that in place and get it to the point where, in fact, contracts could be let. This Minister chose to cancel the project.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: What this Minister is saying, Mr. Chairman, that we didn't do it in four years, what he is telling us, is that we should have cancelled the commitments that the previous government had made. We should have pulled the funding from the commitments that the Schreyer Government made, in order to get on with other projects that we might have seen of a higher order and that isn't what we did, Mr. Chairman. What we did was carry on to the extent of the funding that was available with the projects that were on the books. That's what we did, Mr. Chairman, and then we planned, in an orderly fashion, to undertake this particular development.

But what we are getting from this Minister is cancellation of a project such as this. He moves in on a federal-provincial agreement in the Domain area and decides unilaterally to cancel that agreement because he doesn't happen to like the way that one was worked out and the fact that it might benefit some people. He wouldn't cancel the Abitibi agreement, though. He stands here very piously and says he regards commitments and agreements to be something that have to be recognized by the government.

So, Mr. Chairman, what we have with this Minister is that whatever the opportunity is at the time, whatever happens to suit him, then that's the decision he makes and he'll worry about justifying it later.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 13.(a) . . .

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I have one particular question having to do with the clean-up operation on the upper Sturgeon Creek, is it?

HON. A. MACKLING: East branch.

MR. H. ENNS: East branch, a figure for \$35,000.00. I understand that's been outstanding for some time. Can the Minister indicate to me what the difficulty is? It's not a large amount; it's the final clean-up of that east branch of the Sturgeon Creek. Work apparently is done, the clean-up project may require some additional work. I note that Highways has done some work in that general area and there may be some minor work that has to be continued, but the explanation for the outstanding amount of \$35,000 final payment of hold back to contractor, what precisely is the problem that's holding back this \$35,000 from the contractor involved?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'm given to understand there is some disagreement on the part of the department and the contractor as to the requirements of the contract, and I wouldn't want to put on the record any speculation as to that because it may involve a dispute that will be the basis of a legal claim; I'm not sure. I gather that there is a difference of opinion as to the quality of the work or the specification of the work to be performed and that's the reason for the hold back.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, it's a long way; it's a long time. Among the items, Mr. Chairman, that I assume have been deleted in the \$6 million to \$7 million reduction, is there any consideration for anything to be done in the Dennis Lake area in the central Interlake area? The Minister should be familiar with that situation. Again, I'm not suggesting that we were to the point of letting contracts, but certainly we were getting much closer to resolving that long-standing issue at Dennis Lake. Have we gone back to square one at Dennis Lake?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'm happy that the honourable member has asked me about that. I would not concur with him that any significant progress had been made on this prior to my becoming Minister. That certainly is not what was indicated to me when the group attended at my office and the honourable member himself attended with them, and I was pleased to have the first introduction to that problem that had been long standing for, well, in excess of 20 years.

I did visit out there with the regional engineer. I did meet municipal officials out there; toured the area. We have under active consideration some proposals for works and I hope that later on I'll be able to confirm those to the honourable member.

I would point out to the Honourable Member for Arthur that that happens to be not in St. James Constituency.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, but in the Capital Works Project currently before us, there is no appropriation for Dennis Lake?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, although there are no funds earmarked there, it is my expectation that funds will be available under the appropriation of the Jobs Fund.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, there's been a very significant reduction in the amount of capital that is available in the department now. Can the Minister give us an indication of what sort of reduction in staffing there has been as a consequence of this cut in available capital?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, earlier in Engineering and Construction, I had indicated that there was a reduction of 14 staff years and I can review the highlights of that with the honourable member, should he wish. They were positions that were vacant, but if the level of the department's activity had required it, would have been filled.

MR. B. RANSOM: Is the Minister saying then that we have this year an \$11 million capital program, last year we had almost an \$18 million program, and the same staff is required to carry out the \$11 million program that was required to do the \$18 million?

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I beg your pardon; someone asked me another question. I'll deal with the first question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question on the floor, not the informal one.

HON. A. MACKLING: The capital spending, although it's in the book at \$11,386,100, has to have added to it those works that have been allocated and earmarked for spending under the Jobs Fund, and there is \$2.7 million of works there in which we will find some spending. I don't have the figures here. I won't deal with the dollar amounts. One of the items is Dennis Lake as I've indicated.

MR. B. RANSOM: Well, which projects under the Jobs Fund will go ahead then to make use of the staff which was available to carry out an \$18 million program last year?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, there are parks initiatives; there are initiatives in respect to forestry nurseries; there is the initiative in respect to Dennis Lake; and there is the spending in connection with the valley town dikes.

MR. B. RANSOM: When are those projects going to begin?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, they are scheduled to certainly proceed during the course of this fiscal year. I can't give exact dates for start-up on some of these things. I think some of them may already be certainly in the work. The nurseries' spending is already in the work; and park initiatives, some of that is already in the work.

MR. B. RANSOM: What are these people doing now?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I don't understand the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What are these staff doing now?

MR. B. RANSOM: Right. Well put.

MR. J. DOWNEY: A good question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. D. ORCHARD: That is rather a simple and direct question.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, we have a broad variety of program involving all of the 17 projects that are listed here. We have a great diversity of work in connection with conservation districts, municipal work programs that we co-ordinate and assist; all manner of things, Mr. Chairman.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, has the Minister overstaffed in the department as a consequence of this cut in capital, or are the jobs so-called created in the Jobs Fund simply a transfer of jobs from his department into the Jobs Fund?

HON. A. MACKLING: I don't believe so, Mr. Chairman.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, what do you believe?

MR. B. RANSOM: Well, which is it, Mr. Chairman? There has to be one or the other.

There's a reduction of over \$7 million of capital. The department had staff last year to carry out an \$18 million capital program. Now the Minister says that he's not going to be overstaffed this year, and the reason he's not going to be overstaffed is that they're going to be working on projects that are in the Jobs Fund.

Now the Jobs Fund was created to create jobs, new jobs, that was the big impetus that the government was undertaking. Now either the Minister is overstaffed, he's either overstaffed in his department, or else the jobs and the work that is being done under the Jobs Fund are not new jobs at all.

So I would like some indication from the Minister as to just which of those situations prevails, and if not then I would like some more specific answer from the Minister rather than the generalities that we have been getting.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I had taken it as a given that all honourable members appreciated the fact that the government doesn't do all this work themselves. Our staff, our engineering construction, are not going to be doing all of the work involved in any one of the items that I've referred to. In respect to the development of the plans, the programs, the specifications, all of our staff is required in respect to development of the plan of the program, but when we come to spend the dollars to get the work done, we are not going to hire the staff to do that in House. Those people will be hired, and employed by general contractors who will bid for these various job initiatives. So to suggest that, you know, we've got surplus staff; we have staff and that is how government is operated from time immemorial. The major projects we put out for tender. We haven't changed anything.

We still need staff to develop the proposal, design the structure where there's a structure involved and supervise all that. We have no change in that policy or program. So to suggest that, you know, there's some mixup, some misunderstanding about jobs is completely ridiculous.

MR. B. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Chairman, what the Minister is telling us then that it takes the same amount of staff to design \$11 million worth of work as it does to design \$18 million worth of work, so presumably he can do \$30 million worth of work with the same amount of staff.

Now how many jobs are lost then by contractors? If there's \$7 million worth of work that's not being contracted out, there's \$7 million worth of work that contractors aren't doing and the people aren't being hired to do. So while that money is going into the Jobs

Fund to create jobs there, how many jobs are being lost by the contractors because they don't have this work to do anymore?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to indulge in the kind of idle speculation that the honourable member wants me to do. I point out to him that, I don't know why his arithmetic fails him, but he continues to refer to capital of 11.3 million. I've indicated that there's another 2.7 million. That makes a total of 14 million.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 13.(a).

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, another area that's been of constant concern to a particular group of farmers and that has to do with up north in The Pas area, the Pasquia area.

We were certainly under some strong representation over the years about some further development work in that area. I note some reference to Pasquia Polders I and II amounting to some \$160,000 for some land drainage reconstruction.

But, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is well aware that in his other capacity as the Minister responsible for Wildlife trying to resolve the issue of land use up there in the Saskeram, he's being pressured on the one hand to maintain optimum use for wildlife purposes within the Saskeram.

Would he not concur that development of, for instance, Polder III, which is a major project, estimated to be anywhere from \$10 million to \$12 million back three years ago or four years ago, that at least out of consideration to his Member for The Pas that some initiative be shown at Pasquia on Polder III?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I thank the honourable member for his question. I would like to comment on that. But first let me put on the record as well that the fact of our spending last year was, although we had voted \$17 million, almost \$18 million, the actual spending was \$12 million. So for the honourable members to appear emotional or excited about a \$14 million allocation budgeted spending as against 18, in actual fact our spending was 12.

Mr. Chairman, in respect to The Pas area and the Pasquia. True, the amount here is for reconstruction in Polders I and II. We are spending, and I don't know where this item is reflected, some \$50,000 on soil and ground water testing in Polder III to determine the suitability of part of Polder III for agricultural production. Hopefully those tests will confirm that there is a significant amount of land in Polder III that can be brought into agricultural production and we're certainly concerned to develop that if that's possible.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, in dealing Parks Capital Program. Can the Minister indicate just generally, how does this capital program in the Parks Division compare with say the previous year or two? Is it up or down, are we doing more or less?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, last year we had a voted authority of 3.8 actual spending. Mr. Chairman,

we had voted last year 3.8 million; it's 2.1 million say this year. That's the variation. The most significant reduction is in respect to infrastructure and improvements.

MR. H. ENNS: You're going to let the toilets fall down.

HON. A. MACKLING: But I would like to add the caveat that I'd indicated earlier - that \$800,000 is earmarked for work that will be job-intensive and allocated and spent out of the Jobs Fund.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. L. HYDE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm sorry, I stepped out of the committee for a moment or two there and I missed some maintenance. I trust that the Minister will accept me at this time.

I want to mention a few things about the Delta Beach, if I may. There's some 20 cottages on the new subdivision, the west subdivision on the west beach of Delta Beach. I've received complaints ranging from the high taxes that are assessed at this time, plus the shameful condition that the beach has been in the last two years, following the spring runoff that comes from the Portage Diversion. It just seems that the management is the big concern and I'm wondering if - well to start with, where the management, I think, of the maintenance on the Portage Diversion needs to be taken a good look at.

I mentioned it to you, Sir, one year ago, on your Estimates and made a suggestion to you that the practice that has been followed for a number of years, where the attempt is to - well, what they're doing or have been doing, is tramping down the reeds in the Diversion with a crawler tractor, flattening them down and then comes the spring runoff. What they do? With that rush of water, they end up out in Lake Manitoba and the rush of water just makes a circle and ends up back on the beaches in front of our cottages.

This last year it was a total mess. Now, I haven't seen the condition of the beach as of today, but I've been informed that it is even worse from the way it was a year ago, even to the point where we have today, logs, trees that have floated down that Diversion, due to the ice jam, I admit, due to the ice jam, and something had to be done there to allow the water flow, but the fact is, that there is a total mess out there and the cottage owners themselves just cannot deal with it. It has also been mentioned that there's even dead horses that landed up in there.

I trust that you, Mr. Minister, will see that this situation will be cleaned up because the cottage owners themselves, they just are telling me they cannot continue to afford to pay the taxes that they're being assessed today and try to clean up the mess that they have on the beaches.

I've been told, Mr. Minister that this last year there was a \$35,000 bill against the clean-up of that Diversion and the beach. I have no guarantee of that figure, anymore than I was informed of that. I trust that there's some truth in it. If that is the case, I suggest that a new look must be made on the way they're handling that situation out there.

It has been suggested that it would be well to start with the swathing of the reeds in the fall of the year,

in time that those leaves will be dry to the point where they can be windrowed out of that channel and burnt. And I, being a farmer, the background that I have - I can easily see that this could easily be the solution to the problem that we are faced with out there.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I guess our experience hasn't been all that commendable in respect to the clean-out of the channel. A different technique was tried last year. The reeds were cut. That didn't work and they tried to burn them, but the mess still was washed out on the beach. The previous technique of merely flattening them down seems to be the more effective way of dealing with it and we're thinking we go back that way again this year.

In respect to the clean-up, the honourable member is correct. It cost approximately \$35,000 last year. It's going to cost the taxpayers of Manitoba money again this year. However, the use of that Diversion channel has certainly assisted in water control and ice control on the Assiniboine River, so although it's expense, it's considered, I guess, to be well spent.

I might say that although normally ice doesn't go down that channel, it did this year in substantial volume and we're fortunate it did. Because if it hadn't, we had a peculiar ice buildup on the Assiniboine and we would have had perhaps much more serious consequences in respect to the City of Portage la Prairie, if the ice hadn't gone down that Diversion channel. It was not a typical ice problem on the Assiniboine River. We hope that we're not going to be faced with that again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 13.(a) - the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. L. HYDE: Mr. Minister, you no doubt, all right - you may have tried the new practice on that Diversion, but I still maintain to you, sir, that you possibly didn't finish your job. You may have mowed them. I'm not sure about that. You may have mowed them as you say, but I'm sure that they can be side delivered to the effect that they're out of that Diversion and up on top where they'll dry.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I think that I'm prepared to discuss with my staff the problem that's there. Maybe we can interest someone in taking contract to harvest those reeds or dispose of them somehow, because it seems to me, we've tried two different techniques. Neither of them have been particularly successful. The last one was worse than the first. We are open to offers in respect to that problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 13.(a)—pass; 13.(b)—pass; 13.(c)—pass; 13.(d)—pass.

Resolution 128: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$11,386,100 for Natural Resources for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984—pass.

We are going back to the Minister's Salary, 1.(a)(1) - the Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, Mr. Chairman, I didn't have the pleasure of sitting in

on a lot of the Estimates with the Minister here and finding out just what he is doing in the total department. But I think it's pretty clear from the discussion that I've been part of this evening, that the Minister is faced with the same kind of problem imposed on him by the urban Cabinet that his colleague, the Minister of Highways and Transportation was faced with, in that an urban Cabinet and an urban backbench has decided that the priorities of spending are certainly not in Capital works and infrastructure development outside of the City of Winnipeg. Hence his department, this Minister's department has suffered, as did the Minister of Highway's Department suffer in spending this year. It's unfortunate for rural Manitobans that this government has such a weak Minister who is ineffective around the Cabinet table in garnering dollars to carry on needed projects in terms of water resource development and water protection, flood protection and drainage in rural Manitoba. That is going to be a hallmark of this government; it's going to be what the people outside of the City of Winnipeg most remember this government for, that they cared not for infrastructure spending in rural Manitoba, in Highways and in Water Resources. That may be quite salable for a year or two in the City of Winnipeg by an urban Cabinet, an urban-oriented, an urban-influenced Cabinet, but even the people of Winnipeg are going to recognize the fallacy and the lack of wisdom and foresight that has been forced upon this Minister and his colleague, the Minister of Highways and Transportation, by the urban Cabinet in taking a substantial reduction in capital expenditures. I suppose that is a criticism that we're going to be able to level very easily at this Minister and this government

But the revelation tonight by the Minister of Natural Resources on his capital construction spending was truly damning of this government's policy direction.

We had the Minister of Finance in the Budget develop as the centrepiece for his Budget the \$200 million Jobs Fund. We did some quick calculations and we found, I believe, it's something like 18 million in new money in the Jobs Fund, the rest of it is carryover or reallocation from elsewhere, and we labelled it the "fraud fund". That's a name that will bear true because it is a fraud fun, but what the Minister told us tonight causes us to believe that it is a "double fraud fund", that not only is there not \$200 million worth of new money, as the Minister of Finance tried to mislead the people of Manitoba into believing when he introduced the Budget. Not only is there a fraud perpetrated by this government in terms of the dollars allocated, but we find out tonight that part of the new money is in projects which normally would appear as part of a line department, namely Item 13 in the Department of Natural Resources capital spending, some \$2.7 million.

So, we've got the first fraud in that the money is in there, and the second fraud that simply jobs that ordinarily would be undertaken in the Department of Natural Resources are now going to be undertaken in the Jobs Fund, which equates to no new jobs being created for those dollars being spent. Hence, the terminology, the "double fraud fund" by this government.

It's an incredible revelation, and the Minister tries to skate around the issue of what's being spent in terms of capital expenditures by his department this year and last year. You know, we've often thought of the Minister

of Finance as the main chef in this government, as the head book cooker, but we now know who his assistant chef is, it's the Minister of Natural Resources. He's the assistant book cooker with the kind of convoluted reasoning and arguments he gave us tonight to justify the vast, the huge, decrease in capital expenditure that he's had to take, because he had no clout around the Cabinet table.

So, Mr. Chairman, we have a great deal of difficulty in giving this Minister and this government very much credit in the Department of Natural Resources.

You know, Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate from your standpoint that you may not understand and recognize the value of the kinds of dollars that normally are spent on drain reconstruction, etc., in the Province of Manitoba, in this department, in the capital expenditures, but I want to tell you they're terribly important to the rural Manitoba people, to the farm community. To have this government go from almost \$18 million last year to just over \$11 million in any man's numbers is a full 50 percent reduction in their funding. You know, that's unacceptable.

The Minister can talk all he wants about how they have to repriorize funds and they have to be careful of the budget. That didn't stop a 19 percent increase in overall government spending, but it did give us a 50 percent decrease in capital spending in Natural Resources.

You know, the Minister is calling upon rural Manitobans, and the Minister of Finance is calling upon rural Manitobans to pay more than their fair share in taxes. They have no qualms in pushing to the limit tax collections in rural Manitoba, but they sure draw the line when it comes to replacing those tax collections with needed capital infrastructure spending in Highways, in Natural Resources, in drainage reconstruction, and water projects. No problem with the tax collections, but a big problem when it comes to that urban Cabinet in getting money allocated to where the tax collections are being made.

As I said, Mr. Chairman, that's a failing of the Minister of Highways, it's a failing of the Minister of Natural Resources, and it's the crowning failure of this government. This is a government without policy direction. The First Minister talks about maintenance of the infrastructure program and how that's the objective of this government. Well clearly, he isn't telling the truth when he says that, because in Highways, in here, the spending is down. There is no maintenance of the infrastructure. There is going to be a deterioration in Natural Resources, in the Water Resource Division, through the drains, through the Parks, all under the administration of this department. There's going to be a deterioration in the highway system, just the exact opposite of what the First Minister constantly says is happening. It is a failing of the government, it's a failing of some of the backbenchers who are from rural Manitoba, purport to represent rural constituencies, for them not voicing strong objection to this urban Cabinet when they propose massive reductions in spending like we've seen in Highways and in Natural Resources.

It's a failing that's going to come home to haunt them, Mr. Chairman, and I do not want to provide any good advice to this Minister or this government, but it's going to cause them to be a very short-lived

government in the Province of Manitoba. I look forward to the opportunity of kicking them out of office and replacing them with our party, our government, that's going to once again put emphasis where emphasis is due in Manitoba so that all Manitobans get a fair share of government spending and a fair share of the infrastructure that's needed to keep this province strong, growing and vibrant for the future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to speak to the Minister's Salary because I think there is every indication in the world that the Minister in his responsibilities dealing with the Resource Department that he deals with and dealing with the Water Resources and the whole broad range of responsibilities within the Cabinet has demonstrated, as has been pointed out through the process of the Estimates, that he has not stood up to protect: No. 1, the staff that work for him, because after all I think that most people within the Department of Natural Resources and most people who work for government want to feel that they're a productive part of what government is doing. — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, the Member for Springfield makes a comment that I suggested they were overpaid. I didn't, Mr. Chairman, hold that against the civil servants. I'm condemning the government who were prepared to be weak-kneed or to open an agreement that was not at the request of the employees, but the employer was out-snookeyed at their whole process of wage negotiation.

Don't hold it against the employees. But what I do feel sorry about is that the employees, I'm sure, would like to feel that they're productive in society. Really what they're going to do in the next year's time, with the amount of monies that have been made available, and the projects that they've had identified for them to proceed with, they're going to be set there in a neutral position. That to me is not, Mr. Chairman, playing a productive role in society.

You know, when you look at the little bits and pieces. For example, when you look at the western region, the southwestern region of the Province of Manitoba; \$132,000 spent on Spruce Woods Park; a little bit at Cornwallis Wayside Park, 5.5 million; a wayside park on Highway 34, 7,000.00; Camp Hughes gets \$6,000.00; Turtle Mountain gets their washrooms repaired, repair exterior walls to washroom. I asked the other night - I'll go through those too if he wants - but I asked the other night that the Minister consider the expanding of the government responsibility to look after a public beach on a lake in southwestern Manitoba, Lake Metigoshe, but they haven't got time to do that because that doesn't fit within his priority. I don't want to get into the details, I want to talk of the overall approach that this Minister is taking.

I have another thing that bothers me somewhat. I was not here when they dealt with Crown lands, Mr. Chairman, but I had received, as the Minister did, just recently from the municipality of Oakland - for many years they have leased a piece of Crown land from the Province of Manitoba for a waste disposal site, and as a matter of, I'm sure just, ongoing good faith and bookkeeping that the cost of the rental of that particular

property was \$1 per year. That is a legal agreement and I'm sure the province doesn't make any money out of it and it's just a matter of accommodating the municipality. But you know what? When Ms. Eyer - the name is familiar, I'm sure, to most people here; who is the head of the Directors Branch; I'm sure it wasn't her but I'm sure it came from the Minister - that rent for that nuisance ground, this particular year, went from \$1 to \$20.00.

Now as Jack Benny would say, it's not the money, it's the principle of the thing. That's right. It's not the money, it's the principle to take it from \$1 to \$20.00. I asked the Minister, because the Municipality of Oakland said, we were all kind of agreeing with the 6 and 5 guidelines that were set out by the Federal Government, that they're not going to pay the Province of Manitoba their \$20. They're going to maybe pay them a 6 percent increase on the use of that property. That's a fairly direct approach in opposition to what the government have requested.

I asked the Minister if he's going to take the Oakland Municipality to court over the charges of a nuisance ground, or are they going to take the garbage, or what are they going to do, you know? — (Interjection) — Well, certainly they'd give them all their garbage and I'll tell you that's what the government deserve. I would recommend they give the government all their garbage.

That's the kind of incompetent administration that we're seeing taking place. There is no consistency, no leadership, no direct policy guidelines throughout the total government other than this, that take advantage of those people who are living in those areas - and I again refer to the map - take advantage of those people that are paying taxes, take advantage of those, because you know we're only hear for a short time and we're really going to sock it to them, suck it out of them, so we can do what we want with them. Dribble it away, dribble it away in ways in which we think as a government, or they think as a government is in their best interest.

As my colleague has just indicated, don't maintain the infrastructure. You can refer to highways, agriculture, resources. Yield to the whims of those people who want to build an arena in downtown Winnipeg. I've not got anything against spending money in the City of Winnipeg.

HON. A. MACKLING: Who said we were doing that?

MR. J. DOWNEY: Who said we were doing that?

HON. A. MACKLING: If you want to attack Bill Norrie and Lloyd Axworthy, go ahead, don't lay that on us.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I haven't heard here tonight; I haven't heard from any Cabinet Minister; The Minister of Urban Affairs has not said that they're opposed to a downtown arena.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Stay relevant, stay relevant.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have not heard the Minister of Natural Resources say that they aren't going to support that kind of an expansion. I haven't heard that.

MR. D. SCOTT: It is not part of his estimates.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, okay, he says it's not pertinent. I'm saying the government, I haven't heard the government say that.

The Minister of Natural Resources is a member of Treasury Bench and we're debating his salary, okay, and there's only so much money as he keeps telling us and there's only so much money to go around. In his department there isn't any to go around. In fact there's so little that he has to cut back on projects that may in the long term help the people of Manitoba. He has to pretend that he's going to give people jobs in a Job Fund, but he's just transferring them from his own department into new jobs. That's not helping one more student or one new person.

So, Mr. Chairman, I have to say that I think this government has truly proven in a year-and-a-half, a year and 18 months, whatever it is now, that, and I can't think of any other words, that they're incompetent, unable to prioritize their expenditures to deal fairly with those people in Manitoba who pay taxes and expect some form of government service. Not in handouts, but in truly government responsible areas like the drainage programs or the road programs. But they at least expect a tip of the hat and a little bit of funds back through those kinds of programs, but it's not coming.

So what will happen, Mr. Chairman, is they'll get their just reward. You know, they may think because they've got a certain base of support within the city or in northern Manitoba. We're not a party for all of southwest and southern Manitoba, we're a party that truly believes that all of the province, each region of the province - if each region is strong then the province is strong. I'm a firm believer in that. I think that each and every Manitoban believes in that. Unlike the New Democratic Party believe, they believe . . .

MR. A. ANSTETT: You said every Manitoban believes that and we're included in that.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I don't exclude the Member for Springfield from being a Manitoban. I don't exclude any member of the government from being a Manitoban, but I don't think they're a very fair Manitoban in their administration of the provincial affairs and the public funds that they're administering.

That's one thing I do think that they're not, and that's a very fair administrator. I think, and you look back at the four years, and certainly we, as the electors told us, they didn't want us to carry on in a responsible way, they wanted the New Democratic experience and they got it. The people of Manitoba will say through the election system next time around that the New Democratic Party weren't able to satisfy the overall needs of the people through their responsibilities and will replace them.

MR. H. GRAHAM: They failed and they failed miserably.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I think, Mr. Chairman, you don't need to go back to the map, but I think you can go to the whole area of Resources or Highways or even the way in which they deal with the Salaries that the taxpayers

of Manitoba pay for. That's not a very fair way to treat people, and as I indicated the just reward will be theirs when they have the next election.

So, Mr. Chairman, that this Minister being a part of the executive council, he was a latecomer to the executive council, we all know that, and it took him a long time to get on board - I don't know what he did to achieve that, but he was a latecomer, that he in his responsibility has failed the people who expected him to perform better, whether we talk about Garrison and that's all a matter of debate for the larger international scene, and I'm sure in the long term he will regret his participation in the anti-American demonstration because I think he should be rejected or removed from any negotiations on that particular problem that we're having, and his credibility has been diminished. The loss of funds within his department would certainly give us reason to believe that he is not credible and capable of carrying on, and his overall approach of his not being quite as straight-on and during this Estimate process, I think it's important to point out that he tried to make light of or tried to gloss over those kinds of issues that each and every one of us take very seriously. He tried to side-step or make kind of a light issue of it and say that it was either being looked at or part of his program, but no money to back it up.

So, I, Mr. Chairman, have not only, as do my constituents, lack of confidence in the government which he is a part of the overall larger scene in Manitoba, but his department he has failed, and I just have no confidence in him and would hope that the Premier takes the necessary action to replace him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have a few concerns that I would like to reiterate, and the first of those was just referred to by my colleague for Arthur having to do with the Garrison situation and how the actions of this Minister may jeopardize the position that Manitoba has with respect to that project. Of course, it needs little review, the fact that the Minister did participate in a demonstration in front of the U.S. Consulate in March, and a flag was burned at that demonstration. Of course, in the eyes of our American neighbours the Minister is associated with that unfortunate event.

That was a danger that the Minister ran. I think he was, indeed, naive and showed poor judgment to have gone there, attempting to act as an individual person when a Minister of the Crown is always a Minister of the Crown. He cannot pretend to be something other than a Minister of the Crown. I think the whole caucus and Cabinet showed naivete and poor judgment in sending the two Ministers to that demonstration, and the result . . .

MR. H. HARAPIAK: They weren't sent, they went of their own free will.

MR. B. RANSOM: Now, Mr. Chairman, the members opposite said they weren't sent; then they weren't stopped from going because it was discussed in caucus, and they were so naive and showed such bad judgment that they allowed two members of the government, two

Ministers of the government to go and demonstrate in front of the U.S. Consulate, and they ran the risk of being part of an incident and that is indeed what happened.

Now, this Minister is in a difficult situation as it relates to the Garrison Diversion project, because the Minister was in the process of putting together another trip to Washington whereby members of the Provincial Legislature and the Federal Legislature would be imposing upon the good graces of congressmen and senators in the United States. I must say that last year we were received very well and very graciously in Washington, and the Minister has jeopardized that by his actions, by his naivete and poor judgment.

Mr. Chairman, the question of the Capital project at Pelican lake concerns me, not just because the Minister cancelled the project, or allowed the funds to lapse, as he puts it, but because of the nature in which he described that event and justified that event, by saying that we had four years to do something, and didn't do it, and by indicating because it was in my constituency, I had a specific interest in seeing this project go ahead and should have done it within those four years.

If I had chosen to play politics with that project, Mr. Chairman, I would have directed the staff to proceed in the fall of 1981 and let some of the contracts and begin the work on it, but because the staff told me it wasn't possible to let the entire contract and begin on it, and it would mean duplication in letting another part of the contract in the spring, then I chose not to let any part of the contract in the fall of 1981. That clearly was a mistake to do that, Mr. Chairman, and the Minister has given every indication that was a mistake, that I should have proceeded. So, presumably we will have knowledge, we'll have the benefit of the Minister's advice when we get to that point again. — (Interjection) — Yes, the members opposite may on some occasion become familiar with how government works.

So, Mr. Chairman, that is something that I find personally disappointing in the way the Minister handled that, and I know that hundreds of people who have an interest, either on a casual basis for recreation at Pelican Lake, or the children who have taken swimming lessons there and who aren't able to take swimming lessons there on occasion now, for the people who have businesses there who depend on the lake, I'm concerned about all those people who are going to suffer as a consequence of this unilateral decision that the Minister has made.

The Minister has demonstrated in his handling of his department a lack of willingness to come to grips with problems. Time and time again we hear the Minister stand up in the House, I remember the very first indication of it last year. If it wasn't the first speech I heard the Minister make, it was the first one that impressed me at least, when he stood up and spoke on a project having to do with water and talked about the needs that there were for water management and he talked about the report that the Water Commission had brought in and what need there was to get on with doing necessary work in the area of water management.

Then the first thing we find out, of course, is that the Minister has replaced the people on the Water Commission who had done such a good job, in his own words; and from thereafter we continued to hear talk from the Minister about the problems and, admittedly,

he seems to be able to single out some of the problems from time to time, but he has shown a singular inability to act on those problems, or a lack of will or a lack of desire to act on those problems.

The question of the nightlighting, for instance, is one example of the situation. It's a problem that the Minister, I believe, at some time is going to wish that he had acted on earlier because it's going to become serious as time passes.

The thing that strikes me most now about this Minister's management of the department, is the general fluffiness with which he has managed this department. Whether it's a lack of being able to engage him in serious debate over policies, whether it's in the Parks area, whether it's in the Wildlife area - problems have been clearly outlined by his staff, his own report dealing with the Five-Year Report on Wildlife, and the Minister doesn't leave us with any feeling that he really understands the situation or that he intends to take any serious action.

Then I guess the final point, Mr. Chairman, is that this Minister is either a willing participant in the so-called Jobs Fund, or else he has been taken in, as others seem to have been taken in by the Jobs Fund. The government's response to the worst recession in 40 years - the response which they ask people to pay \$140-some million of new taxes this year; \$70-some million of budgetary money, new money that's supposed to be going into the Jobs Fund and we're finding out that this department, like others, simply has money taken from one pot and transferred into the Jobs Fund.

When we ask the Minister if he's had to reduce staff as a consequence, he says, no, he hasn't had to reduce any staff. They're going to be working within the Jobs Fund - projects under the Jobs Fund, so there's no new jobs created by the Jobs Fund then, there's simply a transfer and then the Minister says, well, all the work that was cut wouldn't be handled by the department, it would be handled by a private contractor.

So what we have by taking funds out of this Minister's Department, by the Minister allowing them to be taken out of his department, is people unemployed that normally would be working for private contractors. The direction, the connection is so obvious, Mr. Chairman, as to defy understanding, as to why the government would think that they could pull this off.

On top of it, to make matters worse, is that the administration of the money that's been put into the Jobs Fund is going to be more difficult and less efficient than it would have been, if they'd have left the money with the Minister in his department, to go ahead with the kinds of works that needed to be done. The people were there, the mechanisms were there to put them in place.

Now they're got it run by a committee and chances are that there are going to be even more jobs lost as a consequence of that. What they are doing here in this department, as well as in others, is allowing the basic infrastructure of the province to deteriorate, and as Dr. Barber pointed out in his very interesting report, which the Minister of Finance tabled a week or so ago, is that the basic capital infrastructure of the province is extremely important. What this Minister and others are doing is allowing that basic infrastructure to deteriorate, so that the ability of our provincial economy to function efficiently is impaired and this Minister has allowed it to happen in his department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I can only reiterate the concerns that have already been expressed thoughtfully, in some instance, eloquently by my colleagues.

You know, the Department of Natural Resources, although not by any means the biggest spender in government, but it happens to be the kind of department - that's what makes it one of the more interesting and exciting departments of government to be responsible for - touches on all Manitobans in a very visible way. Not just rural Manitoban, but urban Manitobans, in so many different walks of life. This Minister's inability to recognize that fact and to make sure that the department receives the kind of attention in funding that it hasn't got under this Minister, is something that he will regret and this government will regret.

Mr. Chairman, this government will regret it even more so when the comparison is made with the indecent haste with which this same government is entering into the expenditures of very large sums of money, in what you can only describe as jet negotiations between the Federal Minister, Mr. Axworthy, and different members of this government, and the Mayor of this city, and without any in-depth studies, without any pre-planning but millions of dollars are being talked about to be spent in a hurry - to do what? I don't know. To further the political aims of one lonely Federal Cabinet Minister, or to satisfy the political aims of this government in the Inner Core of the City of Winnipeg?

But, Mr. Chairman, I can only tell the Minister that the comparisons we've been making at this committee and in the same committee when we dealt with Transportation, or with Agriculture - that comparison will only be made more visible to Manitobans, when whatever is being concocted and concluded in such indecent haste is before the people of Manitoba to judge.

Mr. Chairman, mention has already been made about this Minister's unbelievably - and I have to say it this way, because there's no other kind of way of saying it - stupid act with respect to jeopardizing his position re the sensitive negotiations on that major and important concern of Manitobans, the Garrison Project. Mr. Chairman, it's his Premier that called it poor judgment and naive but, Mr. Chairman, and I speak to you, because I think maybe I can get you to understand. I can't understand - really I can't understand the continued poor judgment that's being exercised.

Mr. Chairman, it doesn't really matter how much Ministers of this government explain away their action, if you and I, as friends, and you know the Minister of Natural Resources made a great speech the other day avowing and dedicating the kind of friendship that he had for the American people, he talked to them as his friends. Well, I can't understand this continued lack of poor judgment. If you and I are friends, Mr. Chairman, and you believe and I believe that I have, in some way offended you, and if I truly am your friend, I will apologize - not necessarily because I even conceived that I made an error, but if we are friends, you know simply to maintain that friendship. I can't understand this obstinacy on the part of two friends - people that avow their friendship for our American neighbours to refuse to apologize.

The truth of the matter is our friends across the line are offended. We have that in very official form from the State Department in very strong language, and we have it in unofficial forms from contacts that we have had, that I'm sure the government has had, from individual contacts, from individual American citizens and American leaders in the State of North Dakota and elsewhere.

But, Mr. Chairman, that's the point. It's not just a question of showing initial poor judgment or naivete, it's the question that the more unforgivable is the continued lack of judgment even today, in the Chamber. So, from that point of view, I couldn't agree more with the comments made by the Member for Turtle Mountain about the Minister seriously considering his position vis-a-vis the heading of any delegation to win friends and influence people in the United States Congress, Mr. Chairman.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what is very disturbing to members of the committee and that came about through the examination of the Estimates was the kind of decisions this Minister is obviously prepared to make, and that has to be a concern where on the one instance he rationalizes breaking of contracts, agreements with Federal Governments to carry out a pilot demonstration program, in this case involving drainage, an instance that we just dealt with tonight, for whatever reasons, the cancellation of a program that was on stream, was ready to be proceeded with. It only leaves us to wonder, Mr. Chairman, how many other projects that in the course of our investigation of his Estimates are treated in similar manner that we didn't unearth or uncover during the course of the past 20-odd hours that we've dealt with the Minister's Estimates.

Mr. Chairman, integrity is probably the most important asset that a Minister has, that any government has. In dealing forthrightly with people and with members of the opposition it goes a long way. If the Minister wishes to say, if the government wishes to say, it's certainly their right, that it's not in their priority to carry on a particular program, then simply say so, and you don't carry it out. That is done. After all, that's why changes in government take place, other governments get elected. But, Mr. Chairman, you don't try to hide behind extraneous reasons for why something wasn't included in the manner or way it was originally set out to be.

I can tell the honourable Chairman that one of the reasons why some of my colleagues thought less than they should have of me as a Minister of Highways, unlike they thought of my colleague here, the Member for Pembina, is because it was my good grace to be Minister of Highways the immediate subsequent year to taking over from the Schreyer Administration in 1977, and we had acquisition of right-of-way made, we had survey and plan designed for different roads. I can show you today the road program of 1977 and 1978 which involved in many instances roads that weren't necessarily of our political priority, but they were certainly the priority, and they made common sense because of the state of readiness, the state of preparedness that the department was in under the responsibility of the then NDP Administration. They were carried on and they were carried through, whether it was double laning No. 59 Highway to Libau, whether it was carrying on the work in Mr. Pete Adam's country, whether it was substantial and massive amount of work,

dedication of some \$17 million in the North on road work, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to put that on the record that a government plays very loosely with its integrity if it cancels programs in the manner and the way this Minister has cancelled these programs.

Well, Mr. Chairman, it's not my wish to prolong the debate on the Minister's Estimates. I want to thank my colleagues for the participation in these Estimates. I am moved to indicate to the Minister that I will be moving the traditional motion to reduce the Minister's Salary to \$1.00 because of the actions taken by this Minister; because of his inaction taken around the Cabinet table; and because of his lack of candor in describing them to us. At least the Minister of Transportation told us up front that, yes, the roads of Manitoba will be neglected to some extent. Yes, he was taking a severe cut in the highway production, that there will be less money for maintenance, but this Minister has tried to skate around the issue. This Minister has tried to talk in very flowery terms about all the things that he wants to do, but in terms of the actual monies that we are now passing these Estimates, it isn't there.

Mr. Chairman, does the Minister wish to respond?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, I do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister wishes to respond.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I thank all of the honourable members for their contributions. I say that partly with tongue-in-cheek because I'm thanking them for drawing to my attention what they perceive to be my inadequacies, but it gives me an opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to reflect on their argument.

First of all, let me go to the Honourable Member for Pembina. He continues to insist that the total capital program - and this is reflected also in the argument of the Member for Turtle Mountain - that the total capital program is \$11.4 million and last year it was 18. Despite the fact that staff here confirmed, and I advised the committee that the actual capital spending last year was 12 million. We have 11.4 million in the Estimates, but in addition to that, 2.7 million of the capital spending is appropriated under the Jobs Fund - a total of 14 million. — (Interjection) — Well, I listened without interjection when the honourable member made his contribution, and I would appreciate him giving me the same courtesy.

Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Arthur is concerned about a local issue. I appreciate issues like that regardless of the dollars involved. It's important to the municipality, I will have a look at that. What I assumed to be the rationale for the increase from the token \$1.00 to \$20 is that it costs so much to process paper, just any kind of a licence or permit, that there is a desire on the part of government to at least try and recover costs of processing the paper. Obviously, we're getting nothing for the land, the land rental, but it costs us money to process the paper, and I think that taxpayers expect us at least to charge whatever the nominal fee is, at least it should cover the cost of processing the paper. I think that was the initiative. However, I will look at that.

Well, there are a number of honourable members who have indicated that I was naive, exercised poor judgment and so on in respect to attendance at a demonstration of concern in respect to the alleged American involvement in support of Somoza's return. Mr. Chairman, anyone who has read anything of the kind of human atrocity, the scale of which really does boggle our mind, that has occurred in South America and in Latin America has to be troubled. And I am troubled that we, along with the United States, participants in the United Nations, seem to lack courage in respect to taking the initiative to respect the Charter of Human Rights, the Charter of Nations that we adopted when we joined the United Nations, that there would be no involvement in neighbour countries, and as a good neighbour I think we can call upon our American friends and point out to them our concerns, and that is the framework in which that concern was evidenced. I have put on record my distaste for what occurred there - the flag burning. And I want to assure honourable members that I was concerned and continue to be concerned about that event, but I think that people in the United States are broad-minded, understand the issues, have themselves indicated in no uncertain terms to their administration, their concern about that issue.

Now honourable members may think that I am foolhardy, but I was down in Washington a couple of weeks ago, chatted with members of Congress, members of staff, talked to a Senator. Well, Mr. Chairman, there is effective democracy in the United States. They are prepared to tolerate differences of viewpoint and respect people as friends, despite the fact they disagree.

Mr. Chairman, just moving quickly for a moment because I know honourable members don't want to hear me at any great length, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain is understandably concerned about Pelican Lake and I don't blame him. I'm not trying to duck the issue in respect to Pelican Lake. But I say to the honourable member, I am concerned about equity and fair play for communities in this province.

Now I say that, the Honourable Member for Lakeside had addressed to me early, the problems of Dennis Lake. Well, we are looking at doing something for Dennis Lake but, Mr. Chairman, unlike the municipality that's affected by Dennis Lake, the municipalities up to the point in time that I addressed them, had not been prepared to put anything into the effort at Pelican Lake. But the Municipality of Armstrong, the constituency of the Honourable Member for Lakeside, is prepared to put up money for the problem and they have assured me that there is money available to assist in that improvement in the area.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that wasn't a first. Municipalities elsewhere faced with problems have undertaken with government to share in costs for improvement. The Federal Government, you'll remember, Mr. Chairman, insisted - insisted that the local communities in the Red River Valley had to participate. I didn't agree with that. I didn't agree with that because I believed that in that instance it was foreign floodwater that was exacerbating the problem that those communities faced. But the question of some local input is well-known.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think the honourable members have had their fun with me, personally. I want, despite that, to indicate to them that this department remains

vigorous; this department remains decisive and notwithstanding their relatively unkind words to me this evening, they know and their colleagues know, that they're welcome in my office, in connection with the problems that they face in those constituencies. I might say, as late as the beginning of this week, I had one of their colleagues in my office, again, in connection with a very substantial problem in the constituency.

I continue to hold that kind of policy, Mr. Chairman, and notwithstanding the tenor of their remarks that have been addressed to me tonight, I will continue to follow that policy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A couple of points that I would like to deal with that the Minister has raised again.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think, if we're going to go on at any length, we might as well . . .

MR. B. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Chairman, there's some . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair recognized the Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: There's some difficulty. Whenever I was Minister of a department, I don't ever remember having the last word in the department at all.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, I'm not asking for the last word, but there was a certain understanding.

MR. B. RANSOM: The Minister raised a couple of points here and . . .

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think we should deal with them tomorrow or on Thursday then, if that's . . .

MR. B. RANSOM: . . . I'd like to deal with them. Mr. Chairman, the Minister speaks about the lack of courage of people to take action with respect to the Central American situation. That is simply confusing the issue or missing the mark. If the Minister had a concern, as he clearly does, there was a mechanism which the government could have followed.

The government could easily have called in the Consul General, Mrs. Mullin, and they could have expressed their position to her and she could have made that position known and Manitoba's position would not have been jeopardized. The government could have made their position known, but he chose not to do that, and it was the wrong way to go about making their position known.

The members opposite here have said on a couple of occasions, they keep saying, who told them, how did the Americans find out about what went on here? That's a peculiar position for the members opposite to take, as if somehow we are supposed to cover up for their bad judgment and naivete. Well, Mr. Chairman, they don't understand how the system is to work. People

go to a demonstration, presumably they participate in a demonstration, in order to be able for people to know that they're participating in a demonstration. That they're being . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Member for Turtle Mountain has the floor.

MR. B. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When people participate in a demonstration it is by its very nature, a public demonstration. They want people to know and if it's in front of the U.S. Consulate, presumably they wanted Americans to know and when the Americans now find out about it, they somehow cry foul play, that we weren't supposed to have communicated that to them.

So, Mr. Chairman, I wish to deal with that point and to say to the Minister that we know that everyone is concerned about equity and fair play, when it comes to funding and we will see what kind of equity and fair play the Minister is going to apply to a project like the control of Lake Dauphin, for instance, which is on the government's "Wish" List. We will be anxious to find out what kind of local government input there will be for that project.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no motion on the floor at the moment.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, it's with some regret that I move the motion, as an expression of our continuing concern about the management of this department under this Minister, that his salary be reduced to \$1.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: According to Rule 64, sub-paragraph 9, "Where the Committee of Supply, or a section of the Committee of Supply sitting after 10:00 p.m. on any day, the Chairman or the Deputy Chairman of the Committee shall proceed to put motions as the course of the business of the Committee dictates, but shall not accept any vote that defeats a motion approving an item in the Estimates of the government."

And subsequently in sub-paragraph 10, "Where the Chairman or Deputy Chairman of the Committee of Supply refuses to accept a vote on a motion or defers a vote on a motion under sub-paragraph 9, he shall put that motion, without further debate, as the first item of business at the next sitting of the Committee of Supply in the Chamber.

The hour being after 10:00 p.m.- in fact, it is now 11:25.

MR. B. RANSOM: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, the motion has not been put forth. The Member for Turtle Mountain said point of order.

MR. B. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

My colleague moved a motion, and you read the appropriate section, Sir, which says that the vote cannot be accepted. It doesn't say that a vote cannot be taken.

I would suggest to you, Sir, that the appropriate procedure is that the vote is taken in the committee, is not accepted by the Chairman, and is referred then

to the House for a formal vote. But the question should be called in the committee and simply, the result is not accepted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The result will not be accepted.
The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, the whole purpose of placing that rule was that no negative votes would take place after 10:00 p.m.

A MEMBER: How do we know it's negative?

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, the only case in which a vote can be deferred until the next day is where there's a request then for a formal count. That has not taken place.

If there's only a voice vote and the Chairman affirms the voice vote as a defeat for the motion in this case, which in this case then would not change the estimate, there will be no requirement to defer the vote to tomorrow.

I agree with the Member for Turtle Mountain on that. If, however, there is a requirement for a count-out, then that count-out has to be deferred until tomorrow.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Not so. It's only if it is defeated.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, if the Member for Virden has something to say I'd be happy to hear from him when he has the floor.

The discussion in Rules Committee in 1980, which the Member for Virden chaired, resulted specifically in amendments to this section to clarify that question, and make it clear that no count-outs which could result in the defeat of a government estimate would be allowed. That's been the policy and that was established under his direction as chairing that committee.

I would submit, Mr. Chairman, though that you have called for the question, after the Member for Lakeside moved the motion, without allowing any further debate. You have read the rule to members on the assumption that all the members were ready for the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are the members ready for the question? As many as are in favour of the motion, say Aye. As many as are against, say Nay.

The Nays have it.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I request a formal count.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise.

SUPPLY - NORTHERN AFFAIRS

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: Committee come to order. We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Northern Affairs, Item 4.(a)(1) - the Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, just a few further words on the Northern Development Agreement. It seems evident to me on the information that the Minister has provided that in total there really isn't much more money. In fact, I would guess on the capacity of the

dollar to purchase goods and services that actually the average federal input of \$25 million a year is no higher than it ever was and that provincial input is lower than it was for a number of years. What the Minister seems to have negotiated was provincial delivery of those programs, that basically were already covered under Amendment 3 and 4, I think it was.

It's been close to a couple of years since I had some involvement with this, but that seems to be basically what has been negotiated and we were prepared to go along with those programs as well. In fact, we were continuing those programs, so there really is no difference in approach between this government and our own in handling those projects. But what has happened, as far as I can make out, is that the Federal Government has simply launched off on their own in their attempt to gain greater visibility.

I have serious doubts whether the people of Northern Manitoba are going to be served very well by the Federal Government launching out on their own, because it's generally been my feeling that the government that's closest to the people serves them best. They are most sensitive to the needs of the people, and when one is talking about communicating, consulting, having discussions with the local people, I think that's best done by the government that's closest to them. In this case, it would have been the Provincial Government, even as distant as the seat of government is from Northern Manitoba, it's a heck of a lot closer than Ottawa. I think that the people of the North would have been better served if the province had a hand in delivering more of these programs.

Clearly, the Federal Government wasn't going to go along with that, and it seems to me what the Minister settled for after a year of negotiations was not that far off the position that the Federal Government had been taking for some period of time.

So, Mr. Chairman, I just would hope that the delivery works out in the interests of the people of Northern Manitoba, but only time will tell whether that proves to be the case or not.

HON. J. COWAN: Well, without wishing to prolong the debate and without getting back into whether or not it's a good Agreement, I think it's better than nothing and I've indicated that. I think it's a far cry from perfect, and I've indicated that. I think we are better off as a province, and the North is better off for us having this Agreement, and I've indicated that.

I will agree with the Member for Turtle Mountain. I believe he is correct in his assessment that if the province was more involved in delivery of some of those programs it would be a better Agreement even yet. I indicated that was one of the areas where we did have some discussions and disagreements and one of the areas where the Federal Government held firm in their belief that they should be delivering the programs. I also agree with him that time will tell, as to whether or not that is a workable solution.

I can assure you, and I think we both would agree right now, that it's not better, that it would be better to have the province doing more of the delivery and more involved in the cost-sharing. I think only time will tell whether it's even workable, but we will certainly provide every assistance and co-operation we can to

the Federal Government to help them make it work because from what I've seen to date they're going to need our help and our assistance, and as well the organizations that represent Northerners and the residents themselves, I'm certain, will be assisting in trying to help the Federal Government make this work, primarily, because we want to see the Agreement work and that's the only way it's going to work now.

So I think we're in basic agreement on a large number of points that have been discussed. I think there is still an outstanding question as to whether or not it's a significantly different Agreement than the amendments, or whether or not, in fact, it is an Agreement that provides benefits to the North. I believe it does. I believe it is.

Earlier in the day, Mr. Chairperson, we had some discussion about the Steering Committee and the appointment of Eshmade Associates as a consultant and I've since had an opportunity to discuss this briefly with staff and will provide the information to the Member for Turtle Mountain that I have available now.

One is in respect to minutes of the Steering Committee and I indicated if they could in fact be released, I would release them. I understand that there are no verbatim transcripts of the Steering Committee meetings and I don't think we would expect that there would be of a committee of that sort. Notes on task, legal forms, work schedules, etc., personnel have been recorded by Hydro and are circulated to the four parties. We will be in the process of checking with the other three parties to see if they have any objection to releasing those notes. If not, we will do so. If they do, we will indicate who had the objection and why these are objected. I think we'll just have to wait to see the result of that.

Were there consulting services used on an arena design besides Mr. Eshmade and Associates by the Steering Committee, was another question which the Member for Turtle Mountain addressed to me.

I have to go back a bit in history to provide a proper overview, but it's my understanding that prior to the establishment of the Steering Committee, the four parties discussed alternative arena capacities with Mr. Brian Johnston of Perc Limited, Professional Environmental Recreation Consultants Limited. These discussions preceded the establishment of the Steering Committee, so it was the four parties holding those discussions, but not under the formal structure of the Steering Committee. They held those discussions.

Later on Mr. Eshmade was used during the review of the claim and the remedy. He was called in to provide assistance and discussions among the four parties to review the technical factors about recreational facilities in the North. It's my understanding that he had some involvement with the Department of Recreation, Fitness and Sport in the past and did have some knowledge of those particular subject matters. He has a history of involvement in the structural design of arenas in other Northern locations, as well, I'm told. I can't be more specific, but that's my information at this time.

Once the Interim Consent Order was signed, the four parties' consensus was to continue Mr. Eshmade's services, and Manitoba Hydro contracted with him on April 20, 1982. My understanding of how that process was carried out is as follows. He was used previous to the order to provide advice. When Manitoba Hydro

sought a consultant, his name came forward. Manitoba Hydro did check with the Steering Committee to see if there were any objections, and it's my understanding that there were no objections to the use of Mr. Eshmade.

So when they say that in fact it is a decision of the Steering Committee, there may be a basis for that, in that there were no objections and it was discussed. But definitely they are under contract to Manitoba Hydro and it was Manitoba Hydro that came forward, not in the first instance to recommend his services, but in respect to the contract which we have before us to ask if in fact he was acceptable to the other parties. No objections having been raised, he was offered the contract I understand.

MR. B. RANSOM: Just one brief question then, further on this, Mr. Chairman. Does the Minister know upon whose recommendation Eshmade first became involved?

HON. J. COWAN: I believe it was through the province in the first instance previous to the Steering Committee being formed to discuss with the four parties the general approach which could be taken in respect to construction of this type of facility in the North. Whether it was a direct recommendation, or a decision, or a discussion I can't tell you at this point but certainly the province was involved at that stage.

MR. B. RANSOM: The Minister says that it might have been through the province. Can he tell me whether that was through Northern Affairs or Recreation, or just what agency within the government?

HON. J. COWAN: I believe Northern Affairs checked with Recreation Fitness and Sport to see who had expertise in this area and it was recommended by them that this individual had that expertise. I don't know if they recommended any other names. No. It's my understanding that they did not recommend any other names and then we brought that information to the other parties to the Interim Consent Order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I understand this is the area in which we could discuss the BUNTEP Program.

I wonder how many students graduate from Brandon University each year from this program? Approximately how many?

HON. J. COWAN: Because that is a matter that is more delivered by the Department of Education, so it'll take me a minute to find the information for you. But we'll attempt to find that.

It's my understanding that the target enrollment for '83-84 in BUNTEP is 110 students. Two additional centres are scheduled for startup in 1983-84, that being in Peguis and one in Dauphin.

MRS. C. OLESON: Do the graduates that graduate from this program, do they consistently stay in the program and what sort of a commitment do they give when they enter into it? Pardon me. I mean continue to work in that field after they've graduated?

HON. J. COWAN: That is detailed information that I would have to obtain from the Department of Education, I can certainly do that for you and get back to you on that, but we wouldn't have it available to us. It's a good question and we'll certainly try to provide the information to you at a later date.

MRS. C. OLESON: Since the program is cost-shared between the Federal Government and the Provincial Government, what does it cost the Provincial Government? On what basis do we share the cost of this?

HON. J. COWAN: It is my understanding that it is shared on a 60-40 basis, 60 percent being the contribution of the Federal Government and 40 percent being the contribution of the Provincial Government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Under the new Agreement, it was indicated that the federal people would be establishing an office in Thompson. Can the Minister indicate whether any federal people are now located in Thompson? Is the office completely functional there or what is the situation in that regard?

HON. J. COWAN: It is my understanding that there are two staff presently situated there. There is a physical building that is undergoing renovations, or was undergoing renovations as of Friday when I had the opportunity to meet with the Advisory Committee in Thompson - that was last Friday. There are eight staff that will be further located there in the future.

MR. D. GOURLAY: With respect to the delivery office of the federal department located in Thompson, I would like to receive the opinion of the Minister with respect to that arrangement.

I had indicated earlier that I was of the opinion that it would have been better to have had the major input from the federal people perhaps located in Winnipeg with regional offices located throughout the North, to cut down on a lot of travelling time by many of the Northern people, the different organizations, the MMF and the Northern Community Council and other organizations that would be dealing with the federal people.

I am just wondering whether this was a concern that the Minister had during the time in negotiating this Agreement, or does he feel that the DREE office located in Thompson is a good move.

HON. J. COWAN: I think it's a matter of there being disadvantages and advantages to the location of any office or any operation including this building and this operation. The factors are no different in respect to the Thompson office.

It does provide a direct access for certain organizations such as the MKO, such as the Keewatin Tribal Council. It does provide easier access for a number of communities with large population basis, such as Norway House, Cross Lake, all the Northern communities, that are above the line of Thompson, The Pas, Flin Flon. It's easier to get to Thompson in some

ways, not all ways, than it is to get to Winnipeg. So I think it does provide access to certain groups.

On the other hand, when you talk about the Island Lake area, when you talk about some of the Interlake area that is served by the Agreement, it would probably be more suitable to have it located somewhere else. If you speak of the Island Lake area, it would probably be most suitable to have a nice office building in Red Sucker Lake. That's not in place of the fire hall, members opposite, or the fish station. However, the fact is that Winnipeg is a closer operating centre for those groups of communities than is Thompson, so there are disadvantages in that way.

There's also symbolism involved here, and I think that's important as well. I think it's good to have it in the North; I think it's good to make people look to the North, address the issues in the North and that office in some ways does that. So while I'm not of one strong opinion one way or the other, I do see advantages to having it in the North. I do recognize, affirm and acknowledge the disadvantages that the Member for Swan River addressed in respect to travel of organizations, and travel of groups and individuals to contact the office. But I think that's becoming less and less a problem with the phone systems we have throughout all the communities now, with the access that we have to and from the communities, and with the fact that there is an office in Winnipeg that can address some of those issues and then forward information to Thompson. While it is a disadvantage, it is not insurmountable.

I think his idea of having regional offices, having one office located centrally, perhaps in Thompson, to give it the symbolism and the operating efficiencies for the communities around there, and then to have regional offices out there might be something worth looking into. You can accomplish the same thing in some ways by having individuals doing a lot of travelling, going into the communities, holding workshops and holding seminars. I think that might be the most appropriate way to go and some of that will be done. So I don't think it's of major significance, but I do recognize that there are difficulties in travel which may be precipitated because of its location in Thompson, but it would be no worse than its location anywhere else in the province.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could bring us up-to-date on the Career Resource Centre activities. — (Interjection) — That's under the Department of Labour, is it?

HON. J. COWAN: Again, that's a program that is under a different department. I can certainly take questions as notice and try to get the information back to you. But I would have to do it in that manner, because I don't have the detailed information in front of me.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Yes, that's fair enough. I wonder if the Minister could indicate what new programs are now in place or anticipated will be in place shortly as a result of the new Agreement. Are there any new areas that will be introduced in the near future, if they're not already contemplated?

HON. J. COWAN: I can't address all the Economic Development Programs that the Federal Government

is reviewing. I believe there are 19 applications - 27 applications since I last made myself aware of the statistics for programs - and some are undergoing a feasibility study process now; some are being reviewed by the Program Delivery Advisory Committee, some are being reviewed in other ways and we would expect to see those programs start to come onstream fairly soon.

But in regard to provincial programs under the ACCESS program delivery portion; Native Medicine is a target for this year; Northern Nursing is a target for this year; Northern Social Work Program; Northern Management and Administration Training Program will be target routes for this year.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Chairman, are there any new programs under way that are being delivered by any of the federal departments involved in the New Agreement? I'm looking at, for instance, the Canada Employment Programs and Services - the \$40 million program which is funded 100 percent by Canada - and I'm wondering what activity is happening there, if anything at present.

HON. J. COWAN: As I indicated earlier, there are 27 applications for proposals that are being looked at under Sectors (a) and (b), I guess, and also under Management Consultant. We are in the process of setting up a liaison program for the communities to provide information on the program.

I can't be more specific at this time but I certainly can get the information for the member. Perhaps I can be more specific.

Resource Opportunity Development Program, which is \$12 million DREE, which is ongoing. There's a Northeast Manitoba Development Program which is \$2.5 million DREE ongoing. There's the Canada Career Opportunities which is \$2.4 million ongoing right now and there's a whole series of others that are before the Advisory Committee for review.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Chairman, I've noticed recently in the Winnipeg Free Press there's been some articles critical of the New Northern Development Agreement and one article I have here was on April 12th, "Chief cites red tape and delays," and it's quoting here, "Chief Russell Tobacco of the Moose Lake Indian Band said yesterday four other proposals have been reviewed and sent back for further information." Then he says, "Communities are being very frustrated with the way the Agreement is being put to work. We've waited so long to get it signed and now they are being held up until the red tape gets sorted out."

I wonder if the Minister could sort of give some indication as to what are the problems that the Native people, and obviously some of the Metis communities or Northern Communities, are running into with their proposals.

HON. J. COWAN: There are a number of problems that result in that sort of sense of frustration on the part of individuals who see benefits for their communities and for their society in general, as a result of the Agreement.

One is the long time which it took to get the Agreement onstream. We discussed that earlier, so there

is a sense of frustration that is built in to the first initial months of the Agreement. People have been saying, we've waited a long time for this Agreement; here it is, let's get it moving.

One of the difficulties is addressing the ways by which these programs will be analyzed and evaluated by the different Advisory Committees, so that's taken some time. It's taken a couple of meetings just to set up the terms of reference on how you look at a proposal and what you want to do with that proposal and how it fits in with the rest of the Agreement.

That's extremely important, because if you don't have that in place in the first instance, what you do have is a format start to be developed around specific applications of the Agreement, so you're not proceeding with a standardized procedure throughout; you're sort of nipping and tucking all the time trying to respond to this particular proposal, to that proposal, to a proposal of a bit of a different sort and you can never get consistency in the Agreement. You can never get it flowing. You can get it jerking along and you can get it advancing here and going off on tangents, but you can't get the thrust which you need, so you have to have those terms of reference.

Part of those terms of reference are that those programs be evaluated. How are you going to determine, as an Advisory Program Delivery Committee, if a program should be proceeded with if you don't have a complete evaluation of it? It's a necessity. I think it's viewed by all as a necessity but at the same time, because of the frustration that occurred over a long period of time, there is a lack of tolerance on the part of all individuals, myself included, and I'm certain the Federal Government and their program delivery people as well as provincial program delivery people, had that same frustration. Well, let's get the thing rolling; let's get it moving; let's get some money on the table; let's get some programs out there that we can take a look at.

We are at the point now where we have developed those terms of reference, where we have indicated what we believe to be necessary by way of review of the programs before the programs are approved one way or the other. Some of them have to undergo more assessment than others, especially if you're dealing with timber rights on a program, or if you're dealing with other departments on a program, so that sense of frustration exists.

Finally, as I indicated earlier, one of the things of which I am most proud about this Agreement is the Advisory Committee, which is termed the Ministerial Advisory Committee. That Committee is comprised of representatives of the different organizations. That Committee has the responsibility for meeting on a quarterly basis now, although it was intended in the first instance only to meet once a year. That Committee has as its function a review of the overall Agreement and the development of the general thrust, the general policy, the general principles of the Agreement, and then the other committees fit the programs within that.

We've only had an opportunity to meet twice, unfortunately. Actually a similar type group met previous to the Agreement being signed for a final consultation, but the official Advisory Committee has only had an opportunity to meet twice, the last meeting being held last Friday.

I am concerned that if we were to allow a lot of projects to go ahead previous to that second meeting, two things would happen. One is, that Committee would start to feel redundant. People would say, well, all these projects have gone ahead anyway; why are we here? What's the purpose? And I didn't want that to happen.

Secondly, I felt that the general principles, thrust and the format of the Agreement would be developed again in an ad hoc manner by different programs providing different services and the general thrust would be built around that rather than that committee having an opportunity to look at the five-year plan, where they hope to be at the end of five years, how they hope to get there and then fit the programs into that plan.

We had the discussion at that meeting on the frustration which was experienced by those groups, because Chief Tobacco was there and there were others who had expressed similar frustrations that were there, and we talked that out. I'm not certain I convinced them that it was the right thing to have done in the first instance, but I am certain that I convinced them that was the way things were done. The frustration was partly because of that and I take some responsibility for that. But I would rather have us give due consideration to those things that I addressed, the global matters, previous to getting swung into certain trends and patterns by ad hocism and have the frustration surface as a result of that than I would to have to fight for five years trying to give a general direction to the agreement because we didn't take the time in the first instance to do it right.

What I also said on Friday, and I think will hold true, is that we're now at the stage where we've done that preliminary work. That Advisory Committee is going to be discussing some specific concerns over the next couple of weeks and then will be meeting with us again. I think the agreement will start to roll much quicker now; you will start to see a quickening up of the pace. But it will have been done in the proper way, and I think that's important. So the frustration is very real; it's there for a number of reasons. I must assume some of the responsibility for the frustration, but I think what we did was the right thing to be done at the time.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I had another article - I just can't put my hands on at the present time - but I think it was referring to the problems some of the Metis communities were having in getting projects put together. I am wondering, is there any input from the co-ordinators serving those communities to assist those areas to put the proposals together and provide resource backup for the communities to have a respectable application to be presented to the Advisory Committee.

HON. J. COWAN: The co-ordinators aren't that, playing a role. We've had three informational services with them for the different regions, I believe, to advise them of what the agreement is, how it can be best used by the communities and how they can best assist the communities in taking advantage of the agreement. As well, we're asking the co-ordinators to look at other provincial and federal programs for economic development, for social development, which may be appropriate, and to assist the communities in filling out

the application forms and making certain they're aware of the programs and reviewing options for their own areas.

So they have been doing this as a part of their normal duties and, we provided them with some of the backup services and the backup informational sessions which we feel are necessary for them to do a good job.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Perhaps, the Minister had indicated this. If he did, I missed it and I apologize. I would ask him again, applications that are submitted for economic projects in the various communities, you indicated the Advisory Committee was originally intended to meet once a year, but they are meeting on a quarterly basis. How do the ongoing projects, how were they received and dealt with? I am sure that the applications will be coming in on a regular basis from the various communities. How are the mechanics of that dealt with?

HON. J. COWAN: There are two Advisory Committees: one is the Agreement Advisory Committee, which I referred to as the Minister's Advisory Committee, the committee that the Federal Minister and myself participate in the meetings on. That committee was intended to meet at least once annually; that's how it is spelled out in the agreement. We thought we might have to meet twice annually, and at the first meeting it was determined that at least in the first little while we should be meeting quarterly, so we're doing that. But the applications themselves go to a Program Advisory Committee, which is modelled on the Special ARDA format. That meets once a month and reviews the specific applications on a once-a-month basis.

The Advisory Committee at the ministerial level is again to address the broad thrust and to ensure that proper evaluations are done of the delivery of the agreement to make certain that thrust is being met. But the Program Advisory Committee, which does not contain the Ministers on it, meets once a month. It has three representatives from the province, three from the Federal Government, two from MKO, one from FNC, one from BIN, two from the MMF and two from the NACC.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Did I understand the Minister to say that this is the same as the Special ARDA Committee that deals with applications under that program as well or is it a separate?

HON. J. COWAN: It is modelled after the Special ARDA Committee. It's not the same committee, no.

MR. D. GOURLAY: The sawmill at Cross Lake - I know the name but I am not sure that I want to say it - Pimi-chi-ki-mac. It has had some problems over the years and, of course, with the lumbering situation the way it has been, especially the last couple of years, it has run into further difficulties. We were hoping that we could get that included in the new agreement. Is that being considered under an application now, or what is the situation with that mill?

HON. J. COWAN: It's my understanding that they have made an application under Program One to the agreement. It is being reviewed at the present time.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I believe one of the programs, too, deals with the upgrading of Northern airports. I wonder if the Minister could give us a list of those airports that will be upgraded this year under this program or under the agreement.

HON. J. COWAN: There is a list of airports which are eligible for upgrading and no decision has been made yet as to exactly what airports will be constructed under the agreement. I don't have the full list right here with me but, going from memory, it would be Tadoule Lake, Poplar River, Wasagamach, Oxford House. Every airport and airstrip is eligible for upgrading, but I believe those are the ones where construction and major upgrading would be undertaken. Shamattawa would be included in the upgrading portion of that as well. That does not mean that by not having mentioned the other communities they are excluded; it just means those are the ones that come to mind right away. I can get a longer list, but it might be more appropriate to address it on a general basis, those communities that don't have other forms of alternate transportation available to them, are remote, are in the Northern Affairs area and don't have all-weather access are eligible. The ones that jump out to mind are the ones that I just mentioned.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Are there any communities that do not have an airstrip at the present time that would be anticipating getting air service, or are they all serviced right now?

HON. J. COWAN: Tadoule Lake does not have an airstrip as of present. Wasagamach has an emergency airstrip. I've seen it, it runs across a road in the community and goes up and down a couple of hills. They call it an emergency airstrip because if you land on it it is certainly an emergency, or there will be an emergency shortly thereafter. So it, for all intents and purposes, does not have an airstrip. I don't know when the last time it was when a plane landed on that airstrip, but I certainly commend whoever piloted it because it was an act of raw courage, dedication and commitment to the circumstances, I am certain.

The Poplar River does not have an airstrip of licenceable standards. Granville Lake does not have an airstrip, Sherridon does not have an airstrip of licenceable standards, but it has all weather access through the train. I am certain there are others that have airstrips that are not licenceable, but the ones that don't have any airstrips are those I mentioned.

MR. D. GOURLAY: To be considered for airport assistance or upgrading, are these applications dealt with through this advisory committee? How is that processed?

HON. J. COWAN: No, there's an anomaly there and I'm not certain why it is, but it appears to work best this way; that is, the decisions are made primarily by the province through its own mechanisms through the Department of Highways and in consultation with myself or the Minister of Northern Affairs, whomever that might be at the time.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I believe the Minister indicated, and it was my understanding prior on making some calls

that the evaluation and consultation which is cost-shared by the province and the Federal Government would be dealt with strictly by DREE. The Minister indicated earlier also the Department of Northern Affairs would have an input. I wonder if the Minister could indicate what role the Department of Northern Affairs will have in the evaluation of the new agreement.

HON. J. COWAN: There's an Evaluation Committee with a chairperson and a co-chairperson. It has two representatives from the province and two representatives from the Federal Government, and they report to the management board. They are undertaking the evaluation.

What I indicated earlier was in respect to liaison and information provision. One of the first issues which we addressed at the first meeting of the Agreements Advisory Committee, that is, the one with the Minister sitting on it, was that of how do we get information out there? The MKO came forward with a proposal for an information officer, an information employee, that would report to them and would do a lot of the work of providing information to the Treaty communities. At that time the Manitoba Metis Federation also laid a proposal on the table.

Since that time the Manitoba Metis Federation has worked out an agreement with the Northern Association of Community Councils to provide that interlocking liaison. I believe their proposal has been approved or is in the final stages of approval. I don't know if any money has flowed yet or any signatures been put to documents. Certainly it was indicated that would be improved.

MKO is going back and reviewing their proposal with the other organizations of Treaty Indian people, and they are going to bring forward a modified proposal, and if in fact they can carry the same ground, I don't see any reason why that wouldn't be approved as well. That's what I meant when I said that if it was intended that portion be a part of the agreement to give the Federal Government a higher visibility it certainly has not worked out that way.

The Advisory Committee itself has played a very strong influence in that. I like to think that the province has participated in that in a meaningful way as well. We would anticipate that some of that money as well would be used for sessions in different communities. Those sessions would be provided by staff from both the Federal Government and the Provincial Government. It's not strictly a provincial program. It's turned into, I would hope and would like to think, a program of the Agreements Advisory Committee, because they are the ones that are largely responsible for having to suffer the consequences of whether or not the agreement works or fails.

MR. D. GOURLAY: While we were government and in working on negotiating the new agreement, one of the items to be included was assistance for the development of co-op stores, credit unions, fisheries, and the like. I notice that in the election campaign material that the NDP put out also indicated one of their campaign promises was to promote additional co-op stores and credit unions in the Northern areas. Is this tying into the new agreement facilities to establish these types of projects?

HON. J. COWAN: Well, there's nothing to exclude it from being within the agreement. They would probably have to be addressed by the Program Advisory Committee as single applications. They'd be addressed on their own merits, but certainly I would see nothing that would exclude them. As a matter of fact, there are probably things that would encourage individuals to bring forward applications under the agreement as it is now structured in that regard.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Is the Minister aware of any applications before the committee now with respect to, say, co-op stores or credit unions?

HON. J. COWAN: I'm not aware of any at the present time. One would anticipate that there would be some though.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(a)(1) - the Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I couldn't let this item go past without giving some notes of congratulations to the Minister. I know how much he's been working on this particular item over the last year-and-a-half that he's been in office, and I would certainly congratulate him on being able to finally complete an agreement. I realize there was some discussion earlier about the type of agreement that was reached, but it certainly will have a great amount of benefit for the North.

There was one item I didn't want to highlight, and that was in terms of the number of programs that are being added via the new agreement, particularly the Social Work Administrative Studies Program. I raised this in the discussion of the Estimates of the Department of Education. It was indicated those will be located in Thompson; I'm very pleased to see that. They will join the BUNTEP Program and the Northern Nursing Program, which are already located in the community of Thompson as being another way of expanding educational service to not only Thompson, but the entire North itself. As I said, I'm very pleased to see these particular developments.

I'm also pleased to see the spirit of consultation that is taking place in regard to these specific developments in the overall agreement. I had the pleasure to travel with the Minister on Friday when he was travelling up to the second set of consultation meetings on the new agreement. I really give him credit for taking the time to do that. We spent approximately two-and-a-half hours travelling up by Aztec, and he then returned a couple of hours later. That may seem like a lot of time to put in, Mr. Chairman, by some people down south, but it's an example of, I guess, walking, or perhaps in this case, flying that extra mile to talk to the people of the North. I must say I appreciate that as a Northern representative that our Minister of Northern Affairs and, in fact, other Ministers who are willing to take that extra time to come up and talk to us right on our home turf.

I just wanted to add that small note, Mr. Chairman, and also really highlight the fact that I'm very pleased to see the fact that there is being expansion of programs in my constituency to serve not only the City of Thompson, but the entire North itself.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(a)(1)—pass; 4.(a)(2) - the Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: If the Minister could just give us an indication of the reduction in the items here?

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, again, as per the procedure we established yesterday, I'll give the '82-83 adjusted vote as compared to 1983-84 request and the increase or decrease.

Overall the adjusted vote in '82-83 was \$101,900; the request is \$95,800, for a decrease of \$6,100, or 6 percent. It breaks down as follows: Fees were \$29,700, are \$25,100; Facilities and Equipment were \$17,300, are \$14,000; Specialized Equipment stays the same in both years at \$1,400; Operating Costs increased they were \$9,500, they are \$12,100; Subsistence goes from \$20,200 to \$19,800; Transportation and Other goes from \$23,800 to \$23,400, and that adds up, I hope, to the global figures I gave you earlier.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, S. Ashton: 4.(a)(2)—pass; 4.(b)(1) - the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I understand that this is the place in the Estimates where the Minister is prepared to talk about the Treaty Land Entitlement Commission?

HON. J. COWAN: Yes.

MR. B. RANSOM: Perhaps the Minister could just inform the House of where the issue stands at the moment, what progress has been made, what discussions have been carried out since receiving the report from Mr. Mitchell.

HON. J. COWAN: Since receiving the report we have circulated it and, as the member knows, there were some difficulties in that regard due to printing but we've gotten those sorted out, I think. All those individuals who wanted a report now have a copy of the report. We've not received a great deal of response back on the report itself, but I expect that will be coming over a period of time, and certainly would encourage any response that others, including the members opposite, but others outside of this Chamber may feel to be appropriate, because we need that sort of ongoing consultation and co-operation to resolve this longstanding and difficult issue.

We've had two meetings of the Federal Government, the Provincial Government and the representatives of the Treaty Land Entitlement Chiefs. One was on March 1st, and the second was on March 29th. During those meetings we addressed, first, the time frame in which we wanted to work and we felt that it would take six months to go through the recommendations and to review them and to come forward with whatever solutions were possible at that time. So we've given ourselves that sort of a schedule. I'm hoping that we'll be able to resolve most of the issues during that period of time but I'm not certain that we will finalize all of them, dot the i's and cross the t's, or do it otherwise, as the case may be, whatever is appropriate, but I do think that we will, in fact, have made significant progress. Hopefully, what we could do is tie it all into an agreement of some sort, not a Treaty, not a contract but just an agreement, that these policies and

procedures are appropriate for dealing with Treaty Land Entitlement.

The issues, of course, that are outstanding are numerous. Some of them are strictly of a bilateral nature and we've indicated in the discussions with the Federal Government that we believe that to be the case. That, of course, is because of the longstanding historical Treaty relationship between the Indian people and the Federal Government. At the same time, we believe there are others that are appropriately items which the province should take some active involvement in and we are doing that. So there is bilateral discussions and there's trilateral discussions ongoing and there hasn't been any resolution, as of yet, as to the final format that the policy will take, except to say that it is hoped that it will be in the form of an overall agreement which would address the general policies.

MR. B. RANSOM: What is the government's position with respect to the recommendations made by Mr. Mitchell, Summary of Recommendations? For instance, method of calculating the amount of land remaining due to a band, what is the government's position in that respect?

HON. J. COWAN: There is a danger in being too definitive when you're involved in a series of discussions such as we are because there is a bit of give and take that is necessary, so I'm certain the member will appreciate that. I'll answer those as openly as I can at this stage, and acknowledge where it is that perhaps we need to review the matter a bit more with the other parties and not stake out a position right here and now for fear of the impact it would have on the overall discussions. On that one we believe that that is a matter of bilateral agreement between the Federal Government and the Treaty Indian people. We believe historically it has been so, and I think we have acceptance of a general nature that it should be something that is bilateral between the signatories to the Treaty. The province was not a signatory to the Treaty; our obligations in that regard are to make land available under The Natural Resources Transfer Act, and so we figure that is something that has to be determined by those two parties.

MR. B. RANSOM: If the Federal Government and the Native people themselves decide that a certain formula is acceptable to those two parties, the Minister sees that as something the province would be obliged to accept?

HON. J. COWAN: If it were determined to be reasonable we would accept it; if it were not determined to be reasonable we would undertake to explain why we felt it was not reasonable, and try to convince others of the soundness and the logic of our arguments.

MR. B. RANSOM: Obviously, there's a question then about what the Minister would see as being reasonable. Would he care to offer any suggestions as to what might be reasonable?

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. J. COWAN: I think any agreement that corresponds to the legalities in the spirit of the Treaties

would be agreeable to us. Now there are, in fact, other parts of the recommendations which we may want to discuss, if you're going through them one by one, which might have some impact on what would be reasonable and unreasonable. So, as part of a package, something might be reasonable that would not be reasonable if it weren't part of that package, and if there were other factors that were involved in the decision as to what land would be made available.

MR. B. RANSOM: The Minister refers to legalities in the spirit of the Treaties. Would he care to comment as to whether or not the recommendation by Mr. Mitchell, having to do with the amount of land owing to a band, whether or not that is based on legalities, or whether that is some sort of a compromised position, taking into consideration the present circumstances?

HON. J. COWAN: I don't believe that the two are mutually exclusive. I think there is certainly room for a great deal of interpretation in respect to what the legal provisions in the spirit of the Treaties are and we need only look across the country to see the way by which different bands receive their entitlement to understand that there is no one set way which is so above and beyond all the others, in its legality or its application to the spirit of the Treaties, that it is acceptable to all parties. So, I don't believe that the two are mutually exclusive. I believe what he has attempted to do, and I'm second guessing him, perhaps I should not be, but you've asked me the question, is to find something that would be acceptable to all the parties. I can't tell you whether or not that is acceptable to the Federal Government, or to the Treaty Indian people at this time because they have not given me official indication that it is; and I would certainly want to hear from them previous to making a definitive statement at this stage.

MR. B. RANSOM: On Page 64 of Mr. Mitchell's report, he says, "In other words, historically, the amount of land entitlement, in Canada's view of its Treaty obligations, was to be determined on the basis of Band population at the time of last survey or last selection, less the acreage already received." That position would seem to open up, Mr. Chairman, the possibility that a Band would be wise to almost fulfill their entitlement at a given point in time, leave it a few acres short, and come back 20 years later and ask for a fulfilment of their entitlement up, once again, to a few acres short.

Does the Minister interpret that statement as I have outlined it and, if so, does he think that was the spirit of the Treaties at the time they were signed?

HON. J. COWAN: There have been those that have interpreted it in exactly the same way that the Member for Turtle Mountain has suggested it can be interpreted. That is why I believe - and again I don't want to try to second guess the author of the report - but I believe he indicated in his recommendations that when you pick a cutoff date beyond that date, the entitlement will not grow or the amount of land available to the Band will not grow, so you have a cutoff point that says; beyond that date, it's not going to grow so don't do that to us, don't pick all of your entitlement up to

the last few acres, leave them in hope that there'll be another survey of the population; so that's in there. The interpretation is certainly one which has been addressed by others, promoted by others and it's certainly a concern, yes.

MR. B. RANSOM: Why would a Band ever choose to fulfill their entitlement if that was the case? Could the Minister ever see a Band wanting to fulfill their entitlement if that was the legal interpretation of the Treaty?

HON. J. COWAN: It would be equally inappropriate for me to try to second guess the Bands as it is to try to second guess the author. However, there is a certain logic which would indicate that, if there was no cut-off date, that it would be advantageous to allow opportunities for future surveys. Whether or not a Band would take advantage of that would be a matter for the Band to decide; whether or not the opportunity will be there, in the instance of the Province of Manitoba, is something for us to address in the ongoing discussions.

MR. B. RANSOM: Can the Minister give us at least a general outline of what it is that he hopes to achieve overall, then, in the negotiations concerning entitlement?

HON. J. COWAN: I hope to achieve a policy which will provide for a fair and equitable settlement of this outstanding debt. I hope that is achieved in such a way so as not to impose injustices on individuals who may be affected by the settlement in one way or another. I have some sense that we will be able to accomplish, at least the latter part of that, that we will be able to provide for a settlement which does not, by its very nature, create injustice on individuals who have had traditional use of the land for a long period of time, either be it that they are Treaty Indian people who have had traditional use for certain purposes, or whether they be non-Treaty people in Metis communities, or on farms, or on other public pieces of property that have been used by them for a long period of time. So that's basically what I would like to see happen, fair and equitable settlement of an outstanding debt, but certainly done in a way so as not to create new injustice nor new hardship.

Finally, I would like to make certain that when the public needs that land back for bona fide public purposes, that we have a mechanism to obtain that land back in a reasonable and sound way which acknowledges the needs of those people who would have the land by way of Treaty and, at the same time, acknowledges and recognizes and affirms the fact that they are people of a province that, in fact, does have bona fide public works which are necessary for the entire population of the province, and that they would be, by some mechanism, prepared to relinquish that land if that was the case.

That's basically the overview that I would hope to see accomplished. Perhaps I shouldn't say it, at this stage but I will because I believe it benefits the process, but I'm fairly confident and optimistic that we can do that. I think if we do it in a reasonable way, and so far

what I've sensed on the part of all the parties, is a willingness to strike a consensus; then, in fact, we will have accomplished that, but those are the basic principles from my perspective. The other parties may have other principles which they believe as strongly in as I do in those, or as this government does in those but, at the same time, there are certain principles beyond which there's no need holding discussions because it's just not going to work and you'll never be able to strike the consensus or reach agreement. I don't think that will be the case in this instance.

MR. B. RANSOM: Of course, Mr. Chairman, it's very easy to agree with the Minister. I hope there will be a fair and equitable settlement; I can't imagine anybody going to the table trying to negotiate an unfair, inequitable settlement, or I can't imagine anyone going to the table with the objective of negotiating a new injustice; but what the Minister might see as fair and equitable, and what the Native people might see as fair and equitable, and the Federal Government or other people in Manitoba might see as fair and equitable, could of course be different things.

It is my understanding that there are Bands in the province now whose entitlement has been fulfilled and there is no claim for further acreage for some of those Bands; is that correct?

HON. J. COWAN: I couldn't give you the specific names - I was checking to see if we have them - but I would certainly think that to be the case.

MR. B. RANSOM: Then, Mr. Chairman, where is the justice then in settling with the Bands who have not, for whatever reason, had their entitlements fulfilled to this point, on the basis of population, say, the end of December, 1976, as opposed to a Band that perhaps moved and obtained a fulfilment of their Treaty in 1923; where is the justice in that kind of a settlement?

HON. J. COWAN: If I thought we had the perfect answer to those sorts of difficult questions, then there wouldn't have been the need for the process which we have undertaken, which is to try to find answers that are acceptable to the public at large and acceptable to the other parties to this process.

Bands that have fulfilled their entitlement already will not benefit - and I shouldn't say that so categorically; I can't see them benefiting by any new agreement, they have accepted their entitlement; that is the way it is. There are Bands that have not accepted their entitlement, for reasons not only of their own making, and there's an injustice there. There are Bands that don't have entitlement because they have not been validated or for other reasons, and they may, in the future, have entitlement; they may not in the future have entitlement, and there were injustices there perhaps, I don't know. That's something for the Federal Government to decide because it is a validation process and it is their process.

What we're trying to do is to find a way by which we can have the most equitable settlement; the most fair settlement. Let's address the issue of a cutoff date for example. What you are saying is there have been inequities in the past, but at the same time you're saying,

those inequities shall cease to exist as of the date of this Agreement. Perhaps that's a fairer way to go. You can never erase the historical injustices that have already taken place, but you certainly can talk about making certain that they don't perpetuate themselves.

The whole concept of what is owing to the Band by way of lands through their Treaty is a matter that should be most rightly discussed between the Federal Government and the Bands themselves, in this instance through the Federal Government and the Treaty Land Entitlement Chiefs' Committee. They're the ones that have to address those thorny issues because they are the ones that are going to be most affected by it. What we are doing as a province is saying that is a bilateral discussion; have that discussion; take a look at what you can come up with; come back, provide your answer to us, and if we think it's unreasonable or unfair or inequitable in such a significant way as to cause us concern, we will advise you of those concerns.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I think there is another way that it might have been approached, and it hasn't really been approached in that way, but the governments could have approached it from the point of view of strictly a legal requirement to fulfill the legal obligation that was still outstanding, and then proceed to try and negotiate or determine, to somehow obtain the sort of a land base or a resource base that would be sufficient to provide some kind of meaningful economic activity to the Band. That might involve the Bands who settled back in the 1920s, or whatever, that they would all be brought into that kind of discussion, because really this will create more injustice - because the system was originally an unjust system in that there was variation that some Bands were to be given 640 acres for a family of five and others were to be given 160 acres - now that was an unjust system to begin with and by expanding that many times, it's simply compounding an injustice.

To think that 640 acres of land in the Red River Valley was equal to 640 acres of land at Red Sucker Lake, it simply doesn't stand up, that's not the case. So it could be approached from the point of view of fulfilling the legal entitlement first of all and then negotiating to try and provide some sort of meaningful economic base. I know it's not an easy thing to do, but it is another way in which it might have been approached.

I realize that the Minister and the government are going to be involved in some negotiations, so it's rather difficult to expect them to put specific positions on the record. But on the other hand I have some difficulty also in understanding how the Minister is going to approach the negotiations if he doesn't have a starting position. Our government at least had set down a number of points in policy form, which to a substantial degree were a continuation of what had been pursued by the Schreyer Government, but they were set down as points, at least, to talk about and a base to begin.

Can the Minister give us an indication of what it is that he and the government are going to take to the table when they sit down?

HON. J. COWAN: Well, to break that set of comments into three distinct areas. Firstly, in regard to the proposal for a more equitable way to settle this question, it is

quite frankly that I had not considered in any detail previously. It does sound as if it is one worth further consideration. I will advise the other parties of the discussions of that proposal, and I'll do so with some enthusiasm when we next meet, which is in a couple of weeks, I believe, or within a couple of weeks. So I'll put that on the table and we'll take a look at it because it is one that I think merits further discussion and it's one that has not been discussed in detail to date.

The second part of the statement involved the fact that the previous government at least put forward a nine-point policy statement to try to create discussions around it. I think perhaps we're doing the same thing in a different way. We're saying, let's create the discussions around the generalities first and develop the policy in a bilateral and tripartite fashion as a result of those generalities, and as a result of a review of those generalities and what seems to be appropriate. So hopefully the end result will be something which is a consensus and satisfactory to all parties. We've tried to do it in as open a way as possible through the Treaty Land Entitlement Commission.

In regard to what we're placing on the table, I am in a difficult position because, as you are aware having been involved in discussions of this sort, things evolve. So what you have to do as part of the process is to leave room within which you can move, so that if something is extremely important to you, you can then move away from something that is less important to you and try to create the consensus in a co-operative fashion. So it's extremely difficult for me to put forward in this format at this time, definitive answers, having not put them on the table with the other two parties. Had the Federal Government and the Treaty Land Entitlement Chiefs put definitive proposals on the table already - it would have to be both of them that did that because a lot of it's bilateral - then I could respond to them but, unfortunately, that has not been the case yet.

I've asked them to sit down and talk about the amount of land which they believe would be appropriate, or the formula which they believe would be appropriate, to calculate the amount of land for entitlement. They haven't presented that to the province yet. A lot of the other parts of the recommendations and policy will depend on that particular document which is of a bilateral nature.

How do you provide for expropriation? Well, one way is to do it in a way in which the nine-point policy did, and that is to say, 99 feet back from the shoreline from the ordinary water mark - 99 feet back - is not available to the Bands. That's one way to do it, and that provides for Hydro expansion primarily.

The other way to do it is to say there are purposes by which the public should have access to that land for bona fide public purposes and there should be an expropriation mechanism that is agreed to, is workable and is acceptable to all the parties. But if you don't have that then certainly you're going to talk about the population figures in a somewhat different way, so it all becomes interlocked.

You know there's a question of land. Do you talk about land that was unoccupied at the time The Natural Resources Transfer Act was signed or do you talk about land that's unoccupied at this time? What's the definition of occupied and unoccupied? Well, obviously

that is going to be in some way affected by how much land you're talking about. So when you build a consensus you have to leave room to shape the formula so that it's acceptable to all the parties. That is why I can't give you a definitive answer. I would like to be able, quite frankly, I'd like to have this done and over with.

I would like to have the policy in place because it will be easier for all of us once that is the case but we're moving as quickly as we can, given the circumstances, we've moved relatively quickly, I think, although it's taken longer than we would have hoped it to have taken. We are still, I think, in the final stages of the development of the policy and I believe we're doing it in the right fashion, the right way for our style.

I can't be more explicit than that. I think it would be unfair, inappropriate and somewhat foolish to address a detail here and to lock ourselves in positions through this debate when one hasn't had the opportunity to hold the full discussions which are necessary to develop the formula which we all want.

MR. B. RANSOM: I'd like to make one thing clear, Mr. Chairman, and that is, I'm not criticizing the Minister or the government for what they're attempting to do. This issue has been outstanding for 100 years and hasn't been settled yet, so some new approaches obviously need to be tried. But I'm trying to make a few suggestions that might be useful and to try and find out what the Minister's position is because there is a concern. I think there are other people involved, there are other Manitobans involved and how are they going to know what the Minister is going to do. Is it going to arrive at a point where it's a fait accompli, that one day the Minister announces we've got a settlement and we've agreed to turn over 800,000 acres to X number of Indian Bands and it may have been selected from under any number of circumstances. So that's a concern that everybody needs to know, as the process develops how it is unfolding.

The question of the 99-foot reserve is something I should just comment on for a minute because it attracted far more attention than, I think, was justified over the years. Unfortunately, it attracted so much attention that we weren't able to concentrate on some of the more significant things.

It really isn't anything different than we apply to anyone else having land. We keep a public reserve along the shoreline and we had settlements at Easterville, for instance, where this wasn't entitlement; this was mitigation. But settlements were made nevertheless where the land was turned over to the Band except for the 99-foot shoreline reserve and that was leased to them. It was never a question of denying the Indian people access to the land or that they wouldn't be able to build upon it, but the actual title of it was to remain, as has been the case in some situations, and I don't think it's provided any problem.

The question of expropriation always was a very crucial one and it could be that the present system that's recommended in here might be workable. I am not exactly sure in detail how the Federal Government has ever applied that particular section of The Indian Act previously, that allowed for expropriation. But I certainly always felt that if there was a process in place

that the government could get land if and when it was needed, then that would make it much better and much easier to turn over substantial amounts of land.

Just a couple of other points then, if the Minister can give me an indication of how he plans to deal with the question of water power reserves because there are water power reserves all over the North that do seem to create some difficulties. Can he give us any indication of an acreage formula that he might be using? Can he give us an indication of the comparative acreages under the nine points that we were using, the date of application for survey as opposed to the recommendation of Mr. Mitchell?

HON. J. COWAN: I'm sorry if I sounded a bit defensive before. I'm not defensive about it and I certainly didn't want to leave the impression that the Member for Turtle Mountain was attacking either the process or the conversation. But it's something which I think is extremely important to all the people of the province, whether it be Treaty or non-Treaty, and it's something which is taking a great deal of time to work out in a proper fashion.

I don't want to comment on what specific entitlement formula would be acceptable to the government. Let me make it clear that it's acceptable to the government, this is a government decision, not the decision of any one individual, just as I'm certain the nine-point policy was the decision of the government, not the decision of any one individual, although it certainly is my responsibility to make recommendations to the government to provide for discussions.

The reason I don't want to talk about a specific formula is, as I indicated before, because we are involved in discussions which are fluid. The Member for Turtle Mountain just said, why don't you think about this, first, survey and some sort of economic development that coincides with that to try to work out some of the inequities that could be provided to Bands that already have their full entitlements. I indicated that is something we hadn't discussed; something which I think merits further discussion and consideration; and I indicated that I would bring it to the table with some enthusiasm; but if I were to indicate right now that I had in my mind - which I don't - a preconceived formula as to Treaty Land Entitlement then it would be difficult for me to bring that to the table. So I'm certain you recognize that.

But I do want to be clear on the principles. One is, that there be an agreement, a policy, you can call it whatever you want, but that it's in the form of an agreement; that quantum is bilateral but we will certainly provide whatever assistance we can, such as the suggestion which was just brought forward or a feeling of concern if those bilateral discussions come forward with something which concerns us.

We also insist that there must be a way to re-acquire that land for bona fide public purpose and that would address the water power reserves, that would be part of that formula and you can do that in a number of ways. We're hoping to get an expropriation mechanism that works. We're looking at what Mitchell recommended; we're testing it; we're also looking at other options which are being brought forward and testing them. But in the end the principle is, that it

must provide for a way by which the province can reacquire that land for bona fide public purpose, that is the bottom line. So that is a principle which we feel very strongly about.

We also feel very strongly, as do the Treaty Indian people and the Federal Government according to every conversation I've had with them, that the rights of current users be protected. We're not exactly certain how that's done yet, but those lands that are currently being used be protected so that we don't create new injustices.

We're also discussing economic development in respect to Bands where lands can't get entitlement because all the land around them is being currently used and you don't want to create those sorts of injustices. That, again, is something we believe the Federal Government should be discussing directly with the Treaty Indian People. We believe it is their obligation, their responsibility, but we sit in on the general discussions and then they go off and have their bilateral discussions on those things.

What we have indicated to them is we know that there are bilateral concerns. All we want to do is be informed of the fact that you're having the discussions, not what you're discussing, and be informed of your decisions, just as has always been the case with validation; that's a bilateral concern. The Federal Government informs us when they're reviewing a validation claim and they inform us when they've made a decision on a validation claim. So we consider bilateralism to be of that sort.

Those are the principles; I hope I am not being too vague. I am trying to be as explicit and detailed as I can given in the circumstances. I will try to answer other specific questions. One of course was, do you use the date of The Natural Resources Transfer Act as a date by which you judge whether land was occupied or unoccupied. As a province, we are currently doing a survey, or attempting to do a survey, as to what was occupied then, what's unoccupied now, what would be the effect of using either one of those formulas. What is unoccupied versus occupied? There is a whole long list of definitions that looks like a regulation in some ways of occupied Crown land. Do we use that list; do we have to develop a new list?

Those are questions that have to be addressed. We are addressing all of them over a period of time and we're doing so in, I hope, as flexible a way as we can without rejecting those basic principles which we feel are important.

So I hope that answers that part of your question. In respect to shortfall entitlements, outstanding shortfall entitlements. If one was to use a formula that was being used, in regard to population of data first survey times entitlement per Treaty - I will give you the validated figures first, and then I will give you the validated plus under review figures, because there are some that are under review by the Federal Government not validated. The validated figures would be 76,894 acres. If one uses the Treaty formula, and by that, December 31, 1980 population, that's the formula that some would suggest was the Treaty formula, perhaps it's misnomer, but to use that formula, 1980 population, you would be talking about 611,914 acres. If you use the Saskatchewan formula, which is December 31st, 1976, you would have a figure of 525,087.3; that's validated.

Now, under review, and I am combining the two now, the first would be 80,340; the second would be 878,002; and the third would be 723,603.4.

I think the point has to be made, as well, that even using the largest number there you're still talking about less than 1 percent of the mass of the land in the province, although it is a large figure, granted. I think it has to be put into that perspective, as well.

So I hope I've answered your questions to your satisfaction. If not, I'll try to provide as much detail as I think is possible, given the circumstances that we're still involved in negotiations.

MR. B. RANSOM: I have one concern, Mr. Chairman. The Minister's approach to the bilateral nature of determining the entitlements. Clearly the province has an obligation, under The Natural Resources Transfer Act, but that obligation is by no means clear; there is no piece of land that has any sort of specific caveat against it. That land belongs to all Manitobans and I would hope that the Minister isn't simply going to sit back and say, it's up to you, go ahead, it's bilateral; let us know when you're done and we'll turn over land that belongs to all Manitobans, providing it is reasonable. By that time it may well be too late.

The Minister may just have to be involved a little more in this than simply sitting back because, while everybody wants to see this just and equitable settlement, there are also other interests that have to be looked after at the provincial level, as well. I suppose there is also a selfish factor, from the provincial point of view, that if the province was to pursue the suggestion that I had made earlier of settling at minimum levels to fulfil the Federal Government's obligation, and then the province proceeds to negotiate on the basis to provide an economic base, then it's the province that then is dealing with the Indian People and working with them in a constructive way. So the Minister probably can see how that could well work to the benefit of the province and of the Indian People, as well.

Just one final word from me, Mr. Chairman, on this, having to do with the expropriation issue. I know that Mr. Mitchell has used the word "bona fide" requirements and the Minister has used that, as well. I just want to have it on the record and to stress that I would not want to see the government expropriate land from anybody without having a bona fide reason. That's one reason why I would like to see property rights entrenched in the constitution of the country because the government should not be able to expropriate land from anybody without just reason for doing so and without having a process of hearing and appeal and such.

So, I don't see that this is any different than expropriating land from anybody else. I would hope the government would not be trying to take land from an Indian Band anymore than they would try and take it from anybody else, except for bona fide purposes.

HON. J. COWAN: I didn't mean to imply, by referencing bona fide in this circumstance, that we would not be applying the same principles to other expropriation. I can't speak for Mr. Mitchell, but I would assume that because he was looking at the expropriate mechanisms that exist for other types of land he may have just picked up the language that's used there as well.

So, I appreciate the comments which the Member for Turtle Mountain has made. I will, in fact, ensure that recommendation, as a matter of fact, I'll probably do it the easy way and give a copy of the Hansard to the committee for their review, but I will present it in an enthusiastic way as something which I believe merits some detailed consideration and further discussion. I'll use the Hansard to make certain that it's an accurate reflection of his comments, but not to disassociate myself from them, just to make certain that his words are being addressed properly and we'll discuss it, and I hope to be able to get back to him within a number of months, as we tend to finalize the process and carry on the discussions.

I value the way in which he's approached the subject, the comments and the criticisms and the suggestions which he's provided to us. I think they've been helpful and, if I might just in a very general way say for the record, that throughout this process all the parties, whether they be parties with interests in respect to land and the use of land, whether it be municipalities, or mining companies, or wildlife federations, or the Treaty Indian groups, or the Federal Government, or the Provincial Government, have approached this in a constructive manner. The comments we've had tonight, I think have been extremely constructive and I know they will help the process. I think by doing that we will be able to accomplish that consensus that provides for a fair and equitable settlement, and I know the words are somewhat vague at this point, but do so in a way that is productive for all the province.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I wonder if the Minister could indicate what other activities will be anticipated in this area for the coming year with respect to Surveys and Mapping and also - this is the area that the Neyanun Corporation - I would like to know what activities that corporation is undertaking at the present time.

HON. J. COWAN: I'll answer the second - well, actually, I'll answer all of them. That's under the Northern Flood Agreement, which is Vote 4.(b)(3), but let me discuss them now. Basically, the Northern Flood Agreement last year was an adjusted vote of \$712,800.00; this year a request of \$722,000, for an increase of \$9,200, or 1.3 percent.

Let me give you the general figures in respect to the Expenditure detail. Again, I use adjusted vote '82-83 as a base and I'll reference this year's figures to it: Land Exchange, \$30,000 in each year; Surveys and Mapping, \$275,000 last year, \$145,000 this year; Geo-Technical Surveys, \$22,000 last year, \$10,000 this year; Arbitrator Expenses, \$125,000 last year, \$50,000 this year. Moose Monitory . . .

A MEMBER: What is a Moose Monitory?

HON. J. COWAN: What is a Moose Monitory? Oh, a Moose Monitory is a moose monitoring. You have to see my book to understand why I was thrown off by that. There is a typographical error there, but at any rate we weren't doing much last year. There was no cost, but it's \$50,000 this year. The Wildlife Advisory and Planning Board was \$117,000 last year, it is \$30,000 this year; Community Liaison, \$43,000 last year, \$28,000

this year - that's a committee; Employment Task Force, \$59,000 last year, \$29,000 this year; Agreement Co-ordination, \$20,000 last year, \$25,000 this year; Claims, Legal Counsel, \$20,000 last year, it's expected to be \$25,000 this year; Cross Lake Impact Study, which is a claim that we're addressing, \$50,000; Cross Lake Area Training, which we've talked about is \$90,000 - or perhaps we haven't. That is the arena, so we have talked about that. Conservation Officer Training, \$80,000; Hydro Project Compensation Review, \$80,000 and, excuse me, from the Cross Lake Impact Study on down there was no money spent this year and that's new money, so that \$50,000, \$90,000, \$80,000 and \$80,000 is new money. The Neyanun Development Corporation Board was \$1,800 last year and it's nothing this year, so I think it's probably self-sufficient at this stage.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Does the Minister have any indication as to the economic activities that the Neyanun Corporation is presently undertaking?

HON. J. COWAN: Mostly it's been small, individual loans to entrepreneurs but there have been some larger loans under consideration. I'll have to get the detail for you, I don't have it here. But it has, in large part, been individual loans to entrepreneurs in the Northern flood communities.

MR. D. GOURLAY: The only other question I have then, Mr. Chairman, would be under Other Expenditures. Then perhaps we could pass all those items, if that's okay.

I would just wondering the reason for the 63 percent increase in Other Expenditures for this year.

HON. J. COWAN: I have a corrected copy here; let me go through it. Fees were \$23,200 last year, are \$61,100 this year; Facilities and Equipment was \$10,600 last year, \$10,300 this year; Specialized Equipment was \$4,700, now \$7,200; Operating Cost was \$24,400, now \$30,300; Citizen and Other Employee Assistance was \$7,700, now \$10,000; the Treaty Land Entitlement Commission was \$50,000 and is \$50,000; the Communications is a new item at \$12,000 and the Native Affairs Committee of Cabinet is a new item at \$16,000. We addressed some of the communications earlier on, both in the administration part and in the part when we discussed NACC and what we'll be doing with them to assist them in developing a newsletter.

MR. D. GOURLAY: The Communications input covered the NACC Newsletter, additional contribution to that?

HON. J. COWAN: It covers that plus an individual that we may bring on to assist them and to assist the department. I'm not certain exactly how we're going to go yet because we're still involved in discussions with NACC, but we have allowed for a position and whether or not we need to proceed with it will remain to be seen. But it's certainly under active review and we may, in fact, be filling it as the year goes by.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Where would this person be situated, in Winnipeg or some other location?

HON. J. COWAN: As I indicated earlier, there are advantages and disadvantages to any location, so if

they are going to be doing a lot of work with NACC then they would be here because NACC's head offices are here. If they're going to be doing a lot of work just with the department, then they would be here as well, most likely, but they could be in Thompson depending on what final job description we provide for them. But we're in preliminary stages there; we haven't bulletined it. We have not defined a job description primarily because we want to work with the NACC for awhile and see what they can come forward with by way of a proposal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(b)(1)—pass; 4.(b)(2)—pass; 4.(b)(3)—pass; 4.(c)(1) Canada-Manitoba Special ARDA Agreement, Salaries and Wages - the Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: As the Minister indicated in the House at the latter part of last Session, the signing of a new Special ARDA Agreement, I wonder if the Minister could now indicate to us any policy changes with respect to the new agreement as compared to the previous agreement that they had.

HON. J. COWAN: The major policy change is, I think, in the length of the agreement. It was a five-year agreement and it is now a three-year. It was extended to March, 1984, so we didn't get a new five-year agreement, and we discussed some of the difficulties before negotiating with the Federal Government and getting them to make long-term commitments. There wasn't any difficulty in getting them to agree to the extension, but there is a difficulty in getting them to make long-term commitments. That's why we have the sort of arrangement we have.

There is one major policy change as well and that's in regard to the program, Fish Facility Upgrading. The member is aware of the Special ARDA Committee and the role they play in addressing proposals, but also the role they play in addressing general policy. When the negotiations were undertaken they looked at what was happening in ways by which the Agreement could be made better. They wanted a five-year agreement, by the way, but they accepted a three-year extension because they saw the handwriting on the wall in that instance.

They also wanted to allow for fish facility upgrading in the projects. Before they were primarily projects to individuals, fishermen or trappers, and this would provide for infrastructure. So during the 1982-83 financial year the Special ARDA Program, and the Federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Canada Community Development Projects, the Northern Job Creation Program, and Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation, have worked together to replace or repair 20 fish holding facilities located on isolated Northern Manitoba lakes; four remote community fish collecting stations; and 14 major fish sorting and packing stations.

Special ARDA, to date, has provided \$362,359 toward the cost of materials for those facilities; and \$143,688 toward the cost of improving road access. We hope that the facilities will enable 1,000 fishermen to earn higher incomes from their livelihood and that's the intention. By the way, that \$143,000-some-odd went toward hydro power installation to these facilities, as well, and transportation.

The difference is that previous to '82 they identified and concentrated on individual assistance; they're still doing that, but they're also spending some of the money on this upgrading and replacement of fish facilities; that's the major policy change.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Is there any provincial dollars involved in the upgrading of the fish stations in co-operation with the Special ARDA federal dollar input?

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, there was. Yes, through the Northern Job Creation Program, there's been assistance with Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation, as well, and Canada Community Development, so it's a matter of taking a lot of money and putting it into a pool and using it for the provision of these facilities.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I'm wondering about the Special ARDA Program itself. As I understand, previously there was no provincial dollars involved in that program, as far as Capital structures, say, the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation structures. I know that when the Minister was the critic, in the previous administration, he had some concerns about we were not concerning ourselves with these fish plants. We were looking at the new Special ARDA Agreement, and that maybe we could tie in with the federal people to upgrade some of these fish stations.

Now the Minister is saying that there has been some provincial dollars go into those areas, but through a different program. Is this what he's saying, and that Special ARDA has not changed, there'll be no policy change as far as input of provincial dollars through that avenue?

MR. D. BLAKE: Remember those little speeches, Jay?

HON. J. COWAN: I certainly do remember the speeches, but I'm not certain I understand the question in the context of the speeches.

There is, in fact, provincial money involved and that was a policy change which I addressed. It appears as if the work which the member indicated started some time ago came to a successful conclusion.

We have also involved ourselves, as a department and as a government, in assisting in the construction through the use of job creation money for labour, but also the Special ARDA is providing Capital dollars.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(c)(1)—pass; 4.(c)(2)—pass.

Resolution No. 132: Resolve that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,785,400 for Northern Affairs, Agreements, Management and Co-ordination for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984—pass.

Item 5.(a), Communities Economic Development Fund.

The Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Yes, the Minister had indicated that there had been some policy changes with respect to CEDF during the past year. I wonder if he could supply us with the changes that have taken place in the CEDF?

HON. J. COWAN: Firstly, I want to indicate that this will be in committee on Thursday, as well, for the

detailed examination of the dollars and the loans, but the general policy changes can most appropriately be addressed here, as well.

There was a revised policy approved by Cabinet on January 12 of this year. That was a policy brought forward by the Board of Directors of the Communities Economic Development Fund in consultation with others.

The major areas of policy where there was a change is the restriction on the geographic location of businesses to be established was lifted. The Fund continues to place emphasis on economic development in Northern Manitoba.

Under the new policy Indians of Treaty status may apply to the Fund with no restrictions. We felt that was necessary, by way of principle, but also by way of the Charter of Rights and the concerns we had regarding that. So for both reasons that change was made.

The Board also became responsible for applications up to \$150,000.00. Their responsibility is to make recommendations to the Minister for loans exceeding that amount. As you are aware the previous level was \$75,000.00.

The final major area of policy change was that the Chairperson or the General Manager of the Fund could consider applications up to \$25,000, as compared to a previous level of \$10,000.00.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I wonder if the Minister could elaborate further on the applications from Treaty Indians located on reservations.

HON. J. COWAN: There has been an area of concern because of the inability sometimes to go in and collect bad debts on a reserve. Bad debts happen all over the place and usually you can go in and seize the equipment or seize the assets. Of course, with the status of reserve land, and the special nature of reserve, that sometimes was not possible. So there was, in the past, an exclusion as to Treaty Indians being able to apply to the Fund with no restrictions; there were certain restrictions that had to be met. We felt that exclusion was counterproductive to the Charter, firstly; and secondly, that we could deal with the difficulties in other ways.

When we discuss any loan application - by we, I mean the Board of Directors; there is certainly, in this area, getting direction from the government as a whole - one of the things that they must discuss, as a loaning authority, is the ways by which they can recover their losses if, in fact, the loan does not come out the way in which they had anticipated it would. If the business fails; if the individual fails; if for some reason the loan payments aren't being made, how do they go in and get the assets back to cover as much as possible the loss on the loan? That is something that is discussed in respect to all loans applications; the equity of the loan and how to get that equity out if you have to.

We felt that if it were acknowledged that there is difficulty in obtaining equity, in respect to Treaty Indian operations on Treaty land, that would be one of the basic factors that the Board would consider in regard to making that application. You don't, in regard to discussing that application. You don't approve applications where you feel there is very little possibility of obtaining your equity if, in fact, the applicant for the loan should fail for some reason or another. We felt it

would be considered in the normal course of the discussions anyway.

Let me give you another example. If I want to start a business, I want to go to the loan fund. I want to get \$100,000 and I can offer them \$50,000 equity and show them how they can get the other \$50,000 out of the materials I'm going to purchase, that's a fail-safe loan in a lot of ways. They can get that money back and I will get that loan much faster than if I go to them and say I need \$100,000, \$50,000 of it's for operating - so there's no equity there, it's for salaries and other things - and I'm only able to put \$10,000 equity of my own into the loan, I'm not going to get that loan as fast. So the fact that equity was not accessible to the loan fund or to the board, if in fact the loan went bad, would indicate that I would have a harder time getting a loan from them. So we feel the normal considerations which are given to equity and the options of getting assets back in case of a business failure would provide enough protection in this particular instance.

We also said that, where possible, there should be an agreement reached with the Chief-in-Council or another responsible body where a loan is being made on a reserve, so that in fact they would not be fighting in the efforts on part of CDF to go in and recover assets. If those things are done or if the equity is provided for in other ways there was no reason to have that restriction in there. It's just a part of the general operating procedures and it doesn't provide for any different approach to Treaty Indian people than it does to anyone else. We felt it was a fair way to put it and also it was a way that did address the issue of the Charter of Rights.

MR. D. GOURLAY: How many applications have been approved to date from Treaty Indians on reservations?

HON. J. COWAN: I can either get the material for you and get it back to you or we can go through it on Thursday at 10 o'clock when - I believe CDF is first stop, is it not? Well, we go through Moose Lake and Channel Area Loggers and then CDF, so it might not be on Thursday, but I'd certainly be prepared to have that information available to you at the committee hearings or I can get it and bring it back here, whichever you prefer.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I think that's fair enough. We will be discussing it in more detail, other details of CDF, so that whether it be this Thursday or whether it be sometime later, that's fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 5(a)—pass.

Resolution No. 133: Resolve that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$161,000 for Northern Affairs, Communities Economic Development Fund for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984—pass.

Item 6. Northern Development Agreement - the Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I wonder if the Minister could just explain this item.

HON. J. COWAN: This figure represents the cost-shared current programming for the following departments. I'll

give you the department, the program and the amount of money. Agriculture, and the program is 4-H North, for a total of \$133,800; Education, the programs are BUNTEP and ACCESS, for a total of \$6,693,000. BUNTEP is \$3,396,600; ACCESS is \$3,296,400. Labour and Employment Services, Career Travel \$105,300; New Careers \$1,763,300; Employment Services \$1,157,000; Youth Core \$459,900, for a total of \$3,485,500.00. Do you understand that? I get thrown by these big figures all the time.

Northern Affairs Department is providing the Fire Training for a total of \$178,000; the grand total is \$10,070,600, of which some is the Enabling Vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 6.—pass.

Resolution No. 134: Resolve that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$8,392,200 for Northern Affairs. Northern Development Agreement - Canada-Manitoba, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984—pass.

Item 7.(a)(1) Expenditures Related To Capital Assets, Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets - Northern Development Agreement - Canada-Manitoba, (1) Northern Affairs - the Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I wonder if the Minister can supply us with a list of projects under this item.

HON. J. COWAN: There is some difficulty in identifying each project, as you are aware, by amount because we're still discussing with the communities what the projects will cost, and we're trying to get the best deal possible. But I can go through the different global categories and I'd be prepared to share with you the more specific information on the agreement, that it would not go out of the Chambers, so as to preclude public tendering from being done in an effective way or discussion in the communities being undertaken in an effective way. I can do that if you wish, but I think I can give the global figures at this time.

The adjusted vote for '82-83, and that includes the Enabling Vote, was \$4,890,200; the '83-84 request is \$5,330,200; the increase in that instance is \$440,000 at 9 percent. You see, I got all those big figures, so I must be getting better.

It breaks down into the following categories, and again I'll give you '82-83 first and '83-84 requested second. Roads \$571,500, request for this year \$573,700; Water-Sewer, last year, \$2,065,000, this year \$2,292,000; Recreation \$80,500 last year, \$161,000 this year; Equipment Acquisition \$148,700 last year, \$52,600 this year; Waste Disposal \$189,000 last year, \$199,000 this year. Buildings \$760,500 last year, \$1,102,000 this year; Docks \$26,500 last year, \$53,000 this year; Subdivisions \$185,000 last year, \$79,000 this year; Survey and Land Acquisition \$127,500 last year, \$35,000 this year; Fire Programs \$736,000 last year, \$294,500 this year; Line Power \$458,400; Miscellaneous \$30,000, and those last two didn't have any amounts for them as of last year.

Do you wish the detailed information by region, which I can give to you if you feel it's necessary?

MR. D. GOURLAY: Yes, that might be useful. I'm really not that interested in the amounts right now, but just the different regions, types of projects.

HON. J. COWAN: The Dauphin area for all those is \$332,400; the Selkirk area is \$2,374,800 and that's the east side, of course, above Selkirk: The Pas area is \$483,100; and the Thompson area is \$2,139,900; and that breaks down pretty much on the basis of those projects that are needed in those communities at this time in their development; so one year that may change region by region in a significant way but it averages out over a long period on the trend line.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Is the department building any roads this year for resource development into any forested areas or any projects where roads might be required for economic development projects?

HON. J. COWAN: This is basically internal roads as it always has been but there may be activities that are undertaken under the Northern Development Agreement or under Job Creation Program, but they're not provided for in this figure. This is basically those internal roads which have to be maintained and serviced.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 7.(a)(1)—pass; 7.(a)(2) - the Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I wonder if the Minister could give us some detail as to the capital asset costs in reference to other departments.

HON. J. COWAN: I missed the question in trying to find my place in the book. Could the member repeat it?

MR. D. GOURLAY: Under Item 7.(a)(2), it indicates the list of Other Departments. I wonder if he could just fill us in on that.

HON. J. COWAN: This figure represents cost-shared capital programs from the Department of Highways relating to airstrip development and internal roads at Norway House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 7.(1)(2)—pass.

Resolution No. 135: Resolve that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$5,041,800 for Northern Affairs, expenditures related to Capital Assets for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984—pass.

Item 1.(a) - the Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Perhaps we could rise at this point I'm not sure whether there's any other members that are involved in the other committee may like to — (Interjection) — Okay, we could check if you don't mind waiting for a moment. I guess we can proceed and finish it up.

I don't really have much further to add other than I think it'll be interesting to see how the new development turns out and we'll certainly be watching it with interest, the new input from the federal interests.

I think in my comments at the start of the Estimates for the Minister of Northern Affairs, I indicated that what a change a year and one-half makes and that the critic of the former administration, I think, did his job well as far as criticizing the government of the day that

we weren't doing enough with respect to the Department of Northern Affairs and the various Northern committees and I accept that.

We worked at the job and tried to make improvements wherever possible and we did expend quite a few dollars of provincial money as well as federal money and it was pointed out here earlier tonight that the flow of provincial dollars is down somewhat from the previous years. I think, on the average we are running somewhere from \$9 million to \$11 million on the average and this year, I think the Minister indicated that it would be something in the area of \$7 million.

Certainly, I think it is disappointing that the Agreement with the federal people wouldn't have included many of the types of projects that the Northerners had requested through infrastructure in roads and development into the opening up many of the Northern communities, especially along the east side of Manitoba.

However, we have to give the current government credit for getting the Agreement signed and in place and, as I indicated earlier, we'll be watching with interest the developments as they take place and certainly we'll be reviewing the Estimates a year from now and we'll probably have many more comments to make at that time.

An item that I had wanted to raise earlier and I missed out on it - I notice that the letterhead that the Minister is using now contains English as well as some other language and I presume it's Cree but I'm not sure, or maybe it's a combination of different Indian symbols. Perhaps the Minister would want to comment on that and also whether how much extra this logo will be costing the Department of Northern Affairs?

HON. J. COWAN: The writing is in both English and in Cree syllabics. I can't indicate how much extra it would cost except that the cost would be that of translation, and since it's not a major document that's being translated - it's only "Minister of Northern Affairs" that's being translated - it would probably not be that much. We may have even got it gratis I don't know, but I can find out.

What it means, if I understand the language correctly, is the Oguma who travels a lot, the Oguma in the Cree language being translated roughly into, "The boss who thinks he is a boss but he really isn't a boss," or in short form, "the phony boss," that's my understanding of the translation, at least that's what they tell me, so I have to accept it not knowing the language myself. But I could find out the cost. I would not expect it to be significant. I can tell you it was a lot of work getting the translation done and I only hope it says that which we anticipated it to say.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Do all Indians understand those symbols or is just the Cree Tribe that it would communicate to?

HON. J. COWAN: Well, there is a number of different languages that are spoken by Indian people in the province. The syllabics are more symbolic than anything else. There are very few people who can read syllabics anymore. Syllabics is the written form of High Cree, which was introduced a number of years ago, and it gained some favour for a period of time but has since

fallen out of favour and that's why it was difficult to get it translated. It was difficult because not many people speak it and write it well. A lot of people speak it - excuse me, not many people write it well, so it would primarily be the older individuals that would find it valuable to them. However, if they couldn't read the writing above it, then the letter wouldn't be of much value to them.

We haven't gone to the extent of getting our letters translated into syllabics, although we do have some documents translated into syllabics, and especially where we're going to be dealing with the more remote communities and communities where there's a large population of older individuals of elders. We do it as much out of respect as we do it out of communication needs. That would be the same way by which we put the syllabics on the letterhead. It's out of respect and deference for the language. It's symbolic more than functional, but we believe that symbolism is valuable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(a) - Mr. Minister.

HON. J. COWAN: If I can just make a few brief comments. I want to thank the members opposite for the constructive way by which the Estimates have proceeded. There have been some good suggestions, which I have indicated I will carry forward to other parties, whether it be within my own department or outside of my department in respect to different programs and proposals. There are always going to be areas where we disagree, sometimes more emphatically than other times, but there are always areas as well where we find agreement under unusual circumstances.

I think one instance is the Northern Development Agreement. We disagree as to perhaps the overall value of it. I have a vested interest in promoting it, having been one of the negotiators of it, and I think that it is valuable. At the same time, we both agree that it could be a much better agreement if it had been differently negotiated. I indicate if it were up to the province alone, we would have made that changes, many of the changes that have been recommended by the members opposite, although not all of them.

So I think in this set of Estimates it's been a productive experience for myself. I think we have sought out areas of consensus as much as possible. I think we've identified areas where we disagree, and I think we've made a determination to take a look at things which we can't comment on right now in a definitive way over a period of time. We will carry on those discussions as the opportunity presents itself in future years.

I hope that the members opposite have found the way by which we have approached these Estimates to be satisfactory to them and helpful to them in their role as opposition at the same time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(a)—pass.

Resolution 129: Resolve that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$320,100 for Northern Affairs, Executive, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984—pass.

Committee rise.